

the Eastern Rite, which spilled over into Western Europe (chiefly) through the Byzantine colonies at Venice and (later) Genoa, and is concentrated today in the monastery at Mount Athos, Greece. It was from Mount Athos that the concoction of the "Third Rome" cult was spread throughout the credulous of Russia during the 16th century.

The Russian version of Gnosticism is grafted onto the old Phrygian cult of Dionysos, the cultural root of endemic Russian nihilism. This cult is based on the worship of the "earth goddess," the "Great Mother," and on the sacredness of her soil and of the blood of the people to whom she has given that soil. Like the Nazi doctrine, and the plan for a Nazi world-empire of a ruling German race, hegemonic over the semi-autonomous regions of each subordinate race, the Russian Gnostic cult is savagely racist—or, in present-day counter-intelligence lexicons, "integrist." Hence, the Soviet love-hate relationship to Islamic fundamentalism and its current practitioners.

Although contrary, "Westernizing," rationalist tendencies and currents, exist within the Soviet population and within the ruling triad of state power, it has been the "Third Rome" impulse which has been insurgent within Soviet foreign-policy and related matters since Khrushchev. It was sufficiently conspicuous of *EIR's* intelligence functions, back during 1972, that we published an assessment of détente, characterizing the Soviet thrust of foreign-policy as one which could be described as a "New Constantinople" perspective.

As we have written, describing the resulting situation, in another location, the three-way relationship among the United

States, its British "ally," and Moscow, creates a spectacle in which the United States is given the role of the Queen on a giant, world-wide chess-board. The United States is the White Queen, being played by a two-man team of British and Swiss oligarchies, with a Venetian kibbitzer actually orchestrating the team's play. On the opposing side, is the Andropov-Pimen-Aliev team from the Soviet KGB. In the effort to beat the Russian team, the White team is attempting to trap the Red team by gambitting the White Queen. The Red team is reaching to make a move accepting the gambit.

We are approaching the end-game of Bertrand Russell's WAPWG and Pugwash projects. Both players are determined to destroy the United States; but, which team, White or Red, will check the other's King? Which, White or Red, will seize the prize of a world-federalist government?

This is the essence of Khrushchev's play against President Kennedy, at Vienna, in the Berlin crisis, and in Khrushchev's orchestration of the events of spring, summer, and fall 1962, forcing the President into the Cuba Missile-Crisis. That is Andropov's launching of his replay of the Cuba-Missiles-Crisis tactic from as soon as he occupied his present office. These are only important "plays." To understand the "plays," one must know what game is being played. To understand nuclear deterrence, and the "environmentalist" policy of turning the United States into the impotent wreckage of a "post-industrial society," one must understand the "great game" which was set into motion by Bertrand Russell's item, published in the October 1946 *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists*.

Part I: The Pugwash Papers

Kissinger imperiled U.S. national security: suppressed evidence on Soviet E-beam program

by L. Talionis

As outlined in an extraordinary evidentiary document submitted on April 8 by NDPC Advisory Board Chairman Lyndon Hermyle LaRouche, Jr. to Vice-President Bush and members of the Senate, former National Security Adviser Henry A. Kissinger acted together with Soviet and British government officials during 1960-72, and most specifically during the 1969-72 SALT I negotiations, to suppress factual intelligence in his possession on U.S.S.R. strategic defense commitments of a nature most vital to U.S. national security.

The evidentiary document contains the initial substantive results of a security investigation launched at the request of Mr. LaRouche three weeks before President Reagan's his-

toric repudiation on March 23 of three decades of U.S. "Mutually Assured Destruction" posture, in favor of a beam-weapons-based strategic doctrine of *Mutually Assured Survival*.

According to rapidly accumulating hard evidence brought to light, Henry Kissinger and close allies in the U.S. policy advisory community acted in collusion with Soviet and British political, military, science, and intelligence circles to keep former President Richard M. Nixon in total ignorance of most substantive indications of *firm Soviet commitments to develop strategic defense laser and related directed-beam weapons: systems not only not proscribed by the disastrous*



Leonid Brezhnev and Henry Kissinger in 1974 in Moscow.

"Treaty on the Limitation of Anti-Ballistic Missile Systems" signed in Moscow by Richard Nixon and Leonid Brezhnev on May 26, 1972, *but carefully kept outside that treaty's textual framework* by Henry Kissinger, Soviet Ambassador to Washington Anatoly Dobrynin, Soviet Chief Negotiator at SALT Vladimir Semenov, and such U.S. SALT negotiators as Gerard C. Smith, Raymond L. Garthoff, Paul Nitze, Wolfgang Panofsky, et al.

Henry Kissinger, as former President Nixon's Director of the National Security Council, was eminently positioned to have informed the President of the Soviet beam-weapons effort, accumulating evidence of which had been in Kissinger's possession since not later than 1962. Yet, in arrogant contempt of the oath he swore to uphold the Constitution of the United States upon his naturalization as an American citizen in 1943, Kissinger chose, or was instructed by outside agencies, to withhold such vital evidence. Nor, in his previous 1959-68 top-security attachment as expert adviser to the Weapons Systems Evaluations Group of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the National Security Council, the Department of State, and to the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency (ACDA), did Kissinger act to alert Presidents Kennedy or Johnson.

In the following, I shall report in some detail such findings as have been carefully examined and validated in now intensified investigations, leaving more recent findings from documents and private discussions, currently subject to verification in North America, Great Britain, and continental Europe, to be reported on at a later date.

I. Sokolovskii and U.S.S.R. beam-weapons policy

For the overwhelming majority of Western military strategists, who still foolishly cling to the delusion that the U.S.-NATO doctrine of mutual nuclear deterrence (Mutually Assured Destruction—MAD) was ever allowed to figure prominently within the framework of four postwar decades of unrelenting Soviet *war-winning* military-strategic posture for

conditions of general thermonuclear war, a careful reading of Soviet Marshal V. D. Sokolovskii's superior *Military Strategy*, first published in Moscow in 1962, should serve to dispel such delusions most rapidly.

This outstanding document of general military-strategic policy, the first of its kind to be published in the Soviet Union in more than three and a half decades since Aleksandr A. Svechin's 1926 *Strategy*, is also the first hard indication available in the U.S. public domain of a firm Soviet commitment to soonest-possible deployment of "total defense" beam-weapons technologies.

