

freeze ensures thermonuclear holocaust, and that beam-weapons development is the only means for ridding ourselves of the unchallenged power of thermonuclear weapons. They will act properly for such practical reasons, but whether they believe in the efficiency of culture or not, they will contribute to changing culture in the way most favorable to securing war-avoidance. Later, having discovered my argument on culture to have been correct, they will come to recognize and to understand the deeper point, the point of view from which I have in fact elaborated my policy-proposal.

The world's press on beam-weapons

In his "Reply to Soviet Critics/Why A Beam Weapons 'Arms Race' Is Necessary" (see page 26), Lyndon LaRouche showed how those attacking him and Edward Teller for proposing development of beam weapons are blocking the only chance mankind has to live beyond the age of nuclear terror. The following is a partial compendium of the press coverage the LaRouche-Teller controversy has generated.

Soviet Union

Voprosy Ekonomiki (*Questions of Economy*), U.S.S.R., November 1982. Soviet investment specialist Viktor Krasovski:

[The broad introduction of appropriate new technologies] will raise the temperature of the economy. . . . The achievements of scientific and technological progress are realized in expanded socialist reproduction of the U.S.S.R. through capital investments. It is precisely in the course of carrying out these investments that we are creating interlinked complexes of high-energy physics, space research centers, progressive technological schemes of advanced nuclear energy and laser technology, that we build scientific-production centers at enterprises with pilot workshops and laboratories, and that we construct the most modern production equipment, including electronics, microprocessors, bioengineering equipment, automatic devices, modern robots, and latest-generation computers.

Izvestia, Dec. 19. Deputy Head of the General Staff, Army Gen. V. Varennikov:

. . . .The Pentagon is already building beam weapons, so we need them also. . . . It must be said that the danger of the military plans of the imperialist powers is growing in connection with the speedy development of military affairs, the possibility for the appearance on the basis of the latest scientific achievements of principally new types of weapons and military technology, including highly precise conventional weapons systems and weapons based on new physical principles.

Pravda, U.S.S.R. Yereimei Panov:

[Manhattan Project scientists like Teller] had not hearts beating in their chests, but machines. [The same heartless people are now influencing] pragmatic planners of the military leadership of the U.S. [to build] military space ships, laser weapons, military bases on the moon, etc. [which yesterday appeared to belong to the sphere of] pure fantasy.

Literaturnaya Gazeta, U.S.S.R.:

Edward Teller is a cannibal, . . . lover of the bomb . . . hater of mankind.

Western Europe

London Guardian, "Greening of a troubled Germany," Nov. 29, 1982.

. . . . An organization called the European Labor Party, run from the United States, has been running a smear campaign against both [Gen. Gert] Bastian [former head of the 12th Panzer Division in Wurzburg who has written and lectured against weapons modernization programs] and Petra Kelly [one of the three leaders of the German Greens]. "I have told the American Embassy that the ELP are run by the CIA and that they ruined my reputation and his life," says Kelly. "They have run a verbal campaign against us and also in their magazine. The military depends on them for information. The Ministry of Defense sent out warning notices about us to their commanders, but we have succeeded in getting these withdrawn from the Army files."

Allgemeine Jüdische Wochenzeitung, West Germany, "Mysterious War at the Shatt-Al-Arab." Dec. 3, 1982:

. . . the beginning of a totally new species of arms which will not kill people any more, but will destroy atomic missiles during their devastating flight, before reaching their aim and bring them down. Of course in Washington and Moscow these new defensive missiles are known and it is known that, within a few years, they can be produced relatively cheaply, with a highly developed preciseness and in great quantities. Therefore one has to ask the question as to what the Americans and Soviets want to negotiate in Geneva, as the agenda of their negotiations might be overridden in a short time by technical developments?

Corriere della Sera, Italy. "But which Leonardo? We

propose bombs, says the organizer of controversial conference," Dec. 5, 1982. *Reportage on the Humanist Academy conference on Leonardo da Vinci*:

We are creating a peace movement in opposition to the so-called peaceniks who support abolition of nuclear energy, said conference organizer Fiorella Operto. . . . The conference speakers were almost all spokesmen for the Humanist Academy which puts itself forward under other titles. The movement is led by Lyndon LaRouche in the United States, who has provoked polemics with this thesis.

Il Manifesto, Italy, "A conference on Leonardo? Let's leave it to the POE," Dec. 5, 1982:

The conference was sponsored by a bizarre institution, the Humanist Academy, which includes a number of personalities from the POE. It is said they are CIA . . . a sect. . . . And then with the blessing of the Milanese authorities, students went to the incredible conference where instead of learning anything new about Leonardo, they were met with enthusiastic speakers on beam-weapons and praise for the Reagan advisor Teller—the father of the H-bomb.

