

SYNARCHY MOVEMENT OF EMPIRE

(ICLC DRAFT DOCUMENT)

BOOK I

THE EARLY SYNARCHY MOVEMENT OF EMPIRE

THE FRENCH REVOLUTION of 1789-1815: A SYNARCHIST INTERNATIONAL EXERCISE IN PURGATIVE VIOLENCE

**by
Pierre Beaudry**

LEESBURG VIRGINIA, JUNE 2005

DEDICATION.

This book is dedicated to the LaRouche Youth Movement (LYM) worldwide, and particularly to the French LYM, who deserve to know the truth about French history and world affairs. Previous generations of French citizens had settled their accounts with their immediate past history by either going to war, or by getting involved into absurd coups d'Etat, however, they never knew why they were doing so. My generation of Bohemian Bourgeois (BoBos) has not done that; it didn't care to do anything for history, nor for the future generations. It was only interested in lying and in taking care of "Me, Me, Me!" The problem that the youth of today are face with is that the truth about the French Revolution, about Napoleon Bonaparte, about the synarchy, about the destruction of the Third Republic, or about Vichy fascism, has never been told. So, either the truth comes out now, and finally exorcises the French population as a whole, once and forever, or else the French nation is doomed to repeat the same mistakes of the past, again and again.



BEASTMAN BONAPARTE

SYNARCHY MOVEMENT OF EMPIRE

(ICLC DRAFT DOCUMENT)

BOOK I

THE EARLY SYNARCHY MOVEMENT OF EMPIRE

**THE FRENCH REVOLUTION of 1789-1815:
A SYNARCHIST INTERNATIONAL EXERCISE
IN PURGATIVE VIOLENCE**

1.1 THE ORIGINAL MARTINIST CULT OF LYON18

- 1.2 INTRODUCTION**
- 2.2 RELIGIOUS FANATICISM OF THE MARTINIST CULT**
- 3.2 THE Gnostic HERESY AND THE MARTINIST SYNARCHY**
- 4.2 THE CATHARS**
- 5.2 WHAT IS MARTINISM?**
- 6.2 THE CHARACTERISTIC OF LOUIS-CLAUDE DE SAINT-MARTIN.**
- 7.2 THE SOPHISTRY OF "LIBERTE, EGALITE, FRATERNITE."**
- 8.2 MITHRAIC STOICISM.**
- 9.2 HOW CHRISTIANITY REPLACED THE MITHRA CULT**
- 10.2 CHRISTIANS WHO ARE NOT CHRISTIANS**

2.1 CAGLIOSTRO AND THE NECKLACE AFFAIR.51

- 1.2 FRANCE IN 1785**
- 2.2 PROFILING CARDINAL DE ROHAN**
- 3.2 THE STING**
- 4.2 THE DAY OF PURIFICATION**
- 5.2 THE MASTER DECEPTION**
- 6.2 THE UNFOLDING OF THE SCAM**
- 7.2 THE TRIAL**
- 8.2 FROM VANITY TO ASYMMETRICAL WARFARE**

**3.1 THE RHINE-RIVER BORDER POLICY
AND THE EARLY SYNARCHY OF EMPIRE:.....68**

- 1.2 INTRODUCTION**
- 2.2 THE NEW LOTHARENGIAN (CAROLINGIAN) EMPIRE**
- 3.2 THE OATH OF STRASBOURG.**
- 4.2 THE CAPETIAN KINGS PICK UP THE PIECES**
- 5.2 THE DUKES OF BURGUNDY AND THE LOTHARENGIAN EMPIRE**
- 6.2 THE FRENCH REVOLUTION AND THE {ENTENTE BESTIALE}.**
- 7.2 MIRABEAU'S {POLITICAL PHARMACY}**
- 8.2 THE FAVIER PLAN FOR FRANCE, ENGLAND, AND PRUSSIA.**
- 9.2 THE SHOCK OF EUROPE AND THE BATTLE OF VALMY.**
- 10.2 DUMOURIEZ'S BELGIUM EXPERIMENT**
- 11.2 IMPOSING "FRENCH DEMOCRACY" IN WESTPHALIA**
- 12.2 TWO EMPIRES, TWO RESTORATIONS: "DU PAREIL AU MEME."**
- 13.2 THE MISSION OF FRANCE**

4.1 NAPOLEON BONAPARTE: THE MODEL FOR MODERN FASCISM106

- 1.2 THE MODEL FOR MODERN FASCISM.**
- 2.2 THE RELIGIOUS SOURCE OF THE CULT OF NAPOLEON**
- 3.2 THE POLICY OF LOOTING: THE ITALIAN MODEL**
- 4.2 MEET JOSEPH DE MAISTRE THE SOPHIST CULT LEADER**
- 5.2 DE MAISTRE 'S MISSION: REPLACE {AGAPE} BY {INIQUITY}**
- 6.2 LOOKING THROUGH A GLASS DARKLY**
- 7.2 THE POLITICAL RELIGION OF NAPOLEON BONAPARTE**
- 8.2 JULIEN THE APOSTATE AND MITHRAIC STOICISM**
- 9.2 THE GROTTO OF MATROMANIA**
- 10.2 THE MARTINIST ORDER AND BONAPARTE**
- 11.2 MODERN MASONIC ORDER OF MARTINISM AND SYNARCHY**
- 12.2 SYNARCHISTS ON UNIVERSITY CAMPUSES**

5.1 BONAPARTE BEASTMAN OF PROVIDENCE154

- 1.2 JOSEPH DE MAISTRE: A SATANIST GUIDE**
- 2.2 THE DISMEMBERMENT OF THE AUSTRIAN EMPIRE.**
- 3.2 NAPOLEON BONAPARTE: THE "MAN OF PROVIDENCE."**
- 4.2 THE SATANIC FUNCTION OF THE EXECUTIONER**
- 5.2 THE PROSTITUTES OF THE DIRECTOIRE.**
- 6.2 THE CURIOUS POST SCRIPTUM OF BARRAS.**
- 7.2 ROMANTIC ENTHUSIASM VS MORAL ENTHUSIASM:**

6.1 BONAPARTE THE MODERN TORQUEMADA OF186

- 1.2 INTRODUCTION**
- 2.2 THE BRITISH EMPIRE CONTROL OF THE SEAS**
- 3.2 BONAPARTE'S FIXATION WITH GREAT BRITAIN.**
- 4.2 BONAPARTE'S PLAN FOR SPAIN AND PORTUGAL**
- 5.2 THE TALLEYRAND TREASON OF ERFURT.**
- 6.2 THE CLAW OF SATAN**
- 7.2 THE SPANISH BLOODBATH OF THE BEASTMAN BONAPARTE**
- 8.2 THE BLOOD CULT OF {LOS HERMANOS PENITENTES}**
- 9.2 CONCLUSION: HOW RUSSIA VANQUISHED THE BEAST-MAN**

7.1 JOSEPH DE MAISTRE, JACQUES NECKER, AND MALLET DU PAN 216

- 1.2 INTRODUCTION**
- 2.2 THE PROBLEM OF THE BALANCE OF POWERS**
- 3.2 THE NON-EXISTING BRITISH CONSTITUTION**
- 4.2 APPENDIX I. SHORT BIOGRAPHY OF JOSEPH DE MAISTRE**

SYNARCHY MOVEMENT OF EMPIRE

(ICLC DRAFT DOCUMENT)

BOOK II

THE MODERN SYNARCHY MOVEMENT OF EMPIRE

1.1 SAINT YVES D'ALVEYDRE: THE SYNARCHIST OF A ONE-WORLD EMPIRE...9

1.2 INTRODUCTION

2.2 AGAINST THE PEACE OF WESTPHALIA AND AMERICA

3.2 A SYNARCHIST CONSTITUTION FOR EUROPE

4.2 SYNARCHIST ALLIANCE AGAINST ISLAM AND THE "TARTARS"

5.2 THE EXCLUSION OF ISLAM

6.2 SAINT-YVES D'ALVEYDRE, A VICTIM OF BIPOLARITY

7.2 THE HATRED OF PLATO AND OF {AGAPE}

8.2 ATTEMPT AT DESTROYNG THE SUBLIMITY OF JEANNE D'ARC

9.2 WHY THE STRAUSSIANS HATE JEANNE D'ARC

10.2 THE CREATION OF THE {ORDRE MARTINISTE ET SYNARCHIQUE}

11.2 THE ORIGIN OF THE SYNARCHY DOCTRINE

12.2 EISENHOWER INVITED TO HEAD THE AMERICAN SYNARCHY.

2.1 HOW LEIBNIZ PROVED D'ALVEYDRE WRONG 200 YEARS BEFORE HE WAS BORN.....39

- 1.2 LEIBNIZ AND THE PURSUIT OF HAPPINESS**
- 2.2 THE DUKE OF ORLEANS DEPLOYMENT AGAINST LEIBNIZ.**
- 3.2 HOW JOHN LAW FAILED AGAINST LEIBNIZ**

3.1 FAILED ATTEMPTS AT DESTROYING THE THIRD REPUBLIC52

- 1.2 THE LEFT-RIGHT FRENCH FASCIST SYSTEM**
- 2.2 THE FAILED COUP OF BEAST-MAN BOULANGER (1889)**
- 3.2 LEFT AND RIGHT OPERATIONS .**
- 4.2 THE FRENCH INVASION OF THE RHUR (1923-1930)**
- 5.2 THE FAILED COUP OF BEASTMAN LAROCQUE (1934).**
- 6.2 HOW DE GAULLE FOUGHT THE SYNARCHY**
- 7.2 DE GAULLE'S PARADOX OF {ASSAULT ARTILLERY}.**
- 8.2 THE BATTLE OF FRANCE**
- 9.2 THE WOMEN BEHIND THE FASCIST COUP OF 1940.**
- 10.2 A SUBLIME MOMENT TURNS TO TRAGEDY.**
- 11.2 THE SINKING OF THE FRENCH FLEET (1940)**

4.1 THE UNTOLD STORY OF HOW THE SYNARCHY SABOTAGED THE FRENCH MILITARY AND SET UP THE INVASION OF FRANCE, IN 1940.107

- 1.2 INTRODUCTION: THE HISTORICAL ANOMALY**
- 2.2 THE LEIBNIZIAN PRINCIPLE OF PROPORTIONALITY:**
- 3.2 THE GENOCIDAL POLICY OF NATIONAL DEFENSE**
- 4.2 PURGE OF THE REPUBLICAN ELITE.**
- 5.2 GEOPOLITICAL SELECTION OF BATTLE UNITS**
- 6.2 THE PHONY BATTLE OF FLANDERS (May 10 to May 16, 1940)**
- 7.2 HOW THE BATTLE OF FLANDERS WAS RIGGED.**
- 8.2 POLITICAL AND DEMOGRAPHIC FACTORS OF THE RETREAT**

5.1 HOW THE SYNARCHY DESTROYED THE THIRD REPUBLIC.....127

- 1.2 PIERRE LAVAL: SYNARCHIST BEASTMAN OF VICHY**
- 2.2 HOW THE SYNARCHY BANKERS PLAYED PIERRE LAVAL**
- 3.2 HOW PIERRE LAVAL CAME TO POWER**
- 4.2 THE DESTRUCTION OF THE THIRD REPUBLIC (JULY 9-10, 1940)**
- 5.2 VICHY COLLABORATION WITH THE AMERICANS (1941)**
- 6.2 THE FLANK OF SAINT-PIERRE ET MIQUELON**
- 7.2 LAVAL RETURNS TO POWER (APRIL 1942)**
- 8.2 BANQUE WORMS AND THE INVASION OF NORTH-AFRICA**

6.1 ORDRE NOUVEAU: THE DOMINICAN FASCIST YOUTH MOVEMENT162

- 1.2 INTRODUCTION**
- 2.2 THE UNITED FRONT OF THE EUROPEAN YOUTH**
- 3.2 WHERE THE YOUTH WERE RECRUITED FROM**
- 4.2 THE SCHOOL OF THE CHATEAU DE LA FAUCONNIERE**
- 5.2 THE URIAGE CADRE SCHOOL AND THE KNIGHT-MONKS**
- 6.2 BEHAVIOR MODIFICATION**
- 7.2 ALEXANDER MARC-LIPIANSKY AND THE DOGS OF GOD.**
- 8.2 ORDRE NOUVEAU AND PERSONALISM**
- 9.2 HOW THE DOMINICANS CREATED FRENCH FASCISM**
- 10.2 ALEXANDER MARC LIPIANSKY'S LETTER TO HITLER**
- 11.2 THE GERMAN YOUTH MOVEMENT OF GEGNER.**
- 12.2 THE BOURBAKI HOAX**
- 13.2 THE MARCH 1924 SPECULATION OF THE FRENCH FRANC**
- 14.2 THE ASSASSINATION OF DIMITRI NAVACHINE**
- 15.2 ANDRE WEIL AND MATHEMATICAL BRAINWASHING**
- 16.2 CONCLUSION.**

7.1 THE SYNARCHIST POLITICS OF TERRORISM.....205

- 1.2 BONALD AND MAISTRE ULTRAMONTANISM**
- 2.2 THE BIPOLAR DISORDER OF THE {TWO SOULS}.**
- 3.2 THE DUPLICITY OF THE BIPOLAR PERSONALITY DISORDER**
- 4.2 MAISTRE AND BATAILLE: THE POLITICS OF EXTREMES**
- 5.2 PERVERSION OF CHRISTIANITY AND OF SOVEREIGNTY**
- 6.2 THE ACEPHALE SECRET SOCIETY**

SYNARCHY MOVEMENT OF EMPIRE

(ICLC DRAFT DOCUMENT)

BOOK III

THE SYNARCHY INTERNATIONAL

1.1 HOW THE SYNARCHY RAN THE SPANISH CIVIL WAR.....7

1.2 INTRODUCTION

2.2 THE SPANISH CONSERVATIVE REVOLUTION.

3.2 THE POLITICAL BACKGROUND OF THE SPANISH CIVIL WAR.

4.2 HOW THE SPANISH SECOND REPUBLIC WAS DESTROYED

5.2 THE SYNARCHIST LOOTING OF SPANISH RAW MATERIALS.

6.2 THE CONDOR LEGION OF HITLER IN SPAIN : 1936

7.2 THE NAZI SLAUGHTER OF GUERNICA : APRIL 1937.

8.2 THE SYNARCHIST-ANARCHIST EXPERIMENT: MAY 1937.

9.2 THE AMBASSADOR'S REPORT TO WASHINGTON.

10.2 ANNEX : THE TANAKA PLAN AND THE BEAST-MAN OF JAPAN

2.1 FRENCH SYNARCHIST CONSTITUTION.....67

1.2 THE DEFECTS OF THE FRENCH CONSTITUTIONS

2.2 BOUNDARY CONDITIONS OF A NATION-STATE

3.2 THE POLITICAL FUNCTION OF REPRESENTATION

4.2 MAURRAS AND THE IDEOLOGY OF VICHY

5.2 A GLIMMER OF LIGHT AFTER THE MERRY-GO-ROUND

3.1 FAILURE OF THE SYNARCHY EUROPEAN CONSTITUTION.....85

1.2 WHY THERE COULD NOT HAVE BEEN A VICHY CONSTITUTION

2.2 THE NEW SYNARCHIST EUROPEAN CONSTITUTION

3.2 HOW OLYMPIAN GODS THREATEN TO DROWN EUROPE.

4.2 THE FALSE UNDERLYING ASSUMPTION OF SYNARCHISM

4.1 SOME FRENCH SYNARCHIST ACTIVITIES AFTER WORLD WAR II...105

- 1.2 RESEAU VOLTAIRE**
- 2.2 CURRENT SYNARCHIST, THEOCRATIC, AND ARISTOCRATIC FAMILY GROUPS OF FRANCE.**
- 3.2 THE SYNARCHY INTERFACE WITH FLQ TERRORISTS.**
- 4.2 COMMUNISTS, ANARCHISTS, AND ENARCHISTS.**
- 5.2 CONCLUSION**

