

1983: LaRouche's Offer Of Strategic Cooperation

The following is excerpted from an address by Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr. to the Schiller Institute, Sept. 3, 2001. LaRouche discusses his authorship of an earlier collaboration, around the Strategic Defense Initiative, and his role in today's opportunity, around the Eurasian Land-Bridge.

We have—by a selective process—a position in the world, which is unimaginably good for most of you. That is, our influence in the world, in places that really count, has been spreading rapidly in recent periods, largely because events coincided with what I forecast was going to happen. Look at the record of what I forecast. It's the best record of forecasting in modern history! Consistently. What we've written and published again, and again, and again, as my words, on forecasting, have been true.

The Strategic Defense Initiative

For example, we've just got more and more on this thing, about what happened in 1983, on the SDI. I created the SDI, no one else did. Reagan *named* it the SDI, or adopted it, and promulgated it. I didn't invent the word; he did. Or, he's responsible for inventing it. But the concept which he presented in that broadcast, was nothing but mine. On March 23, that last five-minute segment of his television broadcast. The concept, every part of it, was an exact replica of what I'd been saying, up to that point; nobody else invented that. Oh sure, we had scientists, and so forth, who collaborated—we had military, we had general officers from all over the world, collaborated with me on that one. And scientists. But, I put it together. They would never have put it together, without my direction. Never. They couldn't do it. They didn't have the conception. They had a knowledge of this, and a knowledge of that, and a knowledge of this—but *they couldn't make it work!*

The central thing is, the world was going to hell, because of what had happened in 1945, after Roosevelt's death. The idea of using nuclear weapons, to create a system of terror, and to create a global conflict between two major powers, or power blocs, which create the atmosphere of conflict and nuclear terror, which would be used according to the intention of John J. McCloy, and others, to create *world government*, to eliminate the nation-state. I knew that. Therefore, knowing, as I said, that the Soviet government was stupid on this question, and the U.S. government was stupid, I said, "We have to break that system! We have to free the world, from a situation, in which flotillas of nuclear-armed missiles can threaten to create that kind of confrontation." The way we do it, is by

shifting the emphasis in science, number one, on the question of using science, as we always had, in competent military policy, to shift to the strategy of defense; as defined, for example, by Vauban and Lazare Carnot, and Scharnhorst, and others. As we've always had that policy: a policy of defense. Get the enemy, if he's going to attack, to come to you, on your terms, and there, beat him.

Shift to that, through unleashing science, which had been *deliberately halted*—the progress of science had been halted—beginning 1927, by Bertrand Russell's order! There is no science today: It's been halted! No scientific thinking. There's mathematics at the blackboard, but no scientific thinking. There's mathematics on the computer, but no scientific thinking of the type we've been discussing. It doesn't exist.

The question was: If we can get the Soviet government, and other governments, the German government—a lot of them agreed—others. If we can develop this kind of system, and cooperate in doing it, and spreading its benefits, *we can reverse the trend*, which was put into place by Bertrand Russell and Company, in 1945-46. And, there were many, in the Soviet military and others, who *agreed* with that; many in this country; leading general officers in Germany, in Italy, in France, in other countries—*agreed*. We organized it. I simply had a chit, so to speak, from the relevant authorities inside the Reagan Administration, to conduct the bank-channel operation, a chit, which I got in December 1981. The authorization to conduct a back-channel discussion on this policy, with the Soviet representatives.

I put it together. I had already designed the policy earlier. But I said, "This is what I'm pushing. This is what I will present, as a discussion-point." And Washington said, "Yes. Okay." And I *did* it. We got right up to the edge—at which everything was ready to go. The President of the United States made an offer, in that broadcast, echoing me, which could have changed the world for the better, *instantly*.

