

Washington showdown: MAD versus beam weapons

by Paul Gallagher

President Reagan faces the necessity to relaunch his public campaign for beam-weapon antiballistic missile defenses, to counter Henry Kissinger and the Scowcroft Commission forces in the administration who are insisting that the doctrine of Mutually Assured Destruction (MAD) must be preserved "for another generation," and beam-weapon research buried in a few secret laboratories.

The ground is rapidly shifting around the White House on this issue because of rapid progress on beam weapons only hinted at in most coverage of the ongoing National Security Council Defense Technologies Study review. During the last week of July, Radio Moscow dropped the entire fabricated baggage of claiming the "scientific infeasibility" of ABM energy beams, and admitted that the superpower race to develop and deploy these weapons is on. At the same time, technological breakthroughs continue to point in the direction of *very early development* of beam weapon anti-missile systems, including x-ray laser (see article, page 13), making possible long-range strategic defense against large numbers of missiles.

Ironically, the administration is the only party currently sticking to the public fiction that technological development until "around the year 2000" will be necessary before beam-weapon defense is possible—and it is doing so because of a forced compromise with Kissinger's Scowcroft Commission, the defenders of "MAD."

If Kissinger and Shultz corner Reagan into bargaining away beam weapons at the Geneva arms talks, they will now be developed rapidly anyway on both sides, but in secret, and not for the purpose of ending MAD and "attacking the

means and the causes of war," in Dr. Edward Teller's phrase, but for disguised, limited deployment to protect offensive warfighting and command capabilities.

This is precisely *Moscow's version* of what beam weapons are for. That form of ABM strategy will do nothing to stop the countdown toward a new "Cuban missiles crisis" over Euromissiles, and the collapse of Europe under KGB-run waves of "peace movement" destabilizations and terrorism.

Radio Moscow drops the mask

Radio Moscow, in an English-language broadcast to North America July 26, was responding directly to the new reports of rapid progress in beam-weapons technologies, which appeared in the third week in July in *Aviation Week and Space Technology*, in the *Executive Intelligence Review*, and in the *Frankfurter Rundschau* and other European newspapers. The broadcast followed an extended debate in the U.S. Senate July 19, in which these reports were entered into the *Congressional Record* and numerous senators called for an all-out drive to end MAD, citing the aggressive Russian preparations for ground-based ABM defense centered around laser and particle beams.

The Soviet broadcast, which made liars of the entire Soviet Academy of Sciences on this subject since March 23, is worth quoting:

Lockheed and other companies have conducted studies that show that chemical-powered lasers could destroy ballistic missiles three times more rugged than

the existing models. If developed, these lasers would be put in an orbiting station that would detect missiles after launching and track and destroy them in flight. This is roughly what President Reagan had in mind when, last March, he proposed building an anti-ballistic defense system in outer space: American lasers destroy Soviet missiles.

What is the Soviet Union to do with American missiles, let them in? The answer is obviously no. *

While Moscow admits that an all-out race for beam-weapon defense is on, Kissinger, Shultz, Scowcroft, Robert McFarlane, Alexander Haig, and their congressional allies are trying to impose a suicidal administration consensus reported by one official to be as follows: the United States wants a broad R&D program whose aim is that *after another generation of MAD weapons* is developed and has become obsolete, America will have the *capability* to shift to the predominance of defensive weapons over offensive. This R&D "threat" is the ace in the hole to force the Soviets to stop proliferating new offensive weapons systems.

"Another generation of MAD" is the lunatic scheme of the Scowcroft Commission, put under way in February by Henry Kissinger. It involves offering the Soviets a "deal" based on restructuring both superpowers' offensive weapons from fixed, highly accurate land-based multiple-warhead missiles to mobile single-warhead "Midgetman" missiles. Like all such deals embraced in the name of maintaining MAD since the days of Robert McNamara, this one bears no relation to actual Soviet strategic plans. Radio Moscow's outburst should have made that plain.

