

Beam weapons will neutralize space

by Colonel Marc Geneste

Col. Marc Geneste is a 25-year career officer with the French Army, and currently vice-president of the Center for the Study of Total Strategy in Paris.

We all are surprised and a bit shocked to hear Monsieur Mitterrand, Mrs. Thatcher, and others say that this big idea of President Reagan's, the Strategic Defense Initiative, is not very good for the future of humanity, or for Europe.

This is the official view in Europe these days, at least in France; but please don't worry about the official pronouncements. I have personal experience: A few years ago, I was very much involved in the building, with the French AEC, of the neutron bomb, which to me is a very important contribution to deterrence in Europe. And one day we were surprised to hear the defense minister say in parliament, "I swear that France is not interested in the neutron bomb and never will be," while we were working at it—quite a surprise! Thank God, three weeks later, President Giscard had a special TV show just to say to the French, "We have made it! We have it!"

French scientists, military technicians, have been since the beginning very much interested in this new technology of the Strategic Defense Initiative.

Yesterday, when I came into the United States, I had a lot of trouble bringing in my suitcase. You have quite rightly the prudence to control all your imports except, very strangely, the free access to the United States that you have given, by treaty, to ICBMs. This SDI is *not* militarization of space: On the contrary, it has to be *neutralization* of space, where ICBMs will not enjoy this fantastic privilege of entering without opposition. If we present SDI as *neutralization* of space, instead of militarization, I think we will have immediately won in Europe, even at the level of politicians.

SDI is the condition of arms control and of disarmament. To me, the Geneva talks have not been resumed *in spite* of SDI, but *because* of SDI. The Russians may be what they are, but at least they are very reliable opponents! You can be confident that they will never give up any privilege unless they are forced; and here, apparently, the first big success of SDI has been to show them that they had better come back to the negotiating table if they want to have a chance to limit SDI. They will try to; it's up to you to defend it.

And I want to expand a little bit on this idea of SDI as a condition of disarmament. Coming back to this very interesting talk of Helga Zepp-LaRouche, disarmament is in the long run, to a large extent, the condition of improving the Third World. So let's have a look at this big idea, "Is disarmament possible through new technology?"

Mutual insecurity

This cartoon shows security after 20 years of the MAD system; you can see on two powderkegs Russia and the Allies, dancing on their powderkegs, with Qaddafi trying to set fire to the whole thing. This is not security! Naturally, the Russians have put SS-20s and Backfire bombers in our powderkeg; we reply with Pershing IIs and cruise missiles in theirs; now they complain about that, and they are about to put SS-21s in our powderkeg. There are already 13 tons of TNT per capita on the planet, and if we do not change this approach, I don't know how it will end.

Now, how can we get out of this? Just have a look at this balance between attack and defense. If offense wins, it's a military temptation, naturally, and it can lead to war. If defense wins over offense, it's deterrence and peace. So the purpose of arms control should be to push on the defense. And for the first time in history, technology offers us a fantastic opportunity, such as we haven't seen for 2,000 years. For the first time, projectiles become vulnerable. Since the stone or the bow and arrow, there has been no way, or no one ever thought, to stop projectiles in flight! We could be protected only by shelters, armor, shields, trenches—against projectiles. This is the first time that we have the chance, thanks to technology, to stop them in flight! This is a fantastic evolution in tactics and in warfare.

And when you can stop nuclear weapons with non-nuclear weapons, then no one is going to shoot these nuclear weapons if they can be stopped by beam weapons. And since beam weapons fly at 40,000 times the velocity of rockets, there is no possibility of saturating the defense with a lot of projectiles. Since there is no way to saturate the defense on the ground with land forces, if we use the other breakthrough in technology—namely the tactical nuclear weapon, namely the neutron bomb—then the two tools of offense are neutralized, projectiles and men. We have deterrence and peace.

So the role of arms control is today to push on this defense part of the balance, since it is now technically feasible for the first time in history. We are living through quite a large opportunity. Better take it; and then, if we achieve arms control and disarmament on this basis, there will be no more reason to keep ICBMs than we have reason to build, today, horse-cavalry divisions or B-52s that you are throwing out because they are obsolete. Obsolescence of the tools of offense is a big hope of humanity—not only on the military side, but also for the big project of Helga Zepp-LaRouche, because here, we might find, in the long run, a lot of money to fight not only war, but the causes of war.