

the RPR-UDF alliance, Cheminade noted, "but it offers no alternative other than a vacuous form of 'nationalism.' This, in turn, can lead to clashes with the American government over such issues as the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) or NATO, which can be dangerous if informed by no other perspective than mere opposition.

"At the same time, there is a growing uproar against the German Bundesbank and its high interest rates, which some see as the cause of the ruin of the French economy. If leaders such as Philippe Séguin, who is calling for closer Franco-British relations and wants to let the French franc float like the British pound, are still a small minority, an atmosphere of animosity toward the present German policy is growing, once again with no real alternative. This means heteronomy in Europe, with no sense of mission or design, a suicidal policy in a period of depression and threats of the reemergence of a dictatorial regime in Russia.

"The charade is that the RPR is nationalistic, but with no Gaullist strategic perspective, and can therefore be turned into an enraged, chauvinistic, and impotent force; the UDF, on the other hand, is pro-European, but supports the neoliberal, monetarist Europe of the European Community's Maastricht Treaty, not de Gaulle's 'Europe of the Fatherlands,' " Cheminade said.

The position of the friends of LaRouche in France, campaigning under the banner of the New Solidarity party, is to support those Gaullist forces who reject the "free-trade" suicide of GATT and demand protection for national agriculture and industry, but also to stress to them that they have to do three things if they want to really face the challenge of history: Propose a program for European development from the Atlantic to the Urals, the Paris-Berlin-Vienna Productive Triangle approach; stop the "privatization" of the Banque de France and the sale of the public sector to the financial enemies of the nation; and set up a monetary union with Germany, based not on high interest rates, but on long-term, low-interest rate credit to finance European development.

Cheminade warned, "Unfortunately, these points are not really understood, because, contrary to Gen. Charles de Gaulle, those who parade about as his heirs do not understand that the survival of the nation depends on the capacity of its leaders to shift to a new set of axioms," as defined by the New Solidarity program.

Fragmented political scene

Cheminade took a closer look at the breakdown of returns in the first round of March 21. "True, the ecologists got 'only' 7.62% of the vote (as against the 15% predicted), but a sizeable part of the youth simply abstained or voted for the right to 'stick it' to the left; they deserted the ecologists because they appeared as too compromised by their association with the Socialists. The Communist Party (CP) got 9.18%, as against 11.31% in 1988, but manages to remain a reference point in working class areas. The National Front

of Jean-Marie Le Pen got more than expected, reaching 12.41%. It got much more than the average in regions stricken by high unemployment: 25% in Provence-Côte d'Azur and Languedoc-Roussillon, and about 20% in northern France. Finally, if we add up the protest votes (CP, ecologists, National Front, and diverse minorities), we reach about 35% of the total vote—almost as much as the official right-wing UPF tally. Because they are not directly involved in alliances, the National Front and the ecologists (more than 20% of the vote) are not going to be represented in the National Assembly."

He added, "The election has shown the degradation of a significant part of the French population. All kinds of slates focusing on secondary issues have appeared, including one for 'Natural Law' (which is the cult of transcendental meditation!) and another one of 'animal lovers' called 'New Ecology,' whose candidates got 2-3% of the vote, even when they had been recruited by mail or classified advertisements. Opinion polls showed that only 20% of the voters had actually read the literature put out by the candidates, sent free of charge by the French post office, and more than 33% only decided how to vote in the last two weeks before the elections. In the Lorraine region, a 'Party of the Fed-Ups' got more than 5%, even though most candidates were unknown and, by their own choice, lacking in any program.

"The mental state of the population, as revealed by the elections, is the main danger. A recent poll of television watching habits showed that the average French TV set is on 4 hours and 59 minutes per day, as against 'only' 3 hours and 53 minutes in 1983. And the most watched programs are American serials." But, "In this situation, the ideas of the friends of LaRouche in France are attracting more and more interest. The coming fall of the right, after that of the left, is their opportunity."

LaRouche: France must take new initiative now

Lyndon LaRouche made his own comments after the results were made known on March 28, "on the significance of the French elections in the light of the ongoing crisis in Moscow and the crisis of confidence in the political establishment of the former Atlantic Alliance."

"Something must be done very promptly about the rapidly deteriorating situation around the world, centered in, obviously, the deterioration in Moscow at the time of a general, downward-spiraling collapse, and the threat of an early international financial explosion centered upon the ballooning derivatives markets," LaRouche said.