In a chapter on "Methods of Conducting Warfare," in the 1962, 1963, and 1968 editions of Sokolovskii's text, our attention is drawn to the following two paragraphs:

In our country the problem of eliminating rockets in flight has been successfully solved by Soviet Science and technology. Thus the task of warding off strikes of enemy missiles has become quite possible.

It is interesting to note that the problem of anti-missile defense is far from being solved in the West. The United States has developed the "Nike-Zeus" and "Wizard" systems . . . for the direct encounter between a missile and an antimissile missile. . . . Work is being conducted on the use of space means (anti-rocket "screening" systems).¹

Following which, the 1962 and 1963 editions jar the reader with this third paragraph:

Possibilities are being studied for the use, against rockets, of a stream of high-speed neutrons as small detonators for the nuclear charge of the rocket, *and the use of electromagnetic energy to destroy the rocket charge in the descent phase of the trajectory or to deflect it from its target. Various radiation, antigravity, and antimatter systems, plasma (ball lightning), etc., are also being studied as a means of destroying rockets. Special attention is devoted to lasers ("death rays"); it is considered that in the future, any missile and satellite can be destroyed with powerful lasers.*²

This third, startling paragraph is deleted in its entirety from the third, 1968 edition of *Military Strategy*!

Certainly, neither Henry Kissinger nor any of his fellow travelers in the U.S. advisory community may claim ignorance of the 1962 edition, or of the telltale omissions of the 1968 edition. Within one year of the appearance of the original Soviet, 1962 edition, two English-language editions of *Military Strategy* were published in the United States.³ One of these, appearing simultaneously in London and New York in 1963, was translated and furnished with an introduction by *Raymond L. Garthoff*—the SALT I delegation's executive secretary during 1969-72, and its leading expert on Soviet weapons systems!

Nor did Kissinger have to wait for the Stanford Research Institute's publication in 1975 of Harriet Fast Scott's meticulously annotated and cross-referenced translation of the third edition of *Military Strategy* in order to discover the

highly significant discrepancies in content between it and the 1962 and 1963 editions. Scott's original translation of the 1968 edition was published the very same year by the Foreign Technology Division of the U.S. Air Force Systems Command.⁴

edition of the Sokolovskii text is, incidentally, a most interesting political intelligence footnote to the period immediately preceding the 1972 ABM Treaty.⁵

1968 was a very busy year

It would be a serious error to infer from the Soviet leadership's decision to delete any reference to directed-beam-weapons systems from the much-delayed publication of the third, 1968 Moscow edition—following Leonid Brezhnev's and the Soviet General Staff's consolidation of power during and after the April 1966, XXIII Party Congress—that the U.S.S.R. had abandoned development of an antiballistic-missile beam-weapons defense as unrealistic. That would, of course, be the attempted thumb-nose line of argument with proponents of the "Star Wars" variety of response to President Reagan's March 23 decision to develop such systems, as Henry Kissinger, or George Ball (whose "advisers in Houston tell me beam weapons are unrealistic"), have repeatedly attempted of late.

Anyone seriously entertaining such wishful notions is urgently advised to focus a moment's attention on two parallel developments occurring as the "purified" 1968 edition of *Military Strategy* had begun appearing on the shelves of Moscow's bookstores.

The first of these developments is the publication in Moscow of N. Sobolev's *Lasers and Their Future*, which, complete with a detailed diagram, provides an in-depth description of the function of ABM laser-defense systems:

To destroy an enemy missile, not to let it reach the target, it is sufficient to put its control system out of action. This can be done by burning through the missile shell or rudders by a laser beam. This will cause vibrations in the missile and result in its complete destruction.

. . . Such a system must have a receiving unit for processing the signals incoming from the early warning and target tracking radar stations. . . . The tracking station must aim at the target an optical radar in which a laser serves only for determining the distance to the missile.

Such an optical radar can furnish very precise data on the coordinates of the target, and these data are used to actuate another system employing a high-power laser, designed for destroying the target . . . at the most vulnerable point of the missile during a period of time required for a hole to be burnt through the missile. . . .⁶

"Another possible anti-missile laser defense system," continues Sobolev, is an "orbital space station equipped with

target detecting and tracking radars, as well as with lasers"—and leaves it at that.

The Sobolev text was first published in Moscow in 1968, and was translated into German to appear in 1972 in Leipzig, East Germany. Finally, in 1974, the Russians obligingly published an English-language edition through the Moscow Mir publishing house.

In the autumn of the same year which marked the appearance of the Sokolovskii and Sobolev texts, the U.S.S.R. successfully tested an orbital satellite beam-weapon device, according to the U.S. *Satellite Situation Report* of mid-April 1969.

According to that report, three space vehicles—Cosmos satellites 248, 249, and 252—were launched from the Soviet Tyuratam Space Center between October 19 and November 1, 1968. Once Cosmos 248 had achieved orbit, Cosmos 249 and 252 were launched in pursuit. Some 300 miles above earth, as the two chasing satellites were closing in on the third, they suddenly exploded into fragments, while Cosmos 248 continued its trajectory unharmed. According to the *Satellite Situation Report*, the twin explosions destroying Cosmos 249 and 252 were non-nuclear.⁷

This orbital directed-beam test took place close to four years before ratification of the 1972 ABM Treaty! Again, Kissinger and his associates cannot claim to have been unable to add the hard evidence of this alarming episode to their already existing knowledge of such ongoing Soviet beam-weapons R&D and deployment. Apart from the fact that such official reports were made available to Kissinger's National Security Council as a matter of priority, the *Satellite Situation Report* of the Cosmos incident cited above was also referenced in detail in a campaign booklet, *U.S.S.R. vs. U.S.A.—The ABM and the Changed Strategic Military Balance*, published in May of 1969 by the American Security Council, in an admittedly somewhat weak-kneed effort to sway American public opinion in favor of deploying the modified ABM "Safeguard" system.

