
Interview: Gen. Revault d'Allones

'The Soviets' peace movement is an act of war against the West'

General Revault d'Allones (ret.) is a leading Gaullist and was a close collaborator of Gen. Charles de Gaulle, both during the war and after the Liberation. He participated in the regroupment of the Free French armies in Africa, was part of de Gaulle's General Staff in London, and was in Leclerc's army, which liberated Paris. General d'Allones is a defense expert of the RPR, the leading opposition party in France, a leading member of the association La France et son Armée, and last year published a report on the Defense of Europe. He is a Compagnon de la Libération. The interview was conducted by Philip Golub.

EIR: General, you played a significant role in the French armies which regrouped after the invasion of France. We will soon be celebrating the 40th anniversary of D-Day. Could you tell us of the role the Free French played in the liberation alongside the Allies?

D'Allones: It would be incorrect to separate the roles played by the military forces of the Free French abroad and those at home. From the very start until the end of World War II, there were Free French forces in combat. If the soldiers of the Free French were at first but a handful of brave men and women, our ranks grew month by month and year by year in spite of the losses we sustained. The forces inside France were also at first very small, yet they too entered the struggle in 1940 and their forces never ceased to grow in spite of ferocious repression. Their role in the Liberation? Well, one must appreciate their role from the very start of the occupation: The constant flow of intelligence transmitted to the Allies was indispensable for their bombardments, operations, and finally, the Normandy and southern landings.

The role of the resistance in preparing D-Day through the sabotage of enemy installations is well known. The resistance also played a great role in the liberation of Paris. The forces of the First Free French Army which landed in Provence, southern France, or the action of the 2nd armored division of General Leclerc which landed with Patton in Normandy and then liberated Paris, Strasbourg, and Berchtesgarden, concretized and symbolized the renaissance of France and of its armed forces. Nothing would have been possible without our allies: Our weapons were American after having been British

in Africa and elsewhere. At the same time, our own participation in the battle was indispensable to our allies and cannot be vulgarly measured. Lastly, I cannot fail to remember the courage and role of the volunteers from our ex-colonies who fought and died at our sides in the struggle for liberty. General de Gaulle intended that France be present on the day of victory; the Free French Forces and the resistance made that possible.

EIR: What was your personal role, how did you participate in these events?

D'Allones: I landed in Normandy with the 2nd armored division of Leclerc. We engaged in the gigantic battle of tanks and airplanes which led, in the month of August 1944, to the destruction of the two most prestigious armored divisions of the Third Reich. Our division was part of the Third Army of General Patton who was a prestigious chief who knew how to command. With Leclerc, we could have gone to the very end of the world . . . and we almost did!

EIR: If you look at Europe today, 40 years after, one is struck by the growing resignation and spirit of capitulation, the fear which has grown alongside the growth of Soviet power. This fear is expressed in pacifism, neutralism. What do you think has caused this and what can be done to reverse it?

D'Allones: Neutralism is one thing which we cannot expand on here. Pacifism is another. Your question in reality refers to the growth of pacifist movements and actions which profit from what you correctly characterized as a "spirit of capitulation." We know that it is the product of an offensive led and animated by Soviet Russia using extremely powerful means of finance and propaganda. As always in operations of subversive warfare, the aggressor has an enormous advantage in that its victims believe credulously that they are fighting for their own ideas and their own interests, and hence refuse to admit that they are nothing but the ridiculous puppets of a diabolical manipulator. The Soviets' pacifist offensive is geared towards two areas: first, towards what is generally termed the "second circle," the Warsaw Pact countries partially occupied by Soviet troops, and, second, of course,

Western Europe. Among the Warsaw Pact countries, there are significant fissures. Even if one cannot see motion occurring there now, there is nonetheless motion there.

Russia's central aim now is to reorganize German politics, to "Finlandize" central Europe at least up to the Rhine. For the moment, France is less directly threatened by pacifism. However, the Communist Party is in power with the blessing of Moscow. Nonetheless, the CP's action in favor of the so-called peace movement is limited by their desire to stay in the government, and hence, what the Socialists will or will not tolerate. The French CP, for example, was forced to tone down its attacks on the deployment of American Euromissiles once Mitterrand had come out strongly in favor of deployment.

