

known as the most brilliant French strategist of the post-war period, reaffirmed all the principles of the Gaullist defense posture in a radio interview April 26, including the refusal of France's integration into NATO, total rejection of the Schlesinger doctrine of "limited" nuclear warfare, and the continued "multi-polar" targeting of French nuclear weapons — i.e. not particularly aimed at the Warsaw Pact forces, but at all potential aggressors. A Jobert associate, General Binoche, concretized these views in an interview with the Italian magazine *Europeo* this week: "I've never seen any Russian soldiers parade down the Champs-Elysees, but I have seen a lot of Germans do so."

This viciously anti-Atlanticist and tacit pro-Soviet stance was further expressed by Gallois and "baron" Alexandre Sanguinetti when they were asked to comment on the death of Soviet Marshall Grechko. While the former strongly stressed the professional and psychological "stability" of the Red Army staff — in implicit contrast with the "unbalanced" NATO headquarters — Sanguinetti boldly stated that "Grechko was a just and moral man, both personally and in military affairs."

And the PCF....

One of the most important aspects of the Gaullists' renewed thrust for an independent French national defense is their deliberate attempt to rally the PCF to their views, so as to neutralize both Giscard and the pro-Atlanticist leadership layers around Mitterrand in the SP. At a symposium on defense held ten days ago by Gaullist general Buis, PCF defense specialist Louis Baillot stated that his party "acknowledges the existence of France's strategic nuclear force." This line, reiterated in a radio interview yesterday by Marchais, represents a reversal of past PCF policy. The French Communists, while previously sympathetic to the Gaullists' anti-NATO stance, had always refused to endorse the force-de-frappe.

There are numerous indications that the "convergence" between the PCF and the Gaullists involves other issues than defense. The Communists recently endorsed an emergency program for the moribund French aerospace industry introduced by Gaullist parliamentarian Lucien Neuwirth. The

Communist-controlled CGT trade-union is reportedly conducting parallel demonstrations to the UDR in defense of the supersonic jetliner Concorde. In a complete change of line, the financial daily *Les Echos* now praises the "sense of responsibilities" of the CGT, contrasting it to the often adventurist actions of the anarcho-sindicalist CFTD.

There is also evidence that the emerging Gaullist-PCF axis is beginning to wreak havoc within the SP leadership. Today's *Le Monde* reports that Mitterrand's lieutenant and Mayor of Lille, Pierre Mauroy, came out endorsing an industrialization program similar to the one advocated by Debré April 29. Other reports indicate that a potential split is shaping up among the Socialists: in the course of an SP executive meeting this week, Mauroy and others accused Mitterrand and his tendency of monopolizing party administrative posts. This is the first sign of tension registered within the Socialist leadership since the party's foundation in 1971.

And Nero Fiddles

Meanwhile, Giscard and his acolytes are doing their best to kill in the egg the emerging anti-Atlanticist, Gaullist-led national unity coalition. Yesterday, Interior Minister Ponia-towski introduced a new bill in parliament which would eliminate from the second round of all legislative elections all candidates who did not receive at least 15 per cent of the registered vote in the first round. This is carefully calculated to eliminate PCF candidates and bring about an SP landslide. A SP-dominated parliament would enable Giscard to appoint an Atlanticist SP-led government, without the PCF or Gaullist impediment.

Aside from this threat, Atlanticist spokesmen like *L'Express* editor Jean-Jacques Servan-Schreiber moot that Giscard will call for early legislative elections if his "tax on speculative gains," uniformly denounced by the left and capitalist circles for its unjust provisions, is defeated in parliament in two weeks. Giscard has reportedly threatened to withdraw support from the UDR members who refuse to vote for his bill. However, this does not faze the Gaullists in the least — a majority of UDR deputies now consider that a Giscard endorsement is "a liability" in the eyes of their electorate.

Exclusive IPS Translation: Excerpts from Jobert's Program for Europe

Gaullist Leader Jobert Calls for End of Atlanticist Domination of Europe

NEW YORK May 1 (IPS) — The following are excerpts from an article published in the May 1976 issue of L'Nouvelle Revue des Deux Mondes, a French scholarly and political monthly headed by Gaston Palewski, a Gaullist member of France's Supreme Court, the Conseil constitutionnel. Michel Jobert, after a long career as an inspector of the state's finances, became known when he was appointed Minister of Foreign Affairs by then Prime Minister Pierre Messmer (1972-1974). He was instrumental in operating a rapprochement between France and Great Britain, and in opening the door to British membership in the European Economic Community (EEC). Throughout his tenure as foreign minister, he always emphasized the necessity for the Atlantic Alliance "to have two pillars of equal strength: the

United States and Europe." His repeated stress on this issue occasioned open clashes between himself and leading Atlanticists like U.S. Secretary of State Henry Kissinger and the then West German Finance Minister Helmut Schmidt. Since the 1974 presidential elections in France, which resulted in the victory of pro-Atlanticist Valéry Giscard d'Estaing, Jobert has been a consistent critic of the government of renegade Gaullist Jacques Chirac, primarily on domestic issues. His Revue des Deux Mondes article sanctions his return to an active role in the foreign policy arena.