U.S. doctrinal ignorance

It is important to bear in mind, and vital for Western military strategists to understand, that the Sokolovskii Doctrine was from its inception, and firmly remains today, official Soviet military-strategic policy, and unrelentingly so. As such, it was very much subject to the undivided attention of the new Soviet leadership emerging under Leonid Brezhnev during especially the late 1964 to 1970-72 period of power consolidation in the Kremlin. This advanced conception of modern war-winning strategy, shaped under the leadership of Marshal Sokolovskii in collaboration with such leading strategists as Cherednichenko, Gastilovich, Prokhorov, Zavalov, et al., was to a great extent developed in direct opposition to the dangerous MAD overtures made by Nikita Khrushchev and his Deputy Premier Anastas Mikoyan, among others, during and in the years following the XX Party Congress in 1956.

That is not to say that the U.S.S.R. adopted formally the MAD concept of Mutual Deterrence under the Khrushchev regime. But Khrushchev and a number of his fellow anti-Stalinist allies did come very close to adopting crucial aspects of this doctrine, or the Cuban venture would not have been undertaken. It was Khrushchev's failure to adhere to the traditionalist outlook soon to be known as the Sokolovskii Doctrine, culminating in his MAD-tainted, grossly miscalculated, 1962 Cuban brinkmanship venture, which above all toppled him in October of 1964. As Lyndon LaRouche has urgently stressed, former KGB Chief Yuri Andropov is currently attempting to stage a new "Cuban" crisis through the recent Swedish-Norwegian submarine incident and related developments in the North Sea and the Middle East, in an effort to force a MAD-reflecting confrontation with President Reagan from which the President is meant to back down.

It was on the basis of a clear commitment to the Sokolovskii Doctrine that Leonid Brezhnev came to power, carried on the shoulders of the Soviet General Staff. To imagine that Andropov's current geopolitical contortions represent a change from this unwavering commitment "is to show utter ignorance of the Soviet system and Soviet world-outlook," as LaRouche emphasized in a recent article in *EIR* on what the coming U.S.-U.S.S.R. "missile crisis" negotiations look like in the light of President Reagan's new strategic doctrine of Mutually Assured Survival. "The Soviet Union did make significant adjustments in strategic doctrine," states LaRouche. However:

They did not dump Sokolovskii's doctrine; they modified its application to the new political, scientific, and economic trends which erupted clearly in the West beginning with President Johnson's launching of his "Great Society"; we began tearing down the scientific research capabilities of the United States and our allies; we began transforming our nations into the pathetic rubble of "post-industrial society." If the Soviet Union could but wait out our work of destroying ourselves from within, perhaps by the 1990s, the Soviet Union would emerge as the world's single, unchallengeable strategic power by default.⁸

This Soviet "waiting-game strategy," Mr. LaRouche points out, "demanded three critical elements: 1) Preparing militarily for the possibility that we might throw a thermonuclear strategic salvo; 2) Doing nothing to alarm us into dumping MAD and our post-industrial policies; 3) Doing everything possible in the way of arms-control institutions and decoupling Europe from the United States, to ensure that we slipped peacefully past the point of no return. . . ."⁹

This is what Western leaders and strategists must seek to grasp. And the fact, as LaRouche has repeatedly emphasized since President Reagan's invocation of the Mutually Assured Survival doctrine, that:

Now, with the President's declaration of March 23, the world strategic situation has been changed

fundamentally and irreversibly. The new U.S. strategic doctrine is operational, unstoppable, and irreversible.

. . . This means a crisis in Soviet Strategic doctrine. It does not change Sokolovskii. Nor does it resurrect Sokolovskii; Sokolovskii never died. Rather, it unmasks Sokolovskii; it removes the disguise.¹⁰

The problem is thus not the hardnosed, traditionalist outlook characterizing Soviet war-winning posture for conditions of general thermonuclear war—rejecting, while exploiting fully, mutual deterrence as something the "crazy capitalist lemmings" invented towards their own downfall—but the vitally complete lack of understanding, or even knowledge, among the majority of Western political leaders and military strategists of the conceptual foundation of such a doctrinal outlook. Without that insight, they are not going to grasp the deeper political-economic implications of the President's doctrine of Mutually Assured Survival, and much less know-how to advance it successfully.

The kernel of the problem, as an editor of translations of selected Soviet writings on military thought, published by the U.S. Air Force, is compelled to admit, is that: "In the Western world the concept 'theoretical foundation of military thought' probably would have little meaning. At best, the subject would hardly warrant a one-hour lecture at a senior war college. There would not likely be a common basis from which the subject could be discussed."¹¹

It is into this postwar vacuum in U.S. strategic outlook that a number of British and Anglo-Soviet institutions seeking to subvert and destroy our scientific tradition introduce Henry Kissinger.

II. Pugwash and the subversion of U.S. national security

In July of 1968, 27 scientists, legal experts and policy advisers from a number of Western and East bloc countries gather in the small Danish village of Krogerup north of Copenhagen. The occasion is the **Third Pugwash Symposium** convened to assess "The Implications of Anti-Ballistic Missile Systems".

Among the participants gathered at this private, by-invitation-only meeting are: **J. Rotblat**, Secretary General of the **Pugwash Conferences on Science and World Affairs** and University of London physics professor; **C. Frank Barnaby**, Pugwash executive secretary and subsequently the 1971-81 director of the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI); MIT's **Bernard T. Feld**, chairman since 1963 of the U.S. Committee on Pugwash and one of the most vocal actors in the deception game staged immediately following conclusion of the Moscow ABM Treaty; and **George W. Rathjens** of MIT and the Council of Foreign Relations, former deputy assistant director of ACDA and later special assistant to its director, 1962-65, and Director during 1965-68 of the Weapons Systems Evaluation Division of the Institute for Defense Analyses.

