



Exclusive interview

France's Raymond Offroy warns of war danger

Raymond Offroy, an ambassador-at-large for the French government, granted this interview with EIR on Feb. 18. Offroy is in New Hampshire as the personal guest of Lyndon LaRouche, a contender in that state's Feb. 26 Democratic presidential primary. In public speeches, he has warned that the threat of nuclear war hangs over "millions and millions of lives across the world."

A life-long diplomat, Offroy was a companion and colleague of France's great leader Charles de Gaulle since the 1940s period of the French Resistance. One thing de Gaulle taught me, Offroy said in Manchester, N.H., "is that you have to fight for what you want. The battle in the United States today reminds me of our fight to free France in the 1940s, when de Gaulle, his other companions and I were stripped of our nationality by Vichy France, forced to leave behind our families, to continue the fight."

"I see Democratic candidate Lyndon LaRouche as America's de Gaulle... LaRouche is the only man who can really avoid the risk of a world depression. I say the only man because he is the only one to advocate a joint union between Europe and the United States. If LaRouche is, as I hope, elected President of the United States, then we will have a world monetary system which would be based on the main ideas of the European Monetary System set up by Giscard d'Estaing and Helmut Schmidt.

Following is the text of the interview.

Q: How do you connect Phase Two of the European Monetary System to the danger of war presented by the Pershing missiles in West Germany?

A: In my opinion the important thing is to know whether the Western powers understand that by the invasion of Afghanistan the Soviet Union wanted to show that it has both strength and determination and that they want negotiation on the question of arms in Western Europe. If we understand this, and if there is some kind of negotiation for the Pershing missiles and the cruise mis-

siles in Western Europe and especially in West Germany, in that case we will maintain detente. In that case, I think we may go pretty rapidly into Phase Two of the European Monetary System. However, if the spirit of confrontation prevails, if for instance we refuse to enter negotiations so long as there are Soviet troops in Afghanistan, if we lose the three years before us between the NATO countries' decision and the setting up of the missiles, if we maintain the spirit of confrontation, the Cold War will resume, and I think the second phase of the European Monetary System will once again be delayed.

Enemies of detente

Q: Could you be as specific as possible about the forces in West Germany and France who are opposing the Schmidt-Giscard perspective for detente and a joint effort to develop the Third World?

A: Not long ago, we discussed this with Couve de Murville, a former foreign minister for President de Gaulle, who is now the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee in the National Assembly. He had made a very interesting speech on the question of the Pershing missiles, which he said is less important than the Afghanistan question. We are trying to educate French public opinion. But on the other hand, those who listen to what is said in London or Washington, always repeat the same things: that we must show our strength, our determination. These people are advocating a U.S. military initiative, notably in the Persian Gulf. I think there are two schools of thought in French public opinion: those who realize that detente is necessary, which is Giscard's opinion, and those who belong to the warmongers' party, identical to those in Britain or the United States who only desire to inflict a defeat on the U.S.S.R.

I could name a lot of publications, *l'Aurore*, *l'Express*, and others who are more or less influenced by the Zionist

lobby. They want to defeat the U.S.S.R., not only because the Soviets invaded Afghanistan, but also because they think that Jews are not allowed to live as they please in the Soviet Union, or because they are anti-Soviet, anti-communist, or because they are controlled by passion.

I don't think there are any representatives of this tendency in the government. Giscard has a very strong position, but in France it is always difficult not to take into account what is said by the press, the radio, and all journalists. There are a lot of warmongering journalists. I was surprised, just before I left for the United States to hear M. Lecanuet, who is a notorious Atlanticist, defending Giscard's policy on this matter. So I think that our President does his best to bring the majority of the population along with him. I also noticed that Chirac, though he likes to pick a bone with Giscard, in his latest speech praised Giscard's detente policy.

To sum up, the warmongering group is mainly represented by journalists and the Zionist lobby, as a whole.

Q: Would you include the Rothschilds and Lazards in this grouping?

A: Yes, I would. Even in a paper like the *Le Figaro*, you have de la Gorce who works with Giscard, but you also have Annie Kriegel, Patrick Wajzman, and others who work with the Zionist lobby. But I think that the most influential force is the French Socialist Party (PSF). There are some PSFers who more or less approve of the government's stand, but the Zionist lobby is also a force in the party. In my opinion, the Zionist lobby, who wants to defeat the U.S.S.R., think they can do this with Cold War. In my opinion, this lobby is very dangerous: they think they can stamp on the feet of a wild bear like the Soviet Union with impunity.

Germany's Ostpolitik policy

Q: How do you view the situation in West Germany?