5.1 THE SYNARCHY INTERNATIONAL ANTI-AMERICAN POLICY115

by Irene and Pierre Beaudry

- 1.2 RADICAL EUROPEAN SOURCE OF ANTI-AMERICANISM**
- 2.2 JEAN THIRIART AND LUC MICHEL OF THE PARTI COMMUNAUTAIRE NATIONAL (PCN), OR EUROPEAN COMMUNITARIAN PARTY.**
- 3.2 BERNARD ANTONY OF CHRETIENTE ET SOLIDARITE**
- 4.2 CHISTIAN BOUCHET OF NOUVELLE RESISTANCE.**
- 5.2 THE OAS ASSASSINS OF DE GAULLE AND THE FRONT NATIONAL**
- 6.2 BLAS PINAR'S FRIENDS IN FRANCE**
- 7.2 THE INTERFACE WITH SPAIN**
- 8.2 SYNARCHIST NAZI-COMMUNIST JEAN-FRANCOIS THIRIART: A DELPHIC MODEL FOR LAROUCHE'S EURASIAN POLICY**
- 9.2 GEOPOLITICS OF THE FOURTH REICH.**
- 10.2 A REVIVAL OF {MITHRAIC STOICISM}: THE PURE EVIL OF POWER**

6.1 MAKARENKO AND THE BIPOLAR PERSONALITY.....164

by Irène Beaudry

- 1.2 DE TE FABULA NARRATUR**
- 2.2 THE GORKY COLONY**
- 3.2 THE CREATION OF CAPOS**
- 4.2 REPLACING COLLECTIVE CONTROL BY WILLING NATURE**
- 5.2 TREAT ANIMALS AS HUMAN BEINGS**
- 6.2 IN CONCLUSION**

SYNARCHY MOVEMENT OF EMPIRE

(ICLC DRAFT DOCUMENT)

BOOK IV

THE MENNEVEE DOCUMENTS ON THE SYNARCHY

1.1 THE SYNARCHIST MOVEMENT OF EMPIRE (S. M. E.).....10

1.2 COMITE SECRET D'ACTION REVOLUTIONAIRE (C.S.A.R.)

2.2 PREPARATIONS FOR THE COUNTER-REVOLUTION

3.2 SYNARCHY RECRUITING FRENCH FASCIST CADRE

4.2 THE C.S.A.R. TAKING OVER OF THE STATE

5.2 THE FRENCH PHALANGE OF ABBE GEORGES DE NANTES

6.2 A TIME-LINE OF THE C.S.A.R. ACTIVITIES

7.2 SABOTAGE OF THE REPUBLICAN INSTITUTIONS BY THE C.S.A.R.

8.2 THE FAILED LYAUTEY COUP D'ETAT OF 1928

9.2 THE FAILED LAROCQUE COUP OF 1934.

10.2 THE FAILED PUTCH OF THE CAGOULE IN 1937

11.2 CURRENT SYNARCHIST ACTIVITIES IN FRANCE, SPAIN, AND ITALY

**2.1 THE BRITISH FABIAN SOCIETY CONTROL OF FRENCH SOCIAL REFORMS
AND THE LAZARD-ROTHSCHILD INTERNATIONAL BANKING CARTEL. ...46**

1.2 SATANIC {HERMENEUTICS} VERSUS {MAIEUTICS}.

2.2 BRITISH FABIAN SOCIETY RUN THE JULY 9TH PLAN OF 1934

3.2 LAZARD FRERES BANK CONTROL OF FRENCH FINANCES.

4.2 LAZARD TAKE OVER BANQUE DE PARIS ET PAYS-BAS.

5.2 BRITISH LAZARD BROTHERS LEVERAGE OVER FRANCE

**6.2 HOW THE ROTHSCHILD BROTHERS AND THE LAZARD BROTHERS
FORMED AN INTERNATIONAL FINANCIER-FAMILY CARTEL MODELED
ON THE DUTCH AND BRITISH EAST INDIA COMPANY.**

3.1 JOSEPH RETINGER: SYNARCHIST FOUNDER OF THE BILDERBERG GROUP AND OF THE EUROPEAN UNION.....65

- 1.2 INTRODUCTION**
- 2.2 HOW DE GAULLE FRUSTRATED THE BILDERBERGERS**
- 3.2 JOSEPH HIERONIM RETINGER (1888-1960)**
- 4.2 RETINGER'S PRE-BILDERBERG PERIOD**
- 5.2 RETINGER IS GROOMED AS A RIGHT WING ARISTOCRAT (1909)**
- 6.2 RETINGER GROOMED AS LEFT-WING LABOR ORGANIZER (1919)**
- 7.2 RETINGER IN US JAIL FOR THREE MONTHS (1922)**
- 8.2 RETINGER LAUNCHES THE EUROPEAN UNION (1924)**
- 9.2 THE HITLER-CHURCHILL DUNKIRK DEAL (1940)**
- 10.2 RETINGER SENT INTO OCCUPIED POLAND BY S.O.E. (1943)**
- 11.2 RETINGER IS SUPPORTED BY AVERELL HARRIMAN (1946)**
- 12.2 RETINGER ORGANIZED CCF GROUPS WITH CIA FUNDS (1948)**
- 13.2 COMMITTEE ON A UNITED EUROPE (1949)**
- 14.2 MENNEVEE LISTS OF BILDERBERGERS**
- 15.2 HOW THE BILDERBERG GROUP CONTROLLED NATO**
- 16.2 CHARLES DE GAULLE'S MEMORANDUM ON NATO.**
- 17.2 "PERFIDIOUS ALBION"**
- 18.2 THE BILDERBERG GLOBALIZATION WORLD ORDER DELUSION**

4.1 GEORGE BALL AND THE BEASTMAN POLICY OF OUTSOURCING.....104

- 1.2 DENATIONALIZATION OF BUSINESS.**
- 2.2 GLOBALIZATION: THE NEW NAME FOR A COLONIAL EMPIRE**
- 3.2 AMERICA VERSUS EUROPE**
- 4.2 THE OBSTRUCTION OF THE AMERICAN CONSTITUTION**
- 5.2 TRANSFERING POWER FROM NATION TO BUSINESS.**
- 6.2 A SUPRANATIONAL CODE OF LAW FOR WORLD COMPANIES**

5.1 THE CURSE OF OTTO SKORZENY.....114

- 1.2 INTRODUCTION**
- 2.2 RETOOLING OF BEASTMAN SKORZENY**
- 3.2 THE ARGENTINE IMPORT-EXPORT OF NAZI BUSINESS.**
- 4.2 SCHACHT AND SKORZENY IN SPAIN.**
- 5.2 THE ANOMALY OF THE BEAST-MAN-DEMON OF WAR.**

APPENDIX I

**{THE SYNARCHIST MOVEMENT OF EMPIRE (S.M.E.) and THE
REVOLUTIONARY SYNARCHIST PACT (R.S.P.) linking the French
affiliates}. by Robert Husson, in {La France Interieure}, no.29, February 15,
1945.127**

SUMMARY

- I THE THREE TYPES OF SECRET SOCIETY**
- II THE S.M.E. A FEW PAGES OF ITS SECRET HISTORY**
- III THE SYNARCHIST PACT DOCUMENT**
- IV THE SYNARCHIST ORGANISATION OF NATIONS**
- V THE SURVIVING HOPES OF SYNARCHY.**

ADDENDUM: WHO'S WHO IN THE JEAN COUTROT SYNARCHY

APPENDIX II

{THE LAZARD FRERES BANK AND THE BATTLE OF THE SYNARCHIES}, by Roger Mennevee, in {THE POLITICAL, DIPLOMATIC AND FINANCIAL DOCUMENTS}, Paris, 1954. (Excerpts.).....187

1.1 THE BANKING HOUSE OF LAZARD FRERES AND CO. OF PARIS

- I- THE GROWTH OF THE LAZARD BANK-PARIS AND ITS ROLE IN THE CURRENCY CRISIS OF THE FRANC, (1924-1926).**
- II- THE LAZARD BANK AND THE FOREIGN FINANCIAL OPERATIONS OF THE FRENCH GOVERNMENT, (1926-1939).**
- III- DEVELOPMENT OF THE LAZARD-FRERES PARTICIPATION, FORMATION OF THE "DIRECTORIAL TEAM."**
- IV- CURRENT SITUATION OF LAZARD-PARIS, (1954).**

END

SYNARCHY MOVEMENT OF EMPIRE

BOOK I

Chapter I

CHAPTER 1

THE EARLY SYNARCHY MOVEMENT OF EMPIRE

**THE FRENCH REVOLUTION of 1789-1815:
A SYNARCHIST INTERNATIONAL EXERCISE
IN PURGATIVE VIOLENCE**

1.1 THE ORIGINAL MARTINIST CULT OF LYON

- 1.2 INTRODUCTION**
- 2.2 RELIGIOUS FANATICISM OF THE MARTINIST CULT**
- 3.2 THE Gnostic HERESY AND THE MARTINIST SYNARCHY**
- 4.2 THE CATHARS**
- 5.2 WHAT IS MARTINISM?**
- 6.2 THE SOPHISTRY OF "LIBERTE, EGALITE, FRATERNITE."**
- 7.2 MITHRAIC STOICISM.**
- 8.2 CHRISTIANS WHO ARE NOT CHRISTIANS**

1.2 INTRODUCTION

As Lyndon LaRouche reported, the French Revolution, from 1789 until 1815, had been run by the synarchist freemasonic order of Martinism, and was used as the Venetian "stiletto" of Lord Shelbourne and the East India Company in order to prevent the French population from establishing a Republican nation-State following the model of the American Revolution. This author has reported previously on how Lord Shelbourne and Jeremy Bentham had used the freemasonic assets, such as Jacques Necker and the Duke of Orleans, Philippe "Egalite" to set up the coup of the Bastille of 1789. (See EIR articles on {Jean Sylvain Bailly,...}) This present report on the Martinist leadership of Count Joseph de Maistre and of Count de Cagliostro, will complete the picture and show how this British run Synarchy maintained an uninterrupted continuity of control over the policy of the French Convention of Danton, Marat, Robespierre, Mirabeau, and Dumouriez, as well as the war policy of the Directoire all the way to the end Napoleon Bonaparte's Empire, in 1815. These Martinist Masonic assets were in regular and constant touch with their London counterparts of the British secret service.

The following pages shall develop three main aspects of the Martinist freemasonic order. The first general aspect of this cult pertains to the quasi-Christian Aristotelian eruptions of pseudo-knowledge, known in its crude form as a Gnostic-Manichean Cathar Cult of {blood and soil}, whose revival in the 18th century, originally gave birth to Martinism, and whose specific characteristic of Satanic worshipping gave birth to the Beastmen of the French Revolution, the first politically organized terrorist {Children of Satan}, known as the Terror. The second aspect relates more specifically to the source of religious terrorism of the 18th century French Enlightenment centered essentially around the writings of Claude de Saint Martin and Joseph de Maistre, both of whom represented themselves as Delphic expressions of {Christian Spiritual exercises}. The third aspect of Martinism, deals with the modern form of Theocratic and Emporocratic Synarchy design of Saint-Yves d'Alveydre, which was nothing else but an explicite attack against the Peace of Westphalia and of its governing physical principle of the *{Advantage of the other}*, as well as an attack against the

American form of a Constitutional Republic, and against Islam.

One of the most important discoveries that one can make, with respect to the principle of the Peace of Westphalia of 1648, is to discover the crucial difference between a true Christian and a Martinist. This can be done with the help of the pedagogical experiment of Saint Paul, in I, Corinthian, 13. What Paul says is that the most important Christian virtue is not Faith, it is not Hope, but it is **{Agape}**; that is **{Love of Mankind}**.

Then, the apostle adds that when you attempt to relive the discovery of that most fundamental Christian principle, you make the discovery of something that you see "**{As if you were looking through a glass darkly.}**" This means that a true Christian discovers the optimistic moment of distinguishing that quality, through the redemption of Christ, that is, where one's self interest lies entirely in the **{Advantage of the other}**. On the other hand, what a Martinist sees, in such an experiment, is the magic moment of distinguishing himself as an elite, distinct from the rest of humanity, and of seeing himself, as if in a flash of illumination, as a leader who is given the opportunity of taking **{advantage of the other}**.

2.2 THE RELIGIOUS FANATICISM OF THE MARTINIST CULT

If someone wishes to discover the cause of the occurrence of religious terrorist-cults endangering civilization today, the first place they must look into is Gnosticism and its different offshoots. During the so-called religious war period that engulfed Europe from the time of the **{purgative violence}** of executioner, Thomas Torquemada and his expulsion of the Jews, in 1492, to the Peace of Westphalia, in 1648, religious conflicts had become the fuel for warfare, which had been orchestrated systematically by the Venetian controlled Habsbourg Empire from both Austria and Spain. Those differences, however, were not significant enough to keep a war going for a thousand years.

During the 1648-1789 period of relative peace on the Continent of Europe, religious cults, outside of the Catholic-Protestant denominations, were being organized in and around freemasonic secret societies, representing a variety of

Gnostic, quasi-Judeo-Christian Cathars, and straight pagan cults, which were directly involved in launching the violence of the French Revolution and have represented an explicit danger to the progress of European western civilization, and specifically a threat to the continuation of the Constitutional Republic of the United States up until today.

It is such a Gnostic-Roman Empire type of resurgence, represented by the neo-Cathar Martinist order, in alliance with the commercial banking families such as the Barrings commercial banks, Lazard Freres and the Rothschild family interests, and so forth, which are still at the heart of world terrorism today, much in the same manner that the Mitra cult and the Venetian banking families did, in fueling European religious warfare during of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. This Gnostic threat represents much more profound differences with Christianity than did the Catholic-Protestant conflicts of the so-called European religious wars. The current oligarchy, just as their predecessors of the past two thousand years, consider that Christianity has been an unjust usurpation of the classical tradition of Rome, a crime of *{lese majesty}* to the authority of the Empire.