1. Anaesthesia

Surgeons are luckier than politicians: When they operate, they do not have to worry about their patient's opinion, the

anaesthesiologist is there to make sure he remains quiet until the end of the surgical intervention.

However, despite the important improvements realized, especially in the past two years, we must confess that the technique of political anaesthesia has not reached the same degree of perfection. Perhaps because the patient was not sufficiently relaxed before the "Europe" operation which has just been undertaken, perhaps also because, despite their skill, the surgeon and his anaesthesiologist are still in the process of steadying their hand which, for some grave reason, sometimes starts to shake.

...One avoided for some time cutting into the sensitive spot, but as one could not apparently accept to pursue a military independence policy in regard to the United States, one proceeded with small changes, believed to be painless: There were personnel changes, one reinforced with NATO a collaboration whose gravest forms are not necessarily the most visible, as for instance maneuvers, which may be useful to our own defense...

But if anaesthesia has only partly succeeded in the domain of technological and military independence, the result was far superior on the financial and monetary plane. Of course, we are here dealing with more secret organs whose disorders have less spectacular effects, even if they are more serious over the long term. Moreover, the anaesthetizing technique is much more sophisticated here: Declarations which are as peremptory in their tone as empty in substance, mysterious vocabulary, rosary of meetings, summit meetings, half-way-to-the-summit meetings, meetings in the marsh, each ending with the publication of a communique which repeats that of the previous one and announces no other decision than that of holding another meeting. The sleep-inducing effect of this treatment is unquestionable: softly lulled, public opinion falls asleep, the anaesthesiologist may even go smoke a pipe in the Matignon gardens (Matignon is the French Prime Minister's residence — Ed.), while the surgeon removes all reference to gold in the international monetary system, to fixed parities, limits or controls, sales or purchases of gold by the central banks, removes the IMF rules which do not please the United States and maintains those which they like, sets up an infallible mechanism for the development of world inflation, and above all, ensures the supremacy of the dollar. However, the patient is sound asleep, and if by chance he opens one eye, he sees or hears a president or a minister explain advantageously that each of these steps backward contributes to the influence of France.

We are almost told, as was the case with the routed military headquarters during the war, that "our troops retreated to positions prepared in advance." Yet, what then was only a poor excuse would today be the expression of reality. For it seems, during the patient's sleep, that our present leaders silently prepared the international (and notably European) policy positions where they are leading us now (they are not those on which they were elected, at least not by a large number of the electors who carried them to power — let alone the others).

For, in the political domain also, small changes were used, as well as not fully spoken words, taken back as soon as pronounced, to be later picked up again in a new key. These subtleties also acted like an anaesthetic, and certain Gaullist electors long believed that, after administering a powerful euphoric drug to prevent all pain, the skillful practitioner could also stop the hand of the surgeon. Alas! This time, the surgeon reveals his true intentions and begins to cut into living flesh, even if he succeeds in remaining silent.

2. The Nightmare

Similarly, how pathetic appear the speeches or manifestos of men who once struggled for national independence and who, refusing to be awakened make believe that it is only a question of completing the implementation of the Rome treaty, and improvising at length on the mode of election, hope that the European parliament, once elected, will only scrupulously busy itself with tariffs and the circulation of green vegetables among the states?

...Is it so difficult for the professionals of politics to understand that if tricks and mysteries may sometimes be useful to them to solve little daily affairs, they become, when the national destiny is at stake, not only a mistake, but a catastrophe?

But to allow a clear debate (on the Tindemans Plan for a NATO-controlled European "Super-state"), it is indispensable to begin by defining words, and first, that of Europe. Let us say simply that, in our view, "Europe" will remain a purely geographical term as long as it is not free of all foreign powers. This is to say that it is not simply a matter of independence established by juridical texts and represented by glorious symbols, but of a real independence, economic, monetary, technological, cultural, military, and therefore political.

The first argument (against an independent Europe), a capital argument, as it determines in particular the position of Germany, is that of security: the USSR keeps in Eastern Europe crushing forces which only American forces can counterbalance. For a long time, this argument remained without an answer in a Europe ruined and weakened by the war. Today, it has lost most of its value, for two essential reasons.

The first is the economic recovery of Europe which allows it to support a sufficient defense effort: if, even without being substantially increased, it were reoriented in the direction of independence and not of Atlantic integration, it would permit setting up of a respectable force. In fact, Europe now has at its disposal — thanks to France — the strategic weapons which it lacked for a long time... Ironic comments on the "bomblet" (the French nuclear force) have stopped... These weapons continue to be improved, at great expense for France. The financial capacity of Europe is of course sufficient to face these expenses. If some refuse to apply these financial capabilities to the development of a strategic force, under the pretext that they are in French hands, while they accept — under less visible forms, such as support for the dollar standard — to participate in the development of the U.S. military potential, let them stop claiming they are for Europe.