La Repubblica, Italy, "Leonardo conference an 'atomic' bomb," Dec. 5:

European Labor Party member Fiorella Operto ignored Leonardo and instead propagandized in favor of relativistic beam weapons as a means of dealing with nuclear terror. . . . They defined ecologists and peace supporters as "terrorists." Amidst general shock, they compared the Manhattan Project with Brunelleschi's dome, a delirious theory which was rapidly ended by a teacher present.

This led to chaos in the hall and general confusion.

In the meantime, a telegram was sent to the superintendent of schools denouncing "the involvement of the schools in a conference propagandizing its own theories in favor of rearmament and the atomic bomb."

Unita, Italy, Dec. 5:

Fiorella Operto at a conference on Leonardo found it opportune to bring up the work of Leonardo to support rearmament and the proliferation of beam weapons. Picking up on the re-armament content made by the Reaganite Teller, she tied it to the project that led to Brunelleschi's dome. Responding to disagreements, she said, "The parallel is useful for the following thesis: Beam weapons are the only possibility for neutralizing atomic weapons. This is the only way for ensuring peace just as we have to insist at the same time on the development of peaceful nuclear programs. In fact, those who oppose this program are really against peace."

It is difficult to conclude that in the science work of Operto there is an intelligent use of the work of Leonardo. The thesis itself seems to be: "If you want peace, prepare for war."

Il Sole 24 Ore, Italy, citing Georgii Arbatov, head of the

Soviets' U.S.A.-Canada Institute:

I am convinced that especially today, Western Europe has overtaken the United States in political prestige. [Europe's greater importance will be based on Western Europe] and not the United States [being] the major assault force of NATO. . . . The United States has an enormous number of nuclear weapons, but nobody till now has succeeded in using them without committing suicide. . . . I think it is foolishness to believe that in conditions of an unlimited arms race it is possible to live with impunity, just because we succeeded in living all these 37 years. . . . This is confirmed by the antinuclear movement developing in 1981 and 1982 in Europe and the United States. . . . We are witnessing the beginning of a rethinking of the reality of the nuclear age from the side of a powerful movement of the people. . . . But, in reality, the progress of science and technology, and, in this case, the growth of weapons of mass annihilation, especially nuclear weapons, has overturned the world of traditional conceptions. What for millennia has been developed as the recourse to the strength of weapons as an instrument to ensure security and survival, has become pure delusion. . . . A world without war and weapons has become the only means to save civilization and the human race.

Eastern Establishment U.S. press

New York Times, "New Generation of Nuclear Arms With Controlled Effects Foreseen," Oct. 29, 1982:

Nuclear weapons planners foresee a new generation of arms in which the heat, radiation, or blast effects of a nuclear explosion can be used far more selectively than those of existing weapons, according to scientists and Administration officials.

Other private and Government experts, however, doubt that the concepts will result in new weapons that could protect American strategic arsenals or population centers. They oppose these vaguely described advances as "Buck Rogers schemes" that are intended to increase the weapons research and development budgets of military and atomic energy laboratories and to blunt public pressure for a freeze on nuclear arsenals, development and testing. . . .

"There are potentially broad new capabilities emerging," agreed George A. Keyworth 2d, President Reagan's science adviser. "There are no clearcut systems applications yet, but we should have a better idea of what we can do in less than 10 years." . . .

Administration officials cite the following as examples of weapons being contemplated: bombs that would be designed to create a large electronic magnetic pulse to knock out an enemy's communications systems; lasers by which atomic explosions would generate X-rays, which, in turn, would power a laser beam for destroying enemy missiles, and other "directed energy" weapons that would be tailored to destroy a particular target with few side effects. . . .

The most vocal proponent of the third-generation concept is Dr. Edward Teller, known as the "father of the hydrogen

bomb." Dr. Teller recently met with President Reagan to urge him to increase financing for the new concepts. In a speech at the National Press Club on Tuesday, Dr. Teller criticized the proposed nuclear freeze, arguing that it would prevent the development and testing of new defensive weapons, which, he asserted, could vastly increase the nation's security.

"These concepts could result in weapons, which can only be used to destroy the offensive systems of a potential adversary, and may well render offensive nuclear systems ineffective, thus removing the threat of nuclear war," concludes a recently released report by the Senate Armed Services Committee.

