

# EIR Special Report

## *A reply to Soviet critics*

# Why a beam-weapons 'arms race' is necessary

by Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.

*The following article was released on Dec. 22, 1982.*

My Soviet critics warn me that the government of the Soviet Union is presently committed, unswervingly, to a doctrine of opposition to deployment of space-based anti-missile beam-weapons. I counter with the observation, that there are actually no permanently unswerving policies of this sort in world affairs among rational governments, but only the prerogative of rational governments to cling, even unswervingly, to present policies pending submission of conclusive proof that a better policy must replace those of the present.

As to the scientific-technical feasibility of anti-missile beam-weapons, I am certain that my Soviet critics entertain no general disagreement with my proposals on this point. It appears that the central Soviet objection to my proposal is their voiced argument, that development of space-based beam-weapons means the unleashing of a new technological arms-race, an argument used widely among supporters of the nuclear freeze and peace movements in the U.S.A. and Europe, as well as the Soviet Union.

I do not disagree with my critics' observation, that deployment of anti-missile beam weapons implies a technological arms-race. Nor am I insensible of strong Soviet objections to an implied increase in Soviet arms budgets in the order of magnitude such a new arms-race would imply. However, I would strongly recommend to my Soviet critics my opinion that their budgetary concerns, their frustration at the crippling effects of present Soviet arms-expenditures levels, may have excessively and wrongly influenced their views concerning advanced military technologies generally.

Nonetheless, while conceding to them the two cited points of argument, I insist that their objections to beams-weapons development depend upon dangerously wrong judgments of the present and near-term strategic situations. To be most specific, I insist that if the policies associated with the international nuclear freeze and peace movements are imposed upon nations and upon international agreements, thermonuclear war—thermonuclear holocaust—is virtually certain during the course of the years immediately ahead. 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. I insist that it is people, not weapons, which choose war, and that it is the effects of policy of nations, including military policy, upon the shaping of culture and cultural outlooks, which determine the political preconditions for warfare. I insist that the cultural impact of beam-weapons development is indispensable to developing the political preconditions for war-avoidance.

That latter point, the cultural-impact issue, is the kernel of my general counter-argument as a whole.

We must situate this central, cultural-impact argument within a summary analysis of the presently growing danger of thermonuclear holocaust. I stress to my Soviet critics, that the characteristic feature of developments since 1962-63 under the influence of Mutually Assured Destruction (MAD) dogma, has been to impel the world through an illusory phase of 'detente,' into the presently growing ripeness for unleashing of preconditions for thermonuclear holocaust. I insist that Soviet circles have been so attracted by the kind of detente-negotiations subsumed by the MAD doctrine, that they have overlooked the fact that the MAD doctrine virtually ensures ultimate thermonuclear warfare.

Probably, my Soviet critics will agree immediately with some of my leading observations on this matter, and may therefore be induced to recognize that they themselves have erred in failing so far to put all the pieces of this matter together in the necessary fashion. I am hopeful that, their viewing all of the leading implications of the MAD doctrine in a single setting, will persuade them of the correctness of my fears on this account.

As part of my technical argument itself, I indicate what has already been indicated in recently published locations: that a "NASA-like" crash-program for development and deployment of space-based and supplementary anti-missile beam-weapons systems will not cost the economy of the United States a single net penny. The technological spillover of advanced military technologies into the civilian sector will so much accelerate average per capita productivity that there will be a net gain in real income per capita to the economy as a whole. If the Soviet Union were to approach the matter in the same fashion, the same economic logic applies.

### **1. The contradictory logic of MAD**

The political-cultural shocks of the October 1962 Missile Crisis and the 1963 assassination of President John F. Kennedy created political-psychological conditions, both in the U.S.A. and worldwide, in which frightened institutions were prone to tolerate the introduction of a strategic doctrine called Mutually Assured Destruction (MAD). Although Soviet stra-

tegic doctrine did not accept the U.S.A.-NATO versions of the MAD theory until perhaps 1977 or slightly later, Soviet thinking converged on the MAD doctrine's argument at least to the degree that nuclear warfare was viewed as "almost unthinkable" if not as entirely, or absolutely so.

It was attractive to believe, that the probable near or total obliteration of homelands of adversaries by thermonuclear bombardment, made general war so horrifying that such war had become more or less unthinkable. There developed, increasingly, the curious love-hate view of monstrous thermonuclear arsenals, in which the very fear of such weapons was interpreted as assurance that general war was no longer a possibility, that no situation could develop, in which "World War III" would actually erupt.

