

## EIR Special Report

# Beam-weapons strategy relaunched at Erice conference

by Paolo Raimondi

In a major historic move, U.S. President Ronald Reagan and the group of scientists working with Dr. Edward Teller have publicly relaunched the campaign for a new defensive system based on the directed-energy technologies or "beam weapons," thus strongly countering the threat of a Soviet preventive nuclear strike as announced recently by the KGB paper *Literaturnaya Gazeta*.

The occasion was the "Technological Bases for Peace" conference organized in Erice, Italy, Aug. 20–23, by the Ettore Majorana Center for Scientific Culture of Professor Antonino Zichichi, which was attended by such scientists as Teller, Lowell Wood, and Richard Garwin from the American side and Academicians E.P. Velikhov, A.P. Aleksandrov, and Markov from the Soviet side. The U.S. pro-beam-weapon forces decided to repeat to the world the fundamental concepts and plans already contained in the President's March 23 speech: overcoming the era of nuclear terror (Mutually Assured Destruction—MAD) and beginning a new one based on the policy of Mutually Assured Survival (MAS).

The conference resulted in the formation of a commission of 100 U.S. and Soviet scientists to investigate the feasibility of defensive beam-weapon development and to conduct a computer analysis of the effects of nuclear war. Italian newspapers described the Soviet agreement to participate in such a commission as a "sudden change in the attitude of the Soviet delegation" during the course of the conference, in response to Dr. Teller's forceful intervention. This is the first time any Soviet officials have agreed to discuss anything about beam weapons—except how to prevent the United States from building them.

President Reagan surprised both the Soviets and the Western allies by sending a message of greeting to the scientists gathered in Erice, calling upon their moral and scientific commitment to work for peace through the advancements of science and technology. Reagan wrote: "War is the scourge of nations, and nuclear war would be the scourge of mankind. . . . As scientists and teachers, you hold a special responsibility to use your wisdom and influence to help develop and use the knowledge that will lead to an age of true security against the threat of nuclear war." President Reagan announced that after four decades the world now has a



The National Democratic Policy Committee rallies in support of "Mutually Assured Survival" on Capitol Hill, April 13, 1983.

NSIPS/Stuart Lewis

chance to emerge from the nuclear terror of the MAD doctrine, "if we succeed in applying the fruits of scientific and technical advances to develop a new generation of defensive systems."

Reagan's challenge was covered by all the Italian media for several days, whereas the American press totally blacked it out. Reagan's statement has thrown out the window a good deal of speculation about the White House backing down to Soviet blackmail on the strategic defense issue, and has remoralized those who kept working for a peaceful beam-weapons defense system despite an almost completely averse environment.

Inside the conference at Erice, a beautiful medieval town overlooking the Mediterranean sea near Trapani in Sicily, the atmosphere changed totally. This meeting had been organized by Professor Zichichi from the CERN nuclear research institute of Geneva, which is suspected to be one of the most dangerous nests of KGB spies in the West (see *EIR*, Aug. 23, 1983, pp. 36-37), and it was supposed to become the forum for a big Soviet "peace loving" anti-defense system propaganda drive.

The Soviet delegation came armed with an appeal signed by more than 50 physicists and other defense-related scientists stating that "we declare in full responsibility that there cannot be a defensive essence in nuclear [sic] weapons and that their creation is practicably impossible." This was an explicit response to the "speech of March 23, 1983" in which "the President of the United States proposed to the American people . . . the creation of a new, gigantic system of anti-ballistic missiles, having a purely defensive character . . .

capable of giving the United States absolute security in the eventuality of a nuclear conflict." Signers of the Soviet statement include those physicists, such as Velikhov himself, who are most heavily involved in coordinating the Soviet beam weapon research and development programs! And in the Soviet weekly *Literaturnaya Gazeta* of Aug. 10, Fyodor Burlatskii, an adviser to Yuri Andropov, wrote that development of beam weapons by the United States would be a *casus belli*—implying that Moscow would launch a preventive strike if necessary to prevent their deployment! (See article by LaRouche, p. 24.)

