

## NDPC poster called 'brutal'

Sometime on Friday night, community groups allying with the NDPC to form a Committee Against Genocide, plastered the city with a poster depicting Harriman as a pink baboon with the caption: "Anglo-Saxon Superman. He thinks he's superior because he's pink." The poster was a big hit in the black and Hispanic wards and is presently being mass-produced for circulation throughout the United States.

The poster has been called "brutal," "vicious" and numerous other things which can't be mentioned in these pages, but I can only guess what Pamela Harriman was saying as she was seen gesturing wildly while leaning over the backseat of the car, trying to point out the posters to Averell.

The postering was done in preparation for a Saturday demonstration called by the Committee Against Genocide to protest the presence of Averell Harriman and the adoption of his policies at the convention. One-hundred people demonstrated, and it was covered on local television with more prominence than other numerically larger protests.

## LaRouche not a Democrat

By the second day of the convention, MaGnat's staffers were telling everyone who would listen that LaRouche was not a Democrat.

"But didn't he run in 14 primaries for the presidential nomination?"

"I don't care. He's not a Democrat."

"But didn't Steve Douglas win 35 percent of the vote in Philadelphia?"

"I don't care. He's not a Democrat."

After all this haranguing, guess what happened at the meeting of the accountability commission? They couldn't decide what a Democrat was! The vice-chairman of the panel put it something like this: "The accountability effort is not going to work unless we agree on what are the basic principles of the Democratic Party. Therefore, over the next months, the commission will try to define the cardinal principles of the party."

Mr. MaGnat's resolutions were all voted up—because it wasn't possible to vote them down; the "participants" went along, perhaps convincing themselves that a display of "unity" would help them win in November. Privately, they know better.

Many Democrats from around the country want Charles Manatt out as chairman of the Democratic Party. Farmers, trade-unionists, who don't like his and Topsy O'Neill's support for Paul Volcker's high interest rates. Minorities who don't like the genocidal platform Manatt and Harriman just engineered. This will happen, no matter how brutally we have to interrupt Manatt's funeral services.

---

## Conference Report

---

# A Manhattan Project for beam weapons

by Laura Chasen in Washington, D.C.

Both public and secret-session discussion broke out around the Defense Department and Congress last month on how to develop anti-ballistic missile defense systems—weapons capable of "killing" strategic ICBM barrages launched by the superpowers or by third nuclear powers. Since *EIR* founder Lyndon LaRouche's January speech in Washington, in which he called for open U.S.-Soviet competition to develop and deploy ABM "beam weapons" in space and "end the age of mutual thermo-nuclear terror," the issue has moved to the fore.

On June 24, the Fusion Energy Foundation presented a two-hour Capitol Hill briefing outlining a "Manhattan Project" for beam-weapon missile defense to 60 representatives of Congress, the Pentagon, aerospace firms, and foreign embassies. This was the highest-profile session among a number of June meetings on space-based ABMs, involving the American Institute of Aeronautics and Astronautics (AIAA), Gen. Daniel Graham's High Frontier group, secret sessions of the House-Senate conference committee on military appropriations, and others.

FEF plasma physicist Steven Bardwell, who gave the major presentation on beam weapon systems, had been invited to Capitol Hill by Rep. John Rhodes (R-Ariz.). Dr. Bardwell, author of the 1977 pamphlet on beam weapons entitled "Sputnik of the 80s," has just written a technical White Paper on the subject for *EIR*, following the release of a National Democratic Policy Committee discussion document on ABM "war-avoidance" strategy by LaRouche and a book by Gen. Graham for "High Frontier."

## The 'nuclear-freeze' question

Introducing Bardwell's Washington briefing was FEF Director Paul Gallagher, who asserted that the "nuclear freeze" movement is seeking to halt all nuclear progress, civilian and military.

Gallagher stated: "General Daniel Graham and political economist Lyndon LaRouche have both advanced a very fundamental conception, that at the moment it is necessary in the development of war-

fighting and war-avoidance capability for the superpowers, in a situation in which the danger of confrontation is clearly increasing, to look for a scientific and technological leap forward . . . of the sort which occurred with the development of the ICBM, and occurred with the development of the atomic weapon. . . .

