

The Soviet Union threatens pre-emptive nuclear war

by Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.

The following news release by 1980 Democratic Party contender for the U.S. presidential nomination Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr. was issued on Aug. 22 in Washington, D.C. Mr. LaRouche is chairman of the advisory council of the National Democratic Policy Committee (NDPC), a registered political action committee representing a mass-based faction within the Democratic Party, and was the first public proponent of the new U.S. defensive strategic doctrine which was established by President Ronald Reagan on March 23, 1983.

During the past week, several leading Soviet publications, including the KGB outlet, *Literaturnaya Gazeta*, have launched attacks, including threats of thermonuclear strike, against the new strategic doctrine announced by President Ronald Reagan on March 23, 1983. This is complemented by escalating attacks on me from the Soviet press and through other channels, blaming me as intellectual author of that strategic doctrine.

How much credit I merit for the President's doctrine is not worth discussing here, except to admit that I fully support the public declarations of the President, Defense Secretary Caspar Weinberger, and Dr. Edward Teller, in everything I know them to have stated publicly on this subject, and also to concede that I have expert qualifications on the policy issues involved in that doctrine.

In view of the character and seriousness of these Soviet attacks, the time has come for me to reply directly to the deliberately false statements on this subject by all Soviet officials and their Western admirers since March 23, 1983.

What the President and Secretary Weinberger proposed, contrary to Soviet falsehoods on this subject, was that both superpowers agree to deploy purely defensive antiballistic-missile systems capable of freeing humanity forever from the threat of thermonuclear ballistic missile warfare. Mr. Weinberger indicated a willingness of the United States to share technology to the effect of ensuring that both powers pos-

sessed such defense. The fact that the President and Mr. Weinberger made precisely such an offer has never been admitted publicly by any Soviet official.

What has been published by Soviet officials, in public statements available in North America and Western Europe, or in the Soviet press, has been entirely false, and known to be false by those Soviet officials. In short, they have been consistently lying on this subject.

The most important, and most frequent falsehoods issued by Soviet officials have been the following.

First, they have charged that the beam-weapons proposal outlined in statements by Dr. Teller, President Reagan, and Secretary Weinberger, was a preparation for a "first strike" against the Soviet Union. If both superpowers have defensive beam weapons, a first strike by either power is an impossibility, and the Soviet leadership knows this very well.

Second, the Soviets have substituted for the policy of Dr. Teller and the President a directly opposing policy, the "High Frontier" proposal issued by the Heritage Foundation and Lt.-Gen. (ret.) Daniel Graham. They have cited Graham's proposal for rocket bases flying in space, and have used that as a pretext to attack the directly opposing policy to the "High Frontier" policy, the actual policy announced by the United States.

This has its amusing side. General Graham and his cronies have been touring the world, denouncing me as a "Soviet KGB agent" on grounds of my support for the doctrine promulgated by the President. The Soviets, who have virtually threatened to kill me for my part in supporting the President's actual doctrine, also denounce me for supporting a policy which they allege to be General Graham's. This I consider not only abusive against me by the Soviets, but they insult my intelligence by suggesting I would support any part of a scheme as childishly amateurish as Graham's "High Frontier."

Finally, not exactly a Soviet lie, but intentionally misleading: They allege that a development of defensive beam-weapons systems unleashes an uncontrolled "arms race."

To the degree the Soviet use of "arms race" in this connection has any sensible interpretation at all, it means that improved versions of defensive systems will make early makeshifts technically obsolete. It also means that somewhere down the pike, some new technological breakthrough will probably develop an offensive weapons-system able to overcome the defensive systems. That line of argument would appear plausible, if it were possible to overlook the fact that the Soviet Union has been in a continuing arms race in the categories of naval buildup and more advanced nuclear-missile systems than the U.S. has produced. It is they who are in a red-hot arms buildup while the U.S. military capabilities have been collapsing of old age in most categories.

I am privileged to know that the Soviet officials do not believe what they have published repeatedly on this subject. They are opposed to the March 23, 1983 doctrine: fanatically opposed to it. The real reasons for their opposition, discussed only in private, are different than what is published.

Essentially, the Soviet leadership believes that the doctrine proposed by the President would work as the President, Dr. Teller, and Secretary Weinberger have described it. Anything to the contrary from a Soviet official is simply an out and out falsehood. What they object to is not the weapons systems proposed; they are presently in a crash-program effort to complete such weapons systems for themselves! What they object to is the United States' developing such a system.

