

So they decided to dispense with my head; and the Soviets made a number of very demonstrative pressures, including a close associate of Andropov dubbing me, personally, publicly in the Soviet press, as a *casus belli*. Fyodor Burlatsky, a close friend of the Mondale circles in Minnesota, and a very close adviser to Yuri Andropov, a top KGB official, associated with the magazine *Literaturnaya Gazeta*, identified me publicly, to the world, as *casus belli*: That is, if the Reagan administration continued to have any relations with me, and the U.S. government continued to have relations with me, in connection with the SDI, that could lead to World War III. That's what was said; it was said, repeatedly. In 1984, a major campaign was run to break the LaRouche connection to the Reagan administration, telling the Reagan administration, it had better do that openly, as a sign of good faith for any dealings with Moscow. So we had Sen. Daniel Moynihan (D-N.Y.), as a voice echoing the Soviet demand, in the Congress, and elsewhere at that time. A number of other dupes, witting and otherwise, echoed the Soviet demand: "Get him out of there, at all costs!" A barrage of press, mass media, black propaganda, the wildest lies you ever heard against me, were not only issued, but repeated over, and over, and over, and over, and over again.

Soviets demanded LaRouche's head

It didn't work. We continued to function. The Soviets ran into trouble. From August through October 1986, the Soviet government—the Gorbachov government—demanded my head, and demanded that the United States government put me promptly in prison. In response to this pressure from the Soviet government, a massive, 400-man, armed raid was done on the city of Leesburg, in Loudoun County, Virginia, at the beginning of October 1986, *under Soviet orders*; and orchestrated with complicity of a well-known Soviet intelligence channel inside the United States, the drug-pushing Anti-Defamation League, the friends of Edgar Bronfman, and other such scoundrels from the organized crime repertoire. By 1986, the Soviets were in real trouble. They had to respond to the SDI. And despite the Reagan administration's capitulation on many points, the Soviet efforts to preclude the danger that the United States might develop an effective ballistic missile defense, *wrecked* the Soviet political system. The strains *wrecked* it.

This was apparent already in 1986: For example, in October 1988, I gave an address in the Kempinski-Bristol Hotel in West Berlin as a part of the 1988 election campaign—broadcast later throughout the United States—in which I forecast the imminence of the circumstances in which Berlin might become again the capital of a united Germany. This had been in the wind since 1986. What caused it? The SDI. What caused it? Well, in a larger sense, I caused it.

Well, here I sit in jail, as a reward for setting into motion the process which successfully *cracked* the Soviet-Communist empire, *without war*.

Soviet 'Third Rome' outlook rejected SDI

Congressional candidate Lyndon LaRouche addressed the issue of why the Soviet outlook of the "Third Rome" led the Kremlin to so vehemently reject the Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI). The following is edited from remarks made on June 16.

It is now just over seven years since I, together with a number of my associates, published our first warning in the *EIR* that the Soviets were moving along a new track in the direction of establishing a Moscow-dominated world empire, and that all Soviet behavior must be seen from a new standpoint corresponding to this fact. This warning, published in May 1983, was the result of an evaluation of the Soviet personal threats against me, prompted by President Ronald Reagan's announcement of the SDI on March 23, 1983.

In back-channel discussions conducted prior to President Reagan's announcement, I presented to the Soviets the option that the United States might 1) decide to move to a global Strategic Ballistic Missile Defense based on new physical principles; 2) that the United States government, in making this proposal, would offer to the Soviets cooperation in proceeding toward this in the least destabilizing way; and 3) that the new technologies forced into being by development of strategic defense, would be of the greatest benefit to the respective powers and the global economy in general.

The Soviets, in the course of these back-channel discussions, had stated they agreed with my analysis of 1) the feasibility of Strategic Ballistic Missile Defense based on new physical principles (what most people would think of as the SDI); 2) that there is no doubt in the Soviets' mind at the highest level that the development of these strategic military technologies would result in a great benefit for the civilian economies, through technological progress. But, they said, 3) we will oppose this because our economy cannot match the U.S. economy in digesting such types of technological progress. . . .

