

The strategic gambits behind France's 'Cheminade case,' 1990-91

by Mark Burdman

We have recently reported on the close link between French President Jacques Chirac's cowardly turn toward appeasement of Great Britain, in a new "Entente Cordiale" relationship, and a growing pattern of attacks on former French Presidential candidate Jacques Cheminade, the associate of Lyndon LaRouche. As we indicated in "Chirac Forges New 'Entente Cordiale' with the British" (see *EIR*, May 31), there has been a repeated pattern, over the past ten years, of attacks on Cheminade, and his associates in France, coinciding with important negative turns in French government economic policy or global strategy. Here, we review a series of events in 1990-91, the period coinciding with then-French President François Mitterrand's shameful abandonment of the fundamental strategic tenets of Charles de Gaulle in favor of French cooperation with the countries of the Third World aspiring to development. Instead, Mitterrand fully aligned France with the "new world order" and "Gulf war" policy of British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher and U.S. President George Bush.

Mitterrand was to celebrate his illicit relationship to Thatcher and Bush, in one of his last acts as he was dying of cancer, by traveling to Colorado Springs, Colorado, for an Oct. 8-9, 1995 conference sponsored by the George Bush Presidential Library Foundation. He did so, despite his extreme personal circumstances, he told journalists, "out of friendship for George Bush." As we indicated, that gathering was probably the site for decisions taken to escalate attacks on Cheminade, in 1995-96.

Mitterrand's obsessions

We begin, here, by reconstructing the state of mind of Mitterrand, Thatcher, Bush, and friends, from late 1989 into 1990. As most recently confirmed in the memoirs of former French Presidential adviser Jacques Attali, Mitterrand was in an extreme state of nervousness about the newly reunified Germany. When it became obvious, in late 1989, especially with the fall of the Berlin Wall, that Germany was going to be reunified, Mitterrand went into a frenetic deployment, to head this off. When his diplomatic efforts in the direction of the East Germans, Russians, and British failed to prevent reunification, he was devastated. By the time he had regained

his composure, in the spring of 1990, he had come up with a fallback strategy, helping architect what soon came to be known as the Maastricht Treaty. Maastricht is a design to "contain Germany," as well as to destroy the economies of western European nations through the imposition of massive austerity and budget-cutting measures.

Mitterrand's actions throughout this period, are of the sort classically adopted by the "Entente Cordiale" faction in the French political class over the past 100 years. As with the original Entente Cordiale that was formalized with Great Britain in the years leading up to World War I, and which was a key factor in *causing* that war, the idea is for the French to play the junior partner, in a strategic arrangement with the British Empire. From this standpoint, it is clear that Mitterrand, and those in Britain who utilized him as a British asset, would not at all be happy with what LaRouche was doing, and the potential impact this would have in France.

In 1989-90, LaRouche, of course, was incarcerated, a political prisoner of George Bush. From his prison in Rochester, Minnesota, LaRouche celebrated the reunification of Germany. After all, on Oct. 12, 1988, he had made a speech at the Kempinski Bristol Hotel, in Berlin, forecasting the coming reunification of Germany, in the context of the situation created by the ever-worsening collapse of the economies of the Communist bloc. LaRouche's bold proposal in Berlin was exemplary of the kinds of policy leadership he was taking, that enraged the Bush-Kissinger crowd, and had already led them to engineer his judicial railroad, as shown by his indictment by an Alexandria, Virginia federal grand jury on Oct. 14, 1988. It seems, as the "Cheminade case" demonstrates as well, that such policy interventions touch a very raw nerve, indeed.

In November 1989, LaRouche launched his program for infrastructure and infrastructure-corridor development of Eurasia, a bold initiative centered around the "Triangle" region of the European capital cities of Berlin, Vienna, and Paris. Implementation of such a policy would make of Eurasia, the motor for a new era of global progress and development. Such were the promises that that time held, and which were seized upon by LaRouche.

Given that one of the three vertices of the Triangle is the

capital of France, LaRouche was obviously projecting a key role for the French nation, in his “Grand Design.” Such thinking was very much in the tradition of Charles de Gaulle, especially as de Gaulle had promoted a post-World War II reconciliation with the (West) Germans, as the basis for European development and security.

Intent on destroying anything that might be associated with de Gaulle, the Mitterrand clique certainly understood the potential effect, as a *crucial policy conception*, that the Triangle proposal would have in France. They didn’t appreciate LaRouche’s contribution, especially because they undoubtedly had assumed that he had been “silenced” when put in prison.

