

Genoud case: Swiss tribunal to judge Nazism and terrorism?

by Thierry Lalevée

Next Nov. 15, what may become a historic trial will open in the Palais de Justice in Geneva. Accused are half a dozen journalists from Switzerland and France belonging to the *Tribune de Genève*, the daily newspaper *Le Monde*, and the French weeklies *Le Point* and *L'Express*. The plaintiff will be Lausanne-based Nazi François Genoud, assisted by one of the most renowned lawyers of Switzerland, some say the most expensive, Maître Bonnant, who in recent years also defended Licio Gelli, the grand master of the illegal Propaganda-2 Freemasonic lodge.

The roots of this trial were sown more than three years ago, when in March 1982, a Swiss terrorist, Bruno Breguet, was arrested in Paris. After a shoot-out with the local police, Breguet and his German sidekick, Magdalena Kaupp, were arrested with weapons and explosives which were to be used against Paris's townhall. They were then charged for planning terrorists activities on behalf of France's underground terror movement, Direct Action, and the international network associated with the infamous "Carlos."

While Kaupp seemed to be new at the game and was mostly known as an associate, not an activist, of the West German underground terrorist "Revolutionary Cells," this was not Breguet's first time out. The young Swiss from the Tessin region had been caught by the Israelis in the 1970s, while on a special terrorist mission on behalf of George Habash's Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine. Condemned to 15 years in jail, he was freed in the wake of Menachim Begin's election in June 1977. Mystery surrounded and still surrounds that early release, which was brought about by diplomatic pressures from the Swiss government, most publicly initiated by Nazi banker François Genoud. Maître Cruchon, who then became Genoud's son-in-law, was Breguet's lawyer.

Kept quiet then, such friendships were revealed publicly in 1982, first in *Le Monde*, then in Geneva and in French weeklies. After his 1977 release, Breguet was taken under Genoud's protection—a most important link, as the terrorist "Carlos" publicly threatened then-Interior Minister of France Gaston Deferre with retaliation, should Breguet and Kaupp not be released immediately. On the day the first hearings

opened in Paris, a car-bomb exploded in Rue Marbeuf, killing an innocent passerby. In subsequent days, bombs were discovered at railway stations, and one exploded in an express train, killing several people.

Questions arose: Who, then, was François Genoud? What connections did he have with Carlos? What were the implications of Genoud's past and present activities as a Nazi, and his relationship with international Palestinian terrorism?

These questions we have often answered in the pages of *Executive Intelligence Review* in recent years, bringing forward new documentation and evidence of Genoud's political involvement in terrorism. As we exposed his network more and more deeply, Genoud's standard reply has been, "It is not worth suing *EIR* and *New Solidarity*." Instead, after a few months, he decided to sue the other publications, with financial gain in mind. He has not sued in protest at being called a Nazi or a terrorist, but on three marginal points which, under a new Swiss press law, he is financially assured of winning.

- First, he argues that, contrary to what has been written, he was not arrested in 1964 in Algeria for financial embezzlement, but for political reasons; to say otherwise is an insult to his reputation as a banker.

- Second, he claims that though he may have been associated with German Military Intelligence (Abwehr) during the war, he was never formally a member as has been implied.

- Third, although he admits to having helped Bruno Breguet in his trials, he denies that he personally financed the defense.

The points are ridiculous, compared to what has been otherwise said about him for years. But the suit had its effect. Since the complaint was filed in June 1982, most publications have refrained from publishing anything more against him, in order not to interfere with a judicial process that the Swiss and Genoud's lawyer have deliberately made very slow. Genoud's name disappeared from many newspaper columns, giving him the obscurity he prefers for his very secret operations.

The fact that the trial will finally occur stems more from

a political decision than a judicial one. The defendant's lawyers had been pushing for it for some time. Genoud had decided to play for time. Then in the spring, in apparent coordination with Jacques Verges, the lawyer of the Nazi "Butcher of Lyon," Klaus Barbie, Genoud changed tactics and lawyers; he decided to go for the trial and to win it. The long-standing, low-key family friend, Maître Cruchon, was replaced by the star, Maître Bonnant. Genoud, who has now admitted that he chose Verges for Barbie, obviously wants to establish a parallel between his own trial in Geneva and Barbie's upcoming trial in early 1986. Though fighting on the three absurd points cited above, he obviously wants to use a financial victory as a whitewash for Nazism.