What can be done about this? First, people must realize that the "peace movement" and the pacifists are deployed as an *act of war* against the West. People must also realize that strategic problems will not be solved all by themselves.

There is no question that this offensive has found fertile ground in our Western nations, apparently exclusively preoccupied with materialism. It is doubtful that a nation would rise to fight for the right to a good weekend or the right to have a television! This being said, I am convinced that it would be an enormous error [for the Soviets] to believe that Europe's peoples will not react. If fundamental, transcendent moral values are threatened, if our civilization itself is threatened, we will have to react with violence, enthusiastic energy, even fury. Look at what is happening in Afghanistan and Poland. There is no doubt that resistance would grow in the Federal Republic, in France, even in Holland, if fundamental values were to be deeply endangered. Wilhelm II mistook the will to fight of France in World War I. Moscow today would risk a great deal in attempting to renew wars of conquest.

EIR: The strategic context has, of course, changed. Deterrence is rapidly dying as new defense-weapons systems are developed; I mean the Strategic Defense Initiative or beam-weapons. What do these changes mean for strategy in the European theater?

D'Allones: Nuclear deterrence proved its efficiency for a time. Global war was avoided. Today, however, the value of deterrence is being questioned, and it is wise to think about this issue. We cannot destroy our nuclear arsenals yet. That would be madness! Yet, for how long will nuclear weapons be able to prevent aggression? That is the real issue. There are two areas of answers: One is strategic and the other technical.

The strategic answer revolves around varying conceptions of the use of strategic nuclear weapons. The West has generally held the idea that war can be avoided and aggression deterred through the deterrent value of nuclear weapons that we do not desire or intend to launch. Soviet doctrine, on the contrary, makes nuclear weapons a central factor in a policy

of conquest of Western Europe and advocates the massive use of nuclear weapons to make such a conquest possible. It would take us too far to examine this in further detail. Let us look at the technical issue.

You know of course, and your publication has done much to make it known, that a new generation of weapons are under development in Russia, the United States, and elsewhere. These new weapons will render short-, medium- and long-range ballistic nuclear missiles inoperative. They will thus remove the danger of all missile-launched nuclear attacks. The new weapons will thus finally permit us to develop a real defensive deterrence rather than the present doctrine of Mutually Assured Destruction. I, for one, am an advocate of these new weapons and desire that France provide itself with laser- and beam-weapon defense systems as quickly as possible. Until we have deployed the new weapons, we must continue to modernize and develop our nuclear arsenal. We must develop the formidable reconversion to beam-weapon defense in close collaboration with the other members of the Alliance, particularly the United States. Peace cannot imaginably be maintained if there is not a strengthening of cooperation and links between France, West Germany, and the United States.

EIR: From that standpoint, how do you conceive today of the idea of a Gaullist Europe?

D'Allones: For me, Europe is, first, an idea, an expression of our common will. We must work toward common goals, common policies. The institutions will come later, and any attempt to impose institutions before having created the political base for Europe is at best useless. Europe is an economic, political, and military necessity. Europe is responsible for the survival of our civilization, and that must be its essential role. My idea of Europe is that of a dynamic, enterprising, living, creative continent, the very opposite of a Malthusian, destructive Europe.

The defense of Europe requires a bold push for the development of new weapons and their applications. This demands scientific and technical collaboration with the United States. We must courageously enter into the space-exploration age, we must develop the Third World, we must reverse our demographic decline. But I am not merely talking about Western Europe. I am not merely talking about the small peninsula which ends at the Iron Curtain. If Europe is only that, it becomes merely the target of one side or the bridgehead for the other! No! Europe is a continent which stretches to the Ural mountains. We must have a design and that project cannot be anything less than the liberation of the nations presently enslaved in the East of Europe. I would like to see Europe's politicians show courage and affirm this clearly.

EIR: On the occasion of the 40th anniversary of D-Day what message would you send to the American people?

D'Allones: [In English] Don't drop Europe! Thank you.