Teller's rational appeal left the Soviets with no choice but to agree to sign the final declaration and try to maintain their "peace-loving" image. Whether or not this shift portends a Soviet policy shift away from total opposition to negotiation with the United States on development of defensive systems remains to be seen. But at Erice, it was an unquestionable victory for Teller, an affirmation that beam-weapons technology can indeed become a reality if men commit energy and resources to its success. Teller told participants: "It is a wonderful thing. . . . It is a small step on the road to creating reciprocal comprehension and confidence." Teller recalled that President Reagan had consistently spoken of mutual development of the new defensive system both for the United States and the U.S.S.R.

### Teller versus *Pravda* and *The New York Times*

Dr. Teller's task was to explain to the citizens of Europe the concepts behind the President's widely defamed defensive system, through several interviews to all the major Ital-

ian papers, radio and TV networks.

He told the Erice gathering, as reported in *Corriere della Sera*, that "until two or three years ago, I too was firmly convinced that the philosophy of Mutually Assured Destruction (MAD) represented the only way to maintain peace. Then my student [Livermore scientist] Lowell Wood made me change my mind. Now I think that the construction of a global system of defense is technically possible, that it is more economical, and that it will be able to secure peace. . . . I can only say that the weaponry involved is exclusively defensive, that the laser-beam guns play an important role, and that this system does not imply the deployment of nuclear weapons in space: in space there will be only the 'eyes' to see if the missiles of the enemy have taken off. These weapons will be built only to destroy missiles already in flight and not to hit ground-based silos," Teller explained.

To illustrate better the qualities of the new defensive system Professor Teller compared it to the mobile British fleet which in 1588 defeated the Spanish "Invincible Armada."

In an interview to the Italian daily *La Repubblica* Sunday, Aug. 21, Teller counterattacked the propaganda line of the Henry Kissinger/KGB crowd which has slandered Reagan's new doctrine as "star wars." Teller said: "Star wars? This is all the invention of papers like the *New York Times* and *Pravda*. Reagan never spoke of military satellites or super-weapons; he did not use even the word 'space.' He only said that we have to replace the strategy of terror with the equilibrium of security. These new technologies will be eyes directed against the enemy and will be a defensive system and nothing else; they will stop only the adversary committed to strike."

Teller then underlined in the interview that in five years "we can already have a system which will demonstrate how the money spent for the research has been spent well. . . . But," he stressed, "the problem is not money, but ideas. For this I ask that in the elaboration of these projects all the NATO allies should participate, all the available minds. The more ideas, the better." Anyway, he added, "I need only half a billion dollars for the next year." Teller's line received strong backup from the respected Livermore Laboratory physicist, Lowell Wood. In his speech and in several interviews, like one he gave to the Rome daily *Il Messaggero* Aug. 22, Dr. Wood stressed that "the ideal weapon is the laser."

The anti-beam weapon factions inside the conference were put on the defensive. Richard Garwin of IBM, a close friend of Kissinger in the Trilateral Commission who was universally labeled as a Jimmy Carter spokesman by the Italian press, complained that the defense system is too expensive, too vulnerable and will provoke a new arms race. Soviet spokesman Velikhov's praise of Garwin (see documentation) hardly came as a surprise. Teller dismissed Garwin by reminding him that what is needed is not more money but better minds.

Italian Chief of Staff of the Army, General Cappuzzo, also spoke out against the beam weapons policy, wondering if such a program would not "cost too much," and recommending instead the plan of NATO Supreme Commander Bernard Rogers for a conventional arms buildup to counter Soviet superiority.

The press did even bother to mention the names of those friends of Gen. Daniel Graham of "High Frontier" who put forward their usual fantastic plan for militarization of space with nuclear weapons.

### **Soviets lose face**

But it was the Soviet delegation led by Evgenii Velikhov, the vice president of the Russian Academy of Science, that lost face most visibly in the debate. Velikhov dedicated all his time to denouncing the beam weapon policy, which he insisted is a U.S. bid to gain a first-strike capability. "There is only one way to achieve peace—balanced nuclear disarmament. From the American side . . . there is an attempt to convince the population that there is a new system, the so-called global anti-ballistic system, placed in space. . . .

