movement—as evidence that Poland has the same enemies as Ibero-America. The debt weapon could be used by them both in a fight for "sovereign nation-state republics, and . . . the establishment of a world order dominated by a community of principle among such sovereign republics," which LaRouche defined last year (*EIR*, June 30, 1981) as the solution to the question, "Can Poland Yet Be Saved?"

British banking sources have said privately that they are watching the pattern of collaboration among debtor countries, concerned that Poland might be attracted to those efforts. Tours of Ibero-America in recent weeks by Polish trade officials and by Foreign Minister Stefan Olszowski have resulted, thus far, in several barter deals of Polish coal for grain and oil (see article, page 35).

The British sources expressed the intention of offering Poland an individually tailored solution, even at the price of more rescheduling and *de facto* moratoria, in exchange for "constructive" reform—putting consumption and sections of industry on the chopping block in order to pay debts.

Wrangling over the economic reform occupied much of the Central Committee plenum. The first phase of reform, instituted in January 1982, consisted solely of crisis-management: drastic price hikes and rules for accountability of companies is to turn a profit or face being disbanded.

One purpose of the price hikes, coming after wage increases won by Solidarnosc, was to limit consumption (some products were rationed), so as to reduce imports. But the plenum heard recriminations against price-setting officials for callousness with regard to the population, the purchasing power of whose currency fell by 30-40 percent since Jan. 1. While fending off criticism, the government has yet to fashion a more comprehensive economic program.

There was some attempt by party members to make political capital of the anger about prices, at Jaruzelski's expense. The most extreme challenge to Jaruzelski's competence came from Tadeusz Grabski, an ousted Politburo member who boasts connections in Soviet and East German party circles, in a letter circulated to his co-thinkers—and, assiduously, to Western reporters. Grabski's attack on over-concentration on the economic reform as a detriment to the party's ideological integrity received wide publicity in the Western media, even though it did not make it onto the floor of the plenum of debate. Grabski is also marching under the standard of "debt moratorium," according to reports of his opinions circulating in Europe; but for him, this would be aimed not at the goal of a reorganization and revival of world trade, but at shutting down relations with the West and wreaking as much havoc as possible while doing so.

According to government spokesman Jerzy Urban, the government hopes to end martial law by January 1983. Both Urban and Jaruzelski, however, said that an outbreak of strikes and demonstrations would change that timetable once again. This condition will be tested on Nov. 10, by the scale of response to a call by underground leaders of the banned Solidarnosc organization, for an eight-hour strike.

DOE admits sabotage of U.S. fusion power

by Paul Gallagher

Thermonuclear fusion energy and related plasma-age technologies are the frontier of technological breakthroughs and future industrial strength for both the superpowers, and other nations of the world. Until early October of this year, the Department of Energy (DOE) and the office of the President's Science Adviser (OSTP) maintained that the United States was pursuing fusion as rapidly as its scientific progress justified, despite failure to carry out the Magnetic Fusion Energy Engineering Act of 1980. The Act's mandated goal was commercial fusion by the year 2000; the DOE and OSTP under Reagan have continued the Carter policy, in late 1980 and early 1981, of denying that such a goal was possible *or necessary*.

Now, following embarrassing exposures during recent months of ongoing sabotage of the rate of progress of fusion R&D, including exposés by *EIR* and by *Fusion* magazine, the DOE has admitted to Congress that the United States is needlessly delaying fusion development.

On Oct. 1, members of Congress received the DOE's Program Management Plan for the future of the American magnetic-fusion effort. The plan suddenly abandons the past year's figleaf of attacks on the scientific and engineering "readiness" of fusion by White House Science Adviser George Keyworth and the Office of Management and Budget. It admits that those agencies' sabotage will probably delay commercial fusion energy by at least a decade, in violation of Congress's mandate to develop this technology on a crash basis.

The effect of this report to Congress is akin to the point in the old television courtroom dramas when the guilty party was forced to rise, admit the crime, and blurt out what delusion led him to commit it. The Oct. 1 plan lists clearly, in a section on "Options, Risks, and Benefits," the major areas of difference *as to effects* between the current austerity program, and one which would actually follow through on the 1980 Act. It shows in detail how the recommended DOE "option" will fail, and implementation of the Act would succeed.

