

## Beam-weapons sabotage: Heritage boosts Andropov

by Donald Baier

At a New York City press conference held under tight security Jan. 17, Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr. charged that "a very dirty game is being played" to destabilize the Reagan administration's commitment to developing space-based directed energy beam weapons—weapons that could defend the United States population from enemy ICBM attack.

"This Heritage Foundation mess in Washington has been tolerated for too long," LaRouche emphasized, singling out the purportedly conservative think tank as an example of the elements put into motion on behalf of the drive to sabotage beam weapons. He labeled Heritage "an extremely dangerous agent of a foreign government."

LaRouche also demanded that the Senate reject the nomination of Kenneth Adelman as the new head of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. Adelman, he said, was part of the sabotage network associated with the Heritage Foundation.

Since last spring LaRouche, the Democratic Party's most threatened and most controversial figure, has carried on an international campaign for a crash program in beam weapons development, to provide a science driver that would create vast new U.S. technological and industrial capabilities, forcing a U.S. economic recovery. Condemning the Heritage "dirty operation," LaRouche noted, "We are presently in a world economic depression. Destabilizations now on strategic questions are most dangerous."

LaRouche's press conference was triggered by a United Press International wire detailed Jan. 16. The UPI wire asserted the existence of a classified Pentagon strategy docu-

ment proposing the development of *offensive* space-based weapons, to attack satellites and launch nuclear attacks on population centers. The UPI wire and similar stories emphasized the "space warfare" aspect of the Pentagon's guidance document, which was said to have detailed plans for fighting a protracted nuclear war.

### The UPI leak

"Now I understand why Soviet spokesmen have asserted so vehemently that in pursuing space-based weapons, the United States is planning for a first strike," commented LaRouche, who recalled that at a November 1982 seminar on defensive beam weapons he had given in Bonn, West Germany, Soviets present had insisted that the offensive version of space-based weapons development was official U.S. policy. He charged that the timing of the press leak, by "confirming" that Soviet perception and contributing to manufacturing a climate of fear on defense questions, was intended to effect "a destabilization of Reagan policy and to aggravate the chances for negotiations between the United States and the U.S.S.R. This increases the war danger tremendously," LaRouche stressed.

A full investigation of the responsibility for the UPI leak, as well as an earlier May 1982 leak to the *New York Times* along similar lines, should be undertaken at once, LaRouche added.

The UPI leak occurred during the same week that the Heritage Foundation issued "A Defense Strategy for the 1980s," advocating an all-out conventional weapons buildup

and omitting all mention of defensive beam weapons systems, including those recommended in the High Frontier project conducted under Heritage auspices. At the same time, rumors swept Washington that Heritage was behind a campaign to kill all budget allocations relevant to the development of defensive beam weapons.

White House science adviser George Keyworth and British Air Vice Marshal Stewart Menaul are among those who were identified as claiming that development of space-based beam weapons must be postponed to the distant future.

Earlier in the week, ACDA Director Eugene Rostow had been fired by President Reagan, and it was subsequently leaked to the press that he and chief U.S. arms control negotiator Paul Nitze had reached a private understanding with Soviet negotiators on the deployment of medium range missiles in Europe which was subsequently rejected by the White House. Press accounts in both the U.S.A. and Europe portrayed the administration as "intransigent" on arms control, although the Soviet government too had officially rejected the Rostow-Nitze private deal.

In the view of LaRouche, all this, coming in the week prior to the President's State of the Union message and final budget decisions, the same week in which the Soviet Foreign Minister was visiting the capital of America's most important NATO ally, West Germany, added up to a deliberate effort to manufacture a climate of intense pressure on Reagan, with the aim of forcing him to abandon technological development on military-industrial frontiers in the name of arms control and budgetary restraint. LaRouche pointed the finger squarely at the Heritage Foundation.

"It is owned by two branches of British intelligence, the International Institute for Strategic Studies in London, and the Mont Pelerin Society, with many of the top Heritage officials directly associated with the left-wing British Fabian Society," he said.

It is "this crowd," LaRouche continued, "which has done the job on Reagan, together with Bishop Paul Moore of the New York Episcopal Archdiocese, former Secretary of State Cyrus Vance, and others. It is part of an 'understanding' between London and [Soviet party chief] Andropov.

"The gameplan of London in this situation is to split Europe from the United States," charged LaRouche, "and then to drive the United States, as an isolated, enraged beast, mad." Allegations that beam weapons development will contribute to the danger of thermonuclear war are 180-degrees opposite to reality, he said. "Weapons don't cause war, people do."

