

# 'Shame, shame, shame on those bishops'

by Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.

*The following statement was issued on May 5.*

It is not ordinarily permissible that a political figure intervene into the internal proceedings of a religious body, except when religious bodies intervene in a major way into policy-decisions affecting the matters of life and death of not only our republic, but civilization itself.

The overwhelming majority of American bishops of the Roman Catholic Confession have intervened forcefully into the attempted shaping of the strategic policy of the United States, without any visible sign of attention or response to the strategic doctrine which President Ronald Reagan promulgated on March 23, 1983. Worse, they have intervened into an emerging nuclear showdown between the United States and Soviet Union, to the effect of lending their support to a lying set of arguments promulgated by the Soviet leadership and its supporters.

On this matter, one must point a finger of condemnation towards those erring bishops, and cry "Shame, shame, shame" against their reckless political opportunism.

The leadership of the Nuclear Freeze movement, which those bishops have opportunistically rallied to support, is committed to a neo-Malthusian policy, whose objectives include measures of genocide against the alleged "over-population" of darker-skinned Asiatic, African and "Mediterranean" races of the world. These are the evil policies of the Club of Rome, the Anglo-Soviet International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis (IIASA), the World Wildlife Fund, the Aspen Institute, the Ford Foundation's and Rockefeller Foundation's funding efforts, and the evil proposals, called "Global 2000" and "Global Futures," to the same effect promulgated by the outgoing Carter administration.

These "Nuclear Freezers" propose a three-point military policy for the United States: 1) a sharp reduction in total military spending, 2) a cessation of all development of means by which the menacing thermonuclear arsenals of the world might be made technologically obsolete, and 3) a build-up of the kind of "conventional" military forces appropriate for fighting colonial-style wars against the populations of nations of darker-skinned peoples.

## **The threat**

There exists, as the best-informed among those bishops should have known, a curious and influential doctrine within the Slavic population of Eastern Europe, the doctrine of "The Third and Final Rome," according to which Moscow, Kiev, Sofia, and Belgrade will become the center of a new, worldwide Byzantine Empire, to rule the world forever.

According to authoritative circles meeting recently at a conference in Rome, Italy, this "Third Rome" or "Mother Russia" dogma was introduced to the Russian portion of the Eastern Rite in 1520, by a missionary from that notorious cult-center of sodomy and Gnosticism known as the Mount Athos monastery in Greece. This doctrine was a pseudo-Christian, Gnostic dogma modeled on the heathen cult of the "mother-earth-goddess" otherwise known by such names as Cybele, Astarte, and Isis, and has been the root of strange "Old Believer" pan-Slavic, and Lucifer-worshipping theosophical cults in the East over the intervening centuries. This cult-doctrine, in various secular and religious-cult guises, has been on the rise in that part of the world again, threatening to place madmen of the general characteristics of the Ayatollah Khomeini in positions of power over the terrible strategic resources of the Soviet state.

This force is a powerful factor in a present design for world-hegemony. Since approximately the time Nuclear Deterrence was conduited into U.S.A. and NATO policy from the Anglo-Soviet policy-shaping process known as the Pugwash Conference, the industrialized nations of Western Europe and the United States have been in a long process of internal self-destruction in both material and moral qualities, a process which has been predominant since approximately 1967-1968. This devolution of the principal OECD nations into the moral and material ruin of "post-industrial societies," has been the condition causing a worsening of the conditions of life throughout most of Africa, Ibero-America, and much of Asia as well. This process of self-destruction of Western civilization's moral and material qualities has had profound strategic significance for circles in Moscow. This process of our self-destruction has aroused, to the point of obsession, a

view from Moscow which sees the "Third Rome" becoming a reality before the close of this century.

The risk, according to such views from Moscow, is that at the last moment before its strategic power blinks out, the United States might rise on its hind legs to resist surrender to the "Third Rome" forces, using the power of its nuclear arsenal to effect that last-ditch resistance. The problem facing those Eastern forces is how to sow despair and confusion into the leading circles of the United States, to ensure that the United States drifts peacefully into helplessness.

This political strategy from Moscow has been complemented by Soviet military strategy, which, since no later than 1962, has been based on the development of directed-beam anti-ballistic-missile systems, by means of which the nuclear arsenal of the Soviet Union might be made unchallengable by the United States. The recent developments in directed-beam technologies in the Soviet Union, combined with Soviet development of the kinds of space-laboratory capabilities essential to putting a directed-beam system suddenly into space, have brought matters to the point that by as early as the period 1988-1990 such a Soviet strategic ABM capability could be deployed.