Their deepest, real objection to the President's proposal is the Soviet fear that U.S. development of such a defensive weapons system would spark a major economic recovery in the United States. It would. They fear that the U.S.S.R.'s problem-ridden civilian economy would fall behind the U.S.'s significantly after a few years of a U.S. recovery sparked by spillover of beam-weapons technology into the civilian economy. A recovery of the U.S. to its relative economic strength of the middle 1960s is something the Soviet leadership is presently determined never to tolerate.

Look at the matter from the Soviet standpoint for a moment. The West is in a worsening economic depression, and about to go over the brink in the worst international financial collapse since 1931. We are now escaping from the greatest economic upsurge (in official statistics) since the Great Hoover Boom of the Summer of 1929. Our military strength is eroding and the will of the Congress, Democratic Party, and liberal Republicans brings sneers of delight to gentlemen in Moscow. Western Europe is in large part on the edge of breaking away from the Atlantic Alliance, into the semi-neutrality of a Middle Europe buffer zone between the two superpower blocs. If you were Secretary Yuri Andropov, viewing this from Moscow, might you not be tempted to believe that the old adversary, the United States, is about to destroy itself from within? Under such conditions, and with present and growing margins of Soviet strategic advantage, if you were Andropov, who would you imagine might win

any potential thermonuclear showdown?

Would you tolerate your old adversary, the United States, going through the remoralization of a major economic recovery? If you were Yuri Andropov, and you believed that a fellow named LaRouche had come close to shifting the U.S. toward adopting such a recovery policy, you would really hate that fellow LaRouche, and you and your crowd would attack LaRouche just about as violently as the Soviet press and other channels had conducted their international campaign against LaRouche since March 23, 1983.

So far, the reasons for the Soviet hatred of the March 23, 1983 announcement, for Soviet lies about the policy, and hatred against LaRouche, among other such matters, are all apparently merely common sense.

Now, as we look at the deeper reasons for Soviet reactions to the President's doctrine, their motives become more tangled, and much uglier.

The legacy of Pugwash

In my judgment, there is no legitimate reason for nuclear warfare between the United States and the Soviet Union, if the issues could be confined to the vital interests of the two powers as sovereign nation-states. Unfortunately, the issue is not confined to such vital interests. The problem is that the most evil person of the 20th century, the late Bertrand Russell, succeeded in organizing the postwar world into three "empires," a Soviet empire, a China empire, and a third empire, nominally dominated by the military power of the United States.

The situation has been created, in which each smaller power of the world is either directly part of the imperial "sphere of influence" of one of these three powers, or conducts its foreign policy as a kind of balancing act among either two or all three of those powers. The Soviet Union, China, and the United States are as much locked into this arrangement as the lesser powers struggling to avoid being either gobbled up or destroyed by this arrangement.

The immediate strategic problem, the imminent danger that successive strategic miscalculations by the powers might trigger an otherwise unthinkable thermonuclear war, is that the combination of the prevailing strategic doctrine—nuclear deterrence—and the effects of economic and monetary collapse, will produce a state of hyper-instability among the governments of the world, a condition which almost guarantees thermonuclear war by escalated miscalculations.

The essential problem is not bad nations or wicked governments—although there are such governments. The problem of bad governments could be solved, at least to the degree required to prevent general war, if the present monetary and economic crisis would stop, and if this imperialistic nonsense could be ended.

Who is to blame? Is the culprit the United States or the Soviet Union? What Kissinger typifies in U.S. policy-mak-

ing is pure evil, and what Andropov represents in foreign policy at present is monstrous in its implications for civilization at large, but ridding the nations of gentlemen such as Kissinger or Andropov would not lessen the growing danger of general war. The essential problem is not something which could be eliminated by attempting to eliminate some "bad nation." The problem is the policies set into motion by Bertrand Russell, especially Russell's evil Pugwash Conference. The problem, which Russell did more than any other single individual to create, is a policy establishment which bridges leading circles in both Eastern and Western Europe, a collection represented in the United States by our Eastern Establishment. It is the continued influence of that lunatic bunch of clowns, not any particular nation as such, which is the root of our present problem.

The Soviet leadership knows this very well. So does Kissinger's business partner, Britain's Lord Carrington, the man who described Soviet Secretary Yuri Andropov as "our asset" in the Soviet Union.

