



From the desk of Pierre Beaudry



**FRENCH GOVERNMENT ARCHIVES ON THE
FASCIST COUPS D’ETAT OF 1927, 1934, AND 1940.**

[Annie Lacroix-Riz, {*Le Choix De La Défaite*}, Armand Colin, Paris, 2007,
671 pages.]

by Pierre Beaudry 5/7/2008

“We have not vanquished France,
She was given to us.”
(Field Marshal Walter von Reichenau.)

In the main, except for a number of additional names, the “Vichy Documents” that Annie Lacroix-Riz has investigated in her book confirm the French banking conspiracy of the Synarchy Movement of Empire (SME) that historian Roger Mennevée had reported in his revue *Les Documents Politiques, Diplomatiques et Financiers*, during the 1940’s, and which had been known to the FDR intelligence community during the World War II period. The Lacroix-Riz findings reveal nothing significantly new about the three fascist coups d’Etat that set France up for the Nazi invasion of May 1940. As a matter of fact, Lacroix-Riz said that the reports of “Roger Mennevée, who had scrutinized the financial press since 1919, [were] almost as precise as the State Archives.” (LCDLD, p. 79.)

“*They Chose Defeat*” is an appropriate title for such a historical singularity because it immediately indicates that the invasion had been prearranged conspiratorial action. Indeed, the choice of the defeat was a conscious and a well prepared plan that was orchestrated by the British, Dutch, and French Banking oligarchies, in order to break the will of the republican forces and the general population of France as a sovereign nation-state, and with the intent to institute fascism throughout the world.

Lacroix-Riz’s sources of documentation came from the Renseignements Generaux of the French National Archives, the Archives of the Ministry of Foreign affairs, of the Bank of France, of the Paris Police Commissariat; from the Army Historical Service, and several published archives of French Diplomacy, from the British Foreign Policy Papers of Her Majesty’s Stationary Office, the German Foreign Policy Papers, and the Foreign Relations of the United States (USGPO, 1946-1959), as well as the Library of the International Contemporary Documentation BDCI, Nanterre, where she consulted the *Documents...* from 1920-1940, before Mennevé left for the United States.

I have used the acronym LCDLD as the abbreviation for *Le Choix De La Defaite* (LCDLD) (*They Chose Defeat*.) I will now proceed to review the three-fascist military coups that Lacroix-Riz reported in her book; that is, the Maréchal Lyautey coup of 1927, the Colonel La Rocque coup of 1934, and the Synarcho-Cagoulard coup of 1940. The missing fourth military coup, which was the fascist Coup of General Boulanger of 1887, will be documented in a next report from the historical accounts of historian and statesman, Gabriel Hanotaux.

1-THE FASCIST COUP OF MARECHAL LYAUTEY 1927.

According to Lacroix-Riz, the idea of creating a French version of fascism appeared in France in the early 1920’s when two nominally catholic organizations, the *Patriots League* (Jeunes Patriotes) of the ultra General Curieres de Castelnau, and the National Catholic League, (Action Française), of Pierre Taittinger, were launched as a form of dictatorial experiment to capture the youth of France and establish a dictatorial form of government. [In order to facilitate the reading, I have highlighted the

sections that Lacroix-Riz has quoted from the relevant government archives.]

According to Lacroix-Riz, Police records indicated that

“The Patriotic youth, children of general ultra Curieres de Castelnau (League of Patriots and National Catholic Federation) and (since December 1924) “**youths**” of Taittinger were linked to Action Française, which protected their meetings and had transmitted to them his traditions: the JP [Jeunesses Patriotes] were “**always walking around with a club or a cane**” and “**in certain circumstances, [...] pistols.**” Taittinger pretended to throw at “**the enemy, that is to say [...] the communist groups**”, his “**shock troops**” armed as “**corps francs**”, “**shock centurions.**” This red screen dissimulated the “**decision to engage into a merciless war against parliamentary institutions**”, announced on December 25 with “**the program flyer**” of Taittinger “**to all of the sector leaders and centurions**”: “*the main change to be claimed by his group was the suppression of Parliament.*” (Renseignements Generaux, May 1925-June 15, 1928. F7-13231, to 13236 from the National Archives. LCDLD, p. 18.)

The same police report stated that the alleged objective of this “**Bankers dictatorship**” was to rid France of Communists. However the police files also added that, behind the red baiting of these so-called Catholic groups, the decision “*was to enter into a merciless war against parliamentary institutions*” and destroy the Third Republic. The report also added that “**the Catholic charity societies, the church guilds, the seminaries [were] centers of fascism, organized militarily.**”

According to Lacroix-Riz, during the same month of June 1925, the head of the electricity industry, Ernest Mercier, created the Redressement Francais, with the collaboration of well-known figures of the industry, Raphael Alibert, Etienne du Castel, and Albert Petsche. This latest group also included the Forges Committee presided by Francois Wendel, which had oversight of the Steel Industry, the Railroad Companies, and the sector of electricity. Lacroix-Riz added that both the Lyautey coup of 1927, and the La Rocque coup of 1934 had been organized through the Forges Committee of Wendel and were financed by the Banque Mallet Freres et C. which was the “**administrator of the biggest nobility fortunes in France [...], that of**

the de Guise family, of the Duchess of Uzes, of the de Luynes family.”
(LCDLD, p. 117.)

The typical way by which the political control mechanism of the steel industrialists worked can be exemplified in the case of President of the Republic, Albert Lebrun (1871-1950). In 1931, Albert Lebrun had been handpicked by Francois Wendel for the senatorial seat of the Meurthe-et-Moselle region of Alsace-Lorraine. After the assassination of President, Paul Doumer, in 1932, Albert Lebrun conveniently became President of the French Republic, just in time for the La Rocque coup of 1934, and then was reelected, again, in 1939 for the coup de grace of 1940. Lebrun was the perfect puppet of the financial and the heavy industry elite of the Synarchy Movement of Empire (SME) until the time came for the new fascist order to be established in France.