Instead of regarding the Italian Renaissance as a great achievement in the progress in Christian civilization, as it truly was, the imperialist faction of European oligarchy saw the great breakthrough of Nicholas of Cusa, and the subsequent emergence of the nation state under Louis XI of France and of Henry VII of England, as the greatest setback for the tradition of the indivisible authority of Rome and its "Pax Romana," primarily because it represented the emergence of a new set of laws based on fostering the common good and the general welfare of all of the people. <note> (Louis XI, inspired by the sublime actions of Jeanne d'Arc, had established a policy of general education of the common people and a form of government based on "common consent." That was the reason Louis XI had established for his own son, in the *{Rosiere de Guerres}*, a republican Monarchy, whereby the King would be elected by the "common consent" of his peers, along the lines of a concept of "legitimate authority arising from elective concordance" that Nicholas of Cusa had established in his *{Concordancia Catholica}*. The King then became the first among equals. This was the first and only national policy orientation proclaimed in France for the benefit of the other before 1648. This was a total revolution and in total opposition to the Gnostic authority of Roman Emperor Julian who considered that Christianity was a

religion created for slaves, poor people and ignorant masses.

It is for that reason that a number of pseudo-religious institutions were created during the 1789 to 1815 period of the French Revolution, and developed different forms of synthetic imitations of Christianity, whose {Gnostic characteristic} were used to launch the terrorism of the Bastille, of the Terror, and of the first modern fascist Empire of the Beast-Man, Napoleon Bonaparte, as a military warfare capability against Nation States.

The best way to guard against any such effective resurgence of {politicized religious cults}, exemplified by the Phrygian cults of the Cathars variety, and by the Martinist cult in particular, is to educate the citizenry as to the fallacy of composition that these synthetic cults represent, and by exposing the fraudulent epistemological character that Martinism espouses by comparison with true ecumenical Christian institutions of peace in existence today. It is not enough to simply denounce them as evil, but one must understand their epistemological makeup, in order to be able to fight them more effectively. Unless you know your enemy, you cannot win against him. The fundamental ecumenical characterization to be tested, from the vantagepoint of education and political application, is predominantly the question of the distinction between {Man and beast}, as an application of the fundamental principle of {man created in the image of God,} but viewed, here, from the standpoint of the principle of Westphalia.

3.2 THE GNOSTIC HERESY AND THE MARTINIST SYNARCHY.

From the very beginning of Christianity, the Gnostics, or those who called themselves of a "different opinion," than the Christians, began a systematic opposition to the apostles, and adopted an "elitist view" against the general teaching of the Gospel. They were of the opinion that the dogmas of the Gospel were good for the common people, but that the superior minds and the ruling oligarchy required a "secret doctrine" which was reserved for the elite. The mysteries of Christianity were then to be transformed back into the mysteries of Eleusis, what was otherwise termed the {gnosis}, the secret knowledge of the elite, which was, in fact, a compendium of cosmogonical and theosophical rehash

of the old pagan religions of the Orient, that the so-called "neo-Platonic" school of Alexandria had adopted as the basis for their theory of illumination, called **{emanation}**.

This doctrine of **{emanation}** became the basis for all of the heresies against the Catholic Church from the very beginning of Christianity until today. The principal early authors were Simon the Magician, Irenee of Lyon, Hyppolyte of Rome, Tertullien of Carthage, Clement of Alexandria, and his disciple Origene.

The doctrine of **{emanation}** established that all beings had come out, and continue to come out of God, without diminishing Him, or without weakening Him, precisely in the manner in which the rays of the Sun emanate from that star, without reducing its power, a variation on the doctrine of the Sun god Apollo. However

, the more the emanated creatures were moving away from the divine source of light, the more they became imperfect and corrupt. The closer to matter, the more evil they were becoming. Consequently, the more those creatures desired to become **{reintegrated}** into their original status of perfection, what the founder of Martinism, Martinez de Pasqually, called **{Reintegration of Beings in their Original Virtues, Powers and Qualities}**, the more they had to combat against the evil forces.

The most ancient form of such an emanation doctrine comes from Zoroastre, in Persia, who substituted the divine principle by the material power of the stars from which emanated good and evil, spirit and matter, which were incarnated respectively by the power of light, {Ormuzd}, and the power of darkness, {Ahriman}. The same doctrine, with the same universal characteristic of emanation, are found in certain traditional Hindu sects, in the Jewish Cabala, in the ancient Egyptian mythology of Hermes Trismegiste, as well as the Neo-Platonist school of Plotinus, and similar Gnostics. The hermetic writings of Hermes Trismegiste, for example, were given as revelations, not discoveries, and they presupposed an intimate personal relationship to God, which then established the initiate into a sort of privileged position with respect to the world. If ever someone asks you if you have a "personal relationship to God", beware, you are being challenged to become a Gnostic.

The founders of Martinism, Martinez de Pasqually, and Louis Claude de Saint Martin, were direct sycophants of this emanation doctrine. During the French Revolution, Martinist Magician, Mesmer, whom both Benjamin Franklin and Jean Sylvain Bailly had denounced as a charlatan, attributed the emanation powers to celestial and animal magnetism.

4.2 THE CATHARS

Martinism actually originated in the Gnostic cult of Manicheism called Cathar, which, during the 12th and 13th century, identified their members as the "pure" people, the selected few, who believed in the ancient heresy of the duality of the world based on the cyclical fight between the God of goodness (Light of God) and the God of evil (Darkness of Satan). This was the most important form of Christian heresy that had been fought systematically and successfully by Saint Augustin and the original fathers of the Church.

The Cathar priests were known as the {perfects} who claimed to attain trance-like states of nirvana, or impersonal states, by inducing themselves and their initiates into what Aristotle had called {catharsis}, which is a state of trance induced by some unnatural repetitive motion, or breathing in some unnatural position, or induced by scenes of repetitive violence. The term was first coined by Aristotle to identify the effect of a "state of purification" brought about by means of dramatic and violent scenes.

Certain Byzantine forms of ascetic practices, linked to Greek hermits of the 11th century led to the so-called vision of the "divine light" of God. In the solitary retreat of a cave, the hesychast, otherwise known as an {omphalospsychic}, would say the "Jesus prayer" in a bent position with chin down on his chest and staring at his omphalos, repeating unceasingly "{Lord Jesus, Son of God, have pity on us!}" While reciting the prayer, and controlling his breath in a rhythmic fashion, inhaling on {Lord Jesus}, holding back his breath on {Son of God} and exhaling

on {have pity on us}, the hesychast would suddenly experience an ineffable sensation of felicity and would find himself enveloped with a powerful "supernatural" white light, and thus, experiment a "vision of God," somewhat like the witnesses who contemplated the transfiguration of Christ on Mount Tabor. The difference, however, is that the hesychast had induced himself onto hyperventilation, and was about to lose all consciousness.

The Cathars were originally imported into southern France, in the Languedoc region, from Bulgaria where was spawned the cult of the Bogomils, otherwise known as the {Buggers}, a radical religious cult that rejected procreation as dirty and sinful, but vented their sexual impulses on each other. They had networks all across Europe, in France, Germany, Italy, Bosnia, Croatia, Bulgaria and Switzerland. In France, the cult had been organized around the estates of the Duke of Toulouse, during the Papacy of Innocent III (1198-1216). The Cathars began to be chased out of France by the local Catholic communities, around 1204, at the Montsegur fortress-temple, which their members claim to have used as a refuge for the Holy Grail. There are close affinities between the Cathars, the Sufis, the Cabalists, or any other sort of {blood and soil} cult. The fanatical Gnostic Cathars resisted until 1244, when Montsegur was taken and most of their followers committed suicide by throwing themselves from the walls.

The Cathar tradition, however, lived on among the Templars and different secret societies throughout the ages. During the French Revolution, Martinists such as Joseph de Maistre of Savoy, and Fabre d'Olivet of the Languedoc, and Cagliostro of Italy, were the more notorious. During the nineteenth century, one of the most active Martinist Cathar leaders was Charles Nodier who became the grand Master of the highly controversial {Priore de Sion}, a notorious {blood and soil} cult, which circulated the heresy that Christ did not die on the cross, but escaped with Marie Magdalene, and gave birth to the dynasty of the Habsbourg Emperors. Most of the so-called classic French cultural elites of that period, such as, Victor Hugo, Honore de Balzac, Alexandre Dumas Son, Delacroix, Gerard de Nerval, etc., were members of that Martinist Cathar cult.

A reasonable person might think that such a myth is so unbelievable that its exaggeration alone should keep people away, however, this is not the case for the Martinists. Martinists believe that it is precisely because myths are "unreasonable" that they attract people. They assume that the common people will always be

attracted because they love to indulge in diversions, which are unreasonable. This is one of the most important lures that the Martinists have been using in their arsenal of lies, and this is the key issue that synarchist, Alexander Kojeve, the close collaborator of Leo Strauss, brought up to the attention of Leo Strauss about {Roman Emperor Julian and his art of writing}. Kojeve based his argument on the underlying assumption that since "the very appearance of truth is totally relative in most of the theological myths," the common people will believe in them precisely because falsity can be made attractive when it is dressed up in some kind of attractive form. So, following in the footsteps of Satanist Emperor Julian, Kojeve peddled the perversion that, in matters of theology, "most human beings should firmly believe in things that are perfectly unbelievable."

This is why the Art of Julian the Apostate and the art of the Straussians are based on the art of lying. As Kojeve put it "Practically speaking, the ancient art that Leo Strauss has rediscovered consists in writing approximately the opposite of what he believes, in order to camouflage what is being said." (Alexandre Kojeve, *{L'Empereur Julien et Son Art d'Ecrire}*, Fourbis, 1990.) This is how the current Children of Satan in the Bush-Cheney administration functions in the United States today. I shall come back on this point later.

Aside from the kookier side of this {blood and soil} cult, there are certain features of their belief structure, which are important to examine, especially from the standpoint of their claim to a Neo-Platonic form of epistemology. Again, remember that if you don't know any better, and you are disposed to believe in this nonsense, you are a prime target for Satanists. Think twice about it, because, if it walks like a Christian, talks like a Christian, and looks like a Christian, it may just be precisely the opposite of a Christian. The best disguise of Satan is to dress- up as a priest.

5.2 WHAT IS MARTINISM?

During the period leading to the French Revolution, there were 282 masonic lodges in France, including 81 lodges of the Grand Orient in Paris alone, 16 in Lyon, 10 in Toulouse, 10 in Montpellier, 10 in Bordeaux, and 6 in Marseille.

The Martinist Order was founded in Lyon France, based on the "philosophy" of four of the most important Masonic cult leaders of the eighteenth century, Martinez de Pasqually, Louis Claude de Saint-Martin, Jean-Baptiste Willermoz, and Joseph de Maistre. Although Maistre was not a founding member of Martinism, his participation in the original founding period, created in Lyon by the three others, made him one of the most important elements of this original leadership.

The {Martinist Order}, defined {Martinism} in the following manner:

"{First of all, {What is Martinism?} It is a system of philosophic thought, essentially Christian in outlook and tradition, which is chiefly based on the doctrinal tenets of a work called: {Treatise on the Reintegration of Beings in their Original Virtues, Powers and Qualities}, by a Frenchman of Spanish extraction named, Martinez Pasquales. This work gives a particular interpretation of Creation, of the Hierarchy of Beings, the Fall of Man and the way for Man to regain his original status in the scheme of things...so as to be re-established in his initial privileges. Martinez Pasquales considers Man to be in exile in this earthly existence, deprived of his powers. Man's main aim must be, therefore, to work at becoming restored to the condition that was his originally. This he can achieve by following a certain technique which constitutes the secret part of Martinez' doctrine. This technique was taught to him in the Temples of a secret society founded by him: **{The Order of Elus-Cohen}, or elect Priests, from the ranks of high degree freemasons.**}"

The founding principle is presented as Christian in outlook, and Catholic in tradition, but is, in fact, Gnostic in essence, that is, dominated by what should be called {Mithraic Stoicism}, or more explicitly, Sado-Masochistic initiations, which include human sacrifice rituals.

Martinez De Pasqually (1727-1774) first created the {Martinist Order} around 1754, in Lyon France. Pasqually had been also the founder of the "{Ordre des Chevaliers Masons Elus Cohen de l'Univers}," a Jewish Cabalistic secret society whose doctrine was expounded in a book entitled {The Reintegration of Beings in their Original Virtues, powers and Qualities}, reportedly a 'pseudo-commentary' on the {Pentateuch}.

"Louis Claude de Saint Martin (1743-1803) was initiated into Pasqually's

{ELU COHEN} in October 1768, by Baudry de Balzac, and towards the end of 1770, he became Martinez de Pasqually's personal secretary. Saint Martin's contribution to Martinism was to emphasize the "Inner Way", through which one can find the Essence of the universe as {oneself}. The entire doctrine is self-centered in such a way that every man can perceive the Life Substance behind the universe as {Himself}. Just to show how much Saint Martin's interest of "Man" is really the interest of "Me," this quote: "Man is the only true witness and positive sign by which the Supreme Universal Source may be known. Man should sound the depths of his {own} being, and affirm the sublimity of his {own} essence, if he would demonstrate the Divine Essence, for there is nothing else in the world that can do it, directly." This is the process by which you become God, the same idea that the Archangel Satan had before the fall. This self-centering process is also a reflection of a most important influence on Saint Martin, which came from the German occultist of the 17th century, Jacob Boehme.

After de Pasqually's death, Saint Martin tried to convert the {Elus Cohen} to his personal blend of Christian mysticism, but failed to convert the rite, and decided to leave the order. Meanwhile, he published several works. His first book has been published in 1775, {Des Erreurs et de la Verite} (Of Errors and Truth); {l'Homme de Desir}, Lyon, 1790; {Ecce Homo}, 1792; {Le Nouvel Homme}, 1792; {Le Ministere de l'Homme-Esprit}, 1802. It is not certain that Saint Martin founded an order of any kind, however, there's some evidence found in private correspondences, in which one finds references to the existence of a group called the {Society of Initiates}, founded in 1785 by Jean-Baptiste Willermoz.

6.2 THE CHARACTERISTIC OF LOUIS-CLAUDE DE SAINT-MARTIN.

The following report is based on a brief biography that Papus wrote in {*Louis-Claude de Saint Martin*}, Bibliotheque Chacornac, Paris, 1902. Claude de Saint Martin ((1743-1803), was the co-founder of the Martinist Order with Martinez de Pasqually (1710-1774), and Jean Baptiste Willermoz. He was a self-proclaimed "Christian Neo-Platonist philosopher" who claimed to represent a current of {Mystical Illumination}, putting the emphasis on the {inner way} of reestablishing the original state of man before the original fall. He liked to call himself and be recognized among his peers as the "Unknown Philosopher."

After his college years, Saint Martin studied law and became a Court Lawyer in Tours. He soon quit the Law profession to join the military where he was promoted lieutenant in the Regiment of Foix. His new position gave him a lot of leisure to read and meditate. Saint Martin befriended an officer of his regiment, M. de Grainville, who introduced him to the occult society of Martinez de Pasqually. In April of 1771, Baudry de Balzac initiated Saint Martin who received simultaneously the three grades of Elus Cohen. During the same year, he resigned from the military and moved to Bordeaux to become the secretary of Pasqually. This is when Saint Martin began a correspondence with Willermoz, the leader of the Elus Cohen of Lyon. By April 17, 1772, Saint Martin was initiated in the Rose Croix.