Whether Carrington and Andropov like or despise one another personally, I do not know; I do know that they have a working partnership against the United States and President Reagan. That partnership is not the sole cause of the danger of general nuclear war today, but it is not far from the center of the problem. The problem lies not in themselves as individual personalities; the problem is the policy they share in common, the imperialistic doctrine of Bertrand Russell's Pugwash Conference.

Go back to October 1946, when this problem began. In that month's issue of the *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists*, Bertrand Russell began launching his campaign a "preventive nuclear war" against the Soviet Union, the proposal by Russell which led to an actual Anglo-American warplan for such an operation, "Operation Drop-Shot." Russell's motive was not anti-communism; Russell's policy motive of the 1946-55 period was the same "international socialist" program he had published repeatedly during the 1920s, in alliance with H.G. Wells. Russell's motives were not anti-socialist; they were racist. Russell proposed a "world-government" with a monopoly over the possession and use of nuclear arsenals. His motive for "preventive war" against Russia was to crush Russia before it could develop nuclear arsenals. "World government" meant to Russell, Anglo-Saxon world empire, and reducing the populations of the darker-skinned races, as he stated in print repeatedly during the 1920s.

When the Soviet Union acquired not only nuclear arsenals, but H-bombs, Russell found "preventive war" a bit discouraging. So, he organized the founding of the Pugwash Conference in 1957. His new proposal was to divide the new world-empire into two divisions, one Western, the other Eastern. The Soviet government accepted the offer. Later, a third proposed empire was surfaced, China; Russell's circles thought that three contending empires gave better options for having two gang up on one sometime down the line.

Despite the Soviet acceptance of the Pugwash Conference's imperialist plan, there were squabbles in the Soviet Union over this, sometimes quite visibly, into the 1968-72 period. However, from the beginning, the Soviet government was a participant in the Pugwash Conference, and was a complicit party to the entire operation.

The basic policy, which the Soviet government is supporting rather violently against President Reagan today, was laid out in all major features at the Second Pugwash Conference of 1958, in a keynote address delivered by a Bertrand Russell crony, Dr. Leo Szilard.

The gist of Szilard's keynote address was dramatized in the film, "Dr. Strangelove," with Szilard the real-life model for "Strangelove."

The leading points of Szilard's address were:

1) Build up the thermonuclear arsenals of the superpowers to the degree that the launching of war against the other by one would ensure the total destruction of both. This was Szilard's plan for preventing actual war between the superpowers directly.

2) Permit "limited nuclear war."

3) Plan for a Middle East petroleum crisis, leading to destruction of the nations of the Middle East.

4) Redraw the political map of the world, dividing the entire world between the two superpowers. This is the "New Yalta" policy of Kissinger's business partner, Lord Carrington, today.

In other words, putting Pershing II's in Germany was not a new idea Henry A. Kissinger pushed through NATO and the U.S. government in 1979. It was something the Soviets had accepted way back as early as 1958. They knew, since Szilard's "How to live with the bomb—and survive" address of 1958, that the doctrine of nuclear deterrence was based on the intention to have limited nuclear war in places such as Europe! By accepting the policies of Pugwash, continuously, as each new feature was adopted at conferences in which they negotiated these policies, they accepted the whole package. That is a fact proven in writing hundreds of times over that period.

Moreover, every strategic policy imposed upon the United States from the time of President Kennedy's death until March 23, 1983 was negotiated by the Soviets behind the scenes, usually long before the U.S. government knew the policy was coming down. Russell's crowd among U.S. scientists, Eastern Establishment types of McGeorge Bundy's and Ave Harriman's circles, and the Soviet government, rigged the strategic policies of the United States behind the backs of the U.S. people and, usually, the President and Congress of the United States. (Since the Eastern Establishment owns large chunks of the leading leadership of both major parties, Presidents and Congresses usually did as the cronies of McGeorge Bundy ordered, and asked few embarrassing questions about the actual parentage of the strategic policy they passed through.)

Such is the great superpower conflict.

This does not mean that McGeorge Bundy is a Soviet agent. It means that the crowd associated with and a leading faction in the Soviet Union have a working partnership, a partnership which will continue until one succeeds in killing the other off. It is a case of "common and conflicting goals." They have a common commitment to the Pugwash Conference policies, but no commitment not to destroy one another whenever the opportunity to do so more or less safely presents itself. Strategic policy since 1963 has been a rigged game, with both opponents cheating as much as they dare.

