

the embarrassment of the U.S. community here, they are totally flabbergasted.”

“... There are narrow-minded people in this world and we have to expect it, but, certainly, it reflects unabashed intervention into local affairs and, unfortunately, he did not even understand what is going on in this country. And, to talk about people power when demonstrations are taking place in Indonesia, where lives were lost, and condoning that?”

“... For heaven’s sake, try to understand what is really going on in this country before you open your mouth and put your big foot into it.”

APEC businessmen react to Gore

As reported by the *New Straits Times* on Nov. 20, Gore’s abrupt departure after his speech, prior to the closing dinner of the APEC Business Advisory Council, was also seen as a slap in the face to the more than 1,100 local and foreign CEOs who underwrote the three-day conference and much of the APEC conference itself.

Former Malaysian government official and Sungei Way Group of Companies corporate adviser **Tan Sri Ramon Navaratnam** could not contain his revulsion when asked by reporters to comment. He described Gore as “*kurang ajar*,” and then translating, said: “I cannot find a more suitable term in English other than bad breeding, arrogance and insensitivity.”

Tan Sri Dr. Noordin Sopiee, chairman of the Institute of Strategic and International Studies, Kuala Lumpur, took out a full-page ad in the leading daily, *New Straits Times*, on Nov. 18, as “A very personal statement”: “As a Malaysian, I am fed up with stupid, ignorant, *kurang ajar* idiots insulting my country. Mr. Gore should not only have left the meeting room immediately after insulting us. He should have got on the plane and left the country. And he should not come back until he has learnt some manners.”

Richard Holwill, co-chairman of the Asian Task Force of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce and International Affairs director of Amway Corp., apologized for Vice President Gore’s Nov. 16 speech, saying it was “ill-informed and indicative of an inexcusable ignorance of the objective facts of the situation here. His interference in an ongoing domestic political and legal dispute was unwarranted and absolutely inappropriate.” Holwill served as U.S. Ambassador to Ecuador during 1988-90. “Most disturbing,” Holwill added, “his decision to make those statements at an international forum where several international statesmen were prepared to discuss important issues, trivialized the power and influence of the U.S. In doing so, the Vice President demonstrated . . . that he is simply unqualified to represent, much less lead, the nation.”

Philip Burdon, co-chairman of the APEC Business Advisory Council: “I question the U.S. Vice President’s judgment in bringing a political debate into an economic forum.”

A Passion For Innovation

Russian editor’s views on publishing LaRouche

by Rachel Douglas

Members of a Schiller Institute delegation that visited Moscow in October noted that the Russian press is still remarkably quiet about the financial crisis abroad. Even after Aug. 17, when Russia was at the epicenter of a global financial earthquake, the media treated it as a “Russian” crisis, not a global and systemic one. An exception is the articles of Prof. Taras Muranivsky in the weekly *Ekonomicheskaya Gazeta*, issued under the editorship of Aleksandr Chekalin, who also puts out the newspaper *Razvitiye*.

Ekonomicheskaya Gazeta was the only Russian publication to publish a translation of Malaysian Prime Minister Dr. Mahathir bin Mohamad’s landmark address to the International Monetary Fund meeting in Hong Kong in September 1997, in which Dr. Mahathir reflected on the deceptions of the “free trade” model underlying the so-called Asian Tiger economies, and called for currency speculation to be banned. From *Ekonomicheskaya Gazeta*, Mahathir’s text came to circulate widely among Russian lawmakers, in the bulletin of the Federation Council staff’s Department of Information and Analysis. Muranivsky’s articles have dealt with the phenomenon of derivatives trading as a new dimension of the global “bubble” economy, the failure of leadership to address the systemic nature of the crisis, including in the new framework of the Group of 22 nations, and Lyndon LaRouche’s New Bretton Woods policy alternative. Most recently, *Ekonomicheskaya Gazeta* carried LaRouche’s eight-point “emergency action program,” written Sept. 27, titled “What Each Among All Nations Must Do Now.”

In the Nov. 5 issue, *Ekonomicheskaya Gazeta* presented the full text of an interview, in which Mr. Chekalin answered questions from Karl-Michael Vitt of the Schiller Institute and Professor Muranivsky. Chekalin explained his attraction to LaRouche’s ideas, as flowing from his education and journalistic career in the Soviet period. “The education I received in the Soviet school system, and then at Moscow University,” he said, “made me be always attracted to things new—to change, which is, if you will, the only constant factor in our life. As a newspaper man, I was in on the ground floor of most of the economic experiments, conducted in

the Soviet Union during its last two decades, before 1991. Innovation was, in general, an organic feature of Soviet life. For that reason, when one of the publications of the Schiller Institute came my way, and it presented LaRouche's ideas, I sought out the representative of this institute in Russia, Dr. Taras Muranivsky. It turned out that he and I had a mutual acquaintance, Pobisk Kuznetsov, who had tried to introduce in the U.S.S.R. a management system based on the 'millionik' [per million] principle. He had even developed a program of this sort for the Moscow region, using physical indicators, for the purpose of precluding the production of superfluous, unnecessary items. Some time later, I wrote an article under the somewhat pretentious headline, 'Kuznetsov Finds a Co-Thinker in an American Prison,' referring to the fact that he had found LaRouche, who was persecuted, in effect, as a dissident. We even published a special appeal to the Congress and the President of the U.S. in defense of this American scientist."

