

reorganization and centralization of foreign policy functions.

A party Central Committee Plenum is expected to take place in April, at which time further personnel shifts and policy debate may reveal how much Andropov has succeeded in consolidating power.

It is an open question, whether any figure at all in the Soviet leadership is capable of shifting, in response to Reagan's breaking the anti-technology stranglehold on U.S. policy, to the attitude Marshal Zhukov had nearly 40 years ago, before Britain provoked the Cold War. But what is not in question, is that the Soviet military will lay claim to an even bigger say in national policy, as it had already begun to during Brezhnev's last months and Andropov's first as general secretary.

No high-ranking Soviet military officer commented on Reagan's speech in the first week after it was given, but three of them, including Strategic Rocket Corps Commander Vladimir Tolubko, were promoted to the rank of marshal.

Tolubko is one of the officers to have intervened into the discussion that is swirling around Soviet economic policy overall, and investment practices in particular. He published an article in the party journal *Kommunist* in February, in the same issue where Andropov outlined a program of chiefly organizational measures for improving economic performance. The point Tolubko stressed, quoting Andropov, was that the Army and Navy must get what they need "especially in the present international situation." He went on to say that "The Soviet Armed Forces are . . . tied by thousands of strong threads to many branches of the country's economy," so that any improvement in overall economic performance means that "very importantly, considering the deterioration of the world situation, the defense potential of the U.S.S.R. will be reinforced."

The military's claim was staked even more strongly by Gen. V. M. Shabanov, Deputy Defense Minister for Armaments, in a late February article for the Central Committee weekly *Ekonomicheskaya Gazeta*. He echoed a benchmark *Kommunist* article Ogarkov wrote in 1981, which called for a tighter interface between the civilian and defense sectors of the Soviet economy. Under the subheading "The Economy and Defense," Shabanov wrote:

It is only possible to strengthen the country's defense capability on the basis of a highly developed economy, above all industry. . . . For strengthening the country's defense capability, great significance attaches to the positions of the 26th congress of the CPSU on the primary development and technical re-equipping of the basic branches of industry. . . , which have been and remain the foundation of the economy and defense, and on the introduction and production of equipment and technology that is new in principle, which raises the flexibility of production, its ability to shift from one type of production to another without violation of production rhythm.

---

## Documentation

---

# Europe responds to the end of MAD era

*The following are excerpts from Western European commentary on the March 23 strategic policy statement by President Reagan, and its implications.*

### Great Britain

Reaction in Britain to President Reagan's beam weapons policy has been uniformly hostile. Newspapers across the political spectrum from the left-liberal *Guardian* to the right-wing *Daily Telegraph* all denounced the policy as "star wars" and played up the Soviet negative reaction to it.

*Times* of London, March 25: "In less time than it takes to watch the Johnny Carson show, President Reagan announced on television two nights ago one of the most fundamental switches in American strategic concepts since the Second World War. It sounded, and still sounds, amazing—even when placed in the context of bitter political infighting over his defence budget. But the response from the Russians, which was prompt and antagonistic, indicates that they at least take it seriously. Should we do so too? . . ."

"President Reagan's statement . . . is more likely to alarm his allies than comfort them. . . ."

*Guardian*, March 25: "Ronald Reagan frightens ordinary people. . . . Now, almost randomly, toward the end of yet another television session, Mr. Reagan prepares the world for a future of lasers, microwave systems and particle beams in outer space. 'Star wars,' says Senator Edward Kennedy. 'Terrifying,' says Senator Mark Hatfield. What can the old man in the White House be thinking of?"

*Winston Churchill III*, Tory Member of Parliament and stepson of Averell Harriman's wife, Pamela Churchill, in an interview with *EIR*: "Every system has a counter-system. It is quite absurd to say that you can destroy 2,387 Soviet missiles from space. Anyway, space systems themselves are highly vulnerable to anything. Look, the U.S. has said all along it won't let the Soviets put these things into orbit. So, by the same token, the Soviets won't allow it. Before they become operational, they will be zapped." When informed of recent overtures by Defense Secretary Weinberger and others for U.S.-Soviet parallel development of ABM systems in space, Churchill III sputtered: "These are grandiose state-

ments, but what happens then? . . . Is this all just short-term opportunism, so the U.S. can make it seem like it is stealing time from the other side? This was tried once before, with the ICBMs, and it didn't work. . . . These new systems will just continue the arms race. We are entering a new era of greater uncertainty. With MAD, we knew there couldn't be nuclear war, since both sides could guarantee the destruction of the other. Now, it is back to the drawing board."

