
Open Letter to Yuri Andropov

You have chosen to plunge the world into war

by Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.

When you rejected even exploratory negotiations offered by President Ronald Reagan, on the basis of the new U.S. strategic doctrine publicized on March 23, 1983, you consciously chose thermonuclear war to occur sometime during the several years immediately ahead. You know that, and I know that. Unfortunately, there are many people, including heads of governments around the world, self-deluded by their own wishful thinking, who are refusing to accept very simple facts on that subject.

I would not go so far as to argue that you like the idea of a thermonuclear war, that you desire that experience. I mean that you are consciously aiming the Soviet Union toward a thermonuclear confrontation with the United States, and you are prepared to risk the possibility that in such a situation the United States will shoot, rather than back down to the present Soviet margin of advantage, in the event the U.S.S.R. goes to the point of launching a pre-emptive strategic strike against the United States. (I have personally gone through the calculations, based on comparison of known U.S. capabilities and known portions of Soviet capabilities.) I am certain that you believe the probability of U.S. backdown is much greater than I do; you are very, very wrong: You overlook the lessons of Pearl Harbor, and what happened to the peace movement of that time on the morning of Dec. 7, 1941.

For example, if Germany and the Benelux nations begin to shift out of NATO, toward a "Middle Europe" constellation, such a development, occurring in the context of what is now occurring in the Middle East and Northern Africa, will hit the consciousness of leading institutions and much of the population in much the same way as the events of Dec. 7, 1941. The anger and rage building up because of the deepening general economic depression, detonated to a state of angered desperation by occurrence of the impending monetary collapse, will intersect such developments as a "Middle

Europe" eruption. All of the frightening developments will seek to attach themselves simplistically to one single issue for action. The mood will be, "Now we have to fight!" Most Americans will seek to find agreement among themselves on a choice of tangible adversary to be fought. That choice will be, inevitably, the Soviet Union.

Take the case of the Harrimans, for example. W. A. Harriman not only praised Mussolini as early as 1927 (in the front pages of the *New York Times*), but, during a 1932 conference sponsored by his family's and Morgan's New York American Museum of Natural History, his family endorsed and praised Adolf Hitler and the Nazis, with special praise for the Nazis' "racial hygiene" policies. The Morgan interests, partly through the I. G. Farben cartel, which they controlled at that time, were crucial backers of the German Liberal Party leader Hjalmar Schacht's decision to put Hitler into power—with more backing of leading monied interests from outside Germany than from within (a small matter not so strangely overlooked during the Nuremberg Trial proceedings later). However, after Winston Churchill and others recognized the certainty of a previously unexpected course of events in the impending war in Europe, that Hitler would strike west first, before attacking the Soviet Union, beginning 1938 the Harrimans and Morgans, among others, began to drop their earlier, strong affections for the Hitler regime, and assumed leading positions to their own advantage within the political machinery of war preparations.

You must not overlook the fact, that the same gang which entered Bertrand Russell's Pugwash Conference operations, proposing to divide world rule between two nuclear empires, was also the same gang behind Russell's earlier, persisting demands for "preventive nuclear war" against the Soviet Union. Many Soviet circles delude themselves by describing these scoundrels as the "realists"; there is a point of devel-

opments in progress now, at which these wretches will see their special interests threatened with Soviet destruction, at which point those present leaders of the Nuclear Freeze and associated peace movements will adorn themselves with Phrygian caps and lead the procession demanding war.

I know these scoundrels Soviet circles call the the "realists" very well. They were full-fledged fascists during the 1920s and 1930s, were really fascists during the war, and are fascists today. Moreover, they are fanatical racialists, as was that proponent of genocide against "darker-skinned racial stocks," Bertrand Russell; the fundamental issue for them is the perpetuation and increase of the worldwide power enjoyed by the circles of oligarchical "families" they represent in North America, Europe, and elsewhere. At the moment they see you threatening their "families' " interests, they will suddenly become the most fanatical U.S. patriots against you, not because they like the constitutional republic of the United States—they hate the "ideas of 1776," and always have—but because the United States represents the only power which could check Soviet advances.

Thus, on the point of a "new Pearl Harbor" as I have described it broadly above, the U. S. population—the honest people—and these oligarchical families will be plunged into an anti-Soviet alliance with one another, an alliance of opposites on the limited basis of passionate commitment to "common but conflicting aims."

Except for that point of strategic miscalculation, which prompts you to underestimate the consequences of your recent and continuing rejection of the new U.S. strategic doctrine, you, Yuri Andropov, have chosen to plunge the world into general thermonuclear war.

Let us also consider the fact, that leading circles of the Soviet Union presently view me as intellectually the most dangerous adversary of the Soviet Union. In a certain, twisted sort of logic, that present Soviet characterization of me as "worse than President Reagan," is based on fact. I am very much a patriot of the United States, such that when the existence of the constitutional republic founded in 1789 is imperiled, I would mobilize from out of my nation capabilities beyond your imagination, to defend my nation by war if that need be: I know how a nuclear war can be successfully won—as do, more or less accurately, Soviet military circles associated with Zhukov, Sokolovskii, and Ogarkov. I would mobilize to win such a war quickly, if such a war were threatened. That much about me is true.

What you allege against me is a threat to you only if you leave me no choice. If you would be sensible, I, together with forces more or less in the footsteps of the late Gen. Douglas MacArthur, am the very component of U.S. thinking suited to sit together with Soviet specialists steeped in the Sokolovskii tradition, to thrash out options to be delivered to my President and your government, to obtain durable peace. The choice lies in your hands. My President, supported by Defense Secretary Caspar Weinberger and Dr. Edward Teller, has made you a fair and generous offer of negotiations of

a new strategic doctrine, a doctrine which, from the U.S. side coincides more or less exactly with Soviet military doctrine. You have refused those negotiations; therefore it is entirely on your head that the moral responsibility for the thermonuclear war now rests.

