

Congress's defense budget cuts show influence of Moscow

by Paul Gallagher

The following testimony on the Strategic Defense Initiative budget was delivered by Paul Gallagher, executive director, Fusion Energy Foundation, to the House Appropriations Committee, Subcommittee on Defense Appropriations on May 15, 1985.

Thank you for the invitation to address this appropriations committee today.

The Fusion Energy Foundation has published mass-circulation materials since 1977 on the potentials for a revolution in military firepower through relativistic energy and particle-beam technologies. In these materials we have demonstrated the 20-year determination of the Soviet Union to use these technologies for strategic anti-missile defense; and the necessity for the U.S. policy shift which became known as the Strategic Defense Initiative. These books and pamphlets have been the most widely circulated unclassified materials internationally on the subject, informing military and civilians in all allied countries of this potential technological revolution. They have forecast the impact of these technologies on the industrial economies of the West: a "productivity revolution" accomplished by applying a science and technology driver to an industrial recovery, paying for the military investment many times over.

The full funding level for SDI requested by the President for Fiscal Year 1986, is still dwarfed by demonstrable Soviet levels of manpower and expenditures on strategic, air, tactical, and civil defense. The President's request, in our judgment, is the absolute minimum level necessary for U.S. national security in the most crucial, frontier areas of military technology development, which are known to be such by the Soviet leadership. The President has provided for an acceleration of the program to initial technology demonstrations. His request is the minimum level necessary to prepare to develop these ABM technologies, if the Soviets continue their provocative confrontation policy, as in the shooting down of our officer in East Berlin and the refusal to apologize or even forego new such killings as policy.

Congress should fully fund the President's request, as the very least of its responsibilities.

Those calling for cuts in the SDI program from both

inside and outside of Congress have stated as their goal, to prevent the program from entering the stage of broad-scale technology demonstrations and tests, such as the HOE demonstration of July 11, 1984. The proposed cuts in the requested funds will clearly accomplish that goal of the program's opponents.

These cuts would prevent the Shuttle-based demonstrations of sensing, pointing, and tracking technologies; the complementary aircraft-based technology demonstrations; the demonstration of ground-based lasers and fabrications technologies for large, segmented optics; and other technologies essential to developing principles of mid-course, boost-phase and terminal defense.

It is precisely this strategy of technology demonstrations under the SDI, which have forced the Soviets to take the *potential* of this U.S. effort seriously, and which have generated the interest on the part of our allies in throwing their own capabilities into the effort.

Secondly, these demonstrations and tests of ABM technologies, have been conducted by the Soviet military with increasing frequency for seven years! The continuous *testing and upgrading* of their ABM interceptor system and of capabilities for making it a mobile national system, are undeniable facts. The Soviet *demonstration and testing* of capabilities for a national ABM radar tracking system, are undeniable facts.

In addition, U.S. satellite and other intelligence since the 1970s has shown the Soviet military testing: the firing of ground-based lasers at reentry vehicles; the firing of ground-based lasers at objects in space; the relay of ground-based lasers from mirrors in orbit to submarines; the propagation of high-power electron beams in the atmosphere; the demonstration of high-power x-ray lasers with various pumping modes at sites administered by the Lebedev Institute; and possibly both pointing and tracking and mirror fabrication from the Salyut space stations.

In fact, the design conceptions being pursued by the SDIO for both the neutral particle beam, and electromagnetic launchers, were in fact borrowed from Soviet design conceptions developed earlier.

Soviet Defense Minister Sokolov, attacking the SDI in

an interview with Soviet television May 6, stated that the Soviet Union "is developing all of the advanced technologies for space," but has not *yet* used them to develop space weapons—Soviet code words for ABM weapons. Sokolov clearly implied to his Soviet audience that Soviet advanced technology ABM defense is nearing the shift to weapons development, testing, and deployment. If the Congress would direct its attention to Soviet policy discussions and writings other than those explicitly intended for the eyes and ears of the Congress, then Soviet ABM policy, including the suppression of the U.S. SDI, would become clear to them.