## U.S. armed forces in Europe

*Stars and Stripes*, the unofficial publication of the U.S. Armed Forces, has given repeated prominent coverage to the new U.S. defense doctrine.

In the March 30 issue, the Fusion Energy Foundation's artist's rendition of the beam weapon was reproduced by *Stars and Stripes*. The paper cites the statement of the FEF's Director of Research Uwe Parpart-Henke that beam-weapon technology could be developed in 10 to 12 years. In the March 29th edition, *Stars and Stripes* ran Associated Press's interview with Parpart-Henke, in a page four article entitled "Space-Based Missile Defense by '95 Called Possible."

"Parpart, a physicist who heads research for the Fusion Energy Foundation, headquartered in New York City, said he could not estimate the total cost of such a defense, but he suggested a program of that magnitude ultimately might require the United States to spend about \$10 billion a year, which he said was comparable to outlays for the Apollo moon-landing program. His projection for reaching an operational space-based laser defense against missile attack from the Soviet Union appears considerably more optimistic than President Reagan's. Last week, Reagan expressed hope for such a defense by the end of the century.

"He stressed that his group is not suggesting nuclear weapons in space, but that it focused attention on lasers, which are concentrated light beams, and charged beams of radiant energy because that is one method of igniting the fusion process in generating nuclear energy on earth."

A few weeks previously, *Stars and Stripes* had published an interview with Dr. Jonathan Tennenbaum of the FEF and Paul Goldstein of the *EIR*, outlining in detail President Reagan's defense policy.

## Italy

Italian newspapers have given widespread coverage to Reagan's initiative, and to the support it has received from the Fusion Energy Foundation and from noted economist and *EIR* founder Lyndon H. LaRouche. Highlights of the coverage include:

*La Notte*, the most important evening paper of north Italy March 29 article headlined: "Democratic Leader Supports the President." "New York—President Reagan's speech on the 'anti-weapons' weapons to counter to the Soviets was welcomed in different ways in the U.S. Strong criticism by

some liberals like Kennedy contrast with the support of both Democratic and Republican leaders.

"A representative of the Democratic Party who defines himself as the chief competitor of Charles T. Manatt for the leadership of the Democratic Party, Lyndon H. LaRouche, declared after Reagan's speech: 'Today I am prouder to be an American than I was since the first man put his foot on the moon. This is the first time in 20 years that a President of United States showed publicly great ability in statecraft giving a new hope to the future of mankind. Ronald Reagan showed the greatness of a President. It has been a moment of greatness that will never be forgotten.' Then, passing to a more specific issue, the technology to be used to realize a new defensive strategy, Lyndon H. LaRouche Jr., who has also been a candidate for the Democratic nomination in the 1980 presidential elections in some states, declared: 'The new strategic doctrine demands the development and the use of the existing technologies and of new technologies that require, first, a space system of interception able to identify and to destroy the enemy missile at the moment of ascent, i.e., when it is more vulnerable and the nuclear warheads are not yet separated from the carrier. Second: the strategic missiles and the nuclear warheads that escape the first anti-missile screen in space must be destroyed before they reach their military target. This will require the development of a system of support called terminal defense system. . . . Fourth: we need antisubmarine systems.' "

*Il Tempo*, the largest newspaper in central Italy, ran a front page article March 29 titled: "According to a U.S. Scientist: In Ten Years, the 'Star Shield' Will Be Ready." "Some, like scientist Uwe Parpart, a physicist who heads the Fusion Energy Foundation, are more optimistic than the President himself. Parpart says that a system of laser anti-missiles defense with bases in space able to protect the whole territory of United States, may be realized in 10 or 12 years. A ground-based laser system could become reality by 1990, ten years before the deadline established by Reagan. The total cost of such system is around \$10 billion per year and would be comparable to what the American taxpayers spent for the program which resulted in the conquest of the Moon. . . ."