Do not argue that the President made this offer merely as some sort of ruse, to hide plans for a "first strike." You do not believe such nonsense yourself, otherwise you would have discussed the President's and Secretary Weinberger's actual offers, rather than issuing barrages of nothing but wild falsehoods. Let us suppose you were suspicious of the President's offer, this would have required you to offer *exploratory negotiations*. Except for the most recent accord between Teller and Velikhov, you have so far rejected every avenue of exploratory or other negotiations. You have strengthened the position of forces which oppose the President's offer, the forces of the same fascists who concocted the Pugwash doctrine of Mutually Assured Destruction (MAD), the policy leading us into nothing but a thermonuclear war. *You chose thermonuclear war, and accelerated the possibility of its early occurrence.* You helped to push Henry A. Kissinger back into government, a development which would not have occurred if you had responded to the President's proposal with at least exploratory negotiations. With Kissinger and what he represents in power in Washington, a thermonuclear World War III is almost guaranteed for the period ahead.

If the Soviet Union is almost demolished in thermonuclear war, do not blame me; blame yourself.

We may disagree on some of the fine points, but I know that you know that the essential point I have presented to you is entirely true.

The Soviet government must reverse its present policies, immediately and dramatically. If it does not, thermonuclear war is virtually assured.

Beginning with a two-day public seminar convened in Washington, D.C., during February 1982, I presented simultaneously to your government and my own a proposed strategic doctrine for avoiding World War III, a proposal to overthrow the insane and immoral policies of both governments and NATO from the Pugwash Conference. Many people of influence in the United States quickly accepted this proposal, and, when Dr. Edward Teller was persuaded to become spokesman for such a new doctrine, the President was won to accept its broadest military features, although not—at least visibly—its included economic-reforms features.

Your government had more than a year to study this new strategic doctrine before March 23, 1983. You may have been confident that leading Democratic Party circles, and others whose brains have been "Pugwashed," would have succeeded in preventing the President from adopting any principal features of my proposed doctrine. If so, you clearly underestimated the President and the internal dynamics of the political process in the United States. Once the doctrine was promulgated, you should have accepted at least exploratory negotiations immediately.

One of the key included elements in your blundering refusal to negotiate immediately was your misestimation of my influence in the United States. I have no direct influence over the President, of course, but it must have been obvious to your informants from the United States and Western Europe—among other locations—that the circulation and influence of ideas associated with me is sufficient today, that conceptions circulated from me and my immediate circles permeate circles throughout the United States and some other nations, to the effect that the influence of these ideas pops up in many influential places and proceedings. This is also demonstrated to you by the fact that Soviet agencies have watched closely, and filed routinely, accumulations of operations directed against me by McGeorge Bundy et al. since the spring of 1968, attacks which have escalated, especially since 1973, to the degree that attacks directed against me by leading forces supportive of the Pugwash Conference's strategic and Malthusian dogmas have made me a leading household synonym for the word "controversial public figure" worldwide. In such circles, it has become lately the leading concern of such forces throughout many parts of the world to go almost to any extreme to prevent me from assuming the positions of power they fear I would surely secure without hundreds of millions of dollars of effort deployed against me worldwide each year at this time. The fact that a strategic doctrine proposed by me could circulate through the internal processes of the United States, to become a fundamental change in U.S. strategic doctrine a year later, ought to have taught you something.

What it should have taught you is not that I have any direct power, in the usual sense of power. I have almost none, as your government knows, except the power of ideas. What March 23, 1983 should have taught you is that the species of world-outlook I represent has such great organic appeal among the people of the United States in particular, that even the most powerful political and financial forces of Europe and North America have so far been unable to halt the accelerating growth of my ideas' influence. That should have taught you something about the character of the United States, its cultural character, and associated potentialities.

It should have taught you that the strategic doctrine announced by the President has powerful appeal to the American people, such appeal that even the concerted lies and hatred against me mobilized through the major news media and other channels of actions could not prevent such appealing conceptions from spreading to the effect seen.

If you had accepted the President's offer, your acceptance of even provisional negotiations of the new strategic doctrine would have increased the credibility of the philosophical world-outlook among the U.S. population and leading institutions which was reflected in the doctrine and associated offer. You were choosing between the cultural heritage of the American Revolution—the "ideas of 1776"—and the opposing, oligarchical cultural heritage associated with Morgan, Harriman, et al., "families" which are outgrowths of the

treasonous "Essex Junto" of New England and its New York accomplices over the period of treason by that crowd, 1796-1863.

By overlooking such considerations, you have done great damage to the possibility of avoiding thermonuclear war, and contributed to the ongoing destruction of all of the nations of the developing sector during the course of this decade. You have put yourself on the side of evil, on the side of the policies of the "oligarchical families," allying yourself in fact with those forces now imposing genocide on one nation of the developing sector after another.

Is it also the case, that the Soviet government is so steeped in false pride, that it cannot admit that it has committed a wicked blunder on this point? Would the Soviet government rather cling to a policy which assures thermonuclear war, which fosters genocide against the developing sector, than "humiliate" itself before the eyes of its foreign adversaries, by admitting that a mistake has been committed?

