

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



1970s, as the leader of a political action group (the International Processes [sic] of Labor Committees), he began to agitate for unconditional moratoria on the payment of Third World debts and proposed an interconnected packet of international development programs, the goal of which was to put an end to poverty forever, by means of the support and development of high-technology industry and agriculture in those countries.

"Mr. LaRouche visited India, Thailand, and Latin America. He met with leaders at the level of I. Gandhi, José López Portillo, and R. Alfonsín, in order to create a single front against foreign indebtedness. This led his collaborators into direct confrontation with the ruling elite in London and Washington, in the person of Secretary of State Henry Kissinger. The latter coldbloodedly and unflinchingly utilized the IMF and the World Bank for the depletion (by means of hunger and disease) of hundreds of millions of people, whom the Anglo-Saxons view as colored (i.e., subordinate) races. Although LaRouche was in prison at the time, he warned that the IMF would apply the very same policy to eastern Europe. He [illegible], that the shock therapy which . . . [illegible] . . . Poland and Czechoslovakia (under the vigilant eye of Harvard economist Jeffrey Sachs) would lead to huge personal traumas, the collapse of industry and agriculture, civil unrest, and, if this program were applied to the former Soviet Union, possibly even world war.

"At the beginning of 1990, he proposed an alternative which he called 'The Paris-Berlin-Vienna Productive Triangle.' Without a capability for rapid transportation of freight, according to him, nothing will come of plans for the industrialization of the East and the modernization of agriculture. The governments of the West ought to subsidize with long-term, low-interest-rate credits the construction of an all-Eu-

ropean high-speed rail network, together with new roads, bridges, and canals.

"When this is achieved, it will be necessary to move into the second phase of an industrial and agricultural revolution, bringing a sharp growth in living standards for all the people of eastern Europe. This proposed plan was rejected by Anglo-American ruling circles, who fear that the development of eastern Europe will mean new spheres of power on the continent, which they will not be able to dominate.

"It is worth noting the statement of Secretary of State James Baker in September 1991: 'The model for Europe is Mexico'—a country, plunged by the U.S.A. into a sort of 'free trade' period, when employment, living standards, and basic food consumption have fallen already 30% since López Portillo left the presidency in 1982."

### Legal persecution covered

A second article is a translation of a speech given in Moscow earlier in the year by Anno Hellenbroich of the Schiller Institute. It has two subheads: "On the Persecution of Lyndon LaRouche" and "Harsh Treatment of LaRouche's Collaborators." It covers LaRouche's presidential campaigns and television broadcasts of 1976, 1980, 1984, and 1988, the development of the National Democratic Policy Committee (the LaRouche wing of the Democratic Party, founded in 1980), and the March 1986 Illinois victories by two NDPC-backed candidates. The counterattacks, including slanders instigated by the Anti-Defamation League, are recounted, including the fact that LaRouche was accused of killing Olof Palme (a charge bolstered by none other than Boris Pankin, Soviet ambassador to Sweden in 1986).

The Moscow paper gives a thorough summary of the cases, highlighting the role of federal Judge Albert Bryan, who presided over the judicial railroading of LaRouche to prison in late 1988 and sentenced the American statesman to a harsh 15 years in prison on vague "conspiracy" charges in January 1989. The mistreatment of Lewis du Pont Smith, an heir to the du Pont chemical fortune who was ruled "mentally incompetent" by a corrupt court at the instigation of his family, after he contributed money to LaRouche-associated causes, is covered.

Reaching the 77-year sentence being appealed by LaRouche's colleague Mike Billington, the Russian translator (even though writing for an audience with personal experience of the Gulag) was so shocked that he inserted an exclamation point, and translated the "violation of Virginia security laws," which referred to securities in the financial sense, as "security" in the sense of "national security." The account summarizes the complaints about the LaRouche case that are before the United Nations, and concludes with the fact that the U.S. government is sitting on documents related to LaRouche, using the excuse of national security, while people accused in the Iran-Contra case were given access to their documents. "Isn't that inequality before the law?"