There developed the much-believed delusion, that the risk of World War III was reduced to the imperatives of "crisis management." It was increasingly accepted doctrine, that the remote possibility of "nuclear misunderstandings," between the two superpowers and their respective allies, required NATO and the Warsaw Pact to establish "crisis management" methods and institutions, by which accidents could be dealt with in such a way that thermonuclear bombardment never actually occurred, even in the case some mad commander of nuclear forces of one of the powers, or some third party, might actually unleash one or more nuclear weapons.

At the end of the 1960s and beginning of the 1970s, the notions of crisis management spun out of MAD became the featured element of an enterprise known as detente. Arms limitation agreements and associated agreements and institutions of strategic protocol became integral to the apparent geometry of strategic relations.

However, already by the beginning of 1973, when the signatures on arms-limitation and related detente-agreements had merely dried, detente began to unravel, with the ominous emergence of NATO doctrines of "forward-based nuclear defense," leading into the British-Kissinger 1979 effort for adoption of the so-called Euromissiles proposal. It is the grave, and apparently continuing error of Soviet and some Western influentials, not to recognize that nuclear forward-based defense is the consistent and necessary consequence of a MAD-linked form of detente.

The key to Soviet errors of assessment on this point is a manifest wishful element in the Soviet view of the connection between MAD and detente, notably the mistaken Soviet doctrines which ritually distinguish between so-called "realists" and the "military-industrial complex" in the U.S.A. itself. In fact, on this point of Soviet doctrine, such social-political categories of Soviet policy-assessment are non-existent elements within the Atlantic Alliance as a whole. Clearly, Soviet assessments do not understand the real motives and continuing purpose of the MAD doctrine.

Soviet officials can and do recognize:

If MAD doctrines of deterrence are efficient, then, the West can "contain" the Soviet strategic potential through a

mere "aura of power" attached to the reality of thermonuclear arsenals. In other words, the view develops that the U.S.A. no longer requires large reserves of trained citizen-soldiers, and no longer requires the economic agro-industrial logistical basis for in-depth war-fighting capabilities.

What Soviet statists have failed to comprehend, is the fact that the immediate purpose of the MAD doctrine was to permit the gradual take-down of precisely those features of the U.S. civilian economy which would have to be developed to a high level of war-fighting potential, if an adversary status existed between the powers under other than MAD conditions.

If the U.S.A. maintained a strategic-adversary relationship to the U.S.S.R. without a MAD deterrence posture, this adversary status would have required the U.S.A. to maintain virtually "dirigist" monetary and economic policies, to the purpose of promoting the highest potential rate of investment and employment of the labor-force in technologically advancing agriculture, industry and basic infrastructure, while fostering higher rates of technological and economic progress among both its military allies and those developing sector nations, such as Ibero-American states, integral to the total logistical potential of the U.S. economy.

This would have forced emphasis upon capital-goods-producing industries, upon classical and scientific education in public schools and universities, and heavy emphasis upon science and engineering both as professions and as the cultural influence affecting the world-outlook and skills of labor generally.

MAD permitted its backers to steer the U.S.A. and Western Europe in the direction of transformation into what is called a "post-industrial utopia." In the main, that change in the character of the civilian society of the Atlantic Alliance nations was the long-term purpose of MAD.

This change in character of the U.S.A. (in particular) began at a relatively slow pace, and accelerated over the course of the recent two decades. Since MAD represented a shift away from the traditional philosophical world-outlook of the U.S. population, as well as traditional military doctrine, the post-industrial society policy could not have been imposed unless its initial measures were cautiously gradual.

The first major development, after the inauguration of MAD as such, was the Johnson administration's adoption of a fraudulent policy called the "Great Society." The "Great Society" was modeled in principle on the "Triple Revolution" thesis earlier promulgated by the Ford Foundation and Robert M. Hutchins. This policy was adopted under direct pressure from British secret intelligence (the London Tavistock Institute) in the form of Tavistock's Rapaport Report. This Rapaport Report denounced the cultural impact of NASA, denounced the effect of NASA in promoting pro-science outlooks and increasing admiration for rationality within the U.S. population. It demanded, and Johnson accepted, an immediate phasing-down of advanced research and development. Johnson used the "Great Society" program's misleading rhetoric of increased funds for "social programs," as

the pretext for collapsing the structure of research-and-development.

Two other developments are crucial in tracing-out the preparations for the presently growing threat of thermonuclear war.

The first of these developments was Johnson's escalation of the Vietnam War. This escalation of a bloody, "no win" mode of colonialist warfare in Southeast Asia, had the principal political effect of disaffecting a majority of the population from traditionalist outlooks toward military policy in particular, and technological optimism more generally. It is most instructive, that the same Anglo-American faction which earlier launched the Vietnam War also organized the anti-Vietnam War movement!

The second development, overlapping the political by-products of the protracted Vietnam War, was the 1963 launching of the rock-drug-sex counterculture with the dispensing of tens of millions of doses of LSD-25 to the U.S. youth population. After the events of May-June 1968, much of the youth movement assembled around the issue of the Vietnam War was reprogrammed, to become the terrorist and environmentalist movements launched on both sides of the Atlantic during 1969-1970.

