

Why Moscow's medical community won the Nobel Peace Prize

This year the Nobel Peace Prize was given to an organization, the International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War (IPPNW) co-founded by Dr. Yevgenii Chazov. Chazov is a member of the Central Committee, the personal physician to the last several Soviet heads of state, the Soviet Deputy Minister of Health, and the "boss" of the infamous Dr. Sergei K. Litvinov. Litvinov is the Assistant Director General of the World Health Organization in charge of the Communicable Disease Division.

We publish here an interview with Dr. X, a French physician who tried to create an organization of physicians for the prevention of nuclear war and for the preparation of medical doctors for civil defense tasks in the case of nuclear war. No sooner had this organization been created than an infiltration operation was run against it by the French Communist Party and the international peace movement. The comments are especially interesting in the light of the awarding of the Nobel Prize to the International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War (IPPNW), which ran the infiltration on behalf of Moscow's policy aims.

EIR: Could you explain how your organization came to birth, historically?

Dr. X: The idea of this organization was launched by two physicians, Dr. Jacques Richard, who lives in Le Mans, and Dr. Michel Haag, who lives in Paris. After having participated in a congress of the International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War [IPPNW], they had the idea that such an organization had to be created in France, where nothing such existed at the time. They gathered several of their friends, and they created, on Sept. 10, 1984, the Association des professionnels de la santé pour la prévention des guerres nucléaires, bactériologiques et chimiques [PSPGNBC—Association of Health Professionals for the Prevention of ABC Wars], of which I became a member at the time of the foundation. Originally, the idea was essentially prevention of nuclear war, i.e. trying to influence international politics to avoid war. Our goals became more precise, in the form that we said: "Okay, we must avoid war, of course, everyone wants to avoid war. But it should not jeopardize our independence or the integrity of our territory." In other words, we set out to find ways of protecting civilian

populations in the case of conflicts or accidental triggering of nuclear warheads.

EIR: That's when you were contacted by a group of other physicians?

Dr. X: Yes. At the time, right at the beginning of the association, even before the first general assembly that was to decide its statutes, the association was contacted by physicians mostly linked to the "Appeal of the Hundred" [a communist-originated petition against Euromissiles in 1983] and to the Appeal of Stockholm against nuclear war—i.e., an emanation of the Communist Party.

EIR: Who were these physicians?

Dr. X: There were Dr. Philippe Denis and Dr. Danièle Gilis, as well as Dr. P. Permin. They came to meet Drs. Richard and Haag, saying, "Your association interests us, we would like to participate in the board of this association." Given their communist origin, Drs. Haag and Richard refused to accept them on the board. Seeing that they could not get their way, they decided to create their own organization, the Association des médecins français pour la prévention des guerres nucléaires, founded on May 2, 1984. It included only physicians, and was concerned only about nuclear war; bacteriological and chemical warfare was taken out of their concern. Our association's general assembly took place on Sept. 29, 1984, in Paris. The other association came, namely Dr. Denis, and demanded a fusion of the two associations. There was a vote of our association, and the outcome of the vote was against the fusion, but accepted a collaboration on the aim. At the time I had fought against any idea of fusion and cooperation as well, but I was overruled. Shortly thereafter, our president, Dr. Richard, decided to resign and was convinced to join the other association. We lost a few of our members, who joined the other organization. In June 1985, there was the international congress of IPPNW in Budapest, and the other organization was recognized as representative in France of IPPNW. The IPPNW leadership told us that we would be accepted provided we joined the other, communist-initiated, organization. Dr. Haag came back, slightly alarmed by the strange atmosphere in the IPPNW congress. And he told me, "I think that it is better that we do not take part in

the IPPNW, because I have the impression the IPPNW has ideas very different from ours.”

EIR: What did these two French organizations represent numerically?

Dr. X: This was a foul game from the beginning. At the very beginning, the other group had a file containing a lot of names, about 200 physicians; this file obviously came from somewhere, it had not been created like that from one day to another. At the time, we were about 80, so obviously, had we accepted the fusion, we would have been wiped out right at the first General Assembly, and they would have taken control of the board. Furthermore, to make the figure of their membership more impressive, they accepted in their association all kinds of people who were not physicians, although from the standpoint of IPPNW, only the number of actual

Right at the beginning of the association, even before the first general assembly that was to decide its statutes, the association was contacted by physicians mostly linked to the “Appeal of the Hundred” against U.S. missile basing, and to the Appeal of Stockholm against nuclear war—i.e., an emanation of the Communist Party.

medical doctors is considered. Recently, they said they had about 300 members, but we don’t know if this takes into account only physicians or not.

EIR: Who are the people who, in the Budapest congress, have decided to accept only the communist created association?

Dr. X: Well, IPPNW has a European board, situated in London, and an international headquarters in Boston, Mass. I don’t know in detail who are those who took the position for the other association. I know that Dr. Richard (who had joined the other organization) was in contact with Dr. Nugent Conn, who was Executive Director of IPPNW. I would like to add a few names of the people belonging to the support committee of the other association. There are Dr. Schwartzberg, Dr. Milliez, Dr. Jasmin, Dr. Bousquet and Dr. Georges Mathé [most of them signed the Appeal of the Hundred]. Looking back at the matter, I am very happy that our association was not recognized. It leaves us free to act the way we want, without being forced to adopt positions of IPPNW.

Obituary

C. Douglas-Home, Editor of *The Times*

by Laurent Murawiec and Michael Liebig

On October 29, Charles Douglas-Home died of cancer at age 48. The young editor of *The Times* of London, in the three years of his tenure, had revived the sagging fortunes of the newspaper. But more importantly, his commitment to fight through thick and thin on behalf of President Reagan’s Strategic Defense Initiative, had made him one of the most important political allies of the United States in Europe.

For the last three years, a long series of articles in his newspaper relentlessly pressed the case not only for SDI, but for its moral and strategic underpinning, the concept of Mutually Assured Survival. Douglas-Home’s editorials explored the avenues of British and European participation in the SDI and of a European Defense Initiative. When the British foreign secretary, Sir Geoffrey Howe, threw a violent anti-SDI fit last March, the *Times* chief sent him a shell against which no defense was found, “Mr. Howe’s Unilateral Declaration of Independence from SDI.”

Mr. Douglas-Home was execrated—the word is not too strong—by the numerous and powerful appeasement elements in Whitehall, who blamed his courageous stance upon his supposed “eccentricities,” against the conventional wisdom shared at the moment by the vast majority of the mandarins, the peers, the experts, and the legion of London-based worshippers of Neville Chamberlain. As he jokingly told the authors a few months ago, “There is no lack of people in Whitehall that want my scalp. Let them dance!” The authors clearly remember some of his enemies, in high places in government and elsewhere, repeatedly predicting his demise. What they could not stand or fathom was a commitment to truth that was most unusual in today’s press world.

Over the years, the authors had the chance of meeting Mr. Douglas-Home a number of times, and had been impressed by a quality of personal courage—the courage of standing firm for one’s own ideas. They were impressed by his patriotism as well as by his ability to look at the future, and the interests, of the Western world as a whole. In their last, recent meeting with Mr. Douglas-Home, his acute interest in Peruvian President Alan García’s war on drugs had stood equal to his commitment to convincing Mrs. Thatcher of the urgent necessity of Britain joining in the SDI.

A tribute should be paid to a brave fighter who died far too early. His loss is not only that of *The Times* and of Britain, it is that of a precarious Western civilization.