The secretary of defense, in the most recent review of *Soviet Military Power*, has compiled for Congress the evidence that the Soviet strategic high-power laser and neutral particle beam programs can reach the *deployment of first layers of defensive weapons systems* during this decade. Even that first stage of deployment, if it is unilateral on the Soviet side, would irreversibly establish Soviet strategic superiority over the United States and hegemony over Europe and Asia.

The role of the ABM Treaty

The history of the writing of the 1972 ABM Treaty shows, that it was on Soviet insistence, that ABM technologies using new and advanced physical principles were *exempted* in the language of that Treaty. ABM defense centered on high-power directed-energy and plasma weapons has been stated Soviet military doctrine and policy since 1962. They have never shown the slightest willingness to deflect from that course, spending ultimately half of their military budget on defense.

In the face of that reality, a rollback in the Fiscal 1986 SDI budget to the levels of the Carter years' research program, would tell the Soviet command that it will achieve its goal—military dominance over the United States and decoupling of its allies by 1988-89. You are being told to cut SDI by washed-up former government military and scientific officials, weapons advisers and designers from the MAD era—individuals and groups who publicly joined the Soviet leadership to declare war on this program immediately in 1983—and by representatives of international bankers who demand the United States relinquish sovereignty over its own credit system and national budget.

Anyone proposing now, not to rapidly expand the Strategic Defense Initiative to involve the entire Western alliance, exploit our lab, industry, and university capabilities fully, and *at least match the Soviet beam-weapons program in manpower and engineering experience*, is proposing strategic disaster and capitulation, by the alliance, to the loud public demands of the Soviet Union. Anyone proposing to do this "for reasons of fiscal constraints," is simply finding an excuse to meet the brutal, daily repeated Soviet demand.

For Congress to be stampeded by this International Monetary Fund pressure is Soviet policy. On Soviet national television March 30, Russia's leading "U.S. expert" Georgii

Arbatov bragged to the Russian population that the SDI would be sabotaged: "In the next spiral of the arms race, the Washington leadership has apparently made a very serious mistake. The . . . resources of the American economy have been overestimated and the scale of the arms race has exceeded its resources. . . . It is an objective fact—the current level of military expenditure is a backbreaking burden for the U.S. economy. Appropriate modifications must be made."

Prior to the SDI, U.S. programs in this area, relative to the Soviet level of effort, were a joke, and the Fiscal 1985 SDI program was reduced by Congress below the inflation-adjusted level of the previous programs. The Fiscal 1985 program funds are now being obligated, and spent, at a rate greater than the defense budget as a whole—recent fraudulent claims to Congress notwithstanding. The Fiscal 1986 request

Vote full funding for SDI technology research and development. Vote in addition industrial mobilization credits to allow this science driver to have full impact on our industrial base. The wealth produced and revenues flowing back to the Treasury will more than pay for the expenditures, and can start a genuine U.S. industrial revival based on the frontier of technology.

would, for the first time, place the United States and NATO seriously into the defensive weapons technology race with the U.S.S.R.

The future of the Western alliance

The potential of the Strategic Defense Initiative is now the *only* thing holding the alliance with Western Europe and Japan together against overwhelming Soviet strategic superiority in those theaters. Without the potential of the SDI, the deployment of the Pershing missiles in Europe would not have been politically possible. It is the sole reason for the Soviet presence at the Geneva negotiations. These are well-known facts among our European allies. They publicly state that they require two things: a full U.S. commitment to a program large enough to involve them in developing strategic, tactical, and air defense; and a full share in large-scale industrial technology spinoffs. West German military spe-

cialists have in fact begun to evolve a strategic design conception for the entire European theater side of SDI, which they have informally titled the Tactical Defense Initiative.

The European opinion, communicated to U.S. military officials, is that the "sleeping giant" of American technological and industrial strength can be focused for the first time since the NASA program, through the SDI, in order to accomplish a genuine economic and strategic recovery.

The United States has requested aid for this program from its allies, in the form of national spending and private industrial participation. The allies, with the present exception of France, have offered this aid. *Their participation and aid will be lost overnight if the expansion of the U.S. program is now canceled*, for reasons that should be obvious to anyone who sees strategic programs in real terms, rather than through the haze of budgetary numerology.