After the German invasion, on July 10, 1940, Lebrun was told to transfer his presidential powers to Maréchal Petain whose first action was to declare null and void the 1875 constitution of the Third Republic. During his entire political life, Lebrun had been at the service of the top leaders of the Synarchy Movement of Empire (SME), such as Francois de Wendel, who Lacroix-Riz described as “one of the more noticeable personalities of the industrial and financial world [...], one of the Regents of the Bank of France [...], the true head of the Wendel dynasty from Lorraine, and who owned the Steel Industry of the Briey Basin and of the Sarre region of Germany.” (Annie Lacroix-Riz, *Le Choix De La Defaite*, Armand Colin, Paris, 2007, p. 5) Lacroix-Riz noted that the German propaganda machine, “the Hitler fortress”, considered the Alsace-Lorraine (Elsass-Lothringische) (LCDLD, P. 61) had been completely under the authority of Francois de Wendel’s Forges Committee.

Lacroix-Riz reported that in 1927, Francois Coty, the director-proprietor of the *Figaro* and *L’Ami du Peuple* newspapers also financed this alliance. The question that Lacroix-Riz was attempting to answer is: “Was there such a thing as French fascism? [...] How was it put together by comparison with its Italian and German counterparts?” (LCDLD, p. 17.) Lacroix-Riz reported that according to the Renseignements Generaux and police files that the French fascist plan was developed historically in three waves. The First Wave was from 1922 to 1933; the Second Wave was from 1933 to 1939; and the Third Wave was from 1939 to 1945.

The Renseignements Generaux, and the police files showed that by 1926, in the middle of the first phase, there was a fusion of seven right wing fascist groups: 1) Action Française, 2) Faisceau, 3) Patriotic Youths, 4) Patriot League, 5) The National Catholic Federation, 6) Redressement Francais, and 7) Croix de Feu, including War Veterans. It was the same Croix de Feu and World War One Veterans groupings that attempted to establish a fascist dictatorship in the United States, in 1934 with the Mallet-Morgan-Dupont banks against the American Presidential candidate F. D. Roosevelt. In a private meeting held at the headquarters of the League, one informant reported:

“We will need to recruit the greatest number of youth and have them join the Action Française or the Patriotes Leagues. – Why? – Because we have to organize fascism in France and be ready for all eventualities. The communists will attempt to take power, and we cannot count on the Government to stop them. We must organize to maintain order. It is useless and even detrimental to try recruiting partisans by putting forward religion. We must not first approach them with that, and especially not involve priests. It is by denouncing the dangers of communism and in showing them that we are the only ones organizing against it that we will attract them to us. Later, they will go back to religion by themselves.” (Renseignements Generaux (RG), June 3, 1925, F7 13228, AN. LCDLD, p.19.)

The Putsch of Maréchal Louis Hubert Gonzalve Lyautey (1854-1934) can be best characterized as an Ultramontane-catholic coup attempt to turn the French constitutional government of the Third Republic into a protectorate dictatorship, otherwise known as a “proconsul” form of colonial regime, run from behind the scene by the Duke of Orleans family interests, Jean-Pierre clement Duc de Guise and his son, Henri, comte de Paris, last and current pretender to the throne of France.

Lyautey was an expert in colonial warfare methods of political and military control of the French colonies who had learned everything from his mentor, Maréchal Boulanger, during the occupation of Tunisia in 1883. Lyautey was celebrated among his kind as the peacemaker of French Algeria and French Morocco. In 1912, he had become the commandant and “pacificator” of Morocco. This lasted 13 years, after which he was recalled to France in 1925, made Maréchal, and was chosen to become the so-called

pacificator of Alsace-Lorraine in 1926. I will show in my next report on Hanotaux, that the so-called Alsace-Lorraine geopolitical game was a revival of an old Venetian divide and conquer strategy that goes back to the dismemberment of the Charlemagne Empire at the Verdun Treaty of 843. One of the options was to create an independent Alsace-Lorraine region, reestablishing the old Kingdom of Lothar along the lines of that Treaty which reflects, historically, the traditional revanchist opposition between France and Germany.

The Renseignements Generaux of October 30, 1944 confirmed this Alsace-Lorraine flank in an extraordinary candid explanation for the attempted coup by Maréchal Lyautey and his revanchist, Cardinal Emmanuel Suhard, who later became the Archbishop of Paris during the Vichy regime. The RG reported:

“With his nomination to Strasbourg, Emmanuel Suhard conducted in great secret, during two years, an activity which was considered, at the time, “almost separatist,” whose purpose was hidden carefully in the back of a few consciences and never transpired outside of National Security files. Indeed, he actively organized a local Coup d’Etat that was aimed at bringing Maréchal Lyautey in the position of dictator – it was then called proconsul – of Alsace-Lorraine. The conspiracy had as backbone the clergy of the two provinces,” in accordance with “the following plan: first launch a loud anti-catholic and anti-clerical propaganda throughout Alsace-Lorraine, in order to shock the religious sentiment of the population and have them rise up against the ‘judeo-masonic” republican Government in Paris. Under the cover of this discontent, created in Alsace-Lorraine, by a coup supported entirely by the catholic Alsatian clergy, a proconsulate is established by Maréchal Lyautey. It would not be an autonomist government: the proconsul and his ministers would declare themselves totally French and even French nationalists [but...] only an administrative and political break with Paris, aimed at shielding the Alsatian and Lorraine people from the naggings of a Government inspired by Satan and leading France to the abyss.” (Renseignements Generaux, October 30, 1944, Handwritten commentaries on the case of Suhard, GA 5-10, Archives de la Prefecture de Police (APP). LCDLD, P. 21.)