By 1972-1974, the youth of the U.S.A. and much of Western Europe had been significantly conditioned to support the irrationalist Malthusian ferment of the 1970s.

These convergent structural, social and political changes of the 1963-74 period intersected two major developments in the world economy. The first was the destruction of the Bretton Woods agreements with the August 1971 decoupling of the U.S. dollar from gold-reserve basis and the orchestration of the 1973-1974 petroleum-price crisis. Out of these developments of "floating-exchange rates" and "energy conservation," the worsened monetary conditions for long-term credit in world-trade and investment and energy-usage were employed to the effect of putting the OECD sector, plus the developing nations generally, into a spiral of economic devolution at accelerating rates.

The attempt to elaborate a military policy within these economic constraints took the form of tearing-down the relative classical strategic capabilities in-depth of the Atlantic Alliance, while attempting to compensate for in-depth weakness through more aggressive assault-postures near Soviet borders.

This curious shift in NATO and related policies intersected an additional, most-important feature of developments in prevailing military thinking.

If one believes in thermonuclear deterrence, as the MAD doctrine prescribes, then one believes that one can conduct policies of practice of a sort which would otherwise trigger general warfare, without actually risking general war. Since the other side, presumably, would not actually risk thermonuclear warfare, it must adapt itself to tolerating degrees of aggressive measures which would otherwise be *casus belli* for even World War III. Those policies which assume that

the Soviet leadership would “accept nuclear warfare in the European theater” without resorting to intercontinental warfare, is an expression of this dangerous tendency in belief.

I do not believe that “flexible response” deployments, such as the Euromissiles, would probably lead **directly** to thermonuclear holocaust. I argue that such deployments lead to a deterioration of the strategic situation, such that the likelihood of thermonuclear war triggered by other developments is increased—as I shall explain in due course here.

Normally, the danger of general war, and local warfare, is often perversely a contribution to maintenance of peace, to precisely the extent that nations are made aware thus of the danger of pressing too hard against the vital national interest of potential adversary-powers—up to a certain limit, of course. If that observation is conditionally true, the opposite is unconditionally true. If a power believes it can go almost to any lengths in provocations against a well-matched adversary nation, there is the fostering of a corresponding disposition for “brinkmanship,” for thermonuclear blackmail as a growing feature of policy.

So, the basis for past detente, 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 obligation to weigh policies against their consequences, which is key to the growing danger of thermonuclear holocaust under present circumstances.

## **2. The countdown to nuclear warfare**

The blend of adversary-relationship, and fear of means of general warfare, impels each of the adversaries to contemplate and attempt the destruction of the other by non-military means. Out of this shift of strategy to the domain of psychological warfare, and in the setting of the presently worsening breakdown of the Bretton Woods monetary order, develops the most probable scenario for plunge of both powers into thermonuclear holocaust.

Those Anglo-American influentials who presently back the nuclear freeze and peace movements, such as the U.S.A.’s Harrimanites, choose “peace” only because they continue to be persuaded that the “Soviet Empire” is approaching the preconditions for its destruction from within. The working assumption among these purported London and Manhattan “realists,” is that the Soviet “Empire” is about to be destroyed by waves of insurrections sweeping out of Eastern Europe, through the Ukraine’s Uniate population, through the Caucasus states, and into Soviet Central Asia. Naturally, the possibility of such insurrections is being assisted by these circles, and supplementary measures of economic warfare, and possibly measures to reduce Soviet agricultural output, are being employed.

In the view from Moscow, the Atlantic Alliance’s nations exhibit notably potentialities for destruction from within. The

rock-drug-sex counterculture, the anti-science Malthusian movement generally, the growth of terrorist movements, potentialities for linking terrorist forces to desperation-riots of unemployed, and the peace movement itself, typify a process of “Western civilization’s” destruction of itself from within. It occurs to some in Moscow: If these nations wish to destroy themselves so, let us help them in their endeavor.

At the moment, the OECD and developing nations are already in a deep recession. Except for social-welfare measures institutionalized, in part, during and following the depression of the 1930s, the social impact of the present depression upon the U.S.A. would be already greater than during the worst of the 1930s. Parallel developments are accelerating in Europe. Unless there is a radical shift from recent trends in OECD nations’ monetary policies, during no later than mid-1983, there will be a multi-trillion-dollar monetary collapse, worse than anything known during Europe’s nineteenth and twentieth centuries to date.

Naturally, if the U.S.A. and other governments change their present policies appropriately, this present economic depression can be halted and reversed. We assume, for the moment, the case in which no such sane alteration in policies occurs.

