

tributions and decided to recover them. Their mother had said nothing to them of her political activities, as they got on but poorly. The apparent legal avenue open to them, was a civil suit to obtain repayment of the loans to the estate.

But, rather than proceed thusly, the heirs were advised by unknown persons to proceed criminally against Mr. Cheminade, which persons led them to believe that they would thereby recover both the gifts and the loans; those who advised them to do this, full knowing the protracted and parlous nature of such a legal venture, had in mind quite another object: a media campaign against Mr. Cheminade as a "thief," which was to cut off his political career in the bud.

In March 1987, the heirs duly made out a criminal complaint, founded upon the claim that their mother had been ill with Alzheimer's disease. Under French law, a person who receives loans or gifts from another, that other not being of sound mind, and this weakness being apparent to third parties, is guilty of theft.

An instructing magistrate, Mlle. Lherault, was named. . . . After two years of investigation, in the course of which Mlle. Lherault pored with bone-grinding thoroughness over the personal histories and finances of Mr. Cheminade and friends, she closed the case, under the heading "Refusal to Instruct." This means that the magistrate found no cause for a criminal complaint and refused to send the case up to trial.

Among the extraordinary things before Mlle. Lherault, was a *posthumous* psychiatric report by a high-society psychiatrist, Professor Dubec. The latter, who had never seen the patient alive, nor even conducted an autopsy, concluded that she was mad and suffered from Alzheimer's disease. Professor Dubec had entertained a lively correspondence concerning Mme. Pazéry, with another high-society psychiatrist, Professor Oughourlian, of the American Hospital at Neuilly, known mainly for his connections to the American establishment.

The Hospital of St. Anne, where Mme. Pazéry died, gave *two different* dates of death but never produced a death certificate, nor an official report on the cause of death. The heirs of the accused told the magistrate unblinkingly, that the mother, who, they otherwise alleged, was desperately ill with Alzheimer's, in fact lived alone, dined in restaurants, used a credit card, had never been put under guardianship, did all her own banking and finances, and drove her own automobile. . . .

Again, the High Court which found against Mr. Cheminade on first instance in 1992, was the scene of wild buffoonery: the solicitor for Mme. Pazéry's heirs, Maître Dewynter, waving before the judges a brain scan which had never been produced to the accused, and the date of which had been altered, so that it did not correspond to documents in the complainants' own possession. In fact, it later transpired that the American Hospital at Neuilly, which was supposed to have carried out the scan, did not possess a scanner at that altered date! Whose brain was on the picture, is a moot point. It also later transpired, which fact was never made known to

the accused until the complainant's solicitor raised it in open court in October 1995, that the Medical Secretary of the American Hospital, was Mme. Pazéry's sister, who was plainly in touch with the complainants. . . .

LaRouche comments on the case

In an interview with "EIR Talks" on Jan. 18, Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr. had this to say about the developments in Paris:

The main attack against Cheminade, is because he's associated with me. The political class in France, the dominant section, showed, during the election campaign, with what they said about me, that I was the major issue. The hardest issue in the French Presidential campaign, was my personality. Here I am, in the United States. What does that mean?

Simply: The French establishment recognizes me as an important American. They do not want, more out of French chauvinism and ties to the Entente Cordiale mentality with the British, they don't want any American influence, internally, in France. Jacques was probably the most competent candidate, in terms of qualifications, for President that was running. There are other people in France who would be qualified, competently, to run for President, but they just didn't happen to be running. And Jacques was the only one among those running for the Presidency, who was actually qualified for the position, in terms of the issues that have to be dealt with.

So, they think of Jacques as a danger, a threat to the political class. They're out to try to defame him, to bankrupt him, to eliminate him, by every dirty trick they can imagine. And, when Jacques sided with the strikers against Chirac and Juppé, in the December events, this for some people in the government and in the political class was just too much. And they're out to crush him.

However, what they have done, as the record shows now, when you look at the pattern of things that have been done, beginning with the period of the elections themselves, is that the political class in France has created, as it did in the 1890s, a new Dreyfus Affair in the form of what it's done with Cheminade. Here's a prominent, gifted man, a former French official, very talented, insightful, very popular when he's directly dealing with the French public; and they want to get rid of him.

It's going to come back on them. The Cheminade case is the albatross around the Chirac establishment, the Chirac-Mitterrand establishment. And, sooner or later, what they've attempted to do to Cheminade, will destroy them. And I think it will be rather sooner, than later. Events are coming on fast, events which they wish to believe will not happen. But the events will come; and when those events come, there will be an accounting of many things by the French population, 90% of which do not like what has been happening in France in the recent period.