The Milan daily *Corriere Della Sera*, March 29: "Uwe Parpart, a physicist who leads the New York based Fusion Energy Foundation, says that the laser anti-missiles defense system with bases in space, able to protect the U.S.A., globally can be realized in 10-12 years. According to Parpart, a ground-based laser defense system limited to the defense of key targets could become reality in around seven years."

*Avvenire*, the largest Catholic daily in Italy, March 29: "The White House Proposals Have Been Anticipated by Precise Scientific Experiments—The Beam Weapons System":

"The 'revelations' of President Ronald Reagan on the new laser weapons able to destroy satellites and missiles provoked great interest. But this seems to be not completely

new, if it is true, and already last September some of the contents of the Reagan's speech had been anticipated in Rome by an American scientist during a press conference.

"Jonathan Tennenbaum, European coordinator of the Fusion Energy Foundation and collaborator of Professor Steve Bardwell, appeared at a press conference organized by *Executive Intelligence Review* on the issue of 'Beam Weapons: the Only Instrument to Overcome the Nuclear Threat.' In discussing this issue, Professor Tennenbaum noted that in the United States 'two documents have been recently issued on the question of military planning, by the Defense Council. These documents are extremely serious, above all because they are favorable to an increase in expenditures for conventional rearmament. In fact, in the documents,' Tennenbaum continued, 'it is said that the danger of nuclear war is not so high because of the risk, thus the only possible way out for the defense system is conventional rearmament. On the other hand, in case of nuclear conflict, there would be no hope.'

"Besides, according to the U.S. military, it is necessary to give a stronger push to new technologies and electronic apparatus for the future weapons as shown by the recent conflict in the Malvinas. And again: in the two documents it is underlined that bipolarism is practically finished. . . . The theater of future conflicts will be the Third World and one can foresee an escalation of terrorism internationally. 'Two concepts expressed in the documents,' Tennenbaum stressed, 'are very false. First of all there is today an high risk of a nuclear conflict, and multipolarity only makes it more concrete. Second, in case of conflict something can be done.'

"In which direction? The U.S. scientist explained it by presenting in detail the beam weapons defense system, 'a system that is not complex is able to destroy at least 50 nuclear warheads. . . . The system can be localized in hilly or mountainous areas in connection with mirrors able to reflect the beams on the target to be hit. This can be made more effective with the use of satellites.' "

*La Repubblica*, March 26: "No U.S. President ever introduced with such great confidence a program for research and application of a technology devoted to replace in a relatively short span of time the conventional and also nuclear arsenals. And, with a kind of system previously considered only science fiction. . . ."

*Osservatore Romano*, official Vatican newspaper, March 25: "Reagan's proposals have created a lot of dissent among scientific strata and the military. . . . Those in favor of the beam weapons notice a certain parallel situation between Reagan's speech and the 'historic' speech with which John Kennedy mobilized the United States for the conquest of the Moon."

### **Federal Republic of Germany**

The official West German government response to President Reagan's announcement was cautious, and the press

has been divided in its assessment.

*Manfred Woerner*, West German defense minister, welcomed Reagan's announcement as "implementing a strong moral-political position and new military possibilities . . . each of the NATO member nations will certainly participate in research efforts to develop such weapons . . . but they are still music of the future, a program for the next century."

*Franz-Josef Strauss*, leader of the Christian Social Union in Bavaria, said in an interview to the daily *Die Welt* March 26: "The technical concept of such a missile defense system has already existed for some time. It is not sensational news. But you have to face the fact, that such a system is technically possible, most probably also technically feasible, but can

---

---

*British publications and spokesmen were appalled by the new doctrine of defense instead of deterrence. The U.S. armed forces newspaper in Europe and the Italian press, gave broad play to the enthusiastic statements by Lyndon LaRouche and the Fusion Energy Foundation. West German and French reactions were mixed; Die Welt affirmed, "Technology does not know any never." The voice of the Swiss banker, the Neue Zürcher Zeitung, railed against President Reagan for daring to assert that science can change geopolitics.*

---

---

only be deployed in the year 2000. . . .

"It means for the smaller powers that a mixture of conventional arms and nuclear weapons must be kept. . . .

"President Reagan is as much a tough as a flexible politician. . . . He will surely prove that he is looking for a way in which, one day, the policy of deterrence, at least in the intercontinental arena, could be changed, added to, modified, and replaced by such a defense system."

