

clear bombardment and stop nuclear blackmail by small "out-law states." But the breakthroughs flowing from this effort promise a new industrial revolution, centered on successful early development of fusion energy.

These leading figures' drive to change U.S. policy was preceded, in February 1982, by Lyndon LaRouche's call for a "Manhattan Project" for beam-weapons technology in a major Washington, D.C. political address. LaRouche then released a book on beam-technologies and military policy through the National Democratic Policy Committee which circulated 15,000 nationally. The FEF's educational campaign to teach all of Washington about beam weapons, followed LaRouche's speech.

Documentation

What the 'freezers' are saying now

The transplanting of the European "peace movement" to the United States in its "nuclear freeze" form, as documented by *EIR* in a March 1982 Special Multi-Client Report, was a project of Robert Strange McNamara and the RAND-Pentagon "systems-analysis" war-planning networks involving Daniel Ellsberg, William Colby, and Henry Pollard and Marvin Goldberger of Union of Concerned Scientists. We further showed that its objectives, then not publicly stated, were worldwide elimination of nuclear energy, and a U.S.-European conventional arms buildup for wars of depopulation and neo-colonial subjugation.

On Oct. 4, the Einstein Peace Award for 1982, the annual award administered by the Union of Concerned Scientists and its parent, the Pugwash Conference of Scientists, was bestowed on McNamara and McGeorge Bundy.

On Oct. 19-20, an international "Fate of the Earth" environmentalist conference with particular focus on the nuclear freeze, was held at New York City's Cathedral of St. John the Divine, under the sponsorship of the Friends of the Earth. There the previously hidden agenda of the "freeze" was made public to its supporters. At the main nuclear-freeze organizing session, Hampshire College Dean Arthur Westing spoke for other leaders present: "A successful nuclear freeze will involve an increase in military spending. . . . Nuclear weapons have given war a bad name. So we have to increase conventional weapons to deal with the Soviet threat. Disarmament should not be our goal: we must deal with the national-security issue." The concluding conference resolution called for "a world constitutional convention for a democratic

federal world government, whose first duty would be to control, dismantle, and destroy all the nuclear weapons, nuclear waste, and nuclear material in the world." Another resolution stated: "We recognize the inseparable link between nuclear-reactor facilities and nuclear-weapons proliferation."

In California last month, with a nuclear-freeze referendum on the state election ballot, former CIA Director Colby emerged as a public "freeze" spokesman, made available for radio and TV debates by the Californians Against Nuclear War. A spokesman for that organization at its Los Angeles headquarters, questioned about the incongruity of Colby's prominent role in the dirtiest war in U.S. history, replied: "The butchery Colby was involved in before was different—it was not here. This [nuclear war] would be here, and in the Soviet Union." Asked if butchery against non-white populations in the Third World was therefore tolerable, the spokesman said: "I don't mean to say that. But let's just say the Vietnam War was different from what we're trying to stop now."

In a pre-referendum speech on Oct. 27 promoting the nuclear freeze at California Institute of Technology in San Diego, CalTech President Dr. Marvin Goldberger asserted to an incredulous audience of students that "McNamara and his associates are true advocates of peace." Goldberger had been challenged by Dr. Steven Bardwell of the Fusion Energy Foundation, but refused to debate him.

Daniel Ellsberg, who for 10 days had also refused to debate Bardwell, ended up in a confrontation with the physicist on Oct. 29 at San José State College. At a press conference Ellsberg had delayed while trying to have Bardwell removed from the room, the "freeze" spokesman was besieged by reporters asking him why he refused to debate, and finally yelled that Fusion Energy Foundation co-founder Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr. and his associates are "political disrupters and provocateurs." While Ellsberg was screaming and sputtering, Bardwell briefed the audience of 200 and debated with them; the freeze organizers again ordered Bardwell kicked out, and, with cameras rolling, he continued to answer questions about Ellsberg's designs for cluster bombs and so forth as he left. Ellsberg proceeded to attack Dr. Edward Teller and technology in general; students demanded that Ellsberg address the question of McNamara and a conventional buildup; finally, a 15-minute "floor fight" ensued between Bardwell and Ellsberg.

In an earlier debate between Bardwell and UCLA nuclear-freeze advocate Dr. Theodore Forrester, the latter insisted that both McNamara and Colby were "men of peace," and that their leadership of the nuclear-freeze movement was welcomed.

Speaking to students at the University of California at Irvine Oct. 26, Dr. Bardwell recounted that he had taken part in peace movements and efforts to prevent nuclear war for 15 years. "If someone told me they had a new peace movement . . . led by McNamara, Colby, and Maxwell Taylor, I would say, 'Do you think I'm a fool?'"