If we can assume, during the next several years ahead, that the Soviet economy suffers nothing more painful than a severe, self-imposed austerity, then the material and political strategic resources of the Atlantic Alliance powers will collapse relative to Soviet strategic capabilities. Yet, despite that general collapse of capabilities, the thermonuclear arsenal will remain.

For this case, we might assume a significant reduction in thermonuclear arsenals. We cannot assume, however, that either strategic power would actually reduce its thermonuclear arsenal below the level it believes adequate to obliterate the other.

There would be an analogous, if reversed case were the OECD nations to stabilize their economies and the Soviet Union to suffer major internal weakening.

In this direction of developments, the qualitatively weakened power has the choice either to submit to the organic or arbitrary increase of world strategic hegemony of the other, or to remedy the relative weakness by resort to thermonuclear blackmail.

Let us consider for the moment, only the case in which the U.S.A. is the relatively weakened power. In that case, the government in Washington, D.C., will not be that of the personally genial President Ronald Reagan. The forces linked to Averell Harriman, the Morgans and Jay Lovestone will reach down into the scrap-heap for some approximation of a fascist government, a government born out of riots of unemployed and others in the streets. In such an unfolding of events, the same Harrimans and others now sponsoring the peace movement will remember that it was their families which supported the British and the BIS in imposing the Adolf Hitler dictatorship in Germany. Once their confidence

in an internal disintegration of the Soviet "Empire" is destroyed, all peacefulness will vanish from the faces of the Harrimans and their kind. Their view will be "Après nous, le déluge!"

### 3. The deeper roots of MAD

The key to understanding the the present strategic situation is to remember that the American Revolution was fought against Britain because the forces allied to Benjamin Franklin could not and would not tolerate the economic policies associated with the British East India Company's Adam Smith. Any contrary explanation of the American Revolution is sheer fraud. Moreover, despite President Wilson's, and ex-President Theodore Roosevelt's alliance with Britain in the First World War, from the period of the naval conference conflicts into approximately 1938, the United States developed and maintained a plan for war against Britain and Britain's Mitsui allies in Japan, called "War Plan Red." During the last World War, President Franklin Roosevelt projected and demanded an end to both British imperialism and the monetary policies of Adam Smith for the post-war world.

The death of President Roosevelt coincided with the abandonment of vital U.S. strategic interests, in favor of subordinating U.S. policy to the anti-Roosevelt post-war policies of Winston Churchill. This British subversion of U.S. policy took the included form of Bertrand Russell's relatively short-lived 1947 proposal for preventive nuclear war against the Soviet Union, and also took the form of W. Averell Harriman's, and Britain's successful isolation of the most dangerous surviving U.S. patriot of the period, Gen. Douglas MacArthur. With the passing of the Eisenhower administration, and with the added effect of the assassination of President Kennedy, the Anglo-American faction's grip on both U.S. foreign and domestic policies increased to the point of becoming virtually dictatorial.

The issues of this struggle within the United States are parallel to and connected to the great division which developed in mid-eighteenth century Russia.

The collaboration between Gottfried Leibniz and Peter I resulted in the magnificent Petrograd Academy and the remarkable industrial development, quantitatively surpassing Britain's, during the first half of the century. The Leibniz faction in Russia, associated with Leonhard Euler, Mikhail Lomonosov, Aepinus, et al., was directly allied with Benjamin Franklin, and was key to Russia's key leadership in sponsoring that League of Armed Neutrality which finally secured the young United States' decisive, humiliating victory over Britain.

During the middle of the same century, worsening monstrously under Catherine and her lovers, the social, economic and cultural reforms launched under Peter I were substantially repealed or neutralized, especially by the so-called French faction ("Voltaireans"), and by the Venetian and British networks. Russia was sent into social and economic retreat, from which it did not significantly recover until the renewed in-

dustrialization under Alexander II, Abraham Lincoln's war-time ally.

The same division between the followers of Leibniz and of Bentham and Rousseau, which characterized eighteenth and nineteenth century Russian history, has also characterized the internal conflicts within the U.S.A. from the period of the American Revolution onward. In the U.S.A., the division has been between the followers of the Leibniz-allied Franklin current and the British-influenced followers of Rousseau, Adam Smith, and Jeremy Bentham.

This division's significance was developed into its modern form by the nineteenth-century British policy-influencing circles associated with John Stuart Mill and John Ruskin, the policy current which has ruled Britain in such exemplary guises as the Fabian Society, the Round Table, the Royal Institute for International Affairs, the Tavistock Institute, and the Scottish Rite Freemasons presently under the direction of Michael Duke of Kent. Ruskin's master-perspective for returning Europe to a neo-feudalistic utopia is key to identifying the matrix of neo-feudalistic thinking behind Malthusianism generally and the motivation for the MAD doctrine in particular.