U.S.S.R. Academy of Sciences were also present. They were **I. V. Milovidov, I. G. Pochitalin, and A. P. Vinogradov.**

In a lengthy keynote speech on the development and characteristics of ABM systems, Frank Barnaby, formerly a physicist with the United Kingdom Atomic Energy Authority, outlines a number of interesting "Methods of ICBM Destruction" other than missile-to-missile systems:

There have been speculations that the Soviet Union is developing some kind of "shield" anti-missile system. *Alternatives to a plasma of charged particles that have been suggested for defence screens include small pellets and gases. The future use of lasers for ABM systems is another possibility* if it becomes feasible to project sufficiently large fluxes of radiation over great distances. Methods of destroying an opponent's offensive missiles during the very early phase of their trajectories, for example during the boost phase, have been suggested.¹²

Two years later, George Rathjens and B. T. Feld will reappear as organizers of the **Tenth Pugwash Symposium** in June, 1970, at "Wingspread," Racine, Wisconsin. The subject: "Impact of New Technologies on the Arms Race." Two other arms control veterans help organize the symposium. One is **Franklin A. Long**, of the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation (together with the Johnson Foundation and the American Academy of Arts and Sciences a sponsor of the meeting) and the Council on Foreign Relations, a 1961-66

member of the President's Science Advisory Committee and assistant director of ACDA during 1962-63 as well as Director of the Arms Control Association 1971-76. The other is **Steven Weinberg** of Harvard and the Council on Foreign Relations, who did postgraduate work under Taoist disciple Niels Bohr at the Copenhagen Institute for Theoretical Physics in 1954-55 and was destroyed as a scientist as a result. He was a consultant to the Institute for Defense Analyses 1960-73, and for ACDA 1970-73.

Among other twilight advisers we find Harvard's **Abram Chayes**, a trainee from the Washington law firm of Covington and Burling, member of the Brookings Institution, 1961-64 adviser to the State Department, and co-editor with Jerome B. Wiesner of *ABM—An Evaluation of the Decision to Deploy an Antiballistic Missile System* (published in 1969), a collection of essays of the "Popular Mechanics" variety pulled together at the request of Sen. Edward Kennedy, who circulated it as part of his crusade against the deployment of an anti-missile defense system for the United States; **George B. Kistiakowsky** of Harvard and the British Royal Society, Special Assistant for Science and Technology to President Eisenhower, and member 1957-63 of the President's Science Advisory Committee; MIT's **Jack P. Ruina**, 1963-65 president of the Institute for Defense Analyses, and Director of the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency 1962-63; plasma physicist **Bruno Brunelli** of the Italian Laboratory of Gas Ionization; Soviet Pugwash veteran **Vasilii Yemelyanov** of the U.S.S.R. Academy of Sciences'

Emergency Conferences

Sponsored by the National Democratic Policy Committee Stop the Kissinger-Harriman Missile Crisis: Build the World with Beam Technologies

A series of emergency public policy meetings to inform the U.S. population on the strategic military and economic crisis the nation faces. Only through a World War II-style mobilization of the population and the economic resources of the United States can both crises be reversed. The development of defensive directed-energy weapons will revolutionize the capital goods and metals processing sectors of the economy, opening the only path by which the United States can lead an international recovery from the current depression.

Partial Schedule of Events

Dallas-Ft. Worth.....	June 10	San Francisco.....	June 16
Philadelphia	June 11	Los Angeles	June 17
Houston	June 11	New York City	June 18
Buffalo, New York.....	June 11	Cleveland	June 21
New Haven, Connecticut	June 11	Pittsburgh	June 22
Seattle.....	June 15	Denver	June 24
Concord, New Hampshire	June 15	Orlando, Florida.....	June 24
New Orleans.....	June 16	Washington, D.C.....	June 30

For more information, call (202) 223-8300 or (212) 247-8820.

Disarmament Commission; and Soviet physicists **Roald Sagdeev** and **Vyacheslav Seychev**, to name but a few.

During the "Wingspread" symposium, Brunelli exchanges views with Sagdeev and Seychev in some detail on the subject of the potential military applications of such pure fusion triggers as high-powered lasers, high-velocity macroscopic particles, and intense relativistic electron beams.¹³ Seychev will delve into the subject of magnetohydrodynamic (MHD) systems as a compact source of electrical energy adequate to trigger plasma reactions, and adds:

These special advantages make the MHD generator attractive for military applications. There have been some publications about military applications of MHD generators both for tactical aims and for strategic aims (for jamming radars and other things).¹⁴

In the "Summary of Discussion" conducted by the three physicists in the published version of this symposium, it is stated in conclusion that "Lasers or electron beams of high enough power to ignite a fusion reaction could conceivably be used as weapons in their own right."¹⁵

To suggest that the evidence of Soviet R&D and deployment of directed-beam weapons amassed so far here, and discussed repeatedly among officials and consultants of ACDA, was not available, to Henry Kissinger and other presidential advisers in connection with the negotiations leading to the 1972 ABM Treaty, is totally beyond credibility. Just how much beyond credibility, we shall learn shortly.

Russell

In October 1946, the contemptible Bertrand Russell, father of today's so-called peace movement, wrote an article in the *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists*¹⁶ advocating the creation of a totalitarian world government "to preserve peace," equipped with absolute powers over international trade and economic policy, and possessing the "monopoly of armed force" to police individual nations deprived of their national sovereignty:

When I speak of an international government, I mean one that really governs, not an amiable façade like the League of Nations or a pretentious sham like the United Nations under its present constitution. An international government . . . must have the only atomic bombs, the only plant for producing them, the only air force, the only battleships, and, generally, whatever is necessary to make it irresistible.

In this world-federalist Fourth-Reich army, Russell insists, "there must be no possibility of the development of national feeling," so each of its members "should be carefully trained in loyalty to the international government." It must also be equipped with a "large army of inspectors who must have the right to enter any factory without notice; any attempt to interfere with them . . . must be treated as a *casus*

belli." To Russell,

The monopoly of armed force is the most necessary attribute of the international government, but it will, of course, have to exercise various governmental functions . . . to decide all disputes between different nations, and will have to possess the right to revise treaties. It will have to be bound by its constitution to intervene by force of arms against any nation that refuses to submit to arbitration.

This murderous hominid then calls upon the United States to use its nuclear arsenal to wipe out the Soviet Union before that country developed a nuclear-strike capability of its own (thanks in large part to a group of British SIS scientist-operatives active in the United States and Canada, the Russians soon did). Russell magnanimously offered the U.S.S.R. a reprieve provided they accept his totalitarian world government. "If Russia acquiesce willingly," he writes, "all would be well. If not, it would be necessary to bring pressure to bear, even to the extent of risking war."

All of which, he sanctimoniously insists, in the name of "ending great wars."