A: I think that in West Germany, a man like Chancellor Schmidt is very much in favor of detente, first because he strongly favors *Ostpolitik*; there are extensive trade relations between West Germany and the Soviet Union, and Schmidt wants to keep this up. The other day I learned that not since World War II have there been so many Germans traveling to and from the Soviet Union. This is very important. But there are also people like Foreign Minister Genscher and Bavarian Minister President Strauss, who totally support the warmongers' viewpoint.

Q: What do you think impedes Giscard and Schmidt from proceeding with Phase Two of the European Monetary System?

A: What stands in the way are the people who oppose the development of the Third World; for example, in Great Britain and the United States, and certain financial circles in France and Germany. As they work underground, it is difficult to know exactly who the most influential among them are. It is easy with a journalist and one can see exactly what they write; however with these underground financial circles, although we know they are applying pressure, it is hard to know exactly who is doing it. ... it involves the secret societies of the so-called jet set.

Who is Raymond Offroy?

Mr. Raymond Offroy, an internationally known diplomat and deputy in the French National Assembly, was among the first leaders to rally to General de Gaulle's side during World War II. He is currently President of the "France-Arab Countries Parliamentary Group" (since 1973) and Co-President of the "European Association for Euro-Arab Cooperation" (since 1974).

Mr. Offroy was Deputy General Secretary of the French Committee for National Liberation (1943) and then of the Provisional Government of the Republic formed in July 1944 after the liberation of France. He became head of the Information & Press Service of the new government.

After being Consul General in Milan (1949), Raymond Offroy was elevated to the rank of Plenipotentiary Minister in 1952. He was Ambassador to Bangkok from 1952 to 1957, after having held several posts in Indochina.

Mr. Offroy was responsible for European Community Affairs in the Foreign Affairs Ministry in 1959. He then served as Ambassador in Nigeria (1960-61) and as Ambassador in Mexico (1962-65).

Mr. Offroy was elected deputy to France's Parliament on the Union des Democratres pour la Republique (UDR, Gaullist Party) ticket in the Seine-Maritime department in 1967, and has been reelected since. He has also served as a representative of France in the European Parliament.

The author of several books on World War II and the Resistance, Raymond Offroy is also an Officer of the French Legion of Honor, and has been decorated with the Rosetta of the Resistance and numerous foreign orders.

Q: Why have Giscard and Schmidt not come out more openly on the question?

A: I think they have not moved into Phase Two of the European Monetary System because they wanted to see whether a certain climate of detente could be maintained with the Soviet bloc. I think they are waiting to see whether detente can be maintained; they think it would be difficult to issue bonds to the Third World, to increase its purchasing power, to have increasingly linked currencies, all because of the war danger. The price of gold has shot up in the last three months; this madness has made Phase Two of the EMS difficult to implement. If we can only maintain detente and defeat the warmongers, if the peacemakers win, then the gold price will drop back to a normal level and we can proceed with EMS, Phase Two.

By normal price, I mean around \$500 an ounce, taking into account the amount of Eurodollars floating around. We must also see whether it is possible to arrive at some kind of agreement with OPEC. All these things are linked; the North-South dialogue, or what Giscard calls the triad, between Europe, Africa, and the Arab world. We must arrive together at a decision about what to do about the United States printing mountains of dollars and thereby provoking world inflation. This in turn leads to an oil price increase and this is a vicious circle.

All these questions are linked and I think the key is the international situation. Will it be possible to have negotiations with the East? Will it be possible to have what de Gaulle once called detente and cooperation? If all this is possible, then we can go further with the EMS. If not, with the crazy gold price, with currency speculation rife, it will be very hard to implement EMS Phase Two.

I think too that the reason the warmongers are pushing now for violent confrontation with the U.S.S.R. is because they want to defeat the EMS.

Oil Prices and the EMS

Q: How do you perceive the role of the Arab countries?

A: I think that countries like Saudi Arabia and Iraq realize that it is in their own interests to maintain the oil price within limits. But so long as the United States refuses support to the EMS policy, things will be difficult. Prices are increasing in the West; so is inflation. The Arabs say they would not increase the oil price if the dollar were stable, if prices in the West in general remained within certain limits. If you take for example the price of automobiles today as compared with 1974, you see that relatively speaking, the oil price has not increased

that much. Some Arabs of course say they will continue to increase the oil price so long as inflation continues in the West; however, others do say that we must help the West to stop price increases as it is in our own interest; we should maintain oil prices within certain limits.

I would like to add one thing: some people in the Arab countries say that it is the policy of some oil companies and some governments like that of the U.S. to increase oil prices, as it increases their profits. You have seen the enormous profits made by the oil companies in the last two years, really preposterous. Most of these oil companies are headquartered right here in the United States.

“What is important is not only that LaRouche should be elected, but that his programme should be carried out, as in my opinion, it is really the solution to the economic crisis...Rueff carried out this policy with the Third World, when he called for a gold-based monetary system.”