And, the General Secretary of the Communist Party [Andropov] said, "No." Why did that idiot say no? He didn't say, we're going to discuss it. He didn't say, we're going to negotiate it. He said, "No. I don't want to hear any more about it. No!" And, his stooge, Gorbachov launched an attack, including one intended to assassinate me, over that issue. Why? Because, the Soviet government, like our own government, our own elite, was corrupt. Not corrupted by Communism, but corrupted by something worse: corrupted by systems analysis. If you look at the people, who acted as traitors to Russia, under Gorbachov, and under Yeltsin—the so-called bankers, the speculators—these people were all members of a team, created by Andropov, the friend of Armand Hammer, as Gorbachov was a friend of Armand Hammer, both funded in part, by the Hubert Humphrey Institute headed by Henry Kissinger in Minnesota; their foundations. This faction, the Andropov faction, is the faction, which introduced what is called liberalism, into the Soviet Union and Russia. I was



LaRouche discusses March 23, 1983: "The President of the United States made an offer, in that broadcast, echoing me, which could have changed the world for the better, instantly." Now, after Sept. 11, 2001, the strategic offer is coming from LaRouche and from President Putin.

proposing, and many agreed, a science-driver program to eliminate the problem, on a global basis. These guys were with Bertrand Russell. It didn't start then. I think it started in the 1950s — big. But, nonetheless, that's it.

So, you see what the issue is: We've come to this point, and this was something I've been working on for a long time; but, we've come to point, that if you go back to 1983, that was a turning point in history, in which I was the personal figure, who was key to a turning point in history. We lost. The United States lost. The people of the United States lost. The people of the Soviet Union lost, and suffered greatly as a result of that turn, against what I had proposed. But we were there! If Andropov had said, we'll discuss it, in response to Reagan's address of March 23, the world would be a far better, different place, than it is today. *And, I made and created the opportunity for that turn.*

Now, when you get a taste of having done, personally, something like that, you don't have any doubts of who you are, or what your capabilities are. I now come to another situation, more important, than even then, in which mankind faces a general collapse, a new Dark Age. I have in my hands, again, as in 1982-83, I have in my hands, the programmatic approach, and the understanding, needed to save this planet, from a self-imposed catastrophe.

That's the truth! And, that's the way you have to approach it. Because that's the truth. You can't say, "Well, maybe," "maybe this," "maybe something else could have done this," "maybe something else could have done it in 1983." No. No one could have done it. I was the only person on this planet, who dreamed that up. But, a lot people then accepted it. No one else put it together that way. The same thing is true today. We did, as a direct result of that — when in 1988, I said, "This damn system is coming down," the Comecon system, it was coming down. When it came down, there wasn't anybody in the German government, who was prepared to cope with it.

There was no one in the U.S. government who was prepared to cope with that situation. They improvised. I was right. They got me out of the way, for that reason — *put me in prison, for that reason.* And, then so on and so on, it continued.

The Eurasian Land-Bridge

We launched, from prison, the Eurasian Land-Bridge program — Helga, and I, and others; we launched it. It was a handful of us. With a lot of support. We launched it. We launched a campaign parallel to that, around me, which Debra Freeman ran in Washington, coordinated it. In 1992, we were committed to extending the Land-Bridge program into a Eurasia Land-Bridge program. In 1993, this work was done, pushed significantly by us, publicly. And in 1996, you had the famous conference in Beijing, which was organized, at our prompting, with Helga participating.

We're now — where we are: We've made advances. There's an unbroken continuity, between what we've been doing from the get-go, from 1966, approximately, to the present. There's a continuing program, a continuing conception of the historical process, which has continued since 1966 among us as an association. Out of this view, and its application, we have developed a programmatic approach, to dealing with the world situation. We have been repeatedly proven *right*, by the events of 1971, the events of 1975, '76, '79, '80, '82, '83, '86, and thereafter. We've now come to this point: A continuity of our understanding of the historical process in which we live, in which we — with me, in particular — play a key part, in determining what the future history of mankind will be for a century more to come.

That's the truth. It's a hard truth. It's a difficult truth for most people to easily understand. But, you can not win, unless you do as we have done, in everything we've done, that's of any count: *Tell the truth.* And don't, as the New Testament says, don't Peter out.