The other main feature of the game was the commitment of "international socialists" such as Russell, Bundy, and Kissinger, to destroy the institutions of 1) the sovereign nation-state, 2) industrial capitalism, and 3) technological progress. This meant, as Russell and Wells proposed during the 1920s, collapsing the economies of what we call the developing nations, to the point that local wars, famines and epidemics wiped out hundreds of millions of "excess" darker-skinned individuals of Africa, Asia, and Latin America.

Do the Soviets accept such genocide against the developing nations? There is a powerful genocide lobby in the Soviet leadership, around names including Djerjmen Gvishiani and Ivan Frolov, names which have been promoted since Andropov's rise to power. There is, however, no evidence that the Soviets have been so far directly engaged in Malthusian operations against peoples of other nations, barring casualties in military actions. Nonetheless, they do know that this genocide is the policy of George Ball, the Global 2000 gang, and the circles of Harriman and McGeorge Bundy generally, and they are aligned with these fellows *against* President Reagan, and LaRouche, *with* the fellows who are crushing the developing nations. How guilty does this make them? Draw your own conclusions. They are presently in back-channel arrangements with the whole tribe of these genocidalists, ostensibly to ensure the defeat and humiliation of those terrible fellows, Reagan, Teller, and LaRouche. Draw your own conclusions.

Issues of March 23

Do you really believe that the Soviet leadership is committed to peace? The only chance for peace was the offer President Reagan and Secretary Weinberger made publicly, repeatedly, beginning March 23, 1983. If Moscow had simply offered to discuss that offer with the President or his representatives—and they had indicated channels open to them specifically for this purpose, knew exactly what telephone number to ring—they could have quickly verified the "sincerity" of the offer; there was no need to inspect chicken-livers for signs of the President's "true intentions."

Without such negotiations, there is no visible way to avoid a thermonuclear showdown between the two superpowers sometime between now and perhaps 1985–87. It is difficult difficult to forecast an exact date, but the logic of the

situation means that such a showdown is inevitable, unless the Soviets pick up the President's March 23, 1983 offer. They Soviets know this logic well; when they rejected the President's offer, they knew with absolute certainty that they had decided to go for an unavoidable showdown.

Those arrogant, cynical, blind fools think that if West Germany and Italy, and perhaps the Benelux nations too, were to drop out of NATO over the winter of 1983–84, that such a development would not hit the U.S. population like Pearl Harbor 1941? The United States would mobilize for war, and perhaps nothing could stop what would follow. Their smug, fanatical conceit prompts them to delude themselves that the United States, a nation never conquered, would submit to the visible onrush of Soviet hegemony? The "peace movement" would evaporate overnight!

What about their attitude toward developing nations? True, they would not wish China to gobble up an India half-destroyed by Switzerland-steered separatists' insurgency movements. Otherwise, they know that the only chance for saving the people of most of Asia, Africa, and Latin America from hellish, genocidal economic collapse and political instability, is an economic recovery centered upon the United States. By supporting the Pugwash Conference doctrine, which they support loudly and violently against "March 23," they are virtually ensuring that an Africa now being butchered by their client Qaddafi actually dies, and hundreds of millions elsewhere also die. Is this the long-professed Soviet affection for "oppressed and progressive" peoples?

There is a very simple moral rule which ought to be observed in this world. Each of us is morally accountable in full, not only for the actions we take, but the foreseeable consequences of those actions. Whatever evil the Soviet government supports is an evil whose consequences are as much Soviet crimes as the crimes of Soviet allies against President Reagan's March 23 policy. Let the Soviet Union not blame President Reagan for Kissinger's actions, since Kissinger would never have crawled back into the government had Kissinger's back-channel Soviet cronies not mobilized to destroy President Reagan's March 23 doctrine and offer of peace.

The Soviets have miscalculated, by imagining that the U.S.A. would back down under conditions which would actually unify the United States to prepare for possible nuclear war. That is the calculated risk Andropov et al. have chosen to take. If war comes, do not blame President Reagan; the President offered peace and the Soviet leadership rejected it. Therefore, if war comes because of the Soviet rejection of peace, it will be the Soviet leadership which is guilty of whatever destruction of humanity ensues on this planet. Meanwhile, the Soviet press has actually threatened to launch such a war.

If the Soviet Union wishes to avoid nuclear war, it could show its intent by, for the first time, actually admitting in print the exact nature of the President's offer of peace.