
Review of a Book Review

LaRouche and Teller Vs. The ‘Utopians’

by Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.

February 25, 2002

Alasdair Palmer, “Dr. Strangelove, I presume?” London *Sunday Telegraph*, February 24, 2002. A review of *Edward Teller, Memoirs: A Twentieth-Century Journey in Science and Politics* (New York: Perseus Press, 2001).

Dr. Edward Teller and I never got along well personally, after my mid-1970s attack on his role in promoting the energy policies of Nelson A. Rockefeller’s Commission of Critical Choices. Nonetheless, on some issues, including what became known as President Ronald Reagan’s Strategic Defense Initiative, Teller and I came to a degree of agreement on the issues which brought us into common cause against both Soviet General Secretary Yuri Andropov and nuclear madmen such as Zbigniew Brzezinski, Samuel P. Huntington, and the ultra-utopian nest around Lt.-Gen. (ret.) Daniel P. Graham’s Heritage Foundation.

I have reviewed my first-hand knowledge of the relevant facts of those 1980s issues earlier, in various relevant locations. However, reviewer Palmer’s tendentious argument, appearing in the context of the recent Munich Wehrkunde event,¹ requires that I now add a necessary, very sharp point of rebuttal to Palmer’s careless sophistries.

The pivot of all today’s leading global strategic issues, is the well-known alliance of Bertrand Russell and H.G. Wells, around the ultra-nasty utopian themes of Wells’ 1928 *The Open Conspiracy*. This was the alliance which featured the Russell support for Wells’ repeatedly, publicly expressed hope, beginning 1913, for “world government through nuclear terror.” The influence of that scheme has been the principal root of a perversion, known, appropriately, as the “utopian” strategy prevalent in U.S. policy-shaping today. That is the perversion, which, as President Eisenhower and General MacArthur later warned, has taken over U.S. and other military and related thinking, increasingly, in the aftermath of Hiroshima and Nagasaki.

Since the beginning of the U.S.’s repeated follies of use-

1. See Rainer Apel, “At Wehrkunde Meeting, U.S. Speaks Loudly About Carrying Big Stick,” EIR, Feb. 15, 2002.

less protracted warfare, begun in Korea with U.S. President Truman’s firing of General of the Armies Douglas MacArthur, the U.S. strategic military doctrine has degenerated in favor of current predominance of utopian conceptions of strategy.

The subsequent trend has been toward innovations in strategic policy and practice which echo the ancient Roman legions, the Grande Armée of Napoleon Bonaparte, and Hitler’s contribution to the notion of “universal fascism,” the Waffen-SS. Brzezinski and other William Yandell Elliott cronies, such as Huntington, only typify the trend toward notions such as perpetual “special warfare,” which erupted boldly to the surface in such atrocities as the “Bay of Pigs” adventure and the 1962 attempted assassination of France’s President Charles de Gaulle.

The attempted assassinations of de Gaulle, the assassination of Italy’s Enrico Mattei, the orchestrated ouster of Prime Minister Harold Macmillan, the hastened retirement of Chancellor Konrad Adenauer, the assassination of Kennedy, and the later launching of the U.S. war in Indo-China, like the ouster of Chancellor Erhard in Germany, typify a 1960-1966 cultural-paradigm phase-shift in politics, orchestrated popular opinion, economics, and strategy, away from the tradition of Sylvanus Thayer’s West Point Military Academy, in favor of a global, utopian mind-set and practice.

This shift was not limited to internal affairs of the U.S.A. and western Europe. The case of Yuri Andropov’s rise toward power in the Soviet system, since mid-1950s Hungary developments, points to origins of a related, pro-utopian cultural paradigm-shift within the Soviet system, which reverberates in world affairs to the present day. That coincidence in decadence, between our utopians on the one side, and Andropov on the other, is key to any account of the history of SDI. This is key to any competent opinion on the role of Edward Teller in allowing some of his “young friends” to push him into supporting a project which I, together with responsible representatives of President Ronald Reagan, had earlier set into motion. This was set into motion, chiefly, through the instrumentality of my February 1982-February 1983 back-channel discussions with the Soviet Union’s representative.

Against that general background, the following is to be said. If Palmer’s piece is taken at face value, he has yet to actually understand any of the topics at which he aims his conclusions in his review. Since I am a key insider of the whole of the SDI affair, I enjoy exceptional authority, and responsibility, to say, that Palmer’s treatment of Teller’s role in the SDI affair, is not only a run-on fallacy of composition, but a distinctly silly one on all crucial points. He had disregarded the relevant, available evidence on that subject; he should have known better.