On September 10, 1773, Saint Martin travels to Lyon and meets with J. B. Willermoz for the first time. In October 1774, Saint Martin met with an "Unknown Agent," in Lyon. This "Unknown Agent" was a British agent of Shelburne who had traveled to Lyon to set up the Coup of the Bastille and the demise of Louis XVI and Marie Antoinette with the "necklace affair." Saint Martin traveled several times to meet with the Lyon MARTINISTS of Willermoz, and lived in Lyon for a period of two years before returning to his home base in Bordeaux, to work with Abbe Fournier, from 1775-1776. In June-July of 1776, Saint Martin refused the proposals of a "personne considerable" (Madame de La Croix?), and traveled to Toulouse with Fournier. By 1778, he was in Paris with Prince de Luzignan, and often traveled to Versailles. The most active members of the Lyon Martinist order at that time were: Willermoz, Saint Martin, Hauterive, Grainville, and Lavallette de Langes.

On December 18, 1780, Saint Martin warned all of the Martinists that Madame Maréchal de Noailles was spying on him, that he had been discovered as the "Unknown Philosopher", and called for all "precautions to be taken to prevent her from reaching whom she had discovered." Saint Martin went into hiding for a few days at the home of the Duc de Bouillon, then returned to Lyon with Court de Gebelin, a close associate of Jean Sylvain Bailly and of Benjamin Franklin. On February 1784, Saint Martin swears allegiance to the occult society that Mesmer has founded, the same Mesmer that Bailly and Franklin had denounced as the charlatan of "animal magnetism." This Mesmer Lodge was the mother group that

later formed the SOCLETE DE L'HARMONIE. Saint Martin was also in touch with the BIENFAISANCE LOGE in Paris and had made a very negative judgment on CAGLIOSTRO: "I consider this man to be the tormentor of Truth," said Saint Martin. This was a case of the teapot calling the kettle black.

On April 29, 1785, the British "Unknown Agent" meets Saint Martin at the Willermoz Lyon Lodge, where he dictates about a hundred notebooks on what was required of them in the coming period. Some of these documents could still be found, at the beginning of the 20th century, in the Archives of Papus. In January 1787 Saint Martin traveled to London with Zinnowief. Among his official acquaintances, he met with two mystics, Law and Belz and was in touch with some of the English aristocracy, namely, Count de Divonne, Mme de Coisslin, Lord Beauchamps, and the "scientist" Herschell. He stayed at the house of prince Gallitzin and Tieman. Prince Gallitzin was the key agent of Martinis in Russia, during the reign of Catherine the Great. Catherine was so upset by the Martinists that she had a play written against them (title?), which became famous in the theaters of Moscow.

The most important book on Russian Martinis seems to be written by M. N. Longuinoff, {*Novikof et le Martinisme de Moscow*}, Edition de l'Archive Russe, Imprimerie Gratchow et Cie, Moscow, 1867. The main Russian Martinists were:

Nicholas Novikof, leader of the Russian Martinists
Brigadier Tchoukow,
Doctor Bagrinasky,
Colonel Ladijensky,
Colonel Prince Tcherkasky,
Alexis Novikow,
Jean Lopouchine,
Brigadier Jean Tourgueneff,
Major Alexis Koutosow,
Prince Nicholas Troubetskoi
Lieutenant General Prince George Troubetskoi,
Simon Gamaleia,
Lieutenant Nicholas Novikoff,
Prince Engalitcheff,

Captain Baron Schrender (Prussian),
Schwaetz (The international agent of Saint Martin).

Saint Martin cites himself:

Kachelof,
Markof,
Zinnowief,
Stavronsky,
Vorontzoff,
Count Rasonmoski.

After London, Saint Martin traveled to Italy with Prince Galitzin, after which he returned to Lyon in February of 1788. On February 6, 1788, Willermoz wrote in a letter that the "Unknown Agent" had come for the last time and would not return for a while. In the same letter, Willermoz made the revelation that Saint Martin had made a prediction what was about to happen in 1789. In fact, the "Unknown Agent" from England did return to Lyon, in 1790, only to destroy and burn 80 of the compromising notebooks he had dictated to the Martinists of Lyon a few years before Bastille Day. He reportedly stayed in Lyon until 1796.

As if by a mere coincidence, after the "unknown agent" returned to Lyon, there was a fall out in which Saint Martin requested, on July 4th, 1790, that his name be taken off the records of all Masonic associations. From 1788 to 1791, Saint Martin traveled to Strasbourg, and from 1791 to 1793 he returned to Paris where he pretends not to be affected by the Terror.

It is hard to establish how many of the Martinists had been involved in the violence of the French Revolution Terror. One thing is certain, however, is that as an institution, the Lyon Martinist order as well as its Weishopt counterpart in Germany, were controlled by London.

Saint Martin spend the last years of his life writing his {*Letter on the Revolution*} (1795) which became the blueprint for the writings of Joseph de Maistre on Providence and his views on the executioner. From 1798 to 1801, he edits his two volumes of {*L'Esprit des choses et le Ministere de l'Homme-Esprit*}.

Louis-Claude de Saint Martin died of apoplexy on October 13, 1803.

By defining the characteristic of Saint Martin's form of mysticism, we are able to determine also the characteristic of his diabolical mission. The following steps represent, for Saint Martin, the different stages the mind has to go through in order to attain the ultimate state of mystical development.

1 - The first step that Saint Martin considered was that of "liberating" himself from all of the ideas that others wished to impose on his mind without the control of his own reason. Like the Hegelian negation of negation, Saint Martin rejected all that is material, that is, all that is not conducive to the development of the spirit.

2 - After the negative form of what he called "retrieving his personality," Saint Martin opted for the "mental way" of developing his personal will. However, here a problem arises. This "cerebral way" can lead the initiate into one of two opposite directions. One can find its ultimate development in ceremonial Magic, which is the way that Cagliostro had chosen, and the other he called the "Theurgic direction," which is the way Saint Martin had chosen. In short, the Magic way leads to Satanism, the Theurgic way leads to God. Papus explained the difference like this: "Just as Magic develops personal will, and, often pride, so Theurgy kills pride in order to develop humility and replace command and orders given to the willing Spirits of the Astral by Prayer and the appeal to Angels of the divine Plan." (Papus, {*Louis Claude de Saint Martin*}, Librairie Generale des Sciences Occultes, Bibliotheque Chacornac, Paris, 1902, p.48.)

3 - Between this Manichean opposition of good and evil, Papus claims "there exists a third way, which is mixed and often tenebrous, and which pushes the Spirit toward the pride of believing you are God himself, which leads to despising Prayer and the humble call to superior forces. This route lies between the exercises of astral gymnastics considered like the summit of all possible evolution and the most naïve beliefs of personal reincarnations and of the powers of undetermined entities as well as unknown. This route has taken different names depending on the periods, and whether it was the Pythagoreans or the Philosophers of the 17th or 18th centuries, the followers of Cagliostro, or the modern anti-Christians, we always recognize them with their spirit of division and of denunciation, with their love of telling false stories, and personal gossip and with a thousand other signs,

which have no more fooled Saint Martin, when these wonders were reported to him from the Northern School, than it fooled other contemporary Martinists, or any follower of a true Theurgic school." (p. 49)

And so, the trick is very neatly done. Remember that Papus is not a Theurgist, but a Magician. As for Saint Martin, the fact that he was not a Magician, but a Theurgist by temperament and his disassociation from the methods of Cagliostro was not sufficient to clear his good name from any participation in the terrorism of the French Revolution. This may have taken the appearance of truth from inside of the Martinist lodges, but the fact remained that the Satanism of Cagliostro and his direct involvement in the Affair du Collier and in the terrorism of the Bastille, were all to well know by Saint Martin no less than two and a half years before the fact, which makes him nothing less than accessory to terrorism.

7.2 THE SOPHISTRY OF LIBERTE, EGALITE, FRATERNITE.

Most of the themes that Joseph de Maistre developed in his 1796 {Considerations on France}, which include, the fall of man, the role of Providence, the reversibility of innocent victim paying for the guilty, were all taken from Saint-Martin's writings, and all of the were implemented during the French Revolution. According to French historian, Louis Blanc, it was the "Sacred Ternary" of the Martinists - {Liberte, Egalite, Fraternite} - which became the motto of the French Revolution of 1789. What the Martinists did, starting with Joseph de Maistre and Louis Claude de Saint Martin, was to replace the Ecumenical Christian principle of {love of mankind} by the reactionary synarchist principle called {Liberte, Egalite, Fraternite}, otherwise known secretly by the Martinists as {Liberalism, Communism, Synarchism}.

As modern time synarchist Count Richard Coudenhove Kalergi put it in his {Man and the Totalitarian State}: Since it is utopia to believe that you can establish Equality in a capitalist system, and it is a similar utopia to believe that one can have Liberty in a communist state, the only way to resolve these

contradictory utopias is with Synarchism. This is how Kalergi translates the {Sacred Ternary}. Here is how this Cretan subverted the universal history study of Schiller, with respect to Sparta and Athens:

"{The total man, the totalitarian State: we observe the two ideals confronted at the origin of our European history: incarnated in Athens and Sparta.

"Sparta: a communist aristocracy; Athens: a capitalist democracy; Sparta, the totalitarian State; Athens, the Total man. In Sparta man lives for the State; in Athens, the State lives for man."

"The revolution of liberty has been slowed down; the revolution of equality was a failure. The revolution of fraternity shall renew the links between peoples, between classes, and shall spread throughout the world the happy news of the fraternity of free men.}" (Coudenhove Kalergi, *{L'Homme et l'Etat Totalitaire}*, Paris, Plon, 1938, pp. 29 and 229.)

Saint-Martin also initiated the French subversive theme of the {Man of Desire} (1790), and the "desire for recognition", the Hegelian {Master, Slave} dialectic, which became the favorite theme of Alexander Kojève, and the source of brainwashing of the Paris youth generation of the 1968 events, against the Charles de Gaulle government. This {Desire for Recognition} became the badge of honor of the entire competitive baby-boomer generation since the 1960's, the "Bobos" or "Bohemian Bourgeois" as the French call them.

Louis Claude Saint Martin is said to have had close contacts with Court de Gebelin, Benjamin Franklin, Sir Francis Dashwood and the Golitzin family in Russia. He studied the writings of Swedenborg, and wrote his {Nouvel Homme} in collaboration with Swedenborg's nephew. <note> (When Saint Martin died in 1803, his influence lived on, especially in France, Italy and Russia. Papus (Gerard Encausse), who is considered the father of modern Martinism with Saint Yves d'Alveydre, wrote several books on Saint Martin, especially {Louis Claude de Saint Martin}, (1902) and {Martinisme, martinesisme, et franc-maconerie}, (1899). There is also a book by Franz von Baader on {Les enseignements secrets de Martinez de Pasqually,} (1900).)

"Jean-Baptiste Willermoz (1730-1824) was a pupil of Martinez de Pasqually, who became a mason in 1750. In 1753, he founded a lodge called "{La

Parfaite Amitie,}" of which he became the Master. He worked with {Bacon de Chevalerie}, a Deputy-Grand Master of the {Elus Cohen}. Willermoz was introduced to the German Masonic Order of {'Strict Observance Templiere'}, in 1772, which was connected to the Weishaupt {Illuminati of Bavaria}, the most famous masonic order of Germany, during the French Revolution, to which belonged Jacques Necker and Philip Egalite. In 1774, Willermoz founded a new lodge in Lyon France, called the {Reformed Scottish Rite Lodge of Charity}. This lodge was specifically oriented to destroying the idea of {Agape}, the principle of the Peace of Westphalia. As we shall see in a moment, the modern founder of the Synarchy, Saint Yves d'Alveydre, wrote an entire history book {Mission des Souverains} as a diatribe against the Treaty of Westphalia. His animosity and venom were directed against the Westphalia gathering because it had introduced a principle of the {Advantage of the other}, and failed to establish a Synarchy of Empire based on {taking advantage of the other}.

During the period leading to the French Revolution, there were as many as 282 masonic lodges in France, including 81 lodges of the Grand Orient in Paris alone, 16 in Lyon, 10 in Toulouse, 10 in Montpellier, 10 in Bordeaux, and 6 in Marseille. Thus, the entire nation had been taken over

According to Emile Dermenghem, {Joseph de Maistre Mystique}, on September 4, 1774, Joseph de Maistre (1753-1821) joined the Scottish Rite {Loge des Trois Mortiers} (Lodge of the Three Mortars) of Lyon, at the age of 21. He became a {Grand Orator}, and was operating directly under the authority of the Great Lodge of London. Four years later, on September 4, 1778, Maistre joined Lyon and Chambery, the {Reformed Scottish Rite Lodge of Sincerity}, which was dependent on the grand master the Duke Ferdinand of Brunswick, and was headed by Jean-Baptiste Willermoz. It is from these two lodges that Maistre was known to have conducted most of his secret activities. <note> (Joseph de Maistre's lodge des {Trois Mortiers} had been created in 1749, by Joseph de Bellegarde, Marquis des Marches, and was the oldest lodge in Chambery, capital City of the then Kingdom of Savoy. Out of the Lyon lodge, there were four great initiates of the highest grade {Grands Profes} of the {Masonic Knights of the Order of Charity of the Holy City} who were the key Martinist leaders covering the events of the French Revolution. They were: "{Hippolyte, Chevalier de Ville, (a Castro), Senator, President of the {College Metropolitain de France} (Lyon); Marc Rivoire, senior, Bourgeois depository (a Leone alto); Joseph, Comte de Maistre (a Floribus),

Attorney General, Senate substitute; Jean-Baptiste, Comte Salteur (a Cane),
Attorney General, Senate substitute.}")

Dermenghem reports that Maistre had an unpublished {Memoire au Baron Vignet des Etoles sur la franc-maconnerie} (Memoire on Freemasonry to Baron Vignet des Etoles), written in 1793, in which Maistre details how he had "spent a lot of time with these Gentlemen in Lyon." Maistre was also a member of the {Elus Cohen}, along with Willermoz, Saint Martin, and Martinez de Pasqually. The story of how Maistre got initiated into his "Vengeance Order of Sincerity" against the French Revolution is worth telling. Let us examine a few of the shadows.

When Maistre was being prepared for his initiation to the {Elus Cohen} degree, Willermoz gave him several lessons on his {theory of conviction}. In one of his letters, Willermoz wrote: "{The demonstration established through the efforts of the mind will never give the sentiment., while the sentiment, on the contrary, will lead to the conviction of the mind. In your case (Joseph de Maistre), the doubts that you wrongly erect as law has your mind bridle the sentiment, and therefore puts a stop to all of its effects, while if the sentiment should be left free to act, it would become a guide more certain since it would not be submitted to the prejudices which almost always restrains the other...When man gets rid of his prejudices, he opens his intelligence to all of its rights. He judges sanely everything that is of his recourse. But he who has not done that, in believing he sees everything, does not see a thing, because, by seeing and feeling everything with the material eyes, the facts remain hidden to his intelligence.}" One should compare this satanic statement with the poem of Lazare Carnot on {Enthusiasm}.

Then, Willermoz gave the young Maistre the example of the "{man who penetrates into a grotto without a light, and trusting only his own eyes, would not see anything, and could not believe in the existence of objects which another man who, with the help of a torch, would be able to observe. That torch is your sentiment.}" Thus, Willermoz concluded: **{reason does not see any better than the human eye in the dark}**. It is very important to note here that everything that is taught in the masonic initiations always subordinates reason to the senses, that is, subordinates reason to the Aristotelian axiom of "truth" which says: "**There**

exists nothing in the mind that has not first been seized by sense perception }.

