

'Nevertheless, Marshal Ogarkov. . .'

by Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.

The following are the observations of Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr. on the prepared announcement delivered to a Moscow conference on Sept. 9 by the Soviet Chief of Staff, Marshal Nikolai Ogarkov.

General Ogarkov's insistence that there was a cloud-cover

over the sea and land traversed by Korean Airlines Flight Seven, and his report that Soviet stations had been monitoring that airliner's radio transmissions, does not improve the Soviet Union's moral position in this affair, but makes it profoundly worse.

Shortly before the Soviet pilot butchered 269 civilian

'Sacrificing life for the motherland'

Marshal Nikolai Ogarkov, Soviet Armed Forces Chief of Staff, appeared for the first time ever at a Moscow press conference on Sept. 9, to give a formal-legal justification for killing 269 civilians on Korean Air Lines Flight 7. With maps, he illustrated the claim that the plane was on a spy mission coordinated with U.S. military intelligence. Ogarkov even lied on matters of detail, saying for instance that a Soviet fighter pilot, who was taped talking about the flashing navigation lights on the KAL jetliner he was about to shoot down, really meant lights on another Russian plane—never mind the fact that the taped flier refers to the lights "of the target"!

It can happen again, Foreign Minister Andrei Gromyko said earlier in the week, when he warned that other planes flying in Soviet airspace would get the same treatment: "No matter who resorts to provocations of that kind, he should know that he will bear the full brunt of responsibility for it." Ogarkov ominously praised the Air Defense fighter pilots who did the deed: "They have been discharging their duties with honor, and in the future, if need be, they will also perform their combat tasks."

Inside the U.S.S.R., the release of the official government story of KAL 7 and its endorsement by Ogarkov were the signal for a wave of propaganda aimed to psychologically condition the population for war. The press and broadcast media produced flocks of "aviation experts" to bolster Ogarkov's account. Special brainwashing is

designed for soldiers, whose special radio station is lately talking about "sacrificing life for the motherland, to fight the coming Third World War, should the imperialists force it on us." The weekly *Literaturnaya Gazeta* on Sept. 7 glorified Soviet Air Defense pilots as practically mythic heroes who defend the Motherland when they "turn the target into a flying explosion." In language characteristic of deepest, primitive Russian chauvinism, *Literaturnaya Gazeta's* A. Prokhanov, already known for calling an intercontinental ballistic missile "alive" and "a symbol of supreme spiritual flight, as Ivan the Great's church steeple was for our (15th century) ancestors," drew his own paranoid mental map, describing a visit to a ground command station in the far north: "I sit at the command point. I feel . . . the global military confrontation gripping the whole earth today. . . . I feel the NATO . . . bombers, taking aim at our cities and villages . . . aircraft carriers, ready to move to our waters and attack those targets in the North Russian plain, by the naming of which your terrified and tormented heart gets ready to put itself under attack, to shield these sacred things."

Prokhanov glorified the Air Defense "In front of you is the enemy, . . . behind you is the fatherland and its cities. And you are the only one who has the power to save them. This truth is present in the blue eyes of the major. . . . He feels his machine, his terrible-beautiful fighter, like a living being. Her smooth, heavy flight. Her capability for turning and gliding. Her 'corporeal' and 'spiritual' qualities. . . . Seizing the target in his radar sight, he speaks to her, as to a living being: 'Now come on, do your best, my friend. Come on, don't let me down, my dear.' And the 'dear' lets out the missile in front, and turns the target into a flying explosion."

airline passengers, the airliner had broadcast its reported position to Japan air-control. The pilot's report reversed the numbers for the plane's approximate latitude and longitude, and reported a position which would have placed the airliner on its proper course, well out of Soviet airspace. If the statement made by General Ogarkov is accurate in reporting Soviet monitoring of the plane's transmissions, then the Soviet command has a copy of the airliner's broadcast of its position.

If there was a cloud-cover over Sakhalin, as the General's statement also asserts, then the evidence is that the pilot probably never knew he was over Soviet airspace. In that case, the shooting-down of a pilot leaving the vicinity of Soviet airspace was the murder of innocents.

Furthermore, if the airliner pilot had believed his navigational instruments, he would have been obliged to disregard any Soviet instructions radioed or signaled to him.

In this case, there was no willful violation of Soviet airspace by the airliner, but only a case for suspicion of some tampering with the airliner's navigational computer, perhaps at Anchorage, Alaska.