LaRouche called for direct U.S.-Soviet negotiations on parallel development of defensive space-based weapons-systems "without British mediation" as the only possible way out of the strategic problems posed by the so-called deterrence theory associated with the Robert McNamara doctrine of Mutual and Assured Destruction, updated by Henry Kissinger to include "limited nuclear war."

Newly appointed Arms Control and Disarmament Agency Director Kenneth Adelman, fresh from his post as Deputy Ambassador to the United Nations, is typical of the strategic insanity associated with the MAD viewpoint. Adelman is the author of an article in the Heritage Foundation's *Policy Review* journal entitled "Beyond MAD-ness," in which he proposed the doctrine of "limited nuclear war" first elaborated by Kissinger and put into practice in the Carter administration's policy document PD-59. Adelman's piece agitated for a low-technology defense policy, orienting U.S. strategy toward a "prolonged nuclear conflict"—the same emphasis as in the leaked UPI wire.

"We have to bring to light the background of this very dirty operation," LaRouche insisted. "We must smoke it out now and eliminate the nomination of Adelman so that we can go back to the original beam development policy with a clean slate."

### The European angle

A main feature of the operation is to pit Western Europe, and particularly West Germany, against the United States on arms control issues, to pressure the U.S.A. to abandon space-based defensive weapons development. Defense experts for West Germany's Social Democratic Party have confirmed that SPD Chancellor candidate Hans-Jochen Vogel is discussing with his U.S. and Soviet co-conspirators plans to ban space-based weapons systems by treaty. The SPD circles linked to Andropov's friends in the party's Willy Brandt wing, and their collaborators in the "left-wing" anti-technology rabble of the emerging fascist Green Party, are pushing a defense policy identical to that of the "right-wing" Heritage Foundation report just issued in the United States.

At the same, the "left-wing" Democrats in the U.S. Congress—under the thumb of Averell Harriman's British wife, the former Pamela Churchill—are collaborating with Kissinger protégé Secretary of State George Shultz and other traditionally anti-Reagan Republicans to "lock the administration on the arms control track."

A spokesman for Congress for Peace Through Law, the Harriman peace lobby on Capitol Hill, revealed this week that hearings are planned for mid-February in the House Foreign Affairs Committee on the Kennedy-Hatfield nuclear freeze resolution—again, a policy recommendation that amounts to the same conventional buildup pushed by the Heritage Foundation.

The House hearings will showcase the "sensational information in the leaked guidance about U.S. offensive space warfare plans and nuclear first strikes," said the Peace through Law spokesman. "We will have a big propaganda show that embarrasses the administration." He predicted House passage of the freeze resolution in early March—before the national elections in West Germany. "This will give a tremendous lift to the peace movement both here and in Europe, and set the stage for major demonstrations in the early spring.

We intend to lock the administration into the arms control track before summer," he said.

In the Senate, Sen. Larry Pressler (R-S.D.), intends to use the UPI leak to get a new round of hearings on banning "dangerous space weapons, especially any kind of beam weapons," the spokesman added.

But as LaRouche pointed out, if this gameplan succeeds, the world will be "locked in to war." Under MAD, the worse the depression collapse, and the associated decline in U.S. military-strategic capability with the arms control-conventional buildup policy, the greater the United States impulse to rely on the theory of "deterrence" as a rationale for a policy of increased "bluffing" with nuclear weapons. Therefore, said LaRouche, anyone, in Washington or Moscow, who is campaigning against beam weapons development, is dangerous to human survival.



## Teller will soon crack beam-weapons secrecy

by Paul Gallagher

Dr. Edward Teller spoke on space-based defensive anti-ballistic missile (ABM) weapons at the Georgetown Center for Strategic and International Studies Jan. 18, in the face of the all-out British-Soviet campaign to stop, and ban by treaty, U.S. beam-weapon ABM development.

Teller's forceful presentation not only reiterated that first-stage ABM protection with such systems can be deployed within 5 years; he also announced that within weeks he will be freed, for the first time, from the Anglo-American legacy of secrecy regulations, and allowed to "tell the American people what the Soviet leadership knows" about high-energy

antiballistic-missile beam weapons.

"If you don't say that it can be done," said Teller of the immediate prospect space-based directed-energy beam technologies, "then you are going to lose the political battle with the freeze movement." Such a defeat, Dr. Teller has stated, will lead to nuclear war during this decade as the United States relies on the disastrous MAD (mutual assured destruction) doctrine and a shrinking, obsolete deterrent.