The question in Moscow now, is whether the U.S. development of an equivalent defense-system might be delayed by at least approximately two years, thus ensuring the probable victory of the "Third Rome."

True, there are many voices saying, falsely, that such directed-beam strategic ABM defense-systems are "music of the future," and so forth. Such people are either simply ignorant of the facts, or, in some cases among scientists and informed strategic specialists, are outright liars. Whether they intended this result or not, the majority of the bishops have aligned themselves with forces dedicated to genocide and with the Soviet leadership and its accomplices in attempting to destroy the United States.

Worse. Since Henry A. Kissinger intervened in 1979, to force the so-called double-track policy through NATO, the world has been headed toward a new U.S.-Soviet missiles-crisis, far more deadly than that of 1962. Unless the United States capitulates to a decisive margin of strategic inferiority, as implicitly demanded by Soviet General Secretary's published *Der Spiegel* (April 25) interview with that confessed drug-smuggler Rudolf Augstein, the Soviet Union is prepared to place a number of Soviet thermonuclear missiles approximately equivalent to the projected Pershing-IIs deployment within less than 10 minutes' striking-time from the continental United States. This could begin to occur as early as May, as late as August-September, or as late as October-December 1983.

Under the conditions demanded by the Nuclear Freeze movement and the majority of the bishops, there is no peaceful solution to the negotiations that missiles-crisis must trigger. Under the continuance of a Nuclear Deterrence posture by both superpowers, there is no solution unless one of the two superpowers concedes what is in effect a decisive margin

of strategic superiority to the other.

Worse, that kind of confrontation will occur under a condition known as "launch on warning." When both superpowers have deployed highly-accurate thermonuclear missiles within 5 to 10 minutes striking-time of the other, the defending power must adopt as stated policy the intent to launch a full strategic thermonuclear strike against the homeland of the other, the moment any launch by the other is detected. By the time the new missiles-crisis occurs, both superpowers will be operating in a "launch on warning" mode.

The kinds of problems we must now include among the Soviet threats directed against the United States sometime during 1983 include the following:

1) The placement of as many as three to five Soviet missile-carrying submarines off both the Atlantic and Pacific coasts of the United States, and possibly also augmented by forces in the Caribbean. We might estimate that each submarine would have available 16 missiles, each with three thermonuclear warheads, totalling to as much as 250 thermonuclear warheads aimed within less than 5 to 10 minutes striking-time of targets within the United States.

2) The placing of Soviet missile-carrying submarines in the North Pole region, possibly augmented by mobile SS-20s.

---

---

*The U.S. Roman Catholic bishops should be familiar with the curious and influential doctrine of "The Third and Final Rome," according to which Moscow, Kiev, Sofia, and Belgrade will become the center of a new, worldwide Byzantine Empire. This force is a powerful factor in a present design for world hegemony.*

---

---

3) If the Soviet Union's navy has deployed stealth technology for a more advanced variety of mini-submarine than those provocatively deployed increasingly against Sweden's coastal waters, we have the prospect of nuclear and thermonuclear underwater mines or thermonuclear-armed robotic submarines within our coastal waters near major population-centers.

If General Secretary Yuri Andropov follows an improved version of the tactic which Nikita Khrushchev employed over the Spring and Summer of 1962 to trigger the previous U.S.-Soviet missiles-crisis, what he will do is to deploy the indi-

cated or kindred quality of threat against the United States, while proposing all sorts of peaceful arms-limitation arrangements in press releases from the Kremlin. His game, like Khrushchev's scheme for forcing a backdown by President John F. Kennedy in 1962, will be to force the United States to make the first open reaction triggering the open missiles-crisis, and to present himself, Andropov, as the great peace-lover, hoping to win sufficient support from dupes such as the American bishops, to place President Reagan in the disadvantageous political position, and therefore, presumably forcing the President to give Andropov the vital margin of strategic concessions Moscow desires.

Whether witting or not, it is into this game that the majority of American bishops have played.

### **The cause of the crisis**

This threatened missiles-crisis has been the inevitable result of the Kissinger-McNamara Nuclear Deterrence and "detente" formulas cooked-up in the Anglo-Soviet Pugwash Conference.

The argument for Mutual and Assured Destruction (MAD), or Nuclear Deterrence has been, that if we outlawed development of means by which thermonuclear ballistic missiles could be destroyed in flight, the thermonuclear arsenals would rule the world. It was argued that this arrangement made general warfare between the superpowers unthinkable. On those grounds, strategic delivery-systems were developed up to a certain level, and colonial-style war-fighting capabilities were maintained, but the ability of nations to continue warfare beyond the point of the initial thermonuclear barrages was allowed to rot away in the West. This military policy was used also as an excuse to argue that we no longer required the civilian strength of technologically progressive industrial and agricultural growth. Beginning the middle of the 1960s, the United States and Western Europe began the process of being transformed into the wreckage and spreading social misery of "post-industrial society."