Now I must act again, as I did in February 1982. The proposed strategic doctrine I proposed then is the only valid strategic doctrine for war avoidance today; it would be insane to propose to trade that doctrine away for "disarmament agreements" or any such diplomatic trash. However, merely restating the doctrine is not sufficient. Something new has been added to the world's situation by your misguided refusal to consider even exploratory negotiations. Therefore, features must be added also to the original proposal. Broader, deeper issues must be considered and addressed, in addition to those already considered in the strategic doctrine's formulations and design.

I act now as I did in February 1982; I place my proposals publicly before the nations and conscience of the world, and present them most emphatically for the attention of your government and my own.

Pugwash and 'Third Rome'

The manner in which your government foolishly rejected even exploratory negotiations of the President's offer, was crucial evidence pointing to the dominating features of current Soviet policy-thinking. When any government consciously chooses to risk thermonuclear war, rather than explore the only available alternative actually presented, certain conclusions must be drawn concerning the intellectual and moral state of mind of that government.

Something very evil is influencing the philosophical world-outlook currently shaping the decisions of the Soviet government.

Some of my friends, including my close friends in many parts of the world, are frightened that I should refer publicly to such things. They allege that even if what I have caused to be published on this subject were true, it is "tactically" wrong, "counterproductive," to utter it. Those friends are badly mistaken; I should never have accomplished the scientific discoveries I have accomplished, nor would my association have grown to its present role in world affairs, had I been

susceptible of intellectual and moral cowardice of the sort which they, in fact, have strongly recommended to me. About important questions, only the harshest truths are permissible.

We shall get nowhere, unless I address with ruthless accuracy the specific, visible element of philosophical outlook which has prompted your government to adopt the wicked decision it has adopted on the issue of strategic negotiations.

Unless you recognize that flaw in yourselves, the entire world is destined for early destruction. "Diplomatic" evasions of truth are never a good policy, and often the hallmark of manipulators whose efforts for good must ultimately fail because they lack the courage to pursue a rigorous course of action in support of fundamental principles.

There are three elements chiefly directing you to the

The Soviet media response to beam weapons

A TASS release from Rome, reprinted in the Soviet government paper *Izvestia* of Aug. 26, acknowledged in straightforward coverage the result of the conference of Soviet, American and European scientists held Aug. 20-23 in Erice, Sicily: "The international seminar of physicists in the Italian city of Erice on problems of peace and disarmament, in which scientists from both socialist and capitalist countries took part, has signed a project of agreement on cooperation among the U.S.S.R., U.S.A., and Western Europe. This document provides for the creation of a permanent scientific group which will study proposals on the possibilities and feasibility of developing and creating a global system of defense against nuclear war."

This is the first time since President Reagan's March 23 speech on strategic defense as the means to avoid war, totally blacked out in the Soviet media, that a major Soviet daily has as much as mentioned such an idea as "feasibility of defense against nuclear war." Neither the party paper *Pravda* nor the army paper *Red Star* of the same date published the release.

A sample of earlier Soviet coverage:

***Izvestia*, Aug. 25:** . . . The Heritage Foundation. . . with clearly marked "hawk's plumage," proposes that 400 satellites be put into orbit armed with. . . lethal ray guns for attacking targets on earth. . . . This argument was used in the well known "star wars" speech delivered by. . . Reagan in March. What such "arguments" contain is revealed by Prof. M. Kaku of New York University. . . . They provide "not a security based on peace but a security that is to be produced by a nuclear war that becomes inevitable."

Radio Moscow in English, Aug. 23: . . . We may recall with what alarm the Americans received last March Reagan's program on so-called Star Wars. A group of prominent U.S. scientists and public figures then called on Andropov to assist in banning space weapons.

Moscow Domestic TV, Aug. 20: . . . It really is a terrible danger, because from space the earth looks as if it is in the palm of your hand; . . . it seems indefensible from such weapons as lasers, and all the more because in

space, where there is no atmosphere, laser weapons increase their power and range. . . . We [want to] shake hands in space with U.S. astronauts and not look at each other through gunsights. . . . not exchange laser blows. . . .

Moscow Domestic TV, Aug. 25: . . . The testing of an antisatellite weapon, which the U.S. plans to carry out in the near future, will be the first step leading to war in space. That is the alarming warning issued by the Center for Defense Information, an influential U.S. organization. . . . Admiral Gene LaRocque, director of the Center, described this [Andropov's] peace initiative as a unique opportunity. . . . If it is not taken, the admiral said, an outbreak of war in space, which will inevitably spread to the earth, will become more likely. . . . Three Star Wars films have broken all records. . . . The upshot of this is that Hollywood has gradually carried out the advance brainwashing of public opinion, by preparing the ground for the serious space wars which President Reagan, who began his career in Hollywood, is getting ready for mankind.

Sotsialisticheskaya Industriya (Central Committee daily), Aug. 24: . . . Beam weapons. . . focus energy in a narrow beam. When this is achieved the beam becomes, as the militarist press likes to repeat persistently, a "death ray." . . . But as the well-known American expert K. Tsipis notes, "An effective laser weapon will be of impressive proportions. . . ." It is this last fact which particularly attracts the military-industrial corporations. Incidentally, California's Heliotechnics . . . is actively involved in the development of laser weapons for space. Its biggest shareholders include the notorious "father" of the American hydrogen bomb E. Teller. . . . Well-known American specialists on military-technical problems have made well-founded objections to Reagan's decisions. Some of them describe as the "biggest lie" the President's assurances that sophisticated types of weapons are the key to a humane, peaceful future.