"First of all, I believe that this system is very difficult to realize. It is very costly and we do not yet have the right

## **Erice document: scientific study of ABM defense**

*The following account of the document issued by the Ettore Majorana conference on "Technological Bases for Peace" was published in the Rome daily Il Tempo Aug. 24, with the headline: "No to Deterrence Doctrine: The Erice Document."*

At the conclusion of the international meeting that took place in Erice, a document was signed concerning an accord for scientific collaboration, which bears the signatures of Professor Teller for the United States, Professor Velikhov for the Soviet Union, and Professor Antonino Zichichi for Europe. The following is the text of the document:

● The mutual exchange of ideas, data, and information, which resulted from the three sessions of the Erice international seminars on nuclear warfare, are of greatest importance for us.

technology. But this is not all. In reality this system will be very vulnerable and dangerous. It is more a system for a first strike than a defensive one. In any case this will push everybody towards a new arms race on a more sophisticated level. For example the construction of a type of missile with only one warhead, capable of penetrating the defensive shield."

Velikhov, in an interview to the Italian Communist Party paper *L'Unità*, went further in threatening the West, in language similar to that of the Burlatskii piece in *Literaturnaya Gazeta*. "In the present situation of relations of forces, peace is guaranteed by equilibrium [the MAD doctrine of balance of nuclear terror—PR], and any new development is objectively destabilizing because it increases the possibility that the adversary could attack us first, destroying all our defense network," he said.

Asked about the role of the U.S. Pershing II and cruise missiles scheduled to be deployed in Europe this year, Velikhov answered: "We do not consider them as medium-range missiles but as actual strategic weapons. The Soviet Union will respond to them not only vis-à-vis Europe but more in particular vis-à-vis the United States. The decision on the Euromissiles will be fundamental for the future. If they are

installed this will change the global worldwide strategic equilibrium. I am afraid that such a development will lead to the temptation the U.S.A. had already in Vietnam and in China, to go for a limited nuclear conflict. Imagine a limited nuclear war in Sicily for example. . . ."

At this point Velikhov indicated that only in the disarmament talks is there a concrete road toward peace, and underlined the importance of the recent announcement by Soviet President Andropov that he would ban killer satellites in space. Teller immediately rebuffed this Soviet attempt to present the U.S.S.R. as the only pro-peace force in the world, counterposed to the "warmongers" promoting beam defense. "The Russians have unilaterally sent killer satellites into space. We have evidence for this," he said. "Now they have unilaterally decided not to send them anymore. In other words, they do everything by themselves. . . ." Teller went on, according to *Corriere della Sera*, "Which do you consider more dangerous, the sword or the shield? If I try to defend myself, this is not a provocation. A shield, only a shield—this is the type of defense we want to realize."

Then another American scientist, Anthony Battista, a staff director for the House Armed Services Committee, intervened. "We know that you have already two orbiting space-

● The previous sessions opened the path to new investigations of the global effects of a U.S.-U.S.S.R. nuclear clash, the results of which were discussed here in a climate of scientific rigor, and therefore objectively. The results obtained by various research groups in the East and the West on the simulation of a nuclear conflict have been very important for understanding the consequences of a U.S.-U.S.S.R. nuclear conflict. Such studies should be developed further with greater collaboration on an international scale. This is to avoid any suspicions about the validity of the results obtained. This is the first point to emerge during this third session.

● Another important point emerged during this third session, and is precisely the problem of defensive weapons. The underlying philosophy of this new point lies in the problem of studying the possibility of identifying new means for getting out of the present balance of terror. The first of these means is the reduction of nuclear arms. The second is the idea of new defensive weapons. And here there are some questions: 1) Is it possible to identify the characteristics and properties which a weapon would have in order to be effectively considered defensive in nature, i.e., the opposite of offensive? 2) Is it true that an advanced system of defense could produce destabilizing effects? And, if that is so, why and how? 3) Why not study new methods of getting out of this balance of terror?

● It is therefore proposed to form a joint Europe-U.S.-U.S.S.R. research group, based at the Ettore Majorana center, for collaborative study of two above-mentioned points: 1) The simulation and evaluation of the global consequences of a U.S.-U.S.S.R. nuclear conflict. 2) A way out of the present balance of terror; and, in particular, if it is possible to conceive of a new type of defense system against nuclear destruction.

● The joint research group is composed of U.S., Soviet, and European scientists (and possibly from other countries), selected by the signatories of this document, who are: Prof. Edward Teller for the U.S. scientists and specialists, Prof. Evgenii P. Velikhov for the Soviet scientists and specialists, and Prof. Antonino Zichichi for the European scientists and specialists.