Administration support for greater emphasis on third-generation weapons is meeting strong opposition from proponents of a nuclear freeze and from some scientists. Richard L. Garwin, a physicist at the I.B.M. Thomas J. Watson Research Center, argued that negotiating a comprehensive test ban with the Soviet Union would be far more in the nation's best interest.

Christopher Paine, of the Federation of American Scientists, called the third-generation weapons "a perilous ruse perpetrated by the weapons builders to keep them in business."

"These so-called defensive concepts are only likely to continue the arms race," asserted Mr. Paine. "The Soviets will develop countermeasures, the arms race will continue unabated, and stability will be threatened. There is no technical fix for mutually vulnerable nuclear forces."

New York Times, "Teller Faulted on Bomb Calculations," Nov. 13:

Hans Bethe, a Nobel prize-winning physicist, has charged that faulty calculations by Edward Teller, known as the father of the hydrogen bomb, and other technical problems hindered the bomb's development rather than political opposition by the late J. Robert Oppenheimer. . . .

"Everybody recognizes that Teller more than anyone else contributed ideas at every stage of the H-bomb program, and this fact should never be obscured," [Bethe] wrote. . . .

But Dr. Bethe also cautioned, as he said others had, that "nine out of 10 of Teller's ideas are useless" and that Dr. Teller "needs men with more judgment, even if they are less gifted, to select the 10th idea, which is often the stroke of genius." . . .

Boston Globe, editorial, "Pentagon Atari," Nov. 14:

On the fantasy screens of video-game arcades, space commanders zap invaders into space junk. Other than the diversion of teenage lunch money, and perhaps a subversion of studies, not too much harm is done.

The costs of such fantasies are higher in real life. An emerging Reagan Administration public relations blitz, featuring catchy concepts like Space Command, killer satellites, particle beams, "force multipliers," and "High Frontiers," shows where the arms race is going.

The arms control movement threatens to hold the Pentagon team to short yardage, so they've shifted to a passing game. Their strategy: Sell Americans on an arms race they'll think is fun. . . .

The gaudiest Pentagon fantasy to date is the ring of space-based laser stations which would destroy hostile missiles as they are launched from earth. The space-laser notion is derided by most experts as hopelessly expensive, impractical and easy to disable or foil. At immense cost it might work well enough to kill a few orbiting satellites, but that can be done just as well with a well-placed hand grenade. Lasers would be useless against a swarm of ballistic missile warheads. Still . . . if space lasers could be sold to a sci-fimesmerized public, they'd be a procurement officer's dream. . . .

The Pentagon must do more than dream up ways of using elegant hardware. It must explain how wars will be less likely, and more "manageable," when each superpower has acquired the ability to strike the other blind at a moment of international tension. The test for space war enthusiasts is not to run up high scores in Atari-like war games, but to show some common sense.

U.S. campus press

The California Tech, "Who can seriously believe this stuff?" Dec. 10, 1982:

. . . [Paul Gallagher, Executive Director of the Fusion Energy Foundation proposed] an all-out effort to develop high-power energy anti-ballistic beam weapons, on a scale similar to that of the Manhattan Project. He claimed that, were this to take place, the U.S. would be invulnerable to attack by nuclear missiles by the 1990s. He also maintained that the know-how derived from the beam technology would cause an industrial revolution and pull the economy out of its current crisis.

The title of Mr. Gallagher's organization . . . is misleading. The Fusion Energy Foundation and the newspaper *New Solidarity* are merely extensions of an obscure, distorted political organization titled the National Democratic Policy Committee (NDPC).

Notre Dame campus newspaper, "Beam weapons group—a dud," Dec. 6, 1982. Guest Columnist Dan May:

Amid the flurry of lectures and writings concerning the nuclear freeze, a strong anti-nuclear freeze group voiced its opinion last Wednesday on this campus. The slogan, "The Nuclear Freeze will cause Nuclear War!" headlined on their literature, caught many peoples' eyes, not to mention enraging a few tempers. The group is the National Democratic Policy Committee. . . .

They believe that the freeze on nuclear weapons and particularly nuclear energy is a substantial part of a plot to reverse the gears of technology to reduce the world to a "pre-industrial feudal Malthusian nation-state." . . .

[The NDPC's] talk about beam weapons does raise a valid

point: Is nuclear disarmament enough? Nuclear disarmament would alleviate much of the threat nuclear weapons pose, but for all the limitations on nuclear weapons we can impose, the nuclear technology remains.