Once the SDI was announced, within a matter of weeks, top Soviet agents around the world at the highest level, said that what I had done (they blamed me personally for what Reagan had announced and Defense Secretary Caspar Weinberger had backed up) was a threat to the entire life's

work of General Secretary Yuri Andropov, which meant to the apparatus of Marshal Nikolai Ogarkov, and Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachov, the putative crown prince, the political heir of Andropov. At that point, the Soviet press launched an escalating campaign for my elimination from the scene. . . .

Designs for world empire

Why would the Soviet government reject the most effective war avoidance policy to come from the U.S. government in decades, which is obviously the only way to get honorably out of the danger of an early thermonuclear conflict, through the introduction of defensive means?

We looked carefully at some of the symptoms here, and we looked also more deeply at Soviet culture, or Russian culture, to find out how, in terms of the Russian mind, this response to SDI worked; and what we saw is that Andropov et al., were in the process of dumping the facade of Marxism-Leninism as such, and were going rapidly toward what we call today perestroika, of the type which had been intended by Soviet ideologues from the very beginning back in the early 1920s.

The long-term intent of the Soviets, to sum it up—or the Russians, those behind the Soviet experiment—had been to eradicate from Russia the heritage of Peter the Great as a channel of influence for Western philosophical thought and practice, such as that of Gottfried Leibniz, who had influenced greatly the successful but rather short-lived economic reforms of Peter the Great.

The Russians were determined to exterminate these Western influences from the Russian Orthodox Church, that is, the Muscovite Church, which Peter had attempted to reform, and from various aspects of Soviet culture. What the Russians were doing, was going back to a more barbaric, pre-Peter the Great culture, an Ivan Grozny, the so-called Ivan the Terrible, kind of culture, and adopting Ivan the Terrible's commitment to establishing Moscow as the capital of an eternal, pagan Roman Empire, a so-called Third Rome.

Let me interpolate something here, because that helps understanding.

The idea of a Third Roman Empire, successor to Rome and to Byzantium, has been floating around for a long time. The Russians, the Muscovites, that is, picked it up about the middle of the fifteenth century, and it was made an official doctrine of the Czars from about 1510 on, the famous pronouncement of Philotheus of Pskov, is the referenced policy document. The very title of Czar, or Caesar, was adopted by the Russians, by both Ivan Grozny and some of his immediate predecessors, as a way of affirming the commitment to making Moscow the worldwide capital of a Third Roman Empire, a Roman Empire based on pagan Imperial Rome, not Christianity, despite the pretensions for a very shallow, dubious form of gnostic Christianity, which infested the Muscovite monasteries.

So, the Russians were going, back in the spring of 1983, toward that. They had a master plan; and the master plan was based on the assumption that the Anglo-Americans would continue with their monetary and financial policies, in which case Moscow saw that the Anglo-American economies—already collapsing physically—would also reach a point of a financial collapse, a 1929-32 sort of phenomenon. And they hoped that by inducing the United States and Britain to disarm, significantly, under the pressures of financial and economic collapse, that Russia, or Moscow, by living out and surviving through this stormy period of a new financial collapse of the Anglo-American system, would emerge as hegemonic; and, thus, be on the road, in the course of the nineties some time by aid of military threat potential, to achieve the foundations of a global empire for Moscow.

Others dreamed of a 'Third Rome'

The idea of the Third Rome is not new. There were elements in this in the Holy Roman Empire, particularly the Hapsburg phase of it, or the people who financed the Hapsburg venture, particularly from the period of Charles I (Charles V of the Holy Roman Empire, the famous Charles I of Spain). Then, after the defeat of the Spanish Hapsburgs, things became less decisive. Napoleon Bonaparte, as emperor, saw France as the instrument of establishing a pagan Imperial Rome, and Europeans defeated that. The British liberals associated with the British East India Company in particular, had also adopted the idea of a British Third Roman Empire.