How the SDI Was Born

What became known later as the SDI, was the outgrowth of my intensive 1975-76 studies of the process, led by William



Lyndon LaRouche (left) and Dr. Edward Teller, in 1983, when both were organizing for ballistic-missile defense based on the development of “new physical principles.”

Conferences, is typical. His Unification of the Sciences network, and such of its spin-offs as the Josiah Macy, Jr. Foundation’s Cybernetics project, are typical of the spiders-web of utopian foundations, and what-not, which have been the typical transmission-belts of utopian ideology and schemes over the period since Wells’ 1928 *The Open Conspiracy*.

It was fully consistent with this, that Wells and Russell, and their accomplices, chose to define nuclear weaponry as the ultimate technology, the highest level of technology to be allowed to be deployed. A “one world” empire, “world government,” was to be brought into being, and made perpetual, by the use of nuclear terror to herd the population in what may be fairly described as Wells’ design for an “Orwellian nightmare.”

The Kennedy “crash program” for a manned Moon landing, threatened thus to destroy the life’s work of Wells, Russell, and their accomplices. The effort to

Yandell Elliott protégé Zbigniew Brzezinski, in crafting the Trilateral Commission, and the 1975-1976 “Project 1980s” of the Brzezinski-led New York Council on Foreign Relations (CFR). My investigations took into account the pre-selection of Georgia Governor Jimmy Carter as 1976 Presidential nominee, and the role of sundry wild-eyed men, such as James R. Schlesinger, in crafting the intended nuclear strategic perspectives of the new administration.

It became clear to me, during that interval of my assessment of these and related matters, that the recently concluded SALT and ABM agreements negotiated, by Henry A. Kissinger, with the Brezhnev government, were not a guarantee of nuclear-weapons stability, but, under the kinds of policies typified by Brzezinski and Schlesinger, an increased potential for superpower thermonuclear confrontation.

Unfortunately, few people, including people who have no good excuse for not knowing this, appear to recognize the extraordinary influence that pair of scoundrels, Wells and Russell, together with their lackeys and cronies, have played in shaping the course of Twentieth-Century policy-shaping, especially since their formal reconciliation during the course of the post-war 1920s. Russell in particular, openly stated his literal, British aristocrat’s hatred of everything for which the U.S.A. has stood since prior to its birth. From the 1890s Cambridge years on, Russell hated genuine physical science. His notorious role in the issuance of the ultra-empiricist *Principia Mathematica*, is typical. His decree calling for the end of scientific progress, during the period of the 1920s Solvay

crush that kind of science-driver impetus within the space program, beginning the 1966-1967 interval, reflects the coincidence in aims between the Russell anti-science ideologues and the utopian military gang then steering the virtual perpetual warfare in Indo-China.

My reaction to the pattern of developments around the project of making Carter President, was to seek a lever through which to reverse the drift toward utopia in all facets of leading international political and military trends. What was needed to do this, was a science-driver program of the type needed to ensure the ultimate elimination of the apparent absolute power of nuclear strategic arsenals. My approach was not to propose buying such an arsenal as a finished weapons-system, but to engage the nuclear super-powers in a common commitment to the perspective of bringing about such a change over the medium to long term.

Leading scientific circles agreed with the scientific-technological feasibility of adopting such goals. What convinced many of them, in the U.S.A., the Soviet Union, western Europe, and elsewhere, was not only that the development of relevant “new physical principles” was feasible; the crucial feature of feasibility in my proposal was, that the technological spill-overs from such a crash program’s mission-orientation, would produce the greatest, Franklin Roosevelt-like increase in the productive powers of labor the planet had ever known. In other words, the gains in productivity, per capita, from the program, would exceed the costs of maintaining the military side of the program.

The Telegraph's Smear Job

Sunday Telegraph reviewer Alasdair Palmer doesn't beat around the bush. He denounces Dr. Edward Teller as "deranged," and "the model for Dr. Strangelove, the maddest mad scientist of them all," and dismisses Teller's memoirs as "elaborate self-justification."