So, not long had the 1972 ABM treaty been ratified, than we reacted to our growing economic and military weakness in general by increasing the aggressivity with which we deployed thermonuclear arsenals. NATO's MC 14/3 and proposed MC 14/4 were reflections of this. This was the same thing as the policy variously named "Forward Nuclear Defense," "Flexible Response" and "Theater-Limited Nuclear War in Europe." As we became weaker and weaker, we relied more and more on placing large arsenals of thermonuclear weapons as close as possible to within the "no-warning-time" five-minutes striking-distance of the Soviet Union itself.

It is that forward-march of "Forward Nuclear Defense," caused by the Nuclear Deterrence policy itself, which has brought the world to the brink of a 1983 U.S.-Soviet missiles-crisis. With between 400 and 500 Soviet SS-20 warheads potentially targeting Western Europe, there is no French Force de Frappe, and virtually no Europe from the instant war begins.

There is only one possible solution to this menace: eliminate the cause, eliminate both Nuclear Deterrence and the neo-Malthusian policies, which are the combined cause for the threatened new missiles-crisis.

President Reagan has offered the Soviet leadership "Mutually Assured Survival": that both powers enter into new negotiations based on coordinate development and deployment of strategic ABM defense-systems, to ensure that neither nation can be destroyed by thermonuclear barrage. Are the bishops opposed to such a policy of Mutually Assured Survival, or did they simply ignore altogether the operational strategic doctrine of the United States?

---

---

*Andropov's game, like Khrushchev's scheme for forcing a backdown by President Kennedy in 1962, will be to force the United States to make the first open reaction triggering the open missiles crisis, and to present himself, Andropov, as the great peace-lover, hoping to win support from dupes such as the American bishops.*

---

---

If the United States and Western civilization are destroyed over the coming decade, let it be recorded for the information of future generations of humanity, that it was the lack of reason and morality among the those nations, not Soviet power, which caused their destruction, and that actions such as this shameful action by the majority of American bishops faithfully reflected that immorality.

Is this exaggerated, too harsh? Not at all. A civilization which tolerates the policies leading to genocide, such as those of Notre Dame's Father Theodore Hesburgh for Ibero-America, is a nation which has abandoned the most elementary regard for the sacredness of human life on principle. Such a nation, like the Nazi Third Reich, has lost the moral fitness to survive. Those bishops, who profess to support such Papal encyclicals as *Populorum Progressio*, and *Laborem Exercens*, as well as *On Human Life*, to raise no objection against such evil, and can yet recklessly issue this cited declaration in the name of concern for peace and human life, have committed a political and moral abomination.

Let us hope this shameful resolution of the bishop's conference will be at least ignored, if not repudiated.

## Weinberger: defense means choosing life

*Below are excerpts from remarks by Defense Secretary Caspar W. Weinberger on April 27 at Fordham University, a Roman Catholic institution in New York City. In his speech, titled "The Moral Aspects of Deterrence," Mr. Weinberger suggests that President Reagan's new beam-weapons policy was based on concern with the deficiencies of "deterrence" which does not include an in-depth strategic defense. Ellipses in quotations within the speech are in the original.*

We learn from the Book of Deuteronomy that Moses, at the twilight of his life, summoned the children of Israel together. He reminded them of God's commandments to his people. And he ended with these words: "I set before you life or death, blessing or curse. Choose life, then, so that you and your descendants may live." . . .

So too religious leaders today call us, not just as men and women responsible for our individual souls, but as a nation responsible for our common fate, to choose life. Let me then firmly state my disagreement with those who say that the Catholic bishops and other religious authorities should not be addressing the weighty questions posed by modern arms. You will not hear me talk today about rendering unto Caesar—for life is a gift not of Caesar but of God.

The charge to choose life is also a political responsibility, echoed in our Declaration of Independence and in our constitution. And in the age of nuclear weapons this charge has taken on new meaning for all people. . . .

Therefore, in speaking today about these moral and religious dimensions to nuclear deterrence, I intend to speak from two perspectives: that of an individual Christian, and that of the Secretary of Defense.

Do not mistake me. I do not believe those two roles are incompatible. But they present several inherent challenges, and it is these challenges that I wish to share with you. For, as I have been forced to confront them, so also will each one of you as future leaders of our nation.