Radio Moscow to North America, Aug. 23: The world is really at a crossroads now. It is time for humanity to choose where to go further: either towards Reagan's star wars that mean an inevitable end to the world or to ban outer space for any weapon, to keep it peaceful for all times. The Soviet Union has made its decision and the question now is what position the United States will adopt.

wicked choice of decision you made in response to the President's and Secretary Weinberger's offers. (You have no right to denounce me for what I am about to say about you. My denunciations of the relevant swine of my own and other nations on my side of the strategic division are specific and thorough. I cannot be accused of being inconsistent or unfair in my denunciations of your behavior on the same issues.)

The first of the three elements chiefly to be considered is the effects (in this case upon Soviet policy and thinking) of the succession of two postwar strategic policies of the oligarchical families' faction of the United States and Europe. The first in this succession was Russell's proposal for "preventive nuclear war" against the Soviet Union, a war proposed in service of Russell's demand, beginning the October 1946 *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists*, to create a "world government" with a monopoly on possession and use of nuclear arsenals. This continued under the auspices of present leaders of the international "nuclear freeze" movement, and Russell's World Association of Parliamentarians for World Government (WAPWG) until approximately the 1955 WAPWG conference, in which Soviet representatives participated. In response to Soviet development of both nuclear and thermonuclear arsenals over the 1949-54 period, Russell steered a second project, called the Pugwash Conference, which has negotiated with Soviet representatives, through that and correlated "back channels," every strategic doctrine adopted by the United States and NATO until March 23, 1983! Both of these statements you know to be entirely accurate, both explicitly and in respect to their broader implications.

Thus, from the vantage-point of every ordinary U.S. citizen, the European and U.S. leaders of the Nuclear Freeze and allied movements appear to be indisputably agents of the Soviet KGB. You and I know that this image may be true in significant part, but that it is broadly an oversimplification. The reality of your rejection of the President's proposal of March 23, 1983, was your maintaining a very special kind of alliance with the Western faction which has been the Soviet partner in the Pugwash Conference and associated back-channel proceedings. Accepting the President's proposal would mean tearing up an existing, longstanding devil's pact with the gang of racist, oligarchical scoundrels associated with the life's work of the most monstrous degenerate of the 20th century, Bertrand Lord Russell.

You know that Russell's earlier proposal for "preventive nuclear war" against the Soviet Union and the Pugwash Conference have identical objectives and spring from the same motives and evil philosophy. In summary, a "world government with a monopoly on possession and use of nuclear arsenals" was nothing but a proposal for an Anglo-Saxon world empire, to be ruled by a coterie of families, including Lord Russell's own, in the model of the Assyrian, Babylonian, Median, Persian (Achaemenid), Ptolemaic, Roman, Byzantine, Ottoman, Austro-Hungarian, and Russian empires of the past, the idea of empire which was the goal of the

faction in 18th-century Britain centered around David Hume, Lord Shelburne, and the British East India Company offshoot of the Venetian Levant Company.

When Soviet development of nuclear and thermonuclear arsenals made "preventive nuclear war" less appealing to the great humanitarian and pacifist Bertrand Russell, Russell et al. drew upon the military knowledge of relevant British scholars, and cooked up a proposal modeled upon the agreement between King Philip of Macedon and the Chaldean-Phoenician banker-priesthood families controlling the Achaemenid Empire from within. Russell caused to be proposed to the Soviet government that a single world empire be established, eliminating the institution of the sovereign nation-state worldwide, but that this empire be ruled by two separate forces, rather than one: an "Eastern" and "Western" division of a single world empire. Not without factional commotion within the Soviet Union on this issue and its sundry leading implications, the Soviet government has, in net effect, accepted Russell's two-empire proposal, and has tolerated, within limits, the oligarchs' proposal of creating a third, Chinese empire, which fellows like Brzezinski have attempted to extend to include Japan, Southeast Asia, and chunks of a ruined India. (I believe you draw the line against the demolition of India to such purpose, and perhaps also, it appears, Southeast Asia—unless the the United States makes the error of a strategic build-up in that area.)

The Soviet Union's assigned role in this arrangement is broadly that earlier projected to King Philip of Macedon. This arrangement, first presented to Soviet representatives in the form of Dr. Leo Szilard's elaboration of the doctrine of Mutually Assured Destruction (MAD) at the second, 1958 Quebec conference of Pugwash, was emphasized in Szilard's included proposal to "redraw the political map of the world" between the two superpower alliances, the policy presented associated with Lord Peter Carrington's "new Yalta" doctrine currently in process of global implementation in Asia, Africa, and Yugoslavia.

You may find it more comfortable to your conscience to think of this as "spheres of influence." I prefer a more honest word, "empire," "naked, brutal imperialism," everything against which the American Revolution was fought, and, to the extent I gather the means, what I shall destroy in every part of the world such a monstrous abomination reappears.

Don't speak to me of U.S. imperialism unless you are willing to speak in the same way of Soviet imperialism. Both our nations have been drawn into the policy framework for the postwar world by Russell and his abominable accomplices. If we are to eliminate imperialism, we must negotiate to eliminate it jointly from the practice of both our nations, rather than aiming to bomb the other to extinction (by one imperialism) on the grounds that the other is an imperialist power. Our nations, together, dominate the world, and we do it very, very badly.