“If we continue to seek merely incremental improvements in existing military systems, which is the dominant policy in U.S. planning and procurement today, we are not simply going on faith that major technology breakthroughs bearing on the arms race are not going to occur. Worse than that, we are pursuing the policy of military procurement which directly feeds the credibility of the ‘nuclear freeze’ movement. . . .

“There is a continuous tradition which has afflicted American military strategic thinking, which has repeatedly assured Americans that whatever technologies had just been developed were the most advanced that would ever be developed, at least for the foreseeable future. One might call this the ‘Oppenheimer syndrome.’ It began with the denial that the Soviet Union would develop an atomic weapon at any time in the 10- to 15-year period after the Second World War, and proceeded to the denial that it was possible for either superpower to develop the hydrogen weapon, and so forth. . . .

“The United States took nine years between its successful A-bomb and its successful H-bomb. The Soviet Union took four. Between its beginnings of testing of ICBM capabilities, and its deployment of an ICBM . . . the U.S. took seven years; the Soviet Union took four. The United States has been working on anti-missile missiles, on ABMs, since 1955, in one form or another for 27 years. . . . We are seeing once again a situation in which the pursuit of a *strategic* breakthrough, a real science breakthrough, by the Soviet Union, is aimed entirely at strategic war-fighting, whereas on the United States and its NATO allies’ side, further strategic breakthroughs are being denied, and we are focusing on conventional warfare. . . . In doing so, we are feeding the movement against nuclear technologies.

“These prospects for ballistic-missile defense weapons, beam weapons, are not fundamentally based on communications technologies, or on sophistication of related optics technologies. They are a field of power generation, very intense power generation capabilities and their application, from nuclear sources. . . .”

Dr. Bardwell told the Capitol Hill audience that crude anti-ballistic missile systems, based partly in space and using conventional technologies, could provide significant protection to the United States within five to six years, as a stopgap. He said that laser and particle-beam ABM systems, far more effective, powerful, and potentially very long-range (destroying missiles soon after launch) could be developed as first prototypes in

seven to eight years—and that the Soviet development program is on such a timetable.

Bardwell began with the following formulation: “Since the advent of nuclear weapons and the development 5 to 10 years later of ICBMs capable of delivering those weapons, the world has faced an intolerable military situation—two powers, primarily, have held an offensive capability for which there was no effective defense. This is a unique situation in the past 400 to 500 years. That situation is inherently unstable. A conflict, whether begun from accident, or temporary insanity, is unstoppable once it begins. . . .

“There are technologies on the horizon to change that situation. In five years, eight years perhaps, we can see a situation when it would be possible for President Reagan to call up President Brezhnev, and say, ‘One of my men accidentally launched a missile; here are its coordinates; we will try to shoot it down, I hope your people will too’ . . . or where a third power, like Libya, launched a missile against Europe, that need not lead to a holocaust, but could be defended against, prevented by technology. . . .

“The essential task of a military strategist is to identify the areas of technological progress and scientific growth which deal with those areas of national security. . . . This is the development of technologies which simultaneously revolutionize warfare and reduce the likelihood of war by virtue of solving the seeming limits to growth and development that countries face. . . . Today, there is no question in my mind that the front edge of technological development . . . which both solves the nightmare of the threat of nuclear war and deals with the underlying causes of war, is a family of technologies based on plasma physics and nuclear fusion.

“These develop a class of beam weapons which make real defense against ballistic missiles possible for the first time in 25 years. Secondly, they provide a means for producing unlimited amounts of energy and opening up an arena of new industrial technologies, which will revolutionize industrial civilizations to a greater degree than electricity did 100 years ago. . . .

“What a military leader must do at this point is identify that technology; deploy the resources to master it; develop an order of battle adequate to use it in a military sense; and most importantly, develop the civil and military engineering to apply it to domestic economic growth. . . .