What was required for this coup was to have the entire control of the French press in an uproar that would force the Paris Government to capitulate. The coup failed because many of the Strasbourg clergy disagreed with l'abbe Suhard and managed to have him return to his Paris seminary. Suhard was later hand picked by Pius XII and Hitler to become the Archbishop of Paris during the Nazi occupation. Suhard was very conveniently nominated by Rome precisely during the week of the Nazi invasion.

During the same period, and in collusion with the coup, Francois de Wendel, regent of the Bank of France, and president of the Committee of the Forges of Alsace-Lorraine, was holding weekly meetings to establish an industrial collaboration between France and Germany, in accordance with the fascist leaning Locarno agreements of 1925. According to the Archives of the Paris Police (APP), the creation of this cartel was created for the explicit purpose of establishing a European block against Anglo-American competition based on the Locarno Treaty, which was nothing short of the Lisbon Treaty of the time. It was run by Austin Chamberlain (older brother of Neville), whose purpose was to put Alsace-Lorraine into the hands of the Synarchy bankers centered in London. This may well be why the synarchist spirit of appeasement with Germany was also called the "spirit of Locarno."

The Police report confirmed this fact by stating that the purpose of the Alsace-Lorraine steel cartel of Francois Wendel was to establish **“a consortium that would integrate all of the big companies of the steel industry of France with the aim of preparing the proposed commercial agreements between France and Germany. [...] The leading directors of the industrial firms wished highly to realize a durable agreement between France and Germany in the economic domain in order to fight against the Anglo-American competition (sic).”** (Renseignements Generaux of the APP, Minutes of the May 31, 1926 meeting. LCDLD, p. 55)

By September 1926, the Police files reported that joint contracts were signed between the members of the French cartel and the reconstitution of the steel cartel of the Reich was established. The French leaders of the steel industry were, Francois de Wendel, Theodore and Charles Laurent, Joseph Eugene and Adolph Schneider, Henri de Peyerimhoff, Rene Duchemin, Pierre Lyautey, Jean Schlumberger, le comte Felix de Vogue, Vladimir d'Ormesson, and Ernest Mercier.

According to the Police source, in 1927, a second cartel of chemical products was created between Kuhlmann and IG Farben, “**controlling 80% of the chemical industry of the two countries.**” However, this French-German rapprochement was not really anti-Anglo-American, but anti-Soviet. This alliance was a persistent Synarchy Movement of Empire offensive against Russia, since the German debacle of 1923. The idea was to go East first. The industrial alliance of 1927 was followed in 1928 by a military alliance that guaranteed the rearmament of Germany under a mutual political and military security pact “against any attack from a third party, establishing a ratio of 5 to 3, that is, 500,000 and 300,000 men of similar recruitment, same equipment, and same armament. A Supreme Headquarters composed of French and German generals would be instituted, to which the two armies would be subordinated.” (*Gazette de Vossischezeitung*, fall of 1928. LCDLD, p. 52)

Lacroix-Riz showed to what degree the Synarchy had incorporated the French finance, industry, and the military into its anti-Bolshevik war preparation, to which even a Paul Reynaud, under the Presidency of Poincare, had signed a number of mutual agreements in Berlin, when he met with the German industrialist, Arnold Rechberg, in April of 1929.

2-THE FASCIST COUP OF COLONEL LA ROCQUE, 1934.

Lacroix-Riz reported that the documents from the Renseignements Generaux for May 5, 1934, relative to the events of the financial scandal of the Stavisky Affair that led to the riots of February 6, 1934, corresponded to “the first great fascist attempt at taking power (the second being that of the Cagoule in November 1937, the third – the successful one -, the one which followed the defeat).” (LCDLD, p. 123.)

This coup began when a notorious financial crook, Alexander Stavisky, who was involved in a Bayonne municipal bond scam was found “suicided” under highly suspicious circumstances, and was then made to be the fall guy for this operation because he was a Russian Jew. The right wing press outlet used the story to go after radical politicians who had been involved in the affair, thus demonstrating the “**utter corruption**” of the parliamentary form of government. The fascist right, whose aim was to

destroy the Third Republic, exploited the scandal that led to the riots of February 6, 1934.

In reality, this was a synarchist-run test to evaluate two things: one, the degree of vulnerability of the French parliamentary system and two, see if it were possible to establish a fascist dictatorship from inside of France, without the help of a foreign intervention. It was at that time that the choice was made to launch the Nazi war machine westward. This was done under the cover of a systematic campaign of fear against the Soviet Union externally and against communism internally. Thus, the fascist sophistry of this French styled McCarthyism became necessary in order to prevent the danger of a communist takeover.

The same experiment with the same Francois de Wendel, J.P. Morgan, and Mallet banking interests, and the same fascist group of Croix de Feu and World War I veterans was being conducted on the other side of the Atlantic, in the United States, against the democratic campaign of FDR. Lacroix-Riz also found in the Renseignements Generaux files that showed how those Protestant as well as Catholic banks were involved in the U.S.: **”That is the houses of the Protestant High Bank, notably Hottinger and Co., Mirabaud and Co., de Neuflyze and Co., Vernes and Co., Mallet Freres. [...] Including Societe Generale de Belgique.”** (Renseignements Generaux, January 8, 1952.)

Although the true nature of the fascist coup was not identified at that time in France, as the fraud that it was, it was revealed openly for what it was in the United States by Major General Smedley Butler (USMC-ret.) who denounced the banker’s dictatorship before the general media. Nobody believed the lie that “America needed fascist government to stop the threat of communism.” The scheme worked in France however, because it was run from behind the scene by the old European oligarchies of the Orleans, de Guise, d’Uzes, and de Luynes families who had total control of the media. These are the same families pushing the fascist destruction of European nations states through the infamous Lisbon Treaty today.

Financed originally by the perfume industrialist Francois Coty, and by Ernest Mercier, the Croix de Feu fascist shock troops were rallied around Colonel Francois de La Rocque who recruited World War I veterans behind a pseudo-catholic form of corporatist ideology extracted from the influence of Joseph de Maistre, Louis de Bonald, and Felicite Robert de Lamennais.

