

# Heritage Foundation pushes 'Third Rome'

by Allen Douglas

On March 15, the New York-based Congress of Russian-Americans and the Truespeak Institute of Washington, D.C., co-sponsored a forum at the Heritage Foundation in Washington. The event featured speeches by U.S. Secretary of Education William J. Bennett and Dr. John Lenczowski, former Soviet desk head at the U.S. National Security Council; its purpose, in the words of CRA's Eugenia Ordynsky, was "to discuss what really happened" in the Russian Revolutions of 1917. With the notable exception of Secretary Bennett's keynote, this event, the first in a Heritage-backed series to present the "truth" about Russian history, was pure *dezinformatsiya*.

Secretary Bennett noted at the outset that he was no expert in Russian history, and said, "My context is not so much 70 years ago, but today's schools." He stressed that his fundamental concern was for the continuation of America as a great republic, and that for this, basic reforms in America's abysmal education system were necessary, and in particular, "During the course of the last three years, I have made several pleas for the teaching of history—history and citizenship, a plea for the teaching of the first for the sake of the second."

Within that worthy theme, he interpolated a series of remarks, which appeared to reflect material with which he had been reportedly deluged by the event's co-sponsors. For example: "How many of us realize that a broad consensus existed for the replacement of the Czarist regime—that everyone wanted democracy?"

During the question period, William Gill, author of the exposé of State Department treason, *The Ordeal of Otto Otepka*, took strong issue with this summary. "Democracy" was the ostensible desire only of a small clique of lawyers and politicians, he said, and, because of the nature of the Czarist regime, there was no method of determining what "everyone" wanted. This correspondent took Gill's remarks one step further, and stressed that the allegedly "democratic" February Revolution was as conspiratorial a coup as the Bolshevik revolution of October, and that several key figures of the "democratic" provisional government, such as War Minister A.I. Guchkov, not only worked for the Bolsheviks all along, but continued that collaboration in the infamous Bolshevik spy organization, the "Trust."

Secretary Bennett's response to the combined intervention was entirely honest, "Fair enough. I stand corrected."

## Enter Dr. Lenczowski

The real theme of the event, respecting implications for U.S. policy toward the Soviets, was presented by former National Security Council official Lenczowski, now a senior consultant to the Council on Inter-American Security. The issue, said Lenczowski, was whether "communism has harnessed Great Russian nationalism and Russian imperialism to its goals, or has Great Russian nationalism and imperialism harnessed communism for its goals?" He made clear that his view was the former.

In the question period, this correspondent intervened again to stress the case of the writer Fyodor Dostoevsky, a publicist for the old Russian aristocratic families who ran the Czarist police, the Okhrana. Dostoevsky had explicitly stated in his 1877-80 *Diary of a Writer* that the revolutionaries were useful, if usually unwitting tools, of "Great Russia," and that it was precisely they who were the most fanatical opponents of the Western-style "Petrine state" in Russia, something Dostoevsky and his backers were committed to eliminating. Given that, as author Stefan Possony once put it, "the Bolsheviks were little more than an operational arm of the Okhrana," Lenczowski's analysis was precisely the opposite of the truth.

Lenczowski responded that, while "perhaps some individuals may have had these Machiavellian ideas," of engineering a dynastic shift to a more fanatical Russia by using the revolutionaries, Russian nationalism is still greatly to be preferred to Russian communism, and at the bottom of Russian nationalism is a laudable institution, the Russian Orthodox Church. "Russian nationalism is a product of civil society and it is integral to the Orthodox Church. The communist attack on civil society has eroded that component of nationalism. And I believe we are dealing with communism, not Russianism!" After the forum, Lenczowski was more explicit, arguing that "a Russian imperialism based on the Orthodox Church and nationalism is more benign than Russian imperialism based on communism."

As British intelligence chief Arnold Toynbee pointed out decades ago, "Under the Hammer and Sickle, as under the Cross, Russia is still Holy Russia, and Moscow still the Third Rome." Instead of a perspective of winning the cultural war between the West and Russia, through a U.S. commitment to all-out SDI development and a Moon-Mars mission, which would emphasize the best elements of Western culture—the divine-like creativity of the individual human being, in the fashion U.S. presidential candidate Lyndon H. LaRouche has stipulated—Dr. Lenczowski and his Heritage Foundation associates have accepted the fact that there will always be Russian imperialism. Since this is true, they say, U.S. policy-makers should support the reemergence in Russia of the undiluted, primeval form of Russian imperialism—the Orthodox version.