Nevertheless, all such considerations put to one side, the essential fact remains that the Soviet command shot down a civilian airliner when it might have averted such a tragedy by contacting Washington during the period of more than two hours the airliner is indicated to have been under Soviet observation.

'For the sake of argument. . .'

For the sake of argument, assume the worst, that some non-Soviet agency was more or less willfully tempting the Soviet command to shoot down the airliner, without the pilot's knowledge of this circumstance. Does that justify the Soviet command's shooting down the airliner? Would the Soviet command argue that the United States, for example, willfully put the baby in the cage with a hungry cannibal? Would the Soviet command insist that it is such a hungry cannibal? Would the Soviet command argue that the bureaucratic paperwork of standing policy commands it to behave as a hungry cannibal?

If we grant every argument of General Ogarkov's statement, the General is insisting that it is Soviet policy to behave like a pack of ravenous cannibals in such matters.

We do not argue that Soviet airspace is not inviolable by international law. Also, U.S. airspace is similarly inviolable, a fact which seems to be overlooked many times a year by the Soviet command. The Soviet command asserts it has a right to shoot down civilian airliners if it chooses to do so under similar circumstances. On the contrary, every civilized nation has the moral obligation to do everything possible to avoid shooting down a civilian airliner. It is the uncivilized character of Soviet legalistic self-righteousness in the matter which is approximately as horrifying, perhaps more horrifying than the act of shooting down the airliner itself. The Soviet Union might have at least telephoned the White House—it had a span of almost two hours to do so, and did

not.

This is the point which the Soviet command stubbornly overlooks, that it is its assertion of such standing orders which is horrifyingly immoral.

The underlying issue of policy in this case is Soviet imperviousness to the most essential principles of Judeo-Christian civilization, an indifference to Judeo-Christian morality as monstrous to us as the immorality of certain Swiss bankers who care not how many nations die as long as their usury is collected on time. Like certain currents of the Russian Old Believers and kindred spirits within the Russian Orthodox Church, or the monstrous religious beliefs of Ayatollah Khomeini, the Soviet arguments of policy in the matter of the airliner incident echo a hideous sort of pagan theology: that the Creator is not a creature of lawful reason, but of arbitrary will. The Soviet Union does not locate its sovereignty under the governance of any principles of moral law, but interprets sovereignty as a mere secretion of the arbitrary will of the Soviet people. The arbitrary will of that people, deemed secreted in the persons of leading Soviet bodies, is apotheosized as God.

A higher law

The existence of civilized behavior among nations depends upon agreement to the principle that there exists a higher body of knowable law which is the same for all peoples, and that nations and individual persons may seek to compose their differences in policy by submitting their wills to a search into that higher body of law they pledge themselves to seek in common.

One needs no Bible to know that such a higher law exists. As the great Indian patriot Bal Gangadhar Tilak emphasized, many thousands of years ago, in part of what is now the Soviet Union, there existed a pre-Vedic and Vedic people with a precise knowledge of astronomy which is awesome for us to discover existed at such an ancient time. Look to the stars, as did Johannes Kepler, and see that universal law rules us all. As we are able to follow Kepler in discovering the laws of astronomy, so we are able to adduce through our powers of reason other aspects of universal law.

No people has a sovereign right to impose any condition on the peoples of this planet merely because that people chooses to will such a condition to be brought about. It is the worst barbarism to argue the contrary; to argue on premises of the mere will of one people is the essential distinction of uncivilized beast-man.

That which distinguishes civilized man from the brutes is perception of the essential distinction between men and those mere cattle we rightly slaughter at the pleasure of self-interested policy. The evidence of that distinction abounds for all to see who are capable of becoming civilized.

Before man's discovery of technology, man existed much like a beast. An average of between 10 and 15 square kilometers of land-area were needed to sustain a human individual. The human population could never have exceeded much

more than 10 millions individuals, with life-expectancy less than 20 years of age; tribes of brutish children in the main, whole tribes easily extinguished by unfortunate circumstances.

Today, through the benefits of technological advances, there are approximately 4.5 billions persons estimated. With technologies now within reach, this planet could sustain tens of billions of persons, at a higher standard of living for each than prevailed in the United States during the early 1970s. Man has demonstrated his potential to increase his mastery of this planet, of nature, more than a thousandfold. No beast could willfully increase its power over nature by even tenfold.