Willermoz introduced Maistre more and more to the question of Hell, the issue of good and evil, the idea of God's punishment, and the question of vengeance, including the "necessary salvation of the damned." These were not speculative questions. These lessons involved direct deployments into the terrorist events of Paris. However, Willermoz thought that Maistre was moving too fast on the question of punishment, and wrote to him that he could solve "{that important question only after having meditated and deepened his understanding of positive rights and the immense will power of all free individuals.}"

Maistre was not satisfied and criticized Willermoz comparing his teacher's idea of the conduct of God to that of "{an imbecile Admiral who, instead of destroying his enemies with the most powerful warship, he would send after them a hundred little boats to amuse them and get beaten.}" On this point, Dermenghem writes a very revealing footnote, which says: "{According to the occult Martinist doctrine, Man had originally been created by God in order to repair the fall of the guilty Angels, and in order to triumph against the Perverse Being. Still not entirely initiated yet, Maistre had asked why God did not intervene directly. Later on, quite to the contrary, Maistre will attach a great importance to the superior intelligences who are distinct from God, and who are the intermediaries between the Divinity and nature.}" (Emile Dermenghem, {Op. Cit.,} p.59)

This is the crucial difference between the Christian principle of {*Man created in the image of God*} and the satanic view of {*Man created to repair the fall of the guilty angels*}. Such "intermediaries" represented the Martinists and their men of Providence, such as the beast-men, Maximilian Robespierre and Napoleon Bonaparte. Today the neo-cons around Bush and Cheney claim that they have been created for regime change, that is, to replace tyrannies by democracies.

During the fall of 1784, and the winter of 1785, Maistre was also in contact with Savalette de Langes and the Marquis de Chefdebien d'Hericothe, who were two {Philalethes} masons from Paris, the equivalent of the {Elus Cohen} of Lyon. Those were the direct overseers of the events that were being prepared in and around Paris. It was in the late 1780's that the lower level Martinist organizers such as Mesmer, Cagliostro, Cazotte, Dupont de Nemour, Count of Saint Germain,

Fabre d'Olivet, Senancour, and others, were being deployed into the Bastille operation of Paris, and collaborated with Robespierre, Marat and Danton, in the {purgative violence} of the Terror. It was the same group of Martinists, which had been deployed together into a preparatory convention of international masonry, held in Wilhelmsbad Germany, in 1782. Saint Martin had prepared all of them for the {Secret Doctrine}, which established:

"{When we penetrate to the very ground of our being, we find that we can unite ourselves by our words with the ineffable source of truth; but that we can also, by its criminal use, unite ourselves with the awful abyss of lies and darkness.}"

At the beginning of 1788, Martinist Cazotte, who had come to Paris from the heights of Fourvieres in Lyon, made a remarkable intervention, during a dinner before members of the Academie Royale des Sciences, at the home of duc de Nivernais. After the main course, Cazotte stood up and made a chilling {self-fulfilling prophecy} that the pro-American faction, sitting at the table, namely the Marquis de Condorcet and Jean Sylvain Bailly, among others, were going to be executed within the next few years. Cazotte announced that Condorcet was going to die in a jail cell, and Bailly was going to die on the scaffold. The {Elus Cohen} of the Martinist Order of Lyon had whispered those words, made to sound prophetic, in Cazotte's mouth.

Similarly, after having had meetings with the Scottish Rite Mother Lodge in London, the infamous Cagliostro published a {Letter to the French}, dated June 20, 1786, in which he made the "prophecy" that {"The Bastille shall be completely destroyed, and the land upon which it had been erected shall become a promenade area."} One does not need to be a clairvoyant to realize that the Bastille coup d'Etat of July 14, 1789, had indeed been "magically" prepared in the London dependent Lodge of the Martinist Order of Lyon, at least three years before the event occurred. For an interesting view of the lower level British agents involved in the French Revolution, especially Barère de Vieuzac, I recommend the reading of Olivier Blanc, {*Les hommes de Londres*}, Paris, Albin Michel, 1989.

8.2 MYTHRAIC STOICISM.

Other freemasonic lodges had been promoting the restoration of outright paganism and the cult of the stars. Among some of the less hidden individuals involved in the masonic subversion of France, one must include the father of Robespierre, who had created a British controlled Scottish Rite Lodge in Arras, where the idea of the {Incorruptible} had been featured. Also, Dupont de Nemours had published a {Philosophy of the Universe} based on the "hierarchy of the celestial spirits." This theme of {hierarchies of celestial spirits} or, {hierarchy of souls} had been at the very center of the Gnostic issue of {belief versus knowledge}, throughout the entire history of mankind.

The Gnostic method is intended to brutalize the minds of the youth with {Mithraic Stoicism}; that is, through an experimental indulging in sadistic {purgative violence}, which the Martinist magicians have dubbed "initiations." The result of this process of brainwashing, is the total destruction of human thinking and emotional capabilities, through sophisticated methods of ego stripping. Those who keep up the appearance of having made it through such "initiations," with a stiff upper lip, become soulless walking dead, and the higher level they can sustain in this stoic endurance warfare, the higher their position will be in the {hierarchy of celestial spirits.}

This is a special version of John Locke's {pleasure and pain principle}. {In this case the pain is that of the other, the pleasure is yours!} In other words, this is the secret process of discovering higher levels of your own resistance to the pains of others, that is the highest degree of the {Disadvantage of the other}, the higher the degree of merit you shall acquire in the {hierarchy of souls}.

This evil power-training system, is precisely the inversion of the degrees of Plato's {bronze, silver, and golden souls}. This initiation of {satanic virtues} is entirely opposite to the {principle of higher powers} developed by Plato in the {Meno} dialogue, and has become the Martinist Synarchy's main instrument of recruitment of young technocrats for the purpose of banking, political, cultural, and religious control of population worldwide.

This is the old idea of the {One-World Government.} "Pambasileia" is the

term used by Aristotle in his *Politiques*, 3, 15,1, meaning absolute sovereign, or Emperor of the world, which had been recognized by Roman Emperor Julien, and Emperor Bonaparte, as being totally {contrary to nature}. This is why it "cannot be spoken of, except in artful and obscure terms." Thus, the Beast-Man is created to become so horrific, that everyone bows down to him out of fear.

This is also the process of government control that the Constitutional Republic of the United States had repudiated in 1787, by instituting the Leibnizian principle of {pursuit of happiness}, and this is the reason why the Martinist Order of Joseph de Maistre assassinated Jean Sylvain Bailly, Condorcet as well as Antoine Lavoisier, and neutralized the mission of Marquis de Lafayette, Lazare Carnot, and other pro-American forces in Paris during and after the French Revolution. This is, finally, the reason why Lyndon LaRouche has provoked the youth of today in discovering the knowable universal principle developed by Carl Gauss, in his 1799 {Theorem of Algebra}, and apply it to history making.

As for the Martinist Synarchy, this question takes them back to the raging battle of the 9th century between the Christian faction and the Gnostic faction in the Charlemagne Empire. This was the war that confronted the Platonic-Augustinian forces of Alcuin against the Aristotelian-Mithraic magicians of Count Hugo de Tours. The Martinists have never forgotten, nor pardoned Charlemagne for having executed Count Hugo, and having joined forces with Alcuin. They have been seeking revenge ever since. The French Revolution has been such a historical revenge.

At the end of his chapter on Joseph de Maistre's relationship to the Martinist order, Dermenghem brings in a crucial anomaly, which is difficult to explain, especially after the entire book had defended Maistre as an exemplary Christian mystic. Dermenghem asks this curious question:

"{Would it not be seductive to believe that, at the age of forty, Maistre discovered that during his entire life until that point, he had followed the wrong principle, that he had erred and sinned into audacious researches to which he had dedicated himself, and that the order in the bosom of which he had been working with such zeal was nothing but a hypocritical and subtle instrument of Satan?}"

I am bringing this question up, at this point, because it is essential that the

Catholic Church revise its views on Maistre, and recognized him for what he truly is, and that is, a Satanist Beast-Man. During his entire life, Joseph de Maistre made believe he was a Christian believer. In the end, he convinced everybody in the Catholic Church, except those who realized he only believed in the hatred of mankind.

When, in 1793, the French Revolution disbanded Masonic Lodges, and the French army invaded Savoy, the satanic {Lodge of Sincerity}, in Chambery, was "officially" closed, all of the masons, including Joseph de Maistre, were officially forced into exile.

9.2 HOW CHRISTIANITY REPLACED THE MITHRA CULT

The cult of the Sun King, Louis XIV was the revival of the pagan cult of the Roman Empire.

The Mithraic cult of the Roman Empire was a religion of the Beast -Man. It was a national religion, which was identified with the power of the Imperial State, which itself was a warrior State because war is the natural derivation of the Imperial State. Its function was not to change man and make him better like Christianity does. Its function was for the perpetuation of the State, for the State and by the State. The priest was a magistrate of the State. This cult never had a church or a religious doctrine, it had a sacrificial temple and a secret code. The link that tied together the priest-magistrate and the citizens was the blood spilled under the secret rule of {*purgative violence*}. The common faith of the cult of Mithra was in the mysteries of Eleusis, of Isis, and of the Phrygian Cybele whose secret initiations were held in underground caves.

The Mithraic cult was constituted into communities, which would be accessible only through a secret type of masonic initiation. Gabriel Hanotaux gives the following description of this roman cult as follows:

{Roman religion was nothing but formalism. Rites, words, actions transmitted by a secret code; nothing which could trouble the soul, loosen the

imagination, move the conscience. It confronted man from the outside, without penetrating in the deepest recess of his intimate life. Subordinated to politics and the law, it was more concerned with conserving the State than to transform the individual.

Contrary to the new religion [Christianity], which was conveying a doctrine, [in the Roman cult] nothing could be created except through pain; as with human beings, the gods suffered, died only to be reborn... Here is the mystery of the univers, which is also the explanation for life. Man is created in sin, under the domination of the powers of evil, and must first deliver himself from the blemish of his soul, in a way he must die to himself if he wants to be reborn; and he must be reborn if he wishes to get closer to the gods and deserve to survive. However, to be reborn under what circumstances, if not by purification?

You must be initiated first, regenerated afterwards. By water, by blood, receive through the sacrifice of the bull, the anointing which erases, you elevate yourself by willingly renouncing yourself to suffering, abstaining yourself, macerating yourself, flagellating yourself, mutilating yourself, to free yourself of forbidden actions and from perverse passions. Achieve sanctity through which you access beatific immortality. Such was the ideal, the meaning of human life.}"
Gabriel Hanotaux, {*Histoire de la Nation Francaise*}, Paris, Librairie Plon, Tome III, 1920, p.80.)

This is precisely the type of so-called "Christianity" that George Bush and his fundamentalists believe in: a cult of purification by purgative violence, in which you don't need to think. You just need to believe.

On the other hand, Christianity contributed to liberating man from its beast like domination and elevated the individual human being to cognitive thinking, a condition which is not akin to a worm, but which considers man as created in the image of God the Creator. This meant that man was able to make discoveries of universal physical principles, which the animal is incapable of. Contrary to the pessimism of the pagan cult of Mithra, Christianity introduced optimism of life based on love of mankind, {*agape*}, that is, addressing man from the inside of his soul, from the inner-directedness of the power of reason as opposed to the other-directedness of force.

From that standpoint, Christ came at a very propitious moment during the collapse of the Roman Empire, not to condemn man but to redeem and save him. This is how Christianity came to replace the blind belief of paganism by the inner-knowledge and spirituality of creative reason. Very rapidly, the new religion became the religion of human fraternity, and became an institution of true power of reason using mind against force. Christianity had abandoned the principle of inequality, which was the law of pagan Rome, and replaced it with a principle of proportionality that was exclusively oriented to the benefit of others. Making your fellow man happy was the new social order. With the advent of Christianity, class distinctions began to disappear. When a small glass is full, it is as filled as a tall glass. It was because of that power of reason that the first Christians were persecuted. For the first time in the history of mankind, the *{hereditary principle}* of privileged classes was replaced by the principle of the *{advantage of the other}*, which became a personal governing principle representing the most powerful cement for the political unity of this unique human species.

The fight between paganism and Christianity continued inside of the Church itself in the form of heresies such as Arianism and Manicheanisms. Paganism has had a hidden place in the Roman Curia for centuries and it is still alive today in the form of fundamentalism. In order to maintain the so-called world order of the Roman Empire, Roman Emperor, Constantine, established the right of the State to supervise the exercise of religions. This is how the theocentric order of ultramontanism was born. Thus, the Emperor became the supreme pontiff of both pagan cults and of Christianity, the head of the Pantheon of gods. This is how the Curia of the Church of Rome was penetrated by paganism during the fourth century. Imperial Bishops joined together with the theologian Emperor. Gradually, Constantine established himself as the referee of religions and the leader of the Bishops. He became the sovereign pontiff of the two Councils of Arles (314) and of Nicee (325), proffered the exclusion of Arius for heresy.

10.2 “CHRISTIANS WHO ARE NOT CHRISTIANS”

There is only one thing that defines the passion of a Gnostic, and that is, his elitist pride and hatred of mankind and of Christianity. This is the passion that all Gnostics, including Satan himself, have in common: their superiority over the common people. As Roman Emperor Julian had noted, Christian religion is for the slaves, the poor, and the ignorant. Gnosticism is for the rich, the intelligent, and the elite. From that standpoint, Claude de Saint Martin and Joseph de Maistre, who tried to pass themselves for Christians, were two of the greatest Gnostic prophets of all times. During the second half of the 18th century, both of these individuals were slightly more than a thousand years behind their time, using ancient Greek sophistry in defiance of reason, in order to subvert Christianity by turning the redeeming quality of Christ into a most vengeful political system called Martinism. Their primary objective was to eradicate the principle of {agape}, love of mankind, which had been established at the Peace of Westphalia, in 1648, in the form of the {Advantage of the other}. From that standpoint alone the Cult of Martinism represents the most important threat to extended European civilization.

For the cult of Martinism to function, it requires two fundamental ingredients. First of all, Martinism is based on the hatred of the common man. In that sense, Martinism is the cult of the elite, the religion of the superior man, and of the oligarch. This is why the absolute precondition for this cult to even exist, resides in the {fall of man}; that is, man must be reduced to a animal, a corrupt beast. Thus, the paradigm shifts of the 1963 new age, and the Martinist creation of the age of {Aquarius-Dyonisius} of the baby-boomer sex-drug counterculture. For the Martinist priesthood, this initial motivation is so strong and overwhelming that, if man had not fallen, if the French Revolution had not occurred, and if the degeneracy of the sex-drug counter-culture did not exist, Martinism could not exist either, and Saint Martin and Joseph de Maistre would not have written a single word of their writings. In fact, fundamentalist cults more generally would not exist, including this perverse alliance between American Protestant fundamentalists with the current Jabotinsky Zionism of Ariel Sharon today.