The jesuitical duplicity behind this oligarchical lunatic's professed desire to end "great wars" is revolting. What Bertrand Russell wanted to end was modern civilization and its monumental progress through science. Like so many of his British peers, Russell hated both. His only interest in the question of war or not war concerned *the efficacy of war as an instrument of genocide and, through this, the ultimate destruction of science!* But he had become somewhat pessimistic as to whether this could be accomplished on an adequate scale through traditional warfare. Clearly, to his taste, World War II had not succeeded in eliminating a sufficient number of human beings—as he was to admit in 1951 in his deranged work entitled *The Impact of Science on Society*:

War has hitherto been disappointing in this respect . . . but perhaps bacteriological war may prove effective. If a Black Death could spread throughout the world once in every generation, survivors could procreate freely without making the world too full. The state of affairs might be unpleasant, but what of it?¹⁷

Since the British geopolitical design of having Russia radioactively obliterated by a ferocious Fortress America—which would, in turn, bleed itself morally and scientifically to death as a result—had failed, a different, longer-term strategy was required. If the Soviet development of a nuclear-strike capability could now be speeded up, it was reasoned, Britain could become the trigger controlling the actions of both superpowers, leading each and the world at large along the brink of nuclear Armageddon. To that end, British spies Klaus Fuchs (a member of the British atomic energy mission to the United States during 1943-46, and a principal participant in the Manhattan Project), Nunn May,

Donald Maclean, et al., assisted in passing on American military secrets, including nuclear-bomb designs, to Moscow.

Hence, by developing a nuclear arsenal of its own, Britain hoped to be able to hold the United States hostage to the continuing threat of a limited British unidentified (submarine-launched) nuclear attack on the U.S.S.R.—unleashing a full-scale Soviet nuclear attack on the United States in return. Leading Labour politician Denis Healy in 1964 identified this piece of insanity to be standing British policy. Then Prime Minister Alec Douglas-Home, he stated, insisted that “you must have atomic weapons in order to be able to trigger off the American Strategic Air Command against the will of the American Government.”¹⁸

It was intended then, as it still is now, that by committing the “dumb American giant” to a MAD-based offensive arms race with the Soviets, compelling it to allocate growing portions of its economy—i.e., its capital-formation base, its R&D capabilities and its scientists, technicians, and work force—to that effect, other vital areas of the economy, and by implication continued progress in science and technology, would suffer proportionately.

This is why the British became so active beginning in the early 1960s in trying at all cost to kill the deployment of a U.S. antiballistic-missile defense (later assisted in this endeavor by Moscow, for reasons which ought to be entirely obvious in light of what has been reported above). It is why London and Moscow continue vehemently, aided by such Trilateral Commissars as Kissinger, Brzezinski, and Gerard Smith, to oppose President Reagan’s “total defense” doctrine of Mutually Assured Survival. If the President yields to containment in this area of the Trilateral and Scowcroft Commissions variety, continued MAD posturing will shortly send civilization into the abyss of thermonuclear annihilation. If not, with the deployment of a superior, multi-layer beam-defense system rendering nuclear and thermonuclear missiles harmless, MAD ceases to be operational, and with it four decades of British nuclear brinkmanship, as the United States launches a new technological revolution.

The horror of Pugwash

As an integral part of an all-out subversive attack on the centers of science and education in the United States in particular, London and Moscow will join hands in a special venture developed out of Bertrand Russell’s call on scientists of the world to unite in what will be a bogus campaign against nuclear war. A campaign designed from its inception to guarantee the continued existence of nuclear arms to hold mankind in the grip of nuclear terror: the *Pugwash Conferences on Science and World Affairs*.

With the so-called Russell-Einstein “Appeal for the Abolition of War” of July 1955 (which Russell wrote singlehandedly; along with other scientists, Einstein merely initialed it shortly before his death), a convenient “letter of credentials” was presented to the world. The forum used to launch this venture in its first phase is, predictably, the World Associa-

tion of Parliamentarians for World Government (WAPWG) which, at Russell’s behest, will sponsor an international conference for scientists held in London, August 3-5, 1955. To the “complete surprise” of those attending the event (only a handful are in fact scientists), Moscow, which had bitterly opposed and criticized the WAPWG at every given opportunity in the past, will hurriedly dispatch a four-man delegation—two members of which will become co-founders of the Pugwash front two years later.

With the necessary lines of communication set up, the founding conference is convened July 6-11, 1957 in the small town of Pugwash (owned by Canadian-born American businessman Cyrus Eaton who had converted it into a conference center) in Nova Scotia, Canada. Among the 22 co-founders participating, are: **Paul Doty**, Harvard, former chairman of the American Federation of Scientists; **Eugene Rabinowitch**, co-founder of the radical, anti-nuclear-energy *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists*, University of Illinois; **Brock Chisholm** of Canada, co-inventor together with the Tavistock Institute and eugenicist Julian Huxley in 1948 of the World Health Organization, co-founder of the 1970 Pugwash division for eugenics and population reduction, World Academy of Art and Science (WAAS); eugenicist and Nobel Laureate **Herman J. Muller** of the University of Texas and of the British Royal Society, former vice-president of the WAAS; **J. Rotblat**, former executive vice-president of the British Atomic Scientists Union, longstanding member of the Pugwash Council and its Executive Committee; Atoms for Peace award-winner and limited-nuclear-war advocate **Leo Szilard** of the University of Chicago.

Participants from the U.S.S.R. are Academicians **D. V. Skobeltsyn**, a pioneer in cosmic-ray research; **A. M. Kuzin**; and **A. V. Topchiyev**. Of these, Kuzin and Topchiyev also participated in the August 1955 conference of the world-federalist WAPWG outfit.

Nuclear population control

Co-founding Pugwash member and nuclear physicist Leo Szilard will quickly move to set the general tenor of the Pugwash campaign to abolish war. Already the following year, at the 2nd, March 1958, Pugwash Conference held at Quebec’s Lac Beauport, Canada, he will make an impassioned plea in the name of peace for a *Soviet-American nuclear arms race* built up to a level of mutual deterrence acceptable to both powers as an instrument of “metastable” tension! In a paper read at the conference, “How to Live with the Bomb—and Survive,”¹⁹ Szilard insists that this represents “an expedient—even though morally unacceptable—‘deterrent.’” Not in the least perturbed by the total absence of morality in this outlook, he expresses the hope lately peddled by **Kissinger Associates** director Lord Carrington, that “when this long-range rocket stage is reached . . . it is conceivable that America and Russia may be able to go one step further, that they may be able to agree on a revision of the map. . . .”

