

‘Mutually Assured Survival’ becomes national strategy

by Graham Lowry

President Reagan’s historic address on March 23 to the American people, committing the United States to the development of defensive beam weapons systems to “free the world from the threat of nuclear war,” has set the stage for a decisive political fight over whether the nation and the Western economies survive. The scientific mobilization the President has called to perfect directed-energy technologies is an effort he rightly says “holds the promise of changing human history.”

It is also the first step toward realizing *EIR* founder Lyndon LaRouche’s proposal for a new “Manhattan Project” leading to a technological revolution sufficient to revitalize America’s enormous productive capacities and to reverse the long decline of the United States toward economic and strategic disaster.

In a single speech, the President has laid the foundations for ending the era of thermonuclear terror, by rejecting the lunatic strategy of deterrence known as Mutually Assured Destruction (MAD)—the doctrine employed by a long line of “strategic thinkers” exemplified by the original Dr. Strangelove, Henry A. Kissinger. Instead, the President called “upon the scientific community who gave us nuclear weapons to turn their great talents to the cause of mankind and world peace, to give us the means of rendering these nuclear weapons impotent and obsolete.”

In a background briefing by senior administration officials before the President’s address, it was announced that over the next several months, government specialists and members of the U.S. scientific community would undertake

an extensive survey of the most promising new technologies for defensive weapons systems—laser beams, particle beams, projectile beams, and high-powered microwaves—as both space-based and land-based defensive weapons. Following that review, the President will elaborate his concrete proposals for beam weapons development, including recommendations for additional funding beginning in fiscal year 1985.

The fight is on

The battle determining the future policy course and the very survival of the United States will now be waged over whether the administration’s proposal to develop this new generation of weapons systems can be turned into a commitment to proceed with the new Manhattan Project required for it to succeed. That requires a head-on war with the MAD crowd, including Averell Harriman’s disarmament lobby and the Tory variety nested at the Heritage Foundation, all of whom are out to scrap any real technological advance by the United States. The President made it clear that the outcome of the battle depends on what the American population demands, emphasizing in his speech that “there is a very big decision that you must make for yourselves.”

The President’s proposal has altered the entire “arms control” debate, and directly counters the freeze movement’s charges that Reagan is not serious about reducing the danger of nuclear war, while committing the United States to precisely what the disarmament crowd wants to destroy—the prospect for a technology-led recovery of full superpower status for the United States. To the further dismay of the

Kissinger-Vance manipulators of arms negotiations, White House briefings both before Reagan's speech and the following morning made it clear that the President intends to transform arms negotiations toward a policy of "Mutually Assured Survival" on the part of both the United States and the Soviet Union. Officials emphasized that as the defensive systems were phased in, ballistic missiles will be phased out, and "all of this will be done through negotiations."

There is every indication that the Reagan initiative has found a positive response in Western Europe, especially in Bonn. Nor was it surprising that the White House received enthusiastic messages from the American population—a population which, as Defense Secretary Weinberger noted on March 25, is capable of rising to the challenges of the kind mastered in the Apollo space project. Dr. Edward Teller, a leader of the Manhattan Project, in the wake of the declassification of portions of scientific research pertaining to beam weapons, is ready to campaign for the Reagan policy, and reportedly has the full backing of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. The "nuclear freeze" strategists in Congress, having already been compelled to postpone the vote on their resolution in the House, are on the defensive—but are determined to defeat the ABM initiative.

Just the day before the President took his case for beam weapons to the American people, the *New York Times* leaked sections of the new Pentagon defense guidance for the U.S. military, revealing plans for developing the new generation of technologies. News of the guidance directives immediately drew fire from the circles of Henry Kissinger and Cyrus Vance, who recognize the threat such a scientific and cultural revival poses to the geopolitical lunacies on behalf of global depopulation and de-industrialization.