For a crash program

SDI is a program developing the most advanced technologies known to man, the universal tools of the next century, into defensive weapons technologies with almost immediate revolutionary impact on industry. Those denying its "feasibility" are challenging the industrial wisdom of scientists, engineers, and high-technology firms throughout the West. They are also disagreeing with the leading laser scientists in the Soviet Union before March 23, 1983, when they were all placed under state orders to lie about the subject.

In all past American experience, such breakthroughs have been achieved by crash programs, conducted by the largest possible scientific and engineering task forces. Each such program has been opposed and decried by government advisers of all kinds. Each led to success in its immediate objective, and leaps forward in U.S. industrial/technological strength.

If you cut this program back, you not only capitulate to Soviet demands and the blackmail of international financiers speculating in U.S. government deficit and debt instruments. You also ignore the clear evidence of Edison's electrification projects, of World War II, the Manhattan and Apollo Projects, and many other "crash programs" going back to the 1690s' smallpox vaccination program in the New England colonies, which was equally violently opposed.

The SDIO is on record, proposing to develop these technological breakthroughs for civilian as well as military purposes, through open as well as classified research, involving the nation's major universities and small firms as well as national labs and aerospace firms.

This effort depends on the Fiscal 1986 budget request, not the pitiful previous levels of research funding, which were so impotent that until 1983 the Soviets contemptuously published general reports of their own beam-weapons research in their open literature.

In addition to the funding of the SDI itself, by the Congress at levels of \$5 billion or more per year starting imme-

diately, Congress should be providing *industrial mobilization credits* of an at least equivalent amount to SDI spending, in order rapidly to develop the industrial base for the success of the program. The FEF has proposed legislation for this in detail, which has been discussed with members of this committee.

Defense Secretary Weinberger stated, in his internationally televised press conference on SDI April 10, that International Monetary Fund "surveillance" of U.S. budgetary policy including its defense budget, as demanded by the IMF and other agencies of the international private central banks and money center banks, would be an intolerable loss of national sovereignty and threat to national security.

Yet whether the Secretary is aware of this or not, the United States has granted such surveillance to the IMF, in documents agreed upon by Treasury Secretary James Baker at the IMF meeting in Washington April 15. The U.S. dollar was driven down by those international banks and private "central banks" from 3.45 DM to 2.97 DM during March and early April, in order to enforce that demand. When the demand for "surveillance" was met, the dollar was allowed to rise again, to 3.23 DM as of this week. At the same time, the drive for a defense budget freeze and massive cuts in the request for SDI funds, was launched, by Robert Strange McNamara and Clark Clifford—both leading representatives of international credit agencies and investment banks—and by the Council on Economic Priorities, a project of the Rockefeller family and Chase Manhattan Bank since 1968.

The opponents of the SDI budget have absolutely no basis for their "estimates" of how, why, and what strategic defense will eventually cost. They are attacking the White House on behalf of the IMF and, in particular, Federal Reserve chairman Paul Volcker. Volcker has been coming before Congress demanding these defense budget cuts for four consecutive years, while himself ballooning the federal deficit through his interest-rate policies and their effect on the U.S. economy. He would willfully sacrifice U.S. national security needs to the "conditionalities" imposed by the IMF on international credit, just as other nations have been forced to sacrifice the means of economic development and subsistence itself to these "conditionalities."

Furthermore, these opponents have consciously colluded with Soviet representatives to try to eliminate SDI or roll it back to an impotent research program, while pursuing their own goal of taking the costs of international *usury* out of the U.S. defense budget.

Congress, in the U.S. national interest, must do the opposite. Vote full funding for SDI technology research and development. Vote in addition industrial mobilization credits to allow this science driver to have full impact on our industrial base. The wealth produced and revenues flowing back to the Treasury from this effort will more than pay for the expenditures, and can start a genuine U.S. industrial revival based on the frontier of technology.