There are two leading features of the imperialism imposed upon the world by the forces behind the Pugwash

Conference series. The primary feature is the doctrine of “international socialism” promulgated during the 1920s by Bertrand Russell, H. G. Wells, and their accomplices from sundry, wicked theosophical cults modeled on the ancient cult of Isis, such as Aleister Crowley’s Lucifer-worshipping Golden Dawn cult. The exemplary references include Russell’s 1923 *The Problem of China* and *The Prospects of Industrial Civilization*, and H. G. Wells’s 1928 *The Open Conspiracy*. The second, derivative feature of the Pugwash imperialist doctrine, the specific linchpin of agreement embedded at the center of Pugwash’s two-empire scheme, is the doctrine of Mutually Assured Destruction (MAD). The function of the military and arms-control policies subsumed under MAD is to create a military order of the sort indispensable for world social and economic order conforming to the specifications of Russell’s proposals for “international socialism.”

We cite a passage from Russell’s *Prospects of Industrial Civilization*, as quoted in C. White, *The New Dark Ages Conspiracy*, New York, 1980:

“Socialism, especially international socialism, is only possible as a stable system if the population is stationary or nearly so. A slow increase might be coped with by improvement in agricultural methods, but a rapid increase must in the end reduce the whole population to penury . . . the white population of the world will soon cease to increase. The Asiatic races will be longer, and the negroes still longer, before their birth-rate falls sufficiently to make their numbers stable without help of war and pestilence. . . . Until that happens, the benefits aimed at by socialism can only be partially realized. *The less prolific races will have to defend themselves against the more prolific by methods which are disgusting even if they are necessary.* [emphasis added]”

This is the policy of the Club of Rome, of the International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis (IIASA), and of the *Global 2000* and *Global Futures* policies issued by the outgoing administration of President Jimmy Carter. This is what such Harriman cronies as Robert McNamara have represented at the World Bank, in sponsoring the Brandt North-South Commission, and in the policies of the fascist Green Party of West Germany today. This is the policy of the leaders of the nuclear freeze movement, including a Harriman family which supported Hitler openly because of Hitler’s “racial hygiene” policies against “non-Anglo-Saxon” racial stocks.

Behold! Yuri Andropov, those “progressive forces” of Pugwash who are your preferred Western partner in the devil’s pact of world-empire of “international socialism”! That suicidal eruption of monstrous bestiality which is the so-called Iranian revolution, the brutish madness of “Islamic fundamentalism,” the assortment of separatist “peoples’ liberation struggles” steered from such centers as Lausanne, Switzerland’s François Genoud, by the Nazi International constituted around the nucleus of Walter Schellenberg’s RSHA Amt VI “foreign nationalities” sections of the Abwehr and Waffen SS: These are your “progressive allies,” Yuri Andropov—

and you know it! Shall we judge your policies, your philosophical outlook by that with which you ally yourself? By what other standard do you propose we measure the content and motive of your policies?

So you acted in response to the President’s offer of March 23, 1983, and so we must interpret the intent behind your employment of statements you know to be wildly false, in your persisting denunciations of the President’s offer. For sake of a devil’s-pact partnership with the “Western” component of your Pugwash back-channel negotiations, you allied the Soviet Union with such monstrous degenerates even worse than Adolf Hitler, and for this “noble alliance’s” interest, you preferred a commitment to probable thermonuclear war over the best offer of assured peace the Soviet Union has received during the entire postwar period! How else can we judge your intent, except by the yardstick of this new parody of the Hitler-Stalin pact?

Some of my friends insist I should not mention such things, as if a doctor might cure a disease better by diplomatically ignoring the fact of its existence. I am intellectually tougher, more rigorous than some of my frightened friends. It is unpleasant, but it is necessary.

What circumstances within the Soviet Union could bring its leadership to such a demoralized state of mind as this well-documented evidence of its behavior suggests? Put aside all my criticisms of Soviet philosophy, economic policies, and so forth. You are urinating on the grave of Lenin with such practices! For decades, the Soviet Union held itself up to the world as the moral champion of the rights of all people to enjoy technological progress, access to education and experiences by which the power of reason might be developed in the individual, and the sovereignty of oppressed colonial and other strategically weaker nations against the rape of their wealth by supranational agencies. Soviet spokesmen may have not understood such goals in the proper light philosophically, but the kernel of the spokesmanship was never worse than a defective approach to a principle identical with that of the “ideas of 1776” and of 1789. Where is your commitment toward the other nations and peoples of the world today? What do you imagine a Lenin would think of you if he could see what you have become in your foreign policy of practice today?

Something has changed very drastically. This change—this drastic change—has two clear and leading features: *A sweep of worldwide cultural pessimism into Soviet society generally, combined with a falling-back toward what Old Russian culture can bring forth under conditions of deepening cultural and moral pessimism.*

I am clearly not opposed to even sweeping changes in Soviet society and Soviet philosophy. Although I refrain from intervening into your internal affairs to any degree out of keeping with the facts that yours is a sovereign state and I a foreigner to that state, I have not been exactly bashful about proposing some important changes in your philosophy and

practice. Some of my recommendations on changes in economic policy you, personally, might welcome, Yuri Andropov, while perhaps resenting the fact that I had proposed them. Some you would not like at all, but it is nonetheless proper, and not a *casus belli*, that I should insist on stating my point.

The question is, *change for what?* Perhaps some among the internal changes you are making I might heartily endorse, scientifically, and possibly also specific measures adopted; I do not believe I have yet sufficient evidence to say. Your present foreign policy, and the philosophical outlook it carries with it, is broadly monstrous, as I have indicated leading points. *Change, yes, but not this change.*

The reality of your rejection of the President's proposal of March 23 was your maintaining a very special kind of alliance with the Western faction which has been the Soviet partner in back channel proceedings. Accepting the President's proposal would mean tearing up an existing, longstanding devil's pact with the gang of racist, oligarchical scoundrels.