By the morning after the President's speech, sources in Washington were already reporting that the "MADophiles" would force an all-out brawl with supporters of the President's plan, hoping to "delay, obstruct, and wait for the next administration to reverse the policy." Sen. Edward Kennedy (D-Mass.), leading spokesman for the nuclear freeze movement on Capitol Hill, was screaming about the President's "reckless Star Wars schemes," while a freeze supporter in the House, Rep. Thomas Downey (D-N.Y.) was denouncing the proposal as "absolute, unadulterated madness." The freeze movement's conventional arms buildup warrior, Robert McNamara, was on television insisting that beam weapons could never work. John Hughes, the spokesman for George Shultz's State Department, was fending off any questions about the Secretary's views on the President's policy initiative, amid speculation that they would be unprintable anyway.

Henry Kissinger's stable inside and outside the administration has not only been pressing for a ban on beam weapons, but is attempting to Watergate advanced-technology advocates within the Defense Department and National Security Council, including NSC consultant and former Air Force Secretary Thomas Reed (see article, page 54). A Harrimanite

spokesman for the Arms Control and Foreign Policy Caucus in Congress grumbled in response to leaks of the new defense guidance, "It is clear that people in the administration in favor of these new weapons have won out, despite the efforts of people in the State Department."

The leadership of the Harrimanite nuclear freeze movement has defined as its primary target stopping the development of directed energy beam weapons. Freeze leaders Vance and McNamara made a special point of demanding a ban on space-based beam weapons in their recent call for \$150 billion in defense cuts. Resolutions have also been introduced in Congress by two Kennedy deputies, Sen. Paul Tsongas (D-Mass.) and Rep. Joseph Moakley (D-Mass.), that would even ban ground-based beam weapons as well as all weapons in space.

On the "conservative" side, prior to the release of the guidance, the Heritage Foundation—which claimed to have the "inside track" in the administration on military policy—has released its "Defense Strategy for the 80s," a report arguing for cheap, primitive weapons as superior to "ineffective" complex systems, and omitting any mention of beam weapons. A Heritage spokesman, contacted the morning after Reagan spoke, stammered that he was "very surprised by the President's proposal," and immediately began talking about "a lot of skepticism in the scientific community about the feasibility of development of these systems." The Heritage counterstrategy, which is echoed in sections of the Defense Department and the armed services, is to argue that if Congress is asked to appropriate funds for beam weapons, the administration will have to abandon equivalent amounts for modernizing conventional and strategic nuclear forces.

The economic factor

There are indications that Lyndon LaRouche's emphasis on the urgency of a crash beam-weapons development program as a vital issue of *economic* survival is making itself felt in the administration. The plain truth of the matter is that the United States is in a depression, with no hope of escape without major investment in a new generation of technologies to revitalize its productive capacities. The world economy is also on the verge of a final crisis—perhaps within days, and certainly within three months. When that crisis hits, not even an immediate return to pre-October 1979 interest rates could do more than marginally slow the collapse.

At the White House background briefing March 23, *EIR* asked whether the administration shared the assessment by the Fusion Energy Foundation that a full-scale beam weapons program would have sweeping benefits for the U.S. civilian economy. A White House official responded, "Certainly. I think there is a lot of truth in that. I think there will be large spinoffs."

In short, since the world's survival depends on ending the threat of nuclear devastation, the United States has no reasonable choice but to invest in developing space-based

beam weapons to prevent any successful ICBM attack—and in the process rescue the Western economy.

That choice is further dictated by the fact that a new “space race” is already on—and the Soviets are winning it. In 1982, the Soviet Union launched a record 102 satellites, to 20 for the United States, and recently the Soviets have accomplished a series of advances pointing toward the colonization of space.