This manifest power of man to discover ever more perfectly the lawful composition produced by the Creator, reflects a quality in the person we associate with the divine. Man is capable of assimilating the Creator's lawful will into his own will, and to become thus a more perfect instrument of the work of the Creator.

Is this theology? Perhaps. It is also science. The stones and the heavens cry these truths out to all persons and nations capable of becoming civilized.

The law of sovereignty

It is not sufficient to know the lawful composition of this universe. It is necessary that one desire to act in conformity with that law. Since we each must die, what is truly our self-interest is to contribute something to perfection of knowledge and use of that law which shall be beneficial to those who come after us. We desire that those who come after us be of a condition fit to assimilate that law and to perfect its knowledge further. Thus, love for humanity on that account is the necessary quality of civilized humanity, without which mere formal knowledge of the law is morally sterile.

To love the law and to love the imparting of the benefits of knowledge of the law to others is the essence of human virtue, the essence of civilization. I can kill in war, but I can never crush the life of a helpless person within my power. That is the law which separates men from brutish half-men. It is to the degree that nations submit to that law that nations have rights of sovereignty under law. Otherwise, the profession of sovereignty is an immoral abomination.

The law of sovereignty took first civilized form through the work of chiefly Cardinal Nicholas of Cusa, beginning with his *Concordantia Catholica*. That doctrine of natural law as elaborated in exemplary form by Cusa is the essence of the Golden Renaissance which perfected Dante Alighieri's earlier designs, to cause the establishment of the first modern form of sovereign nation-state under King Louis XI of France. There were no sovereign nation-states in the proper legal sense prior to Cusa's doctrine. That, for the enlightenment of the Soviet command, is an historic fact. Either they accept that historic fact, or their arguments concerning sovereignty have no proper legal basis, but are merely some paganist concoction left over from the mud of barbarism.

The principle of sovereignty, whose authority is derived from the 15th-century creation of the natural law pertaining

to the nation-state form, cannot defy the body of law upon which the very existence of legal sovereignty depends. That was a point of law implicit in the code which Justice Robert Jackson elaborated for the Nuremberg Trials. It was the Nazis who asserted that the law of the sovereign state was derived from the premises of Holy Blood and Sacred Soil of some particular people, and at the close of the war, the Soviet Union joined in denouncing that principle of Holy Blood and Sacred Soil as a brutish abomination.

Soviet anti-Semitism

I can not separate my view of the Soviet Union's legalism respecting the airliner's destruction from the upsurge of a variety of official anti-Semitism in Soviet publications comparable to the worst seen in Czarist days of the pogroms and Okhrana.

It is true, of course, that being of Jewish parentage is not an absolute guarantee one will never become a gangster. It is also true that terrified people living under Nazi persecution, sometimes find elegance of moral judgment a luxury beyond their means. There is also the worst feature of Zionist practice, which springs chiefly from the Russian traditions of blood and soil taught to the Jewish victims of the Russian Empire's culture. If Soviet officials wish to complain against Zionism, let them cease discriminating, and denounce all those who premise doctrines of sovereignty on distinctions of Holy Blood and Sacred Soil.

The point is that the official Soviet anti-Semites do not limit themselves to complaining of crimes which happen to have been perpetrated by persons of Jewish parentage in some cases. They exploit such particular instances to foment hatred against Jews as Jews. This is racism! It is barbarism! It erupts in the same framework as the brutishness of the shooting-down of the airliner. It stinks of Fyodor Dostoevsky's literary confessions, the Dostoevsky on which Moeller van der Bruck based his doctrine of the Nazis' Third Reich! The same old crap starts again!

Naturally, the Soviets have no monopoly on production of barbaric doctrines. The United States itself has not fallen so far behind in its national productivity that we do not produce an adequate supply of the worst scoundrels on Earth. There is no nation so impoverished that it falls much behind on this point of national pride. The problem is, that whereas President Reagan, on March 23, 1983, offered the Soviet Union a negotiating basis for durable peace, the Soviet leadership, informed by the barbaric misconception of its sovereign will to which I have referred here, is running pell-mell toward early thermonuclear confrontation, and probably thermonuclear war. What has been pouring out of the Soviet Union since approximately March 23, 1983, is not offers to negotiate war-avoidance, but a whipping up of the world and its own population at home, for imminent nuclear warfare.

That, not the violation of Soviet airspace, is the only important implication of continuing Soviet efforts to justify the massacre of unwitting civilians.