

# Pugwash refuted—beam weapons can defend Western Europe!

by Susan Welsh

The accumulated scientific evidence in favor of the United States developing a beam-weapon antiballistic-missile defense system has become so overwhelming that even Britain's Lord Carrington, the NATO Secretary General, has grudgingly conceded that 1) beam defense is possible; 2) the Soviets are developing it; and 3) it is absurd to argue (as he has done in the past) that the achievement of such a capability would signify a move by the United States to "decouple" from Europe by protecting its own shores while leaving Europe vulnerable to Soviet attack.

Carrington made this admission in an interview to the French daily *Le Figaro* published July 24, following a tour of Europe by U.S. Lt. Gen. James Abrahamson, the director of the Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI). The details of Abrahamson's briefings to European NATO officials are classified, but the general clearly convinced Lord Carrington that it was no longer wise or politic to openly oppose the program.

"General Abrahamson has just informed the Atlantic Council about the American projects," the NATO chief told *Le Figaro*. "I have drawn three conclusions from this. First, the United States is at this stage only engaged in a research effort, not production; it is trying to determine what is technically possible and what is not. Second, the U.S.S.R. possesses certain capabilities in this domain, and should the Western world renounce any such effort, it would leave itself dangerously exposed. Third, any weapons system which would be developed would protect Europe as well as the United States. In this sense, General Abrahamson's briefing was reassuring."

Lord Carrington, a business partner of Henry Kissinger, is Western Europe's leading proponent of decoupling from the United States—although he is always careful to phrase this as greater European "responsibility" as a "pillar in the alliance," and to accuse Washington (not Moscow) of being the source of the decoupling drive.

Given that Carrington and company have admitted the scientific and military feasibility of beam weapons, there can be only one basis for objection to the policy: the political grounds that the American SDI does not fit into the Soviet General Staff's plans for the domination of Europe. Ongoing Soviet maneuvers in Eastern Europe and threats against West Germany underline the fact that the reality facing Europe

today is raw Soviet power. Without NATO backing for a crash program for beam-weapon development and correlated defense programs like the neutron bomb, Carrington's "independent Europe" will quickly be swallowed up by the Russian Empire.

## Shultz versus Weinberger

In Washington, the administration is locked in an increasingly out-in-the-open battle between Secretary of State George Shultz—a Carrington/Kissinger crony—and Secretary of Defense Caspar Weinberger, over the SDI and the proposed resumption of arms control negotiations with the Soviets. The Soviets walked out of the Geneva negotiations on nuclear missiles in December, after the first U.S. medium-range missiles were deployed in Western Europe. Then in mid-July the Soviet leaders proposed talks in Vienna to ban space weapons.

Weinberger, in an interview with the *Washington Post* published July 27, said that there is "no point" in going to Vienna for such talks if the Soviets insist on limiting them to discussion of space weapons. He stressed that there must be a prior agreement that the talks will include discussion of nuclear missiles as well. "I very much hope we will go to Vienna, but there's no point whatever in going to Vienna and just talking about one thing," he said.

Shultz, on the other hand, told a closed Senate meeting that the administration will be "flexible" with the Soviets, and that he is ready to go to Vienna in September to discuss the "banning of all weapons in space." When a Soviet spokesman complained about the "negative" U.S. stance which he said would make the talks "impossible," White House press spokesman Larry Speakes quickly emphasized that the talks are still on, and Weinberger announced that he had been "misquoted" by the *Post*.

Also leaping into the fray were Lt.-Gen. Abrahamson and former Secretary of State Dean Rusk, in testimony July 27 before the House Foreign Affairs Committee. Abrahamson vigorously defended the Strategic Defense Initiative: "The SDI is not 'Star Wars.' 'Star Wars' was imaginative, exciting cinema, but, nonetheless, it was cinema. The SDI is real, very real, and the options that the research program may provide could remove much of the military value of nuclear ballistic missiles, thereby acting as a powerful catalyst to

meaningful, lasting arms control.” Addressing critics who say that research into beam weapons should be dropped, Abrahamson said that “that would amount to unilaterally leaving this field, with all its potential, to others, who may have very different objectives than ourselves with a potential for very dangerous consequences to our nation.”

Abrahamson’s testimony countered that of Rusk, overseer of the disastrous U.S. involvement in the Vietnam War as Secretary of State under Lyndon Johnson. Referring to the Soviet call for negotiations on banning space weapons, Rusk said that “it is of the greatest importance . . . that the two sides come to the negotiating table with the serious purpose of preventing the movement of the arms race into outer space rather than go there for the purpose of going through a dance of the gooney birds.”

