

## LaRouche's SDI concept resurfaces in world debate

*This statement was transcribed from remarks made by Lyndon LaRouche on March 1.*

The subject is the world as it appears from the standpoint of 1) the Oleg Gordievsky series published in the London *Times* and the complementary interview in *Time* magazine; 2) the discrepancy emerging between Britain and Gorbachov, in that the Soviet leadership is now emphasizing the need for economic cooperation with Germany, as opposed to the insanity, even relative to Moscow, of Mrs. Thatcher and those like the Sunday *Washington Post* contributor, former CIA director Richard Helms, whose hatred of Germany and distorted memories of the Anglo-American alliance with Moscow during World War II blinds them to all reality of the present time, particularly as it is related to economic and other matters, and related therefore to historical processes; 3) in the same setting, we have to view the international financial crisis, and, on the obverse side, the alternative to that collapse as a total collapse. The result will be that this will appear to be a scattered memorandum covering these topics, but I think that that will not be a defect. I shall try to bring the three and their implications together in the conclusion.

First of all, is the point which is raised in today's *International Herald Tribune*. The apparent discrepancy between Oleg Gordievsky's version of events during 1982 and fact as fact is usually interpreted, or usually would be interpreted by popular opinion, including popular opinion in very high levels of government. The *International Herald Tribune* points out, in reviewing both the three-part series by Gordievsky, ostensibly, in the London *Times*, the series concluding today, and also the interview with *Time* magazine by Gordievsky, that Gordievsky insists that during 1982, the Brezhnev leadership of the Soviet Union reacted strongly to the indications that the United States was proceeding with SDI. The *International Herald Tribune* points out that Brezhnev

was totally out of the picture in November, and queries this discrepancy, or apparent discrepancy, in Gordievsky's report.

Now first, let's take it on bare fact, let's assume that Gordievsky were telling the truth, and let's look, secondly, at what he might reflect, as opposed to what he might pretend to reflect, in this London *Times* series, and in earlier published statements from London, since he has revealed himself to the public a few years ago.

Let's go back to 1982. From whence would the Soviet Union have received indications of a U.S. commitment to what was later called the SDI during 1982, during the period that Brezhnev was active?

As the *International Herald Tribune* points out, there was no official commitment, even behind the scenes, to SDI by President Reagan himself until early 1983, approximately January were the first indications I had which would show a commitment to SDI by Reagan, and late February-early March would be the first time that we had any indications pointing toward what Reagan actually announced, on March 23, 1983, in his nationally televised broadcast.

Earlier than the first of 1983, in October and November, just the time that Brezhnev was dying and already being replaced by Andropov—or the Andropov Kindergarten so to speak, the Andropov-Ogarkov Kindergarten—Dr. Edward Teller, after a long period of reluctance to do so, came out in support of what became known as SDI. That was in late October or November. But that's at a point when Brezhnev was dead, or virtually dead.

So, Gordievsky is not referring, as the *Herald Tribune* points out, to, in 1982, a commitment from the Reagan circles in his own administration. The *IHT* is right on that.

Number two, which the *IHT* does not mention, the other source which might have indicated to the public, that the United States was moving in the direction of something like SDI, would have been the Teller statements of mid-to-late

October and early November 1982. But that's at the point that Brezhnev is dying, is out of the picture, and that Andropov would have been selected to succeed Brezhnev in June-July, and his machine was taking hold. So the impulse would not have come from the Brezhnev machine, but it would have come from the Andropov machine at that point. And, implicitly, the *Herald Tribune* criticism states that that doesn't wash.

How, then, would the Brezhnev machine have seen an SDI impulse commitment coming out of the Reagan administration? There's only one source: me. And the principal sources were a series of public statements and actions, analyses—that is, an intelligible representation of the policy, corroborating what was being discussed between me and a Soviet back channel from a top official in Washington, a top representative of IMEMO, and some other Soviet chaps, as back channels, with whom I was discussing, on behalf of elements in the Reagan administration intelligence institutions.

So, in essence, if there is any truth at all to Gordievsky's reference to Brezhnev's reaction during 1982, Brezhnev was reacting apparently only to me and the efforts of my associates and myself in this connection. And, also, to the fact that the Soviet government knew at that time that I was working closely with leading elements of U.S. intelligence institutions, particularly the National Security Council.