The Soviets have announced the second test of their Cosmoljot, a rocket plane mini-shuttle which is launched from the back of a Bison bomber. The U.S. Defense Department recently published details on the development of a larger Soviet shuttle, already on its launch site, and capable of boosting a payload twice as heavy as the U.S. Space Shuttle’s. The U.S.S.R. has also launched an orbiting service vehicle, the Cosmos 1463, to linkup with their Salyut 7 space station inaugurating the next stage of their plans for full colonization and industrialization of space. In early March, a U.S. communication satellite was apparently “blinded” over the Soviet Union, and has not been in contact since. Experts suspect that it was disabled from the ground, probably by an anti-satellite beam weapon. Publicly, Moscow has uttered the predictable denunciations of the Reagan ABM initiative, but they will have to come to terms with it.

Documentation

The President’s policy for an ABM defense

The following is excerpted from President Reagan’s March 23 address on military policy.

The subject I want to discuss with you, peace and national security, is both timely and important—timely because I have reached a decision which offers a new hope for our children in the 21st century—a decision I will tell you about in few minutes—and important because there is a very big decision that you must make for yourselves. This subject involves the most basic duty that any President and any people share—the duty to protect and strengthen the peace. . . .

Those loud voices that are occasionally heard charging the the government is trying to solve a security problem by throwing money at it are nothing more than noise based on ignorance.

We started considering what must be done to maintain peace and review all the possible threats against our security. Then a strategy for strengthening peace and defending against those threats must be agreed upon. And finally our defense

establishment must be evaluated to see what is necessary to protect against any or all of the potential threats. The cost of achieving these ends is totaled up and the result is the budget for national defense. . . .

Now, thus far tonight I have shared with you my thoughts on the problems of national security we must face together. My predecessors in the Oval Office have appeared before you on other occasions to describe the threat posed by Soviet power and have proposed steps to address that threat. But since the advent of nuclear weapons, those steps have been increasingly directed toward deterrence of aggression through the promise of retaliation. This approach to stability through offensive threat has worked. We and our allies have succeeded in preventing nuclear war for more than three decades. In recent months, however, my advisers, including in particular the Joint Chiefs of Staff, have underscored the necessity to break out of a future that relies solely on offensive retaliation for our security.

Over the course of these discussions, I have become more and more deeply convinced that the human spirit must be capable of rising above dealing with other nations and human beings by threatening their existence. Feeling this way, I believe we must thoroughly examine every opportunity for reducing tensions and for introducing greater stability into the strategic calculus on both sides. One of the most important contributions we can make is, of course, to lower the level of all arms, and particularly nuclear arms. We are engaged right now in several negotiations with the Soviet Union to bring about a mutual reduction of weapons. I will report to you a week from tomorrow my thoughts on that score. But let me just say I am totally committed to this course.

If the Soviet Union will join with us in our effort to achieve major arms reduction we will have succeeded in stabilizing the nuclear balance. Nevertheless it will still be necessary to rely on the specter of retaliation—on mutual threat, and that is a sad commentary on the human condition.

Wouldn’t it be better to save lives than to avenge them? Are we not capable of demonstrating our peaceful intentions by applying all our abilities and our ingenuity to achieving a truly lasting stability? I think we are—indeed, we must!

After careful consultation with my advisers, including the Joint Chiefs of Staff, I believe there is a way. Let me share with you a vision of the future which offers hope. It is that we embark on a program to counter the awesome Soviet missile threat with measures that are defensive. Let us turn to the very strengths in technology that spawned our great industrial base and that have given us the quality of life we enjoy today.

What if free people could live secure in the knowledge that their security did not rest upon the threat of instant U.S. retaliation to deter a Soviet attack; that we could intercept and destroy strategic ballistic missiles before they reached our own soil or that of our allies?

I know this is a formidable technical task, one that may not be accomplished before the end of this century. Yet,

current technology has attained a level of sophistication where it is reasonable for us to begin this effort. It will take years, probably decades, of effort on many fronts. There will be failures and setbacks just as there will be successes and breakthroughs. And as we proceed we must remain constant in preserving the nuclear deterrent and maintaining a solid capability for flexible response. But isn't it worth every investment necessary to free the world from the threat of nuclear war? We know it is!