An independent publication

Aleksandr Chekalin and some of his staff were veterans of *Stroitel'naya Gazeta*, a newspaper associated with former Soviet construction industry. He emphasizes the independence of *Ekonomicheskaya Gazeta*, which is published "with only the funds we receive from subscriptions. We have no financial support from banks, Gazproms, state institutions, parties, intelligence services—not directly, not indirectly (through share-holding or advertising). Thank God that we don't. This makes it possible to analyze objectively, without looking over our shoulders at some 'masters,' to analyze and evaluate what is happening with companies, banks, parties, in the country, and in the world at large."

The editor "confesses," as he puts it, that both *Ekonomicheskaya Gazeta* and *Razvitiye* exist "chiefly to provide a breath of oxygen—to allow certain contemporary Russian geniuses to be heard in public," among them the social theorists Andrei Shusharin and Spartak Nikanorov. "Today, we also have in our pages the original views and fresh, constructive ideas of the American economist and politician Lyndon LaRouche, and his Russian associate, Professor Muranivsky."

In politics, Chekalin calls himself a communist, referring to ideals that he cherished as a youth in the Soviet Union, and still does. His reflections on this background bring to mind LaRouche's essay "Russia's Relation to Universal History," a "Letter to a Russian Friend," which appeared in the Nov. 29, 1996 *EIR*, and has just been issued in Russian, in Bulletin No. 9 of the Schiller Institute for Science and Culture. LaRouche wrote, "Russians, especially old Bolshevik patriots, might argue, that Lenin was necessary, to the degree that the corrupt Czarist institutions had virtually destroyed the possibility that anyone existed, apart from Lenin's Bolsheviks, who could govern in the chaotic conditions created by Russia's foolish western alliance for the war against

Germany. They would argue, that Bolshevism, for all its faults, like Shakespeare's Othello, 'had done the state some service,' a fact, which in all honesty, honorable men, in Russia, or abroad, could not deny. Such Russian patriots would wish it to be said, that, Russia, in its so-called 'Marxist' incarnation, has also died. They would have it said, that Lenin's and Stalin's Russia died of the side-effects of the Bolshevik medicine which had saved it from dismemberment earlier. Those patriots would insist that the tale be told fairly, that it be granted, that there were certain achievements, some of heroic dimensions."

LaRouche had begun his in-person dialogue with representatives of the Russian intelligentsia on the same note, telling a seminar at the Institute for Scientific Information of Social Sciences (INION) in April 1994 (*EIR*, May 13, 1994) about the value of reflecting on the "period of intensive postwar reconstruction" beginning in 1945. "A great part of an entire stratum of the Russian population was destroyed in war," said LaRouche, "yet, despite all of the problems that this represented, there was in Russia, despite all of the horror, everything one can criticize, there was a spirit of reconstruction. . . . The spirit of reconstruction was maintained around the world, into approximately the middle of the 1960s."

Chekalin talked in his discussion with the Schiller Institute representatives, about later echoes of that spirit. "As I said before, while working at *Trud*, *Stroitel'naya Gazeta*, *Pravda*, *Razvitiye*, and *Ekonomicheskaya Gazeta*, I often encountered innovators, and still do. In Soviet times, there were plenty of them. Just look at the fact that major, central newspapers would each receive a million or more letters from readers. Not only letters with complaints about various disorders and offenses, but—and there were many more of these—letters with proposals about how to improve the management of production in the Soviet Union, or science, or social relations, and many of these letters really did help to change life for the better. . . . I was always in contact with innovators and experimenters, and caught the spirit of change from them—a spirit of transformation. In general, communism and the practice of innovation, in my opinion, are inseparable things, things of the same order. As a communist, I try to seek out new ideas, wherever they might be put forward, and by whom. All the more so, insofar as I am editor-in-chief of the newspaper *Razvitiye* ["Development"], and development is probably a fundamental category."

In Chekalin's view, "The new Russian government could take LaRouche's ideas seriously—all the more so, in that some elements of his physical economy are genetically close to methods of management, which proved their effectiveness in several instances in Soviet economic practice. . . . Humanity is not so intellectually rich, as to overlook the pearls right in front of us. . . . In any event, LaRouche's ideas will not be wasted. If not in the U.S., then, perhaps, they may be used in Russia in one way or another."