

Scientific has-beens try to salvage their 'Soviet connection'

by Paul Gallagher

It was at the last Pugwash Conference, in late August 1983, when the "ice cold" Soviet representatives told their Western disarmament-lobby friends "get rid of Reagan and his ABM beam weapons or we're finished with you." At that conference the hype was begun for the Union of Concerned Scientists (UCS) report which was to debunk antiballistic-missile beam weapons once and for all—which report has just come out to great fanfare in the national media.

With its "Space-Based Missile Defense" report, the UCS has produced for Henry Kissinger's entire Mutually Assured Destruction (MAD) fraternity in the West, a desperate propaganda offering to appease Soviet attacks on U.S.-NATO beam weapons development. The report is a pure fraud.

The significance of this fraud lies in its attempt to claim that *engineering and deployment* of global anti-missile defenses (as opposed to mere research) could not be going on, because it is not feasible. This big lie is precisely what Soviet "scientific" propaganda says on this subject, many times every month in official Soviet media, to neutralize the clear and abundant evidence that development of a nationwide ABM system *is* going on—by the Soviet Union.

That evidence has been gathered by U.S. intelligence agencies in hard form by "national technical means" (satellite and related surveillance). It was presented to the National Security Council Nov. 30, producing "a freakout" according to one reliable report. It was reported to European defense ministers Dec. 9 by Secretary Weinberger, and has not been denied in public argument in Europe since. The same evidence has been presented to three committees of Congress during March-April 1984, and published in several military intelligence magazines as well as in *EIR*. As a fearful White House official told *Aviation Week* last December, the Soviets calculate that during this election year, there will be no U.S. reaction even to the most abundant evidence of the Soviet development of ABM defense.

The UCS is an important element in that calculation.

The UCS's fraudulent report covers up an inexorable technology race under way between the U.S. and Soviet Union, to develop ABM systems based on combining interceptor missile technologies with fundamentally new and revolutionary physical principles. The Soviets are winning this

race to date across the board, but fear the overall technological potential of a U.S. "crash program" for beam weapons, and demand that the United States abandon its efforts.

Anxious to prove their continued usefulness to their stern KGB interlocutors, and too worn out scientifically to understand beam-weapons engineering, the old "MAD"-men of Pugwash have offered their services in marketing of this transparent Soviet big lie.

What is the UCS?

Despite its attributed image in the media, the UCS is no youthful anti-nuclear insurgency among scientists. Quite the contrary, its leadership is made up of the most cynical and hard-bitten veterans of the Presidential Science Advisory Panels, Defense Science Boards, and weapons planning groups of the dismal 1957-1972 period, in which the MAD doctrine was set in stone.

Their opening chapter conveys the worldview of these misanthropic spinsters of science: "We cannot regain safety by cleverly sawing off the thin, dry branch [of assured destruction] on which the Soviets are perched, for we cling to the same branch."

In national scientific laboratories across the United States, Europe, and Japan, it is the younger generation of scientists who are challenging these old MAD-men with development of beam weapons, trying both to save the Western nations from destruction and to reduce the imminent danger of nuclear war. This younger generation inspired President Reagan's March 23, 1983 call for an anti-missile shield.

The UCS crowd, while unable to understand the plasma physics and related breakthroughs implicit in beam weapons, does maintain powerful networks of influence in Washington and in the military with which to suppress anti-missile development on behalf of deals offered the Soviets by Henry Kissinger and Gen. Brent Scowcroft. Working in concert with the Heritage Foundation and Danny Graham's "High Frontier" (see below), the UCS has obstructed the unleashing of the younger plasma physics and laser scientists in the national labs, and the launching of a new Manhattan Project for beam defense.

The authors list of *Space-Based Missile Defense* reveals

the character of UCS leadership: Dr. Richard Garwin of IBM, the “genius” behind the infamous electronic wall across the DMZ in Vietnam and one of Robert McNamara’s top weapons planners and designers; Dr. Henry Kendall, leading Vietnam-era weapons designer at MIT’s Draper Laboratory until he suddenly “joined a student revolt” against that lab in 1969; Peter Clausen, former CIA policy analyst and “senior arms analyst”; Adm. Noel Gaylor, former director of the National Security Agency and a man who spent over a decade planning naval uses of tactical nuclear weapons; MAD-era “arms-control negotiators” Ashton Carter, Raymond Garthoff, and Kurt Gottfried; and Dr. Hans Bethe, who in the 1930s denied the possibility of high-energy particle accelerators, in the 1950s of thermonuclear weapons, in the 1960s of concealed underground weapons tests, and in the 1970s of beam weapons.

