

## De Borchgrave fails to undercut Chirac

by Paul Goldstein

The international furor created by the interview given by French Premier Jacques Chirac to the Reverend Moon-controlled *Washington Times* editor, Count Arnaud de Borchgrave, served not only to clearly define French policy toward terrorism and the Mideast, but demonstrated that de Borchgrave is working with factions inside U.S. intelligence associated with the State Department/bankers' policy led by Zbigniew Brzezinski.

Chirac's statements, intended for private messages back to the Reagan administration, were printed in full by the *Washington Times* after Chirac and unnamed French officials denounced the characterization of them as a plot to destabilize the French government. However, despite the best effort of de Borchgrave to set Chirac up in the interview, Chirac turned the tables on him and identified key points of failure in U.S. policy on the question of the Mideast, North Africa, and terrorism.

Chirac began the interview stating that U.S. policy toward Libya was "at times a little primitive" and went on to explain the contradictions in a policy where the U.S. bombs Libyan dictator Qaddafi's headquarters, while certain U.S. oil companies continue to conduct business enabling Qaddafi to reap the revenues from oil. In addition, Chirac identified that moderate Arab states faced with severe economic problems and growing threat of Islamic fundamentalism and "who should be protected [are] being systematically incited by American initiatives to adopt anti-American attitudes . . . so I wonder whether certain American initiatives are really appreciated beyond their quick-fix impact."

Chirac proceeded to defend French sovereignty and French policy toward the Mideast and North Africa, concentrating on Lebanon, Syria, and Tunisia. When de Borchgrave tried

to shift the discussion to the proof of Syrian and East bloc intelligence services' involvement in running terrorism, Chirac raised the question of what kind of strategy there is. "If you tell me," the premier said, "that we are going to declare war on a number of countries and bring them to their knees, that is a strategy that could be debated, though I do not hear anyone suggesting such a course. But if it is merely a war of words, I say watch out. We are faced with a situation in that part of the world which is exceedingly delicate and explosive and requires a modicum of psychology and long-term thinking and planning. It is the lack of peace which bring us terrorism. . . ."

After this interchange, Chirac and de Borchgrave engaged in a lively repartée in which Chirac asked not be quoted. Suddenly, when questioned by de Borchgrave about the statement by the French intelligence service's former chief Alexandre de Marenches, that there is irrefutable evidence on the control of international terrorism, Chirac dropped a bombshell: "Your [secret] services and our own are worthless. Moreover, they are all penetrated. . . . No different then [referring to the era of de Marenches, who headed the SDEDC, France's foreign intelligence service, for over 11 years]. They've always been penetrated."

Perhaps what upset de Borchgrave even more was Chirac's careful criticism of the manner in which Israeli intelligence has operated on the terrorism issue, especially its arms dealings with the Iranians and with elements of Syrian intelligence, in which the Israelis have had a deal to destroy the moderate Palestinians. He implied that the Israelis, even with the help of Syrian intelligence, helped set up the Hindawi Affair, the case the British used to convince the world that the Syrians are behind terrorism. Chirac was not refuting the

idea that Syria is behind terrorism, but simply the specific case that the British were using to demonstrate that fact.

To properly situate why the interview with Chirac caused such an uproar, we must examine the motives of de Borchgrave and his friends that deployed him. First, de Borchgrave is aligned with a faction of U.S. intelligence that helped build up the Socialist Parties' political position in France, Italy, Spain, and Portugal: specifically, the networks associated with Irving Brown and the Socialist International, which are allied with the Moon Unification Church and the Ariel Sharon wing of Israeli intelligence. Besides Brown, whom de Borchgrave has worked with for years, Michael Ledeen, Alexander Haig, Joseph Churba, and the Heritage Foundation are in this apparatus, which represents the forces inside France completely opposed to Chirac's neo-Gaullism and his nationalist stance on foreign policy. They intersect not only President François Mitterrand's intelligence networks, but are deeply involved in supporting Raymond Barre's position in the government coalition and his potential candidacy for President. It is not so ironic that after Chirac's infamous interview Mitterrand criticized the government's foreign policy.