Both Saint Martin and Maistre were trapped into a paradox. They hated the

period of the French Revolution they lived through, and loved it at the same time, because it was for them the greatest gratification of their self-filling prophecy, the confirmation of the greatest act of Providence that ever existed. Their hatred of man, however, had to be disguised as love. In fact, one has to {love to hate} in order to be a Martinist. This love and hate relationship was developed as a doctrine measured by a proportional mixture of hatred of others (pain) and self-gratification (pleasure).

However, the doctrine is not presented in that form. The lure is the negation of man's degenerate condition as an animal, as a {worm}, and a desire to return to the state of bliss represented by the condition of perfection of {original man} before the fall. Saint Martin writes: "{The objective of becoming the servant of God and the consoler of the universe cannot be reached unless one revives the life that was extinguished by the first crime, and purges himself of all of the secondary excrements that have been accumulated since the fall of man.}" (p. 61) Once you believe this to be the truth, you are hooked.

Thus, for the initiate, the first step is to purge himself of all of the fears in the presence of pain. That is how one is made to except the wrath of the vengeful God. Secondly, the initiate must discover that all of those pains inflicted on him, or on others, are "{not ordeals but graces}" given by God for his sanctification. Note how close this is to true Christian {spiritual exercises}. The initiate is then told that this is the only means to attain a state of perfection. Saint Martin concludes that once those two classes of conditions are fulfilled, then the initiate has begun the {"regeneration of man back into his rights, and primitive virtues and titles."}, as was promoted by the founder of the Martinist order, Martinez de Pasqually.

"{It is then, by your groans and your sufferings, that you attract on yourself the substance of the sacrifice, and the fire of the Lord cannot but come down upon you, and must consume both the victim and vivify the sacrificer, filling him with powerful means and continuous possibilities in order to pursue the universality of his work.}" (65). Once the initiate suspects that there must exist such a state of perfection, since life is so terrible in its present condition, he has become a first-degree believer. Again, this is belief, not cognition.

The third step is to begin internalizing the {Inner Way of Reintegration} which is what Saint Martin developed extensively in his writings. The following excerpts are from {Le Ministere de l'Homme-Esprit}. First, it is essential here, to pay attention to the intention, and to see, with your mind's eye, how Saint Martin, under the guise of leading the initiate to the real world beyond the domain of sense perception, and in doing so, denigrates the role of science. Saint Martin writes:

"{I have accepted neither the geometric proofs of Leibniz, nor Newton's fundamental axiom of mechanics, nor the reasonings of Nieuwentyt on this axiom, neither the superb observations of other distinguished authors, nor the combination of chances at infinity, which brings about nothing, nor on motion, which tends to extend in all directions, but which is condemned in its direction by a superior force.

"...As for those who believe in the Eternal God, would they be in a better position to understand and demonstrate his divine eternity, if they were to merely borrow arguments taken from time; and, no matter how strong their persuasion might be, would they not be in an impossible task, assuming they wanted to bring the spirit of man to the height of this compelling truth, by such inferior means?

"...I therefore believe, and I repeat, that in order to attain the objective in question, all of the resources of this world and of nature, are precarious and fragile. ...

"...We shall see emerging from all of this a clarity which might appear to be extraordinary, but which will not be less real: that is if man (who, let us admit plainly, is not of this world) is a sure and direct means to demonstrate the divine essence; if the proofs that we derive from the external order of the world, are defective and incomplete; finally, if the abstract truths and suppositions that we attribute to this world are taken from the metaphysical realm, and find no existence inside of nature, it follows evidently that we understand nothing in this world where we are, except through the glimmers which come from the world where we are not; that it is much easier for us to reach those lights and certainties which shine in the world where we are not, than to become naturalized with the obscurities and darkness which embraces the world in which we are, and that finally, since we have to admit it, we are much closer to

what we call the other world, than we are of this one in which we live.

"It is not even very difficult to agree that it is by an abuse of language that we say the 'other world' of which we are not, while it is this world which is truly the other for us."

"...Thus, if the world where we are not, that is what we call the other world, has, in all instances, priority over this one, it is truly this here world, where we are, which is the other world, because there exists before it, a term of comparison from which it is different; and what we call the other world, being {one} or the first, of necessity is itself of itself, and cannot be anything but our model, and not another world." <note> (Claude de Saint Martin, {Le Ministere de l'Homme-Esprit}, Paris, de L'imprimerie de Migneret, 1802, p.6-8.)

This is Saint Martin's Delphic proof that true reality cannot be accessible through the sensorium. In fact, what you have just read is an intricate sophistry attempting to consciously subvert the idea of Plato's Cave, a satanic distortion of Plato's conception of human knowledge. Let me illustrate the point. Let's begin by making clear the difference between Plato's Cave and the use of the same metaphor by this Phrygian cult of Mithra.

Now, let's look at the reason why Saint Martin denied science the ability to demonstrate the divine nature of God. On the one hand, if science is reduced to the realm of ordinary sense perception and to the domain of empirical evidence of time and space, there is not possibility of discovering new physical principles upon which technological progress is dependent on. That has been, and still is, the disease of European science, for several centuries, and is generally known as Newtonian or Cartesian empiricism. This has been an American disease, especially since the dawn of the age of the baby boomer.

On the other hand, since the invisible world of God is not accessible by those material means, Saint Martin concluded fallaciously that "science" cannot be useful, nor necessary for understanding the nature of man and of its principle. However, since there does exist a "spark of divinity" in man, Saint Martin concludes that it should be used in the communication with the spirits of the invisible world; that is, have contempt for the world of the sensorium and of the "man of the torrent," the common man. This is how the Martinists develop their contempt for the common man and for scientific and technological progress. From

there on, all that is left for man to do is to develop "the mysteries of eternal wisdom." <note> (For Saint Martin there are two types of mysteries: the mystery of nature, and the mystery of spiritual and divine things. "The final objective of the mystery of spiritual and divine things, which is linked with the mystery of our being, is to move us and to excite in us the sentiment of admiration, of tenderness, of love, and of thankfulness." This second form of mystery is more akin to the spiritual nature of man, says Saint Martin, "because since our happiness is to admire, it is also true that to admire is less to know than to feel, which is the reason why God and the spirit are so soft and at the same time so little known."

The Martinists had to devise ways of making believe that the initiates were able to communicate with intermediary spirits. This was done through the manifestations of passes, "{illuminated passes}" representing tangible signals proving the existence of intermediary beings existing between man and God. This is where Hollywood got the idea of visual and sound effects for mass brainwashing of the American population. This is all done with smoke and mirrors and with the intention of blurring the difference between reality and fiction.

What Saint Martin is actually saying in the above-extended quote is that he is an Aristotelian, and that he has no understanding of universal physical principles underlying physical space-time, and no understanding of Platonic ideas, whatsoever. The point is that the Martinists have launched a war against the science of Cusa, Kepler, and of Leibniz. Dermenghem reported that Maistre himself considered Kepler's discovery of his third law, as nothing but the result of some speculation over {magical numbers}; and not because of the proportional harmony between his reason and Divine Reason, as it is {*cognitively*} reflected in the well-tempered solar system as a whole.

Kepler understood the shadows of Plato's cave and was able to derive the {law of gravitation} from them. In other words, the {law of gravitation}, which is not perceived by the senses, establishes, among other things, that the time employed by a planet to describe a portion of its orbit is proportional to the surface area covered during that period of time by the radius centered in the Sun, and that such a harmonic proportionality exists everywhere in the entire solar system, as well as in the universe as a whole. This had become the basis for the Leibnizian

calculus, and the establishment of the principle of {least action} propagation of light. These were precisely the cognitive discoveries that the Martinists have been attempting to destroy, by replacing them with some romantic {catharsis} escape from the physical universe. It is with similar nastiness that Joseph de Maistre claimed that Kepler's discovery of the Third Law was "*following God knows what mystical ideas of numbers and celestial harmony,... which appear to be pure dreams in the light of cold reason.*"(Dermenghem, Op. Cit., p.117)

In Plato's idea of the cave, there is no hatred of the world of sense perception, no {*contemptus mundi*} as the Martinist-Cathars defined the world they live in, and there is no hatred of science, or of human reason. On the contrary, there is an appropriate understanding of the shadows which do not represent true reality, but deformed images of reality that are projected from outside of the cave by the light of reason. In the case of Saint Martin and Joseph de Maistre, the light of reason is to be turned off like the Magician in the opening scene of the synarchist movie, {Harry Potter}. As the formulation for the Martinist initiation of Cagliostro made quite clear: "{Know that the Great Secret of our art is to govern men, and that the only means is to never tell them the truth. Never conduct yourself according to the rules of common sense. Brave reason, and courageously produce the most unbelievable absurdities}.

Moreover, both Saint Martin and Joseph de Maistre represented total contempt for their fellowman, especially the common people, and, from that vantagepoint, their theocratic view of the world merely reflected their Empirocracy conception of the oligarchy they serve. Like all oligarchical conception establishes, man is a mere fallen beast, and a few chosen ones must exercise their powers of self-aggrandizement and superiority over others. Saint Martin also degraded the idea of {immortality} by ascribing to it the desire of superiority over, and recognition by, his fellow man. It was in Saint Martin's {*Ecce Homo*} that the superman of Nietzsche was born. "Man-spirit," writes Saint Martin, "is only drawn by the desire of immortality because of his vanity, because of the impulse of superiority over others, and because of his desire of being admired by them..." Synarchist, Alexander Kojeve, explicitly took this idea from Saint Martin and made it his life principle.

SYNARCHY MOVEMENT OF EMPIRE

BOOK I

CHAPTER 2

CHAPTER 2

THE EARLY SYNARCHY MOVEMENT OF EMPIRE

**THE FRENCH REVOLUTION of 1789-1815:
A SYNARCHIST INTERNATIONAL EXERCISE
IN PURGATIVE VIOLENCE**

2.1 CAGLIOSTRO AND THE NECKLACE AFFAIR

- 1.2 FRANCE IN 1785**
- 2.2 THE PROFILING OF CARDINAL DE ROHAN**
- 3.2 THE STING**
- 4.2 THE DAY OF PURIFICATION**
- 5.2 THE MASTER DECEPTION**
- 6.2 THE UNFOLDING OF THE SCAM**
- 7.2 THE TRIAL**
- 8.2 FROM VANITY TO ASYMMETRICAL WARFARE**

1.1 FRANCE IN 1785

One of the most sophisticated and perfidious affairs orchestrated in preparation for the storming of the Bastille of July 14, 1789 was launched by British Intelligence under the leadership of Lord Shelburne, Jeremy Bentham, and Lord Chatham, in 1785. That political sting operation became known as the {*Necklace Affair*}. This was a multi-faceted dirty-tricks operation run by British Intelligence and the Martinist Masonic Order of Lyon, which jointly deployed their forces to destabilize France and accelerate the coming into being of the terror of the French Revolution.

The Cagliostro Operation was run from London and had no less than four primary objectives:

1. Destroy the alliance between France and Austria to the advantage of England,
2. Discredit the King of France, Louis XVI and destroy his Austrian born Queen, Marie-Antoinette.
3. Bankrupt the Rohan and the Soubise- Montbazon - Guemenee families, which represented the three branches of one of the oldest French families of the kingdom, a rival family to the Duke of Orleans.
4. Establish the Duke of Orleans, Philippe Egalite, as the Jacobin King

In 1785, France had been put under a severe shortage of grain caused by speculators, and most of the provinces had been emptied of their reserves. The generalized scarcity of food was being intended to lead the population to famine riots. These were economic starvation operations run by the City of London speculators, who were setting France up for a terrorist coup d'Etat similar to the Gordon Riots of 1780, in London. Paris had been incapable of providing sufficient food for its population, and the King, Louis XVI, had taken measures, a little too late, calling for the royal household to make sacrifices in a vain attempt to refurbish the royal purse for some badly needed general welfare.

One day, the court jeweler, Boehmer, a financial speculator who knew of

the Queen's weakness for diamonds, proposed to Marie-Antoinette the acquisition of a 1,600,000 francs diamond necklace to complete her collection of jewelry. The jeweler went to the Queen and dazzled this glittering, tantalizing, and tentacular gem in front of her eyes so that she would become infatuated with its splendid beauty. Marie-Antoinette refused the tempting offer. In a last attempt to fascinate the Queen with the said necklace, Boehmer threw himself at the Queen's feet, pleading with her, and saying that if she did not buy the jewels, he would become bankrupt and would throw himself in the Seine River. The Queen was offended by this obvious theatrical display, and replied sternly to him:

"{Stand up, Monsieur Boehmer. I do not appreciate such scenes; honest people don't need to plead on their knees. I would be sad if you were to kill yourself, but I would not be responsible for this misfortune. Not only I never asked you for a diamond necklace, but also every time you offered me some new jewels, I told you that I would not add four diamonds to what I already have. I refused this necklace that the King has offered to me, and I thanked him for it. Do not mention this to me any more and don't ever bring this up again [...] Now, leave Monsieur.}" (Louis Figuier, *{Histoire du Merveilleux dans les temps modernes}*, Paris, Hachette, 1860, p.55)

After this humiliating setback, Boehmer realized that any further attempt at bringing up the subject of the necklace again with the Queen, even by way of an indirect courtly insinuation, would result in costing him his privilege and title as court jeweler. He had to find another way.

2.2 PROFILING CARDINAL DE ROHAN

The Rohan family was a crucial asset in the political balance between Austria and France. The family descended from ancient dukes of Bretagne, and had a claim to a sovereignty title in France. For instance, the Duke of Rohan, Henry I (1579-1638) of Bretagne, was the leader of the Calvinist party under Louis XIII. If the Protestants had won the war against the Catholics, Henry I would have become King of France. Later, Louis de Rohan (1635-1674),

colonel of the guards of Louis XIV, took part in a conspiracy against the king by organizing a landing of Dutch forces in Normandy. He failed and was decapitated. Then, Prince Louis Rene Edouard de Rohan, Cardinal of Strasbourg (1734-1803), had been the Ambassador of France to Vienna, and was a close ally to the Empress, Marie-Therese. In fact, the first reception that Marie-Antoinette was graced with, when she first came to France occurred in Strasbourg, at the princely house of Cardinal de Rohan. The Rohan family also had three Princesses who had married into the Bourbon family throughout the centuries, which gave the Rohan name an even greater prestige, such that no other family of France had a greater uninterrupted princely bloodline, outside of the Bourbon royal family itself. The Cardinal was also a Prince of the Empire. Furthermore, Mme Rohan - Guemenee became the first governess of Louis XVI and Marie-Antoinette's children, before the royal children became governed by the British controlled Polignac family, which turned out to be so destructive for the Queen.

Meanwhile, after having been initiated into the mysteries of the Knights of Saint John and Jerusalem by Pinto, the supreme Knight Commander in the Isle of Malta, a so-called Comte de Cagliostro (whose real name was Joseph Balsamo, born of ordinary folks in Palermo Sicily at about 1743), was deployed to Venice, and then Vienna, before being sent to Strasbourg, and from there, to Paris, from London.

After several years of travel, a renowned alchemist and mystic, the 33-degree freemason Grand Master, known as Count de St. Germain, initiated Cagliostro into the esoteric art of charlatanism, in a castle of Holstein in Germany. Count de St. Germain was an imposter who had made a fortune in Germany by selling an elixir of youth to arrest the progress of aging. Another known scoundrel of that period, Voltaire, claimed that Saint-Germain was, in reality, a paid agent of William Pitt the Younger. [<note> In 1786, the French Commercial Treaty with England's William Pitt the Younger turned out to be a free trade disaster for France.]

