

could think of the implementation of an economic development and great infrastructure projects program, is and remains for me a worthy intention which should be encouraged by all means.

EIR: What do you think of the role played by President François Mitterrand of France in the present crisis?

Nerette: We have all in Haiti deplored that a head of state of the importance and experience of Mr. François Mitterrand should have let himself be pulled into a gallery as subtle and complex as the events of Sept. 30 were.

Frankly, I am astonished. From this standpoint, it is possible to assume that his attitude was formed on the basis of the misinformation being supplied to him by his former ambassador in Haiti, Mr. Rafael Dufour.

EIR: I would like to know what you think of the recent statements by two black American leaders, Jesse Jackson and [Rep.] Charles Rangel [D-N.Y.], who have called for a U.S. invasion of Haiti.

Nerette: These were political statements, with no foundation.

EIR: Do you have any remarks you would like to address to our readers, in closing?

Nerette: There are many, and time does not permit us to enumerate them all.

First, the general impression one gets from this blast of aggression by the big powers against Haiti is as follows: After many years of our democracy being put on ice, our society should have made giant strides to catch up to the advanced group of western countries in matters of democratic conviviality. It was its misfortune that models were imposed which in no way correspond to its culture and its socio-economic context.

The United Nations and the OAS came to organize the elections in Haiti, and you know better than I do how things turned out. The observers did not have the courage to reveal the fraud and other electoral irregularities that were noted.

Was this out of ignorance of the norms and techniques for running elections? May inexperienced experts not come and complicate the life of our people. We already have enough problems.

In addition, may your readers not be duped, for everything which is said about Haiti is not always true, and the Haitian people is open to modern ideas of the rights and liberties of the human person and of peaceful democracy.

Finally, the Haitian authorities are not insensitive and indifferent to the natural reparations which should result from the enormous prejudice caused to Haiti and its people by an unconventional embargo, adopted in violation of our status as a sovereign state and full-fledged member of the Organization of American States. It were better that the OAS had never been created.

Demjanjuk case

Lawyer charges conspiracy, frameup

by Joseph Brewda

The U.S. and Israeli governments conspired to suppress evidence exonerating a man charged with Nazi war crimes, John Demjanjuk's Israeli attorney has charged. Yoram Sheftel told the Israeli Supreme Court Dec. 23 that this evidence, which the U.S. and Israeli governments obtained as far back as 1978, showed that his client, former Cleveland auto worker John Demjanjuk, is not "Ivan the Terrible," the guard at the Nazi concentration camp Treblinka whom he is accused of being. Demjanjuk was deported to Israel in 1985, where he has been in prison since. In 1988, he was convicted of being "Ivan the Terrible," and sentenced to death. Sheftel has petitioned the Israeli court to reopen the case based on the new evidence.

"This is a frameup . . . a case of fraud, deceit and destruction of evidence," Sheftel charged, and compared the case against Demjanjuk to that against Alfred Dreyfus, the French Jewish officer falsely accused of treason in the infamous anti-Semitic show trial of the last century. Sheftel said that the U.S. and Israeli governments proceeded with a case against Demjanjuk because they wanted a sensational trial in Jerusalem involving the Holocaust. Demjanjuk has always insisted that he is a victim of mistaken identity.

That the Demjanjuk trial was sensational is incontestable. It was broadcast live throughout Israel, and became a national obsession, as it was apparently meant to be. One of Demjanjuk's previous Israeli attorneys was found dead in what was claimed to be a suicide, and a bottle of acid was thrown in Sheftel's face as well.

What the evidence said

On Aug. 12, 1978, the U.S. Justice Department's Office of Special Investigations (OSI)—its "Nazi-hunting" unit—obtained 100 pages of eyewitness testimony from people who had known "Ivan the Terrible," and who identified the Treblinka camp guard as one Ivan Marchenko. All of the testimony, from some 25 witnesses, dates back to the immediate postwar period, and had been more recently assembled from the archives by the Soviet government in connection with another Treblinka war crimes trial, that of Feodor Fedorenko of Ukraine. The Soviet government forwarded the trial evidence to the U.S. government in 1978. Included was the testimony of Marchenko's

former lover, who also testified that Marchenko—not Demjanjuk—was “Ivan the Terrible.”

Moreover, all the testimony and documents identified Ivan as having been, at Treblinka, 30 years old, with dark hair, dark eyes, thick lips, and a scar on his neck. Demjanjuk at the time was 22 years old, with blue eyes, blond hair, thin lips, and no visible scars. Also, a photo of Marchenko was identified as being “Ivan” by other witnesses in various trials between the 1940s and 1960s.