Were there signs from Moscow that corroborate what Gordievsky says, or appear to corroborate what Gordievsky says? Yes. There was a Russian Orthodox Church leadership meeting, a public meeting at which, in March, the first negative, and strongly negative, reactions to my proposal for a Strategic Ballistic Missile Defense, were aired publicly. And this came together with an increasing role of the Soviet neo-malthusian Ivan Frolov, of the Soviet global systems analysis group section, who became a top adviser to Gorbachov, and so forth and so on.

### Who is Gordievsky?

All that being said, let's go back to another subject, the subject of Gordievsky's identity.

Gordievsky presently has been a property of the Anglo-American Establishment, particularly a faction which tends to converge with Kissinger, with Kissinger's owners in London, the Chatham House or Royal Institute for International Affairs-Wilton Park group, and a group which goes back to the Trust organization, the Anglo-Soviet Trust of the 1921-27 period, a group which is still committed to that type of policy, of one-world empire in conjunction with Moscow, Moscow as the "policeman of Europe," as it was in the Holy Alliance. This would also be, on the U.S. side, the group associated with McGeorge Bundy, with Robert McNamara, and so forth and so on, the group that was the first to attack the SDI from inside the United States.

That's the group whose views Gordievsky's statements

reflect.

We know that during the summer of 1982, these circles, as well as Henry Kissinger, were reacting to my influence around Washington, with the effort to get me deep-sixed, that is, dead or in jail. This effort, while it was tied to Moscow or tied to the negotiations with Moscow, was nonetheless something which was independent of Moscow.

That's the set of questions which arises now.

First of all, are the Anglo-Americans—including those behind the Gordievsky statement in the London *Times* and the *Time* magazine interview—are these people really in lock-step with leading circles in Moscow on the Germany question?

I think not. I think Moscow is dealing with them, and dealing with this longstanding quasi-alliance with McGeorge Bundy's friends and Trust circles in Britain, while at the same time it is moving ahead to deal with a Rapallo-type orientation to Germany. Two different tracks, which seem to be the same thing sometimes, but are quite different, as I shall indicate.

So we need not make our essential judgment on what Gordievsky is; we need not consider whether Gordievsky is a Soviet mole deception agent—though he is a deception agent and has been to my knowledge since 1983, at least—or whether he's a Western deception agent of the faction of the British friends of McGeorge Bundy, or a shared effort of both. It's irrelevant to the essential point to be made.

The point that Gordievsky is making with this statement criticized as a discrepancy by today's *International Herald Tribune*, is Gordievsky's statement that I personally am at the center of the whole thing. That is the view of Moscow; that is the view of the relevant British circles; that is the view of McGeorge Bundy's circles. They all view me as the number one enemy and view my role on Strategic Ballistic Missile Defense in 1982 as the watershed for the decade of history which began to unfold in 1982, the decade of history which is now coming to the consummation of a fundamental change in the world.

Therefore, the significance of the Gordievsky remarks is that they put me up front as the number one influence in shaping the leading changes in the course of history, over the course of the 1980s, entering into the 1990s. That must be made clear, comprehensible, intelligible, to the population generally, including patriotic institutions of various countries, which need to understand what is going on in the world, that I am at the center, according to Gordievsky, and according to a strict comparison of the facts with what Gordievsky is saying.

The question of who's saying it, whether Gordievsky is saying it on Moscow's behalf, or saying it on behalf of some part of the Anglo-American Establishment which owns him, is of secondary importance. The primary thing is that the London *Times* and the *Time* magazine interview are featuring me, implicitly, as at the center of international policy-shap-

ing; this then begins to make clearer to many people why the U.S. government, after the failures to succeed in assassinating me, fell back on the option, with Soviet encouragement and demands over the 1984-86 period, that I be thrown in prison, if not assassinated.