It is widely admitted, even in the recent fraudulent UPI "military strategy leaks" aimed against beam-weapon development, that although Dr. Teller and other experts are forbidden even to mention the phrase "directed-energy beams" in public, the Soviet Union is well *ahead* of the United States in developing the beam technologies for space-based ABMS. The UPI "leaks" were aimed to assist a general sabotage of the U.S. beam-weapon program, inclusively by tightening the absurd secrecy regulations still further.

Allowing Dr. Teller to tell the American citizenry about the fundamentally new energy-beam technologies for ABM defense being developed, could unleash a powerful counterblow to the phony UPI "leaks." In his presentation, Teller attributed the coming relaxation of restrictions on his speeches to the Department of Energy under new Energy Secretary Donald Hodel.

This and other recent moves, including continuing increases in the administration's public DOD budget requests for areas related to advanced-technology ABM development, indicate that the Reagan White House is attempting to maintain and expand its decision to accelerate beam-weapon development. But these quiet moves in no way match the high-profile intensity of the wrecking activities by British intelligence and KGB assets in Washington.

### Rigged hearings

From the side of the "left nuclear freeze," Oxford-educated Sen. Larry Pressler (Rep.-S. Dak.) is holding a set of rigged hearings in February on his own resolution to ban "particularly space-based beam weapons," in his subcommittee of the Senate Foreign Affairs Committee. After *EIR* learned of the hearings, Pressler-aide William Glicksman stated point-blank that no one representing the Fusion Energy Foundation or the National Democratic Policy Committee of Lyndon LaRouche, Jr., would be allowed to testify. This is an attempt to guarantee that if any experts are to speak in defense of beam-weapons at those hearings, their effectiveness will be muzzled by national security "secrecy," which does not affect NDPC or FEF experts.

On the "right nuclear freeze" side, nominally "conservative" assets of the British military-intelligence thinktanks and the Heritage Foundation are spreading disinformation meant to disorient supporters of the LaRouche and Teller efforts.

Beam-weapons experts in Washington report that Senator Malcolm Wallop (Rep.-Wyo.) and his aide Angelo Codev-

illa, who built a "Star Wars" reputation caricaturing space-based lasers over the past two years, are now spreading extreme underestimates, "off by a factor of 1000," about actual advanced laser and particle-beam potentials.

Wallop's "space-wars" line has generally come direct from British Air-Vice Marshall Stuart Menaul, who visited the United States in late December.

Air Force Lt. Gen. Kelley Burke was recently replaced as head of the Air Force directed-energy weapons program after spreading similar "expert" incompetence. Though out of the job, Burke and his assessment that beam-weapon ABM systems were "more than 20 years away due to their complexity and weight" were promoted in the UPI defense-policy "leak" hoax, as if authoritative. The UPI "leak" installment of Jan. 19 used Burke to try to prove that the only space-based lasers feasible during the next decade were *offensive* weapons and hunter-killer satellites—the Soviet KGB line precisely.

This same dangerous incompetence comes closest to the White House itself in the person of Presidential Science Advisor Dr. George Keyworth. Keyworth has repeatedly contradicted Teller's assessment on the feasibility of defensive beam-weapon systems, both before closed meetings of Congressional Armed Services Committees and in remarks printed in the public press, while maintaining the aura of a "pro-nuclear" younger associate of Teller.

Speaking at Lawrence Livermore Laboratory Jan. 14, Keyworth went overboard completely and proposed shifting the work of the nation's first-rank nuclear-technologies lab to "advanced conventional weapons development." Conventional arms buildup is now recognized as the real goal of the so-called "nuclear freeze" campaign. Thinking himself in quite restricted surroundings, Keyworth was apparently surprised by some journalists' questions on nuclear-powered beam-weapons development; he answered evasively but indicated he thought such development not really necessary, nor feasible.

Quite the contrary, Teller told a questioner at the Georgetown CSIS auditorium presentation: "When you see half a dozen different possibilities, then each month they look better than the previous month, then you can say it is almost certain that at least one of them, probably more, will work. . . ."

Of Keyworth's views, Teller remarked, "Sometimes to be very cautious, is actually hazardous." He emphasized that if the United States mounts a serious development effort, it can deploy a rudimentary form of beam-weapon ABM defense within five years, and a more complete or "strategic" system within a decade.

"By the year 2000," said Teller, "I hope that 95 percent of our defense budget will be spend on defensive weapons. . . . If both sides become defense-minded, not offensive-minded, this is a stable situation. Out of that stable situation, maybe peace will come."