*EIR* has affirmed on past occasions that Rusk, along with former Defense Secretary Robert McNamara, waged the Vietnam War in such a way as to wreck U.S. strategic capabilities. Those who may have questioned that evaluation should reflect upon the traitorous role that Rusk is playing today, in seeking to undermine the U.S. bid to acquire a defense against nuclear attack.

### **Bolstering the European flank**

Weinberger’s supporters inside and outside the administration have placed priority on gaining European support for their cause, as General Abrahamson’s trip indicates. His was not the only such deployment: nuclear physicist Dr. Edward Teller, a leading proponent of beam defense who is personally close to the President, gave an interview to a German magazine in July warning that an agreement with the Soviet leaders today would be comparable to pact with Hitler. And Abrahamson dispatched a member of his personal staff, Dr. Edward T. Gerry, to be the featured speaker at a conference in Britain on the Strategic Defense Initiative.

Teller told *Der Stern* magazine: “As far as I know, the Soviets have so far never signed anything that could really be verified. . . . Signing an agreement with the Kremlin today would be like signing a non-aggression pact with Hitler. . . . I don’t know of any treaty that they have respected.” As for Soviet charges that the SDI means that President Reagan is preparing a first strike, Teller replied: “When the Soviet leaders figure out that we will spend 95% of our resources for defensive capabilities and only 5% for offensive capabilities [as Teller recommends], will they still think that we have aggressive intentions? Of course, I can also beat you up with a shield. But it is much easier with a sword.”

Then Teller lambasted the liberal East Coast news media for trying—unsuccessfully—to mobilize popular opinion against the SDI. “The people are for it. *The New York Times* is against it, as are some scientists. But 80 to 90% of these people are against Reagan, who was nonetheless elected President.” As for the physicists who oppose beam weapons, “they have no access to classified information, which I know

about, but about which I am not allowed to speak.” Teller, an outspoken opponent of U.S. classification policies, stressed that “the Russians know about these things. But how can a democracy work when your own people are not informed? It is not surprising that many American scientists do not want to work for the Pentagon.”

Shortly thereafter, Dr. Gerry of the SDI staff addressed a conference in London on strategic defense, sponsored by a group called Aims of Industry. The purpose of the conference, a spokesman said, was “to inform the public of the feasibility of such a system and that such a system offers a new revolutionary concept in defense, replacing Mutually Assured Destruction with Mutually Assured Survival. . . . The aim of the conference was to rally support in Britain for the Reagan administration’s Mutually Assured Survival doctrine and to involve British industry in the development of some of the technology. Different schools of thought among conservatives are now beginning to listen to pro-beam-weapon arguments.”

The conference was initiated by former British Air Marshal Stewart Menaul, the spokesman said. He added that although Gen. Danny Graham of the Washington, D.C. “High Frontier” organization spoke at the conference (he was erroneously portrayed in the London *Times* as “one of the leading American supporters of President Reagan’s SDI”), it was Dr. Gerry who dominated the proceedings. Graham is a delphic opponent of the beam-weapons policy, and seeks to win support away from Weinberger and the President, and toward his version of 1960s-vintage antiballistic-missile technology.

More such conferences are scheduled to take place throughout Europe, under the direction of Gen. Abrahamson, in the near future.

### **The impact in Britain**

Apart from Lord Carrington’s concession to the beam-weapon advocates, stirrings of change are appearing elsewhere in the British oligarchy. *The Daily Telegraph*, which has previously denounced the SDI as “an irresponsible and wasteful chimera,” changed its tune with a July 21 commentary by Adrian Berry, titled “How the fastest gun in space would keep the peace on earth: President Reagan has the safest and cheapest idea of trying to keep the balance of power by putting laser-beam stations in space.”

Denouncing the “surprising amount of ignorant criticism” that has assailed the SDI, Berry reported that the Soviet Union does enjoy “a small but definite nuclear superiority over NATO. Now the Soviet leaders do not think altogether like Hitler, who loved war for its own sake. But, like Hitler, they apparently wish to dominate the world. . . . To achieve world stability, it may well be desirable to eschew all secrecy, to allow the Russians to build their own parallel system. If both superpowers had weapons in space, then neither need fear a surprise attack.” The SDI “ought to be attempted,” the article recommended.