

Will Kissinger replace beam-weapons program with 'build-down'?

by Paul Gallagher

With the United States' so-called "build-down" arms control proposal of Oct. 5—known as "the backdown proposal" in some Washington quarters—Henry Kissinger's proxies on the Scowcroft Commission and in Congress have pushed President Reagan into a turn-the-other-cheek response to the Soviet terror campaign marked by the Korean Airlines massacre. The suicidal election-year disarmament game condoned by the President is stalling the public launching of Reagan's beam-weapons strategic defense program just as the program is due for massive expansion.

A matured late-September plan to expose the full scope of Soviet SALT I and SALT II violations, and use that as a political launching pad for fast deployment of beam weapon and other ABM defenses, now appears to have been shelved. Its advocates are waging a mere rear-guard, behind-the-scenes battle against Kissinger and his allies.

EIR founder Lyndon LaRouche, who pulled together military experts from across Europe in Bonn Oct. 6 to issue a call for U.S.-European cooperation on rapid beam weapons development (see Editorial, page 64), has called for a crash U.S. program that would spend \$10 billion and more a year to deploy beam weapons during the 1980s.

The Fletcher Commission report to the National Security Council on beam weapons technologies does in fact imply an "early deployment option," according to several authoritative sources, but that report has not been commented on by the President since its formal delivery to him one week ago.

During late September, when the Fletcher Commission's optimistic technological conclusions became known, scientific advisers to the administration were discussing the potential for near-term defense of Europe against SS-20 intermediate-range ballistic missiles, and of the United States against Soviet submarine-launched missiles—a crude, partial, but rapidly deployed ABM defense using a combination of beam weapons and other ABM technologies.

Meanwhile, an agreement has been reached between Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory and the Stanford University Linear Accelerator (SLAC) program to do beam-weapon research and development on the SLAC electron beam machine. The integration of Stanford's extremely important accelerator into beam weapon work had been blocked for nearly six months by the Stanford Arms Control and Disarmament Forum, a group inspired by Pugwash arms

control professors Sidney Drell and Wolfgang Panovsky.

The Lawrence Livermore Public Affairs Office said that "the laboratories are now gearing up to develop the defensive weapons President Reagan called for in his speech in March. The most important of these defensive weapons will generate extremely powerful x-rays capable of disabling missiles or warheads or their guidance systems." The unusually explicit statement makes clear the focus: x-ray lasers and electron beams, and the various technologies which combine laser and electron beam effects to generate powerful coherent radiation.

First steps for defense

Defense against Soviet intermediate-range and submarine-launched missiles (SLBMs) is an easier first-stage goal for a partial ABM system than is defense against ICBMs, as noted by Dr. Edward Teller in a Sept. 26 Stanford University speech, and therefore can be made an immediate factor in the strategic situation.

IRBMs and SLBMs are easier to detect, target, track, and kill because of their slower speeds. The SLBMs' lighter weight and the fact that they must fire one missile at a time at short intervals makes them more vulnerable to prior detection and rapid interception, as would a Soviet decision to move missile subs close to the United States. Rapid deployment of defenses against these systems could include: 1) deployment of conventional anti-ballistic missile (ABM) systems typified by the Low Altitude Defense System (LOADS), whose feasibility was assessed by Los Alamos Laboratory during 1982, and mid-range antimissile interceptors; 2) prototype ground-based laser defense systems whose lower performance capabilities would limit their effectiveness to intermediate range missiles and SLBMs; and 3) deployment of crude "pop-up" defense missiles which carry explosive-powered electromagnetic pulse (EMP), x-ray, and microwave generators for intercepting SLBMs during their ascent phase.

It is becoming increasingly clear, as the scientific reports made at last month's San Francisco Beams '83 conference on directed energy and pulsed power indicate, that the United States is very close, if not actually ready, to deploy short-range directed energy systems powered by nuclear explosions (see *EIR*, Oct. 4, "Laser Breakthroughs Highlight Conference"). Even in their early stages of development, these

systems can be effective against short-range SLBMs or in defending European areas against IRBMs, when combined with anti-missile interceptors and ground-based lasers within a few hundred miles of all potential launch sites.