Should the Triangle proposal gain ground in France, it would undermine a century’s worth of geopolitical axioms held by a predominant element in the French political class. Rather than endorse this proposal, the Mitterrand clique conspired, with Bush, Thatcher, and the Mikhail Gorbachov clique in Moscow, to shift the global geopolitical terrain. It is out of that series of considerations, that, first, the Gulf war against Iraq was launched in 1990-91, and, second, the war in former Yugoslavia was triggered in the early summer of 1991.

A demand from the Ministry of Justice

From this overview, certain crucial things about the “Cheminade case” begin to fall into place.

On May 15, 1990—a most interesting date, as we will see below—the French Ministry of Justice, through the agency of the “Prosecutor of the Republic for the Tribunal de Grand Instance de Paris,” demanded that French Judge Lheraut indict Cheminade and three associates, in a case that had been kicking around for almost four years, and for which Lheraut was the responsible magistrate. The letter demanding that Lheraut so act, was sent by Assistant Prosecutor François Foulon, a man with some curious connections, as we will see in a moment.

On the face of it, the case was ludicrous. It involved the family of Mrs. Denise Pazéry, who had died in 1986. She had been a financial contributor to four organizations with which Cheminade was associated. After her death, the family initiated a proceeding, claiming that Mrs. Pazéry had Alzheimer’s disease, and had been, effectively, a victim of theft by Cheminade and friends. The doctor who provided an “expert judgment” supposedly confirming this claim, Dr. Michel Dubec, a self-professed expert on the subject of “major swindlers,” has just authored a book, listing Assistant Prosecutor Foulon as one of his close collaborators, in composing his work! Indeed, the case was “all in the family.”

The concern of Mrs. Pazéry’s greedy family was, supposedly, to “recover the money.” By December 1989, they had expressed a willingness to settle, in exchange for a monetary sum. Even though the sum requested was large enough to amount to a form of extortion, the point is that the family evidenced a desire for a civil settlement.

So why, then, did the French Justice Ministry, i.e., an agency of the French state, insist on a criminal indictment? What was President Mitterrand’s direct role in this decision? Unfortunately, this is one of the many secrets he has taken to the grave. But the following coincidences must be kept in mind.

The giant fraud of Carpentras

On May 10, only five days before the Justice Ministry move, the entire French nation had been turned upside down, by reports that a Jewish cemetery had been desecrated in the small village of Carpentras, in southern France. Despite the fact that the local Jewish community in Carpentras pleaded for restraint from the French authorities, Interior Minister Pierre Joxe, a close ally of Mitterrand, immediately organized a giant media extravaganza, rushing to the scene with the obvious intent of hyping the situation up, as much as possible. Joxe declared to the press: “We know the guilty, and it’s anti-Semitism and racism.” Literally minutes after the news had been made public, the World Jewish Congress, headed by liquor magnate Edgar Bronfman, went into mobilization, inside France and internationally. Large-scale demonstrations were launched, expressing solidarity with the French Jewish community, against the “anti-Semitism and racism” denounced by Joxe, as well as against “neo-Nazism.”

The problem is, the whole affair, as it was portrayed by Joxe, Bronfman, and the other orchestrators of the events, was a giant hoax. Slowly but surely, the truth emerged: The state attorney of the city of Nimes revealed that the highly publicized “impaling with a garden stake” of a corpse dug up from the cemetery, had never, in fact, occurred. This report had, originally, been a key factor in horrifying French public opinion. It was also revealed, over the weeks following May 10, that Christian graves in the same cemetery had also been desecrated, so Jews were not a sole target. Third, the much-publicized stories of “the painting of the grave-stones with anti-Semitic slogans and swastikas,” also did not correspond to the facts. Gradually, it emerged that investigations were looking into a “satanic cult” as responsible for the desecrations, rather than “neo-Nazis” or specifically “anti-Semitic” groups.

In ensuing years, “Carpentras” has become synonymous with media-concocted fraud. Alfred Grosser, the prominent expert on Franco-German affairs at the Institute of Political Sciences at Sorbonne University in Paris, whose German-Jewish family had to escape from Nazi persecution in the 1930s, recently cited the Carpentras episode as a classical case of media orchestration of a fraudulent coverage of events.

Despite the gradual emergence of the truth about Carpentras, the damage had already been done. The main purpose of the exercise, as soon became crystal clear, was to bring about a mood-shift in the French population, to prepare it for

certain things to come. It was Carpentras, and its immediate fallout, that guaranteed that France, a country with traditionally good ties to various Arab countries, including Iraq, would be on the “right side” when a Middle East crisis would come.

