

the old Stalinist law of 1929, which nationalized all Church possessions and restricted the size of gatherings, the teaching of religion to children, the sale of religious material in book shops, etc. The change, establishing a kind of Church-State *concordat*, was originally set for the beginning of the year. The outbreak of the succession fight in the Soviet leadership has postponed this.

High-level resistance to the *concordat* has been launched by the section of the *Nomenklatura* that would be eliminated from power in the event of a post-Gorbachov "Russian Party" victory.

Nothing better illustrates the growth in power of the *Nomenklatura*'s Russian Party than the successes scored during the past year by the mass Russian chauvinist organizations, beginning with the notorious Pamyat Society. The success achieved by Pamyat and the 16.8-million-strong All-Russian Society for the Preservation of Historical and Cultural Monuments (VOOPIK)—about one person in ten in Moscow is said to belong to VOOPIK—has upset some Kremlin leaders.

Contrary to what many in the West would expect, the most angry response to the new assertiveness of the Church came, not from "ideological hardliners," but from Gorbachov's right-hand man, Politburo member Alexander Yakovlev, one of the architects of *glasnost*.

The Jan. 2 *Economist* of London reported that Yakovlev had recently replied to allegations of leadership indifference toward widespread destruction of historical and religious monuments, especially churches, with the assertion that the Communist Party had no intention of supporting "religiousness," and rejected the "single stream" (*yediny potok*) school of thought, which sees the Bolshevik Revolution as an "organic" continuation of Russian history. He said, "All attempts to depict [Byzantine] Christianity as the 'mother' of Russian culture must be categorically rejected. If medieval Russia merits the attention of historians, it is in no way because of the millennium of the Orthodox faith."

For his views, Yakovlev has become the principal target in the Politburo of Pamyat and other Russian chauvinist groups. Pamyat has never forgiven Yakovlev for his 1972 article, "Against historicism," in *Literaturnaya Gazeta* (No. 46) assailing "Russophile tendencies" in culture, journalism, and history. On Dec. 8, 1987, the Pamyat Society issued an "Appeal" in which it again accused Yakovlev of being a "Russophobe." The document strongly suggested that he step down as Central Committee secretary in charge of the propaganda apparatus. The Pamyat document added what in retrospect echoes the line taken in the March 13 *Sovetskaya Rossiya* "Manifesto." "The press, radio, and television continue to propagate cosmopolitanism and idolization of the West, to the exclusion of national and folk elements."

According to well-informed sources, the April 5 *Pravda* piece that attacked the *Sovetskaya Rossiya* "Manifesto," bore the imprint of Yakovlev.

---

## France

---

# The troubling drift Mitterrand and his

by Jacques Cheminade

*The author is general secretary of the Parti Ouvrier Européen (European Labor Party) of France. In this writing, he comments on the draft presidential platform of François Mitterrand, the Socialist incumbent who is bidding for a second seven-year term as President of France. The first round of the presidential election takes place on April 24. The final run-off between the two candidates who receive the highest number of votes, will take place on May 8. Another candidate, Raymond Barre, was profiled in EIR's March 25, 1988 issue.*

The rejection of the most advanced weapons of our era: In his presidential platform proposal, François Mitterrand offers disturbing pledges to the partisans of a New Yalta deal with Moscow.

His Socialist Party friends, meanwhile, are letting it be known that they will "economize on military spending." They will do this 1) by abolishing the Hades program (which foresees, by 1992, the creation of a large autonomous unit made up of 45 launchers of two missiles apiece, fitted with "neutron bombs" and with a range just under 500 km), and 2) by throwing onto the same scrapheap the "pre-strategic" Medium-Range Ground-Air Missiles (ASMP), which are supposed to be put onto part of the 38 Super-Etendard fighter-bombers which are in service in the Air Force of France.

This may make it clearer why the French Communist Party is putting out the word that it will tell its members to vote for Mitterrand in the second round of the presidential elections, after voting for the Communist candidate in the first round.

## Good news in the Kremlin

In the French President's reelection platform, three things are likely to bring great satisfaction to the Kremlin:

1) Mitterrand congratulates himself for having torpedoed, in 1986, France's adherence to the Strategic Defense Initiative of President Reagan, and blames the SDI for "carrying the arms race into space." This is the opposite of the truth, since not only is space already militarized by missiles, strategic and otherwise, but anti-missile weapons in general, and laser and particle-beam weapons in particular, are "de-

---

---

# in strategy of Socialist friends

fensive” and not “offensive.” The Soviets themselves do not scruple to design, develop, and experiment on what they call “weapons based on new physical principles.” Mitterrand acts as if only the United States were exploring this domain—thus justifying Moscow’s lies.