Le Comte Francois de La Rocque de Severac (1886-1946) was an oligarch initially trained in Morocco under the leadership of Marechal Lyautey and Maréchal Petain during the nasty colonial Rif War in the northern region of Morocco. Thus, the Boulanger, Lyautey, and La Rocque coups formed a direct continuity in this synarchist conspiracy to destroy the Third Republic. La Rocque created an anti-parliamentarian league of paramilitary veterans for the explicit purpose of establishing a fascist dictatorship against the Third Republic. He organised the riots of February 6, 1934, after the Stavisky affair had caused the fall of the Camille Chautemps government, who was then replaced by Edouard Daladier at the end of January 1934.

The reason why the fascists wanted to destroy the Third Republic was due to the fact that, regardless of its shortcomings in comparison with the American Constitutional Republic, it was the best constitution that the French had established since the terror of the 1780's, because it had a built-in "revision clause" for revolving the Chair of the President into the Throne of a Monarch. That was the weakness of the Third Republic in that it had been established to accommodate both Republicans and Royalists. Those were no longer the days when the paradox of a "Republican Monarchy," as Jean-Sylvain Bailly and Lafayette had proposed, would have worked. That compromise feature was the precise mechanism that invited a fascist coup.

So, in 1934, 59 years after it had been instituted, the Third Republic became the target of the fascist *Action Française* of Charles Maurras, who launched a major attack against the new government and called for the instauration of dictatorial powers. On February 3, the replacement of the fascist leaning Paris chief of Police, Jean Chiappe, became the trigger for the huge right wing demonstrations at the Place de la Concorde on February 6.

As if from a pre written script, the police were overwhelmed by the demonstrators and, in "**self-defence,**" they fired back at the crowd. There were 14 dead and 1,500 wounded. Lacroix-Riz confirmed that according to police reports, "**the leagues were dictating their law to the Police Commissariat.**" (LCDLD, p.124.) And, according to the Petrus Faure Report, "**The Croix de Feu Association was supposed to take power.**" (*Evenements*, T.II, 1209, pp. 1323-1325.) I have reported elsewhere that the La Rocque troops had been conveniently separated from the other groups and were not directly targeted in the shooting. At the last minute, La Rocque

also conveniently avoided taking over the Elysée, and the coup was dubbed a failure.

In reality, it was a success for the synarchy because, as a result, the radical-socialist President, Edouard Daladier was forced to resign on February 7, and the staunch right wing colonialist, Gaston Doumergue was nominated as President of a “national unity” government. This was the equivalent of a successful right wing coup because it was the first time in the sixty-year history of the Third Republic that a republican government had been forced to resign under pressure from the street, and a so-called nationalist anti-parliamentarian power had been instituted within the Third Republic as a fifth column. The preconditions were set for destroying the Republic from within.

Then, the balance sheet was made up and the results were tallied from the Renseignements Generaux and the Police Department. De La Rocque claimed that the new Doumergue cabinet was merely a **“temporary bandage on the gangrene.”** The police report show to what degree the experiment had been a profiling exercise on their part. **“The date of February 6 had opened a new chapter in our history, since we have established on that day that the demonstrators were willing to die in order to give France a ‘cleaner face.’”** The Police report added: **“With an agreement between industrial leaders, they would now become the referees, by corporation, and would bring a precious aid to the government.”** (Daily notes from Police Headquarters on meetings and demonstrations, Feb 22, March 3, April 15, F7 12963, National Archives. LCDLD, P. 129.) The “corporatist” conclusion of the Police report shows that the new **“government of public safety”** was the very foundation of a fascist dictatorship. While the Police and the government knew very well the nature of the animal, Lacroix-Riz showed that the whole scheme was presented to the gullible public as a way to “demonstrate that a Marxist revolution was impossible in France.” (LCDLD, P. 131.)

After the failed coup, the fascists went to work overtime, and writer Jules Romains concocted his infamous July 9 Plan (1934), which included an “above party” collaboration from the left as well as from the right. Like a Benito Bloomberg “non-partisan” government of unity ticket would represent in the United States, today, the July 9 Plan called for going against the corruption of the parties by a “non-partisan” effort as opposed to “by-partisan.” This is when Maréchal Petain was first introduced as the patriot

above party lines and above suspicion, “posing himself, with the military and the veterans as hard core guardian of law and order.” The plan was executed as a five-year plan. In February of 1943, the Gaullists identified on *Radio Patrie* that “It must not be said that it [the July 9 Plan] succeeded because of the defeat, but that it succeeded because it brought about the defeat; the defeat was the purpose not the means.” (LCDLD, P. 133.) Thus, the “*Choice of the Defeat.*”

Though she had read William Shirer, Lacroix-Riz chose not to stress that both the failed coup attempt of 1926 by Lyautey and the 1934 failure of Colonel La Rocque were organized from behind the scene by the French oligarchy of the Orleans family. American Intelligence officer, William Shirer, however, established the truth as follows:

"The leaders of Action Française had been secretly urged to become more active by the Comte de Paris, heir of the Pretender to the throne, the Duc de Guise. The young Prince - he was twenty-six - believed that the time was ripe for a serious attempt to restore the Orleans monarchy on the throne of France.

"At the first of the year he and his father had summoned three of the leaders of Action Française, Maurras, Pujo, and Admiral Schwerer, to Brussels, where the "royal" family lived in exile and had criticized them severely for their lack of action. The Comte was sure that the moment was at hand to bring the Republic down. The other leagues, the rightist war veterans, and the nationalist leaders who dominated the Municipal Council of Paris must, he said, be brought into a plot to stage a coup. 'You failed to do anything in 1926,' the Prince told the royalist leaders from Paris. 'This time you have the opportunity to do something. Will you take it?'

"A royalist could scarcely say no to the 'king' or his heir. And though almost speechless from the unexpected dressing-down they had received, the three leaders answered yes." (William L. Shirer, {*The Collapse of the Third Republic*}, Simon and Schuster, New York, 1969, p.202.)