These studies can be carried out in Europe, the United States, or the Soviet Union. Their results should be reported during periodic meetings at Centro Ettore Majorana in Erice. The travel expenses are to be paid by the U.S., Soviet, and European institutions of which those scientists and specialists are members. The expenses in Erice are to be borne by the Centro Ettore Majorana. The bulk of the work and studies which are to be carried out at the Centro Ettore Majorana itself will be defined in the course of further consultations. This accord will be presented by us to our respective governments for approval and further development.

based systems," he said. "You have 12,000 nuclear warheads, and 40,000 tanks plus two systems already in space. What do you have against us defending ourselves? The Soviets want to negotiate only when they are in a position of strength," Battista concluded.

Soviet ambassador Victor Israelyan, head of the delegation to the Geneva arms control negotiations, angrily retorted: "Can any of us guarantee that we will be alive within three or six months and that we will be able to participate in the next conference here in Erice?" All the Italian press reported that the Soviet delegation was visibly embarrassed at this unorthodox open exchange.

Since all the Italian press reported these confrontations in detail for several days, the average Italian citizen is now better informed than his American counterpart on the significance and strategic importance of beam weapons and the new defense systems. *EIR's* correspondents in Rome, Milan and elsewhere in Italy report that the name of Lyndon LaRouche is on the lips of almost everyone, because it is well known that, apart from Reagan's March 23 speech, only LaRouche's movement has continuously been engaged in a major political battle on behalf of beam weapons. Many Italians will ask themselves with surprise if the KGB is already in control of the U.S. information centers and the mass media, if such an extraordinary development as that in Erice has been totally blacked out in the United States. Those Italians who have read the widespread reports in the Italian press about Henry Kissinger's opposition to the beam weapon policy and about his role in the assassination of former Italian Premier Aldo Moro, probably will not have much difficulty in associating this blackout in the United States not only with the influence of the KGB, but also, and above all, with the role of Kissinger.

The other only important political and moral authority that expressed its support for Reagan's fight for Mutually Assured Survival in Erice has been the faction inside the Vatican which, as *EIR* has already known for some time, backs the new defensive systems against the MAD doctrine. In fact the Vatican daily *L'Osservatore Romano* of Tuesday, Aug. 23, after reporting the message of the Pope to the scientists gathered in Erice, underlined the importance of President Reagan's message calling for the realization of the new defense system.

## Dilemma for the Kremlin

What happened at Erice shows that the Andropov-Bur-latskii threats against beam-weapons development are not the only game in Moscow. The diametrically opposed policy of accepting President Reagan's offer to negotiate on the basis of Mutually Assured Survival is also contending for dominance in the Kremlin—and one of the two policies must triumph soon.

But if the next Soviet move is not clear, there is little doubt of the intentions of Andropov's western partners in sabotaging Reagan's beam-defense policy, the grouping cen-

tered around the "Pugwash conference." The Pugwash networks were instrumental in delivering a major threat to the West through the left-liberal German newsweekly *Der Spiegel* the week of the Erice meeting. At the end of an article on the fight around beam weapon technologies and the defense system, *Der Spiegel* quoted Richard Garwin that the new defense system "will lead to war in space, not as an alternative to war on earth, but rather as a prelude to it." *Der Spiegel* wrote: "The danger of a strategic imbalance would necessarily outstrip the technologically inferior Moscow, fears Victor Weisskopf, physicist of the renowned MIT. After a laser briefing at the White House, [Weisskopf] said, 'the Soviets will start a war to prevent the stationing of such a system.'"

The Trilateral Commission has also started to send out signals for an urgent mobilization to sabotage the President's policy. After all, it was the Trilateral Commission, meeting in Rome with Kissinger in April, which expressed its total disagreement with the beam-defense policy and plotted the overthrow of President Reagan to stop it. Arrigo Levi, a Trilateral director and editor of the Turin daily *La Stampa* (owned by a fellow Trilateraloid, FIAT's Gianni Agnelli), wrote a face-saving editorial in response to Erice. Reagan's March 23 speech raised many doubts in the West, said Levi, because of the destabilizing effects of the beam-weapons defense policy. Levi called for an urgent summit between Reagan and Andropov to freeze the development of the new technologies needed for the defense system. The same line was vehemently expressed by the editorial of the London *Financial Times*, a nest of cronies of former British Foreign Secretary Lord Carrington and his business partner Kissinger, under the headline "Arms control: a serious gap." The United States seems much too committed to the new defense technologies, the *Financial Times* declared: "Real limits must be applied to this new dimension of the technologically driven arms race before it runs out of political and financial control."

