

The damage Mitterrand's victory can now inflict

by Christopher White, Contributing Editor

The election of French Socialist François Mitterrand has set off a chain-reaction transformation of world politics. Perhaps the most immediate impact has been first on the delicate factional situation within the political leadership of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, and second on the equally delicately poised entanglements of Middle East politics.

Mitterrand's victory brings the world into a period of intensified chaos and strategic confrontation. The causes of the fundamental shifts that are now in the works are the following.

Mitterrand—a long-time associate of West Germany's notorious Willy Brandt, Sweden's Olof Palme, Italy's Bettino Craxi, and America's Alexander Haig—is a dedicated opponent of the policies adopted by Valéry Giscard d'Estaing, in line with the political traditions of de Gaulle's republic, of seeking to stabilize world strategic crisis potentials through reordering the world monetary system.

During the course of his tenure of the Elysée, Giscard, acting in alliance with West Germany's Chancellor Helmut Schmidt, had established the European Monetary System (EMS) as the kernel of such new credit and monetary arrangements. The EMS offered the basis for political accords based on long-term development-oriented economic agreements, through which potential catastrophic crises could be defused.

In large measure it was the emergence of the EMS from the period of early spring 1978 onward that enabled the world to survive the horrors of the outgoing Carter administration, dominated as that administration was by the psychotic combination of Cyrus Vance and Zbigniew Brzezinski and the monetary policies of the surviving incumbent, Federal Reserve Chairman Paul Adolph Volcker.

As conclusively demonstrated by the consistent opposition of such U.S.-based figures and institutions as Henry Kissinger, the editorial board of the *New York Times*, and the denizens of the lower reaches of the State Department, Giscard and Schmidt were to that extent acting on behalf of vital *American* self-interest.

The option thus created for a U.S. alignment with the EMS is now gone. As the free-fall drop of the French franc on the proverbial morning after the French elections showed, the European Monetary System, as conceived by Giscard and Schmidt, is no more. Gone too is the political conception of the alliance of European nation-states centered on Germany and France, whose own alliance had become something of a bastion of stability.

It is in this way that the victory of Mitterrand, a man identified in the French media in the concluding phases of the campaign as a British agent, will affect the internal Soviet situation and the Middle East.

The Warsaw Pact political command has been in the grip of a fierce battle for some time between two rival factions. The one associated with President Leonid Brezhnev and his allies, primarily from the Ukraine, had sought to build war-avoidance alignments through fostering long-term economic and technological cooperation agreements with Western nations. The Siberian gas pipeline deal, rejected earlier by Henry Kissinger but pursued by the French and Germans, was exemplary.

Brezhnev's opposition is headed by Mikhail Suslov and Boris Ponomarev. Working in tandem with the Socialist International to which Mitterrand belongs, and the Theology of Liberation wing of the Jesuit order, this Soviet faction shares the policy commitments of such U.S. figures as ex-Kissinger subordinate Alexander Haig. They are Malthusians who have allied with the social democrats and Haig on the basis of shared agreement with the policy perspectives of such genocidal blueprints as the Brandt Commission's report on North-South relations and the Carter administration's *Global 2000 Report*.

The ascendancy of Mitterrand shifts the Soviet factional situation in the direction of those who, like Suslov and Ponomarev, would eagerly see the Western nations go down to disaster through the dismantling of the institutions of the modern nation-state, just like the inhabitants of Poland, the tortured victims of the same coalition of forces.

Hence, it was those circles in London, New York, and Washington sharing the genocidal proclivities of Suslov and Ponomarev who worked hardest for Giscard's defeat, in full knowledge that this would transform the political situation within the Soviet Union. James Chase of the Council on Foreign Relations must be included among such circles, along with think tankers from the Georgetown Center for Strategic and International Studies, and Alexander Haig's supporters within the State Department, like James Buckley.

Speeches given by leaders of the Soviet military command in commemoration of the May 8 anniversary of the World War II victory leave no doubt that such developments are in the works. Marshals Kulikov, Ustinov, and Ogarkov all addressed the same theme in the strongest terms, identifying the United States and its allies as the motor force behind a new drive to war.

The ramifications of the Mitterrand victory in the Middle East demonstrate the simplistic nature of the conclusions drawn by the Soviet command—conclusions which, if matched by prevailing illusions within the United States, would lead toward a military outcome of the new depression crisis unleashed by the dissolution of the EMS.

Those representatives of the Arab nations who favor the path of scientific and technological advance had

built political alliances with the European Monetary system, of the sort typified by the Saudi Arabian credit line recently negotiated with France and Germany. France has just pulled out of that agreement, leaving the Arabs with no alternatives but to line up with the radicals from Syria and Libya or to seek the shelter of Weinberger's lunatic expansion of Carter's so-called Rapid Deployment Force.

The radicals associated with Libya's Colonel Qaddafi and the psychotic mullahs of the Iranian revolution, who are also linked to the British triple agent Harold Kim Philby, share the Malthusian worldview of Suslov and Ponomarev in the East and Haig and Buckley in the West.

With the Giscard coalition for development now bereft of institutional forms of development, such forces calculate that they can now begin to wear down their international opponents who have favored industrialization and development.

Thus, within France itself Mitterrand has now indicated that he will begin to dismantle the ambitious French nuclear program launched by his predecessor, and will commit the French state to the genocidal policies of Willy Brandt and his commission.

Much responsibility will therefore fall on Americans to ensure that those responsible for Giscard's defeat—notably, Alexander Haig and his allies—are brought to account. To avoid strategic disaster, it will be necessary to secure the adoption of the economic development-based policies within the United States for which Giscard earned the hatred of the international Malthusian coalition.

'Disaster has struck: therefore rebuild'

by Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.

EIR founder Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr. issued the following statement on May 11, 1981.

To paraphrase Friedrich Schiller's remarks on the rise of the Jacobin terror, in the election in France May 10, a great moment of history had the misfortune to encounter a majority of "little people." The littlest of the wretched voters were the antisocialists of the so-called right, who voted for Mitterrand in the hope that a period of chaos would bring a figure such as Chirac to power.

The strategic consequences of Mitterrand's election will be monstrous. It will be the signal for an attempt to bring the new "Mussolini" of Italy, Socialist Party "II