

## Teller spurs beam-weapon policy in strategic debate

by Paul Gallagher

A political battle over U.S. defense policy has broken into the open, upon which the survival and recovery of the United States as a major industrial power may depend. Two diametrically opposed strategies, for both military deployment and scientific and technological development, are being fought out.

The factional forces of Robert S. McNamara, Henry Kissinger, and the “nuclear freeze” spooks typified by Daniel Ellsberg, are demanding a *conventional military buildup* which would drive the United States back to an electronic parody of a 19th-century colonial naval power, fighting murderous British-style wars against developing countries. One congressional source characterized this policy as leaving the United States with no survivable land-based ICBMs, nor defense against ICBMs, left with only the naval leg of its “TRIAD” standing.

Spearheading the opposing policy course—a dramatic shift of U.S. defense efforts to anti-missile “beam weapons” and energy-beam technologies development—are Dr. Edward Teller and his colleagues at Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, and *EIR* founder Lyndon LaRouche, Jr. and his associates at the Fusion Energy Foundation. They propose an open “beam-weapon ABM race” by the United States and the Soviet Union until ICBMs are no longer a credible threat from any source. In the process, the next frontier of science and technology—plasma technologies including fusion energy—would be crossed.

Speaking to the American Stock Exchange Oct. 25 in

Washington, Weinberger answered a carefully highlighted question on ABM systems, calling them a very promising field which could lead to protection against ICBMs from “the Soviet Union or other countries.” Weinberger on Sept. 20 had told Dr. Richard DeLauer, Undersecretary for Research and Engineering, to pursue technologies for space-based laser defense as rapidly as possible.

Dr. Teller, addressing the National Press Club the next day, attacked McNamara, whose legacy of “systems analysis” networks in the Pentagon will fight to block any serious implementation of beam weapon development. Teller said that “eighty percent of Americans are not for or against the ‘freeze,’ but are extremely frightened, justifiably. . . . The 25-year mutual balance of terror is no longer balanced, only terror. The particular person responsible for this policy of mutual terror was a defense secretary, Robert Strange McNamara.”

McNamara, Kissinger, and company are “unbalancing” that terror as economic depression sweeps the NATO countries. “The Soviets are quite aware of the concepts [for beam weapon development] we are pursuing,” Teller continued. He urged an immediate shift in U.S. defense spending toward, as soon as possible, “spending 95 percent on defensive weapons,” centered on ABM systems. More fundamentally, he posed the choice: “If the freeze people prevail and we don’t submit [to the Soviets], then war would be likely. If we behave more reasonably . . . we would have a good chance to postpone a confrontation . . . and do much more than

avoid war. We can improve the horrible way of life in the Third World, by using technology, and create a situation where the causes of war can be eliminated.”

### **McNamara and the “freeze”**

It is reliably confirmed by a number of sources that President Reagan has personally placed himself behind the U.S. commitment to develop beam weapons, and that Teller has informal leadership of that effort. Teller’s emphasized warning, that McNamara and his co-thinkers are now “unbalancing” the balance of terror they created, has been underscored in Fusion Energy Foundation policy documents in Washington all year; it is one important factor in rallying traditionalist military circles to the beam-weapon effort.

Congressional “freeze” advocates are mounting a campaign to demand defense budget cuts which would fall precisely on advanced nuclear strategic technologies in general, and ABM systems development in particular. The nuclear-freeze movement is now demanding a devastating “package”: no ABM testing, no space-based systems testing, no new strategic systems (MX, etc.) and no further underground testing, the basis for peaceful nuclear-explosives development.

It has now become public knowledge that McNamara, along with former CIA Director William Colby and others who planned and ran the Vietnam War, are running the nuclear freeze; day-to-day coordination is handled by McNamara’s former Pentagon weapons and warfare specialists like Daniel Ellsberg and Henry Pollard of the Union of Concerned Scientists.