As the energy of Soviet Marxism-Leninism has evaporated, there is a slow, accelerating upsurge of the influence of the old *Raskolniki*, centered around the emergence of a *Raskolnik's* sort of church-institution. This occurs, inevitably, in the path of least resistance defined by 1917 and its aftermath. It does not proceed back directly to the Jesuit, Russian Church, and oligarchical institutions associated with the Venetian, Count Capodistria's dictating of Russian foreign policy at the 1815 Congress of Vienna. It proceeds, in state and party institutions, along lines of embedded potentials, through the Parvus and Parvus-linked Bolshevik fragments of the post-1905 period, including the Bogdanov and later Bukharin tendencies. It intersects the fact that the forces in play in both the 1905 revolution—especially in Baku—and in what was unleashed by the Parvus-centered operation in the February 1917 eruption, had strong included features

of a 20th-century Pugachev revolt, which, as we know from the documentation of the latter period and the events leading through the virtual revolutionary insurrection in implementation of the first Five-Year Plan, was the constant feature of the process which Lenin and others focused on channeling, with special emphasis on the Social Revolutionaries, of course. It is mystical elements typified by Dostoevsky and Tolstoy, which adapt to the institutions and ruling ideas of party and state apparatuses, which seep into every pore wherever cultural pessimism exerts its grip.

This is reinforced in a very visible, and very understandable way, by xenophobic impulses nurtured by invasions, threats of war, and other aversive circumstances over a span of 65 years to date. Hatred of the outside world, and therefore despising as well as distrusting every leading cultural impulse associated with Western European culture: This makes ideas and impulses expressed in the extreme by Dostoevsky quite credible to the Russian people in large degree, at least. It is not the fact that Philotheos of Pskov formulated the Third Rome doctrine in 1510 in a certain way, or that this policy was associated with the Byzantine form of church-state relations under czarist institutions under most czars. It is the fact that this deeply embedded cultural matrix must appear to a contemporary Russian farmer, for example, to be fully corroborated by the experience with the United States and Western Europe over most of the past 65 years.

I can, in that sense, make excuses for the Russian people and government, as to what process they were impelled in the direction of such cultural tendencies. I can also document, in many cases, cultural matrices of numerous nations which would make this world a pure Hell if those nations, with continued such cultural impulses, ever gained power over their neighbors. Those elements of Russian culture best identified by the *Raskolniki* are no worse than those of other cases; the most evil cultural impulses I know to exist in the world today are those associated with Bertrand Russell and those in the Western nations attracted to Russell's outlooks and policies on leading issues. *The practical problem is that if the foreign policies of a superpower, are under the influence of such cultural impulses, the world is in danger.*

The practical problem is, that as long as your government is committed to the Pugwash agreements, thermonuclear war is almost certain for the period ahead, and even without a war, a spreading, Malthusian-directed destruction of every existing nation of the developing sector is certain to have been completed by the close of the present decade, a destruction which will lead quickly to the destruction of every other nation of the world before the close of this century. You would find the Pugwash agreements an abomination to be destroyed by every means available, unless the combination of your infection with worldwide cultural pessimism, and your acceptance of the Pugwash imperial doctrine, had not pushed you into adopting a foreign policy best described as a thrust consistent with the doctrine of Philotheos of Pskov:

“The Third and Final Roman Empire.”

Thus, it would be silly to merely criticize your strategic policies, without examining the fact that your present policy is based on a Pugwash devil’s pact with the most abominable scoundrels of the Western world. There can be no practical hope of correction of your commitment to that devil’s-pact alliance with Harriman et al. unless we address that cultural outlook within your present government which permits you to adhere, up to the point of threatening preemptive thermonuclear warfare, to defense of your wicked agreements with the pack of scoundrels.

Only frightened people, who lack the moral strength of intellect to face hard realities, can sustain continued objections to my pointing the finger to the issue of the “Third Rome.” Not only must we in the West (and developing sector) face that unpleasant fact; we must attempt to induce you to see it as I see it. Then, you might will to change it.

Otherwise, all other maneuvers and negotiations in the name of “war-avoidance” will prove to be in the end a terrible waste of mental energies and time.

Finally, on this specific point, I could not blame you morally for rejecting my recommended approach to war-avoidance, as long as the United States had not offered you such an alternative. Once the President and the defense secretary had made the offer publicly, things must be judged

You must demonstrate public commitment to negotiate the March 23, 1983 doctrine’s implementation seriously. If such a properly founded summit meeting could occur between you and the President, I would favor it at the earliest point possible.

differently. You rejected peace, and chose thermonuclear war. It is that choice which must be addressed, and changed.

Time is running out very rapidly.

Practical measures of policy

Broadly, I support everything which contributes to an improved climate of negotiations, but it is foolish at this stage to delude oneself that a “friendlier atmosphere” by itself will do anything but contribute to greater likelihood of thermonuclear war. START agreements and such things are, in themselves, diplomatic trash at this juncture. The fundamentals, to which I have referred above, must be directly faced and resolved. To the extent we believe that merely promoting

a “friendlier atmosphere,” or finding “constructive compromise or agreement” on another silly arms-control agreement—which we shall both break immediately, anyway—is a substitute for facing fundamental issues, we increase the danger of imminent thermonuclear war by deluding ourselves to believe in the effectiveness of what are in fact empty gestures.

Steps toward a “friendlier climate of discussions” are tragically foolish enterprises, unless those steps are consciously directed, and so understood by both parties, toward negotiating within the framework of broad agreement to the President’s policy declaration of March 23, 1983. Negotiation directed toward any other, early end-result is merely generating the false confidence which increases the certainty of war.

