

# Anti-beam fight is spread to Asia

by Jean des Entommures

The International Institute of Geopolitics held a colloquium in Paris April 6-8 on "The Challenge of the Pacific," to try to stop U.S. development of laser antiballistic-missile defense by "proving" that this system will result in decoupling the United States from Japan and its other Asian allies as well as from Western Europe. Participants were intended to be left with the conviction that a U.S. global retrenchment is inevitable, and hence America's allies must fend for themselves—not through beam-weapon defense but by a conventional arms buildup, and not through economic development but by slashing their own basic industries and ushering in the "third industrial revolution."

The colloquium was held 10 days after *EIR* and the Fusion Energy Foundation (FEF) sponsored a conference in Paris on the strategic importance of the U.S. beam-weapons policy for Europe, provoking the Soviet press into a series of prominent articles denouncing the policy and *EIR* founder Lyndon LaRouche, the leading U.S. proponent of beam development. And on March 19, private investors in Thailand decided to launch the Kra Canal there, a project promoted by *EIR* and the FEF as a strategic and economic necessity for the Pacific and Indian Oceans' basin.

The ostensible purpose of the International Institute of Geopolitics meeting was to examine the strategic and economic implications of Pacific development for Europe and the West. About 400 representatives of the military, finance, government, and the press were there from Japan, the Philippines, Korea, Malaysia, France, the United States, Great Britain, and Germany.

But economic development was hardly the issue under debate, as French Minister of Industry Laurent Fabius warned that the Japanese miracle might be nearing its end, as Japan's export markets collapsed and Asia's political and social fragility increased, as shown by the Rangoon bombing and the collapse of the Philippines. André Glucksmann, a new rising star in the right wing of the French social democracy, then told the audience that deep cuts in France's industrial base,

such as the cuts in the steel industry of the Lorraine, are necessary. "In the past war took care of destroying outmoded industries," he said. "War took care of breaking the rigidity of labor, but now we must wage a war on ourselves."

## Attacks on the United States

The concluding speech by Gen. Pierre Gallois conveyed the essence of the proceedings. Gallois, whom well-informed French military sources say has been in the forefront of the attacks and slanders against LaRouche and *EIR*, denounced the United States for "losing the armaments race" and for undermining Europe's own defense capability. Gallois's authoritative source on U.S. political commitments? Former California governor Jerry "Fruitfly" Brown, who lost in his bid for a Senate seat in 1982. Brown told the conference that U.S. taxpayers would oppose any tax increases needed to take the beam program beyond discussion and R&D. Brown's alternative to beam weapons is "hard-headed détente."

Brown's words proved, Gallois claimed, that "whatever the power of the U.S. might be, it cannot do everything. . . . It took 20 years to build a successor to the B-52, twelve years for the MX, while the Russians have acquired modern weapons. It will be difficult for the U.S. to add space defense—though," he added, "such a project is unavoidable. . . .

"The consequence will be that peripheral nations will not be protected. The U.S. nuclear umbrella would be neutralized. . . . Europe, like Japan, does not contribute sufficiently to its own security, but that is the fault of the United States. . . . The U.S. disarmed Europe—it mocked France about the *force de frappe* [France's nuclear deterrent]. That is the reason for Europe's reticence."

François de Rose, a member of the Aspen Institute and a French government official, said that no one knew when and if beam defense could be deployed, and that saturation with offensive weapons could always overcome any defense. This line was then taken up by British Member of Parliament Julian Amery, who began his speech by referring to what his "good friend Henry Kissinger had said in *Time* magazine about the need for Europe to defend itself independently."

Only a few spoke against the anti-beam frenzy. Through constant interruptions from the podium, physics professor Maurice Felden made an impassioned advocacy of beam weapons, terming de Rose's speech humbug and calling for a Manhattan Project-type crash program. Hans Graf Huyn, defense spokesman for West Germany's Christian Social Union, while not mentioning beam weapons, warned that decoupling Europe from the United States would mean "the beginning of the end" for Western defense capabilities. And Wataru Hiraizumi, deputy director of international affairs for the Japanese Liberal Democratic Party, described the extraordinary level of Soviet military deployments in Asia and the need to preserve the U.S.-Japan defense treaty in the face of Soviet imperialist designs on the region.