

Beam-weapon initiative is changing U.S. politics

by Susan Kokinda, Washington correspondent

The advocates of a "nuclear freeze" are running into new obstacles in their effort to order the strategic debate according to their policy needs. The freeze movement was designed to provide the political muscle for a NATO policy of playing Kissingerian "arms reduction" games with the U.S.S.R. while securing a conventional buildup for "out-of-area" NATO deployments to keep the developing sector supine under International Monetary Fund looting. The intervention of the National Democratic Policy Committee, the Fusion Energy Foundation, and the Washington faction for whom Dr. Edward Teller has become a national spokesman, has already gone a long way toward melting the freeze. A "higher peace movement," as elaborated by *EIR* founder Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr., based on anti-missile beam-weapon development, space exploration, and capital-goods exports to the Third World, has begun to transform the definition of the issues. Do you want to freeze nuclear weapons, or do you want to kill them?

The Dec. 7 House defeat of the MX missile, whose demise was planned for by Secretary of State George Shultz and resident IMF lieutenant Paul Volcker as a necessary sacrifice to the dictates of domestic austerity, may backfire on its authors if the heretofore squinty-minded MX debate evolves into a real dissection of the misconceived Mutually Assured Destruction and deterrence doctrines. The overarching question is the pursuit of advanced technology in general, and its potential to revive both the U.S. economy and rational negotiations between the two superpowers.

Efforts to blunt the beam-weapon initiative have emerged

in Congress as Sen. Charles Mathias, Sen. Larry Pressler, and Rep. George Brown took the floor during the first days of December to warn against the possible "militarization of space" and the new class of weapons systems being talked about by both the United States and Soviet Union. But perhaps the most noteworthy response came from White House Science Adviser George Keyworth, who in testimony before the Senate Armed Services Committee on the day after the MX defeat, warned that "it would be foolish to give up our strategic systems for purely defense systems. Maybe some day we can look in that direction. But no technology exists today to make it feasible." Perhaps Keyworth's ardor for the "densepack" MX basing mode and the strategic doctrine of deterrence upon which it is based, has led him to fear a successful effort to shift U.S. strategic doctrine to one of beam weapon-based defense. But his unsolicited comments attest to the perceived potential of the beam-weapon campaign and to the accuracy of continuing reports that the President himself supports the public initiatives by Dr. Teller.

Malthusians attack beam weapons

As important as the strategic implications of the beam-weapon campaign are—that is, ending the threat of thermo-nuclear holocaust by ensuring that nuclear-bomb-bearing missiles can be annihilated in flight—the *cultural* implications are also striking terror among its opponents. "Freeze" supporter Prof. Richard Falk of Princeton University, an on-the-ground instigator of, and unabashed apologist for, the Ayatollah Khomeini's Dark Age, is reportedly concerned



Philip Ulanovsky/NSIPS

The counterculture-infested disarmament movement pictured here is giving way to a "higher peace" mobilization.

about the "technologically optimistic" world-view inherent in the space-based beam weapon proposal. Falk and others accurately assume that a resurgence of hope for a technologically expanded future will destroy the carefully inculcated mood of cultural pessimism imposed on the U.S. with the late-1960s limits-to-growth environmentalist hoaxes. Similar reactions have been received from British psychological-warfare specialists.

Leading congressional spokesmen for the international Malthusian command were deployed to launch the floor debate against space-based beam weapons. On Dec. 2, Sen. Charles Mathias (who has otherwise distinguished himself by propagandizing for the policies of the *Global 2000 Report*, and has associated himself with British directed efforts to destroy the U.S. Constitution) delivered the first shot. In remarks which implicitly acknowledged the damage already rendered to the freeze proposal by suggesting that its specific recommendations might be off base, Mathias said, "An analogous but even more dangerous situation exists in outer-space. Certain outer-space activity has contributed to arms control. . . . But this positive aspect is threatened by a space technology that is rapidly providing the ability to destroy national technical methods of verification. *We must negotiate a treaty outlawing war and arms in space, or prepare to defend our share of Earth from space warfare* [emphasis added]."

That day, Senate Foreign Relations Committee Chairman Charles Percy inserted into the *Congressional Record* a speech by Sen. Larry Pressler (R-S.D.) which singled out the danger

of a "space arms race" and declared that such an effort would not be in the interests of the United States. Pressler is a blow-dried Rhodes Scholar who has sought to repay his British sponsors many times over. Finally, Rep. George Brown, a California Democrat of the Jerry Brown-style of inner space exploration, repeated those warnings with a Dec. 7 insert on the "destabilizing technologies" proposed by Air Force Gen. Daniel Graham, an early advocate of space-based laser weapons.

Real jobs and genuine peace

Thus far, these relatively feeble efforts have in no way kept pace with the LaRouche initiative for beam weapons in space. The FEF-drafted legislation, which couches the development of beam weapons within the context of a vastly augmented space exploration program and additional funding for thermonuclear fusion research, is now in the hands of congressmen and senators who are seriously studying the proposal. Among normally pro-defense Congressmen, many of whom, however, felt compelled to vote against the MX, the uppermost question concerns the level of commitment given by the Soviet Union to this capability. While no one has quite said it as Lyndon LaRouche did—"develop beam weapons or surrender to Andropov"—many recognize that the strategic balance will be unalterably shifted should the Soviets be the only runners in this race. Conservative Republicans, especially in the Senate, are intrigued with the effectiveness of the beam weapon campaign in countering the freeze.

