

Dignitaries from Austria, Hungary ask that LaRouche be freed

A delegation of international dignitaries spent Sept. 20-24 in Washington, meeting with policymakers to urge that American statesman and political prisoner Lyndon LaRouche be freed, and discussing the political and economic situations in their own countries (see EIR, Oct. 1, p. 58, Oct. 8, p. 63). Below are edited excerpts from the statements of three members of the delegation, from a press conference on Sept. 22 at the National Press Club in Washington.

Austria: Prof. Kurt Ebert

Professor Ebert is an international law expert from Innsbruck, Austria.

I have been observing the case of Lyndon LaRouche for approximately four years. It was at this time, when I was first confronted with the case, when there was a rush to trial in Alexandria, Virginia, and this despite the fact that there had already been one acquittal in the same case by a different court here in the United States.

That means that Lyndon LaRouche has been tried twice; and in the second trial he was then sentenced to 15 years. That's an extraordinary punishment.

Now two lawyers have filed a motion of appeal against the denial of a so-called 2255 motion for a new trial and this had been filed already in January 1992; but it was denied by the *same* judge who had originally sentenced LaRouche and several of his associates. This is a gross violation of the principle of fair trial.

Another gross violation of the principle of fair trial, is the fact that an independent American judge had stated very clearly that in bringing forth involuntary bankruptcy proceedings against organizations and publishing entities associated with Lyndon LaRouche, the government had acted literally in objective bad faith, which is a very grave reproach; and that they had committed "fraud on the court." In my eyes, this is a bad crime committed by a government.

This ruling was affirmed on appeal; but nevertheless, the inevitable consequences were not drawn.

On the contrary, we are facing continued inaction by the Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals, which demonstrates how the pattern of gross violation of due process is being continued, despite the growing wave of internationally proclaimed protest against this procedure. . . .

In the particular case of LaRouche, it's mainly two fundamental human rights: the right to fair trial, with many aspects; and the right not to be treated in a degrading manner and not to suffer degrading and inhuman punishment.

The first aspect, the right to a fair trial, has been violated in many aspects. It started with the rush to trial, it continued with the composition of the jury, with all the influence exerted on the jury, with the press campaign and so on. . . .

There are other aspects in this trial of Lyndon LaRouche which grossly violated the right to a fair trial. I will not go into details because everything has been documented and has been published, and you can read it yourself. The fact is quite evident and it has provoked serious concern all over the world, in particular in Europe, because we have a very advanced legal system and human rights machinery. . . . And now, we [Europeans] are doing the same thing as the United States has done for many decades: We are demanding that human rights be fulfilled, that they be granted to *everybody*, irrespective of race, irrespective of sex, irrespective of political opinions, as in the case of Lyndon LaRouche.

Hungary: Janos Denes

Janos Denes is a member of Parliament of Hungary.

On June 4-5, 1993, the Schiller Institute held a two-day conference in Bonn, Germany with the title "Securing a Lasting Peace in Europe." Members of the Hungarian delegation were: Janos Denes, Member of Parliament; Dr. Tibor Kovats, journalist, economist; Tibor Koch, interpreter. Istvan Morvay, titular undersecretary of state, head of the Refugee Committee of the government, also attended the conference as a guest. . . .

The Schiller Institute is officially registered and licensed and is independent of any political parties. Under the leadership of its chairwoman, Mrs. Helga Zepp-LaRouche, the institute has been engaged since its founding in 1984 not only in literature and the fine arts, but, due to her marriage with the American economist Lyndon LaRouche, whose economic research and warnings for Europe inspired her, it shows an increasing interest in the economic and political factors forming the fortune of central and eastern Europe. The Schiller Institute studies the economic and political analyses published by Lyndon LaRouche as early as 1982. These can

briefly be summarized: "What will happen in Europe if the Russians leave?" He foresaw an economic and political vacuum, nationalist and separatist movements flaring up, improperly prepared international loan activities, the gradual drop of the living standards of the populations of exploited and underdeveloped regions, the crash of the improvement of transport, but above all the implacable rule of the international banking and credit system.

Unfortunately, we are witnesses to all that in the present day.