On the Strategic Defense Initiative, Palmer writes: "More dubious still is Teller's version of his role in 'Star Wars.' The way he describes it, Star Wars was a stunning technological success, and was only not deployed because the Soviet Union collapsed (thanks in part to Teller's efforts on Star Wars). Robert Park, a professor of physics who was on the panel of scientists who were to evaluate Teller's ideas, tells a rather different story. He maintains that Teller's plan was batty from the start; his insistence that it would be possible to create an X-ray laser able to destroy incoming nuclear missiles was pure fantasy, a classic example of 'voodoo science.'"

During the 1982-1983 interval, leading professional military, and scientific circles of the U.S.A., NATO, and other countries, embraced my proposal, identifying themselves publicly as supporters of Dr. Teller's public declarations of Autumn 1982.

My crucial point, as Dr. Teller, in late 1982, made the point in his own words, was that such a science-driver cooperation would go beyond merely military concerns, to promote what Teller identified as "the common aims of mankind." In that intention, lay the road to peace.

So, during the relevant 1982-1983 period, the Reagan Presidency continued to support my back-channel exploration of this possible cooperation with the Soviet government, and Reagan made the proposal publicly his own, with his March 23, 1983 proffer to the Soviet government. Unfortunately, Andropov summarily rejected the President's proffer, without even an attempt at exploring the offer, and the U.S. utopians, and their political dupes, began, even on the same evening of the President's broadcast, reciting such literally childish litanies as "Star Wars."

How SDI Was Defeated

By Summer 1982, Agrarian Elliott's utopian clone Henry Kissinger had already inhaled a whiff of my back-channel activity with the Soviet government. He spearheaded an effort to have a special "foreign intelligence operation," under provisions of Executive Order 12333, launched against me, through the Justice Department and other institutions. In January 1983, Kissinger's demand was supported, on the initiative

of *Washington Post* representative Edward Bennett Williams, at a rump session of the President's Foreign Intelligence Advisory Board (PFIAB). The FBI and Justice Department promptly set their "foreign intelligence-style" dirty-tricks operations in motion immediately after that meeting.

In short, the circles behind Kissinger, Williams, and the *Washington Post*, were afraid of me, and feared they lacked the intellectual competence to deal with me except by Gestapo-style means.

Every legal and related problem I have experienced since, is a consequence of that operation conducted, internationally, in concert with "spook" organizations such as the American Family Foundation of John Irwin, the grandson of IBM's "Pop" Watson. The overlap of AFF operations with those of fanatically utopian organizations such as the Smith Richardson Foundation and Mellon Scaife circles, is merely typical.

With these attacks on me personally, Dr. Teller was pressured into reaching a conciliation with wild-eyed utopian Lt.-Gen. (ret.) Daniel P. Graham and the nest of kindred ideologues centered in the vicinity of Northern Virginia's double-dipping precincts. That pact between the circles of Dr. Teller and the Heritage fanatics, ensured that the efforts to continue the SDI policy, without my leading part, would turn out to be the failure it ultimately became. All the mistakes known to me, which were made by Teller's circles, were never anything but the result of that rotten compromise with the pseudo-scientific kooks tied to Graham. Teller's people did not accept the legacy of Gauss, Riemann, et al., on which the success of any relevant, comprehensive science-driver approach depended. Setting up a competition with Graham's allies, the corporate double-dippers, around the lunatic notion of challenging crude, intrinsically futile, "kinetic" weapons, was crucial.

Lazare Carnot Would Have Agreed

The central issue of SDI was never simply military hardware. The essential point was, and remains, the issue of the relationship between strategy and culture. The problem was, and remains, that the utopian military doctrines represent a morally and intellectually decadent conception of warfare, which should have died forever on the battlefields of Napoleon Bonaparte's retreat from Moscow. At the least, they should have died with the dissolution of Hitler's Waffen-SS. SDI was, as utopian opponents such as Eisenhower and MacArthur would have agreed, an affirmation of those, science- and engineering-keyed notions of strategic defense which used to be associated with West Point, and with the revolution in warfare set into motion by France's Lazare Carnot and Germany's Classically trained Gerhard Scharnhorst.

Prior to World War I, all progress in military science, and related statecraft, by modern European civilization, had represented the aftermath of the 1648 Treaty of Westphalia, combined with the notion of a principle of strategic defense

elaborated by France's "Author of Victory," scientist-soldier Lazare Carnot. Carnot articulated this, first in his memoir on Vauban, and applied this in leading France to defeat all invading enemies during his command of the defense during 1792-1794. The same policy was introduced through the leadership of Prussia's Scharnhorst.