The Holy Alliance was considered a transitional approach to establishing a new Roman Empire, and many of the people involved with that were Third Rome advocates. Russia came to the Third Rome again, in the nineteenth century, through such influential circles as Fyodor Dostoevsky's sponsors. Dostoevsky explicitly proposed the establishment of a Third Reich, on the basis of the general philosophical principles which are now advocated by the leading Soviets around Gorbachov and others. Despite disagreements among some of these personalities, rivalries, so to speak, there's a general agreement on the Dostoevskian formula. Dostoevsky was translated literally into Germany, for the Nazis, as *das Dritte Reich*—the Third Reich. So, Hitler was actually carrying out a Russian idea, taken directly from Dostoevsky. Hitler aspired to establish Berlin, in his view, as the capital of a worldwide revival of pagan Imperial Rome; a Third Rome; and Hitler made no bones about it. His killing of the Jews was considered merely a matter of removing the root of Christianity, that is, by removing Yahweh, to destroy Christ. Hitler's wartime objective was to reach the point at which the military victories in Europe enabled him to eradicate Christianity from the face of this planet, a goal which is very close to many Muscovites' hearts.

It is now seven years later, since the spring of 1983. What do we see?



Clockwise from top left: St. Basil's cathedral in Red Square, built by Ivan the Terrible. Fyodor Burlatsky, who called LaRouche's influence in the Reagan administration, a casus belli. A Soviet caricature attacking the SDI as an academic cover for a military offensive.

Uwe Pappart



Stuart Lewis

We see that everything I, together with my associates, wrote back in the spring of 1983, has been thoroughly confirmed. Russia is on a Third Rome track. Those in the West who refuse to recognize it, those who are the opponents of the SDI then, such as the friends of New York banker John Train, who were plotting my destruction with NBC-TV and so forth, at that time, had established their condominium with Moscow. There are funny games going on, in which some people in the West think, well, maybe Moscow is going to collapse, and then they will take over the world, while those in Moscow say that even though they're making retreats on the order of Lenin, two steps backward, one step forward, that they're making retreats in the face of adversity, pending the debacle in the West, the financial collapse in the West, after which the Russian influence over Europe will become dominant; and once the Russian influence over Europe becomes dominant, then Moscow will be in a position to retake everything it has given up, recently, and more, and to conquer the entire world.

The 'authoritarian personality'

As part of this, Moscow is proceeding, culturally, on the basis of a scheme worked out by a top Communist International agent, Georg Lukacs, back in the early 1920s. It was not only Lukacs's plan, but was the general view of the Communist International of the early 1920s, particularly from 1923 on.

The Soviets said, "Ah, we have failed to make the revolution in Western Europe, as we made it in Russia. Why is that? Why could we make a revolution in Russia, and not make it in Western Europe?"

Lukacs said, to sum up his description, "Western Europe has an immunological potential against the Bolshevik virus. That immunological potential is the heritage of Socrates, and the influence of Christianity. Unless we destroy those features of Christianity, or those features of a Socrates converted to Christianity, which represent this immunological potential, we cannot conquer. If we do, we can conquer."

So, on the basis of Lukacs's proposal, a number of ven-

tures were launched including what is called the Frankfurt School of people like Theodor Adorno. And what was adopted as the key feature of this Soviet subversive propaganda, this communist subversion, was called the doctrine of the authoritarian personality, as associated with the work of Adorno.

You look at the subversive work of, for example, the Stasi, the State Security Ministry of East Germany, of the devilish KGB agent, Gen. Markus Wolf, and you see—coming out of the old East German television, cultural recreation, and its literature—you will see this virus of Lukacs, this virus of the satanic Berthold Brecht, the satanic virus of Adorno, the attack on the authoritarian personality.

The authoritarian personality is nothing more nor less than the person who believes two things: number one, that there is a difference between right and wrong. The Soviets wish to eliminate that, just like our pragmatists in Washington do today. Secondly, the understanding that the difference between right and wrong is not an arbitrary thing, but is something which is accessible to all developed human reason; that we as individuals, and as groups of people, have the means, reason, to discover principles where we can know infallibly the essential difference between right and wrong, between that which we must do, and that which we must not do.