As *EIR* goes to press, it is expected that the next attack against the beam defense policy will be delivered at the Pugwash conference in Venice, Italy from Aug. 25 to 29. Velikhov, Garwin, Soviet General Milshtein of the Moscow's U.S. and Canada Institute, Prof. Jacques Freymond from Geneva, and Prof. Abdus Salam from the Trieste nuclear physics institute will participate. This meeting has the beam-weapons policy as its first agenda item and the danger of wars in the Mediterranean and Third World countries as the second. *EIR's* correspondents in Venice reported from a press conference on Aug. 24 that when a journalist asked Dr. Kaplan, the general secretary of Pugwash, what Pugwash thinks about the Erice meeting, Kaplan answered that "beam weapons are not feasible." And Professor Pascalino, the head of Pugwash in Italy, insisted that it is impossible "to transfer these weapons into space."

Kaplan boasted: "We are an important organization and we don't have anything to do with Erice people. We work with top people like Kissinger and McNamara!"

## Italian press: The Teller group fought for 'Mutually Assured Survival'

*The conference on "Technological Bases for Peace" held in Erice, Italy Aug. 20-23 was given in-depth coverage by the Italian press. A small sample of the coverage follows in EIR's translation:*

**La Repubblica, a nationally circulated Rome daily, on Aug. 22. Interview with Edward Teller, followed by commentary:**

**Q:** People have denounced the defense system as "Star Wars."

**Teller:** Star wars? This is all the invention of papers like the *New York Times* and *Pravda*. Reagan never spoke of military satellites or superweapons; he did not even use the word "space." He only said that we have to replace the strategy of terror with the equilibrium of security. These new technologies will be eyes directed against the enemy and will be a defensive system and nothing else; they will stop only the adversary already committed to strike.

**Q:** You speak about a project. But to what extent is it already a reality?

**Teller:** I have studied problems of defense in depth and I am now convinced that this is the way to follow. In it there are so many ideas, although obviously I cannot speak about them: it is a secret. Lowell Wood [from the University of California] has made one of the most original contributions. No, it is not an abstract project even though we need still some more time.

**Q:** How much time?

**Teller:** My experience taught me that in 10 years, one can do much more than what one thinks. But I say that in five years, even if we will not get the ideal system, we can have a system which will demonstrate how the money spent for the research has been spent well.

**Q:** How much money?

**Teller:** For the next year I need a little under half a billion dollars, about 1 percent of the U.S. defense budget.

**Q:** Will it be enough?

**Teller:** The problem is not money, but ideas. For this I ask that in the elaboration of these projects all the NATO allies should participate, all the available minds. The more ideas, the better. . . .

**Q:** Other scientists are not enthusiastic about your proposal. Richard Garwin says that the only solution is disarmament.

**Teller:** Let us be serious. For 25 years we have been trying this without any success. These negotiations up until today have provoked only an arms race. Our new project is based on defensive criteria: we cannot define it as good or bad, but only as useful or not useful. We have studied and we are still studying, but I can say that when a plan can survive three years of criticism, it must contain something good.

**Q:** And the advantages?

**Teller:** First of all it costs less. The instruments are lighter and precise. . . . Offensive weapons are heavy and costly. And this defense cannot be transformed into offense. Defense does not shoot.

Soviet laser specialist Academician Evgenii Velikhov, vice-president of the Soviet Academy of Sciences, is categorical: "To put nuclear arms up in space would unleash a new race, it would increase the dangers. And we scientists know well that a defensive system can easily be transformed into an offensive system. All this with normal costs: it will take \$400 billion, 1,140 Shuttles to destroy a small part of the nuclear potential which has already built up." Not even Richard Garwin is convinced. A theoretician of MAD (Mutually Assured Destruction), he proposes to reduce the warheads of the two blocs to one thousand.

**Il Messaggero, a Rome left-liberal daily, on Aug. 22. Interview with Lowell Wood:**

**Wood:** Killer satellites are one possibility, but not the only nor the best one. The ideal weapon is the laser. Our missile is still flying. The alarm has been given, the computer orders the deployment of the laser beam, which is sent from the earth against a satellite that carries a large mirror. The mirror reflects the beam against the missile. The more the beam is concentrated, the more powerful and effective it is. If we have a continuous laser, then it can follow the missile without any interruption.