The budget cuts: crippling the SDI

Both Moscow and its allies in the Eastern Liberal Establishment, such as recently decorated recipient of the Soviet Order of the Patriotic War, Averell Harriman, have been explicit on how the SDI program can be effectively crippled. Gorbachov and Soviet beam-weapon scientists have demanded that the U.S. carry out no demonstration-level experiments or construction of prototype systems, while preparing precisely such demonstrations and prototypes in the Soviet Union.

The Council on Economic Priorities details how to carry out Moscow's orders in its anti-SDI diatribe, "The Strategic Defense Initiative: Costs, Contractors and Consequences." They demand that: 1) the U.S. must "reduce SDI's emphasis on developing prototype systems"; 2) "Congress should significantly slow the SDI's funding growth"; 3) the U.S. must solely depend on "arms control"; 4) Congress must tie up the SDI in unending "reviews," "assessments," and "blue ribbon panels."

The essential effect of the above proposed House Armed Services Committee's (HASC) \$1.2 billion cuts in the \$3.7 billion SDI budget request is to remove the capability of realizing demonstration prototypes any time in this decade and to prevent the realization of any significant level of industrial infrastructure for laser and optics hardware. Thus the SDI is gutted.

The largest cutbacks would be in Surveillance and Tracking, \$496 million. This technology is "passive" in that it is directed toward merely determining when and where Soviet attacks

The SDI budget request and proposed congressional cuts (in millions of dollars)

	1984	1985	1986	1987
Surveillance and tracking	366.5	546.0	1,386.4	1,874.9
House-proposed cuts			-496	
Directed-energy weapons	322.5	376.4	965.4	1,195.6
House-proposed cuts			-240	
Kinetic energy weapons	195.8	256.0	859.7	1,238.6
House-proposed cuts			-350	
Systems concepts & battle mgmt	82.7	99.0	243.3	272.5
House-proposed cuts			-70	
Surviv. lethality & key tech	23.5	112.0	258.2	316.7
House-proposed cuts			-84	
SDIO program mgmt		8.0	9.2	10.0

are launched. It is the most essential element of any missile-defense system and is of immediate significance for enhancing U.S. defense capabilities—increasing the time for U.S. response to Soviet surprise first strikes. The program consists of developing advanced radars and new methods of missile detection, such as laser radar. In particular, this program is emphasizing the early realization of the industrial infrastructure for rapid construction of large optics and mirrors. As noted in the official SDI 1985 Report to Congress: "The optics must be manufactured at a high rate to allow deployment of a constellation in a timely manner." Because this program is essential to any missile defense system and it would immediately enhance existing U.S. defense capabilities, it has been targeted by both Moscow and Congress for the largest cuts.

While directed-energy weapons receive only the third greatest level of cutbacks, qualitatively this will prevent the realization of proof-of-principle experiments. In particular, the HASC's action will prevent the demonstration of the ALPHA space-based chemical laser technology in combination with the Large Optics Demonstration Experiment (LODE) and the Lode Advanced Mirror Program (LAMP). Both LODE and LAMP are applicable to other laser systems. This space-based laser demonstration project is also crucial to

ground-based laser demonstration projects. The reason is that much of the same optics and mirrors utilized for relaying space-based laser generated beams can also be utilized for ground-based lasers, which utilize orbiting relay mirrors. LODE and LAMP would have gone a long way to realize the industrial infrastructure needed for optics and mirrors for both space-based and ground-based lasers.

The HASC would also undermine major ground-based excimer and free electron laser demonstration experiments. As noted at the recent University of Rochester Conference on lasers and beams for fusion and strategic defense, both the excimer and free electron laser (FEL) have matured enough to proceed to prototype demonstration on a large scale. But the \$240 million House cut will prevent this and only permit continuation of existing research facilities.

The proposed cuts in programs such as Kinetic Energy Weapons, prevent both the possibility of an early response to the ongoing Soviet ABM breakout and reinforce the curtailment of advanced beam weapon development, since research resources and buildup of industrial infrastructure, such as for production of laser hardware, from this area would have to be redeployed to near-term technology to establish any level of credible response to continuing Soviet violations of the 1972 ABM treaty.