But in Washington, a close and careful coordination between Kissinger assets in the administration, and Harriman Democrats opposing beam weapons on the Hill, has been directed to forcing President Reagan and the NSC to subordinate any moves to accelerate beam weapons development to the arms control deals being offered the Soviets through back channels. The go-between linking the two groups has been Kissinger's man on the NSC, Robert McFarlane, who cultivated a "pro-beam maverick" reputation on the Scowcroft Commission for the purpose.

Retooling Pugwash in Europe?

The technological imperative of the beam-weapons race is graphically admitted in an article by one of the leading Western European *opponents* of these systems, Dr. Alan Din of CERN, the European Nuclear Research Center at Geneva. CERN is a European center for the Pugwash disarmament elite among European scientists and home base of the European Scientists for Nuclear Disarmament, formed in 1982 as part of the anti-Reagan mobilization.

In an article entitled "Prospects for Beam Weapons" in the *Journal of Peace Research*, Din attacks those who have "foolishly" attempted to stop beam weapons by denying their

feasibility, calling these "gross underestimates" of technological potentials. Beam weapons will be operational in the 1980s, says Din, and "some kinds could be deployed by the mid- or late-1980s." After reviewing the technologies involved, he concludes that if both powers go for beam weapons deployment, "a U.S. lead in the beam-weapon domain is likely," but Soviet development and deployment is also not to be doubted. Din admits that the 1972 ABM treaty is irrelevant here (it does not ban new, advanced types of antiballistic defense weapons), and winds up insisting that beam weapons must be formally banned by a new treaty, the one proposed by Soviet Foreign Minister Andrei Gromyko at the United Nations banning space weapons.

Kosta Tsipis of MIT is the best known of these "foolish" deniers of beam weapon feasibility, and is the keynote speaker at the ABM beam weapons study group of the Pugwash Conference in Venice on Aug. 26-31, which will feature a 140-man delegation of Soviet scientist led by Yevgeny Velikhov. Tsipis has already begun to change his line, admitting the progress of laser ABM research in an article in the current *Laser Focus*. At Venice, the pretense that beam weapons are unfeasible will have to be dropped. Velikhov is deeply involved himself in developing laser and particle beam weapons for the Soviet Union—reportedly Caspar Weinberger's Defense Department may reveal details on this before the Pugwashers convene.

Gromyko's "let's discuss beam weapons" speech at the June Politburo meeting, in which he refurbished his U.N. space weapons treaty proposal, was the launching point for the intense Kissinger-Harriman "back channel" activity. The focus is an attempt to force Reagan to a summit at which beam weapons become a bargaining chip for "restructuring" offensive weapons structures. Soviet dupes in the United States and Europe are now pushing this treaty to stop beam weapons; one of them, Federation of American Scientists head Jeremy Stone, admitted publicly on Capitol Hill July 26 that Kissinger is one of the pushers (See below).

Defense in the 1980s

It is becoming clear that ground-based and space-based laser chemical ABM systems can be deployed in the 1980s, as both congressional proponents and leading British military experts insist. Furthermore, at least one laboratory in the West believes that a laboratory-scale x-ray laser can be developed in two to three years. This sounds deceptively modest—unlike most high-power lasers, x-ray lasers are considered *more difficult* to build in optically pumped lab versions than in bomb-pumped weapon versions for multithousand-mile-range ABM defense.

Following last month's Leeds, England conference on space weapons, certain British military and intelligence factions are also demanding a "crash program" for beam weapons from the United States. Some of these officials believe that the purpose of the American program will be only to

develop ABM defense for U.S. and European missile fields, naval ships, and so forth, and that "the rest is just political talk." Some U.S. laboratory officials believe the same thing, indicating the "environmental" strength of the line of Kissinger and his British partners Lord Carrington, Lord Solly Zuckerman et al.—"beam weapons cannot be stopped, but they must be made irrelevant to changes in strategic doctrine."