Compelled to pursue the unhinged logic of MAD, Szilard

outlines a Kissingerian scenario in which the “metastable tension” of MAD must periodically find a “controlled” outlet in the form of “limited nuclear wars.” That is to say, in the case of a regional conflict, “America, in order to live up to her commitments . . . may use small atomic bombs there against troops in combat.” Realizing that a Soviet nuclear response may not “limit” itself to this local event, escalating instead to a general thermonuclear launch, Szilard pleads for a mutual “contract” according to which the Soviet Union could instead respond by

. . . demolishing—if need be—a specified number of cities, which have received adequate warning to permit their orderly evacuation. This would then represent a novel method for “exacting a price” which might be quite appropriate. . . .

As a complementary facet in this lurid approach to nuclear war, Szilard suggests that it might be convenient “to have a catalogue, giving the number of inhabitants for all Russian as well as American cities . . . acknowledged as valid by both nations.”

In reviewing what must be the most homicidal approach to the prevention of war, the reader may well ask what in God’s name is going on here! Charles Darwin’s equally demented grandson, the eugenicist Sir Charles Darwin, provides a chilling indication of the true purpose of Pugwash.

In a paper on “Population Problems”²⁰ presented at the conference, Darwin complains that employing “a war of the old kind” to reduce the world’s population count “would be entirely ineffective.” The prospect of using a nuclear war to achieve the direct effect of cutting the world population in half is much more attractive, but he is worried about what it will do to the world economy!

An atomic war would of course be different, but in my view, its direct effect would not be nearly so important as its indirect effects, for these would mean the ruin of the world’s economics. . . . It would only take 50 years to double the population again up to its present value, and then it would all have to be done over again.

Darwin is forced to settle for the combined effects of famine and birth control as what he considers to be a semi-effective interim solution. As for birth control, he laments, “it seems to me really dreadful how little study is being given to the subject—*contrasted for example with the incomparably less important subject of cancer*”!

Is this what mankind may expect from the representatives of science? Is this what science is all about?

These ophidian forms of life, raised in one of nature’s more vicious moments to a two-legged parody of man, are not scientists! They are the demented worshippers of the evil Parson Malthus, fanatics sworn to the destruction of science. They represent all that the American Republic was founded to crush.

III. Kissinger, Pugwash, and the Big Lie

As is already clear from the evidence presented so far, a large number of leading advisors to the U.S. government during particularly 1960-72 were, or still are, members of the Pugwash operation with its proven Anglo-Soviet intelligence interface. As a direct, intended result of the combined acts of treason of these presidential advisers, United States national security was decisively, perilously subverted, along with areas of development in science and technology absolutely vital to man’s continued existence.

Nobel Peace Prize Laureate Dr. Kissinger may not claim exception to this rule of proven service to the enemies of the United States of America. He, too, was a bona fide member of Pugwash and a highly active participant at Pugwash conferences from 1961 to 1966! And during this time, he was simultaneously attached, as indicated, to the NSC, ACDA, the JCS Weapons Systems Evaluations Group, and the Department of State! From 1966 to 1969, when his appointment as National Security Adviser to President Nixon forced him to cover up his complicity in these operations, Kissinger also served on the Science Committee of SIPRI—the **Stockholm International Peace Research Institute** created in 1966 by Pugwash in close collaboration with former Swedish Social Democratic Prime Minister **Tage Erlander**, former Minister of Foreign Affairs **Karin Söder**, and former members of the World Academy of Art and Science, Pugwash’s 1960-70 eugenics and population reduction branch, **Alva and Gunnar Myrdal**.

The most significant among the Pugwash conferences attended by Kissinger are:

● **The 9th Pugwash Conference, Cambridge, England, Aug. 25-30, 1962:** during which Kissinger chaired **Working Group II** on the “Problems of Balanced Reduction and Elimination of Conventional Armaments,” a panel including such Soviet representatives as V. A. Kargin, N. N. Bogolyubov, S. G. T. Korneyev, and General Major Nikolai Talenskii, of the Soviet Academy of Sciences.

● **The 11th Pugwash Conference, Dubrovnik, Yugoslavia, Sept. 20-25, 1963:** at which the anti-ABM campaign is launched at the recommendation of **Working Group I** counting such panelists as B. T. Feld, Franklin Long, and a Soviet team consisting of A. A. Blagonravov, V. M. Khvostov, V. A. Kirillin, V. P. Pavlichenko, General Major Talenskii, and A. N. Tupolev.

Kissinger participated in **Working Group III** on “Denuclearized Zones, Especially in Central Europe and the Balkans” together with Bogolyubov, and the deranged Leo Szilard. Within the context of advocating “denuclearized zones in Europe”, Kissinger and the other panelists will call for a “nuclear freeze”! Another panelist is Leopold Infeld, the nuclear physicist who defected from Canada to Poland.

● **The 13th Pugwash Conference, Karlovy Vary, Czechoslovakia, Sept. 13-19, 1964:** where the call for a “nuclear freeze” and “denuclearized zones,” this time also in

Scandinavia, was reiterated by **Working Group I** with Kissinger, Talenskii, P. V. Andreyev of the Soviet intelligence think tank IMEMO (Institute for World Economics and International Relations), and, once again, Poland's Leopold Infeld.

• **The 16th Pugwash Conference, Sopot, Poland, Sept. 11-16, 1966:** where Kissinger participated in **Working Group II** on "The Reduction of Tension and Political Settlements in Europe" together with Leopold Infeld, and Soviet panelists V. A. Kargin and V. M. Khvostov.

The recommendations of this panel are most indicative, as they include: "The reunification of Germany was accepted by all members of the group as a necessary part of any lasting system of security in Europe. . . ."—a proposal tantamount to a revival of the 1950s Rapacki-Gomulka Plan forwarded as an attempt to decouple the Federal Republic of Germany from the Atlantic Alliance.

