

singer and Shultz, and proponents of a beam-weapons "crash program." Rumors of an impending Reagan policy speech launching a "Manhattan Project" have abounded since October, when the depth of the Soviet confrontation drive began to sink in.

Officially, however, the White House still "believes" that the Soviets may return to the Geneva negotiations. That is the corrupting influence of the allies of Kissinger and NATO Secretary General Lord Carrington.

And officially, the fiscal year 1984 appropriation directly for high-power laser, particle beam and related directed energy technologies is only \$600 million, 20 percent more than the previous year. That is the consequence of the stranglehold

on White House economic policy by Federal Reserve head Paul Volcker and his appeasement-bound Swiss banking mentors. The completely inadequate official funding level persists despite the stated position of the Senate Appropriations Committee, citing the Soviet ABM "breakout," "that it is vitally important to keep the ABM systems technology program funded at as high a level as possible," and that "the Committee would entertain supplemental budget requests for these programs."

A second Reagan "command decision" is now imperative, to launch what LaRouche, Teller, and Colorado congressman Ken Kramer have publicly specified: a second Manhattan Project.

Lyndon LaRouche called the shots on strategic policy in 1983

Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.'s articles and statements appeared throughout the year in Executive Intelligence Review. Below are excerpts from his analyses of strategic military and economic questions.

Why a Beam-Weapons Arms Race Is Necessary, Dec. 22, 1982:

I insist that our choice is between beam-weapons development and early prospect of thermonuclear holocaust.

The core of my argument is that the cultural effects of a beam-weapons development will be to induce a renaissance of combined rationality and fear of war's consequences among the populations and leading institutions of nations. . . . It is the effects of policy of nations, upon the shaping of culture and cultural outlooks, which determine the political preconditions for warfare. . . .

MAD tends to become a lever of thermonuclear blackmail, and a source of encouragement to lunatic degrees of irrationality in relations among states. Governments which are inclined to be irrational believe that they are freed from taking into account the practical consequences of their policies. It is the cultivation of that "freedom" from obligations to weigh policies against their consequences, which is key to the growing danger of thermonuclear holocaust. . . .

If the Soviet Union is disposed to accept the kind of post-war world proposed by Franklin Roosevelt, and if rational

forces lead both nations, war between the powers is virtually impossible. . . . The long-term significance of launching a Beam-weapons development program, is the revival of a vigorous technological optimism, and with that a restoration of the hegemony of rationalism among the peoples and governments of the nations. . . .

LaRouche on the Bipartisan Challenge and the Question of his Presidential Candidacy, March 24:

It has been my repeatedly stated policy and practice since President Reagan was elected, that responsible Democrats should develop a bipartisan posture toward the Reagan administration. This view [is] richly justified by the step which President Reagan took last evening.

It has been, and continues to be my policy, that the great political parties of our nation have no proper self-interest as parties except the most vital interests of our nation. . . .

There are two reasons I would campaign for the Democratic presidential nomination of 1984. . . . My leading accomplishments as an economist, my knowledge and personal connections in most continents of the world, are resources of knowledge and commitment to command decisions on vital issues almost non-existent among other visible candidates. [And], one of the great parties of our nation, the Democratic Party, is being destroyed from within. That party urgently needs a leader, a man for a time of great crisis. . . .

Moscow's Unveiled War Plan Against the United States, May 31:

It has been a long time since any power announced in the press [*Izvestia* May 9] that it has a definite war plan against another power, especially a war plan implied to be made ready to go into operation as early as this year. This is exactly what . . . Soviet Chief of Staff Marshal Nikolai Ogarkov did. . . . Ogarkov simply restated the Sokolovskii doctrine, which has been continuous Soviet strategy for at least the past 20 years. The Soviets have been preparing to fight a full-scale thermonuclear war, to survive it, and to win it. . . .

On March 23, President Ronald Reagan made a generous offer to Secretary Andropov. He announced a new strategic doctrine of the United States, a doctrine which would make possible a takedown of the world's thermonuclear missiles arsenals. . . .