President Reagan and a few scientific and national security advisers have been from the beginning the only members of the administration or armed services who want to totally uproot MAD with beam weapons development. The President must now move back to center stage, fast. His NSC technologies study is due for completion on Oct. 1, but reportedly it is already circulating in draft among cleared scientists and military personnel. The President is reported to be considering a public policy statement based on the report in October. But with reports of technological progress appearing throughout the NATO countries, he could use those favorable developments to go back on the warpath against MAD now. This is the only way to turn the Euromissiles crisis from the not-so-slow death of Western Europe into the arena for forcing Yuri Andropov to accept Reagan's new strategic doctrine.

If the President moves now to fight again for this new *doctrine*—Mutually Assured Survival—all the artificial "Year 2000" wraps will come off the U.S. program, and a true crash effort can be defined, one which will challenge the laboratories, industry, and universities of the United States and its allies to develop the in-depth capacities to deploy total defense in the shortest possible time. That prospect is the basis for the American people's support of the President's March 23 initiative.

'We are unprotected without the President's ABM policy'

Senator Steven Symms (R-Ida.) made the following statement in the Senate on July 19:

If you visit the headquarters for the defense of North America (NORAD) inside Cheyenne Mountain, you are treated to a sobering simulation of Soviet attack. Our infrared satellites, which stare at the Soviet Union from an altitude of 22,000 miles, see the Soviet missiles' exhaust. The ballistic missile early warning radars see the cloud of warheads and decoys in midcourse. As the minutes pass, awesome and accurate predictions are made of which targets the missiles will hit.

Invariably the visitors will ask at which point the U.S. government will shoot down these engines of destruction. They are shocked to hear that the U.S. government intends

to do no such thing. Rather, by threatening to devastate the Soviet Union, even as we are devastated, the U.S. government hopes by threatening, to avoid war.

Obviously, this hope provides no comfort at all once the Soviets have decided, for whatever reason, to attack. Normal human beings instinctively feel there is something wrong with relying for their safety on hopes concerning their enemy's state of mind. They also instinctively recoil from acts of destruction which are clearly unrelated to their own protection.

That is why President Reagan on March 23 boldly told the country that, henceforth, the U.S. government would try to intercept any missile the Soviets sent our way. This is a philosophy that I have urged for several years, but it will involve a basic change in attitudes even more than changes in weaponry.

The notion that any reasonable defense is impossible and that defensive systems are destabilizing is wrong and ill-founded. Since the mid-1960s, we have lived under a unilateral assumption, as I said earlier, called Mutual Assured Destruction (MAD). Under this assumption, we built enough nuclear weapons to threaten destruction of Soviet cities, and assumed that as the Soviets built their strategic arsenal, they would only try to achieve equality in destructive power. Our military and civilian bureaucrats who thought this up were so sure that this threat would bring perpetual peace that they chose to leave the American people, our industrial centers, and our military installations defenseless against any form of nuclear attack.

But to the surprise of only those who failed to read Soviet military literature and who failed to study the characteristics of their weapons, the Soviets have constructed a massive arsenal designed to fight and win a nuclear war. With but one-fifth of their ICBM force they can now destroy the vast majority of our land-based ICBMs and bombers, plus that half of our missile submarines which is in our port at any given time. The remaining Soviet missile force is then available for blackmail. Of course the Soviets have built a nationwide infrastructure for ground-based ballistic missile defense and are building space lasers. Their program is three to five times the size of ours, and is oriented toward early results.

Our doctrine of MAD and our forces designed to implement it simply cannot cope with this threat. After a Soviet first strike, no rational human being, certainly no President, could or would use our remaining anti-city forces. Why should he? Such forces, if used, would not in any way diminish the Soviets' ability to do us further harm. If we were to use our remaining missiles, we would only make certain our own destruction. This situation is intolerable because it invites greater Soviet boldness in international affairs and because it continues to lower the price to the Soviets of military aggression.