### **A cultural paradigm shift**

Even though the Gorbachov and Bush administrations, together with others, have unified around the satanic doctrine of ecologism—that is, the worship of the Mother Earth goddess, the Mother of Satan, variously known as Shakti, Ishtar,

---

---

*The problem is, that the philosophy of government which opposed the SDI, which accepts and adapts to the rock-drug-sex counterculture, which adapts to this usurious process—this kind of mentality is incapable of addressing the tasks now before us.*

---

---

Ashtar, Astarte, Cybele, or now Gaia—not all in Moscow are quite as insane as U.S. Environmental Protection Agency director William Reilly is clearly insane, as well as satanic and wildly gnostic. If you scratch a gnostic, you'll find a satanist coming out in the juices, sooner or later. The best thing you can do with a gnostic if you want to prove whether or not he's a satanist, is to exorcise him.

The relevance of this is not merely to say nasty things about my deadly enemies, the so-called ecologists or rather malthusians, but to point out a crucial problem in the strategic planning of the Anglo-Americans.

You recall that the change—what is called the cultural paradigm shift in Western civilization's governmental policies—occurred over the period between 1963 and 1967. This was a shift both to what is called the rock-drug-sex counterculture and to the proliferation of usury, instead of the proliferation of profits from industrial enterprises, the destruction of profits from industrial enterprises in order to nourish the growth of gain from usury.

This total package was spread by people who were deadly opponents of Western Christian civilization, with its emphasis laid on the individual, for example, by St. Augustine and others, the divine spark of reason, the potential creative powers of reason in the individual as being the feature of man the individual which is in the image of the living God. The shift was in favor of an oligarchical, gnostic view consistent with the traditional belief, for example, of the Russian Orthodox Church. And I must regret to say also Unitarians in the United States itself.

The model and the impetus for this came from circles which are associated with H.G. Wells, Bertrand Russell, and the professed satanist Aleister Crowley, the people who come out of the Fabian circles of John Stuart Mill, and of course the pre-Raphaelite Brotherhood of people like Benjamin Jowett, and his little friends at Oxford.

These people were literally satanists, who belonged to the school of Crowley and Nietzsche and Jung, naturally, and also related to Jaspers and Heidegger and that sort of existentialist, as well as the French existentialists of the Sartre and related variety, or the Camus circle. These are the people who propose to end the Age of Pisces, using their astrological language, that is, the Age of Christ and Western Christianity, to replace that by the emergence of, as Nietzsche said, the Age of Dionysius, or as Crowley and his satanists said, the Age of Lucifer and Dionysius.

So the rock-drug-sex counterculture was essentially what Nietzsche referred to as the "transvaluation of values" to bring the god Satan, i.e., Dionysius or Lucifer or Baal, to rule over this planet, with the destruction of Christ. This rock-drug-sex counterculture was essentially the anti-Christ, and those who wear the mark of such ecologism, the malthusian blending with the rock-drug-sex counterculture, on their forehead, are the people who in apocalyptic terms, wear the Mark of the Beast.

The spread of usury, in place of profit, industrial and agricultural profit, since the middle of the 1960s in terms of U.S. Executive Branch policy, is a complement to that. It is a rejection of scientific and technological progress as the driving force in the increase in the productive powers of labor, so that this economic policy of usury in opposition to scientific and technological progress, investment in energy-dense, capital-intensive scientific and technological progress, is complementary and coherent with the satanic aspect, that is, the rock-drug-sex counterculture.

### **Brzezinski and the technetronic age**

Out of this came certain distinctions, such as the distinctions offered by Zbigniew Brzezinski, who is one of the people attached to this satanic cause in the 1970s. Brzezinski, for example, referred to the technetronic age.

All of these people mean New Age, in the sense that Nietzsche and Crowley referred to the Age of Dionysius, and as people around President Theodore Roosevelt were also New Agers. As a matter of fact, Roosevelt, some will recall, was the founder of what was called the "New Age Movement" of Jacob Reese et al., which later became euphemistically described as the Progressive Party, or the Progressivism movement. We have the Humanist Movement of Paul Kurtz and company, centered up around Buffalo and elsewhere, which is part of the same satanic New Age Movement.

These fellows, in order to transvalue values, had to change the definitions of words. So what Brzezinski did in particular—along with fellows up around the research labo-

ratory of electronics at MIT and similar places, or the artificial intelligence zombies around Pittsburgh—was to say, along with Norbert Wiener, who is taken as sort of the patron saint of this, that the organization of ideas, in the sense of negentropy as Wiener misdefines it with a statistical Boltzmannian definition, is a substitute for scientific and technological progress in economy in the traditional sense.