It was not a mere coincidence that, at the same time, in 1934, the synarchist Lazard Freres and J.P. Morgan financial interests in the United States were staging a similar fascist dictatorial coup against Franklin D. Roosevelt, using the disgruntled Veterans of Foreign Wars with operatives from the Croix de Feu deployed to the United States from France. They

ultimately failed to capture the leadership of General Smedley Butler, who ended the U.S. plot by publicly denouncing the conspiracy of the fascist coup.

I remind the reader that Roger Mennevée noted, quite appropriately, that it was the British Fabian Society, which had been taken over by the Synarchy at the time, which was behind the French coup d'Etat. The publication of the Jules Romains July 9th Plan of 1934 was signed by the following synarchists:

Gerard Bardet,	Armand Hoog,
Raoul Bertrand,	Pierre-Olivier Lapie,
Aymery Blacque-Belair,	Bertrand de Maudhuy,
Philippe Boegner,	Paul Marion
Jacques Branger,	Georges Roditi,
Jean Coutrot,	Jules Romains
Alfred-Fabre Luce	Roger de Sevres,
R...Fouque	Jean Thomas,
Pierre Frederix,	Louis Vallon.
Pierre Gimon,	

Bertrand de Maudhuy was part of the financial Synarchy and became an official in the Banque Worms.

This 1934 Plan led to the creation, in 1936, of the {Centre d'Etudes des Problemes Humains} [Center for the Study of Human Problems], which was run by Dr. Alexis Carrel, and in 1938, the creation of the {Institut de Psychology Appliquée} [Institute of Applied Psychology] which was run by the Fabian leader, Aldous Huxley. These French institutions were personally supervised by the Fabian Society and, personally controlled by Aldous Huxley on location. Huxley was the vice-president and executive committee member of the {Centre d'Etudes des Problemes Humains}, created by Jean Coutrot, the number one recruiter of the synarchy in France. As reported by Roger Mennevée, the central focus of the I.P.S.A. was the "destruction of the human personality." The objective was to transform human beings into "modified individuals," with the use of drugs and surgical intervention "especially sterilization and castration."

In reaction to the partial victory of this fascist league in France, the socialists and communists allied together to form the Popular Front created

in 1935. Their successful elections of 1936 forced the dissolution of the fascist leagues, which became transformed, in 1937, into La Rocque's French Social Party (FSP), which then became the base of the Vichy regime of collaboration with the Nazis in 1940. It was this 1934 failure of the fascist leagues that prevented France from becoming a fascist dictatorial State as Italy and Germany had become during the same period.

However, it is useless to have courageous people sacrificing their lives to the altar of the French Parliament, when it is the Central Bank of France that runs the government. Lacroix-Riz noted the authority of the Bank of France over the Nation State in the manner in which the Bank of France replied to the French government in 1931: **“Without a doubt, the bank could not ignore the duties that would be hers at the hour of national peril; she has never, in such circumstance, haggled over the price of her services to the State: but the latter must above all count on its own resources and manage them scrupulously during calm periods, in order not to be caught by surprise, if it were to be faced with great responsibilities.”** If there were to be some advance, **“it could only be within the limits of the Treasury's availabilities.”** (LCDLD, p. 52. Meeting of the Central Committee of the Bank of France (CCBF), December 31, 1931.) Here lies the difference of principle between the American Constitution and the French Constitution. The defence of the “general welfare” of all of the people and its posterity had been deliberately excluded from the French Constitution, as well as the constitutional right of the government to issue credit.

From the vantage point of this question of principle, this quote from the Bank of France reflects the hard reality of the fact that whatever may happen in France, or in any other European country for that matter, the solution does not reside in either party, left or right, but in the constitutional government. Whenever a financial debacle occurs in France, it is always the taxpayer who foots the bill, never the shareholders of the central bank. So, no matter who is in power, left or right, republicans or royalists, the situation is that France is treated like a *Shepherd State*, and the fears, on both sides of the aisle, are that the nation is incapable of changing the financial status quo with respect to private central banks. This is why banks can always topple any French government on any working day of the week. In France, the banks govern.

The biggest fear, for example, resides in the fact that, if the French citizens were to confront the banking system, the Nation would no longer get loans. However, the idea that the responsibility of issuing loans should come from the constitutional authority of the Sovereign Government of France was never an idea that either the left or the right thought about, and Lacroix-Riz never raised that question either. Thus, the historical complaint of 1935, that Lacroix-Riz noted as a fait accompli, when the Bank of France vetoed loans to the Government's Treasury, **“the French Government was put under the direct tutelage of a group of British banks organized by MM. Lazard Freres and Co. and Montague Norman.”** (Jean Tannery, President Bank of France, Archives of the Bank of France, February 17, 1936, p.67-77. LCDLD, P. 137.) And this, in France, is considered normal. That is just the way things are.

3-THE SYNARCHIST-CAGOULARD COUP OF 1940.

The Archive Documents for 1939 represent a perfect example of how a strategic fallacy of composition can be imposed on the entire leadership of a National government, its military command, and its entire population. Lacroix-Riz documented how a well-positioned fifth column of the Synarchy Movement of Empire (SME) was able to divert the attention of the French government and military away from the real danger of war, and have them convinced that the danger came from somewhere else. The irony, however, is that the strategic situation in France, today, is exactly the same as it was in 1940, and yet both its governing elite and its general population have been diverted away, one more time, by the same fascist Synarchy Movement of Empire (SME) with respect to the Lisbon Treaty's fallacy of composition of Central banking globalization and its strategy of perpetual war led by the hobereau President, Nicolas Sarkozy. This is a clinical case of how “you can fool some of the people all of the time.”