This situation is unnecessary because it is now possible for the United States to build weapons and adopt strategies

that will give the American people real hope of physical safety, and of overturning the present unfavorable strategic balance. This is what the President was talking about. The technology is available for doing this.

'Kissinger was an early enemy of beam weapons'

"Nuclear Freeze" leader Jeremy Stone told a meeting in the Rayburn House Office Building on Capitol Hill July 29 that Henry Kissinger has been aware of the potential for space-based laser anti-ballistic missile systems and has been acting to ban those systems since 1962.

Stone's speech was devoted to an appeal to the nuclear freeze and peace movements in the United States and Western Europe to make stopping President Reagan's beam-weapons program their "number one priority," more important than their agitation against the Pershing II missile deployments in Europe this fall. He strongly implied that Kissinger would act to block this Reagan program from his new post inside the administration.

Stone's group, the Federation of American Scientists (FAS), was holding a day-long symposium on the Hill on how to force a ban on anti-satellite and anti-ballistic missile technologies, titled "Alternatives to an Arms Race in Space."

In the main panel discussion on stopping development of space-based ABM defenses, Stone described in detail the role of the Pugwash conferences of 1961-64 in raising the alarm about the potential for space-based laser and other ABM systems and setting in motion pressure among scientific advisers to governments to ban such defenses. Stone himself worked through those early Pugwash conferences. He described Henry Kissinger as one of his key collaborators from 1962 onward, and said that Kissinger took an in-depth interest in the "threat" of these beam-weapon ABM systems from the early 1960s.

Stone is thus the first principal in the early 1960s Pugwash conferences to reveal what *EIR* has detailed (see Special Report, *EIR*, May 3, 1983, and Special Report, *EIR*, June 7, 1983) as evidence bearing on a requested investigation of Kissinger.

EIR documented in those locations that Kissinger, from 1961 to 1964, led or participated in a string of Pugwash "expert" seminars which examined the feasibility of laser ABM systems, and which had clear evidence of Soviet military intentions to develop them. As early as 1962, only 18 months after the invention of the laser, the Soviet standard military strategy text proposed the development of laser and particle-beam ABM systems. Yet with this knowledge, the Pugwash participants, including Kissinger, set out to quash such work in the West.

Special Report:

KISSINGER'S PLOT TO TAKE OVER THE REAGAN ADMINISTRATION

The surprise naming of Henry A. Kissinger to head the President's Bipartisan Commission on Central America is part of a very ugly and long-standing attempt to subvert the Reagan presidency. But Henry Kissinger's return to official life is far more significant than the Central American appointment would suggest.

This *EIR* Special Report, "Kissinger's Plot to Take Over the Reagan Administration" is essential reading for any citizen concerned about the future of the United States as a republic. Researched and written late in 1982 by *EIR* Washington Bureau Chief Richard Cohen, long before anyone else had an inkling of the Kissinger operation, the report documents a process over months, using the friendly offices of Kissinger confidante George Shultz and others, of quietly inserting "Kissinger's boys" throughout the administration.

The report also supplies background dossiers on George Shultz and Helmut Sonnenfeldt at the State Department: Sonnenfeldt, currently a "consultant" to State, has been repeatedly challenged by Senate committees as a "security risk"; he has been an intimate of Kissinger's since 1945. Further dossiers include top appointees at State, Defense, the National Security Council, and the private business associates of Kissinger, including former British Foreign Minister Lord Peter Carrington and Gen. Brent Scowcroft. Kissinger's numerous private affiliations from Trilateral Commission to the secret illegal Monte Carlo masonic lodge are also identified.

The report is available for \$250.00

**For further information call or write:
William Engdahl, *EIR* Special Services,
304 W. 58th Street, 5th Floor MC-1,
New York, N.Y. 10019
(212) 247-8820**