That is, says Brzezinski essentially, we're throwing away increase of the productive powers of labor insofar as they bear upon man's productive relationship to the alteration and improvement of nature in a physical way. Technology is being redefined as a reorganization of words by aid of computers. This is blended with the earlier version by Hutchins et al., of the so-called Triple Revolution, the Automation Revolution. The Automation Revolution and the Triple Revolution document of 1964 seem almost sane compared to what came out of Brzezinski's mouth three years later.

So, when they talk about science and technology today, that change in the definition of terms has come into play. It no longer means what it used to mean, during the 18th and 19th centuries, for example, or the early 20th century. They appear to say we're going to become rich by investing in computer technology, when, in point of fact, they don't understand what the relationship of the computer is to the productive process, because they do not understand the productive process.

In the same process, with the aid of this crazy, deregulated, free market economy theory, they have eradicated intellectually from inside the institutions, all economists who have any sense of economy at all. And only these people who deal with these mystical definitions of marginal utility, seem to have any influence at all, and the monetarists of that sort prevailed.

We have to be careful when talking about economy; what the term technological progress means in Germany, for example, today, or around Moscow, around the speeches of Valentin Falin, Gorbachov, and so forth, is something quite different than what the same words mean in the mouths of Margaret Thatcher and her circles, or the mouths of the Brzezinski-style, Council on Foreign Relations-style so-called economists, particularly in the United States. This is crucial.

These fellows are saying that they're going to have a recovery based on technetronic considerations, which means the investment in computer technology, with no investment to speak of in developing basic economic infrastructure—i.e., International Monetary Fund-World Bank policies over the decade of the 1980s and earlier, with no investment in capital-intensive, energy-intensive modes of realizing new scientific and technological progress. Simply by better computers, by better computer administration of the chaos, they're going to have technological improvement.

What they really mean, is they're going to find new ways to do on a grander scale what Hitler did in his slave-labor

death camp system: simply to take the unwanted, or so-called surplus part of the population and process it, through prison convict labor and similar ways, to grind it up and extract from it the accumulated investment in producing this portion of the population, and turn the product of that grinding process, that sausage made of billions of human beings, into a yield on usurious types investment in financial instruments. That's essentially what they're talking about.

So that, in a shrinking world economy, where the economy shrinks from over 5 billion persons to about 1 billion persons—which is about what the ideologues of this camp assert—the rich will get richer, at least in terms they like, those people who like to wear red coats and go chasing foxes, that's the sense of wealth, being indolent while a few slaves sustain them, this kind of Brave New World, that's what they're looking for.

That's what they're looking for in China, the grinding up of masses of Chinese into sausage in free enterprise zones, to produce steel and other wealth for the world, while the Chinese population is being reduced by being ground into sausage in this way.

That's the kind of world they're talking about. And computers and computer technology are a way of administering this process in a much more efficient way, of getting efficiently every scrap of value out of every piece of blood and flesh which is ground up by this super-Hitlerian policy which is called the "liberal perspective" of the Anglo-American liberal economist radicals today.

### **The human spirit rebels**

The human spirit, because it is the human spirit, rejects absolutely what I've just indicated. It rejects a worldwide, deep depression of physical-economic breakdown crisis of the type going on; it aspires to sufficient economies to sustain the blood and flesh and minds of the human race as it's constituted, a stability derived from this to maintain the institutions of the nation-state on a stable basis, in a manner in which human beings are not living through a nightmare, but there is some future for themselves and their children and their posterity generally as the Preamble to our Federal Constitution affirms the points made by the Declaration of Independence and related documents earlier. That's what is wanted.

The Soviets, despite all the evil they represent, also are human, and therefore these human concerns manage to express themselves even out of the mouths of Gorbachov and others, because of the strategic validity of human interest, to any nation which wishes to continue to exist as a nation. And the Soviets certainly know that their nation's existence is in jeopardy right now—despite the fact that they have the most powerful military force on this planet. Even that military force has not protected them from a certain dissolution of their society's early collapse.