**L'Unita, the Italian Communist Party daily, on Aug. 22. Interview with Soviet academician Velikhov:**

**Velikhov:** [IBM's Richard] Garwin has written many observations on nuclear war, in documents he sent to Andropov. Andropov has answered all the remarks, and to a large extent it is due to this discussion . . . that my government a few days ago took the historic decision to unilaterally suspend experimentation on anti-satellite systems.

***Il Popolo*, daily of the Christian Democratic Party, on Aug. 21–22. Article by correspondent Luca Lauriola:**

To reach as soon as possible a dramatic reciprocal reduction of the strategic nuclear arsenal, or to prepare and develop in the coming years a global system of active defense that will be virtually automatic: this is the dramatic alternative the superpowers now face, and a decision must not be delayed. . . .

If both sides do not manage to reach a gradual and controlled disarmament, proceeding to build an active defense system will become unavoidable, to escape from the current anomalous situation of total lack of any protective shield. . . .

It was Prof. Lowell Wood, leader of the advanced project group of the physics department of the renowned Livermore laboratories, who opened the session summarily outlining the scenario of a global defense system. . . .

Wood stated that a future defensive system should be totally automatic. . . . [I]n the second place, according to Wood, it is advisable to move the earth-based strategic defense system up in space, where nobody lives, and where, therefore, the consequences of a nuclear conflict would be less dangerous for humanity. Wood then went on to describe summarily such a globally active defense system, based on nuclear and conventional weapons (particularly lasers). To conclude: total automation of the war machinery and its transference into orbital space. . . . The response of the Soviet delegation came immediately after the intervention of Prof. Dixy L. Ray, former governor of the state of Washington. . . . in favor of the propositions of Teller and Wood. . . .

Velikhov stated that to neutralize 100 targets, in his opinion, you would need not \$200 billion, but \$400 billion. You would need to build a fleet of 450 Shuttles. . . . "Wait a second," Teller immediately pointed out, "I think that the U.S.S.R. has abandoned the killer satellites only because these are not a good system. . . . So far," said Teller, "only unworkable active defense systems proposals have been made public, and therefore criticized, while the realistic projects of defense remain secret and it is not possible for me to speak about them. Last year I expressed the wish that military secrets be eliminated. But you know how my proposal was received by the Soviets. . . ."

***Il Popolo*, Aug. 23:**

The U.S.S.R., as Dr. Anthony Battista, a member of the Defense Commission of the White House, had previously stated, has deployed 42,000 tanks on the Western European border, against 12,000 deployed by the West. What is the purpose of this crushing superiority, if not for winning in case of a potential conventional attack? . . . Then Teller, [speaking on the question of the abolition of secrecy], said that, for example, we have learned from sources, and not

from the Soviet colleagues, that the U.S.S.R. was implementing a wide civil defense program based on antinuclear shelters. He only said that among those weapons the laser is included.

"We are in the position of adding," said Teller, "it seems that the Americans have succeeded in defining a powerful process, possibly nuclear, capable of generating powerful and lethal x-ray beams to be used against attacking weapons in flight. Another defense instrument seems to be particle beams emitted by powerful accelerators, beams capable of punching holes in the atmosphere and then, perhaps accompanied also by laser beams in suitable rapid pulsed synchronism, capable of stopping any offensive weapon. . . ."

This year the Teller group says: we no longer fear nuclear blackmail, it is possible to build a system to neutralize the ballistic missiles; therefore nuclear blackmail is about to end and the technical basis for peace is about to produce results, because the premises for the imperial strategy of the Soviet Union, based on an overwhelming about to fall.

***Il Tempo*, a conservative Rome daily, on Aug. 23. Article by correspondent Italo Scarpa.**

The Soviets have two weapons systems in orbit. The Americans have none. The revelation . . . has taken everybody by surprise in the San Domenico convent in Erice, and comes from an American expert in military affairs, Dr. Anthony Battista, who has a prominent responsibility in Research and Development and experimentation in the military field.