Essentially, as long as a society is dominated by a commitment to technological progress, and the development of the potentialities of the individual in a manner consistent with technological progress, the kind of cultural and moral outlook associated with the Golden Renaissance, with the American Revolution, or the Weimar Classic republican movement in Germany tends to be the predominant tendency in society. The anti-republican cultural and moral outlook, as typified by the feudalistic or rentier-financier outlooks, is associated with social practice adapted to technological pessimism.

Technological optimism, in turn, correlates with the scientific world-outlook, with the submission of the human will to discovery of the lawful connection between causes (e.g. policies) and effects in social practice. Technological pessimism is synonymous with irrationalist hedonism, or with the special forms of "spiritual" hedonism associated with hideous paganist cults.

The center of the strategic problem today is the fact that heirs of John Ruskin's neo-feudalist views, including Anglo-American rentier interests such as the Harrimans, or the *fondi* rentier interests behind the Basel Bank for International Settlements, have introduced to society generally and to their own social practice, a hideous form of rabid irrationalism. This irrationalism is typified by the proto-Nazi outlooks of Friedrich Nietzsche, Richard Wagner, Houston Stewart Chamberlain, and the inner core of the Nazis proper—the kind of irrationalism which seeks to impose its irrational will upon society even, like Hitler, at the risk of an existentialist's attempt to enact his own *Götterdämmerung*.

It is not nuclear weapons which constitute the source of risk of thermonuclear war, but rather the spread and deepening of the rabid irrationalism associated with such perpe-

trators of the MAD and post-industrial society doctrines as Robert S. McNamara himself.

This is not the same as to argue that rationality necessarily equals pacifism. There are justified wars in history. Were I President of the United States, I would be disposed to fight a necessary, justified war against any nation-state or combination of adversaries. The issue before us in this discussion is the danger of an unjustifiable thermonuclear war, the kind of war which rational forces governing, respectively, the U.S.A. and U.S.S.R. would never undertake.

It is in that concrete context, not the context of hypothetical wars under hypothetical circumstances, that the importance of rationality as key to peace is under discussion here.

If Malthusian cultural influences were to dominate the institutions of both the U.S.S.R. and the U.S.A., for example, or even one of those powers, thermonuclear war is probably inevitable under the specific conditions of crisis now unfolding. If the interdependency between MAD doctrine and Malthusianism persists in the "West" in particular, thermonuclear war is now virtually inevitable during the period immediately ahead. In other words, if the success of the combined nuclear freeze and peace movements brings to consolidated power the Malthusian irrationalist social forces of the Atlantic Alliance nations, that success of the "peace movement" ensures the circumstances and quality of government in which nuclear holocaust becomes almost inevitable.

If the United States and Soviet Union are in fact committed to avoiding thermonuclear holocaust, it is indispensable that their separate and coordinated policy-efforts combine to the effect of restoring the cultural supremacy of technological optimism, and thus catalyzing the supremacy of rationality among the majority of the population and governments of the leading nations.

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. If unleashing the potential for a technological arms-race brings that rational state of affairs into being, there is nothing to fear from the potentiality of such an arms-race.

Otherwise, if that Anglo-American faction associated with the neo-feudalist heritage of John Ruskin prevails among the Atlantic Alliance powers of today, we probably avoid the possibility of a technological arms-race, but we ensure the virtual certainty of thermonuclear holocaust.

The objective of the Ruskinites has been to bring into being the kind of "science-fiction" utopia in which society is ruled by a small rentier-financier (feudalistic) elite of "families," an elite armed with a small reservoir of advanced military technology, within a society otherwise generally reduced to brutish superstitions and crude, labor-intensive toil. The H. G. Wells "model" to this effect is illustrative of the point.

The dominant feature of the MAD doctrine has been a large-scale and broadly successful "cultural engineering" endeavor centered not only in certain British institutions devoted

to such work, but in a broader spectrum of agencies such as those coordinated under the direction of the Venetian Cini Foundation. To implement the culture-destroying policies associated, exemplarily, with the Huxleys and Bertrand Russell's Unified Sciences Project, it was deemed indispensable to retain the cultural instrument of adversary-relations between Washington and Moscow, while at the same time destroying the hegemony of the technological imperative in maintenance of strategic capabilities. The MAD doctrine not only tended to make technological progress appear, increasingly, superfluous for military policy, but the terrifying irrationality associated with mutual deterrence aided in promoting the irrationalism of technological pessimism.

It is directly related to this that Arnold Toynbee ceased to publish annual reports of world history's progress during the early 1950s, and that the late Carroll Quigley defined 1963 as a breaking-point in the general direction and characteristics of world history. For the heirs of John Ruskin and Aleister Crowley, the "Age of Aquarius" was inaugurated with the MacNamara introduction of the MAD doctrine.