"There is a crisis of leadership in the West, in particular, in which Europe is looking to the United States, which at the moment, on present policy tracks, is ill-equipped to do many

of the things which its European partners would like to demand of it. In this situation, with today's election and its results, France again has the opportunity to play a key role. We see a certain difficulty in decision-making there, and in Bonn, particularly in respect to financial matters.

"In France, the debate is about whether to privatize the Banque de France—which I think would be something of a disaster for the international strategic situation at this time. What is plainly needed, is something along the lines which I outlined, and which was widely circulated at the end of 1989 and beginning of 1990: the so-called Productive Triangle program," a proposal for building up fast-speed rail and other infrastructure within the spherical triangle connecting the French capital of Paris to Vienna and Berlin.

"Essentially, the way to handle, strategically, the Russian situation, is to build a political program around the prospects of a rail system and associated logistics from Brest to Vladivostok—the old Sergei Witte idea, which was much in discussion in France, in certain circles, prior to the rise to power at the beginning of this century of Theophile Delcassé," he went on.

"We need to mobilize, through the use of government national banking credit at low interest rates, the credit-creating potential of the western European countries, and also the United States, for funding a general infrastructural program whose included effects would be to revive the industries of France, Germany, and their immediate neighbors as vendors to these projects, and thus to revive the world economy and bring to an end, at the same time, the thermonuclear lunacy of continuing to impose International Monetary Fund conditionalities and 'shock therapy' programs on eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union, in particular."

The question of LaRouche's 'reputation'

As to this proposal, LaRouche pointed out, "of course there were certain bad things being said about me in certain quarters. However, in France in particular, the Mitterrand apparatus, and others in the French military and intelligence services, remember the period in 1982-84, and remember the issues of the Strategic Defense Initiative, a program which I presented to the French military at the end of 1982, forewarning them, as an ally, of what might be expected from the United States in its attitude toward Russia. Of course, my forecast to the French military and others was confirmed by President Reagan's address of March 23, 1983.

"But as the Mitterrand government knows," the American political leader went on, "the greatest pressure, including in 1986 and 1987, was brought, first by the Gorbachov government, and then by the U.S. and British allies of the new agreement with Gorbachov, in the aftermath of the Reykjavik summit, to have me politically exterminated. Those in France will recall that tremendous pressure was brought on France in this connection, not only from Russia, in connection with a lawsuit which occurred in France, involving me, in which

pressure was applied heavily to ensure that my interests would not prevail in that lawsuit. So the French government and French establishment know very well the fraudulent nature, and the nature of the high-level political motivation, of the bad things which are being said about me still, following the fraudulent prosecution of me, the Gorbachov-dictated prosecution of me, which occurred back in 1988, in particular.

"We should put aside what is, for knowledgeable people, silly babbling about the alleged 'taint' of my reputation, and realize that my legal problems are the results of a very bad political taint on the part of those who are responsible for the prosecution and incarceration of me; that, in fact, I am perhaps a little more significant a case than the famous Dreyfus case in France at the turn of this century.

"If we take into account all France's experience with my back-channel negotiations with Moscow on behalf of the United States during the Reagan administration on what became known as the SDI, there should be no difficulty in French leading circles in recognizing that the reason for my difficulty is the fact that the Gorbachov government, because of my proposal for the SDI, demanded, openly as well as in other ways, in 1986, that the United States government commit itself to imprisoning me as a token of good faith for the negotiations and agreements between the Gorbachov government and the United States.

"In that light, my recommendations, I think, should be taken quite seriously at this time," he underlined.

What must be done

"We need from France—which is capable of doing this, after these elections—new initiatives, as President de Gaulle would have done, to revive a Paris-Bonn initiative, which would have to involve a key role for the national Banque de France, to transform the mechanisms of finance on the continent of Eurasia, particularly western Europe, initially, to a national banking method, of issue of national banking credit targeted dirigistically to assist in these large-scale projects, typified by a rail system from Brest to Vladivostok, but also including cheap credits for the medium to long term for industries which act as vendors to these cooperative infrastructural projects.

"That kind of economic revival is the *indispensable* change in the political situation which is so desperately needed, now that a strategic situation focused on Moscow may be timed at somewhere between ten minutes before midnight and five minutes before midnight on the historical clock. The idea of simply propping up Yeltsin, or a continuation of the presently proposed 'reforms,' is strategic suicide. What we do need to do, is to offer to the East, to essentially all Eurasia, the idea of a global economic development cooperation, which actually addresses the underlying problems which are the principal economic cause of the strategic destabilization of the thermonuclear power situation at the present time," LaRouche concluded.