Fusion Energy Foundation spokesman Dr. Steven Bardwell, currently on an extremely successful tour of West Coast and Southwest campuses promoting beam-weapon development, has stripped campus “freeze” leaders of their support by forcing admission of their links with the hated McNamara and Colby. UCLA Professor Dr. Theodore Forrester, debating Bardwell, shocked the student audience by welcoming McNamara’s leadership of the freeze as a “man of peace.” Another “freeze” proponent in the debate, Dr. Stanley Wolpert, then endorsed Bardwell’s beam-weapons development approach.

California Institute of Technology President Dr. Marvin Goldberger, one of the country’s leading academic “freeze” spokesmen, saw a major CalTech address on the “freeze” Oct. 27 reduced to 40 students by FEF leafletting of the campus on the McNamara connection. Even that remnant was hostile to Goldberger as his efforts to defend McNamara and prove that beam-weapons development was impossible, were routed by Bardwell speaking from the floor.

The effect achieved by FEF spokesmen is magnified by the fact that they are not restrained, as Teller is, by British-imposed layers of classification restrictions. Bardwell has explained, as Teller may not, the potential of energy-beam technologies to students, reporters, and military and govern-

ment circles. This enables him to make clear how a frontier-technology “military” crash effort, will directly assist the development of energy supplies for Third World development, and raise scientific and technological levels throughout the U.S. economy.

### **Turn in the administration?**

The widely-reported turning point unleashing this open debate, was the September White House meeting of Teller and his Livermore colleague Dr. Lowell Wood, with President Reagan, Dr. DeLauer and others. Following that meeting, sources report the President has gotten behind acceleration of beam weapon development, in particular Livermore’s “x-ray laser” development effort. Congressional and military sources differ widely on questions of increased funding levels and emphasis. But there is evidence the White House has embarked on its first serious move toward a scientific frontier, one which is being fiercely opposed in Congress and by the “systems analysis” crowd.

There have been repeated outbreaks of hysteria in the major liberal press as Teller, LaRouche, and the FEF have reached larger and larger audiences. These demonstrate the top environmentalists’ fear that the genie of “relativistic” laser-, particle-, and plasma-beam technologies may be getting loose. The *New York Times*, *Post*, *Los Angeles Times* and *San Francisco Chronicle* have all run major, serialized denunciations of Teller in the past month.

The President’s shift will be resisted even from within the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA), the DOD unit under Dr. DeLauer which is charged with beam-weapon development. DARPA director Dr. Richard Cooper told an *EIR* reporter in Houston Oct. 26 that the U.S. had no need to move faster on beam weapons, since Soviet progress would also be very slow.

### **The strategic unbalance**

It has been publicly known, since at least 1977 reports by the FEF (“Sputnik of the 80s”) and retired Air Force Gen. Keegan, that the most intense and advanced area of Soviet science effort, is high-energy pulsed power and plasma-beam technologies. The Soviets have begun deployments of short-range but powerful laser weapons on their Kirov-class battle-ships, and have successfully tested beam-weapon destruction of an incoming ICBM from the ground. On Oct. 25 *Aviation Week and Space Technology* reported the Soviets are conducting “pointing and tracking tests” for space-based laser ABMs from the Salyut 7 space station. Veterans of the development of atomic power, ICBMs, and NASA’s space technologies, like retired Air Force Gen. Bernard Schriever, Teller and other presidential science advisors, have recognized that the revolutionary potential of beam-weapon technologies equals that of the advent of nuclear energy, and can exceed even NASA’s impact on the economy over decades. The immediate objective is to protect populations from nu-

clear bombardment and stop nuclear blackmail by small "out-law states." But the breakthroughs flowing from this effort promise a new industrial revolution, centered on successful early development of fusion energy.

These leading figures' drive to change U.S. policy was preceded, in February 1982, by Lyndon LaRouche's call for a "Manhattan Project" for beam-weapons technology in a major Washington, D.C. political address. LaRouche then released a book on beam-technologies and military policy through the National Democratic Policy Committee which circulated 15,000 nationally. The FEF's educational campaign to teach all of Washington about beam weapons, followed LaRouche's speech.