Therefore the source is reliable and the embarrassment of the Soviets, after the statements of Battista, became palpable. . . . to the point that Velikhov was totally unable to re-

## **President Reagan's message to East-West scientists**

*President Reagan sent the following telegram to the Ettore Majorana Center for Culture and Science conference on "Technological Bases for Peace" on Aug. 21. Reagan's telegram, which has been publicized by the Italian press, has not been distributed to the U.S. press. EIR had to make over a dozen calls to offices in the White House, National Security Council, and State Department before locating the office in the State Department which was charged with sending the telegram.*

ply. . . . As people will remember, in a discussion with us, Dr. Teller already said that [the proposal of Andropov] didn't "move" him. . . . Today that view was made official by Battista, who revealed that it is a Kremlin custom, first to gain a position of strength, then to wear sheep's clothing. . . .

The Soviets counterpose that any system of defense means offense, but once again Dr. Battista said: "Then please explain to us why Moscow is surrounded by an extremely powerful system of defense." Once again, complete silence from the men from the Kremlin.

***Il Messaggero*, Aug. 23:**

Battista . . . says: "We have to get to work, because I am not happy about that powerful radar system surrounding Moscow." Velikhov interrupts him: "But why, if you Americans want truly peace, don't you agree with the proposal by Andropov to demilitarize space?" Answers Battista: "Because you have already built two defense systems based in space and you make proposals only in the fields in which you are already prepared and ready." A bald-faced exchange lacking all diplomatic niceties.

***L'Osservatore Romano*, the Vatican daily, Aug. 22-23. "The Fathers of Atomic War Discuss the Paths to Peace":**

[B]ut even more important is the acknowledgment of the importance [of the Erice conference] testified to in the message sent by President Reagan. While expressing his confidence that the tendency to base peace on the balance of terror may be stopped, the American president urged the scientists to look for those scientific means, which, by eliminating the risk of a war by mistake, or the possibility of surprise attack,

create the situation of reciprocal confidence necessary for a gradual and agreed-upon reduction of the arsenals.

***La Repubblica*, on Aug. 23:**

Teller says triumphantly: "This is truly a shift. We are in the third generation of weapons, after the atomic bombs, after fusion, the time of defense has come. It took two years to convince President Reagan: finally an alternative solution has been worked out to these never-ending negotiations. . . ."

***Avvenire*, daily of the Catholic archdiocese of Milan, on Aug. 23. "U.S. Scientist Speaks of Russian Superweapons: No Project at Erice":**

Without mincing words Teller talks about the relative uselessness of the policy of détente. Teller says: "If the U.S.A. is studying this problem the reason is that our counterpart has placed in space two different types of weapon systems. . . ."

***La Stampa*, on Aug. 24:**

Soviet and American atomic scientists have agreed for the first time to collaborate on getting out of the present "balance of terror," by studying together "the possibility of creating a new type of defense against nuclear destruction" of the planet Earth. . . . The Italian-language communiqué distributed after being signed, which arrived unexpectedly after the frontal confrontations of yesterday, states that the scientists of the two superpowers have determined to study, "without any more secrets," . . . the new defensive weapons. In the English-language official text, however, those words do not exist, as was pointed out to me by the vice-president of the Soviet Academy of Sciences, who was the one who trimmed down the contents of the accord.

As this annual meeting at Ettore Majorana commences, I extend my encouragement to the distinguished scientists from many nations who have come together to discuss problems connected with the dangers of nuclear conflict and the ways in which such conflict can be avoided.

War is the scourge of nations, and nuclear war would be the scourge of mankind. The citizens of the world face no more urgent challenge than the prevention of war. As scientists and teachers, you hold a special responsibility to use your wisdom and influence to help develop and use the knowledge that will lead to an age of true security against the threat of nuclear war.

For nearly four decades, the increasingly destructive capabilities of nuclear weapons have dominated issues of national security. But in the past year we have seen the possi-

bility that we may be able to change that increasingly unstable situation.

First, we are engaged in very serious negotiations with the Soviet Union on the means of achieving substantial, equitable, and verifiable reductions in our nuclear arsenals and on measures to build the mutual confidence and understanding necessary to reduce the risk of nuclear war.

Second, if we succeed in applying the fruits of scientific and technical advances to develop a new generation of defensive systems, we may be able, at long last, to make nuclear war impossible.

Our hope for the future is not just to halt the growth and the spread of nuclear arsenals, but to reverse such trends. We owe that legacy to the children of the world, and I commend your continuing effort to find realistic ways to make it possible.