Were I President of the United States, I would have offered a wide range of unilateral and negotiated gestures to assure you of my intentions in respect to the March 23, 1983. In fact, within the narrowed political limits of action your rejection of his offer has imposed upon President Reagan, he has done several such things. However, at this stage of the process, I would advise President Reagan, were I asked, not to undertake a personal meeting with you, Yuri Andropov, at this time. He must expect that you might behave as Khrushchev did in the Paris summit with President Eisenhower, in keeping with your present efforts to make Walter Mondale or John Glenn President of the United States. Whereas, a meeting between perhaps Ustinov, Ogarkov, and Basov on your side, and Dr. Teller and some of our military people on our side, should have occurred immediately after March 23, 1983, preparatory to an Andropov-Reagan summit projected for the end of April or early May. That option for a summit meeting has been temporarily destroyed by your conduct on several fronts during the recent months. First, you must demonstrate public commitment to negotiate the March 23, 1983 doctrine’s implementation seriously, such that you personally take some political responsibility for a serious meeting.

If such a properly founded summit meeting could occur between you and the President, I would favor it as the earliest point preconditions for such a meeting were put into place. The President is a personable man, the best on that account we have enjoyed for a long time. The mere establishment of personal contact to underscore personal commitment to proceeding in good faith, is all that I would project for an initial summit meeting. Such a limited accomplishment would be invaluable.

If there were anything which I might contribute personally and properly to the public airing of the ideas contained in my original design of such a strategic doctrine, perhaps in some unofficial oral or literary exchange with Soviet experts, I would consider this as contributing to the desired climate for the President’s officially commissioned discussions with Soviet representatives. Since I have been strenuously attacked as virtually Soviet International Public Enemy Number One, on account of my perceived part in the matter of the

new U.S. strategic doctrine, the form or lack of discussions between me and Soviet experts constitutes a signal which I believe that my President's advisers would by no means ignore.

We must understand that there are two, parallel avenues of discussion which must occur. One must be totally unofficial discussion of conceptions, to the effect that statements exchanged are in no way confused with diplomacy, a purely scientific exchange of ideas. The intellectual environment so enriched becomes a resource from which assets can be coopted by official discussions as they may or may not choose to do so. Meanwhile, you have every sort of clown from the United States and elsewhere crawling about Moscow for discussion of strategic policies, called "clowns" advisedly because they simply lack any relevant knowledge of the deeper issues of strategic policy, but merely regurgitate a mixture of the false information and irresponsible speculations they have overheard from one place or another. This is not to speak of the nastier species, the "Pugwashers." These confused fellows merely make matters worse with their shallow-minded but "official-sounding" utterances after their return.

As to the technical feasibility of the current U.S. strategic doctrine, I am confident that the Soviet specialists such as Major General Basov and Academician Velikhov, and their associates, have no difficulty on the principles of the matter. After all, this has been at the center of Soviet strategic doctrine since 1962, and Soviet progress on relevant areas of science and technology are very impressive. In any case, Dr. Teller and his immediate collaborators are perfectly able to handle this side of the matter, and have little need of assistance from me, except as these matters intersect economic science.

This brings us to the matter of the Soviet government's real objections to the March 23, 1983, as opposed to the smokescreen of misleading propaganda issued from Soviet sources on this subject.

First, you are generally ahead of the United States in developing and deploying ABM systems, and have advanced capabilities, relatively speaking, in the domain of particle-beam systems aptly suited for what is called "terminal defense" generally and "point defense" in particular. With a "crash effort" the Soviet Union will probably match the United States during the first phase of such ABM systems, and will outdo the United States unless the United States also launches a crash program.

Thus, U.S. development of strategic ABM systems premised on the "new physical principles" is not in itself a cause for any legitimate rejections of the March 23, 1983 doctrine as umbrella-agreement for new dimensions of negotiations.

The root of the real objections, secondly, lies in the effects of such "crash programs" on the Soviet and U.S. economies, respectively. This objection has two aspects. First, that the spillover of the same technologies into the Soviet and U.S. economies simultaneously would cause a much greater rate of economic growth in the U.S. than in the Soviet econ-

omy. Second, that this would mean a resurgence of the U.S. position as an economic power, to the degree that the relative U.S.-Soviet positions on this account would take the world back to approximately the middle of the 1960s. It is the combination of these two effects which suggests that the United States would therefore develop the relative economic capabilities for conducting a continued "technological arms-race" which the U.S.S.R. might be unable to match.

Otherwise, the Soviet propaganda barrages accusing the Reagan administration of launching an arms race are misleading to the point of being a falsehood. The Soviet Union is already spearheading an arms race in the domain of thermonuclear ballistic missiles, such that to imply that beam weapons would "start" an arms race is, as a flat statement taken out of proper context, utter nonsense.

The fact is, that technological obsolescence is as inherent in armaments policies of all but very stupid nations as the same principle is inherent in the economy itself, also except in very foolish nations. It would be no less true of beam weapons than of ballistic missiles. Only to that degree, and in that sense, is the Soviet concern about "arms race" under conditions of high rates of technological growth of economies a valid point of deliberation.

However, we must not permit this single, valid point of Soviet objections from acting to implement the new strategic doctrine cooperatively (if possible). The price of not implementing the new doctrine in this way is thermonuclear war. Therefore, it must be our policy to implement the new strategic doctrine as rapidly as possible, whatever the objections. However, if the Soviet government has valid objections, these objections must be solved somehow within the framework of the new doctrine of Mutually Assured Survival. In short, *you need cooperation in solving the problem of economic bottlenecks in the Soviet economy.*

I would think it very sensible that you should say to us: *The new doctrine has some unacceptable implications for us unless our bottlenecks are overcome; we require your cooperation on this matter as part of any strategic agreement.* Personally, I would find such a demand from you a very reasonable demand, apart from the special fact that as an economist I am like the fanatical mechanic who must repair every automobile instantly he recognizes need for such services.