## What Adelman says

*Kenneth Adelman, current designate for the post of director of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, published an article, "Beyond MAD-ness" in the Summer 1981 Heritage Foundation's Policy Review journal. Adelman concluded his article with this statement:*

The U.S. should be prepared (and be seen to be prepared) to put our strategic forces into limited play in limited crises that may arise in the wider world, such as the Berlin Crisis of 1961 and the Middle East War of 1973. U.S. forces should not be fashioned solely for the most remote crisis of all: that of an all-out U.S.-U.S.S.R. nuclear conflict. Unless the U.S. has (and is seen to have) strategic forces supple enough to respond in balanced measure, key allies can only discount the nuclear umbrella. . . .

With the fall of MAD will come the correction of this oversight. Proponents of missile and civil defense advocate that the U.S. match the Soviet efforts to acquire the capacity to fight a prolonged nuclear conflict. . . . [A] limited exchange against hardened military targets [is] the type of capability a PD 59 approach dictates. . . . A successful strike against military and political control targets would reduce the Soviets' ability to project military power abroad.

## What Heritage says

*Each year the Heritage Foundation has published an "AGENDA" document covering all areas of administration decision making. The chapter of this year's document that covers defense policy explicitly attacks advanced defense research and development, emphasizing a conventional military force buildup and McNamara-type cost-effectiveness approaches to kill advanced defense R&D. Excerpts follow.*

This discussion is undertaken in light of the fact that our military establishment has not adapted to meet the single greatest strategic challenge of our era: the threat of conventional forces that might be used against vital American interests. We cannot today defend Europe conventionally. It is highly doubtful we can today defend Southwest Asia's oil fields conventionally. We are forced to rely on the nuclear threat in an era when we no longer possess, and are not promised, nuclear superiority. . . . The focus of this chapter is, therefore, on conventional forces.

[Within the DOD,] overemphasis on long-shots technology has diverted attention away from the most vital con-

siderations of all: leadership, tactics, and unit structure and training. . . .

Conceptually, DOD must come to realize that simple technology is not the same as primitive technology. . . .

[The document then elaborates peculiar budgetary practices to lower the cost of a conventional buildup by scheduling quantity and multi-year purchases from defense contractors to lower the unit cost of a weapon systems, such as the F-15, to "economic levels."]

Marginal or unpromising programs must be terminated until the newly created margin of budget funds is sufficiently large to increase the production rates of more important programs to economic levels. This last item is critically important. Unless funds are reprogrammed into more urgently needed weapon systems, no unit cost savings will be achieved, the buildup will stall and the situation will worsen. [The document also argues for separating funding for testing of weapons systems from research and development so as to reduce the importance of advanced defense R&D by giving testing "an equal voice."]

## From Aviation Week

*Below are excerpts from a Jan. 17 article in Aviation Week "Reagan Realignment Arms Control Team," by Clarence Robinson.*

The Reagan administration is striving to curtail internecine political rivalries affecting U.S. arms control negotiations with the Soviet Union. . . . The President sought to curb the rivalries last week by forcing the resignation of Eugene V. Rostow, director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency (ACDA).

Rostow's ouster follows similar action against Richard Starr, former chief U.S. negotiator to the Mutual and Balanced Force Reduction (MBFR), and the decision not to renominate Robert Grey as the deputy director of ACDA after his confirmation stalled in the Senate. . . .

A number of factors are affecting U.S. progress in negotiating arms control agreements with the U.S.S.R. They include:

- Assertions that Richard Perle, assistant Defense Secretary for international security policy, is using his position to dominate the negotiating process with the U.S.S.R., taking a position calling for a zero option. . . .

- Complaints that Rostow and Paul Nitze, head of the U.S. delegation to intermediate-range nuclear force negotiations, have probed the Soviet negotiators and European allies for positions less than the zero option.

- Reports that Richard R. Burt, assistant Secretary of State for European Affairs, who will visit Moscow late [in

January], has opened back-channel communications with the Soviets that could be used during his visit to move toward a compromise in reaching an agreement on intermediate range nuclear weapons in Europe. Secretary of State George Shultz is expected to join Burt for the Moscow visit. . . .

"Burt is not freelancing this back channel; it's being done with the concurrence of Secretary of State George Shultz and the knowledge of the National Security Council," one administration official said. "Shultz wants to get arms control and détente with the Soviets in gear."

"Posturing, maneuvering and heated debate between right-wing, hardline factions on arms control and more moderate advocates has reached a pitch, and is forcing direct involvement at the highest levels of the administration," the White House official said.

Those administration officials who favor sticking by the zero option proposed by the President claim that Nitze has violated his instructions in probing the Soviet delegation for further reductions below the recent Andropov initiative and has explored something less than the zero option with allied leaders.

