
Beam-Weapons Defense Strategy

LaRouche-Teller proposal dislodges MAD doctrine and 'nuclear freeze'

by Paul Gallagher

In the battle over Western defense strategy, 1982 did not turn out to be what Britain's Tavistock Institute, the BBC, and MIT had planned, the year of revival of J. Robert Oppenheimer and Bertrand Russell. Instead, it became the year of Edward Teller and Lyndon H. LaRouche, and the prospect of mutually assured survival through "defensive nuclear weapons," i.e., energy-beam anti-ballistic missile systems.

At a Feb. 17 *EIR* meeting in Washington, D.C., LaRouche proposed a counterattack to drive back the green-fascist "European peace movement" then beating on the door of the United States.

'Disarmament doesn't work'

"Disarmament doesn't work," said LaRouche. "Disarmament movements throughout this century are the prelude to general war. Peace requires an open U.S.-Soviet race to develop relativistic energy-beam ABM defenses, 'beam weapons.' Technologies can be perfected, beginning with high-power laser technologies, to knock out the proverbial 99 and 44 one-hundredths percent of ICBMs launched. War-avoidance means that one or both of the superpowers must develop this capability."

Because the "peace movement" is premised on the Mutually Assured Destruction doctrine of Henry Kissinger and Robert McNamara, which has frozen the strategic situation around the terrifying and unopposed offensive power of the nuclear ICBM, the movement in truth contributes to the most dangerous threat of military holocaust in the 20th century. Hothoused in Europe, funded by Libya's Qaddafi and the KGB, and engaged in violent demonstrations, this "peace movement" was a *planned destabilization* of Helmut Schmidt and Ronald Reagan, manipulating popular fears associated with Mutually Assured Destruction under the special conditions of a world economic and political crisis.

This international "nuclear freeze" movement was initiated by military and scientific intelligence specialists operating under the direction of Britain's Tavistock and Royal Institute for International Affairs, as well as its U.S. branch, the Council on Foreign Relations, the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI), and similar think-tanks of the northern European oligarchy.

When brought to the United States during 1981, "nuclear freeze" was put under the operational direction of the Union

of Concerned Scientists (UCS), an elite network of "former" military-intelligence and weapons specialists which is currently the most influential anti-nuclear organization in the country. In March 1982, overall control of the "peace movement" was assumed by Robert Strange McNamara, McGeorge Bundy, George F. Kennan, and Gerard Smith at the CFR. This "Gang of Four," as UCS leaders like Daniel Ellsberg, Richard Falk and Henry Kendall refer to them, wrote an April *Foreign Affairs* article proposing a policy of "no first use" of nuclear weapons. This "doctrine," which has received the most effusive public encouragement from Yuri Andropov's Soviet KGB, was nothing but a proposal for a rapid *conventional arms-buildup* by the NATO powers, combined with a halt to any further advances in nuclear weapons, and an absurd pledge not to use nuclear weapons except *after* an all-out attack.

This proposed to make Europe a "conventional" shooting gallery, as French Defense Minister Hernu has scathingly observed. The preoccupation of McNamara et al., however, was the "new era" of "NATO out-of-area deployments" against the Third World, launched by the British attack on Argentina. This doctrine, often accurately referred to as "population and raw-materials wars," requires a conventional military buildup and a tacit Soviet agreement to allow NATO a free hand in most of the underdeveloped sector.

Such a buildup is the policy of the "nuclear freeze," and an outline of it was drafted during 1982 at MIT, by Kendall and others associated with UCS in between leading "peace" rallies. The movement, built through media hype, was a weapon to destabilize President Reagan and force him to accept this lunatic doctrine, in the face of Soviet nuclear modernization and all-out ABM beam-technology development programs, which Kissinger and McNamara insisted could be halted by negotiation and "the crumbling of the Soviet empire."

As Dr. Teller succinctly stated in an Oct. 27 National Press Club presentation, if this McNamara "nuclear freeze" doctrine prevailed, the United States faced either surrender or the certainty of nuclear war during the 1980s. In a December interview with the German daily *Die Welt*, Teller compared the European "greens" to the fascist brownshirts of the inter-war period; Teller was a graduate student in Germany during that time.

Dr. Teller had launched an organizing effort against the "nuclear freeze" during the California state referendum debate on nuclear weapons in September; he then campaigned nationally for a crash program of beam-weapons development and a policy of "attacking the cause of war" through high-technology development of the Third World.

When Teller entered the battle as a public spokesman of great scientific stature, the White House made a clear if unannounced shift to a commitment to beam-weapons ABM development. The program is still secret, but the commitment has moved more and more to center-stage in the arms debate since the MX missile's legislative defeat.