It is not only a hypocrisy, it is an error. The events presently taking place in Europe show the precariousness of the famous American "umbrella," which can from one year to the next, be folded back, because the U.S. Congress is frightened at the idea of being dragged into a new Vietnam. That the U.S. would make a mistake for themselves by abandoning Europe to its fate, one day, does not change anything in the fact that this would surrender it to the other empire which is awaiting it. Hence, "as soon as the effectiveness of protection is doubtful, why should one entrust one's destiny to the protector?" (Charles de Gaulle, *Le Renouveau*).

These truths are so evident that even those who refuse to listen end up hearing them although they do not yet dare say them in public. But, having accepted them in private, they advance another argument: "Let's make Europe under an

American protectorate, they say, and unity once realized, we will know how to act to free ourselves progressively of this protectorate, just as so many other colonized people have done in the past twenty years.

This is a subtle and agreeable reasoning for all those who think that politics consists of waiting, maneuvers, and above all, fear of effort and unlimited compromises. Therefore at the risk of pulling them softly out of their dream of independence, we must tell them that a comparison of Europe with former colonies is, on this score, radically inadequate. first, because many of these countries did not remain really independent, and have again become de facto protectorates of the former or of a new dominant power. Those who refused such an evolution did pay or still pay a price which, rightly or wrongly, no European country would freely accept: political dictatorship and a standard of living freeze. Finally and above all, a foreign protectorate would have graver and more durable effects on a developed economy than on a still under-developed economy: Whereas the latter must implement relatively crude technical capabilities to complete its first steps, our European countries can only live by endlessly improving their technology, thanks to which they will be able to manufacture and export the sophisticated materials which alone enable them to purchase the raw materials they need...

3. The Awakening

Here is, however, the adventure where, consciously or not, the present government is taking our country. One wants to believe that, having become conscious of what is at stake, no Gaullist, no socialist, whatever his tendency, no republican, no patriot — with the strong meaning this word had during the Revolution — will accept this shameful end of our French and European civilization. Then, the hour of awakening will ring.

For we must repeat it tirelessly, the true advocates of Europe are not those who make the loudest noise, but those

who are attached to lucidly defining the conditions of its independence. They know just as much as the advertising agents of an American Europe that, in the present world, the gathering of the countries of this continent is a political, economic and military necessity for the development and even the survival of the peoples who live in it. But they also know that it is not a verbal Europe which will achieve this result, and even less a Europe of slavery...

—**military guarantees:** Transformation of the Atlantic Alliance into an egalitarian cooperative organism, to replace natural subordination; correlatively, integration of the European armies around an independent force of dissuasion (nuclear strategic force — Ed.) on the technological and operational plane; systematic preference granted to European materiel.

—**economic guarantees:** Development of a European industry in all advanced-technological sectors (nuclear, computers, aerospace, etc.) thanks to a tariff policy which has priority over the trans-Atlantic "free trade" which only works one way; in the same spirit, preservation of European agriculture, first condition of independence, which must not depend on the whims of U.S. soybean producers.

—**monetary guarantees:** Establishment of a European standard, partly based on gold, which will put an end to the regime of the dollar standard, the insidious instrument of U.S. colonialism.

—**cultural guarantees:** Notably through the adoption of European working languages which is not those of one or the other Greats.

Once these guarantees are accepted, the problem of supranationality will stop being the reason for discord which it presently is, as each European state will find in European authority the guarantee of its independence as that of the entire Union...

Exclusive IPS Translation

Gaullist General Warns of "American Threat" to Europe

NEW YORK, May 1 (IPS) — The following are excerpts from an interview published in the Italian weekly L'Europeo with French General Francois Binoche. The former head of Allied forces in West Berlin. Gen. Binoche was retired from the Army last year by French President and Atlanticist agent Giscard d'Estaing for making repeated attacks on the pro-Atlanticist West German government. He was formally accused of failing to comply with "obligation reserve" that demands that a French military officer make no political statements about a foreign government. Binoche, who has been on friendly terms with Soviet and Warsaw pact military leaders, is a close ally of Gaullist leader Michel Jobert and is a member of Jobert's Democratic Movement. L'Europeo, which published the interview under the headline, "Frankenstein Has Risen Again," has been active recently in exposing links of Italy's leading Atlanticist, FIAT owner Gianni Agnelli, to provocations and conspiracies aimed at toppling the Italian government.

...But Binoche did not stop there, rather, he adds more arguments to his way of talking, and his way of talking is making

inroads, not only in certain parts of the Army but also in broad layers of French public opinion. All of this seems to us to be very indicative of the state of mind that is being created, and not only in France, in the face of the disproportionate growth of the new German phenomenon...

Question: You speak of German danger. Normally rather, one hears of American danger, regarding economic domination or on the other hand, the Russian danger, regarding military power. Are these the false adversaries?

Answer: Europe, it is said, is under the American heel. This was true in the beginning. But today, dominated by the German economy, by the German currency and industry, we see Europe becoming day by day more German....

Question: But do you think that the Russians could ever accept the reconstitution of a greater Germany at their borders?

Answer: ...East Germany is already a curious "satellite" (of the Soviet Union) which during the so-called "Prague Spring" asked, I would rather say, imposed the Russian military intervention, contributing to it three batallions, which were used. Tomorrow the West German "satellite" of