In the meantime, we will continue to pursue real reductions in nuclear arms, negotiating from a position of strength that can be ensured only by modernizing our strategic forces. At the same time, we must take steps to reduce the risk of a conventional military conflict escalating to nuclear war by improving our nonnuclear capabilities. America does possess—now—the technologies to attain very significant improvement in the effectiveness of our conventional, nonnuclear forces. Proceeding boldly with these new technologies, we can significantly reduce any incentive that the Soviet Union may have to threaten attack against the United States or its allies.

'Changing history'

As we pursue our goal of defensive technologies, we recognize that our allies rely upon our strategic offensive power to deter attack against them. Their vital interests and ours are inextricably linked—their safety and ours are one. And no change in technology can or will alter that reality. We must and shall continue to honor our commitments.

I clearly recognize that defensive systems have limitations and raise certain problems and ambiguities. If paired with offensive systems, they can be viewed as fostering an aggressive policy and no one wants that.

But with these considerations firmly in mind, I call upon the scientific community in our country, those who gave us nuclear weapons, to turn their great talents now to the cause of mankind and world peace: to give us the means of rendering these nuclear weapons impotent and obsolete.

Tonight, consistent with our obligations under the ABM Treaty and recognizing the need for closer consultation with our allies, I am taking an important first step. I am directing a comprehensive and intensive effort to define a long-term research and development program to begin to achieve our ultimate goal of eliminating the threat posed by strategic nuclear missiles. This could pave the way for arms control measures to eliminate the weapons themselves. We seek neither military superiority nor political advantage. Our only purpose—one all people share—is to search for ways to reduce the danger of nuclear war.

My fellow Americans, tonight we are launching an effort which holds the promise of changing the course of human history. There will be risks, and results take time. But I believe we can do it. As we cross this threshold, I ask for your prayers and your support. Thank you, good night, and God bless you.

Documentation

'Hope of ending the thermonuclear terror'

Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr., *EIR*'s founder and the leading opponent of chairman Charles T. Manatt within the Democratic Party, on March 26 praised President Reagan's televised declaration of a new U.S. strategic-weapons doctrine as "probably the most important and well-executed action by any President in 20 years.

"No longer," LaRouche commented, "must Democrats go to bed each night fearing that they must live out their lives under the threat of thermonuclear ballistic terror. The coming several years will be probably the most difficult of the entire post-war period, but, for the first time since the end of the 1962 'Cuban Missile Crisis,' there is at last hope that the thermonuclear nightmare will be ended during the remainder of this decade."

LaRouche, a former contender for the 1980 Democratic presidential nomination, added: "It will be observed by many public commentators, that President Reagan made no commitments to specific kinds of weapons-technologies or to timetables in his declaration of the new U.S. strategic-weapons policy. The President acted with extraordinary statesmanship, by not confusing the newly adopted policy as such with the matters of technical details and timetables.

"Only high-level officials of government, or a private citizen as intimately knowledgeable of details of the international political and strategic situation as I am privileged to be, can even begin to foresee the earth-shaking impact the President's televised address last night will have throughout the world. No one can foresee what the exact consequences of the President's actions will be: we cannot foresee how ferocious and stubborn resistance to the President's policy will be, both from Moscow and from the nuclear freeze advocates in Europe and the United States itself. Whatever those reactions and their influence, the words the President spoke last night can never be put back into the bottle. Most of the world will soon know, and will never forget that policy-announcement. With those words, the President has changed the course of modern history.

"Today, I am prouder to be an American than I have been since the first manned landing on the Moon. For the first time in 20 years, a President of the United States has contributed a public action of great leadership, to give a new basis for hope to humanity's future to an agonized and demoralized world. True greatness in an American President touched President Ronald Reagan last night; it is a moment of great-

ness never to be forgotten.

