

oric may be," he said, they are "in the final analysis the same." He also emphasized the "ideological struggle in the party" after the death of Lenin, saying that the "main causes" of the struggle, its "factors" and "relations" are "highly in-structive" for today.

This string of Stalinist statements reflects the fact that Gorbachov, under growing pressure, has been forced to "ride the Stalinist tiger," as one source expressed it. That is the only way in which he can hope to ultimately prevail in the factional brawl.

The fact is, Gorbachov was forced to *sacrifice* Yeltsin. He candidly admitted on Nov. 11 that the fight against Yeltsin had begun before the January 1987 plenum. This raises the simple question, why was Yeltsin not removed at either the January or the June Central Committee plenum? The answer is that Gorbachov wanted him and was able to keep him. By October, that was no longer the case.

Where things in Russia go from here is an open question. But the short period which has seen the publication of the LaRouche letter, the removal of Aliyev and Yeltsin, and the emergence of the military leadership with its own clear—and differing—"voice," is a foretaste of more momentous upheavals to come.

Documentation

The LaRouche letter and Soviet comments

Below is the full original text of a letter by Lyndon LaRouche, Jr. to the editor of the Soviet magazine International Affairs, together with the magazine's introductory commentary and reply, which were all published in the English-language edition No. 10, 1987. The same material had been published in the Russian edition No. 9, three weeks earlier.

The introductory commentary

"Some time ago, *International Affairs* received a letter from the United States written by a Mr. Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr., founder of a so-called European Workers' Party, which was mentioned in an article by one of our contributors. The letter rudely attacks the author of the article and the journal; what is more, its writer has sued them in a Paris high court. Had it only been a question of Mr. LaRouche's squabble with the journal, his letter would not really have been worthy of note. But he touches on some fundamental realities of today, and we therefore print the full text of his letter and our answer to it."

The letter

Following is the original text of the letter, dated April 12, 1987, from Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr. to the editors of Moscow's International Affairs.

International Affairs

Editorial Office

Attn: Editor English Edition, G.A. Pribegin

14 Gorokhovskiy Pereulok,

Moscow K-16

R.S.F.S.R.

RE: "Neo-Fascism: Weapon of Reaction," No. 3, 1987

Dear Sir:

It is well known that I do not support all of the measures associated with General Secretary Gorbachov. However, I wish to support the General Secretary's campaign against alcoholism. References to me in this item (No. 3, 1987) suggest that Academician Vladimir Pustogarov may have been the victim of drugging with some U.S.-manufactured vodka, perhaps given to him by such an acquaintance as former U.S. Attorney General Ramsey Clark.

In light of the importance of the AIDS pandemic and the eruption of the worst financial collapse in history, there is approximately a 30% likelihood that I shall obtain the 1988 U.S. presidential nomination of my political party, the Democratic Party, and thus be assured of being inaugurated U.S. President in January 1989. Even should I fail to secure my party's nomination, there is a 70-80% likelihood that I shall be a major influence in shaping U.S. domestic and foreign policies.

Academician Pustogarov and others may believe that publishing even the wildest fantasies against me is politically sound practice, since I am classed as a prominent political adversary of the Soviet Union. The academician overlooks the small point, on which Marshal N. Ogarkov might instruct him, that it is the U.S. and U.S.S.R. which are adversaries, and will probably remain so for the span of two generations to come. Since I am an influential voice among those U.S. figures working consistently for a constructive form of durable war-avoidance between our nations, your journal should think it most counterproductive to frighten Soviet children with the imported, obscene fantasies featured in the identified article.

I shall be more precise. Most probably, it will soon be clear to the Soviet government, that its recent and current foreign and strategic policies toward the U.S. and Western European powers are based in part on serious errors of intelligence and strategic estimates. Some influential Soviet authorities have concentrated too much on calculating manifest U.S. strategic capabilities, to the point of overlooking massive U.S. strategic potentialities. These Soviet estimates have relied excessively upon opinions of certain, admittedly very influential, but miscalculating Western political circles.

Russia being Russia, your government will pull away

from what it comes to view as an unrealistic, and probably adventurous outlook. In the language of Leninists, the nature of the current "historical period" has been misjudged. If you read what I have consistently proposed, the correct Soviet estimate of this "historical period" should be apparent to you.

The methodological error in current Soviet estimates, is this. Granted, that I reject the Kantian, Hegelian, and Marxian dialectical method, as a product of axiomatic-deductive method; my own is the contrary Socratic dialectic, whose mathematical guise is consistent with the notion of a Riemann Surface, a Gauss-Riemann manifold as defined from the standpoint of a radically constructive-geometric point of origin. The practical consequence of this distinction, is that current Soviet estimates are too consistent with a Bukharin-like form of reductionism, emphasis upon merely formal logic. You have erred with projected estimates which slide linearly through what physicists would term a "singularity" of the historical process, overlooking the fact, the period opening up now represents a "phase shift," in which the laws apparently peculiar to the preceding interval are overthrown, in which new dynamical relations prevail.