Consider, for example, the biblical injunction to love your enemy. The individual Christian is called to turn the other cheek, to give those who would take his coat not just the coat, but the cloak as well. Yet a Christian acting on behalf of his nation, or, in the case of the United States, on

behalf of an alliance of free nations, cannot simply turn the cheek of innocent people toward their aggressors, or hand over the fruits of other people's labor. Pope John XXIII recognized the protective duty of the Christian statesman in his encyclical *Pacem in Terris*: "The safety of the commonwealth is not only the first law, but it is a government's whole reason for existence." . . .

Since the days when Christians served in the Roman army the church has been helping its people decide when to fight and when to lay down arms, when the state is acting justly and when it is imposing injustice. . . .

Today, the leaders of the Church continue that important role. His Holiness, Pope John Paul II, in his message for the 15th World Day of Peace, summed up the Church's teaching in this way: ". . . Christians, even as they strive to resist and prevent every form of warfare. . . . have a right and even a duty to protect their existence and freedom by proportionate means against an unjust aggressor."

Yet he also gave a special caution for this, the nuclear age, reminding us that: "War is the most barbarous and least effective way of resolving conflicts."

In seeking peace, we pursued a strategy of deterrence that has been the basis of our defense policy ever since George Washington, in the very first State of the Union address, told Congress that "to be prepared for war is one of the most effectual means of preserving peace." . . .

Not only has deterrence worked; it is consistent with many principles of Catholic teaching on war and the use of nuclear weapons, as discussed in the third draft of the pastoral letter on war and peace. . . .

The pastoral letter also reflects a concern which President Reagan raised in his recent [March 23] speech to the American people. "Would it not," he asked, "be better to save lives than to avenge them?" His answer was to propose that we seek to develop a new defense against nuclear missiles. Pope John Paul II has called upon us to seek "a better way." In a world where we cannot simply banish the knowledge of nuclear weapons, defense against missiles may be such a way. . . .

We will never deter war if we do not look those truths in the face. Winston Churchill once said of Neville Chamberlain that he "lacked imagination in evil." But, as Pope John Paul II reminded us in his message for the day of peace, "Christians are aware that plans based on aggression, domination, and the manipulation of others lurk in human hearts."

We also need imagination in peace—that beautiful word which is so freely used and so readily abused. There is great danger that we will ask too little of peace, that we will seek no positive vision for our world.

The pastoral letter shared this concern, quoting from the Pastoral Constitution of Vatican II that: "Peace is not merely the absence of war. Nor can it be reduced solely to the maintenance of a balance of power between enemies. Nor is it brought about by dictatorship. Instead, it is rightly and appropriately called "an enterprise of justice." (Isaiah 32:7). . .

# Emergency Conferences

## Sponsored by the National Democratic Policy Committee Stop the Kissinger-Harriman Missile Crisis: Build the World with Beam Technologies

A series of emergency public policy meetings to inform the U.S. population on the strategic military and economic crisis the nation faces. Only through a World War II-style mobilization of the population and the economic resources of the United States can both crises be reversed. The development of defensive directed-energy weapons will revolutionize the capital goods and metals processing sectors of the economy, opening the only path by which the United States can lead an international recovery from the current depression.

### Partial Schedule of Events

Boston .....	May 25	Houston .....	June 11
Buffalo .....	May 25	Seattle.....	June 15
Chicago .....	May 28	New Orleans.....	June 16
Montreal .....	May 31	San Francisco .....	June 16
Anaheim, California .....	June 2	Los Angeles.....	June 17
Philadelphia .....	June 2	Cleveland .....	June 21
New York City .....	June 4	Pittsburgh.....	June 22
Birmingham, Alabama .....	June 4	Washington.....	June 30

For more information, call (202) 223-8300 or (212) 247-8820.

Tickets: \$10.00

### EXECUTIVE INTELLIGENCE REVIEW

## Special Technical Report A BEAM-WEAPONS BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE SYSTEM FOR THE UNITED STATES

by Dr. Steven Bardwell, director of plasma physics for the Fusion Energy Foundation.

#### This report includes:

- a scientific and technical analysis of the four major types of beam-weapons for ballistic missile defense, which also specifies the areas of the civilian economy that are crucial to their successful development;
- a detailed comparison of the U.S. and Soviet programs in this field, and an account of the differences in strategic doctrine behind the widening Soviet lead in beam weapons;
- the uses of directed energy beams to transform raw-materials development, industrial materials, and energy production over the next 20 years, and the close connection between each nation's fusion energy development program and its beam weapon potentials;
- the impact a "Manhattan Project" for beam-weapon development would have on military security and the civilian economy.

The 80-page report is available for \$250.  
For more information, contact Robert Gallagher or Peter Ennis (212) 247-8820.