The problem is, in this connection, that the government of the United States presently has not the slightest conception of what the Soviet economy needs to repair its bottlenecks problems. The discussions of this in the United States are so clouded with the heritage of ideologically misshaped appreciations and habits of economic warfare, that the only means we have to help you from off our shelves, is to reduce the pressure of economic-warfare measures. I strongly suspect that that form of assistance would not be sufficient to solve the broader problem. Obviously, you require profound internal economic reforms, to the effect of increasing per capita output in agriculture and various categories of industries, and

also ensuring that a rural-to-urban shift in composition of total employment of your labor force results in a large increase in capital-goods capacity, especially in critical machine tool categories (broadly defined).

I have written memoranda of my general knowledge as to how to approach such a problem, which I need not restate here, therefore. I believe that the problem admits of a general solution, provided the Soviet population is won over to acceptance of such changes. Any effective approach would require a "crash program" centered around the most beneficial varieties of large infrastructure-building projects and spearheaded by emphasis on breakthroughs in frontier areas of advanced technology. Effective cooperation from the United States would require that you define such a program, and locate specific needs of economic cooperation in terms of bottlenecks affecting the implementation of the program itself.

Broadly, this requires a scientific discussion of the problem, through aid of which to formulate conceptions which may then be referenced by officials on both sides.

That is the general way I foresee the indicated point of objection as being best approached.

Accompanying the indicated point of your objections to March 23, there is also the aura of your desire that the United States should collapse and more or less vanish from the Earth as soon as possible. Apart from the fact that the growth of the economy under a high-technology "crash program" might strengthen the United States greatly, relative to the Soviet economy, there is the strong flavor of wish in your practice, that we should not continue to exist at all. After all, if the United States collapsed, the U.S.S.R. would more or less dominate the world, uncontested, by default; it is a prospect which I do not think displeases you at all.

I do not believe that you are immediately intent on gobbling up the world entirely, but rather merely being free to do pretty much as you please throughout that world. That is not tolerable; you must give up any thoughts in such a direction.

Apart from narrowly defined military technologies and economic implications, the more general problem for you is that the new U. S. strategic doctrine points in the direction of tearing down every Malthusian and other policy institution associated with Pugwash doctrine. The President's new doctrine attacks the entire structure of the Pugwash doctrine and institutions at their most vulnerable point. *That was my intent in devising such a strategic doctrine:* to break not only the grip of MADness, but also the grip of what you fellows prefer to call "imperialism" from the back of every nation of the world, my own nation most emphatically included.

My design of the entire strategic doctrine, coinciding in every feature with the President's on military matters, is of one piece with my proposals for a new international economic (monetary) order, and such projects as my "Operation Juárez" (1982), the new proposal for economic development of the combined Indian and Pacific Oceans' Basin (Sept. 15,

1983 Washington D. C. seminar) and the policies I proposed in my 1979-80 campaign for the Democratic Party's presidential nomination. My policies coincide in significant degree with President Franklin Roosevelt's policies for the post-war world, the so-called American Century doctrine which was scrapped entirely by the State Department within as briefly as 48 hours of the President's untimely death. As the President said to Prime Minister Winston Churchill during the war (Elliot Roosevelt, *As He Saw It*), the world has ached too long under the sway of "British 18th-century methods," and of colonial empires and their vestiges. We must have a world-order based on the efficient principle of sovereignty of the nation-state and of cooperation in fostering technological progress in the development of the productive powers of labor in every nation.

We must take down every institution which imposes upon nations and their peoples that system of usury and imperiums dating in Mediterranean civilization from the evil Chaldean Ur and the sundry empires built by oligarchical rule on the economic foundations of ground-rent, usury, parasitical commodity speculation, and looting by force. We must establish a world order consistent with the same principles for which the American Revolution was fought and the U.S. federal constitutional form of government established by the administration of President George Washington. Every nation, including the Soviet Union, must enjoy the right to secure existence in pursuit of those domestic objectives which the framers of the U. S. constitution around Benjamin Franklin demanded for the people of the United States.

This is not a matter of sentiment. It is a matter of discovering critical flanks of vulnerability in existing oligarchical power. The great vulnerability of that oligarchical power is that its policies have fatefully steered the two powers which in effect rule the world's affairs into an early thermonuclear war with one another. (Our power, yours and ours, does in fact rule the world's affairs, much as other nations, insulted by this arrangement, might wish to pretend this is not so. Any nation which believes it can cut a niche for pursuing its independent policies, even in relatively small matters, independently of playing between our two powers, merely deludes itself on this point. We are morally responsible, and no one else, for what becomes of every nation and people of this planet.) If your nation and mine wish to survive, we must rise up in agreement to destroy those supranational institutions of power associated with the Pugwash Conference and its policy matrix. Our very desire to merely continue existing, confronts us with a choice between our dying, and our destroying what the Pugwash Conference represents. We have no "third way"; a "third way" exists only as an infantile delusion of silly old oligarchs such as those today imagining themselves almost a superpower with their infantile "Middle Europe" nonsense. This has been, potentially at least, the fatal blunder of the oligarchs; they have produced a circumstance in which our only chance of survival is to break their supranational political power.