Sources say that White House thinking on "early deployment" involves the unveiling of a U.S. potential to build a partial, largely ground-based ABM system for the United States, and another for Europe, over a period of a few years, as a direct response to accelerating Soviet moves toward using their pre-emptive strike capability to destroy NATO.

The quantity and quality of the Soviet buildup has entailed more and more blatant violations of both the SALT I (ABM) and SALT II treaties. The Soviets possess a three-to-one advantage in land-based warheads. They have developed and tested four additional new types of ICBMs. They have so far deployed 350 SS-20 launchers with 700 warheads, ostensibly against Western Europe, which boasts no more than 30 strategically significant targets. Most of those SS-20s are probably fitted with only one 50-kiloton warhead and therefore could reach U.S. targets, as neutron bomb expert Samuel T. Cohen points out in the September issue of *Armed Forces Journal*. In addition, the U.S.S.R. has repeatedly threatened to station nuclear missile submarines very near U.S. coasts, a short, low-trajectory missile-flight away from U.S. targets, in response to U.S. installation of Pershing II missiles in Europe. And the Soviets have already built and installed the huge radars for an ABM defense system to protect their largest missile fields and military command centers from retaliatory strikes.

Therefore, in the late-September planning among strategic defense advocates around the White House, the U.S. drive for accelerated development of partial ABM defense would be linked directly to large-scale public exposure of these treaty violations and the growing "window of vulnerability."

It is this somewhat byzantine approach to accelerating the beam weapons timetable—still falling far short of a full, public crash program to throw away the MAD doctrine and develop strategic defense in depth. Kissinger and the Scowcroft Commission are both demanding the abandonment of this crash program approach. All aspects of Reagan's accession to the "build-down" proposal—including the setting up of a separate "build-down working group" in the U.S. START talks delegation, which will not be directed by the chief of the U.S. delegation, Charles Rowny, indicates their success in setting Reagan up for disaster. The "build-down working group" will be headed by R. James Woolsey, who is both a Kissinger protege and Scowcroft Commission member, and a former Carter administration DOD official.

Kissinger is employing the notorious method of SALT I: he will tell Reagan to make offers the Soviets will reject, in order for the President to make gains in the MX debate and also appear to be a "man of peace." Then he will offer to give up beam-weapon ABM development, the one program that can achieve U.S. and European security, in exchange for whatever phony Soviet promises might be peddled in American election-year politics.

Legalized murder bill

by Susan Welsh

Less than two weeks after registered nurse Sandra Bardenilla recounted the shocking facts of the medical murder of patient Clarence Herbert in a California hospital to a Washington, D.C. conference of the Club of Life, California became the first state in the Union to legalize the murder of so-called terminally ill patients.

Clarence Herbert was a 55-year-old man who was murdered in Kaiser Permanente Hospital near Los Angeles in 1981 after being in a coma for less than 48 hours. Cost-conscious doctors had advised his family that it was futile to try to keep him alive.

Sandra Bardenilla, a registered nurse specializing in the care of the critically ill, was on the Kaiser Permanente staff when Herbert died. She brought a complaint against staff doctors Nedjl and Barber, and charges were filed against them in August 1982 for first degree murder and conspiracy to commit murder. The case is still before the courts.

Senate Bill 762, the Durable Power of Attorney bill, which passed the California state House and Senate without opposition on Sept. 29, will set an important precedent for such cases, since it gives health care professionals immunity from criminal prosecution, civil liability, and professional disciplinary actions when operating within the provisions of the bill.

Governor George Deukmejian, a Republican, failed to veto the bill despite pressure from the Club of Life and other constituency groups to do so. The sign over to a designated family member or other person the right to decide that medical care should be discontinued should the person be hospitalized for a serious illness.

Nancy Spannaus, U.S. chairman of the Club of Life, denounced the decision as "an odious sign of the degeneration of our society." The decision of Governor Deukmejian and the state legislature, she said, displayed "just the kind of pragmatism that millions of Germans demonstrated during the spread of euthanasia practices in Nazi Germany. It is the kind of pragmatism which is leading us to tolerate the Death Lobby and Global 2000's drive to wipe out larger and larger sections of the U.S. population as 'useless eaters,' and entire nations in the developing sector under the same excuse."

Speaking at a conference of the Club of Life in Washington, D.C. Sept. 16, Ms. Bardenilla described the shocking