So now, they look to Germany; they say they want tech-

## LaRouche's fight for strategic defense

*This chronology of LaRouche's early policy statements and actions on strategic defense, documents why the Soviets were—and are—so concerned about his role.*

**May 31, 1977:** A study commissioned by LaRouche on Soviet advances in the field of plasma physics and directed-energy technology, is published as a pamphlet entitled "Sputnik of the Seventies—The Science Behind the Soviets' Beam Weapon."

**Aug. 15, 1979:** LaRouche, a candidate for the 1980 Democratic presidential nomination, issues a campaign paper, "Military policy of the LaRouche administration," which says, "A LaRouche administration will have two leading points in military policy. First, commitment to the development of advanced-technology weapons able to 'kill' incoming missiles in the stratosphere; second, the establishment of universal military training—not the draft—as the means for providing the United States a pyramid of maximum in-depth war-fighting capabilities."

**February 1982:** LaRouche addresses an *EIR* conference in Washington, D.C., attended by many U.S. political and military officials, as well as representatives of foreign embassies and other agencies. The subject is the need for a beam weapon defense system. This is LaRouche's first public elaboration of his new strategic doctrine.

**February 1982-April 1983:** LaRouche functions as a back channel for the Reagan administration in exploratory discussions with Soviet representatives on the possibility of joint deployment of strategic defense systems. In this

role, he worked with officials of the CIA and National Security Council, during the tenure of William Clark.

**March 1982:** The National Democratic Policy Committee (NDPC), the LaRouche wing of the Democratic Party, releases a discussion memorandum by LaRouche, titled "Only Beam-Weapons Could Bring to an End the Kissingerian Age of Mutual Thermonuclear Terror: A Proposed Modern Military Policy of the United States." In it he writes, "There is no solution to the continued balance of thermonuclear terror which is not premised on the ability of at least one of the superpowers to destroy a proverbial 'ninety-nine and forty-four one-hundredths percent' of the incoming missiles and thermonuclear-armed aircraft deployed against its national homeland.

"In principle, such an anti-missile capability now exists, in the form of what are properly termed *relativistic-beam anti-missile weapons systems*. We propose, we insist, that the reformed military policy of the United States be premised upon a commitment to a 'crash program' for developing and deploying such anti-missile beam-weapon systems.

"We go further. We propose that the adoption of such a high-technology answer to the thermonuclear balance of terror become the central reference-point for a comprehensive reform of United States military doctrine and organization of the Defense Department. . . .

"The military component of Washington-Moscow negotiations must include agreement to rapid development of relativistic-beam anti-missile weapons systems by both superpowers."

**Fall 1982:** LaRouche addresses seminars on beam-weapons in Bonn, Munich, Paris, Strasbourg, Milan, Brussels, Madrid, and Stockholm. Senior West European military and political figures request briefings on beam defense by LaRouche and associates of his.

**1983:** The Fusion Energy Foundation, of which

nology. They wish technology, because they know they can't develop it by themselves. They know they need Western technology, but, while they want miniaturization from the United States and Japan, that does not mean that they are stupid enough to imagine that that kind of technology is going to save their economy. They know they need infrastructure, agriculture, and manufacturing. Infrastructure, agriculture, and manufacturing, as the ways of increasing the productive powers of labor through investment in capital-intensive, energy-intensive modes in technological and scientific progress.

That's what every sane force in this world knows is needed, particularly forces representing leading circles in society—those that are sane. There lies the discrepancy between

the Anglo-American view of Germany—as typified or reflected by the Richard Helms piece in the Feb. 25 "Outlook" section of the *Washington Post*—and on the other side, what seems to be emerging as a pro-German unification policy, around Gorbachov.

### The SDI: my strategy for victory

On what basis can the United States and Western Europe throw off the scientific and technological progress needed to stabilize this planet, to prevent the greatest catastrophe imaginable, and how do my ideas and researches pertain to that, and why do the prevailing ideas in the Anglo-American Establishment fail to conform to that? That is, why is it that under my influence, the United States and its allies would

LaRouche is a member of the board, publishes the book *Beam Defense*.

**April 13, 1983:** *EIR* conference in Washington, D.C. on "Directed Energy Beam Weapons Technologies Can End the Era of Mutual Thermonuclear Terror: The Military, Economic, and Strategic Implications of Energy Beam Weapons."