Lacroix-Riz reported that during the spring of 1940, the command leadership of the French Army and the French Government, itself, had their attention deliberately diverted away from the danger of an imminent Nazi invasion and was riveted instead, against communism. The Government was

briefed on the deceptive policy of the Russian danger, especially by General Jules Decamp, head of the Daladier military cabinet and advisor to General Gamelin also member of the cabinet, and Commander in Chief of the French ground army. Lacroix-Riz identified all three leaders correctly as either presumed to be “crazy or totally blind.” In point of fact, Lacroix-Riz showed that they were rather acting as witting agents of the Synarchy.

Here, Lacroix-Riz has a very interesting and little known story that must be told so that the same mistakes are not repeated again. The diversion from the real danger of a German invasion was, of course, the fallacy of an imaginary German invasion plan of Russia, which was the initial plan of the Synarchy, but which had been changed when Great Britain realized that Hitler was becoming a Frankenstein Monster, and that France was incapable of establishing fascism by itself.

Consequently the French Government and Military continued with the initial plans of helping the Germans go east first. This deception was identified as “Operation Finland,” and was used as a cover for the actual Nazi invasion of France. It was primarily the synarchists MM. De Monzie, Albert Sarraut, and general Maxime Weygand who turned plan A into a fallacy of composition, and that fallacy became the basis for the Daladier cabinet strategic posturing up until the May invasion. The top members of the cabinet, Daladier, Decamp, and Gamelin made believe to the population that the real danger was communism and, therefore, they propagated the idea that “the Bolshevik danger was greater than the German danger.”

There is an extraordinary note *On the Strategic Conduct of the War*, of December 30, 1939, which goes through the entire fallacy that the Daladier cabinet made the population swallow. This is a masterpiece of deception, itself called a “diversion,” and probably written by General Weygand because it brought out all of the aspects of his known synarchist concoctions. The note reads as follows:

“Theatres of diversion operations [...] referring to sensitive points“ to be conducted **“before undertaking a general offensive on the North-East front.”** a) The attack via Finland and Scandinavia would cut Germany off from **“Swedish steel”** – curious objective for a country whose steel route to Germany was never **“cut off”**. His paragraph b) on the Caucasus, the dream of Weygand in line with the plans of 1918 studied by Carley, was also worthy of the rest of the

Commanding officers and of Daladier. **“Russian petroleum of the Caucasus are currently being supplied to Germany. It would be in the greatest interest to destroy the Bakou-Batoum pipeline and if possible, the operations of Bakou, where three quarters of Russian petroleum come from. Even a momentary destruction of these Caucasian petroleum operations would cause the greatest damage to the Russian economy, given the weakness of its industry and the lack of productive spirit, which seems to be undermining its administration. And, the Batoum pipeline is only 25 km from the Turkish border. There are, therefore, possibilities of raids with precise objectives without necessarily aiming at occupying conquered lands. It seems possible to obtain from the Ankara government that they turn a blind eye to the presence of armed bands with the mission of cutting the pipeline off and destroying a few pumping stations. These bands could be formed with Chechens or Kurds taking refuge in Syria and whose native land is precisely the Caucasus. If we wished to launch bigger operations, we could approach the Turks by promising them the Tran-Caucasus, which was still, only recently, ottoman territory.”**
C) **”The action in the Balkans”** –a monopoly of Weygand—would consist in **“preventing the Germanic-Russians from advancing in the general Southeastern direction”** via **“an action [...] through Salonic”** or through Thrace. But it might be better **“to provoke an enemy offensive against Romania”** where a **“Russian invasion”** is to be expected.” (*Note on the Strategic Conduct of the War*, December 30, 1939, from Historical Service of the Land Army (SHAT Vincennes, N 580. LCDLD, p. 513.)

If this note is somewhat telegraphic in character, it is because Lacroix-Riz has the habit of inserting her own writings within archive documents, which has the effect of truncating somewhat the meaning of the original text and sometimes giving it a particular spin.

This **“denial and stubbornness”** about the Russian threat was so extreme that, on March 10, 1940, General Gamelin added a handwritten commentary to his previous cited note, stating: **“It is therefore necessary to pursue resolutely our projects in Scandinavia, to save Finland, minimally to put our hands on the Swedish steel, and on the ports of Norway. But [...] from the standpoint of war operations, the Balkans and the Caucasus, through which we can also prevent the petroleum**

from going to Germany, are also of most profitable interest.” (Service Historique de l’Armee de Terre (SHAT Vincennes), N 580. LCDLD, p. 515.)

Moreover, during a speech to the members of parliament in Mid-March 1940, only a month before the actual German invasion of France President Daladier was still pursuing his Finland flank by calling for the parliamentarians to send “175 airplanes, 496 cannons, 797,000 bombs, 400 mines, 200,000 grenades, 5,000 machineguns, 20 million rounds of ammunition, etc.” (Pertinax, *Les Fossoyeurs*, Edition EMF, Paris, 1943, p. 174.)

Then, after the invasion, on May 18, Gamelin stated that “our Air bombing force did not have a sufficient number of modern planes capable of accomplishing the mission” to save Finland alone. **“There was, in general, a lack of organization of our war production, our factories started too late and proceeded with an insufficient rate of production [...] The Germans had little or no heavy tanks in Poland and they attacked us with 3,000 to 4,000 heavy tanks. We had approximately 300 Class B tanks and about the same number of SOMUA.”** (General Gamelin, Note on the Operation Finland, March 10, 1940. *Historical Service of the Land Army*, (SHAT, Vincennes), Vol. 580, Management of the War, September 1939 to June 1940.)

General Gamelin was expelled on May 18, 1940 because he had given the order to resist on May 13. General Weygand replaced General Gamelin on May 20, right after the first wave of the French Army defeat. Gamelin was made responsible for the French defeat. He was tried, convicted, and deported to a German concentration Camp.