So, the Soviets recognize that by destroying this respect for reason, the authority to know the difference between right and wrong, that they could destroy the West. Now, that is proceeding.

How is it proceeding?

Well, in Western Christianity, there has been a long fight against a kind of paganism in Christian clothes called “gnosticism.” It’s been around for a long time, there was a fellow called Simon Magus from the time of St. Peter, who was spreading gnosticism around Rome; so that’s been hanging around for a long time.

But the fight centered, in due course, about something which came to be known as the *Filioque*; the principle that the Holy Spirit, the *Logos*, was made manifest in Jesus Christ. Christ as God and Man. That therefore, the Holy Spirit flows from Christ as it does from God.

What’s tied up here is the idea of the individual as in the image of the living God. That we, through the powers of creative reason, given to us as our potential, a potential which sets mankind apart from and above all the beasts, have the power to know the difference between right and wrong, and to create new conceptions of practice by which the right can be better served. That is the essence of Western Christian civilization; it is known sometimes as the *Filioque* principle, or the principle of reason. And that is what Russian culture, particularly Muscovite culture, opposes, from an Oriental standpoint. Russian culture says that the *Filioque* is the enemy. They reject Christ, in short. And Russian, or Muscovite theology, or Muscovite pseudo-Christianity, is essentially

what’s called a syncretic adaptation of some of the mere terms of Christianity, and outward forms of ritual, to the continued heritage of outward worship of Satan’s mother, Matushka Rus, the Earth Mother goddess.

The Devil changes clothes

Look at what is happening now, around the world. Look at what’s happening in the Protestant churches, for example.

The Church of Scotland now proposes, among others, along with the Anglican Church, the Church of England, to tear up the Book of Genesis, and to tear up, largely, the Gospels and Epistles of the New Testament. They propose, at the same time, to go into Judaism and do the same thing with the Torah, to bring the Bible, Christianity, and the Torah into conformity with a satanic dogma, which teaches that man is nothing but another animal, and must not place himself above the beasts in the moral scheme of things. That is Lukacs’s dogma. That is the essence of satanism, that is the essence of bolshevism.

This is what we warned against in 1983. People said, “Well, communism is going to go away, the Russians are going to dump communism, that’s good.”

We said, “What is good about the Devil changing his clothes, to change a relatively modern costume, Marxism-Leninism, for his old costume, the doctrine of the Third Rome, a pagan Imperial Rome?”

So, we’ve come full circle. All of the signs are about us. Environmentalism, which is an outgrowth of this kind of satanism proposed by Lukacs, is becoming hegemonic. We have Environmental Protection Agency administrator William Reilly in the U.S. government, who’s pushing this kind of garbage. It’s coming from Prince Philip, the consort of the Queen of England. It’s coming from all kinds of sources, but it’s coming especially from an axis which includes Ivan Frollov, close adviser to Gorbachov. It runs through the Laxenberg, Austria, International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis, around people like Dzhermen Gvishiani, the Soviets’ KGB spy, Gvishiani’s friend, Lord Solly Zuckerman of Britain, and Dr. Alexander King, the professed racist mass murderer of Britain, into Cambridge University’s Apostles circle, in the so-called Cambridge Global Systems Analysis Group. It runs sideways from this branch of economics, and runs into the churches, into the top levels of the Church of Scotland, into the top levels of the World Council of Churches, into the attacks on the *Filioque*, the Book of Genesis, and the New Testament. It runs into the top levels of the Church of England. Satanism pours out of the crypts of New York’s leading Episcopal Church, the Cathedral of St. John the Divine and its Lindisfarne kook center in Long Island.

So, what we warned against, in the spring of 1983, comes true, comes full circle. It’s all here now. What conclusions are we obliged to draw from the fact that that analysis, which my friends and I circulated first in 1983, has been so fully vindicated by events seven years later?