One of the most probable dangers in your misrepresentation of me, is that Academician Pustogarov's view might mislead Soviet authorities into an otherwise avoidable general war, whereas the correct representation would probably ensure successful war-avoidance.

It were prudent, to base even the harshest Soviet political criticisms of me upon the consistency of my published analyses and proposals with my actions, and to discard wild fantasies produced by Western agencies which are, in your own correct estimate of their character, either merely "useful fools" or outrightly degenerates.

In the meanwhile, if you wish to discover "neo-fascists" in the West, I recommend to your attention those social-democratic and other currents, in Western Europe and the U.S.A., former Livonians familiar to you, and others, who, increasingly since 1974, have openly and repeatedly described themselves as "neo-corporativists," or proponents of corporativist forms of "democratic fascism" or "fascism with a smiling face." These who propose to bring together major political parties, into coalitions dedicated to creating "one-party corporate state" forms, ought to interest you. These are genuine fascists, who, if ever entrenched, will behave as fascists do. These real fascists include the Western sources from which much of the content of the article was taken.

Sincerely,

Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.

International Affairs' response

What follows is the Soviet editors' reply to the letter from Mr. LaRouche:

It was not immediately that *International Affairs* decided to reprint the full text of the letter from Mr. Lyndon H LaRouche, Jr., concerning the article "Neo-Fascism: Weapon of Reaction" contributed by Vladimir Pustogarov, D, Sc

(Law) (see issue No. 2 of the Russian and No. 3 of the English Edition). This was not due to fear of making Mr. LaRouche's attacks public but to the harsh discordance of his letter from the general tenor and the political and analytic standard of the items carried by our journal. To be frank, we are not upset by Mr. LaRouche's sententious allegation that the "foreign and strategic policies" of the Soviet government toward the United States and its NATO allies are based on "unrealistic and probably adventurous" views. Neither attacks against Soviet foreign policy nor slanderous inventions about it surprise the Soviet or Western reader. Many of them are so frequent and importunately repetitious as to have become worn out stereotypes. Mr. LaRouche is anything but original in assailing Soviet policy, nor is he the only one to do so. There is nothing original about his assertion that the CPSU leadership has an incorrect outlook on historical development or about his advice to take from him lessons on how to forecast the future. All this is very like the time-worn prophecies of those who for 70 years past have been foretelling in vain disasters said to be impending over Soviet Russia. Nor are we overly surprised at Mr. LaRouche's very high opinion of his chances in the coming U.S. presidential elections, any more than at his confidence that he will be "a major influence in shaping U.S. domestic and foreign policies." To put it mildly, he is not the first man to somewhat exaggerate his role in history, in shaping the fate of the world. However, it may well be that neither the White House nor the American press, nor yet the American public has had time to realize in proper measure that he is going to be "a major influence."

We think Mr. LaRouche's strong language against the Western media is something more serious, *International Affairs* has repeatedly taken exception to the unscrupulous means used by individual Western journalists and commentators, to foreign TV and press comments prompted by anti-Soviet sentiment and slander. Nevertheless, we are far from calling Western media people "degenerates" [sic] as Mr. LaRouche does, and so there was some vacillation about printing his invectives in the journal.

There is also Mr. LaRouche's attack against former U.S. Attorney General Ramsey Clark (whose name did not appear in the *International Affairs* article): The author of the article assured the editors of the journal that as a lawyer he knew who Clark was but had never met him. Therefore he—Vladimir Pustogarov—could not have been treated by Ramsey Clark to "U.S.-made vodka" [sic] with evil intent against Mr. LaRouche (contrary to what the letter says).

And what are we to make of "Riemann Surface, a Gauss-Riemann manifold," ideas which the letter considers decisive for the development of civilization? Besides, we wonder what our readers, including those of the English Edition, will say to Mr. LaRouche's suggestion that universally accepted political analysis be replaced by a formalistic search for "radically constructive-geometric point of origin."

The main reason we decided, in spite of everything, to publish the full text of the letter was that the European Work-

ers' Party (EWP) founded by the American Lyndon LaRouche enjoys support among certain political forces in some European countries. This is also seen in the fact this numerically insignificant organization has filed suits in France against the Soviet weekly *New Times*, *International Affairs* magazine and *XX Century and Peace*, a news bulletin published by the Soviet Peace Committee. We may infer from this that the EWP is not hard up or is, at any rate, undeterred by legal expenses.