As the Treaty of Westphalia showed, the only acceptable objective of warfare, if it is justified war, is durable, and productive peace among the victorious and defeated parties alike. Hence, the assured defeat of the attacking party, is the normal standard for strategic doctrine. This was brilliantly demonstrated, by aid of studies of Friedrich Schiller's studies of the Netherlands and Thirty Years wars, in luring Napoleon into the Moscow trap through which the process of destruction of his imperial power was brought about. The Soviet counterattack in World War II, is another example of the application of the principle of strategic defense.

In warfare, as in the related missions of economy, the object is to develop and realize the productive powers of labor of society, as a mobilizable force for realizing objectives of progress for society in general. A defeat will be welcomed by those whose submission provides them the means to a better condition of life than they had had before. Peace between adversaries is a condition achieved through mutual recognition of, and commitment to a durable mutual advantage in cooperation, as it was for the case of the Treaty of Westphalia.

There are many instances of which I know, in which Dr. Teller acted in a way consistent with that principle. That is what he, on his side, and I, on mine, sought, through the SDI policy.

If we now take into account, in retrospect, the horrible mistakes, which the combination of Margaret Thatcher, François Mitterand, and others imposed upon the break-up of the Warsaw Pact system, and contrast the present global economic ruin with the mutual progress which would have been realized under my proposal for SDI, or the 1989 draft proposal of Deutsche Bank's Alfred Herrhausen, Teller and I, each in our own way, were right, all the way through the 1980s, and those who opposed us, especially the curious Yuri Andropov and the future Russian oligarchs associated with him then, were terribly, terribly wrong.

At the very bottom line of the tally to be made, relevant persons in the United Kingdom should ask, and answer the question: Who, what, really, was the Yuri Andropov who made the crucial blunder? What, for example, was the Laxenberg, Austria-based International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis (IIASA), and what did Dr. Alexander King, McGeorge Bundy, the Cambridge systems analysts, and the Mont Pelerin Society, have to do with the fostering of the epidemic of "oligarchical carpetbagging" which has driven the world's second thermonuclear power, Russia, into the corner it finds itself today? Is that the road to peace?

Alasdair Palmer, or his editors, might ask, and answer some of those questions.

Andropov's 'Free Trade' Turn Still Hurts Russia

by Rachel Douglas

Behind the ill-starred rise and fall of Mikhail Gorbachev as Communist Party General Secretary and Russian President, was his predecessor, Yuri Andropov, who was identified by EIR in the 1980s as opening the disastrous Soviet "experiment" with free-trade economics. Now for the first time in the Russian press, a veteran of Soviet intelligence has identified the grouping and relationships, named by Lyndon LaRouche as "Andropov's Kindergarten," as the force behind the liberal economic reforms that wrecked Russia during the 1990s.

The exposé, written by an author identified as "Vyacheslav K.," appears in the February issue of *Stringer* magazine, which was founded by Alexander Korzhakov, at one time Russian President Boris Yeltsin's chief of security. It zeroes in on the nexus of Yuri Andropov's grouping in the KGB. This was rooted in the patronage of Andropov's career, within the Communist Party, by Finnish Comintern leader Otto Kuusinen, and in the International Institute of Applied Systems Analysis (IIASA) in Laxenburg, Austria. IIASA was an arrangement, deadly to Russian economic planning, which was built up after MacGeorge Bundy, senior figure of the U.S. financial establishment, reached an understanding with KGB figure Dzhermen Gvishiani in 1967.

Andropov and 1990s 'Young Reformers'

This story has been told previously only in EIR, for example in Roman Bessonov's series, "IRI's Friends in Russia: the Anti-Utopia in Power" (beginning with EIR, Sept. 6, 1996). More recently, the significance of the "Andropov Kindergarten" as a joint project with British Intelligence and the Mont Pelerin Society, has been featured in LaRouche's direct dialogue with various Russian circles. In his interview in the December issue of *Valyutny Spekulyant*, LaRouche was quoted saying that "on balance, if we put aside the not unimportant matter of personal freedom, the system which the 'Andropov Kindergarten' imposed, as with guidance from the International Republican Institute, of U.S. Mont Pelerin devotees, has done vastly greater damage to Russia and its people than was ever brought upon those people by the Soviet system itself. Saying that 'the young reformers' were not given the chance to prove their system, is like saying that Russia's current shortage of green cheese is the result of the Soviet government's failure to colonize the Moon with