
Interview: POE Secretary-General Jacques Cheminade



‘Soviets find Vatican’s Lejeune more useful than Marchais’

Jacques Cheminade, the secretary-general of the Parti Ouvrier Européen (European Labor Party) of France, was interviewed on March 10 at the New York office of Executive Intelligence Review. Cheminade’s POE is “breaking the rules of French politics” by running citizen-candidates for the upcoming European parliament elections, so far having assembled a slate of 65 candidates. The interviewer is Nora Hamerman.

EIR: I want to ask about President François Mitterrand. Why is it that of all the European governments the French government seems to be open to beam weapons, the new defense doctrine President Reagan laid out on March 23, 1983? For example, the French defense minister admitted late last fall that France is researching and developing the new weapons systems. Can you explain this?

Cheminade: The key point in Mitterrand’s attitude is the old army establishment, which understands the importance of beam weapons as the new advanced technology to be introduced in military weapons. It conceives these weapons the same way de Gaulle conceived the *force de frappe*, the French deterrent nuclear force, as the most advanced technology developed as of today to permit the integrity, independence, and national serenity of the nation.

EIR: So this is coming from that side.

Cheminade: It is coming from that side and from *our* side. We as an institution, the Parti Ouvrier Européen and the association, La France et son Armée, that we launched, have been feeding the military establishment with all our material on beam weapons, and this has produced “riots” in certain places, with people shifting their understanding of the situation, the old pro-French nuclear force establishment understanding that, today, the nuclear force is beam weapons.

EIR: There also appears to be a totally opposite policy coming out of the Mitterrand government. The policy associated with Foreign Minister Cheysson bears a striking similarity to British Prime Minister Maggie Thatcher’s policy of appeasement vis-à-vis the Soviet Union. The French Foreign Ministry did not want to fight the Libyan invasion of Chad, and compromised with Syria. Can you explain?

Cheminade: That is the other side of the Mitterrand govern-

ment. Mitterrand always has two irons in the fire. The other iron is an American iron, but linked to the worst American faction, that associated with Henry Kissinger. Mitterrand is linked to the Schlumberger family, to the Riboud family, to the Felix Rohatyn operation, to certain Democratic party currents. In Mitterrand’s own Socialist Party, in particular, there are forces which use this connection as an opposed connection to that of beam weapons. This is a paradoxical, ironical situation where you have one pro-American faction which is pro-beam weapons, and another pro-American faction which is pro-post-industrial society and anti-science, anti-growth.

EIR: What is the opposition up to? There have been large demonstrations against the government lately, as large as 800,000 I am told, on the question of the right to free access to religious non-public schools. Coming on top of massive unemployment, this makes for an unstable situation.

Cheminade: The problem of the opposition in France, historically, has been conceiving itself as an opposition, and not as a force proposing a program or design. At this point you have a lot of agitation in all kinds of domains—for free schools, against taxes, for industrial growth, but all in a totally heteronomic way. The opposition peddles corporativist schemes and very demagogic attacks against the state, against big powers. It behaves as a negative force, and not as a force proposing an alternative program.

We have one opposition which is the old Gaullist opposition, now in the RPR party, headed by Jacques Chirac, the mayor of Paris, but it has a very poor leadership. Its leadership has forgotten what voluntarism is. Instead they copy recipes they try to find here and there. One of them is “Reganomics”—trying to copy Donald Regan and Paul Volcker. Since the original is at a very low level, a copy of it is really shoddy.

The problem is also that there is a line into Chirac’s party which is the old cult of the *force de frappe*. This is represented by General Gallois, who is strongly against beam weapons. He says that if the United States develops beam weapons it will create a situation of Fortress America where the United States would abandon Europe. This is totally crazy because in any case if the Soviets develop beam weapons and the Americans don’t, the United States would really abandon

Europe. But this does not enter into Gallois' thinking. Gallois belongs to circles in the U.S.A. connected to Danny Graham and the anti-science, extreme right-wing establishment which in the present situation, particularly in Europe, wants to make deals with the Soviet Union, hoping that out of the Soviet Union will come Holy Mother Russia. They want Russia to be a power, established on the basis of blood and soil. Gallois thinks of the *force de frappe* as something that would be negotiated with the Soviet state in the framework of a European arrangement, which Russia would come out of.

EIR: Is this connected at all to the people around Jerome Lejeune, who is a top member of the Pontifical Academy of Sciences?