How did Secretary Andropov react to this generous offer? Neither the text of the President's announcement nor any reference at all . . . has appeared in any leading Soviet publication. The denunciations of the President and his blacked-out speech began pouring out of the Soviet press. . . . President Reagan's March 23 address did not trigger the indicated Soviet behavior; the Soviet game was already afoot months earlier. Reagan's proposed alternative to a crisis had the effect of unmasking the ongoing Soviet intentions. . . . They intend to plunge the world into the new missile crisis, and have assured themselves that they will force the White House into a humiliating backdown into strategically decisive margins of concessions.

The Fall-Winter U.S.-Soviet 'Missiles Crisis' Negotiations from the Standpoint of the New Strategic Doctrine, April 26:

From a purely military standpoint, the President's strategic doctrine of Mutually Assured Survival makes complete sense to a Soviet military traditionalist, just as it does to our own military traditionalists. Soviet objections arise not from the military side of the new doctrine as such, but from the longer-term economic and political implications of the adoption of such a policy by the United States. . . .

The essential point of the Sokolovskii doctrine is its insistence that general warfare can still be won in the age of thermonuclear strategic missiles. . . . [F]ighting such wars depends upon developing the capabilities for destroying salvoes of strategic missiles while those missiles are in flight. . . .

The Soviets . . . modified their application to the new political, scientific, and economic trends which erupted clearly in the West beginning with President Johnson's "Great Society." . . . If the Soviet Union could but wait out our work of destroying ourselves from within, the Soviet Union would emerge as the world's single, unchallengable strategic power by default. . . .

All the double-talk, the delusions, the deceptive games

of the past 20 years are now ended. We are going to survive as a great world power, and our survival into the 1990s and beyond in such a condition, has made some gentlemen in the *New York Times* offices, in London, and in Moscow very, very unhappy for the moment. It will take time before Soviet officialdom generally becomes reconciled to this fact. . . .

What alternative does the Soviet leadership have, but either to accept the terms of the new doctrine, or to go to thermonuclear war?

Open Letter to Yuri Andropov: You have chosen to plunge the world into war, Sept. 13:

When you rejected even exploratory negotiations offered by President Ronald Reagan, on the basis of the new U.S. strategic doctrine publicized on March 23, 1983, you consciously chose thermonuclear war to occur sometime during the several years immediately ahead. . . .

You are prepared to risk the possibility that in such a situation the United States will shoot, rather than back down to the present Soviet margin of advantage, in the event the U.S.S.R. goes to the point of launching a pre-emptive strategic strike. . . . Something very evil is influencing the philosophical world-outlook currently shaping the decisions of the Soviet government.

The first of the three elements chiefly to be considered is the effects (in this case upon Soviet policy and thinking) of the succession of two post-war strategic policies of the oligarchical families' faction of the United States and Europe. . . . Accepting the President's proposal would mean tearing up an existing, longstanding devil's pact with the gang of racist, oligarchical scoundrels associated with the life's work of the most monstrous degenerate of the 20th century, Bertrand Lord Russell. . . .

Something [in the Soviet Union] has changed very drastically. This change—this drastic change—has two clear and leading features: *A sweep of worldwide cultural pessimism into Soviet society generally, combined with a falling-back toward what Old Russian Culture can bring forth under conditions of deepening cultural and moral pessimism. The practical problem is that if the foreign policies of a superpower are under the influence of such cultural impulses, the world is in danger.*

You would find the Pugwash agreements an abomination to be destroyed by every means available, unless the combination of your infection with worldwide cultural pessimism, and your acceptance of the Pugwash imperial doctrine, had not pushed you into adopting a foreign policy best described as a thrust consistent with the doctrine of Philtheos of Pskov: "The Third and Final Roman Empire."

U.S. Policy Toward Moscow after the KAL Incident, Sept. 6:

Despite the Soviet refusal of the offer of durable peace,

the new U.S. strategic doctrine stands in its own right. It is the only sane policy for the United States and its allies—especially now, since Soviet official sources have several times threatened to launch a preemptive thermonuclear attack against the United States.

However, as of late April 1983, this writer, as one who had encouraged the President to make his generous peace offer to the Soviet Union, was obliged to locate and correct the included error in his own assessment of the character of the Soviet leadership. . . .