Lacroix-Riz reported that during the spring of 1940, the synarchy had spiked both the Daladier and Reynaud governments with their top agents. She wrote: “Daladier entered into partnership with as many synarchists as did Reynaud, an initiative that he did not reveal during the Petain trial except by stating that ‘a few men of the synarchy had infiltrated the government,’ among them were Raoul Dautry and the banker Daniel Serruys [Lazard Bank. P.B.]. His rival Reynaud, avowed friend of Paul Baudouin [Vichy Minister. P.B.] and of Gabriel Le Roy Ladurie, had been surrounded by synarchists when he was minister. This continued since November first 1938 in the Ministry of Finance, where his cabinet director was Alfred Sauvy

(who will remain under Bouthillier [Vichy Minister. P.B.]); and his cabinet director, Assemat, first (in alphabetic order) of the **‘most important affiliates’** cited by the Chavin report, who Vichy promoted to **“director of the National Savings Bank for State Markets in 1940.”** (National Archives, F7 15343, Chavin Report 1941. LCDLD, p.524.)

In other words, the last government of the Third Republic had already been packed with top synarchists before Pierre Laval and Maréchal Petain had moved in to impose the Vichy regime. Laval and Petain had been recruited to the Synarchy as early as the early 1920's. The same thing happened on the banking side of the equation, where synarchist, Yves Breart de Boisanger, who had been successively in the cabinets of both Daladier and Reynaud, became governor of the Banque of France under Vichy, etc. Thus, the so-called “divine surprise” came because the synarchist oligarchy in England, in Italy, and in France was the party of peace. The old collaborator and accomplice of Pierre Laval, the synarchist Francois Pietri, the future ambassador to Madrid was clamoring everywhere in the diplomatic world that “it is necessary to make peace immediately and at all cost.” (Renseignements Generaux, October 25, 1939, Dossier II, Archives of Police Prefecture, (APP). LCDLD, p. 534.) Pietri was a synarchist associate of Daladier's mistress, playing up all of the “pacifist intrigues” before the defeat.

The pursuit of this pre-Vichy “appeasement policy” was completely different from Sadi Carnot's post Bismarck “appeasement policy.” The pre-Vichy posturing was aimed at preparing, for after the invasion, the “armistice and cooperation policy” with the occupant. Lacroix-Riz emphasized how, from 1939-1940, it was the “appeasement plan” of the synarchy that brought in the Petain-Laval regime to power. As was also confirmed by Roger Mennevé, the Vichy Documents show that the main players of the defeat were Pierre Laval, Maréchal Petain, General Weygand, and General Huntziger.

Lacroix-Riz reported:

“A note [from 1945] on the armistice and on the responsibilities incumbent upon Petain and Laval” identified that “a certain number of people thought they could reconstruct the facts in the following manner: around May 20 [1940], Weygand and Petain personally met at the chateau of Ferrières, in the

Meuse, a number of German parliamentarians who had come across the lines under the cover of a white flag. [...] It is agreed that the French Government will immediately call for Armistice. The French Army will retreat in an orderly fashion and with honor. This plan failed because Petain was not able to rally Mandel and the ‘tough ones’ of the cabinet who rejected the defeatist arguments and decided to pursue the fight regardless of the initial reversals. The Germans responded by carrying the war to the bitter end. What followed is well known. [Around] May 20th, a certain number of generals gave the orders to retreat that was not required by the situation. For example, the case of General Besson who it is said attended the Ferrières meeting. But there is better. The accusation formulated at that time by Paul Reynaud, then misinformed, against General Corap, does not hold. He was in Belgium at the time with the wing of the marching army. General Huntziger held the sector of Sedan-Mezière. The Huntziger Army included two army corps. One on the right bank of the Meuse River, in the region of Montmedy-Stenay, was commanded by an old general X [...] The second army corps, that of general Y [...], was defending the left bank. “ (Note on the armistice and the responsibilities incumbent upon Petain and Laval, Judiciary Police, APP. LCDLD, p. 544.) The names of the two generals were not given.

Here Lacroix-Riz also noted that it was Huntziger, the very man who later signed the armistice with the Nazis, who was the field general responsible for the defeat. The note continues:

“According to a French deputy, who was an officer of the general X High Command: ‘on May 20, at two o’clock in the morning, general X met with his officers and told them: “We will hold. We have not abandoned one inch of territory. But the Germans have made a breach next to us. The front is broken, we can turn this around. Change immediately the position of the army corp. you have four hours to change from facing North to facing North-West. ‘ During two or three days, nothing notable happened. But general X was fired by Huntziger and was replaced by general [Paul Andre] Doyen. We understood nothing. The only chief who resisted was sacked! On the contrary, in the next sector, it was a precipitous retreat. We were indeed amazed

to see that during the entire duration of this funny kind of war, nothing had been done to assure the defense of sector Y. On the contrary, in our sector, the one of general X, we had made a prolongation of the Maginot Line, etc.”

“After May 20, we had no news of Huntziger. We thought he had left his troops, that possibly he might have been the object of some sanction. Moreover, behind Huntziger there was nothing. The Germans could pass through like they wanted. In his High Command, Huntziger had with him the writer Henri Massis, who later became one of Petain’s counselors in Vichy. According to the Cagouards [hooded ones], he was considered as a great man. A lot of people noticed that he had been designated by Petain to go and sign the armistice at Rethondes, then later became Minister of National Defense at Vichy.” (Idem.)

Lacroix-Riz noted that Huntziger had been charged only once by *L’Oeuvre* Newspaper of December 10, 1940. The Front Page title was: “*At Sedan-Mezière, it was not Corap, it was Huntziger.*” When the newspaper maintained the same accusation on December 12, Lacroix-Riz reported “the next day, December 13, the Vichy government gave the order through general de la Laurentie to the prefect of Police, Langeron, to arrest Deat, the director of *Loeuvre.*” She also reported: “there is, here, a singular coincidence. It was common knowledge at Vichy that Deat had blackmailed Petain with the Huntziger affair. If general Gamelin kept silence at the Riom trial, his former collaborators did not hesitate to defend him. This is how one of his high command officers, Colonel Peribon, today in retirement, asserted that the Gamelin plans for the defense of the territory after the invasion of Sedan were impeccable. The proof is that Weygand took the same instructions from his predecessor, point for point. It is permitted to suppose that by sacrificing Gamelin by bring in Weygand as the head of the Army, the conspirators wanted to have their man in position, in order to cook up the armistice at Ferrières.” (Idem. LCDLD, p.545.) This is also entirely consistent with Mennevée’s evaluation.

