KGB-linked ‘scientists’ at Göttingen: three months to stop beam defense

by Luba George

Over the weekend of July 7-8, a conference, “Scientists Against Militarization of Space,” was held in the university town of Göttingen, West Germany. Its purpose was to launch, as participating anti-American “peace” organizers and “scientists” stressed, “the most intensive campaign ever seen in the history of the peace movement to stop the militarization of space.” Both Soviet government dailies, Pravda and Izvestia, gave front-page play to the conference.

The 2,500 participants included the pro-Mondale, KGB-linked U.S. congressman, George Brown; N. Walker of the American “freeze” movement, foreign policy advisor of Jesse Jackson; former Kissinger State Department official Dr. Leonard Meeker; former astronaut Richard S. Schweikart; a number of Soviet officials; West German Communist Party representatives; and leading peace activists and “scientists.” Together, they declared war on President Reagan’s Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI).

The leitmotif of the conference was the call for action before the November elections to stop development of beam weapons.

“We are targeting 30 Congressmen, 10 Senators, and 1 President,” exclaimed Brown. R. Schweikart, the astronaut-turned-kook, added: “If we can’t get rid of him, then we will force Reagan to compromise [with the Soviets] or at least to declare his willingness to negotiate a ban on ASAT and beam weapons.”

Linus Pauling of Pugwash and the Union of Concerned Scientists appealed to the participants to build the “biggest ever peace movement” in Europe to pressure the United States to stop the SDI. “The nuclear-free zone in Europe will not come to pass as long as the threat of these first-use weapons is regarded as an essential deterrent,” he warned.

SDI is ‘casus belli’

Speaker after speaker declared the oft-repeated Kremlin blackmail and intimidation line: “The SDI is a casus belli”—U.S. development of an ABM system would “justify” the Soviet Union going to war.

Keynote speaker Victor Weisskopf, a member of the Pugwash “disarmament” movement, on the first day of the conference declared that “time is running out to change the present collision course. . . . Very few people know how dangerous the situation is at the moment.” The “collision course,” lied Weisskopf, has been caused by President Reagan’s pursuit of the SDI.

“The pursuit of the SDI. . . is an illusory and dangerous dream. . . far from any technical possibility for many decades if not forever,” declared Weisskopf. But in the same breath, he stated that this “impossible” dream “would drive the Soviet Union to the wall and [Moscow] would go to the limit and beyond in order to prevent the perceived superiority from being realized.”

Former Kissinger State Department official Meeker chimed in: “If we don’t ban U.S. development of the ABM and ASAT system . . . this could lead to a preemptive strike.” The Soviet representative, Irakli Gverditsiteli, member of the Institute for International Relations and World Economy (IMEMO), also warned of the “apocalyptic visions” guiding the pursuit of this “diabolic science.” Prof. Ulrich Albrecht from the Free University of West Berlin and protégé of Robert Jungk, the guru of the European green-peace movement, compared Reagan’s beam-weapons program to “Leonardo da Vinci’s illusory pursuit of the ‘absolute weapon.’ ”

‘Göttingen Declaration’

At the end of the conference, the participants adopted an “independent European” resolution called the “Göttingen Declaration,” drafted by scientists linked to the West German Communist Party. Stressing that “now is the time to stop President Reagan’s plans to militarize outer space . . . before it’s too late,” the resolution calls on all governments to work out and sign treaties to “ban the deployment and testing and use of all weapons in space.” The resolution includes a ban on military satellites, saying that spying increases the war danger, and proposes an “independent” European verification system.

Socialist International chairman Willy Brandt sent a message of praise, and on the last day, S. Kulic from Moscow’s U.S.A./Canada Institute declared: “I am very pleased with the outcome of the congress. . . . Our views and the views expressed here on arms control and disarmament are very similar. We must do everything possible to stop this mad and illogical arms race in space.”

Among the material distributed was the West German Communist Party (DKP) publication, Informationsdienst Wissenschaft und Frieden, which denounced President Rea-
gan’s program as well as EIR and Fusion magazines for supporting it. Both publications are associated with Lyndon H. LaRouche, the intellectual architect of the SDI.

Pugwashers vow to stop space weapons

Excerpts from the keynote speech of Victor Weisskopf, Professor at MIT, and member of the Pugwash “disarmament” movement.

At this moment in history the two superpowers are on a collision course . . . Some people in the United States dream of reaching military superiority over the Soviet Union by technological advances, which they may not be able to duplicate . . .

President Reagan’s speech of March 23rd . . . the Strategic Defense Initiative . . . promising an impenetrable defense system that is sufficiently protected against any nuclear attack . . . is being vigorously challenged. . . . Nobody believes in the government that real defense is possible. This is an illusory and dangerous dream. It’s not 100% effective. It’s part of a first-strike strategy . . . destabilizing and only 80% effective. . . . Unfortunately, people like Edward Teller are the image for young scientists working on lasers at the Livermore Labs. Lasers are impossible. . . . If the United States does produce them, then the Soviets will do the same. Such projects are far from any technical possibility for many decades if not forever . . .

If the United States is perceived to be on the way to becoming superior, either offensively or defensively, even if it is not actually so . . . it would drive the Soviet Union to the wall. . . . They would go to the limit and beyond in order to prevent the perceived superiority from being realized. They may interfere by force against the threatening U.S. buildup, unleashing the catastrophe which was to be prevented by attempting superiority. We must realize that it is the perception of such an attempt, not necessarily the actual attempt that counts. . . . This is a destabilizing condition. Any misinterpretation of actions by the opponent can lead to an escalating conflict, if a defensive act is interpreted as an offensive one . . . The pursuit of the SDI would require the abrogation of the ABM treaty.