If he were reelected, the incumbent President would oppose a European Strategic and Tactical Defense Initiative, which is a fundamental pillar of the future Europe. No wonder the Communist leaders Marchais and Lajoinie are so eager to vote for him.

2) Mitterrand trumpets his support for the Reagan-Gorbachov accords, not only on the “zero option” (elimination in Europe of medium-range nuclear weapons of 1,000-5,000 km), but also the “double zero” option (elimination in Europe of short-range nuclear weapons, of 500-1,000 km). By so doing, he dooms Europe to decoupling from America, since, once the INF accord were ratified by the U.S. Senate, and an “atmosphere of peace” were created, Washington would certainly withdraw its troops from Europe, and Europe would no longer have a direct American nuclear umbrella, whose maintenance is supposed to “cost too much.”

3) Mitterrand skillfully plays on the fears of Germany by pledging that France has no intention of launching nuclear missiles onto German territory. At the same time, he does not propose to the Germans that France defend their land as her own; his Socialist friends, moreover, affirm that the stationing of French pre-strategic nuclear forces on German territory is “excluded at least in peacetime.”

The “pre-strategic” nuclear forces which cannot reach the territory of Warsaw Pact countries from France, will therefore be useless: They cannot be fired against West German territory, but they will no longer be deployable there to be launched beyond it!

As to the pre-strategic nuclear forces which can reach the Warsaw Pact countries from France or from installations outside German soil (Hades, which has a range of slightly under 500 km, and ASMP missiles fitted on the Air Force’s Super-Etendard), it is precisely their suppression which is being proposed! Former Premier Fabius, speaking on Channel TF1 on April 3, let it be known, following this logic, that the Hades program must be scuttled.

Thus will disappear one of the programs—so insistently supported in his day by former Defense Minister Charles Hernu—which could supply a guarantee of French defense for Germany. The Federal Republic of Germany thus finds itself, with the French failure to come to its rescue added to the American one, justified in continuing its “opening to the East.”

This behavior is all the more disastrous since President Mitterrand has implied that the savings in the military domain would allow for more investments in the Third World countries and more “social investments.” According to the Paris daily *Libération*, certain of Mr. Mitterrand’s friends would go so far as to say that “there is no reason to pay court to these people [the military] who have always voted against us, and who will continue to do so.” So the old anti-military demagoguery is back again, just as the name of Pierre Joxe—the former interior minister whose ministry was notoriously soft on terrorism—is frequently cited as the next defense minister. Moscow would not fail to fully weigh the meaning of such an appointment—in their favor.

## Real burden of European defense

In reality, this is leading toward a situation where without admitting it, Europe would be deprived of American *and* European defense. In fact, as Mr. François Fillon, the RPR (neo-Gaullist) member of parliament from Sarthe says, also in *Libération* newspaper:

“Arms control negotiations will not bring any savings to the French defense budget before 10-15 years. After the Washington accord, the Soviets and the Americans possess 98% of the world nuclear arsenal. If, by good luck, in 1989 or 1990 they reach an accord to reduce their strategic nuclear weapons by 50%, they will still hold 96% of the world nuclear arsenal.

“As to putting together a European defense strategy, which I join Laurent Fabius in hoping for, its first result would be an increase in the military burdens of the principal European countries. To acquire its autonomy in defense affairs, Europe will have to assume the burden for the essentials of its security and hence at least partially take the place of the U.S. effort. Finally, in the framework of a European strategy, everyone can understand that French and British nuclear weapons will be called upon to play a capital role. Their modernization will therefore be an imperative necessity.”

Mr. Mitterrand concludes his platform draft by evoking the name of the Socialist Party founder and famed orator Jean Jaurès, “from whom I take my inspiration,” while otherwise he attempts to drape himself in the robes of General de Gaulle. Mr. Mitterrand should re-read de Gaulle’s and Jaurès’ writings, and get them republished—something his Socialist friends have carefully abstained from doing. Thus supplied with ideas, the incumbent candidate would undoubtedly improve his writing style, which in the present draft, lies somewhere between paving-stones and cement.