No engineering stage

Without going into technical detail in this space: the DOE plan apologetically restates the decision *not* to build an engineering-center facility to ignite fusion plasmas, generate

reaction products and power, and test the results on materials, fuels, and various reactor designs for magnetic-confinement systems. Such a facility, based around the essential development of such "systems-integrating devices," was the central feature of the 1980 McCormack Fusion Engineering Act. The plan lists the dubious "benefits" of dropping the legislative imperative as merely "minimizing near-term costs" and "not requiring input from outside the U.S. fusion program [sic]".

The plan proceeds to list its own effects as "risks": first, future decisions on reactor designs will be made with inadequate information; second, long delays (delays of up to a decade) are virtually certain in construction of an engineering test reactor, which is the next step after a general fusion-engineering center program; third, such a reactor is likely to fail to meet its performance goals; and fourth, no proof-of-principle is likely for any alternative design other than the mainline tokamak. The tokamak, while clearly the most developed reactor, is known to be by no means the most advanced fusion facility design.

In closing, the plan presents as an "option" the re-establishment of the national mission orientation and timetable to "reach a fusion demonstration reactor . . . during the late 1990s to demonstrate economic feasibility." The missing ingredient, of extreme importance for national economies and populations throughout the world, is identified as "the level of funding specified in the Magnetic Fusion Energy Engineering Act of 1980."

The only justification even referred to in the plan for delaying fusion energy far into the 21st century, is "the condition of the national economy." But by postponing fusion power to at least 30 to 40 years from now, the administration's new substitute for a policy forfeits fusion as the 1995-2000 "horizon point" for an immediate recovery of the world economy from depression, which would be effected by broad infrastructural-development projects and worldwide electrification.

So vast is the current electrical energy deficit of the underdeveloped world (now estimated at 3 *million* megawatts of capacity), and of the "formerly industrialized nations" like the United States, that to close this deficit a world nuclear revival will have to lead very rapidly, by the end of the century, to the development of thermonuclear fusion reactors, with far higher power densities and with many more applications to increasing human productivity.

A recent economic/demographic study by the Fusion Energy Foundation proved that this overwhelming energy deficit in the developing nations, due to the denial of nuclear energy while fossile fuel costs escalated over a decade, cost the lives of 115 million people, 75 million of them children who died needlessly before the age of 15.

Political effects

The DOE's extraordinary admission of footdragging on fusion points the finger at Science Advisor Keyworth, and the Friedmanites who have undercut what remained of scientific dirigism—government guidance of the pace and direction of scientific and technological development, as in the NASA program.

Under Jimmy Carter, the DOE tried to dismiss the McCormack Magnetic Fusion Act as "permissive legislation."

President Reagan, by appointing Keyworth, visited even worse leadership upon the fusion program. Himself a plasma physicist, Keyworth wielded budget cuts to try to force laboratory directors and experimentalists to admit the "scientific unreadiness" of the program for the engineering stage of development; Keyworth has repeatedly claimed that there is no need for a new energy source for the foreseeable future.

Keyworth is, in turn, being programmed by the Friedmanite Heritage Foundation controllers of OMB Director David Stockman. On Oct. 14 he told a Wall Street audience: "Government displays notorious ineptness when it tries its heavy hand at accelerating the development of technologies. The number-one example was the federal attempt to speed up energy technologies."

Obtaining the confession

The Program Management Plan itself came out of meetings of the Magentic Fusion Advisory Committee, made of DOE fusion officials and leaders of the program from the nation's national laboratories. The early-June 1982 meeting of MFAC was dominated by an opening presentation by Keyworth, retailing these falsehoods. DOE officials used Madison Avenue language to glorify postponing the fusion engineering and development stage "while we better define our product in the perception of the country." They recommended a kind of five-year "contest" among experimental reactor designs, from which only one design would survive, to go on to engineering development. While this was going on, they said, any attempt at engineering-testing of power-reactor conditions, materials, and so forth would wait. It was clear that one or more lines of experimental reactor design was to be terminated immediately.

Executive Intelligence Review exposed that meeting in its Aug. 17 issue as destruction of scientific morale through budget chiseling. *Fusion* magazine published a special issue demonstrating how the fusion timetable could actually be further accelerated by exploiting new innovations in fuels and reactors. At the MFAC and international fusion meetings in early September, that special issue was much commented on by American and visiting scientists. The environmentalist British magazine *New Scientist* admitted in mid-September that Keyworth had failed to get the scientists to police themselves by deciding which of their programs to eliminate. The program's leaders in government and private-sector laboratories are insisting on what they knew to be the truth: the scientific feasibility of fusion has in fact already been demonstrated.

Now, as a result, the DOE has admitted to Congress that the "Apollo Project" for fusion could succeed.