“The President’s address last night obliges me to clarify publicly my own personal commitments on two subjects. First, since I have been increasingly involved in the development of such new anti-missile defensive systems for nearly seven years, it is my duty to respond to the President’s appeal for concrete proposals on the choice of technologies and timetables to be adopted for implementation of the new strategic doctrine.

Technologies and timetables

“The new strategic doctrine requires successful development and deployment of combined existing and new technologies in six definable areas of combined strategic and tactical weapons-systems.

“A strategic defense-system consistent with the new strategic doctrine of the United States requires:

“First, a space-based system of combined target-acquisition, targeting, and directed-beam capabilities, adequate to ensure assured destruction of not less than between 90 and 95 percent of a full-scale launch of strategic ballistic missiles of an adversary power against the territory of the United States and its allies. This system must emphasize killing such strategic ballistic missiles during the ascent-phase of their launching, at the point such missiles are the most vulnerable, and before they have deployed their multiple warhead payloads. At the present moment, the indicated directed-beams technology assigned to this function of strategic defense is the already proven technology of x-ray (Roentgen-ray) lasers.

“Second, the strategic missiles and warheads which survive the space-based anti-missile screen must be destroyed before they can strike specific military targets, logistical capabilities, and population centers. This will require development and deployment of what are called point-defense systems, with effective ranges of between 50 and 100 kilometers. High-powered lasers capable of fulfilling these requirements are proven technologies; we must have rapid progress in development of superior kinds of laser-systems, of what are called ‘tunable lasers’ suited to coping optimally with variable atmospheric conditions.

“Third, we require an additional back-up system, sometimes called a ‘terminal defense-system.’ Such systems are built around directed beams with effective ranges in the order of thousands of kilometers. Such defensive systems defend large areas of nations against missiles and warheads which evade the space-based anti-missile defensive system.

“Fourth, we require anti-submarine warfare systems adequate to acquire as targets, to target, and to destroy all adversary submersible nuclear-weapons carriers at the first instant of hostilities. I would prefer not to speak of those technologies publicly, lest I inadvertently point in directions which are presently secret.

“The two additional categories are ordinarily viewed as tactical.

“First, we require point-defense systems for naval vessels

and aircraft against air-to-surface, surface-to-surface, air-to-air, and surface-to-air tactical missiles, including nuclear-armed cruise missiles.

“Second, we require development of battle-field defensive weapons derived from the same species of technologies.

“On the basis of my knowledge of scientific and related capabilities of the United States and its allies, and also on the basis of my knowledge of Soviet capabilities, I can safely estimate that a full strategic capability, plus major developments in category five, could be deployable by either superpower as early as the 1988-1990 interval, if a program modeled upon the experience of the pre-1967 phase of NASA were mobilized for this assignment.

“Under such conditions of NASA-like mobilization, the pattern of progress in these species of defensive weapons-systems would resemble the progress in development of electronic digital computer systems over the period since UNIVAC I, into today. What might do the job effectively by 1990 would appear bulky, clumsy, and crude by comparison with the systems of the period 2000 A.D., 2005 A.D., and 2010 A.D. Certain applications of lasers for battlefield-tasks, are within the range of short-term development-work.

“The development of the initial generation of such defensive weapons-systems is more immediately of existing laboratory and related development capabilities than a manned Moon-landing was when President John F. Kennedy adopted that Moon-landing as the policy-commitment of the United States.

‘Spinoff effects’

“To complete the general picture on feasibility of defensive weapons-systems, I must put on my economist’s hat for a moment.

“Since the take-down of U.S. research-and-development capabilities, with President Johnson’s launching of his ‘Great Society’ policy, the economies of the United States and its allies have undergone massive contraction in their relative capacity to produce tangible goods. In 1946, at the end of the last World War, the United States employed 62 percent of its total labor-force either in transportation or production of such goods by agriculture and industry combined. Today, we employ less than 28 percent of our total labor-force in these categories.