Through the newly regained independence of Hungary, its citizens make use of their civil rights by presenting different alternatives for international public life and political economy.

We accepted the invitation to the conference in Bonn. We introduced our nation's and the neighboring states' situation. We reviewed other nations' delegates' opinions. We took part in formulating the concluding declaration and signed it after it had been voted upon and accepted. . . .

We thanked chairwoman Helga Zepp-LaRouche for the invitation and acknowledged the Schiller Institute's work in preparing, organizing, and managing the conference. We expressed our hope that, along with her American husband, she would soon visit Hungary. We also expressed our hope for a conference in Hungary, with particular regard to the crisis of this region.

In conclusion I would like to use a quotation about the responsibilities of a journalist: "To inform objectively, to always tell and write the truth and only the truth"—and the media's task in turn is to report this in its full entirety!

Hungary: Dr. Tibor Kovats

Dr. Kovats is a journalist, economist, and member of the Hungarian Association of Former Political Prisoners.

Janos Denes, member of Parliament, my friend and ex-political prison-mate, through his parliamentary activities and recent attendance at the conference in Bonn, gave me a chance to give you an overall picture of the economic difficulties of our close European neighbors, but also of continents far away from us. Allow me to give a short introduction.

On May 15-16 in Bulgaria, on May 22-23 in Zagreb, Croatia, and on May 27-29 in Melbourne, Australia, I took part in international conferences preceding the above-mentioned conference in Bonn. Besides official evaluations, I concluded from talks with Australians and Hungarian people living in Australia that it is no exaggeration to speak of a worldwide economic crisis; inflation is everywhere and unemployment does not spare even a well-organized country never fraught by war, with almost boundless economic potentials, such as Australia.

The delegates of most countries point at the international banking system pursuing a rigid, stubborn financial and credit policy developed during the Cold War, the stiffened and

relentless, by no means "elastic," economic policy of the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund, as the causes of the economic troubles of the world.

It is, however, superfluous to bring up the economic complaints of the Balkan nations, Ukraine, Latvia, or those of Hungarian immigrants in Australia, since it is enough to study the IMF's survey on Hungary.

So that no one can accuse me of being biased, I refer to the answer of a member of the Hungarian Parliament, ex-minister of the Treasury, the communist Laszlo Bekesi, to the question, "How do you rate the principal obtained from the IMF?" published in a Hungarian newspaper. Let me remind you that in spring 1992, the IMF stopped its credit payments to Hungary and that's why current Treasury Minister Ivan Szabo had to achieve a "principal agreement" with the IMF. Mr. Bekesi gave an apt answer, which reads briefly: "First the three-year agreement signed previously cannot be upheld, since the output of the Hungarian economy deviates from the responsibilities assumed there on basic points. These are the budget deficit, the inflation rate, the dimension of the foreign trade and the amount of money in circulation. So the first conclusion is that the three-year agreement failed, it was not fulfilled."

We can fully agree with the latter statement, but we should ask for an eventual revision by the new democratic government of the conditions of the international treaty with the IMF, which was so easily concluded in the communist era, or its inapplicable conditions—in view of the "different output" of the Hungarian economy, *predictably inapplicable*.

In whose interest would a change have been? Of course, in ours. That's why no efforts were made to make a change. They waited until it failed. . . . The same happened in Poland, too.

As is well known among experts, a joint committee of the World Bank and the IMF was in Budapest from March 22 to April 2 of this year. The survey of this committee pointed out that "the majority of the [Hungarian] banks are, according to the internationally accepted accounting standards, technically bankrupt. The Hungarian financial system seems unable to finance the transition into market economy." This should at last be admitted in Hungarian financial circles, too.

The acceleration of the transformation of the economy cannot be achieved: While in 1989-91, bank credits amounted to 34.5% of the total investments of the companies; this rate fell back to 2.9% by 1992, whereas direct loans of the companies from abroad increased rapidly.

Countless evaluations appear day by day about inflation, indebtedness, and economic difficulties in Hungary, but the media are shy to name those political-economic tendencies and programs that are already well-known for experts. It is hard to break through the IMF walls, just as it was with the Berlin Wall. . . . It seems we must wait until it gets knocked down!