Over 15,000 separate Treblinka documents were submitted in the Fedorenko case. There was not one reference to Demjanjuk, although there were repeated references to “Ivan the Terrible.”

Sheftel reported that he had a copy of a 1978 cable from the State Department to the U.S. embassy in Tel Aviv confirming that this Fedorenko testimony, photo, and other documentation had been forwarded to Israeli authorities. He charged that then-OSI head Martin Mendelsohn was in Israel in 1978, when Israel received the Fedorenko testimony, and conspired with Israeli officials to suppress it, because of its bearing on the Demjanjuk case.

Israelis say ‘so what?’

The Israeli state prosecutors and judges did not attempt to contest the new evidence presented by Sheftel, but tried different tactics. Chief Judge Meir Shemgar, for one, interrupted Sheftel to exclaim “What happened in the United States makes no difference. . . . Let’s not forget [Demjanjuk] was convicted on the basis of evidence presented at a[n] [Israeli] trial.”

It is true, in a sense, that Demjanjuk was convicted on the basis of “evidence” presented in Israel. But what was this “evidence”?

Consider that the Israeli government’s star witness, Eliyahu Rosenberg, who tearfully identified Demjanjuk as “Ivan the Terrible” in the 1988 trial, had earlier submitted sworn testimony in 1945 in Germany that he had killed “Ivan the Terrible.” In his earlier testimony, Rosenberg reported, in a 66-page affidavit, that in 1943, while at Treblinka, “We went into the engine room where Ivan was sleeping and Gustav [another prisoner] hit him with a shovel on the head. And there he remained, lying for eternity.”

Chief Prosecutor Michael Shaked had a different approach at an earlier hearing, when confronted with Sheftel’s citation of the Fedorenko testimony. “Is there a difference,” he asked, “if he pushed a boy into the gas chambers of Sobibor or Treblinka?” Demjanjuk was never charged with any crime at the Sobibor camp, nor with having been a guard there. Similarly, Efraim Zuroff, the director of the Simon Wiesenthal Center in Israel and a former OSI attorney, offered another *non sequitur*: “As far as I am concerned, the question is not whether John Demjanjuk is an innocent person, but is John Demjanjuk ‘Ivan the Terrible,’ or another terrible Ivan.”

LaRouche case hits Moscow newspaper

A full-page feature on Lyndon LaRouche appeared in a December 1991 issue of *Svobodnoye Slovo*, the newspaper of the Moscow Organization of the Democratic Union Party. It is a translation by V. Petrenko of two powerful presentations on LaRouche, his policies, and the persecution of him and his associates.

The banner headline is “LaRouche—American Dissident.”

The article, received in the Wiesbaden bureau of EIR Nachrichtengagentur by fax transmission, is accompanied by a portrait of Mr. LaRouche, and two illustrations of his Berlin-Paris-Vienna Productive Triangle proposal for overcoming world economic depression. One is a map of the plan, copied from the German-language pamphlet issued by the Schiller Institute, and captioned, “‘The productive triangle’, a scheme for economic cooperation in Europe according to Lyndon LaRouche.” Second, there is the picture of a maglev train, with the caption, “Lyndon LaRouche proposes to lay such high-speed magnetic cushion lines from Europe to Moscow, St. Petersburg, Kharkov, Kiev.”

Representatives of the Schiller Institute, founded by Lyndon LaRouche’s wife, the German political leader Helga Zepp-LaRouche, have visited Moscow and traveled to several of the former Soviet republics as well as to all of the former eastern European satellite countries over the past year, presenting the LaRouche policy to seminars, think tanks, in press conferences, and in meetings with government officials and opposition groups. On Nov. 12, 1991, an advertisement for the Triangle was placed in the Russian daily *Nezavisimaya Gazeta (The Independent)*, a very widely read publication with a daily circulation of nearly 300,000, after *Izvestia*, the former official newspaper of the former Soviet government, had turned it down on political grounds because the advertisement openly attacked the policies of the International Monetary Fund.

Rigorous opposition to Malthus, Darwin

This first translation reads as follows (lacunae are due to the quality of the fax transmission):

“Lyndon LaRouche, who turned 69 on Sept. 8, is often compared with Sakharov. By profession he is an industrial economist. His theoretical work has been concentrated on the refutation, from a rigorous scientific standpoint, of the malthusian and darwinian ideas . . . [illegible]. . . . The ‘free market’ approach, he exposes as a fraud, behind which hides in ambush the cruiser of imperialism. In the early