The Soviet leadership confronting us today is the Russia . . . which the Nazis' "National Bolshevik" faction and Alfred Rosenberg envisaged as a natural ally of the Nazis. This discrediting of Soviet Marxism, from 1953-56 onwards . . . brought forth a replacement from the bowels of Russian history, the ideology of the Russian proto-fascists, Dostoevsky, Bakunin, and the "Ayatollah" Rasputin. . . .

LaRouche Places His Name in Nomination, Sept. 26:

Recent actions by Democratic National Chairman Charles T. Manatt and former Gov. W. Averell Harriman force me to place my name in nomination to become the 1984 presidential candidate of the Democratic Party. . . .

On Sept. 20, Chairman Manatt and Governor Harriman convened a press conference at Georgetown University in Washington, D.C., to announce that they, and all announced Democratic presidential candidates excepting Rueben Askew, are committed to the Soviet-created and Soviet-steered Nuclear Freeze movement. . . . At the same time, I have been informed from the most reliable sources, that the Soviet government is presently committed to aiding Chairman Manatt and Governor Harriman in securing the nomination and election of one among these Nuclear Freeze candidates. . . .

Therefore, I shall campaign for the Democratic Party's presidential nomination using my candidacy to spearhead the mobilization of a great mass movement of our citizens against the Soviet-supported and Soviet-influenced Manatt-Harriman leadership of the Democratic Party. . . .

This nation of ours requires an economic mobilization echoing that which President Franklin Roosevelt set into motion during 1939-43. That mobilization must begin now—not after January 1985. This mobilization must be centered around the development of strategic anti-missile defenses, in agreement with the new U.S. strategic doctrine announced by the President on March 23, 1983. . . .

My principal job during this campaign will be to continue doing what I have been and am doing, and to provide you and the thousands of new candidates now beginning to run for local offices with a rallying-point around which to build a new political movement in this country.

The Crisis in U.S. Strategic Policy, Nov. 1:

. . . The Soviet leadership is presently escalating a

thought-out plan toward thermonuclear, global showdown with the United States, and will merely accelerate its drive toward confrontation once the first missiles are installed. . . .

Soviet-backed Qaddafi is moving step-by-step to destroy every targeted nation of northern Africa. . . .

Meanwhile, in Moscow itself, the Soviet leadership is operating presently on the perception that present Soviet military superiority, the deepening economic depression of nations under the Bretton Woods System, an imminent, 1931-style international financial collapse, and pressures of the 1984 election campaign will hamstring the Reagan administration so much during the coming six to nine months that the White House will be unable to react effectively to any added element of strategic crisis. This is Moscow's perceived historic "window of opportunity."

The obvious political flaw in the White House is [shown by] the evidence of the White House's blind faith in the fraudulent statistics which report a "1983 U.S. economic upswing" in progress. . . . The White House's inability to perceive the monstrous proportions of the strategic crisis now in progress flows largely from the White House's blindness to the realities of the economic situation. . . .

Globally, our main line of defense is not military, but economic. . . . Almost with the stroke of a pen, the President of the United States could collapse the power and policies of the bankrupt Bretton Woods monetary system, and create a new international monetary order based on a new issue of Treasury gold-reserve-denominated currency notes, pegged at at least \$750 an ounce for gold. The debts could be reorganized, and the internal debt-crisis of the U.S. banks stabilized. This would open up Latin America immediately for a high-technology boom, a boom which would spread to other parts of the world.

Beam Weapons: The Implications for Western Europe, Nov. 9:

Both the United States and the Soviet Union are at present in an extremely advanced state of development of defensive weapons systems of greater firepower than any weapons previously in existence. . . . Under conditions of crash-program development, modeled on the accomplishments of the U.S.A.'s NASA work of the 1960s, both the United States and the Soviet Union could have in place a first generation of such new defensive-weapons systems by as early as 1987 or 1988. . . .

The deployment of such systems would replace the present U.S. nuclear umbrella over Europe, providing Europe for the first time a genuine defense against the destructive force of a Soviet thermonuclear-missile attack, a quality of defense not possible with thermonuclear deterrence. . . .