Incidentally, the U.S. and other Western media have repeatedly laid bare illegal financial deals by Mr. LaRouche and his organizations. Last year, the First Fidelity Bank of New Jersey, U.S.A., sued Mr. LaRouche and the networks of organizations led by him for using fraudulent means to secure large sums of money. This was done in a federal court. And on July 3 last, CBS reported that Mr. LaRouche was charged with conspiring to prevent a federal investigation into the use by his organization of fraudulent methods of raising funds. (Who knows whether Mr. LaRouche will not seize even on this mention of the U.S. television report as a sufficient reason for lodging a further claim in court.)

We have the impression that Mr. LaRouche's court action against several Soviet and foreign periodicals is designed to advertise him and the EWP led by him, not least of all in the light of his declared intention to run for the U.S. presidency. At the same time, we cannot help thinking that Mr. LaRouche is trying to raise a high wall around his organization in order to shut out all criticisms of it and discourage journalists from commenting in a critical vein on the political platform of the EWP.

Both Mr. LaRouche's letter and the EWP lawsuit indicate that they are protection against Vladimir Pustogarov's article describing them as members of the extreme, neo-fascist right. Yet the article gave the EWP and Mr. LaRouche rather little space (nor did it even mention that party's activity in France), and so there is simply no reason to deduce that the author regards Mr. LaRouche as "a prominent political adversary of the Soviet Union." Neither the actual influence of the EWP nor the size of the article allowed the author to detail the programme advanced by Mr. LaRouche and the EWP.

It should be stressed that the article in *International Affairs*, a journal of political analysis, was devoted to analyzing political processes going on in today's world, and its author did not resort to the kind of abusive definitions Mr. LaRouche used in his letter. At the same time, there was a thesis running through the article, and Mr. LaRouche mentions it, to the effect that neo-fascism is dangerous, not only to the democratic system in individual countries, but to international peace and security. The outbreaks of neo-fascist activity now in evidence in a whole number of countries are another reason for our printing Mr. LaRouche's letter.

The letter calls the very existence of neo-fascism a "wild fantasy" misleading political leaders. There is nothing new about their allegation, which comes, to judge by many facts, primarily from extreme right-wingers who either form neo-

fascist groups or are linked with them. Of course, Mr. LaRouche is by no means the only person to deny the existence of neo-fascism. But neither was the *International Affairs* article an isolated item. Its trend coincided with the general concern shown by a large body of world opinion about the neo-fascist menace. The U.N. General Assembly has repeatedly called on the member countries to take steps to combat neo-fascist ideology and activity as well as other ideologies and practices based on racial intolerance, hatred and terrorism.

The Social Democrats, the trade unions associated with them, many other Western political parties and public organizations and the media draw attention to the dangerous nature of the activity of neo-fascist, right-wing radical and right-wing extremist groups. The article referred to, among other things, an assessment of the activity of the EWP by *Vorwaerts*, the West German social democratic weekly, which described the EWP as an "anti-democratic, anti-Semitic, racist and anti-trade union" organization. Nobody can dismiss this assessment, based on direct experience of EWP activity on the West German political scene, as a "wild fantasy."

Mr. LaRouche believes that if there are any "genuine neo-fascists" now, one should look for them in social democratic parties and in the media which expose neo-fascism. This invites the conclusion that Mr. LaRouche and the EWP are champions of peace and democracy while the social democratic parties are a source of fascist danger. Nor is such a conclusion seen by Mr. LaRouche as a "wild fantasy." We are not going in this case to defend the social democratic parties against his attacks, but neither can we fail to note universally recognized realities: It was not the social democratic movement that bred neo-fascism, nor are the neo-fascist groups recruited from Social Democrats.

Mr. LaRouche's attempts to turn these realities upside down cannot detract in the least from well-known historical facts; they merely reflect his political views and affections. Also, they are unquestionably consonant with the malicious attacks which the extreme right in Western Europe constantly launches against the working class movement and democratic institutions, parties and organizations. These attacks are intended to produce a definite effect primarily on the attitudes of the youth who have not lived through the horrors of fascist rule and lack personal experience of anti-fascist struggle.

We believe Mr. LaRouche's letter merely confirms the relevance and timeliness of the article on the neo-fascist danger published in *International Affairs*. The purpose of the article was to show that neo-fascism (right-wing radicalism, right-wing extremism, and so on), in whatever form or disguise, remains a threat to democracy and peace among the nations, a threat that must certainly not be ignored. After all, given definite circumstances, the neo-fascist danger in today's world with its nuclear confrontation and unabating military conflicts, a world in which the Reagan administration is pursuing a "neo-globalist" policy, may develop from a potential into a real threat.