It was during the early 1770's that St. Germain revealed to his pupil the "great secret", which gave Cagliostro the so-called powers of the "divine mysteries of immortality". St. Germain made the claim that he was at least five hundred years old, and often spoke of Henry VIII and Charles V as if these

monarchs had spent delighted moments in his company. Cagliostro was told that he should also delight the good society into having them believe any absurdity he chose to utter. St. Germain told Cagliostro:

"{Know that the great secret of our art is to govern men, and that the only means to succeed is to never tell them the truth. Never conduct yourself according to the rules of common sense; brave reason, and courageously produce the most unbelievable absurdities. Remember that the first resource of nature, of politics, of society, is reproduction; that the chemistry of the mortals is to be immortal, to know the future, while they even ignore the present, to be spiritual while everything they are and which surrounds them is material.}" (Louis Figuier, Op. Cit. p. 99)

Cagliostro was being groomed for the most important mission of his life, which was to be executed against a person of high rank in the French aristocracy. From his teacher St. Germain, he learned that the greatest resource the aristocracy could provide a skillful manipulator was its own vanity, and that there was no greater believer than the credulity of a vain aristocrat who desired to believe in his own delusions. The plan was to take full advantage of the weakness of this aristocrat and rob him blind. After all, thought Cagliostro, why not take advantage of the other, especially when he is so completely willing to be duped.

In accordance with this anti-principle of the Peace of Westphalia, Cagliostro made a profile study of Prince Louis Rene Edward Cardinal de Rohan. He discovered that there was nothing more attractive to the vanity of the Cardinal, who could not be King, than to accede to the position of being apart from all other peers of the kingdom by becoming intimately close to the Queen. His family motto was: "*{King I cannot be; prince I do not dare; Rohan I am!}*" He was even convinced that only a Rohan could succeed in presenting himself before the Queen without being introduced and without offending her. Thus, Cagliostro knew that the greatest desire of the Cardinal de Rohan, the ultimate peak of his vanity, was to be seen in Versailles as one of the close friends of the Queen of France, Marie-Antoinette.

As a former Ambassador to Vienna, and personal friend to Marie Antoinette's mother, the Empress Marie-Therese, Rohan wished nothing more

than to be accepted by the Queen who, personally, had nothing but resentment for him. In his capacity of Royal Chaplain, the Cardinal presided over the royal services, at Versailles, but the Queen was determined to not even give him even a passing look.

3.2 THE STING

During the month of May 1785, after the royal jewelers, Bohmer and Bassanges, offered to sell the King their best diamond necklace, evaluated at the handsome sum of 1,600,000 francs, the British assets around the French court wasted no time in circulating the rumor that Marie-Antoinette was highly interested in purchasing the necklace.

Prince Cardinal Louis de Rohan got wind of the story, but let the thought slip through the sieve of his mind until he was approached by a certain Madame La Motte, during the summer of 1785. Madame La Motte was a phony Countess in the employ of Cagliostro. She claimed to be of the Valois bloodline, which gave her access to the servant's door of the Queen's household in Versailles. She reminded Rohan about the Queen wanting the necklace, and how she was very unhappy because she did not dare upset the King by asking him to pay for such a wonderful object.

Madame La Motte then asked Rohan if he knew of anyone of high rank, who would be discrete and could be trusted enough to do such a great service for the Queen as to front the money for her. "You see," said Madame La Motte, "the Queen said she was willing to buy it with her own money, but that she could not come up with such a sum all at once, and that she only wished she could count on the discretion of a great friend, who would be kind enough to oblige her until she could pay the money back: a friend that could be trusted enough to receive the necklace on her behalf." (Louis Figuier, *Op. Cit.*, p.57)

The vanity of Cardinal de Rohan had been touched. And since there existed no measure more convincing than to have someone confirm his self-delusion, Rohan immediately replied. " Since the King would not put up the money, I will help the Queen. I shall become the secret buyer of the said necklace."

"The Queen," Madame La Motte told Rohan, "was willing to pay for it with her own money, but in several installments."

Several days after this first meeting with the Cardinal, Madame La Motte came to the Prince again, but this time with a letter from the Queen, which had been carefully crafted by a friend of her husband's, the Sieur Retaux de la Villette, an expert counterfeiter in handwritings, who was also in the employ of Cagliostro. Only too willing to serve her Majesty blindly, Rohan recognized immediately the handwriting of Marie-Antoinette, which stated that she had accepted the good offices of the Cardinal and that she authorized him to buy the necklace secretly in her name.

Prince Rohan, wishing nothing more than to be in the Queen's favor, saw no problem in buying the necklace, however, just to be on the safe side, he called upon Cagliostro for his advice. Cagliostro had already entered into Rohan's favor, a few weeks earlier, by saving his brother from certain death, but made sure that he was not perceived as being a party to the antics of Madame La Motte. If there was a miracle doctor anywhere in Paris, who Rohan could trust with his own life, it was Cagliostro.

Cagliostro immediately refused the proposition of the Cardinal in order to establish a judicial distance from the affair in the future, and forced Rohan into a begging position. Cagliostro responded categorically: "If the Cardinal is sick, let him come and I shall cure him; if he is well, he has no need of me, nor me of him." Although the reply was somewhat brutal, Rohan was not offended by his negative response, to the contrary, he found himself in such a pressing situation that he instantly sent Madame La Motte to plead with Cagliostro. After several pleading sessions, Cagliostro finally gave in and gave Cardinal de Rohan the following oracle.

"{The negotiation undertaken by the prince is deserving of him; it will be totally successful; it will produce the highest favors from the Queen, and will cause the kingdom of France to prosper without compare, under the influence, the talents, and the preponderance of Louis de Rohan.}" (Louis Figuiet, Op. Cit., p.60)

The Cardinal could not hope for a better answer from Cagliostro. He was now convinced that there could not be a more beautiful opportunity to

reconcile him with the Queen, and to restore her good grace in his favor. On January 30th 1986, the Cardinal received the necklace and signed the promissory note that Boehmer asked of him.

4.2 THE DAY OF PURIFICATION

Madame La Motte told the Cardinal that the intention of the Queen was to wear those jewels at the celebration of mass on the day of Purification, but that she would have someone come to her place, in Versailles, for the diamonds. The Cardinal believed her and gave her the necklace for safekeeping. A complicated ceremonial was devised so that the Cardinal could witness the necklace changing hands between Madame La Motte and the chamber valet in the service of the Queen at the Trianon, without himself being seen. The Cardinal witnessed the scene and was in seventh heaven.

On the next day, the Day of Purification, the Cardinal entered the chapel to celebrate mass and was devastated to see that the Queen had come to the chapel without the magnificent set of jewelry. She wore no necklace at all. And to make matters worse, the Queen seemed to ignore the Cardinal more than ever, as she did not even look at him during communion. He was so confused that, during that after-noon, the Cardinal went dashing to the house of Madame La Motte, demanding an explanation of what went wrong. Madame La Motte calmly reassured the Cardinal immediately by saying:

"Monsignor, don't you have in you possession the letter of Marie-Antoinette, which says that she consents in accepting your mediation, and who assures you of her gratefulness? What can you fear with this piece of evidence? The Queen can only change her attitude towards you in a gradual fashion, so as to not awaken suspicion at the court. She has too much finesse to precipitate such a change of attitude towards you. This would create a lot of commotion, and initiate a thousand and one suppositions, one more unfortunate than the other." (Louis Figuier, *Op. Cit.*, p. 62)

The Cardinal was reassured and calmed down, but things had suddenly become more complicated for Madame La Motte. By that time, the necklace was already in London, being sold in pieces by her husband, the so-called Comte de La Motte, who had been accompanied out of France by the false chamber valet of the Queen, Retaux de la Villette.

However, there came a moment when the Cardinal wished to have a meeting with the Queen because he considered she took too long to change her attitude towards him. To confirm his suspicions, not only the Queen never appeared in public wearing the diamonds, but also her coldness toward him had not changed at all. Meanwhile, Madame La Motte kept reassuring the Cardinal, but could not keep up the scam much longer without the creation of new letters from Marie-Antoinette.

After Villette returned from London, Madame La Motte used his expertise again, and produced a new letter from the Queen, whose handwriting was again recognized by the Cardinal, who was moved to tears by the affection the Queen expressed toward him. However, there was no mention of the first installment of 300,000 francs that the Queen was to pay for the first payment of the necklace. Madame La Motte explained to the Cardinal that, "The Queen must be embarrassed with this money. This is why she doesn't write about it, She does not want to torment you. However, Monsignor, you would be infinitely agreeable to her if you were to give an advance of those 300,000 francs yourself." (Louis Figuier, *Op. Cit.* p. 63) But, the Cardinal did not have that sum of money and had already advanced 100,000 francs on Cagliostro's alchemy experiments.

Cagliostro's intention was to slowly break all of the resistance of Rohan and force him to pay for the entire cost of the necklace, piece by piece. The objective, here, was to get both the money from the Cardinal and the money from the proceeds of the necklace. So, Cagliostro needed to come up with some new expediency. He had trained Madame La Motte in balancing fear of displeasing the Queen against the need for Rohan to find the money and keep silent. The potential shame of dragging the name of the Queen into a sordid affair of money was for Rohan the hook that kept his purse open to Cagliostro and his scoundrels. This could only work, however, if the Cardinal were to be exalted to the point that he would be ready to make any sacrifice.

5.2 THE MASTER DECEPTION

There was, in Paris, a young woman by the name of Leguay, who was the spitting image of Marie-Antoinette. Cagliostro recruited her and trained her in courtly manners. She was given the name of Baroness d'Oliva and was being prepared to play the role of the Queen. Madame La Motte went to see the Cardinal with a note from the Queen, fabricated in the usual manner, which invited Rohan to a secret rendezvous in the woods of Versailles at night. "You will be able to see the Queen," said Madame La Motte to the Cardinal, "and she will be able to explain to you why she was not able to write certain things in her notes to you." (Louis Figuier, Op. Cit., p. 65) The Cardinal was ecstatic. He was ready to believe anything as demonstrated by the following scene, which was reported by the biographer of Cagliostro.

"{In the evening of the day and hour of the meeting, M. de Rohan was wearing a blue frock-coat and was at the rendez-vous place indicated. He had been accompanied by the Baron de Planta, a gentleman of his household who was waiting at a distance for the return of Monsignor. [...] Under the pale moonlight, Monsignor recognized the profile of the Queen, in a costume, which was a perfect imitation of a very elegant negligée that Marie-Antoinette wore at the Trianon. M. de Rohan began by mumbling his own justification. He began by justifying his behavior and by explaining the exaltation of his feelings, when suddenly, the false Queen interrupted him and said to him in a low voice, but with precipitation.:

'I only have a moment to give you; I am pleased with you; I will soon elevate you to the highest of favors.'

"Then there was the noise of footsteps in the thicket. The so-called Queen seemed frightened. She gave a rose to M. de Rohan, and said to him softly:

'Here comes the Countess of Artois who is looking for me, we must part.'

"M. de Rohan left the thicket immediately in the opposite direction. He joined the Baron of Planta and Mme de La Motte and explained to them the

unfortunate situation with total chagrin. He suspected nothing." (Jules de Saint Felix, {*Aventures de Cagliostro*}, 1855, p. 131-133.)

Although, the Cardinal was tormented, he was also totally infatuated by the declaration of his "royal lover." To further aggravate his new state of drunkenness, Madame La Motte dropped by the house of the Cardinal the next morning and handed him a new letter in which Marie-Antoinette expressed her total regrets about the unfortunate interruption of the night before. In his infatuated enthusiasm, the Cardinal had forgotten all about the 300,000 francs and made immediate arrangements to borrow the sum.

6.2 THE UNFOLDING OF THE SCAM

A few days later, the jeweler Boehmer was by chance called by Marie-Antoinette to bring her back a repaired ornament. Boehmer gave the Queen a note in which he said: "I congratulate Your Majesty for possessing the most beautiful diamonds known in Europe, and I beg of her not to forget me." After Boehmer had left, the Queen read the note and said to her Dame de Chambre, Madame Campan: "He is crazy." The Queen then sent Madame Campan to the jeweler for an explanation. After Boehmer told her the entire story of his selling the diamond necklace to Cardinal de Rohan, Madame Campan realized that the whole thing had been a scam, and told the jeweler: "{*Monsieur Boehmer, you have been robbed of you diamonds, The Queen knows nothing of this.*}"

A few days later, the King summoned Cardinal de Rohan to his cabinet and subjected him to a systematic interrogation. The King was furious. Cagliostro's biographer related the events as follows:

"{Louis XVI suddenly addressed M. de Rohan. It was a veritable interrogation session. The Prince overwhelmed, responded by mumbling. Marie-Antoinette, pale with anger, kept silent, without even looking at the Cardinal. However, the latter, attempting to reach for an extreme means of justification, extracted from his pocket a letter, which he said, was from the

Queen and addressed to Madame de La Motte. Marie-Antoinette made a nervous move of indignation. Her eyes were sparkling. The King took the letter, read it rapidly, and giving it back to the Cardinal, he said: 'Sir, this is neither the handwriting of the Queen, neither her signature. How can a prince of the House of Rohan, how can the grand almoner of the crown, believe that the Queen would sign Marie-Antoinette de France? Nobody ignores that queens sign only their Christian name.

"The Cardinal remained silent.

"But, explain to me what this whole intrigue is about," said the King with extreme impatience.

"The cardinal, was leaning against the table; he was getting pale, and could only respond these words:

"Sire, I am too much troubled to be able to explain myself before Your Majesty."

"The King continued with more benevolence:

"Get a hold of yourself, Monsieur le Cardinal. Go to the next room, where you will find what you need to write on. I do not wish to find you guilty."

M. de Rohan went to the other room.}" (Louis Figuier, Op. Cit., p. 68)

The next day, the Cardinal was taken to the Bastille. On the same day, Madame La Motte was arrested and also brought to the Bastille. Retaux de la Villette was also caught, but the Comte de La Motte escaped to England. As for Cagliostro, he was arrested in his alchemy laboratory of rue Saint-Claude, in Paris, and was also thrown into the Bastille. All of the accused were later brought before a commission of the parliament.

7.2 THE TRIAL

At the request of King Louis XVI, the Parliament of Paris opened an investigation on what was still an obscure plot contrived by unscrupulous swindlers, and apparently aimed at destroying the character of the Queen of France. The Conde, the Rohan, the Guemenee, the Soubise families, were all-present. They were all dressed in black, and were accompanied by no less than forty-nine members of the high clergy, all dressed in red, among whom Cardinal de Rohan, Grand Almoner of the kingdom, stood with dignity and perfect countenance.

The court case was a travesty of justice in which Madame de La Motte got the blunt end of Justice and Cagliostro, who had been the master mind of the whole operation, was acquitted.

The decision of the parliament was read as follows:

"{La Motte, contumacious, is condemned to the gallows at perpetuity.

"Madame La Motte will be wiped. She will be marked on the two shoulders with the letter V and incarcerated in the hospital [Salpetriere] at perpetuity.