**June 15, 1983:** *EIR* publishes Special Report, "The Economic Impact of Relativistic Beam Technologies."

**Nov. 9, 1983:** LaRouche addresses *EIR* conference in Rome on "Beam Weapons: The Strategic Implications for Western Europe." Among those in the sizeable audience are no fewer than 10 Soviet intelligence operatives. (On Nov. 15, the Soviet daily *Izvestia* publishes a broadside attacking LaRouche and the "troglydites" sponsoring the conference.)

Similar conferences are held in Bonn and Paris, in which LaRouche outlines a new strategy for the Atlantic Alliance. The doctrine of "flexible response" must be replaced by a strategy that defends Western Europe, especially Germany, without defense equalling self-destruction. This could only be done through a European Tactical Defense Initiative (TDI) program complementing the American SDI. Besides directed-energy systems in a counter-missile and counter-air role, ground warfare had to be reshaped by new electromagnetic weaponry, including radio-frequency weapons.

**March 30, 1984:** LaRouche writes a "Draft memorandum of agreement between the United States of America and the U.S.S.R.," which includes an emphasis on the beam-weapon defense issue. "If both powers and their allies," he argues, "were to deploy simultaneously the 'strategic' and 'tactical' defensive systems implicit in 'new physical principles,' the abrupt shift to overwhelming advantage of the defense would raise qualitatively the threshold for general warfare."

succeed in what the Soviets think we might be able to do, or what they might think the Germans might be able to do, and why, without the kind of influence I represent, must the United States fail, catastrophically, on this point, of the relationship between science and technology on the one side, and increase in the productive powers of labor on the other side?

That goes right to the same issue as the SDI. From my standpoint, when I presented the SDI, I was presenting in part ideas which were not developed by me, but adopted by me, ideas which depended to a significant degree on demonstrations of feasibility by scientific laboratories and kindred circles in the United States and around the world. The technologies existed and were feasible.

My particular function was to show an interrelationship, between, first, a demonstration of the economic feasibility of such a program undertaking.

The fullscale SDI or the fullscale Strategic Ballistic Missile Defense, based on new physical principles, and the spillover of the technologies employed in those defense technologies into the civilian economy, to the effect that the increase in productivity per capita, would provide a tax revenue base such that the tax revenue from that tax revenue base at current tax rates would show a profit to the United States government, for example, on the account of the SDI investment.

That is, apart from the fact that the SDI would require—this is a 1982 calculation by me—a \$200 billion approximate investment to put it in place, apart from the fact we had to make that investment, that we had to ante up that investment, of about \$200 billion before we got a big payoff, after that point, we should not increase beyond that investment in SDI in terms of net cost to the U.S. government, because at that point, as we saw in the aerospace program of the 1960s, the tax revenue base's expansion by the spillover of SDI technology into the civilian sector, would increase the tax revenue base so rapidly that the increased tax revenues, without increasing tax rates, pouring into the U.S. Treasury, would exceed the additional outlays for SDI maintenance and development, by a large margin. That was the essential economic feasibility.

The second part of the feasibility, was the relation to the strategic question. By increasing the rate of per capita output of the Western part of the world, that is, ostensibly, the part of the world under the influence of Western Christian civilization, we would have the economic means to solve the problems of the Soviet and Communist Chinese economies, which the Soviet and Communist Chinese economies could not solve internally, because of their cultural and related philosophical problems.

So, it was the strategy for victory, without war, with the included necessary means of a new deterrence, a new containment of the impulse toward war, as the means of forcing upon the world, shall we say, the economic solution, the economic road to peace. By making war unprofitable through SDI, we force the world to find a non-war solution, or at least a non-general war solution to the problems besetting it. That was the purpose of SDI.

The problem is, that the philosophy of government which opposed the SDI, which accepts and adapts to the rock-drug-sex counterculture, which adapts to this usurious process, and so forth—this kind of mentality is incapable of addressing the tasks now before us.

What is needed is the mentality which was behind the development of Strategic Ballistic Missile Defense proposals in the United States and elsewhere during 1982, and that comes back to me. And that is the subject which I must address, sub-topic by sub-topic, over the coming period.