(A later frequent participant at Pugwash conferences, symposia, and workshops is the Soviet Union's Georgi Arbatov of the U.S.-Canada Institute, a personal friend of Henry Kissinger, who recently took part in a Dartmouth conference closed task force meeting in April of this year with Pugwash members professor General Mikhail Milshstein and Harvard's Paul Doty, among others.)

Indecent exposure at Oxford

It is not merely today that many of the advisers, then advising President Nixon on matters of defense during SALT

I, belatedly make the fraudulent claim that directed-beam weapons (when not foolishly insisting such systems can never be made operational, anyway) are banned by the ABM Treaty in the form they or their friends contrived to give it in 1972. They made such claims then, too—once that treaty had become legally binding to the signatories, that is. Or had it?

Having succeeded in 1972 in committing the United States to a no-defense course of increasing unilateral vulnerability, there remained for these Pugwash Malthusians the task of fabricating the final Big Lie to cover up the fraud committed at Moscow.

At the 22nd Pugwash Conference held at Oxford in September of 1972, some three months after the treaty has been signed at Moscow, the old arms control hands meet again to congratulate each other: B. T. Feld, Paul Doty, and Kistiaowski are there. So are Franklin Long, Rathjens Jack Ruina, and Barnaby of SIPRI; along with former presidential advisers **Richard Garwin** of the Council on Foreign Relations and on the Defense Science Board 1966-69; **Herbert York** of ACDA's General Advisory Committee 1962-69 and leading member of the President's Science Advisory Committee 1964-68; and the current President of the Arms Control Association, **Herbert Scoville, Jr.**, who worked with ACDA during 1963-73, and before that was a Deputy Director of Science and Technology at the CIA during 1955-63.

In the afternoon of the first day of the conference, after Soviet Academician M. D. Millionshchikov and a certain gentleman from Moscow by the name of V. S. Yemelyanov

EXECUTIVE INTELLIGENCE REVIEW

Special Technical Report

BEAM WEAPONS: THE SCIENCE TO PREVENT NUCLEAR WAR

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 report is available for \$250. Order #82007
For more information, contact William Engdahl
or Peter Ennis, EIR special services,
(212) 247-8820.

have gleefully reported the rave reviews given the ABM performance in Moscow by the Western press, Bernard Feld takes the podium to speak on "The Contribution of Pugwash to Disarmament." Here, unchallenged, he makes the following assertion about systems proscribed by the ABM Treaty:

Development, testing, and deployment of ABM systems or components that are sea-based, air-based, spaced-based, or mobile land-based are prohibited; also deployment of ABM systems involving new types of basic components to perform the current function of ABM launchers, interceptors or radars (e.g., laser ABM) is prohibited.²¹

Feld's assertion that afternoon on Sept. 7 was a bit hasty. True, Richard Nixon and Leonid Brezhnev had signed on the dotted line on May 26 that year. True, the U.S. Senate advised ratification on August 3—months and weeks before the Pugwash Conference at Oxford. But President Nixon did not ratify the ABM Treaty until September 30, and it did not enter into force until Oct. 3, 1972.!

In his excitement, Feld had prematurely shot his load, by more than three weeks!

Did anyone rush to alert the President of the United States? Did anyone shout: "Don't ratify that piece of out-house paper, Mr. President! The Russkies and that two-timing Bavarian son of a bitch had us fooled all along!" Did anyone do that? No. Not a whisper.

And so, President Nixon, rejoicing at what his trusted adviser from Bavaria had told him would be a great victory guaranteed to win him a second term in office, was not afforded the even greater pleasure of telling the Kremlin to stuff the treaty up its collective rear, while ordering the immediate commencement of a Manhattan Project-style crash development of directed-beam weapons just as the Soviets had been doing since the beginning of the 1960s.

Henry Kissinger had delivered more than Moscow and London had bargained for: the national security and future existence of the United States of America, his adopted country.

The issue was clear already then; treason had been committed. Hard evidence was readily available in the public domain exposing the Soviet commitment to full-scale beam-weapons development, as well as orbital testing of such systems. Yet, National Security Adviser Henry Kissinger and his principal collaborators did not only not inform the President, but made sure that such vital information would never reach the Oval Office! The evidence presented in this report establishes beyond a doubt that this is so, as it also documents Kissinger's affiliation with an Anglo-Soviet intelligence front committed to the subversion of United States national security.

There is something very odd here, though. If Bernard Feld's feverish assertion about the proscription of beam weapons is true, then why does the much-hailed 1972 ABM Treaty not mention any manner of beam weapons with a

single word? They did, after all, these remarkable expert negotiators, discuss such systems at Vienna and Helsinki, did they not?

Certainly, they discussed this. And, as we shall soon report in some detail, the Soviet SALT team under Semenov, fully assisted by principal U.S. SALT actors and Kissinger's duplicitous "back-channeling" gambades with friends in the Kremlin, were successful in banishing any reference whatsoever in the treaty to what the Soviet team piously claimed were "systems not known to anyone."

NOTES:

1. Sokolovskii, V. D. (ed.), *Soviet Military Strategy*. Third edition. Translated, edited, and with an analysis and commentary by Harriet Fast Scott (Moscow 1968; Stanford Research Institute, 1975), p. 298.
2. *Ibid.*, p. 454 (emphasis added).
3. The two translations of the first edition of Sokolovskii are: *Military Strategy*. First edition. With an introduction by Raymond L. Garthoff (New York, Praeger, 1963; London, Pall Mall Press, 1963). *Soviet Military Strategy*. First edition. Translated and with an analytical introduction, annotations, and supplementary material by Herbert S. Dinerstein, Leon Gouré, and Thomas W. Wolfe (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, Prentice-Hall, 1963).
4. Sokolovskii, V. D. (ed.), *Military Strategy*. Third edition. Translated by Harriet Fast Scott (Denver, Colorado, Air Force Systems Command, Foreign Technology Division, 1968).
5. The public availability of the third edition of *Military Strategy* was delayed by as much as 16 months. This may be contrasted with the speedy expedition of the first, 1962 edition, which was typeset in March, was printed in mid-April, and appeared in the bookstores by July-August that year. The decision to delete any reference to beam-related weapons from the third edition, coupled with then ongoing efforts by the United States to have defensive missile systems included in any future arms reduction talks, may explain the long delay.