“100,000 times more concentrated forms of energy are made available to us once we have mastered plasma technologies. We have very common materials like aluminum today; however, it was not until energy densities in industrial processes passed a certain threshold that aluminum became a resource. It was not until electricity became industrially available. It was not

refinable by any energy density available. . . . Plasma technologies will produce an increase 1000 times greater than electricity did. Energy density is the technological property that both beam weapons and civilian plasma technologies take advantage of.

"The second thing plasma technologies offer to us is command over the whole electromagnetic spectrum. Today we are almost totally confined to the infrared part of the spectrum—that is, heat energy—for military and industrial technologies. Explosives depend on the rapid expansion of heat and the production of shock waves that that heat energy produces. The most energetic forms of light, hard x-rays, through to long wavelength infrared portions of the spectrum; that qualitative increase in flexibility of capabilities, is the subject of the advantages that plasma technologies bring. . . .

"The essential difference between conventional concepts of ballistic-missile defense, and a beam weapon, is that once the targets have been detected and tracked, they are destroyed not with other rockets or explosives, but with a beam of light, or atomic particles, travelling at or near the speed of light, that can be aimed at one of these ballistic missiles in its boost phase, and destroy it by the bolt of energy from the beam weapon. . . . By basing a laser on the ground, it is able to shoot at a missile or warhead coming in, and to protect a relatively small area. But by adding an orbiting satellite system we are capable of dealing with literally tens of thousands of launched missiles and destroying them before they begin to reenter the atmosphere. . . . A set of approximately 50 orbiting beam weapon stations would be capable of providing 'continental defense' against the largest conceivable ballistic missile attack. . . .

"It is not an accident that the technologies required for the solution to the problems of development of beam-weapon anti-ballistic missile defense are the technologies required for the development of nuclear fusion. . . . You have the same energy-storage and pulsed-power problems, the same transmission problems. Mastering those in either area gives you a solution to both.

"An even clearer indication of the overlap is that they present the same scientific challenges. We are creating a new physics to deal with the energy self-compression of plasmas—the physics of shock waves and their propagation. This is a whole new branch of physics, only now beginning to be studied seriously in the United States. . . . a new scientific endeavor to solve the physics of production and control of ultra-dense energy sources. It also has applications in the chemical industry, in the production of all basic metals . . .

"The Soviet Union, by the report of our government, spends between three and five times as much money, manpower, and effort as does the United States, in the pursuit of these technologies," Dr. Bardwell noted in conclusion.

---

## New LaRouche volume science of psychology

"This book was triggered by the scandalous role of psychiatric witnesses at the Hinckley trial," *EIR* contributing editor Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr. describes the manuscript delivered to his publisher in early July.

LaRouche blames the takeover of most of the U.S. psychological profession by postwar influence of Brigadier Dr. John Rawlings Rees' London Tavistock Institute for the shocking performances in the Hinckley trial itself. He notes that all of those witnesses, defense and prosecution alike, as well as one member of the jury, have dossiers linking them to the Reesian network in the United States.

That serves as the point of departure, rather than the principal content of the book as a whole.

Returning to this question in the concluding chapter of the manuscript, LaRouche poses the issue: Why has the psychological profession in general failed to "blow the whistle" on the policies and practices which Tavistock networks have used to virtually take over control of the U.S. psychological profession as a whole? Where were the ethics of these numerous psychiatrists, psychoanalysts and psychologists generally? Where were the scientific principles it might be generally assumed they would defend?

LaRouche warns his readers against extravagant condemnation of the profession as a whole. Before "Reesian shocktroops" subverted the profession, classical psychiatrists and psychoanalysts had contributed important, unduplicatable service to many of the mentally ill and their families.

However, he adds, "The competence within the profession must be understood as a pragmatic body of skills acquired by successive generations of often gifted and dedicated professionals, a pragmatic competence achieved despite the rejection of elementary scientific criteria by the profession as a whole." He added, "When pressured to make step-by-step concessions of the sort demanded by Tavistock's backers, they retreated step by step. There existed no scientific principles to force them to say at some point, 'Beyond this point I will not be pushed another inch.'"

"Despite the good work done by many professionals," LaRouche continued, "the profession as a whole