

LaRouche has been in prison for the last three years in the United States, victim of a political trial which has been denounced by hundreds of lawyers, former ministers of justice, and political and trade union leaders from around the world. His case is the subject of an inquiry addressed to U.S. authorities by the Human Rights Commission of the United Nations in Geneva. Contrary to what the French prosecutor says, which alleges an investigation of LaRouche in "a very important case of swindle and financial fraud," the charges brought by the American authorities were only "mail fraud," "conspiracy to commit mail fraud," and "conspiracy to impede the IRS." Thus LaRouche has been imprisoned on the basis of accusations as imaginary as those brought against his French friends.

Why? because LaRouche is the man who denounced George Bush's new world order, who goes after drug money laundering by British and American banks, and who has advised the countries of the South to unite in a cartel to refuse to repay the usurious debt that is destroying the lives of their people and the sovereignty of their nations.

Few have been as slandered as LaRouche, the victim of lynching by the media and the judiciary. Who are his enemies? A veritable intervention force was organized against LaRouche by the Anglo-American financial oligarchy and its appendages, including the Anti-Defamation League (ADL), the CIA, the FBI, and their offshoots.

All of these are well entrenched in Paris.

LaRouche and his friends are currently demanding release of 40,000 pages of documents on them, which the U.S. government refuses to make public. Just like the documents on the Kennedy assassination, the U.S. government wants to keep its "family secrets" concealed. The Kennedy affair, the LaRouche affair, an arbitrary connection? No, since those who denounced the big lie of the Warren Commission attest today that John Fitzgerald Kennedy and Lyndon LaRouche have the same enemies, the same smell of trafficking in arms, drugs and dirty money.

The stakes

One observer has called this affair "sordid." Exactly. Nonetheless, the stakes are enormous.

- 1) The right to freedom of association in France.
- 2) The threshold of legal proof required to establish Alzheimer's disease. The conviction of Cheminade would establish a precedent for almost any other case.
- 3) Above all, use of the judicial system for political ends against someone who opposes the established order. Clearly the goal is to make Cheminade ineligible to participate in politics.
- 4) Finally, it is the incompetent use of psychiatry for partisan objectives.

If, after LaRouche, Jacques Cheminade and his friends are convicted, it will be clear why François Mitterrand thinks George Bush is "nice" and calls him his friend.

Kohl faces ill wind from Washington

by Rainer Apel

In the foreground of the American visit of German Chancellor Helmut Kohl beginning on March 21 is an almost compulsive effort by official Bonn to downplay the significance of the Wolfowitz study, in which reunified Germany is represented as one of the major future adversaries of the United States. The study, leaked by the *New York Times* Sunday edition of March 8, states that U.S. defense strategy must be to "prevent the re-emergence of a new rival" comparable to the Soviet Union, and to "seek to prevent the emergency of European-only security arrangements which would undermine NATO." (See *EIR*, March 20, p. 58.)

Even the mass media put a consoling spin on the speech in Bonn by David Jeremiah, the American deputy chief of General Staff, who tried to give the impression that the study is "only one among many and in any case not the official policy of the United States." The German Foreign Office put out the word that U.S. Secretary of State James Baker had assured his German colleague Foreign Minister Hans-Dietrich Genscher that there was no basis for the Germans to be upset.

It seemed like a lot of denials for something which in Bonn has been taken so seriously that Winfried Dunkel, the military attaché of the German Embassy in Washington, made a special trip to the Pentagon in early March to officially protest the statements in the Wolfowitz report.

Indeed, the study by Paul D. Wolfowitz should be taken more than seriously. For one thing the author is not simply "one among many," but is Defense Undersecretary for Policy. Moreover, he is a protégé for many years of Fred Iklé, who once held the same post. Iklé is the author of a similar study, which a few years ago—before German reunification and the breakup of the Warsaw Pact and U.S.S.R.—proclaimed that the strategic and political interests of the United States and Europe were in opposition. The Wolfowitz paper also coincides with President Bush's own ideas. Bush said on March 11 to journalists that he could broadly support the conclusions of Wolfowitz.

Russia, France protest

In a commentary broadcast by Radio Moscow March 11, Victor Innikeyev said that the Pentagon paper says "in no uncertain terms" that the United States would act to prevent the emergence of a rival superpower on the European conti-

ment. The sections calling for using force to stop the spread of nuclear weapons "will certainly make a few eyebrows rise, especially against the backdrop of the Russian leadership's statement that the U.S. is no longer an adversary, but a potential ally, and that Russian nuclear missiles are no longer targeted on the United States. By contrast, the Pentagon will not follow Russia's suit."

