

Trilateral Commission being put to the test in French elections

by Mark Burdman

The national legislative elections in France on March 16 might well be a gauge of what the French electorate thinks of the policies of the Trilateral Commission, even if the ballots do not read "for David Rockefeller" and "against David Rockefeller."

The question of the Trilateral Commission has become, explicitly and implicitly, a focal point in the French elections. If the large electoral lists and depth of activity of the Parti Ouvrier Européen, the co-thinker party of Lyndon LaRouche in France, which has campaigned on an overtly anti-Trilateral Commission platform, were not enough to prove the point, there are a number of other telltale signs.

First, the French economy's failures, under the Socialist regime of President François Mitterrand since 1981, have proved the ineptitude and evil of the Trilateralists' economic orientation, which favors opening up national-sector economies to the looting of the private banks, the reinsurance cartels, and the International Monetary Fund. Last fall the Mitterrand regime hosted the Commission at French government offices, and French Economics Minister Pierre Beregevoy gave the opening speech at the Commission's Oct. 25-27 European Members' summit. The *quid pro quo* for Mitterrand's cooperation with the Commission was a series of economic favors promised by the banks and insurance companies which are the Commission's French base. But these promises have not halted the downslide of France's economy, which is one of the central contributing factors to the Socialists' preference rating dipping below 30%, down drastically from the Socialist triumph in 1981.

Second, the stench of treason coming out of the interior ministry of Pierre Joxe, who has become a full-time protector of terrorist networks in France, is associated in the minds of many voters with an "international conspiracy" against France. The motor behind the attempt to destroy French intelligence and military capabilities, during 1985, was the so-called "Greenpeace Affair," in which Joxe pulled dirty tricks to pin the blame on French intelligence for having blown up the ship of the ecologist-terrorist Greenpeace group in a New Zealand port. Greenpeace's lawyer is Washington, D.C. Tri-

lateralist Lloyd Cutler, former chief counsel to President Carter, who is working with the Paris law firm Bernard, Gaillot, Tessler, and Carton (and particularly partner Laurent Gaillot) to sabotage French intelligence capabilities on behalf of Joxe and the Russians. Since Cutler is also the lawyer for the process of destruction of constitutional government in the United States known as the "Gramm-Rudman Bill," the resentment against Cutler in France has international repercussions.

Third, there is the question of the ambitions of former Prime Minister Raymond Barre, the most enthusiastic true-believer "Trilateralist" among France's Commission members. This has become one of the more controversial features of the last days of the election. Particularly, Barre's decision to renege on his earlier electoral arrangement with the four-party non-Communist "Opposition," by refusing to support a "cohabitation" government of Socialists and Oppositionists that would follow the March 16 election, has gained him the bitter antagonism of leading political forces in France.

In the last days of February, controversy broke out over the appearance of a 48-page anti-Barre sheet, "Un Autre Visage de Raymond Barre" ("Another Face of Raymond Barre"). Although the booklet's allegations about Barre's links to the Trilateral "one-world conspiracy" are often inept and even crude, one of the national pastimes of France has become intensive speculation about who is behind the book. Some accuse the Gaullist RPR, some the Socialists, and some even think that Barre himself put it out to try to neutralize the revelations being published by the Parti Ouvrier Européen on the Trilateral Commission and Barre.

The POE 'surprise'

During the late night of Feb. 24-25, the Parti Ouvrier Européen (POE) filed electoral slates in over 20 French "departments" (approximately states, in American political terms of reference). This qualifies the party for three rounds of television time, between the time of candidate filing and March 16. While the Socialist-leaning daily *Libération*, on Feb. 22, marveled about POE hegemony among France's

hundreds of thousands of French Muslim voters, other regional and local newspapers and electronic media have marveled at the depth of POE activity and support.

Mostly, this reflects the POE's role as a vanguard force among those millions of Frenchmen who suspect that France's economic and strategic decline over the past years has not been "spontaneous," but has been the consequence of a conscious targeting of the French nation for destruction, by what is variously called, "one-world conspiracy," "Trilateral Commission," "Raymond Barre," "socialism," "liberalism," or "Soviet subversion."