These officials also complain that Rostow during an October visit to Italy, Belgium, Great Britain, and Germany conducted discussions exploring hypothetical moves in negotiations that were less than the zero option.

"The cable traffic on Rostow's moves was incredible," a White House official said.

"Anything less than this position [the zero option] is an effort to undermine the negotiations by the State Department and the arms control community," he said. . . .

Right-wing Republicans in the administration charge that Nitze, Rostow, and Burt are "Europeanists who see that Reagan will not back off the zero option and that it is unlikely that he can be persuaded to alter course. So they have looked to the alliance to bring pressure to bear on the President to back off the zero baseline," one member of this faction said.

Those in the more moderate or liberal camp in the administration claim that Perle, through interagency instructions, which became the official U.S. position in meetings with the U.S.S.R., controls the arms-reduction process and that he does not want an agreement.

## From the Valley Times

*From a Jan. 19 article in the Livermore, California Valley Times newspaper, titled "Possible Shift in Lab Work Assailed," by Keith Rogers:*

Changing the balance of Lawrence Livermore Laboratory emphasis on arms development from nuclear to conventional

would be a "lunatic proposal" and would put the U.S. on a course for nuclear war, the chief of the Fusion Energy Foundation said Tuesday.

Paul Gallagher, Executive Director of the New York-based Fusion Energy Foundation, said that White House science adviser Dr. George Keyworth's comments at Livermore last week about using the "wealth of unparalleled talent" at the lab to strengthen the nation's conventional military posture would be wrong advice to the President at a time when scientists are only five years from a crude approximation of a defensive, high-energy laser weapon system.

"If the United States were to adopt the orientation shift from nuclear to conventional arms . . . the U.S. would be on course to virtually guaranteed nuclear war," Gallagher said.

"Keyworth is a Quaker," Gallagher said of the 43-year-old-director of the President's Office of Science and Technology Policy. "He is consistently wrong in his advice to the president. He is wrong every time. He gets most of his strategic policy documents from the Heritage Foundation [which has] links to the British Socialist Society."

To call for work on conventional weapons development at Lawrence Livermore, Los Alamos, and Sandia National Laboratories, Gallagher added, "wouldn't be anything but a lunatic proposal" since these labs have the country's "premier abilities for developing beam weapons for defense."

Lawrence Livermore is actively exploring the technical qualifications for developing directed, high-energy laser and charged particle beam weapons. An experiment at the Lab's Site 300 in the hills south of the Altamont Pass—the Advanced Test Accelerator will soon begin the first physics test on propagating beams of energetic, subatomic particles through the atmosphere.

In addition, at the advice of director emeritus Dr. Edward Teller, Lawrence Livermore Laboratory is pursuing a laser weapon to be used in outer space. It works on the principle of using nuclear bombs to pump x-rays at strategic Soviet missiles in order to burn or shock these missiles and drive them off course.

Keyworth, in a speech before a packed auditorium of Livermore Lab employees Friday, spoke of the Lab's role in developing this "bomb-pumped x-ray laser" and later told reporters that the project is "one of the most important programs that may seriously influence the nation's defense posture in the next decade."

But despite news accounts by United Press International from a purported Pentagon defense guidance plan that the United States is preparing to wage war in outer space, Gallagher said this is not true. Rather, he said, the U.S. beam weapons thrust could only produce a space weapon with defensive capability, not one with enough punch to launch a first strike attack.

To complicate this work with work on electronic gadgetry for conventional arms, Gallagher said, would be a waste of time that could be spent on developing spin-off applications in biology [and] medicine from laser fusion research.

**EIR Special**  
EXECUTIVE INTELLIGENCE REVIEW  
NOW AVAILABLE

## Special Technical Report

# A BEAM-WEAPONS BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE SYSTEM FOR THE UNITED STATES

by Dr. Steven Bardwell, director of plasma physics for the Fusion Energy Foundation.

### This report includes:

- a scientific and technical analysis of the four major types of beam-weapons for ballistic missile defense, which also specifies the areas of the civilian economy that are crucial to their successful development;
- a detailed comparison of the U.S. and Soviet programs in this field, and an account of the differences in strategic doctrine behind the widening Soviet lead in beam weapons;
- the uses of directed energy beams to transform raw-materials development, industrial materials, and energy production over the next 20 years, and the close connection between each nation's fusion energy development program and its beam weapon potentials;
- the impact a "Manhattan Project" for beam-weapon development would have on military security and the civilian economy.

The 80-page report is available for \$250.  
For more information, contact Robert Gallagher  
or Peter Ennis (212) 247-8820.