But are beam weapons the answer? . . . I am not going to pretend that there are easy solutions to our world problems, but I think that the extreme danger nuclear weapons pose demand immediate action. [The NDPC] fail to act on this danger. In fact, they add to it by prolonging the advancement in the technology that is able to destroy the life on this earth and that nature which is so bountiful and beautiful.

Other U.S. press

The (Calif.) Valley Times, "Freeze would halt laser research," Oct. 20, 1982:

A freeze on all U.S. nuclear weapons work would cancel research on a secret X-ray laser defense satellite designed to bring down Soviet ballistic missiles without exploding their warheads, a physicist opposed to the bilateral freeze initiative said Tuesday.

Dr. Steven Bardwell, editor of the New York-based Fusion magazine, said the controversial X-ray laser and other beam weapons on the drawing boards at Lawrence Livermore Laboratory could throw the doctrine of mutually assured destruction "totally out the window. . . ."

Tri-Valley (Calif.) Herald, "Physicist cool toward N-Freeze," Oct. 20, 1982:

The X-ray laser weapon may be too secret for nuclear weapons scientists to talk about, but one independent physicist combined rumor, leaks, physics and imagination to describe that weapon at a press conference here Tuesday.

The laser, said Steven Bardwell, would provide a secure nuclear defense against intercontinental ballistic missiles.

Air Force Times, "Beam Effort: End to Nuclear Threat?" Washington, D.C., Dec. 6, 1982:

WASHINGTON—The U.S. has the capability of deploying, within five years, a hybrid defensive antiballistic missile (ABM) weapon based on beam technology, a member of the Fusion Energy Foundation has said.

Dr. Steven Bardwell, FEF's director of Plasma Physics Research, described at a Capitol Hill briefing the technology now available that would make "nuclear war obsolete. . . ."

The FEF proposal calls for \$300 million dedicated to beam weapon development in FY 1984, then growing to \$1 billion for each of 10 years thereafter.

The (Manchester, N.H.) Union Leader, "Laser Beams Offered as Nuclear Alternatives," Dec. 16, 1982.

Lyndon LaRouche, an unsuccessful Democratic candidate in the 1980 Presidential Primary, has mounted a campaign promoting development of laser beams as a defense weapon against guided nuclear missiles.

He'll probably be raising the beam weapon idea as an

issue in the 1984 Democratic Presidential Primary. Charles Park, a representative of the National Democratic Policy Committee—which LaRouche formed and now chairs—told The Union Leader last night that although the Rochester Democrat hasn't formally announced his candidacy, he is "unofficially" planning to seek the presidency again in 1984. . . .

Steve Komm of Boston, the New England coordinator for the beam weapon proposal, claims the Soviets are already developing similar technology that could make the "Dense Pack" basing plan for the MX Missile "shortsighted."

Komm, an associate of Dr. Steven Bardwell, a science adviser to LaRouche and editor of "Fusion" magazine, said that Dr. Bardwell "did an assessment of Soviet" research in laser beams and determined that Russia is committed to developing beam weapons, and that the U.S. "should embark" on such a plan. . . .

Komm said the laser beam proposal has been "initiated as a major political thrust" by LaRouche and the National Democratic Policy Committee. He charged the liberal media has been suppressing information on beam weapons that the committee has attempted to disseminate.

Fort Worth Star-Telegram, "Physicist hails weapon as economic answer," Nov. 10, 1982:

Foes of new technology are opposed to laser beam technology because "they are absolutely terrified by its uncontrollable aspect," Bardwell told about 30 people in a meeting at Green Oaks Inn that was sponsored by the Democratic National Policy Committee. The committee is led by extremist politician Lyndon LaRouche and is not connected with the Democratic Party.

Aerospace Daily, "Teller Said to Urge Development of X-ray Laser," Washington, D.C., Dec. 1, 1982:

Dr. Edward Teller and Dr. Lowell Wood of the Lawrence Livermore Laboratories are urging the Reagan administration to begin development of a space-based laser, operating in the X-ray wave-length, that would be capable of shooting down Soviet ICBMs during their first few minutes of flight, according to Dr. Steven Bardwell, director of plasma physics for the Fusion Energy Foundation and military editor of the Executive Intelligence Review.

In a press conference held recently in Washington, Bardwell said that successful tests demonstrating the laser had been held in 1980 at underground nuclear test sites in Nevada.

A congressional staffer told The DAILY that Teller, father of the H-bomb, had met with President Reagan about the X-ray laser program.

A scientific advisor to the Reagan Administration said the meeting had taken place late last summer and that the Reagan Administration "regards the X-ray as a serious concept."

White House officials said they had no record of the meeting. . . .