Cheminade: Yes, Lejeune is associated with the Baltimore crowd—the institute of Christian integristas down in Baltimore. He has been working with Father Hesburgh of Notre Dame, and others at Georgetown University, Father Paul Marx, all these connections. This ties into the Fatima-cult establishment which invited Danny Graham recently to give a lecture on the conception of High Frontier. So Jerome Lejeune is especially associated with these forces and forces in the Vatican that now want to make with the Soviet military junta the same kind of deal that the Vatican made with Hitler. They have the same “raison d’église” as we say in France, that promotes the Church before anything else for the sake of the Church’s survival. They don’t care about principles. It’s an “ultramontaine” current in the Church also associated with Jesuit forces.

This has a right-wing face that Jerome Lejeune pretends to represent in the Right to Life movement, and it has a left-wing face around Weisskopf, Hesburgh, and others. These two tie together in the same conception of a purely theocratic force, on the basis of which they want to associate with a Russia dominated by the Russian Orthodox Church.

And all this has a name in the United States. This force on top of Danny Graham, Jerome Lejeune, Gallois, is James Jesus Angleton, who is—I would not call him a Soviet mole, I would call him a *Russian* mole inside the United States. That is what he has always been.

EIR: Can you say something about why Lejeune hates you and your personal encounter with Lejeune? For example, how he conceives of manipulating the Right to Life movement toward the kinds of ends you describe?

Cheminade: I had been at one of the Right to Life conventions and I gave a speech on the Club of Rome. They liked it, because it gave the names of the enemies; they were mobilized thus to fight Malthusianism, zero growth. Lejeune did not like that at all. Lejeune would speak against abortion without naming the names, to promote irrational rage and feelings. He said that the only thing that the Right to Life people should be taught about is to be against abortion, and to go beyond this would confuse them. So Professor Lejeune is totally anti-republican. He doesn’t want the population to

be taught. He wants to keep the secret for an oligarchical inner elite which would manage its own business, like negotiating with Moscow.

The other point on which he was very clear is the military point. He was strongly against beam weapons and he was favorable to some kind of “synergy,” a kookish scheme to get energy from space. He was anti-beam weapons because he said it is a type of scientific discovery that cannot be transformed into technology. When I told him that beam weapons were feasible in a very short period of time, he said that’s absolutely impossible.

So I asked him what his view was of the situation in Europe. He said the Soviet army threatens to invade Europe with conventional weapons and tanks. I replied that we have weapons against tanks. He said yes, but they would not be used, because soldiers never confront tanks in a democracy, even if they have the proper weapons. So I asked why? He said a democracy can never teach a soldier to resist. A democracy is unable to organize an infantry. I asked what kind of regime can organize an infantry? Well, he said, that’s another story.

That’s *his* story.

EIR: Some observers noted that at the recent funeral of Andropov in Moscow in February, Lejeune, who was sent there representing the Vatican, received better treatment than George Marchais, the head of the French Communist Party. Yet many people believe that the French Communist Party is the closest of all the Western Communist parties to the Soviet Union. What does this mean?

Cheminade: That’s very interesting, because in the funeral cortege, Lejeune was definitely ahead of Marchais. In the view of the Soviets, Lejeune is much more useful at this point. Why? Because what the Soviets want to accomplish in France is to destroy the French institutions and the capacity of the French state to resist. They believe that certain Vatican forces like Lejeune, even if they are extremely right-wing in their view, because these forces believe that they can make an agreement with the Russian forces, would cooperate with the Soviet state to destabilize France. That’s how these forces see the role of somebody like Professor Lejeune and his radical opposition to the present French government and his opposition to beam weapons in particular.

What the Soviets want to do in France is to promote all kinds of forces that will destabilize the present institutions, destroy them. So you have many operations at the same time.

You have an operation around Yves Montand, which ties into both an American side, the post-industrial society lobby in the United States, and a Soviet side. First Montand put out decent political commentaries supporting the Reagan administration in Grenada, in Lebanon. Then he was on television talking about the Soviet threat. Before you knew it Montand was talking like the up-and-coming Ronald Reagan: the actor turned president. Two weeks ago he was again a guest on prime-time television, with the whole country glued to him,

thanks to the media hype. Then he revealed his true face. He forecast a “third industrial revolution” based on computers, that would bring East and West together, and he attacked the idea of an FDR-style war mobilization in the West to get the economy going. He said this idea must be fought because it would lead to nuclear holocaust! Everyone knows that, in the United States, Lyndon H. LaRouche made a Roosevelt mobilization his primary electoral platform; the KGB has weird answering services nowadays. The Montand operation is tied into Marie France Garaud’s Institut de Géopolitique which now speaks favorably of beam weapons but attacks LaRouche. Garaud is well known as a friend of Kissinger. This grouping is allegedly anti-communist, but they demand to fight against communism by scrapping industrial firms, and using computers—computers without industry. Of course, the communists like this type of enemy.

