

dor Nitze, Chief Arms Control Negotiator, and Robert McFarlane, National Security Adviser to the President; and
—Dr. Wood's April 23, 1985, briefing to William Casey, Director of the CIA, and Stanley Sporkin, CIA's General Counsel.

We reviewed LLNL records and files, dating from early 1981 through December 1987, to identify pertinent statements by either channel pertaining to these identified statements. In addition, LLNL scientists identified documents containing pertinent statements for our review. We also used data obtained in our prior review of the X-ray laser program.⁹ Our audit was performed at LLNL and the DOE Headquarters.

We interviewed various LLNL scientists concerning the accuracy of Mr. Woodruff's allegations. We contacted

—all the principals named in Mr. Woodruff's allegations,

—the current and prior X-Ray Laser Program Leaders, and

—other individuals identified as possessing key information, including persons named by Mr. Woodruff and Dr. Wood who could support their views.

Our review was conducted from November 1987 through June 1988 in accordance with generally accepted government auditing standards.

Notes

1. Dr. George A. Keyworth (PhD in Physics) was the Physics Division Leader at Los Alamos National Laboratory before becoming the Science Adviser to the President.

2. Mr. Woodruff was the LLNL Associate Director for Nuclear Design from 1980 until February 1984. At that time, he became the Associate Director for Defense Systems, a position he held until resigning in October 1985.

3. Based on their understanding of the physics of an X-ray laser, LLNL scientists developed computer models, which were used with other means to predict the results of underground tests. If the results of an underground test agreed with the prediction, LLNL scientists concluded that they generally understood the physics of how the aspect being measured worked. If there were significant differences, this meant that the physics were not well understood. In general, quantitative means that the results were "close" to the predictions, and qualitative means the results were "not as close." We did not find any agreement on what specific numbers (such as 80% agreement) determine when the results should be described as quantitative or qualitative.

4. The initial LLNL X-ray laser design concept was referred to as Excalibur and had an established brightness (power intensity) goal. Theoretical calculations on a different idea evolved into the Super-Excalibur concept in early to mid-1984, which had a brightness goal significantly higher than Excalibur.

5. The amount of power that can be delivered (per unit solid angle) by a directed-energy weapon. Brightness of the laser beam can be measured either at the laser device (source) or at the target, where the brightness would be less than at the source due to the source-target separation.

6. Mr. Woodruff was referring to Dr. Teller's quote about a single X-ray laser module potentially shooting down the entire Soviet land-based missile force.

7. Dr. George C. Dacey (PhD in Physics) was President of Sandia National Laboratories.

8. Dr. John S. Foster, Jr. (PhD in Physics) helped form LLNL in 1952, was Director of LLNL from 1961 to 1965, and was Director of Defense Research and Engineering in the Department of Defense from 1965 to 1973.

9. *SDI Program: Evaluation of DOE's Answers to Questions on X-Ray Laser Experiment* (GAO/NSIAD-86-140BR).

Call for Investigation: Was there sabotage at Ramstein?

The Schiller Institute issued the following "Call for an exhaustive investigation into the possibility of sabotage in NATO military aircraft crashes" on Sept. 8, following the disaster Aug. 28 at the Ramstein Air Show in Ramstein, West Germany, in which three planes of the Italian "Frecce Tricolori" acrobatic team crashed, killing the pilots and 50 civilians. Endorsements may be sent to the Schiller Institute, P.O. Box 66082, Washington, D.C. 20035-6082, or in Europe, to EIR Nachrichtenagentur GmbH., Postfach 2308, Dotzheimerstr. 166, 62 Wiesbaden, B.R.D.

Since early 1988, an alarming and unprecedented number of NATO military aircraft have crashed in Western Europe, above all in West Germany. With the tragedy at the Ramstein air base, this series of crashes reached a high point. Since then, more military aircraft have crashed.

More and more experts doubt that the cause of these NATO air accidents has really been pilot error or mechanical failure. Since Ramstein, the question of sabotage is being posed with even greater urgency.

There is a wide array of possible sabotage methods, emphatically including sabotage through electro-magnetically induced effects on the pilot and/or on the aircraft's electronics.

The psychological-political and strategic usefulness of the crashes of NATO military aircraft for the Soviet leadership is obvious. After NATO's intermediate range nuclear weapons systems, NATO's tactical air forces are the primary target of Soviet-influenced political campaigns.

In light of this, we the undersigned demand an immediate exhaustive investigation into the series of NATO military aircraft crashes, with respect to possible sabotage operations. We demand that aircraft and pilots be effectively protected against electro-magnetic signal interference. Furthermore, we demand that the relevant information obtained from such investigations be made available to the public.