*Egon Bahr*, German Social Democratic Party foreign policy specialist, in an interview: "No, of course I'm not for space-based defensive weapons systems. . . . Reagan probably thinks this is a good time to get money for present

programs this way.”

*Bildzeitung*, a mass-circulation daily, March 25: “Reagan’s Turn: New Superweapon Against Nuclear Death.” “After 35 years of arms race and more and more new nuclear missiles . . . he [Reagan] wants to finally break the devil’s circle. . . . [Electron beams] can cut the strongest metal like a hot knife can cut butter. . . . Space-based weapons destroy the guidance system of incoming missiles.”

*Die Welt*, March 25: compared Reagan’s speech to President John F. Kennedy’s 1961 announcement of the U.S. intention to land a man on the moon, and detailed the basic facts about laser technology and space-based ABMs. The article stresses the German role in the development of such capabilities. The article concludes, “Technology does not know any *never*.”

## France

While coverage of the new U.S. beam weapon policy has generally been unfavorable, there have been some notable exceptions.

*Le Republicain Lorrain*, the most widely read daily in the Lorraine area of France, gave very positive coverage March 20 to a seminar on beam weapons organized by the Reserve Officers’ association of Metz, which was addressed by European director of the Fusion Energy Foundation Dr. Jonathan Tennenbaum.

“Within five to seven years, a first generation system could be deployed . . . and within 20 to 30 years a second generation system, based on x-ray lasers, could replace it. Satellite-based lasers could thus defend entire nations against aggression.”

*Le Figaro* March 25: Commentator Serge Maffert says that Reagan’s basic idea is to push for an economic war with the Soviet Union, and that Reagan wants Western Europe to join in such economic warfare.

*Le Monde* March 25: Editorializes that man will manage to destroy himself no matter what, and “without massive retaliation, there would be a great risk that war would again become a temptation, and thus a probability.”

## Switzerland

*Neue Zürcher Zeitung*: “Those questions which have plagued many for decades suddenly receive an optimistic and actually classical American answer: It is possible, and it is so because a highly developed technology has meanwhile been developed, which promises gadgets capable of intercepting and destroying intercontinental ballistic missiles, that is, of making nuclear weapons ineffective and superfluous, in other words: changing the course of mankind’s history.”

*NZZ* insists that no matter what, beam technologies cannot create “a new world in which the old constellations and rules of conduct will no longer be valid . . . even if a piece of science fiction became reality.”

# Israel and the Arab growing danger of

by Mark Burdman in Wiesbaden

Governments of several nations in the Middle East and North Africa are bracing themselves for an anticipated upsurge of Khomeini-style religious fundamentalist destabilization.

The detonator on this fundamentalist time-bomb is the emotion-ridden issue of Jerusalem. The revered city of the three major world faiths has been the scene of attempts by Jewish-Zionist religious fanatics, funded by American-based Christian fundamentalists of the so-called Jerusalem Temple Mount Foundation, to stage a provocation on the Temple Mount, the site where the Dome of the Rock Islamic holy shrine stands.

These attempts, and the reverberations they are creating in the Islamic world, could set off religious wars throughout the region. Minimally, the conflicts could completely negate President Reagan’s plans for a negotiated settlement of the Arab-Israeli conflict. Ultimately, as an informed Lebanese source told *EIR*, “this could be the trigger on a third world war.”

At the end of March, Israeli police and security authorities were on heightened mobilization in the Temple Mount area, to prevent any replay of the recent attempt by religious fanatics to stage an armed provocation on the Dome of the Rock. Intelligence officials are concerned that the next efforts of the Temple Mount Foundation operations will be some terrorist extravaganza, possibly including attaching sticks of dynamite to their bodies and threatening to blow up the Dome if their demands are not met. The fanatics, through contacts to religious extremists within the Israeli armed forces, reportedly have access to ground and air equipment that gives them the logistical basis for a major provocation.

Responsible Israeli authorities attached to the Interior Ministry are also concerned, according to Israeli press accounts, with the danger of extremism erupting in Jerusalem from Arab radical and religious extremist networks. This, it is feared, would intersect the increasingly tense situation in the occupied West Bank, the scene of intensive mobilization following the reports of mass poisoning of Arab youth in the town of Jenine.

During the week of March 28, efforts were being made by two British intelligence fronts in the United States, the pro-Khomeini Muslim Student Association, and the Pales-