While refusing to allow this to be drawn directly into the court case, Genoud is now ready to admit that he has been and is a Nazi, and had befriended Hitler's associate, the Grand Mufti of Jerusalem. He has also admitted that he met with PFLP boss George Habash as well as terrorist Wadi Haddad, but claims that such meetings do not mean he is involved in terrorism. More recently, he also admitted that it was he who chose Nazi war-criminal Eichmann's lawyer, Maître Servatius, but insists that in Eichmann's and Breguet's cases, he has never been financially involved. Indeed, his 1980 and most recent 1984 tax declarations report a yearly income of 23,000 and 13,000 Swiss francs. Of these, 6,000 francs came in 1984 from his copyrights for Goebbels's work! François Genoud is legally so poor that there are no explanations for his two houses or his international travels.

However, the trial may not take the turn desired by Genoud and Maître Bonnant. Far from focusing on the mere legal issues which seem so fascinating to Swiss justice, the debate is expected to reach a bit higher. Genoud himself may contribute to it as he is expected to bring Islamic fundamentalist Ahmed Ben Bella, his decades-long protégé, as witness to testify that he had been arrested in Algiers for political and not financial reasons.

The defendants are also expected to bring forward surprise witnesses and new evidence. They may not have much chance of winning the trial on legal grounds; they have to win it politically. Superseding mere details, this trial has to become the trial of National Socialism and its survival over the last 40 years; it will have to be the trial of the role played by Nazism in international terrorism and drugs, and its shady connections with Soviet intelligence. Already in the weeks prior to the trial, international media are expecting to focus on Genoud's case. As we will expose in forthcoming articles, the focus will also reveal the important role played by François Genoud today on behalf of the Iranian Islamic Republic of Ayatollah Khomeini. After all, it is no coincidence that Genoud's daughter just married an Iranian in Lausanne, or that Khomeini's son-in-law, Sadegh Tabatabai, Iran's top arms merchant, just bought a house a few meters from Genoud's, in Pully.

British establishment steps up war on SDI

by Laurent Murawiec

At the San Francisco meeting of NATO parliamentarians on Oct. 11, former British Foreign Secretary Lord Carrington, secretary-general of NATO's civilian bureaucracy, demanded of President Reagan that "the SDI [Strategic Defense Initiative] must be placed on the negotiation table at Geneva." Considering that the U.S. President has tirelessly repeated that his space defense program is not a "bargaining chip," it was a bold step for the Briton to take—and one perfectly coherent with the tireless tirades issuing from Soviet officials on the same subject.

Carrington, an architect of the "New Yalta" accord to cede global hegemony to the Soviet Union, is perhaps emboldened by the rate at which events around the world are bringing "New Yalta" to a realization.

In the same vein, Lord Carrington's successor at the Foreign Office, Geoffrey Howe, raised a few eyebrows at the Conservative Party's annual conference held in Blackpool, England during the week of Oct. 7, when he hinted that the British "independent nuclear deterrent" might after all be negotiable, as the Soviets insist, once "deep cuts in offensive weapons" have been agreed upon by the two superpowers—while Defense Minister Michael Heseltine aired a resounding "no" to the same Soviet demand. Howe also welcomed the latest Soviet propaganda offer of 50% cuts in missiles: "They need to be examined carefully on their merits. . . ."

At the same time, intensive talks continue between London and Washington concerning what role Britain may play in the SDI, and agreement on a memorandum of understanding is expected within weeks, which would make Britain the first NATO country to reach such an accord. Light needs to be shed on Great Britain's real position on the matter.

Professor R. V. Jones, wartime chief of British scientific intelligence, who worked with Winston Churchill's science adviser Henry Tizard, has taken it upon himself to do so in his recently published booklet, *New Light on Star Wars*, issued by the Center for Policy Studies (CPS) in London. Jones, currently of the Center for Defense Studies of Aberdeen University in Scotland, was originally put in charge of drafting the paper by a high-powered CPS study-group convened by one of the center's founders, Sir Alfred Sherman,