This fact alone, warns Innikeev, "outweighs by far the American declarations that they want to see successful reforms in the former Soviet Union based on democracy and the market economy." He goes on that the document "smacks of American attempts at world hegemony," including even "control over western industrial countries that may challenge the U.S. role."

In western Europe, too (outside of Bonn), there were strong protests against the Wolfowitz paper.

On March 10 French Foreign Minister Roland Dumas came out against attempts to have NATO replace the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE) and other agencies in peacekeeping efforts in the Transcaucasus or elsewhere. Dumas's objections were raised in the Brussels meeting of the North Atlantic Cooperation Council (NACC), at which initiatives vis-à-vis the Nagorno-Karabakh conflict were discussed.

At this meeting, the usually well-informed French daily *Libération* notes, U.S. Secretary of State Baker was trying to "breathe new life into NATO by carefully organizing the extension of its influence into the East," in pursuance of his plan for creating a "Euro-Atlantic community from Vancouver to Vladivostok." The NACC, set up in December 1991, is seen by the Americans as the "privileged place of action" for carrying out this project, the paper reported. Dumas warned against the temptation of "asking NATO to substitute itself for the CSCE." To underscore its distance from such plans, France has indicated it will not be represented at the meeting of NACC defense ministers, to be held in April.

Libération linked the French-American controversy in Brussels directly to the "politically explosive Pentagon document," noting that the document foresees Washington as sole "policeman" of the world, having the mission of preventing any rivalry to the American superpower from arising, particularly in western Europe. In Brussels, Baker downgraded it as a "low-level working paper." French Foreign Minister Roland Dumas claimed it reflected "a certain orientation of mind which I hope does not correspond to reality," and added, with a smile, that he had taken notice of the American denial that this reflected official thinking in Washington.

War of nerves in Bonn

Washington columnist Hobart Rowen forecast in his *International Herald Tribune* article on March 16 that Bush would read Kohl "the riot act" over "the tendentious GATT issue," i.e., the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. "Mr. Kohl made a clear commitment, at the Houston eco-

nomic summit in 1990, to get President François Mitterrand to modify France's intransigent stand against reducing agricultural subsidies. Mr. Kohl has not delivered on that promise," Rowen wrote.

The Americans are insisting that Kohl pressure Mitterrand "to make a deal with the Americans and other GATT countries." Concluded Rowen: "That is what Mr. Kohl must do to continue to get American support for Germany's priority targets, including its lead role in eastern Europe and among the former Soviet states. Otherwise he risks a serious break with the United States."

In Bonn radical differences between Chancellor Kohl, who does not want to jolt Franco-German friendship, and the chairman of the coalition partners, the Free Democrats, Count Otto von Lambsdorff, led to a sharp exchange of words inside the coalition in early March. Kohl also said the French government had complained about Lambsdorff's repeated statements calling on the government in Bonn to force France into accepting the pro-Bush GATT compromise. Responded Lambsdorff: "For several months now, I have been predicting that a failure of the GATT talks would be blamed on Germany, on you, Mr. Chancellor." Lambsdorff said that a GATT failure would ruin German exports and send the entire economy down the drain. He dropped a barely veiled threat that the present coalition could break up over such disputes, just like the 1982 coalition headed by Chancellor Helmut Schmidt.

Now what will the chancellor do? If he gives in, he saws off the branch upon which an independent policy befitting united Germany with its newly won sovereignty, would rest. Without close collaboration with France, Germany has no chance against the new American (in reality, Anglo-American, because London runs the Bush party) doctrine. If Kohl does not capitulate, he is facing a growing confrontation with the Bush administration.

Presuming that the new U.S. doctrine runs into stiff opposition in Russia and France, Germany's outlook for surviving this confrontation is not bad. As long as the domestic opposition to Bush is growing, because of the catastrophic results of his economic policies, Bush's ruling apparatus is skating on rather thin ice.

Also encouraging to the Bonn government are indications that after the cantonal elections in France on March 22 there could be a new shape to the government in Paris. The very German-French-oriented Jacques Delors, who is still European Community president, has been named as well placed to take over as prime minister. That could mean better prospects for ending the policy of blockading Bonn which President Mitterrand has upheld since 1989. There is no need for Kohl to make any concessions to Bush, if there is a short-term possibility that Paris might meet the chancellor's proposals for French-German relations halfway. The chancellor should keep his nerves about him, since Bush's nerves are not the best.