The POE campaign is vital to provide the ideas and policies that the next coalition government would need. The POE advocates 1) "dirigist," or state-directed credit policies for national development; 2) cooperation with the United States on the Strategic Defense Initiative; 3) the kind of cultural and scientific renaissance necessary to overcome the plagues of formalism and positivism; 4) emergency measures to deal with the spread of AIDS. The last issue underscores the weakness of all Opposition parties, since none has any program to deal with AIDS, and none, outside the POE, even recognizes it as worth dealing with as an election issue!

The Achilles heel

The almost-certain outcome of the March 16 elections is that President Francois Mitterrand, who does not himself face a presidential challenge until 1988 as matters now stand, will have to agree to the formation of a government of the non-Communist Opposition parties, from the bloc of the Rassemblement pour la Republique (RPR) and the Union pour la Démocratie Française (UDF), with RPR chief Jacques Chirac as prime minister. This is the so-called "cohabitation" arrangement.

The immediately most meaningful question is the margin of RPR-UDF victory, or Socialist defeat. It is generally expected that the RPR-UDF bloc would win about 45% of the vote, while the Socialists, who have been losing momentum after a brief rally in the first weeks of 1986, may not gain the 30% they regard as necessary to avoid changing policies. The French Communist Party is expected to gain between 8% and 11%, with the rest split among the list of populist demagogue Jean-Marie le Pen's National Front, which has also been losing momentum, and various left-wing and ultra-radical groups.

The RPR-UDF would need at least the clearcut victory indicated by these figures, if not even a larger margin, to have the political mandate to carry out the policies that many of the Opposition bloc's policy makers want. Under the most optimistic scenario, that would mean "free energy" to oppose the Trilateral Commission's policies, and to set in motion a policy that would include full cooperation with the United States on the SDI, restoration of French intelligence capabilities in the fight against terrorism and against Soviet subversion, and reversal of the devastating collapse of the French economies that has occurred through the 1980s.

It is precisely on this last point, that the main obstacles lie.

The joint election platform of the RPR and UDF favors a radical "deregulation," or "denationalization" of the French economy, an attempt to import a version of "Reaganomics" (or "Thatcherism") into France. This would include denationalizing the Banque de France, and other banking institutions that had been nationalized by Charles de Gaulle, as a first step, followed by "privatization" of the insurance companies, "deregulation" of transport prices, and so on.

Although many RPR and UDF leaders are organically foes of the one-world-federalism of the Trilateral Commission, this policy package is Trilateralist in content, as it opens up the French economy to massive looting by foreign interests, or as the Catholic daily *La Croix* put it on Feb. 25, to "foreign hands." Some RPR and UDF leaders believe that this "denationalization" is a means of injecting desperately needed funds into France. But the result would be to put the assets of the French economy under the centralized control of the international banking and reinsurance-cartel oligarchy: i.e., "socialism"!

The importance of the POE's alternative, nation-building program lies in the fact that Opposition's economic policy is not set in cement, by any means. Aside from the lure of quick money, the "denationalization" platform represents a political compromise. First, in the RPR, the "Gaullist" Party, there is a faction-fight between the Rockefeller-linked "privatizers" and another group, typified by industrial-policy spokesman Michel Noir, which favors a return to "Colbertism," the policy of centrally directed national development, created by the great 17th-century French statesman, Jean-Baptiste Colbert, who oversaw a rapid rise of France's industry and infrastructure.

The UDF is yet more complicated. Its chief is ex-President Valéry Giscard d'Estaing, whose 1975-81 regime was torpedoed by the economic-austerity policies of then-Prime Minister Raymond Barre. Despite the bitterness Giscard harbors for Barre from those days, the UDF is also the party of the "Barristes," candidates in Barre's slate. The UDF is itself a coalition, and one component in it, the Christian Democrats, or CDS, is historically an anti-Gaullist, one-world-federalist grouping, from which Barre draws his main base.

The only way to remove this factor of Barre/Trilateral Commission blackmail, is for the Barre Electoral List that harbors under a nominal UDF cover to lose at the polls on March 16. That would also hurt Barre's longer-term presidential ambitions, which dictate his strategy of sabotaging formation of a new and viable government after March 16; a weak central government, in his view, means chaos, and chaos means calling early presidential elections, before 1988.

Should Barre's list do badly on March 16, and should the Socialists fail to get their 30%, these results would be interesting signals that the French voters have had enough of Trilateral Commission sabotage, and are seeking a dramatic change of policy.