The public presentations of Teller, LaRouche, and the Fusion Energy Foundation "surfaced" the energy-beam technology-breakout potential so rapidly and powerfully that British intelligence and U.S. congressional liberals are scrambling for fallback positions. The socialist and liberal media of Europe and the United States have issued assaults on reawakened "technological optimism," demanding that space-based ABMs be outlawed by new treaties or congressional resolutions, such as introduced by former Rhodes Scholar Sen. Larry Pressler (D-N.D.).

Policy development

Following LaRouche's February proposal, hundreds of National Democratic Policy Committee (NDPC) chapters across the U.S. circulated LaRouche's pamphlet, "Only Beam-Weapons Can End the Kissingerian Age of Mutual Thermonuclear Terror." In Washington, D.C. the Fusion Energy Foundation conducted educational work among congressional, military, and government representatives concerned with undercutting the "freeze."

By late fall, FEF spokesmen had presented three general public briefings on Capitol Hill at the invitation of members of Congress: 60 to 70 persons attended each briefing. Sessions of questions and debate involving foreign diplomats and U.S. military men followed the presentations.

FEF specialists Steven Bardwell and Charles Stevens had no access to classified reports of work in this highly (and foolishly) secret area on the frontier of industrial technology. They had gained an overview of relativistic beam-weapons potentials from knowledge of plasma physics and fusion research, and from seven years of following and reporting aggressive Soviet development of high-power pulsed particle-beam and laser-beam sources. The U.S. programs they monitored as well were fitful, lagging far behind the Soviet concentration of effort.

Bardwell and Stevens followed up LaRouche's booklet with a detailed analysis of the revolutionary potential of high-frequency, or x-ray, lasers, which was widely read in Congress. Bardwell also drafted for *EIR* a 40,000-word technical report on beam-weapon technologies, comparing the U.S. and Soviet efforts in each field and detailing the industrial effects of developing these technologies.

Teller has insisted on dropping the secrecy of the pro-

gram, since the technological principles involved in directed-energy beams are long since no secret, at least to scientists in the five nations which have developed thermonuclear weapons. He also emphasizes that while ABM development will restore rationality and "buy time," these frontier technologies must be used rapidly to attack the underlying cause of war, the forced poverty and backwardness in developing nations.

The spectre of Vietnam

In early October came a turning point in the debate. The Union of Concerned Scientists gave the "Einstein Peace Award" for 1982 to Robert Strange McNamara, McGeorge Bundy, and other CFR butchers of the Vietnam War, because of their *Foreign Affairs* article. The FEF's Dr. Steven Bardwell then began a 15-day tour of California, engaging in campus debates and speeches at the height of the "freeze" referendum debate; he found that students and professionals discovering the "McNamara connection" wanted nothing more to do with the nuclear freeze. With Bardwell and Teller transforming the California debate, the "freeze" fell from a 25-point landslide in early October polls, to a 3-point margin a month later on election day.

Other "freeze" spokesmen—M.I.T.'s Henry Kendall, Princeton's Richard Falk, and Daniel Ellsberg—were forced to admit the truth: they were not for disarmament at all, but promoting a conventional arms buildup to "back off" from nuclear technologies in the advanced countries. And they opposed all Third World nuclear energy and related economic development projects. Above all, Kendall and Falk told interviewers, they opposed the "American technological optimism" of an ABM crash program.

This "peace movement" was in fact supporting the new conventional arms doctrine of NATO—with funds conduited from a Soviet KGB which thoroughly approved of the change!

A 'higher peace movement'

Since Dr. Bardwell's California tour in late October, the fight over beam-weapons policy has entered a crucial phase, eliciting shifts at the highest levels of NATO governments. In November and December, FEF spokesmen presented their program for energy-beam anti-ballistic-missile defense as a new peace initiative at 40 U.S. campuses, speaking to thousands of students and teachers, and receiving wide press coverage. They also made presentations to personnel at advanced-technology corporations, and met with members of Congress and executive office staffs.

Across Europe, Lyndon LaRouche and his scientific associates there, have addressed audiences of government, industry, and military officials in all the major European capitals except London, proposing a beam-weapons oriented "technology race" by both superpowers. They drew 60 representatives each in Bonn and Munich; 65 in Strasbourg; 50 in Paris; 30 in Stockholm and in Madrid; 20 in Brussels.

In Milan, at a conference organized by associates of LaRouche on the subject of Leonardo da Vinci, 1,500 people

attended. Speakers threw the Italian press into a weeklong uproar by stating: If Leonardo were alive today, he would be proposing and designing energy-beam ABM weapons. Yet despite the howls of the press and the arm-twisting of British intelligence assets in Rome, Dr. Jonathan Tennenbaum's presentation on beam-weapons there two weeks later was attended by 45 top Italian government and military representatives and others.