It happens that neither of us can dare to rid ourselves of thermonuclear arsenals by any means but development of weapons-systems which render missile-launches technologically obsolete. That step we must take, otherwise we can not rid ourselves of this thermonuclear terror.

However, the deeper, longer-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. If we undertake these measures, we shall have visibly freed humanity from 1) thermonuclear nightmares, shall have 2) attacked the terrifying problem of economic depression effectively, and 3) shall have unleashed those circumstances of world trade in which the technological development of the developing nations is undertaken as the late President Franklin Roosevelt envisaged for the work of the post-war period. By deploying advanced technology to solve simultaneously several of the leading problems oppressing and terrifying mankind, we shall have acted most efficiently to promote rapid embrace of technological optimism and rationality among the populations and governments of the nations.

So, the clear technological solution to the problem of thermonuclear arsenals coincides with the indispensable measures of cultural engineering needed to attack and remove the causes of the growing war-danger.

#### **4. Economic implications**

In brief, as you may already know, the LaRouche-Riemann method of economic forecasting has proven itself to be the only method of economic analysis which competently forecasts the consequences of policy in the world today. Therefore, on the authority of the proven scientific authority of that method, I am permitted to insist on the reliable quality of certain forecasts my associates and I have made respecting

the economic effects of beam-weapon development.

The problems of space-deployment, detection, targeting, energizing and use of anti-missile beam-weapons require our massive development of scientific research and technological-industrial development on the frontier of capabilities existing today. The military aspect of this effort is relatively small relative to the non-military scientific and industrial base which must be developed to produce and maintain the kinds of offensive weapons-systems involved. The spill-over of NASA technology into the U.S. civilian economy is exemplary of the combined effects of the kind of program projected. Just as the U.S. economy gained an estimated ten dollars or more in increased wealth for every dollar invested in NASA, the impact of beam-weapons development will be significantly better.

In my method of economic analysis, we put in secondary rank monetary values and even counting of the relative numbers of useful objects produced. We take this data into account only as reflecting a mediation of something more fundamental. The heart of economic science is the maintenance and increase of mankind's power to sustain its own existence. This power is properly measured as increase of potential relative population-density, as I have elaborated this in other published locations. It is from this vantage-point of analysis that the economic feasibility and benefits of beam-weapons development becomes most readily clear.

The proper center of economic policy is an effort to focus as much as possible of the allotable surplus productive capacity of society in the development and proliferation of those technological innovations which most greatly increase the per-capita potential relative population-density expressed by employed productive labor engaged in use of those technologies. Rather than seeking a "fair distribution" of investment-funds to all sectors of production equally, we must give relative priority to the successful, forced development of the most revolutionary kinds of technology.

This was, incidentally, the gist of Leibniz's recommendations to Peter I. This policy was exemplified by the policies of the Ecole Polytechnique under Gaspard Monge and Lazare Carnot. This same kind of approach is exemplified in the cases of the Manhattan Project and NASA efforts.

What has often occurred since Leibniz's time, is that society has failed to follow a correct investment policy except through indirect effects of concerted development of improved weapons-systems. The Ecole Polytechnique's development of mobile field artillery, and the coordinate development of new, modern industries under immediate direction of Claude Chaptal, are illustrative of this. So is the Manhattan Project and the case of NASA. Unfortunately, generally speaking, we have not learned to apply the same methods to the work of peace. Except for cases of actual or feared war, we seem not to have learned the importance of creating a national economic consensus on behalf of effecting critical breakthroughs in technologies; so, modern breakthroughs in technology appear to have been the outgrowth of wars or

major mobilizations in anticipation of wars.

It is known to leading scientific and related circles in both our nations, that that outgrowth of Leonardo da Vinci's discovery of hydrodynamics we know today as relativistic physics, portends both immediate and near-term breakthroughs in productive technologies which aggregately exceed in potential the revolutionary effects of the industrial revolution based on the heat-powered machine and chemistry. The implications of development of lasers in the range of 50,000 to 100,000 kilowatts, for example, ought to be of the highest priority, considering the modest but significant revolution in productive technologies this alone would make possible. If we can couple development of controlled thermonuclear fusion as an energy-source to application of relativistic-beam technologies, we shall have entered a regime of productive technologies which will make all present, conventional production techniques seem relatively stone-age crudities.

In first approximation, the potential relative population-density of society correlates with the useful energy-throughput per-square-kilometer and per-capita. More exactly, we should measure not simply watts of throughput, but the relative negentropy associated with such throughputs. If we consider, even with rough, reasonable approximation, the per-capita energy/negentropy throughput implicit in nuclear-fusion-energized systems of the indicated variety, the by-product of a properly directed beam-weapons development begins to be defined.