The gameplan to destabilize the French government centered around two points. First, the British were becoming increasingly concerned with the unofficial and official improvement of U.S.-French military and intelligence cooperation. For a couple of years, some patriots within U.S. intelligence have consciously sought an upgrading of cooperation with French intelligence, at least those factions opposed to the Mitterrand Socialist government's protection of international terrorism in France. This process began to bear fruit on the question of terrorism and potential joint U.S.-French special operations. This kind of new arrangement, despite the traditional strain in U.S.-French relations, became a threat to the interests of the British Foreign Office and its Mideast policy. The British Foreign Office and its junior partner, the State Department, were attempting to carry out their own arrangements with the Syrians, Iranians, and Russians in the Middle East, excluding Chirac's government.

Second, the internal situation in France is highly fluid, with presidential elections coming up soon, and the handling of terrorism a major policy issue. If the de Borchgrave crowd could shift the favorable climate toward Chirac engendered after the terrorist wave in September and October, toward either Mitterrand or Barre, the Chirac interview would be the opening volley in their battle to topple him.

### **The role of de Marenches**

Central to this destabilization is the activity of de Borchgrave's cousin, former French secret service chief Alexandre de Marenches. De Marenches recently went public with a book about France and the world of secret intelligence, and announced that he has discovered a huge cache of files from the period France was occupied by the Nazis. A systematic rumor campaign against certain Gaullist figures who were in the Resistance and closely aligned with Chirac has begun,

aimed at undermining Chirac's political and intelligence networks.

Anybody who knows or pretends to understand French politics and its intelligence agencies, knows the significance of the Gestapo files, especially in identifying leading figures who collaborated with the Nazis. De Marenches leaked these stories to the French and world press prior to the de Borchgrave interview. At approximately the same time, former President Valéry Giscard d'Estaing announced his opposition to Chirac's support of President Reagan's Strategic Defense Initiative. De Marenches, although he had significant differences with Giscard d'Estaing when he headed the SDEDC, is now aligned with Giscard and Barre along with the Socialists, against Chirac.

### **France's anti-terror policy**

During a recent trip to Paris, this reporter met with several French intelligence officials and got a profile of their thinking concerning the U.S. policy on terrorism. One official made it clear that the French were not only willing to deepen the collaboration with U.S. intelligence, but had proposed several operations concerning Qaddafi's Libya. His frustration became apparent; it paralleled Premier Chirac's statement in the de Borchgrave interview that the United States did not have a coherent short and long-term counter-terror policy. As is apparent in the now-exposed Iran hostage-for-arms deal, Chirac and this official were essentially correct.

France has not appeased or capitulated to the terrorist demands. In fact, several top French officials privately went to Damascus to issue an ultimatum to Syrian President Hafez Assad, that the French know the hand which is behind the wave of terror that hit Europe. This ultimatum was given in mid-October, at the same time that certain French officials were in Washington, D.C. briefing the United States on their policy. When it became clear to certain U.S. circles that the French were embarked on their own policy track, threatening the carefully orchestrated arrangement between the State Department and the British Foreign Office with a faction of Israeli intelligence, the de Borchgrave operation went into full swing.

Finally, Chirac's statement on the role of Israeli intelligence must be clarified, vis-à-vis the briefing Chirac received from West German Chancellor Helmut Kohl concerning Israeli and Syrian intelligence involvement in the Hindawi Affair. It may be that the Mossad and Syrian intelligence set up the Hindawi brothers for the fall in order to destabilize the Hafez Assad regime; however, this misses the point. Syrian intelligence has been involved in international terrorism and receives backing from the Soviets. Moreover, the Sharon faction inside Israel has been playing with Syrian intelligence to eliminate the moderate Palestinians and potentially to create a limited war between Israel and Syria designed to redraw the map of the Middle East, to eliminate the nation of Lebanon. To the degree Chirac is addressing this issue by using the Hindawi Affair, he is right on the mark.