## Report from Paris by Laurent Rosenfeld

# French Socialists' lies on SDI

*A prominent French military analyst examines the Socialist Party statement on the U.S. SDI.*

On July 2, the French Socialist Party put out a "Statement on the Security of Europe," officially taking a position on the U.S. Strategic Defense Initiative. The statement reads in part: "The possible deployment of new anti-missile systems would strike a blow not only to deterrence, but also to the Flexible Response doctrine, the official NATO doctrine."

A retired French top-brass officer, one of the best French military experts on strategic defense, made the following commentary available to *EIR*. The author of these comments, who wishes to remain anonymous, has been a strong advocate of basing defense and security on research, development and deployment of directed-energy weapons in France and in Europe. His comments reflect primarily a French standpoint, but are valuable for an international audience:

"'Would strike a blow to deterrence,' the Socialist Party statement claims. It probably means the French deterrence doctrine established by de Gaulle 20 years ago. But this doctrine is not a fixed dogma; it was only the consequence of a state of affairs which meant, for France (as well as for other countries), a very sharp vulnerability. Should that vulnerability decrease, thanks to an efficient anti-missile system, to the point of almost vanishing away, deterrence, under its present form, would have no more reason to exist. Why should one, in order to 'save deterrence,' never accept a reinforcement of our defenses, and do everything to remain weak, in the name of the 'deterrence of the weak toward the strong' doctrine?

"Speaking about the American deterrence, the argument is identical. Why should the United States refuse any defense, any protection, under the pretext that it were better to be obliterated than to change an obsolete doctrine? We hardly see how the French Socialists will convince our American allies.

"'Strike a blow to the Flexible Response doctrine,' the Socialist statement further argues. First, France has never accepted this doctrine; in fact, this is why it withdrew from NATO. Second, the U.S. intention is precisely to change this doctrine, as soon as it has an efficient defense system against missiles.

"The Socialist Declaration also claims that, 'The deployment of two defensive systems in America and in the Soviet Union *would* bring decoupling.' First, this is a strange use of the conditional mode: Does the Socialist Party of France ignore the fact that the Soviet Union already has numerous and powerful defensive systems, which by the way violate the 1972 ABM treaty? Second, the statement reads 'defensive systems in America,' implying, contrary to all evidence, that the United States intends to defend only its territory, and not that of its allies. Even if the U.S. wanted to do so, it could not: At the beginning, the rockets start off vertically, and it is possible to compute their likely targets only much later, when they are well on their way; yet, missile destruction during boost phase is the most important element of an anti-missile system. Thus, it is impossible to select out which rocket has to be destroyed, and thus, any missile starting out will be immediately destroyed. Third, does the Socialist Party mean that it would accept that the Soviet Union protect itself and not the U.S.?

"'This deployment would decouple further the defense of Europe from that of the U.S.,' says the statement. This is untrue. Quite to the contrary, as soon as the U.S. no longer has to fear massive retaliation, it will be more free to strike anywhere in order to better protect Europe.

"'Strategic defense will not completely protect the U.S. from enemy aggression, but will deter it from employing nuclear weapons to the benefit of others,' the statement adds. Even if it is not 'completely,' isn't it better to receive *one* bomb, than *one thousand*? Second, strategic defense, by protecting the U.S. from massive reprisals, will enable the U.S. to defend its allies.

"The SP statement concludes, 'Thus the SDI, even before its implementation, strikes a blow, by its inner logic, at the European-American strategic coupling.' This systematic repetition of clear lies is alarming. This heavy artillery barrage probably announces a Socialist offensive for a break with the U.S. It is high time to tell the Socialists that there are perhaps several ways of winning a war, but the most secure way of losing a war is to capitulate before it starts. It might be useful to remind them that the French people might well demand a settlement of accounts and revenge, were they to continue in this direction."