Is it “over-conspiratorial” to assert that the higher echelons of the French elites were aware that a giant crisis was building in the Middle East? Not in the least. As Pierre Salinger would later document in a retrospective book on the Gulf war, the reality that the Gulf-Middle East region was irreversibly heading toward a major international crisis, had already become apparent to Palestine Liberation Organization Chairman Yasser Arafat and other Middle East influentials, by *mid-May 1990*.

Is it “over-conspiratorial” to draw a connection between the Carpentras mobilization of the corrupted Mitterrand circle et al., the May 15 Ministry of Justice move against Cheminade, and foreknowledge among relevant French elites that a major Middle East crisis was coming? Not in the least. Two other considerations must be kept in mind, about this April-May conjuncture.

The ‘Pamyat-LaRouche’ hoax

It is obvious that some special operations were being cooked up against the LaRouche movement’s branches in Europe, at this time. Over the weekend of May 6-8, 1990, that is, immediately preceding Carpentras, the World Jewish Congress held its annual meeting in the newly unified city of Berlin. Bronfman was in attendance, as were his leading henchmen, such as Australia’s Isi Leibler, who is, as of this writing, conducting a psychopathological attack on LaRouche’s associates in Australia.

The main purpose of the Berlin event was to pressure German Chancellor Helmut Kohl. The meeting was punctuated with warnings about potential outbreaks of neo-Nazism and anti-Semitism across Europe. With Carpentras coming *only two days after* the WJC event in Berlin concluded, they would have what they wanted.

But there was also a curious sideshow in the Bronfman circus. A delegation of Russian collaborators of the WJC attended the Berlin conference, bringing with them a Russian-language document, purporting to demonstrate that the LaRouche movement in Europe was in active collaboration with the anti-Semitic, proto-Nazi Pamyat movement in Russia. This was based on a supposed press conference by a leading Pamyat creature, in which he supposedly gushed that he was collaborating with western European groups,

By a series of unforeseen developments, the document never saw the light of day in Berlin, but instead was procured by a representative of *EIR* in attendance. An *EIR* mobilization, at the time, preempted what was obviously intended to be an international campaign, not dissimilar to that concocted by the East German, Soviet, British, and other intelligence services, back in 1986, to falsely accuse LaRouche and associ-

ates of responsibility for the assassination of Swedish Prime Minister Olof Palme.

The ADL recruits within the LaRouche movement

Meanwhile, the British, Bush’s friends in the United States, and their counterparts in France were up to a dirty trick, recruiting and cultivating a pro-British, pro-Anti-Defamation League “defectors’ movement” among LaRouche’s associates. At the very moment when the Gulf war became inevitable, this faction split from LaRouche, on the basis of full support for the Gulf war, accusing LaRouche of being a “right-wing anti-Semite.” Some months later, two of those dissidents, Laurent Murawiec and Robert Greenberg, authored articles on “anti-Semitism in the United States.” Demonstrating not simply amnesia but also cowardice, the authors conveniently omitted the fact that they had, each, been associates of LaRouche for almost two decades, and simply cited the degenerate ADL-controlled scribbler Dennis King, as their “source” about the LaRouche movement. This appeared in a book (*L’Histoire de L’Antisémitisme, 1945-1993*) edited in France by “historian of anti-Semitism” Leon Poliakov, containing a series of articles supposedly explaining the origins of anti-Semitism (see “The Poliakov File: History as British Propaganda and Fraud,” *EIR*, Aug. 26, 1994).

Murawiec has, in the past couple of years, been a leading figure in a suspicious “consulting firm,” headquartered in Geneva and Paris, called Geopol, SA, several of whose directors or patrons, have found themselves either in jail, or under investigation by Swiss or international law enforcement authorities.

M. Joxe’s emissary pays a visit

How all these various factors are interconnected, becomes obvious from one episode later in 1990, bringing together Joxe, Mitterrand, and the Gulf war.

In late October, Judge Lheraut made the strongest possible decision in French law, to dismiss the charges against Cheminade and associates. Within a couple of days, the French authorities moved for appeal. This, of course, was at the height of the period building up to the Gulf war. Two months later, on Dec. 28, as Bush and friends were moving to the military phase of their war of “the world against Saddam,” a press officer of Joxe’s Interior Ministry, one M. Lebars, visited the offices of the LaRouche-associated *Nouvelle Solidarité* newspaper in Paris, and asked for a copy of an article Cheminade had written, some months earlier. In that article, Cheminade had likened President Mitterrand’s behavior in the Gulf crisis, to France’s actions against Egypt, in the neo-colonial Suez adventure of 1956. It seems that Monsieur Le Président was not amused. The “mechanisms of justice” were set in motion, to ensure, some years later, that Cheminade and three associates would be convicted, on the ludicrous charges in the Pazéry case.