“It is useful to see our national economy as analogous to a gigantic agro-industrial goods-producing firm. In that view we see operatives employed in transportation, agriculture, and industry as representing the productive costs of producing wealth, and the remainder of the total labor-force employed in some category of ‘overhead expense,’ or as representing the national ‘overhead expense’ of unemployment. In 1946, the ratio of overhead-expense to productive costs, was approximately 28/62; today, it is exactly the reverse, 62/28.

“For nearly 17 years, the U.S. economy has stumbled along by cannibalization of previous investments in basic

economic infrastructure, and in depleting previous capital investments in agricultural and industrial capacities. We have run down our ports, our internal water-management systems, our national transportation-grid, and those basic utilities and services of our cities indispensable for sustaining and developing industries, and providing for a healthy, productive, well-educated labor-force for those industries. We have written off large sections of our run-down goods-producing capacity. We are confronted with a terrifying potential crisis in our nation's fresh-water supplies; the basic general and urban infrastructure needed to keep industry functioning is nearing collapse. We are in worse condition now than we were at the beginning of large-scale World War II defense build-up, after 10 years of the Great Depression of the 1930s.

"If we attempted to reverse this continuing process of economic decline using only existing levels of technology, our farms and industries could not generate a sufficient total amount of tangible wealth both to keep themselves in functioning condition and also to produce sufficient added wealth to reverse the process of ongoing collapse of our nation's basic economic infrastructure. If we were to dump the Federal Reserve policies of Paul A. Volcker today, and concentrate low-borrowing-cost, long-term credit plus investment-capital into our farms and industries, we would slow down the rate of collapse quite significantly, but we would not be able to grow back sufficiently to meet the great costs of repairing our collapsing economic infrastructure.

"The key term is technology. If we could make some great breakthrough in the kinds of capital-goods technologies useful for industries and agriculture, we could generate an upward surge in our national productivity. It happens that the relativistic physics technologies required as part of strategic defensive weapons-systems, from high-powered lasers on up, represent a potential revolution in presently existing forms of industrial technologies.

"Obviously, therefore, the 'spinoffs' from research-and-development in the technologies of the new kinds of defensive weapons-systems are of the greatest urgency for our civilian economy. Laser-isotopes separation means a revolution in our conception of the availability and effective cost of primary materials. Used initially for only the most costly varieties of primary materials, through use and the development, the costs would come down to levels for more general use. High-powered lasers for various aspects of industrial production mean a revolution in manufacturing technology. In biology and health, x-ray lasers mean a breakthrough in biophysics of such areas as cancer research. With these techniques in sight for the period ahead, we can develop new kinds of materials of a type not generally imagined earlier. The potential effects of civilian economy use of technologies related to relativistic physics will have a greater impact, in terms of causing overcoming of natural-resources limitations and in increasing productivity, than the combined effects of development of the heat-powered machine and chemistry during the 17th and 18th centuries."

EIR Special

EXECUTIVE INTELLIGENCE REVIEW

NOW AVAILABLE

Special Technical Report

A BEAM-WEAPONS BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE SYSTEM FOR THE UNITED STATES

by **Dr. Steven Bardwell**, director of plasma physics for the Fusion Energy Foundation.

This report includes:

- a scientific and technical analysis of the four major types of beam-weapons for ballistic missile defense, which also specifies the areas of the civilian economy that are crucial to their successful development;
- a detailed comparison of the U.S. and Soviet programs in this field, and an account of the differences in strategic doctrine behind the widening Soviet lead in beam weapons;
- the uses of directed energy beams to transform raw-materials development, industrial materials, and energy production over the next 20 years, and the close connection between each nation's fusion energy development program and its beam weapon potentials;
- the impact a "Manhattan Project" for beam-weapon development would have on military security and the civilian economy.

**The 80-page report is available for \$250.
For more information, contact Robert Gallagher
or Peter Ennis (212) 247-8820.**