Following informal approaches to Moscow on a freeze or ban of ABM-related systems, President Lyndon Johnson publicly communicated his suggestion to that effect in January 1967. The same month, Soviet Premier Aleksei Kosygin presented himself as an avid spokesman for ABM systems at a London press conference. The following month that year, Moscow announced that it had begun deploying an antiballistic missile ("Galosh") system around the Soviet capital. With the Executive Branch's attention firmly riveted on this development, Johnson renewed his proposal for ABMs to be included in future arms talks during his June 1967 meeting with Kosygin at Glassboro. Kosygin politely rejected the proposal. Finally, in July of 1968, President Johnson, having signed the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, could announce that the United States and the Soviet Union had agreed to open talks on limiting both offensive and defensive missile systems. During the 1969-72 Salt I talks, the Soviets would keep focusing U.S. attention on limiting ABM systems while delaying any constructive discussion on limiting ICBMs (which is why no treaty, merely an interim agreement, on ICBM limitations was signed at Moscow).

The decision to publish a redrafted third edition of *Military Strategy* was taken during the crucial April 1966 XXIII CPSU Congress (at which Marshal Sokolovskii was returned to the position as candidate member of the Central Committee). Drafting is initiated under Sokolovskii immediately following the XXIII Congress, and the third edition is typeset and ready

for the printer by November 1966. Permission to print is withheld, however, and the actual printing does not take place until one year later, in November 1967. Again, public distribution is held back, and the third edition of *Military Strategy* does not appear in the bookstores until March 1968. At this time, Moscow must have received assurances from its allies among the U.S. presidential advisory community that the White House was hooked on the ABM fraud and would not be informed of Soviet efforts in the field of directed-beam weapons systems.

6. Sobolev, N., *Lasers and Their Future*. (Moscow 1968). German-language edition: *Die Laser und Ihre Zukunft* (Leipzig, Teubner, 1972). English-language edition: *Lasers and Their Future* (Moscow, Mir Publishers, 1974). For a concise treatment of the Sobolev text and related aspects, see Rachel Douglas: "Soviet Sources Prove Moscow's Objections to Beam Weapons Phony" in *New Solidarity*, Vol. XIV, No. 14, April 22 (New York 1983).
7. United States *Air Defense Command Satellite Situation Report*, mid-April 1968.
8. LaRouche, Lyndon H., Jr., "The Fall-Winter U.S.-Soviet 'Missiles Crisis' Negotiations from the Standpoint of the New Strategic Doctrine." *Executive Intelligence Review*, April 26 (New York 1983), pp. 48-56.
9. *Ibid.*
10. *Ibid.*
11. *Selected Soviet Military Writings 1970-1975*. Edited by William F. Scott (U.S. Air Force, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 1977), p. 63. Emphasis added.
12. Barnaby, C. F. and A. Boserup (ed.), *Implications of Anti-Ballistic Missile Systems*. Proceedings, 3d Pugwash Symposium, Krogerup, Denmark, July 14-20, 1968 (London, Souvenir Press, 1969), p. 22. Emphasis added.
13. Feld, B. T., T. Greenwood, G. W. Rathjens, and S. Weinberg, *Impact of New Technologies on the Arms Race*. Proceedings, 10th Pugwash Symposium, "Wingspread," Racine, Wisconsin, June 26-29, 1970 (Cambridge, Mass., MIT Press, 1971), pp. 140-149.
14. *Ibid.*, pp. 149-150.
15. *Ibid.*, pp. 150-151.
16. Russell, Bertrand, "The Prevention of War." *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists*, October 1946. Quoted from reprint of article in: Grodzins, Morton and Eugene Rabinowitch (eds.): *The Atomic Age*. Articles from the *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists* 1945-1962 (New York, London, Basic Books, 1963), pp. 100-106.
17. Russell, Bertrand. *The Impact of Science on Society* (New York, Simon and Schuster, 1953), pp. 102-104. This book was first published in London in 1951. For a chilling portrait of Russell and the British oligarchy of his time, see Carol White: *The New Dark Ages Conspiracy* (New York, The New Benjamin Franklin House, 1980).
18. Healey, Denis, *A Labour Britain and the World*. Fabian Tract 352 (London 1964), pp. 13-14.
19. Proceedings, 2nd Pugwash Conference on Science and World Affairs, Lac Beauport, Quebec, Canada, March 31-April 11, 1958. Leo Szilard in paper on "How to Live With the Bomb—And Survive," the final section of which is published in the proceedings. (The complete version is published in Grodzins and Rabinowitch, op. cit., pp. 217-243.) Emphasis added.
20. *Ibid.*: Sir Charles Darwin in paper on "Population Problems." Emphasis added.
21. Proceedings, 22nd Pugwash Conference on Science and World Affairs, Oxford, England, September 7-12, 1972, pp. 161-171. B. T. Feld in paper on "The Contribution of Pugwash to Disarmament." Emphasis added.

It is no longer possible to say:

"I have nothing to do with foreign economic and industrial policies."

JAPAN ECONOMIC DAILY "TOMORROW'S NEWS... TODAY!"



As the world moves toward increasing economic interdependence, you are undoubtedly concerned about:

ECONOMIC & INDUSTRIAL POLICIES
ECONOMIC SURVEYS & FORECASTS
ECONOMIC INDICATORS:
MACRO to MICRO

HIGH TECHNOLOGY TRENDS
TECHNOLOGICAL BREAKTHROUGHS
NEW PROCESSES AND MATERIALS

INVESTMENT CLIMATES
CORPORATE and GOVERNMENT
ACTIVITIES
RESEARCH & INVESTMENT REPORTS

If you are concerned about these issues, you can't afford not to be concerned with Japan.

JAPAN ECONOMIC DAILY
is the only English daily newspaper
published, via satellite transmission
from Tokyo, in the United States.

U.S. Rate: \$180/6 months; \$350/year
Foreign Rate (via airmail):
\$400/6 months; \$750/year

Call or write now:

Circulation, Desk E
Kyodo News International, Inc.
50 Rockefeller Plaza, Suite 832
New York, NY 10020
Tel. (212) 586-0152