With such technologies, the very meaning of the term "raw materials," as we presently use that term, vanishes from our technological/economic vocabulary. With sufficient energy-flux-density deployed in regimes designed in terms of relativistic physics, we create raw materials as we please where we require them.

Additionally, as I have stressed in published locations earlier, the moral maturity of mankind will truly begin as we lift up our eyes from hedonistic squabbling in the mud of our planet, and look to the stars to discover what useful work waits to be discovered as man moves into nearby space for exploration and later colonization.

Meanwhile, if we can resolve now to dedicate both our nations to fostering rapid economic development of developing nations, using the increase of technology and world trade, we have established among nations a moral commitment (in effect of practice) to the welfare of each and every person on our planet, a commitment to affording them the productive powers to meet their own requirements. By enriching ourselves through more advanced technologies, we increase our capacity to fulfill what Dr. Edward Teller has rightly identified as "the common aims of mankind."

If that which I have summarily outlined is the philosophical world-outlook of social practice we associate with the development of beam-weapons, and if that world-outlook predominates in the leading circles of nations, we have at last secured peace—at least, for most of mankind.

If we, as adversary powers, can agree to take this route

of developments, separately, independently, but also cooperating to ensure the maintenance of rough strategic parity in the process, we can escape the grave danger which surely confronts us without such a change in course.

## 5. The essence of rationality

I know, from the increasing assassination-threats against my wife and myself over recent years, the curious benefit available to an old man confronted with the possibility of his imminent death. In this special experience one may acquire an insight into the essence of rationality, apparently not possible for younger persons. This observation I summarize as my concluding, and eminently relevant observation here.

Younger, more foolish people race through life, seeking those varieties of personal gratifications which might be entirely enjoyed in the living flesh. The idea of death, the end of such enjoyments, is known to younger people, but the thought is not quite real to them. They brush aside the thought of death, and order their lives chiefly in pursuit of the experiences they hope to enjoy in the flesh.

With wiser old men, death is the imminent reality, the certain knowledge which principally governs all important aspects of current practice. Wise old men live for that which they leave behind them, for that which they themselves can never hope to enjoy in the flesh. The prospect of death does not make one's life less important, but rather makes of the utmost importance that which one's life contributes to generations yet to come.

What is the essence, the truth of this earthly humanity we call society? In the span of the thousands of years which rightly absorbs the attention of Plato's philosopher-king, what is the value of this ephemeral moment which is the mere decades of an individual life?

The individual, although an ephemeral existence, is not irrelevant, not unimportant. Yet, the wise individual exists truly for society, not society for the pleasures of the individual. What we as individuals can accomplish with our lives, what ought to be our principal joy, is that work which contributes something good and permanent to future society, something which will be superseded, and yet, being superseded, remains the necessary foundation for its successors.

This something to which the wise individual adds is usefully termed "culture." It is culture, as transmitted through language, in the broadest sense of language, and through social practice associated with the use of language, which defines the preconditions of thought and practice of future generations. It is the continuity and enrichment of that culture which determines the future condition of humanity.

In a proper ordering of society, the conception of education proposed by Wilhelm von Humboldt is exemplary of social policy generally. The function of society is to develop as fully as possible the potentialities of each new individual, to afford that individual the opportunity to contribute something good and useful through use of those potentialities, and

to cherish the good and nullify the evil that men and women each variously contribute to the development of culture generally.

This matter of culture is not arbitrary. It is not merely a matter of arbitrary personal taste, as the irrationalist John Ruskin and others have proposed. The goodness or badness of a culture is measurable. This measurement is approximated by increase of potential relative population-density. Does the alteration of culture yield an increase in mankind's power over existence? This power reflects man's advancement in comprehension of and obedience to the lawful ordering of the universe, an advancement accomplished through exercise of the creative potentialities of mind.

All that enters into culture is part of this process—science, art, language, historiography. All that is implicitly judged as it contributes to the common general result, the implicitly measurable result of increase in potential relative population-density, an increase which measures the degree of agreement between man's willful practice and the lawful composition of the universe.

It is old men sensible of these matters who must lead the young to acquire this wisdom of old men, while the young are still young. To old men, the tragedy of youth is that young people recklessly waste youth, that for youth hedonistic delights enjoyed immediately in the flesh are too important. It is a difficulty of youth in all periods of history; it has become a monstrous problem in these days when old men turn to seek the pleasures of adolescent sexuality, or adopt for themselves sexes previously unknown to our species.

Foolish young people, and childish old men and women, are so obsessed with pleasures to be enjoyed in the flesh, that the question of culture, as we have summarily identified it here, is alien to them as a conception. They do not suspect that the short-term practical policies, of person or nation, are of secondary importance and effect in themselves, that all that is done in the present moment is essentially ephemeral in existence. What is of lasting effect upon society is the effect of a present choice of short-term, "practical" policy upon the shaping of culture, that it is culture which will determine how future generations act, whether entire societies prosper or degenerate into death.