Then there is a “center-left” operation of the “Two Faures,” backed by the Elysée, it is said. The Edgar Faure and Maurice Faure list for the June European Parliament elections was allegedly going to be headed by a guy named Bertouin, who is the head in Europe of the Trilateral Commission, and who calls for a United States of Europe, *Mittleuropa*, and so on—which the Soviets like. Edgar Faure has been known in France for years as a Russian agent.

EIR: Where did Edgar Faure come from? Was he a socialist?

Cheminade: He comes out of all beds. He’s a Radical, Center-left. In terms of East-West channels, he is always there, a sort of mini-Averell Harriman. Then you have Le Pen who gets 15-20% of the vote with his *Partie des Forces Nationales*, reviving the old *Action Française* with its blood and soil ideology. Le Pen claims that all of France’s problems come from the Arab immigrant workers who do the lowest paid menial jobs in France. Le Pen is used as a Vichyite [Vichy was the Nazi puppet-state in wartime France—ed.] to create a heavy destabilization in the opposition and further prevent them from coming up with a program. Le Pen is extremely anti-communist, but only promotes hatred of the big state and the big powers, and calls for small powers, small industry, decentralization, and so on. Moscow likes these types of groups and parties. Even if they don’t create such parties, they push them once they exist.

You have a group in the extreme right wing in France: Alain Benoist, who heads an organization called *GRECE*, which is linked to the new “Republican Party” in Munich and to Armin Mohler, i.e., the Universal Fascists. Alain Benoist wrote that the extreme right wing in Europe should not make the same mistake they made in the 1930s and 1940s; this time they should go along with the Soviets.

EIR: He says this in print?

Cheminade: Yes, in print—under his true name, not under his pen name, Alain Benoist. Under his true name, in a publication called *Éléments*, Patrice LaRoche wrote explicitly that. Meanwhile his friends up in Belgium and in France

are saying that the two best leaders in Europe at this point are Greek Premier Papandreou and Austrian Social Democratic leader Kreisky, because only they are independent from America. So they are strongly promoting anti-Americanism at this point. And they want an agreement of all Indo-Europeans against Western ideas. That is what the Third Rome faction in Moscow wants, so they are allies.

And you also have something interesting in that context: Michel Poniatowski’s declaration. Poniatowski, who is in the Republican Party of Giscard d’Estaing, but publicly “independent,” issued a statement that the future is an alliance of all the white races from Madrid to Moscow, against the hungry hordes of the Third World. By definition this guy is in the Third Rome camp.

There was an association historically of deals between the French nobility and the Russians, where Poniatowski was instrumental. The person Poniatowski admires is Talleyrand. You have to look at all these people like Jean Baptist Doumeng who is a financier of the Communist Party, involved in all the Franco-Soviet trade deals, Poniatowski, and others, former Premier Raymond Barre for example, are out to recreate the politics of Metternich. It is all the same families that cooperated with Metternich’s Unholy Alliance.

EIR: Now what’s the Communist Party doing?

Cheminade: Marchais is afraid because he knows the Soviets’ game from the inside. He knows that the Soviets would use the Communist Party of France as a destructive force and no longer as a constructive, state-oriented force. Marchais knows that he has been set up to head the Communist list in the European elections, so that they will get between 10% and 13% of the vote. That would be defeat, and Marchais would have to go. Then the CP would become a battering ram for all the discontent. So the CP would go in a short period of time from being a government force with three or four ministers, who behave very rationally, dress well, wear neckties and are very respectable, to all of a sudden being a vehicle for the most revolutionary ideas.

Marchais doesn’t like the idea much. On various occasions he has protested against the Soviets, against Chernenko, and against the Soviet military junta, particularly on one issue—France as a unified nation. Marchais protested, for example, against the publication by the Soviets of a book on France as an ethnic state. In this book it was said that 80% of the population of France is French, and 20% is either Jewish, Basque, Corsican, Breton, and so forth. So Marchais said it’s a racist concept of the country. He knows this means that the Soviets want to explode France into a set of isolated regionalist groups who go for the destruction of the country.

EIR: So his French nationalist side is at war with his communist side?

Cheminade: It’s his *survival* that is at stake. He knows that the Soviets establish careers in terms of profiles, and that according to his profile his career is coming to an end.