Q: Is there any monetary plan under discussion which could link up the Arab Monetary System and the EMS, introducing gold, which could motivate Giscard to act now?

A: I think that if there were a better understanding, a more comprehensive attitude from Western governments, if they would only realize that the cause of inflation is not the increase in the oil price, but that the oil price increase is due to world inflation, which actually started when the USA decided to remove the dollar from the gold standard. I think there are two schools of thought in the Arab world; one says that whatever the West does, we will do the opposite. This means the economic crisis will never end. The others say we must help the West so long as they appear to want to reduce their oil consumption, and find new energy sources. This brings us to the problem of nuclear energy which is very important. So it depends on whether the Western powers want to arrive at this understanding. The failure of the North-South dialogue was not encouraging.

Q: You have made it clear there is no monetary or economic solution, only a political solution to the crisis,

which means a change in Washington. Do you think that the real solution to the problem is to put LaRouche in the White House?

A: Yes. And to implement LaRouche's program. To have a world gold-based monetary system means that the lender can lower interest rates as he knows exactly what he will reap from his investment. Taxes should be lowered for high technology projects and high mechanization technology in agriculture; industrial investments must be stimulated. As for the question of Third World debt, a solution must be found enabling the Third World to increase its purchasing power in the industrialized world, thus creating a boom in the latter due to increased trade. Nuclear energy for industrial purposes must be developed.

This is one whole package. What is important is not only that LaRouche should be elected, but that his programme should be carried out, as in my opinion, it is really the solution to the economic crisis.

Q: What are the historical precedents of LaRouche's policy?

A: De Gaulle, as you know, who had as advisor Jacques Rueff, who was another friend of Lyndon LaRouche, carried out this policy with the Third World, when he called for a gold-based monetary system. This was more than thirteen years ago. If de Gaulle had been alive he would have denounced Nixon's dropping the dollar from the gold standard in 1971. In 1968, when I led a parliamentary delegation to Mexico—I was also in the USA at that time—and everyone said, "Why is de Gaulle industrializing the Third World, investing heavily in high technology ... this is what we in France call *the plan*. This is the five-year plan system which de Gaulle very much favored. This enabled him to extend low interest rates to the sectors of the economy which were the most worthwhile, those which created productive jobs. De Gaulle did all this. In a book called "Les Chenes Qu'on Abat" (The Oaks Which Are Felled) by Malraux, reporting on the last de Gaulle-Malraux discussion, de Gaulle said, "My economic policy is sound, but I have always had against me money." (By money he meant financial power, as "money" in English is not the right word). "I was always convinced that the great financial powers were ruining the world, that they defeated me in 1969." I hope that this time these financial powers will not defeat LaRouche.

And I must protest, that the Americans always thought that de Gaulle didn't like America. De Gaulle loved America. He believed in the future of the United States, it is a wonderful young country, as if it were his own son. And he once said to me: "What could I have done if I had been President of the United States!"



India

Gromyko is briefed on Gandhi's peace drive

by Daniel Sneider

The Indian government, under Prime Minister Indira Gandhi's direction, is now spearheading a peace initiative in the South Asian region aimed at defusing tensions which could lead to war. The center of attention is Pakistan and the U.S. efforts to build up that nation as a military base against Afghanistan. The Indian initiative is basically simple—to persuade Pakistan to abandon a path of confrontation in exchange for a withdrawal of the large Soviet troop-contingent from Afghanistan.

It was this initiative that brought Soviet Foreign Minister Andrei Gromyko to India this past week for extensive talks with Indian officials including private talks between himself and Mrs. Gandhi. Before Gromyko set foot in New Delhi, a team of Indian special envoys had visited all the capitals of the region—Pakistan, Afghanistan, Nepal, Bangladesh, and Sri Lanka—seeking some sort of regional consensus on the Indian effort. The results of those talks were presented to Gromyko, and from what is publicly available, some kind of basic "understanding" was reached, although practical results may not be visible for a time.

The Indian initiative flows from the visit of French President Giscard d'Estaing to India in late January, a visit which created a strong tie between Giscard and Gandhi and a common commitment to preventing the outbreak of thermonuclear war between the U.S. and the Soviet Union over events in the region. The two leaders have adopted a division of labor in search of regional and international stability clearly visible in the French role in Europe and the Indian role in Southwest and South Asia.

While Western press reports tend to distort the Gromyko trip's results—emphasizing "differences" between India and the Soviets on the principle of Soviet troop presence in Afghanistan, informed sources in Delhi have emphasized that, to the contrary, the talks went very well. The Soviet Union is not concerned whether India formally endorses every point of Soviet policy on Af-