So, perhaps to numerous among my Soviet critics, and others as well, my proposal to view a beam-weapon military policy as a necessary route for securing a policy of war-avoidance may seem a tortured detour. Why not, they might argue, simply agree to disarm, to agree to a policy of peace? Out of that sort of ignorance of the significance of culture, my Soviet critics would support the rise of political power of a peace movement which is intrinsically fascistic in character, in culture. Such a success for peace thus ensures nuclear holocaust. It is the choice of policy which produces the desired shift in culture which is the only truly practical policy.

Yet, even having said as much, I fear that only a relatively few wise old men will agree with me on this point. The rest must be persuaded by the evidence of arguments that nuclear



freeze ensures thermonuclear holocaust, and that beam-weapons development is the only means for ridding ourselves of the unchallenged power of thermonuclear weapons. They will act properly for such practical reasons, but whether they believe in the efficiency of culture or not, they will contribute to changing culture in the way most favorable to securing war-avoidance. Later, having discovered my argument on culture to have been correct, they will come to recognize and to understand the deeper point, the point of view from which I have in fact elaborated my policy-proposal.

## The world's press on beam-weapons

*In his "Reply to Soviet Critics/Why A Beam Weapons 'Arms Race' Is Necessary" (see page 26), Lyndon LaRouche showed how those attacking him and Edward Teller for proposing development of beam weapons are blocking the only chance mankind has to live beyond the age of nuclear terror. The following is a partial compendium of the press coverage the LaRouche-Teller controversy has generated.*

### Soviet Union

**Voprosy Ekonomiki** (*Questions of Economy*), U.S.S.R., November 1982. Soviet investment specialist Viktor Krasovski:

[The broad introduction of appropriate new technologies] will raise the temperature of the economy. . . . The achievements of scientific and technological progress are realized in expanded socialist reproduction of the U.S.S.R. through capital investments. It is precisely in the course of carrying out these investments that we are creating interlinked complexes of high-energy physics, space research centers, progressive technological schemes of advanced nuclear energy and laser technology, that we build scientific-production centers at enterprises with pilot workshops and laboratories, and that we construct the most modern production equipment, including electronics, microprocessors, bioengineering equipment, automatic devices, modern robots, and latest-generation computers.

**Izvestia**, Dec. 19. Deputy Head of the General Staff, Army Gen. V. Varennikov:

. . . . The Pentagon is already building beam weapons, so we need them also. . . . It must be said that the danger of the military plans of the imperialist powers is growing in connection with the speedy development of military affairs, the possibility for the appearance on the basis of the latest scientific achievements of principally new types of weapons and military technology, including highly precise conventional weapons systems and weapons based on new physical principles.

**Pravda**, U.S.S.R. Yereimei Panov:

[Manhattan Project scientists like Teller] had not hearts beating in their chests, but machines. [The same heartless people are now influencing] pragmatic planners of the military leadership of the U.S. [to build] military space ships, laser weapons, military bases on the moon, etc. [which yesterday appeared to belong to the sphere of] pure fantasy.

**Literaturnaya Gazeta**, U.S.S.R.:

Edward Teller is a cannibal, . . . lover of the bomb . . . hater of mankind.

### Western Europe

**London Guardian**, "Greening of a troubled Germany," Nov. 29, 1982.

. . . . An organization called the European Labor Party, run from the United States, has been running a smear campaign against both [Gen. Gert] Bastian [former head of the 12th Panzer Division in Wurzburg who has written and lectured against weapons modernization programs] and Petra Kelly [one of the three leaders of the German Greens]. "I have told the American Embassy that the ELP are run by the CIA and that they ruined my reputation and his life," says Kelly. "They have run a verbal campaign against us and also in their magazine. The military depends on them for information. The Ministry of Defense sent out warning notices about us to their commanders, but we have succeeded in getting these withdrawn from the Army files."

**Allgemeine Jüdische Wochenzeitung**, West Germany, "Mysterious War at the Shatt-Al-Arab." Dec. 3, 1982:

. . . the beginning of a totally new species of arms which will not kill people any more, but will destroy atomic missiles during their devastating flight, before reaching their aim and bring them down. Of course in Washington and Moscow these new defensive missiles are known and it is known that, within a few years, they can be produced relatively cheaply, with a highly developed preciseness and in great quantities. Therefore one has to ask the question as to what the Americans and Soviets want to negotiate in Geneva, as the agenda of their negotiations might be overridden in a short time by technical developments?

**Corriere della Sera**, Italy. "But which Leonardo? We