‘Provocative doctrines’

This congress of hard cases claims that beam weapons are “a defense based on untried technologies and provocative doctrines [i.e., assured survival]. The real-life problems of missile defense,” they continue, “have been studied intensively by the U.S. defense establishment [i.e., by them] for a quarter of a century, and some of the authors of this report have contributed to many phases of this effort. These investigations have made it clear that a total missile defense must overcome a number of daunting obstacles *set by immutable laws of nature and basic scientific principles*. . . . The laws of nature set limits on what humans can do. Nevertheless, it is true that the advances scored by science and technology in our own time have been remarkable, and often unpredictable. But none of these violated firmly established laws of nature.

“What are these immutable laws of nature and basic scientific principles? At this point we shall only give some of the most important examples. First, the earth rotates about its axis and satellites move along prescribed orbits, so that, in general, a satellite cannot remain above a given spot. Second, even a thin layer of atmosphere absorbs x-rays. Third, electrically charged particles follow curved paths in the earth’s magnetic field. Fourth, the wave nature of light guarantees that [laser] beams will eventually flare outwards and become more diffuse. Fifth, the earth is round, and one must be far above the United States to see a silo in Siberia.”

As experimental plasma physicists and engineers in labs around the world know, this is pathetic stuff, worthy of the harrumphing of Victorian-era “natural scientists” sitting around the Club Room at Cambridge and denying the validity of shock wave phenomena or relativity. It sounds, in particular, very much like Dr. Bethe’s published 1938 “proof” that cyclotron energies in excess of 1 million electron volts would violate the laws of nature.

Moreover, it is not necessary to believe such denials of technological breakthroughs in military firepower, in order to write them. For UCS, they are merely the “sizzle” for placing the Soviet demand for an end to U.S. beam weapons

development, in the mouth of “the U.S. scientific community.” This is the standard practice of the Pugwash Conferences since their inception.

Each fraudulent Soviet line of attack upon the LaRouche-Reagan beam weapons doctrine is repeated without deviation. Beam weapons would “augment the emerging U.S. capacity to destroy Soviet missiles in their silos, to give the U.S. a first strike capability.” (The Soviets have a *current* such anti-silo capacity, and a rapidly emerging first-strike capability.) Beam weapons development “constitutes a U.S. rebuff to Soviet overtures to negotiate constraints on ASAT weapons.” This Soviet “overture” was suggested to Andropov by Dr. Garwin himself, according to leading Soviet scientist Y. P. Velikhov, and is a complete fraud which ignores any constraints on the tested Soviet ASAT system. “Our allies in Europe would not be protected by an American ABM system,” and “Europeans would hold the U.S. responsible for exacerbating East-West tensions.” These are, of course, the operating propaganda lines of the East German and Libyan-financed Green peace movement in Europe, and are simple political falsehoods. The Reagan-Weinberger proposal, as amplified directly to European political and military circles by LaRouche’s associates, places an equally high priority *and a shorter timetable* on the defense of Europe against attack by Soviet SS-20s and shorter-range nuclear missiles.

UCS and High Frontier

The only ABM proposal which would leave Europe out in the cold, even if it worked, is Gen. Danny Graham’s High Frontier proposal to use 25-year old technologies for “space trucks” carrying “kinetic kill vehicles” to destroy ICBM’s. Not so surprisingly, this gets the endorsement of the UCS: “Such kill vehicles . . . have several advantages vis-à-vis directed energy weapons: they do not involve as high a level of technical sophistication. . . . In contrast to all the currently proposed directed-energy weapons, kill vehicles show some promise of being able to intercept decoys and warheads in midcourse.” At another point, the authors add another statement which may surprise those who have bought their public image: “*terminal defense* is feasible, provided one only seeks to protect hard targets [i.e., missile silos] and not population centers.”

The UCS report, in tandem with the just-released Scowcroft Commission Report, states on behalf of Henry Kissinger the limits of what the Soviets will tolerate in ABM research by the United States and Europe, in order not to challenge the Soviets’ own all-out drive to engineer and deploy over the next 5-10 years a total national ABM defense centered on directed energy technologies (see Special Report). Should the UCS and Danny Graham succeed in setting these limits, they will complete a 25-year job of establishing complete Soviet military superiority over the United States, and in the process close their own files as “useful fools” of the Soviet KGB.