Surely the other side has good reasons to condemn the actions of the United States, in particular . . . the Strategic Defense Initiative . . . instigated by the Reagan administration. . . . In trying to understand some of the countermeasures and actions of the Soviet Union, we must consider the trying circumstances of the present situation. The large conventional forces of the Soviet Union and the overly large number of SS-20 missiles have as one of their purposes the deterrence of Western Europe from helping revolts or supporting incipient anti-Soviet governments in Eastern Europe . . .

A nuclear-free zone in Europe will not come to pass as long as the threat of first-use is regarded as an essential deterrent. A special responsibility falls on Europe in these matters . . . . Hitler was the last example of what such policies could lead to . . . We don’t have much time. The longer we wait the more difficult it will be to change the situation around . . .

Independent actions have to be taken to: 1) reduce the missile force by a certain percentage and wait for a reaction of the other side; 2) reduce or abolish “mirved” missiles and replace them with single warheads; 3) strengthen the conventional defense in Europe in such a way that it cannot be perceived as a means of aggression.

Declare: 1) no first use of nuclear weapons; 2) no intention to abolish or subvert allies or potential allies of the other superpower; 3) never introduce launch-on-warning.

Negotiate: 1) nuclear arms reductions; keep SALT I and the ABM treaty; ratify SALT II; 2) a comprehensive test ban; 3) a nuclear-free zone in Europe; 4) abolish tactical nuclear weapons.

Excerpts of speech by Hans-Peter Dürr, Director of the Max Planck Institute for Physics and Astrophysics, Munich.

Reagan’s March 23rd televised speech has challenged American scientists and technicians to develop a new all-encompassing defense system against strategic nuclear rockets, which is to make the up-till-now unstable strategy of nuclear deterrence obsolete . . .

Such a defense shield against nuclear rockets is physically and technically unfeasible . . . and it cannot effectively bring us out of our military dilemma. On the contrary, such a step would further intensify the dreadful escalation and the alarming destabilization of the present parity between the two superpowers . . .

Excerpts of speech by Rep. George Brown (D-Calif.).

The SDI is a first-strike policy. Reagan’s Star Wars speech promising the absolute weapon for defense is a great hoax being fed to the American people . . . The seemingly defensive idea is offensive in character . . . We in America are in favor of freeze and oppose further militarization of our own country and in space . . . There will be a lot of activity between now and November . . . We are launching a “Campaign Freeze Vote ’84” to stop Reagan’s plans to militarize space . . . We are targeting 30 congressman, 10 senators, and 1 President . . .

Excerpts of speech by Russell L. Schweikart, former U.S. astronaut.

My colleagues in the Soviet Union agree . . . to the necessity
of short-term opportunities. We must get the message to the
general public that the steps being proposed by the Reagan
administration to militarize space are steps that do not in-
crease security as the American public is being told, but will
decrease security. The United States should negotiate the
ASAT treaty and ban all weapons in space. . . . If we can’t
get rid of him, then we have to force Reagan to at least make
a statement of principle to negotiate an arms control treaty
banning weapons in space. . . . There may be some hope to
get rid of him, then we have to force Reagan to at least make
a statement of principle to negotiate an arms control treaty
banning weapons in space. . . . There may be some hope to
move Reagan in that direction. . . . Space must not be al-
lowed to be dominated by fears, suspicion, and distrust. . . .

From space, as an astronaut, I saw one world, one people,
and one life. . . . We are all citizens of this planet. . . . Ich
bin nicht ein Berliner. . . . Ich bin du und bist ich und wir
sind alle Weltbürger [I am not a Berliner. . . . I am you and
you are I and we are all world citizens].

Excerpts of speech by Linus Pauling, member of the Pugwash
movement and of East Germany’s Leopoldina Academy of
Natural Sciences.

The biggest trouble is controlling the administration in the
United States. That’s what we have to work on now. My
Democratic friends think we have a chance. Even if Reagan
is re-elected, we have an opportunity in November to change
Congress in such a way that he will not have an easy time
like in the last four years. The job that has to be done by the
peace movement in the United States is to fight against Rea-
ning’s program of militarization of space in the next few
months. We must stop this insanity. . . . Nuclear Winter will
come . . . if we don’t stop it. . . . In the United States the
people support Reagan’s SDI program because they are lied
to about the missile gap. . . . Working through channels in
the government will not succeed. We have to have the great-
est mass movement the world has ever seen if we want to
prevent nuclear war.

Excerpts of speech by Dr. Leonard Meeker, former State
Department official from 1951 to 1973, former Ambassador
to Romania.

There are great strategic and political consequences if mili-
tarization is extended to space. The superpowers are at the
crossroads. Now is the time to stop this course. About 15
years ago the choice of MIRVs was made. The United States
developed it and shortly afterward the Soviets did the same.
Everybody regrets it. Another choice was presented: ABM
treaty. The treaty, however, has loopholes. These loopholes
permit the testing of the ABM system . . . deployment is
prohibited. The recent HOE test is the beginning of an anti-
satellite weapons system. The Soviets have also been testing
it for years. Now the United States is developing the F-15
system so that it could attack satellites at an altitude of several
thousand kilometers. . . . and this is not at the end of the line.
There will be unforeseen consequences if we don’t ban U.S.
development of the ABM system. . . . It will increase the
fear of the Soviets that their own deterrent capacity is no
longer effective and force them to work on countermeasures.
This could lead to a preemptive strike. . . .

The draft resolution treaty presented at Göttingen is a
comprehensive, constructive effort with important provi-
sions. Time is short. After another year or two practical steps
will have been taken which may render impossible real con-
trol of anti-satellite weapons. . . . Now is the time to do
something about it. There is hope that next September may
lead to some practical steps to a treaty. . . .