---

## Documentation

---

# What the 'freezers' are saying now

The transplanting of the European "peace movement" to the United States in its "nuclear freeze" form, as documented by *EIR* in a March 1982 Special Multi-Client Report, was a project of Robert Strange McNamara and the RAND-Pentagon "systems-analysis" war-planning networks involving Daniel Ellsberg, William Colby, and Henry Pollard and Marvin Goldberger of Union of Concerned Scientists. We further showed that its objectives, then not publicly stated, were worldwide elimination of nuclear energy, and a U.S.-European conventional arms buildup for wars of depopulation and neo-colonial subjugation.

On Oct. 4, the Einstein Peace Award for 1982, the annual award administered by the Union of Concerned Scientists and its parent, the Pugwash Conference of Scientists, was bestowed on McNamara and McGeorge Bundy.

On Oct. 19-20, an international "Fate of the Earth" environmentalist conference with particular focus on the nuclear freeze, was held at New York City's Cathedral of St. John the Divine, under the sponsorship of the Friends of the Earth. There the previously hidden agenda of the "freeze" was made public to its supporters. At the main nuclear-freeze organizing session, Hampshire College Dean Arthur Westing spoke for other leaders present: "A successful nuclear freeze will involve an increase in military spending. . . . Nuclear weapons have given war a bad name. So we have to increase conventional weapons to deal with the Soviet threat. Disarmament should not be our goal: we must deal with the national-security issue." The concluding conference resolution called for "a world constitutional convention for a democratic

federal world government, whose first duty would be to control, dismantle, and destroy all the nuclear weapons, nuclear waste, and nuclear material in the world." Another resolution stated: "We recognize the inseparable link between nuclear-reactor facilities and nuclear-weapons proliferation."

In California last month, with a nuclear-freeze referendum on the state election ballot, former CIA Director Colby emerged as a public "freeze" spokesman, made available for radio and TV debates by the Californians Against Nuclear War. A spokesman for that organization at its Los Angeles headquarters, questioned about the incongruity of Colby's prominent role in the dirtiest war in U.S. history, replied: "The butchery Colby was involved in before was different—it was not here. This [nuclear war] would be here, and in the Soviet Union." Asked if butchery against non-white populations in the Third World was therefore tolerable, the spokesman said: "I don't mean to say that. But let's just say the Vietnam War was different from what we're trying to stop now."

In a pre-referendum speech on Oct. 27 promoting the nuclear freeze at California Institute of Technology in San Diego, CalTech President Dr. Marvin Goldberger asserted to an incredulous audience of students that "McNamara and his associates are true advocates of peace." Goldberger had been challenged by Dr. Steven Bardwell of the Fusion Energy Foundation, but refused to debate him.

Daniel Ellsberg, who for 10 days had also refused to debate Bardwell, ended up in a confrontation with the physicist on Oct. 29 at San José State College. At a press conference Ellsberg had delayed while trying to have Bardwell removed from the room, the "freeze" spokesman was besieged by reporters asking him why he refused to debate, and finally yelled that Fusion Energy Foundation co-founder Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr. and his associates are "political disrupters and provocateurs." While Ellsberg was screaming and sputtering, Bardwell briefed the audience of 200 and debated with them; the freeze organizers again ordered Bardwell kicked out, and, with cameras rolling, he continued to answer questions about Ellsberg's designs for cluster bombs and so forth as he left. Ellsberg proceeded to attack Dr. Edward Teller and technology in general; students demanded that Ellsberg address the question of McNamara and a conventional buildup; finally, a 15-minute "floor fight" ensued between Bardwell and Ellsberg.

In an earlier debate between Bardwell and UCLA nuclear-freeze advocate Dr. Theodore Forrester, the latter insisted that both McNamara and Colby were "men of peace," and that their leadership of the nuclear-freeze movement was welcomed.

Speaking to students at the University of California at Irvine Oct. 26, Dr. Bardwell recounted that he had taken part in peace movements and efforts to prevent nuclear war for 15 years. "If someone told me they had a new peace movement . . . led by McNamara, Colby, and Maxwell Taylor, I would say, 'Do you think I'm a fool?'"