The failure of Los Angeles Mayor Tom Bradley's nuclear freeze resolution to even reach a floor vote during the National League of Cities conference in Los Angeles on Dec. 2 signaled a perceptible shift in the content of the strategic debate away from the conventional war buildup policies of the freeze leaders. At the League of Cities conference, over 200 mayors, city council heads, and other municipal officials signed the petition circulated by the National Democratic Policy Committee calling for the creation of a strategic policy based on space-based beam defensive systems, on a renewed commitment to technological and economic advance. Among those signing the petition were Mayor Bissell from Oak Ridge, Tennessee, who led the floor fight against the freeze resolution.

The density and quality of activities generated around the country by NDPC/FEF campaigns have surpassed the effort which led to the League of Cities victory. Campus forums on the "higher peace movement" are scheduled around the United States. A two-day tour of New Mexico by FEF Plasma Physics Director Dr. Steven Bardwell (author of *EIR*'s special report on beam weapons) swept Albuquerque and Los Alamos with widespread press response and favorable coverage, characterized by a prominent article in the major daily, the *Albuquerque Journal*, headlined "Fusion Specialist Urges U.S. to Spur Beam Weapon Work." The article stressed Bardwell's contention that the spinoffs from the weapons technology would "further the goals of harnessing fusion energy for commercial power and revolutionize industrial processes."

Bardwell was greeted on his next stop by a previously published editorial in the *New Mexico Independent* entitled "A Real Jobs Program" which counterposes to the leaf-raking proposal currently before Congress, the tremendous economic effect of the development and deployment of space-based beam weapons. That high-technology approach to revitalizing the U.S. economy holds the possibility to break the American labor movement from the grips of AFL-CIO President Lane Kirkland, a member of the Trilateral Commission and the linchpin supporter of Paul Volcker's policy of destroying the U.S. industrial base (see article, page 51). Initial organizing forays into the hardest hit unions such as the United Steel Workers and the Building Trades, indicate the potential for such a "real jobs program"; the Defense Policy Committee of the AFL-CIO this month heard presentations on the space-based beam weapon proposal.

That Kirkland has, as yet, not openly tried to oppose the beam weapon campaign, and that he has deployed his international kapos to disrupt and attempt to destroy LaRouche-affiliated organizations, attests to his fear of the issue and his intent to keep it under wraps until LaRouche can be destroyed.

The fact that the LaRouche organizations are under an intense coordinated attack from the international oligarchy, exemplified by the *New York Times*-instigated grand jury proceedings in New York (see page 54), is not surprising if one understands the importance of the LaRouche-initiated campaign within the current U.S. political geometry. Not

only would organized labor prove itself unable to rescue the economy, but other political forces which oppose the nuclear freeze would be unable to rise out of the parameters set for them.

Exemplary were two press conferences held on Pearl Harbor Day—one by Rep. Mickey Edwards (R-Okla.), chairman of the American Conservative Union, and the other by Sen. Jeremiah Denton (R-Ala.) to announce different campaigns to fight the nuclear freeze. The projected \$1 million publicity campaign of the ACU is contentless at this point, until the organization "market tests" various approaches to countering the freeze! Responding to an *EIR* reporter's question about the effectiveness of the FEF's beam-weapon campaign against the California freeze movement, Edwards conceded that "such defensive systems must be understood and supported," but that "whether we will get into those other issues [will depend] on what is most effective." Denton, when asked by *EIR* why he made support for the MX the centerpiece for his "anti-freeze" campaign but did not mention the possibility of space-based beam weapons, replied, "I've known Dr. Teller for a long time. I respect him as a nuclear physicist, but I'm not so sure about his strategic or tactical prowess. I am aware of his proposals and they bear further study. But the MX is too good a thing to pass up now for something which may have viability in the future."

The next day, at the Armed Services committee hearings, Science Adviser Keyworth discounted the possibility of purely defensive systems. Analyzing the defeat of MX, Sen. Gordon Humphrey (R-N.H.) argued that the adoption of the MAD doctrine during the 1960s, and with it, the rejection of an active ballistic missile defense capability, had led the United States to a situation in which "we are being driven down a road of passive defense in which the options become less and less desirable."

Outlining those "undesirable" aspects of the densepack basing mode for MX, he categorized it as an archaic technology based on materials—i.e., cement used for the hardening of silos—in use since the time of the Romans; he asked Defense Secretary Weinberger if the United States would consider opening up the anti-ballistic missile (ABM) treaty so that the possibility of an active ballistic missile defense of the MX could be explored.

Weinberger replied that while it was not necessary to open up the ABM treaty to defend the MX with ABMs, in general he thinks that "ballistic-missile defense is a more hopeful way of protecting the world," and that he was not one who considered such a defense destabilizing.

Reflecting the still-inadequate level of the debate, neither Humphrey nor Weinberger indicated that they were talking about anything other than land-based ABM capabilities. Nonetheless, the stalemate around MX underscores Humphrey's assessment that acceptance of the MAD doctrine, as opposed to pursuit of an assured defense, has led the nation into increasingly undesirable options. It appears that official Washington is now primed to take on a serious defense debate.