Meanwhile Dr. Teller appeared before the National Press Club in Washington, on NBC's "Nightline," and other television broadcasts, and then himself went to Israel and Europe.

The vigor and density of these initiatives elicited reactions around the world. The opponents of beam-weapon development, who would have preferred never to have been obliged to discuss the subject publicly, began to do so. The outcry began in earnest the week of Nov. 12, with editorial attacks in the London *Financial Times* and London *Guardian* on the notion of developing space-based laser ABM systems. That week the directors of the Tavistock Institute and Royal Institute for International Affairs, speaking to reporters in Europe, denounced "this beam-weapon thing as typical American technological optimism," in the words of one. The head of the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute, a central "nuclear freeze" planning group, denounced "fools" such as MIT's Prof. Costa Tsipis for claiming that beam-weapons were technically unfeasible, rather than suppressing the whole ABM idea.

On Nov. 18, the *Boston Globe* carried a full-page editorial blasting "Pentagon Atari" which admitted that space-based ABMs are on the near horizon and called for a national debate geared to halt them. (The *Globe* has refused to reprint a letter from LaRouche proposing to begin this debate at once.) The *New York Times* and *Los Angeles Times* followed with editorial attacks on space-based military systems; the Soviet *Literaturnaya Gazyeta*, whose editor heads the Soviet-British Friendship Society, published a violent attack on Dr. Teller, while only elliptically referring to his current activities.

In Europe, press coverage directly reflected government policy shifts. Heavy-handed slanders of LaRouche and FEF were run in the German and Italian press, and NATO pressure on the Belgian government succeeded in cancelling an invitation to Bardwell to address a government-sponsored energy-policy forum in Brussels, because he was scheduled to speak on beam weapons at another, earlier event in Belgium. In France, however, *Le Monde* gave prominent and accurate coverage to the beam-weapon proposals. French Defense Minister Hernu conducted a pro-nuclear attack on the NATO "conventional buildup" lunacy. Swedish and other Scandinavian industry-linked newspapers noted: only through the route of U.S. and Soviet ABM development, can ICBM disarmament follow.

The congressional shift

In the United States, as the National Democratic Policy

Committee founded by LaRouche takes the beam-weapon question to the public at large, the battle has become intense, and in some quarters desperate. Opponents of an anti-missile defense are now acknowledging the need for ABM systems—though not, they say, for energy-beam development. Members of Averell Harriman's Democratic bloc in Congress, led by Sen. Larry Pressler of South Dakota and Kennedyite Joseph Moakley of Massachusetts, have moved to introduce resolutions barring all space-basing and testing of new military systems; these, however, have gone nowhere so far. An opposing resolution, sponsored by Senators Syms and Laxalt with the support of 54 others, has called for an end to Mutually Assured Destruction and development of strategic defensive systems. This forecasts an administration flanking response to the MX defeat; in fact, first-stage high-power laser ABM systems can be developed in the same time frame and cost as the MX program.

Meanwhile the Los Alamos Laboratory Theoretical Division has suddenly declassified a 1954 attack on Dr. Teller by Hans Bethe, an attack which was made into a cause célèbre by *Science* magazine and the *New York Times* wire service. The article—which among other things claims that the United States could have countered Soviet development of the hydrogen bomb without developing that weapon itself—has chiefly served, however, to fuel the interest generated by the NDPC and FEF in the beam-weapon potential.

Some of the younger scientific associates of Dr. Teller directly involved in U.S. beam-weapon development programs, have contributed articles on the technologies to defense-related journals—journals distributed to Congress as well. Other defense journals are publishing reports of FEF summaries of beam-weapon potentials.

One forthcoming article by Livermore Lab's Dr. Lowell Wood in *Defense Science* (January 1983) is said to be the most direct rebuttal of "scientific" arguments against space-based ABMs ever published by a scientist directly working on these "secret" technologies.

Will secrecy and MAD be simultaneously lifted off the back of U.S. science and technology? In remarks prepared for his organization's year-end national conference in New York, LaRouche insists that this can and must be accomplished with a crash program for beam-weapons. LaRouche observes that Soviet state policy, as distinct from that of Soviet military specialists, will not abandon the MAD terror-threat and its dismal "disarmament" correlate. Americans are, however, beginning to show support for breaking the MAD bind; LaRouche states his agreement with Teller that the Soviets "are not adventurers," and will respond with cautious rationality to such a development. In any case, they currently have the lead in the ABM development effort.

As these advanced energy-beam technologies come into the light, LaRouche concludes, "American technological optimism" can accomplish a true economic recovery, and establish the basis for the political avoidance of war, which, he specifies, no weapons system alone can provide.