According to Lacroix-Riz, these military and political men were merely the puppets of a cartel of banks surrounded around three banking institutions, the Banque Worms, the Bank Lehideux, and the Banque d’Indochine. A note of the Renseignements Generaux from October 4, 1941

makes the point about the financial institution behind the Synarchy Movement of Empire (SME)

“On the polytechnique society called Synarchy Movement of Empire. In summation, a veritable mafia of old polytechnicians and of financial inspectors, grouped within a secret society with international ramifications, has put its hand on the quasi-totality of the command levers of the State, in the wake of the military defeat of May-June 1940. It organizes the exploitation of our national economy, for the benefit of powerful financial interests and cunningly associating with it certain German groups by means of a new legislative and regulatory armature created for this sole purpose, and through which the administrative organisms of the New French State are nothing but the external services of the Banque Worms.” (Renseignements Generaux from the Archives de la Préfecture de Police (APP), and the Mouvement Synarchique d’Empire (MSE). LCDLD, p. 549.)

Lacroix-Riz reported that according to the Magistrate, Pierre Beteille, Marechal Petain was the actual head of the **“CSAR or more commonly called the Cagoule as the activist instrument of the Synarchy Movement of Empire or synarchy”** (Renseignements Generaux, June 19, 1947. LCDLD, p. 43.) Beteille was the examining magistrate who was responsible for the dossier on the Cagoule, which was otherwise known as the Comite Secret d’Action Revolutionnaire (CSAR), This was the executing arm of the synarchy, the street thug revolutionary arm led by Eugene Deloncle and Raphael Alibert. After the Liberation Magistrate Beteille was appointed to the High Court of Justice in charge of investigating Petain, Laval, Flandin, and Chautemps. Among his papers on “the relations of Petain with the CSAR” Beteille ultimately concluded: **“Possibly the most startling proof, that Petain was indeed the head [words later replaced by “at the head of”] of the CSAR is found retrospectively reported, right after the armistice, by the importance of the role that its directors have come to play in Vichy.”** Indeed, as Lacroix-Riz showed, Petain immediately hired the two top Cagoulards, Du Moulin de Labarthe and Raphael Alibert.

CONCLUSION

In ending this book review, I wish to pay tribute to a sublime individual who was a witness and a victim of this most tragic deception that any sovereign people ever had to suffer in the history of mankind. This man was Marc Bloch, a history professor of the Sorbonne and a resistance fighter who wrote a historical diary about the true nature of this French tragedy and who was executed by a Nazi firing squad on June 16, 1944 for having told the truth about this infamy. As a student of history, Bloch saw the real nature of this grand fallacy of composition unfolding before his eyes and realized that he had the personal responsibility to stop it. As was to be expected, he paid with his life so that others may live in a free world in which such infamies should never happen again.

If anyone were to attempt to measure the cause of such a treasonous outrage as the Synarchy-orchestrated Nazi invasion of France, in 1940, I recommend that he or she read the book that Marc Bloch has written, called *Strange Defeat*. When he was put before the Nazi firing squad in 1944 for having led a four-year resistance, Bloch had left a manuscript with his family, telling the story of what had happened during the invasion. He did not know, before he died, if the truth he spoke and the courage that the French resistance had displayed would reach and touch the generation born during and immediately after World War II.

Bloch's book did reach its goal and stands, for the post World War II generation, as a warning beacon that shines on both the arrogance of fascism, which is still alive and threatening again today, and on the cowardness of his and our own generation in accepting, passively, to go along to get along. The threat is still here for the future of civilization.

Bloch wrote: "Not being prophets we did not foresee the advent of the Nazis. But we did foresee that, in some form, or other, though its precise nature was hidden from us, a German revival *would* come, that it would be embittered by rancorous memories to which our foolish ineptitude was daily adding, and that its explosion would be terrible. Had anyone asked us how we thought a second war would end, we should, I doubt not, have answered that we hoped it would end in victory. But we should have been perfectly clear in our own minds that if the terrible storm broke again, there was grave danger that the whole of European civilization might well suffer irremediable shipwreck." (Marc Bloch, *Strange Defeat*, The Norton Library,

1968, p. 171.) Thus, Marc Bloch set the example by refusing to come to terms with lies.

Annie Lacroix-Riz courageously identified in her book the trusts of the French oligarchy and the big bosses (“Grand Patronat”) as being responsible for the demise of France during World War II. According to the Renseignements Generaux, **“The ministers of the Occupation, supported by the “confidence of the big industries” were “men from the trusts”, and “representatives of 200 families” (the 200 largest shareholders of the Bank of France)”** (March 1944, Jean Bichelonne, Archives de la Prefecture de Police (APP) LCDLD, p. 1.)

By creating the sophistry that France could never become a communist country, the synarchy Movement of Empire (SME) also demonstrated that France could be mystified into being submitted to a fascist regime. Thus, the revelations of Annie Lacroix-Riz are extremely useful because a whole generation of French men and women was guilty of not fighting against the dominating public opinion of their time, and of having let themselves be taken over by a synarchist cabal of an oligarchy controlling the military, politicians, industrialists, journalists, and street agitators. The children of that World War II generation could well again be thrown into a similar tragic confusion, today with the fallacy of the Lisbon Treaty. If this were to happen again, as Marc Bloch forecast, we would most certainly lose the bounties of Western Civilization for several generations to come. Therefore, it is our duty, for the sake of those future generations, that we make sure such a tragedy does not repeat itself again.

FIN