[T]he time has come for me to report certain facts which have never been made public anywhere up to the moment I speak to you now. . . . From February 1982 through the

middle of April 1983, I was engaged in continuing private discussions with representatives of the Soviet Union on the subject of the strategic doctrine which the President announced on March 23. . . . The limited purpose of these discussions was to explore conceptions with a view to reporting my findings to appropriate channels of my government, and to ensure at the same time that were my recommendations accepted by my government, the Soviet government would have competent knowledge of the intent and implications of the policy being proposed.

Despite the private and informal nature of these fact-finding discussions, the President's announcement of March 23 caused those discussions to secure the highest strategic importance in Moscow, and to become a significant factor in the unfolding of the global strategic situation after that date. At the same time, these discussions placed me in a situation of special advantage for understanding exactly what the Soviet government was thinking, and its purpose in rejecting the President's offer of negotiations under the new strategic doctrine. . . .

Soviet interest covered two overlapping areas. The first was my proposed strategic doctrine itself. Second, it had come to Soviet attention that my own quarterly forecasts for the U.S. economy, regularly published since November 1979, had proven consistently accurate, whereas their own, as well as those of the U.S. government and private forecasting services generally, had been usually wrong, and overall absurd when compared with my results. As it turned out, it was Soviet belief that my economic analysis of the proposed strategic doctrine was correct which played a leading part in Moscow's summary rejection of the President's proposal of March 23. . . .

My discussions of these matters with Soviet representatives affirmed what I know by other means. The Soviet government has no serious technical disagreement with any part of the strategic package I have outlined. . . .

I interpreted the orders to break off discussions with me as crucial evidence of Soviet intentions to move quickly toward a thermonuclear confrontation with the United States, and so informed my friends in the U.S. government. I forecast that the Soviets would begin to escalate on a countdown toward a thermonuclear confrontation as early as August 1983. Events proved my spring 1983 forecast of such a Soviet posture to be correct; the countdown toward thermonuclear confrontation began during August, and has been escalating in various sections of the globe ever since. . . .

[I]f President Reagan were reelected, beginning November 1984, he would without doubt unleash a massive economic mobilization modeled significantly on the precedent of the 1939-43 period, to the effect that the Soviet strategic advantage of the present moment would rapidly evaporate. This present period of 12 months ahead is a period of the United States' greatest strategic vulnerability to a Soviet thermonuclear confrontation which has ever existed is or likely to exist in the foreseeable future.

The Soviets respond to proposal: seek a U.S.

by Rachel Douglas

When, on March 23, 1983, the President of the United States offered the Soviet leadership the greatest opportunity of the post-war period, to free the world from the tyranny of Mutually Assured Destruction, Moscow replied "No." The Soviet media never printed what Reagan said.

Under Yuri Andropov, the Soviet Union refused to consider even exploratory negotiations on the development of ballistic-missile defense by both superpowers. On Aug. 10 in the weekly *Literaturnaya Gazeta*, Andropov's long-time adviser Fyodor Burlatskii spelled out the blood-curdling response the Kremlin gave instead: The U.S.S.R. would sooner go to war than allow the United States to develop a strategic defense capability, of which the Soviets had intended to be sole possessors. Reams of Russian newsprint were sacrificed to appeals, proclamations, and tirades against defensive strategic weapons, saying one day that they are impossible to build and the next that they will cause World War III, and never letting onto what is evident from Soviet military writings and scientific work: The U.S.S.R. has had its own anti-missile beam-weapons program for years and is ahead in the field.

Burlatskii called all "space" weapons a *casus belli*, thereby threatening the United States with a Soviet first strike.

As 1983 drew to a close, the Soviet Union had positioned its enormous military forces and widespread irregular capabilities in a war formation: They would deal the United States a strategic humiliation, or else inflict that nuclear strike. Chief of Staff Marshal Nikolai Ogarkov, who became the chief spokesman for the Soviet state as the Soviet military eclipsed the ailing Andropov in the last quarter of the year, confirmed in a Dec. 5 press conference that the threat of putting the U.S. mainland in a less than five-minute range of Soviet nuclear missiles has been carried out with the deployment of submarines off the American coasts. In May, the President of the U.S.S.R. Academy of Sciences had warned that the Soviets would also move to the status of launch under attack at the point new American intermediate-range missiles