"Retaux de Villette is banished forever from the kingdom;

"Demoiselle Oliva is acquitted by the court;

"Sir Cagliostro is discharged of accusation;

"Cardinal de Rohan is discharged of all accusation.}" (Louis Figuier, Op. Cit., p. 111.)

The plan to destroy Marie-Antoinette had failed, but the negative publicity against her dominated public opinion. Though he had been acquitted, Cagliostro was told to leave Paris within twenty-four hours. He went to assist the Martinists of Lyon by spending three weeks of masonic "rituals" in Passy. On June 20, 1786, he left Boulogne-Sur-Mer for London, where he wrote his *{Letter to the French*

People}, a political pamphlet against the Monarchy, against the Ministers and against the Parliament of France. Cagliostro had all of a sudden become very political and seemed to have espoused a revolutionary cause.

8.2 FROM VANITY TO ASYMMETRICAL WARFARE

Cagliostro's political diatribe against the French Monarchy represented, in reality, an admission of his terrorist proclivity. His pamphlet included a self-fulfilling prophecy, which announced, three years before the fact, that the Paris Bastille Prison was being planned for destruction. At the end of June 1786, Cagliostro wrote from London: "*{The Bastille will be destroyed from top to bottom, and the land on which it was erected will be converted into a promenade.}*" (Louis Figuier, *Op. Cit.*, p.119) With this statement, Cagliostro revealed himself completely before the court of justice of history. He was actually confirming that he was, indeed, an agent of British Intelligence, which can also be confirmed in the following manner.

According to British historian, Charles Mackay, Cagliostro began a publicity campaign in earnest against the Queen of France as soon as he got to London. Cagliostro's Paris failure was obviously not well received by his British masters. The first phase of the Bastille project had not gone according to plans and Cagliostro's deployment had to be changed. Mackay reported: "On his arrival in London, he [Cagliostro] made the acquaintance of the notorious Lord George Gordon, who espoused his cause warmly, and inserted a letter in the public papers, animadverting upon the conduct of the Queen of France in the affair of the necklace, and asserting that she was really the guilty party. For this letter, Lord George was exposed to a prosecution at the instance of the French ambassador, found guilty of libel, and sentenced to fine and a long imprisonment." (Charles Mackay, *{Popular Delusions and the Madness of Crowds}* original edition, London, Richard Bentley, 1841, Wells, Vermont, L.C. Page & Company, 1969, p. 254.)

As a result of this new scandal, Cagliostro was forced to retire from his career as a charlatan, and was sent back to France as a terrorist and mob controller

in preparation for the revolution. According to Father Gregoire and Joseph d'Orleans, Cagliostro founded a Jacobin type of Masonic Lodge in Paris under the initials L.P.D., which stood for {*Lilia Pedibus Destrue*}, (Destroy the lilies under your feet). The lilies were the symbolic flowers of the Bourbon dynasty.

In 1788, an associate of Cagliostro from Lyon, Knight of Malta freemason Cazotte, also made a prophecy during a dinner at the table of the Duke of Nivernais. He predicted that no less than four members of the Academy of Sciences sitting at the dinner table would be dead within six years. Cazotte had identified the allies of Benjamin Franklin, Marquis de Condorcet and Felix Vicq-d'Azyr, who were both suicided in prison. He also announced that Dr. Nicolai Roucher and Jean Sylvain Bailly would die under the guillotine, and they did.

When one looks for [*Qui Bono*] and discovers that both Cagliostro and Cazotte were leading masons associated with the Martinist freemasons of Lyon, and were associated with British Intelligence operatives, like Lord George Gordon, it becomes easy to put the pieces together and establish that such self-fulfilling prophecies as the Fall of the Bastille and the prediction of political assassinations of key French leaders were nothing but British-Freemasonic operations run out of London.

That masonic collaboration between Gordon and Cagliostro would have been classified as a mere coincidence had Lord George Gordon not been the British Intelligence operative who launched the infamous London riots of June 1780, which came to be known as the "Gordon Riots." On June 7th of that year, Gordon led a mob to storm the strongest prison in England, the Newgate London Prison, which was completely burnt and demolished within a few hours. The same scenario was to be repeated on July 14, 1789 at the Paris Bastille prison, prepared by a similar British Intelligence operation with the collaboration of the Duke of Orleans, Philippe Egalite, the Martinists of Lyon led by Cagliostro and Joseph de Maistre, and with the help of two Swiss-British agents, French Finance Minister Jacques Necker and Military Commander Baron Bensenval. Both terrorist projects had, indeed, been prepared by Lord Shelburne and Jeremy Bentham to serve as models for modern Synarchist-run {*purgative violence*}, which is today known as terrorist asymmetrical warfare.

The irony of Gordon's earlier terrorist trial lies in the fact that his lawyer got him a quick acquittal after stating to the court that he had been guilty "of nothing more than hare-brained and criminal folly in heading an unlawful assembly. " However, according to historian Richard Morris, this "criminal folly" did result in the loss of quite a few lives. "Of the 135 arrested and tried for taking part in the riots, 59 were sentenced to death and 21 duly executed. Among the assorted ruffians who paid the extreme penalty was the public executioner, Edward Dennis, the wretched hangman of infamous memory in Barnaby Rudge, who participated in the burning." (Richard B. Morris, {*The Peacemakers*}, Harper & Row, Publishers, New York, 1965, p. 83.) The Executioner Dennis, however, may have played a role model for Joseph de Maistre's executioner during the French revolution.

After the fall of the Bastille, Cagliostro made his fatal mistake. His terrorist deployment in France had succeeded and instead of going back to safety in England, he went to Italy. He dared to propagate his freemasonic doctrine in the anti-masonic capital of the world. After the founding of his Egyptian Lodge, in Rome, Cagliostro was arrested by the pontifical police on September 27, 1789, and was tried for his crimes perpetrated under free-masonic cover. His trial lasted eighteen months, at the end of which, he was condemned to death under the January 14, 1739 Anti-Masonic Bulle of Pope Clement VII. But a more lenient Pope Benoit XIV commuted his sentence to life imprisonment. Cagliostro died a few years later in his jail cell. [<note> Pius VI judgement pronounced against Cagliostro, Mars 21, 1791... is convicted of several offences ...by the apostolic laws of Clement XII and of Benoit XIV... which have been established against freemasonic societies...and by the Edict of State against those who are found guilty of this crime committed in Rome and in other locations of pontifical oversight. However, by virtue of a special grace, the penalty which hand over the guilty party to the secular arm of a special grace of commuting his sentence to life imprisonment."

SYNARCHY MOVEMENT OF EMPIRE

BOOK I

*

CHAPTER 3

*

CHAPTER 3

THE EARLY SYNARCHY MOVEMENT OF EMPIRE

**THE FRENCH REVOLUTION of 1789-1815:
A SYNARCHIST INTERNATIONAL EXERCISE
IN PURGATIVE VIOLENCE**

**3.1 THE RHINE-RIVER BORDER POLICY
AND THE EARLY SYNARCHY OF EMPIRE.**

- 1.2 INTRODUCTION
- 2.2 THE NEW LOTHARENGIAN (CAROLINGIAN) EMPIRE
- 3.2 THE OATH OF STRASBOURG.
- 4.2 THE CAPETIAN KINGS PICK UP THE PIECES
- 5.2 THE DUKES OF BURGUNDY AND THE LOTHARENGIAN EMPIRE
- 6.2 THE FRENCH REVOLUTION AND THE {ENTENTE BESTIALE}.
- 7.2 MIRABEAU'S *{POLITICAL PHARMACY}*
- 8.2 THE FAVIER PLAN FOR FRANCE, ENGLAND, AND PRUSSIA.
- 9.2 THE SHOCK OF EUROPE AND THE BATTLE OF VALMY.
- 10.2 DUMOURIEZ'S BELGIUM EXPERIMENT
- 11.2 IMPOSING "FRENCH DEMOCRACY" IN WESTPHALIA
- 12.2 TWO EMPIRES, TWO RESTORATIONS: "DU PAREIL AU MEME."
- 13.2 THE MISSION OF FRANCE

1.2 INTRODUCTION.

What European nations had failed to understand about the French Revolution, and the reason they had been so confused about the behavior of France during and after the terrorist events of the Bastille coup d'etat of July 14, 1789, was not so much because they had been deceived into believing the lie that Bastille day was a day of liberation for the French people, although many had been duped into perceiving that, and most are still duped by that deception to this day; but, rather, because they have not realized that Bastille day was part of a plan to turn the clock of civilization back to the little dark ages that preceded the 1648 Peace of Westphalia. In fact, July 14, 1789 was opening an era of French imperialist conquest and domination against the rest of Europe, under the guise of promoting freedom. These were the early days of an imperialist movement, which Lyndon LaRouche dubbed the {*Entente Bestiale*}.

Throughout its history, France has been dominated by two opposite and irreconcilable policies: the first one was the Jeanne d'Arc and Louis XI policy that Cardinal de Mazarin re-established at the Peace of Westphalia of 1648, and which was based on the idea of developing the nation-State for the {Advantage of the other}, and the second one was the imperialist policy, known in diplomatic quarters simply as the "Rhine River Border Policy," and which was based on the idea of {taking Advantage of the other}. Since France had abandoned the principle of the Peace of Westphalia, officially as early as 1795, she had been seeking other military alliances in order to secure an imperialist foreign policy that was centered on territorial expansion of border extension to the Rhine River's west bank, and all the way to the north sea. This was a totally different policy than the issues of Alsace and Lorraine, which represented, in themselves, complicated questions, but whose resolution, otherwise, resided within the competence of the Peace of Westphalia and had been settled, in its main features, since 1648.

This Rhine border policy was a totally different matter and an explicit foreign policy reaction to the Peace of Westphalia. It was a real nasty piece of

work, that kept coming back to the surface, like a recurring acute {*crise de foi*} that French ambassadors were submitted to, each time their government introduced it on the menu of diplomatic relations. It was a regurgitation of the {*folie des grandeurs*} that reaches back to the {*Oath of Strasburg*} of 834, and to the treasonous grandsons of Charlemagne.

The point is that this piece of imperialist insanity had been established officially during the French Revolution by the Decree of October 1st, 1795, under the Convention, and called for the original borders of the Gaul of Caesar, that is, the Alps, the Pyrenees, and the Rhine River, to become the borders of the new French Republic. This proved, without the shadow of a doubt, that the Convention and its "grandeur de la Republique" was ideologically closer to the {*folie des grandeurs*} of Louis XIV than to the American Revolution of Benjamin Franklin! Even Lazare Carnot had to fight against this foreign policy coming out of the {*Comite du Salut Public*}, and was ultimately forced to break officially, for the first time in 147 years, with the Peace of Westphalia tradition. This was yet another instance, following the careful hiding of the crucial role played by Jean Sylvain Bailly and General Lafayette during the terrorist events of the Bastille coup d'etat of 1789, where the French government, and its accredited historians, have kept the truth of this imperialist policy hidden from the French people during a period of over 300 years.

To further stress the outrage that such a policy had caused in the diplomatic world of the 1790's, I will only mention British diplomat, Lord Macartney, who wrote on November 15, 1795: "One of the many reasons which pushes us into a persistent war against the Convention is the unshakable resolution to never tolerate the slightest mention of their savage project of taking the Rhine River as a border [...] we are on our guards against such a monstrous idea, and we could never hear of it without disapproving of it formally. If the European equilibrium were to be destroyed because of it, it would not matter if it were done under a republic or a monarchy." He could not make the difference between the Revolutionary Convention and Louis XIV either.

Fascism will be the same under the "Orleanist" controlled Convention as under Napoleon Bonaparte who also pursued the same policy of extending the French borders to the Rhine River by conquering the German province of Rhine

Palatinate, Belgium and Luxembourg, and by attempting disastrously to prove that he could also add a few more pieces beyond the Rhine River. From that standpoint, it becomes historically clear that Waterloo was not just the failure of Napoleon. Waterloo was, more significantly, the failure of the French oligarchy's Imperial Rhine Border Policy.

Furthermore, French historian and author of a two volume work on the {Histoire diplomatique de la guerre franco-allemande}, Albert Sorel, reported in his {Essais d'histoire et de critique}, that after 1815, this Rhine border policy had also become the centerpiece of the French alliance with Russia, and had become a {Grand Design} in the foreign policy of the two Restorations, written up as such by the Prince de Polignac in an attempt to get Russia to agree to the partitioning of the Ottoman Empire in exchange for Belgium. Sorel wrote:

"{There are legends in the domain of diplomacy. One of the most accredited ones reports that in 1830, the government of the Restoration (Louis-Philippe) had contracted with Russia an intimate alliance which would have given to France the borders of the Rhine River.}"

This had also been the foreign policy of France under the Minister of External Affairs, August de la Ferronnays (1827-29), with the collaboration of Chateaubriand, explicitly against the Mazarin Westphalia policy. This is what the plenipotentiary Minister of Sardaigne at the Russian Court, Comte Joseph de Maistre, meant by his famous but cryptic exclamation: "We would be infinitely wrong in thinking that Louis XVIII was recovering the throne of his ancestors. He was merely recovering the throne of Bonaparte." In fact, Louis XVIII's ancestors had been forced to maintain the foreign policy course dictated by Cardinal Mazarin in 1648.

Moreover, Napoleon III had the same aberrant policy, aside from being a terrible strategist, as the 1867 affair of Luxembourg showed, when the French Minister of Foreign affairs, the Marquis de Moustier, rejected the offer of the Dukedom of Luxembourg and prevented a war between Prussia and France. De Moustier succeeded in getting a conference of Europe, in London, to agree on a treaty of neutralization, much like the United Nations Security Council decision against the war in Iraq today, demonstrating that the war was not inevitable. Thus,

Prussia's war against France was postponed for another three years. De Moustier extraordinary diplomacy, in the tradition of the Peace of Westphalia, had secured this peace entirely in spite of the incompetence of Napoleon III.

According to historian and diplomat, Gustave Rothan, Bismarck was willing to cede a lot to the French against a Pact of Neutrality with Napoleon III. Rothan wrote: "Up until the eve of the war, it depended only on us (the French) and we could have secured, against our neutrality and the Italian alliance, the gains of Belgium, Luxembourg, the Palatinate, and, at certain moments, even possibly the territory of the Moselle."

However, Napoleon III refused the offer of Bismarck, only because he had speculated wrongly on a Prussian defeat against Austria. To his dismayed surprise, not only did Prussia win, but Germany became unified behind Bismarck, and invaded France in 1870. The irony of this Bismarck victory was not only reflected in the fact that Napoleon III was forced to capitulate, and France forced to lose territory by having to cede, one more time, Alsace and a third of Lorraine, by the Treaty of Frankfurt of 1871, but that William I was declared Emperor of Germany at the Chateau of Versailles, while Napoleon III's Empire was overturned with total humiliation. At the very least, the fiasco of Napoleon had complicated matters on the French-German border of Alsace, by adding insult to injury in this unique part of the world where people are peaceful, speak a German dialect, and live in a French cultural environment. However, the comedy of errors continued and this was not to be the last attempt at implementing the Rhine border policy.

At the turn of the 20th century, Halford Mackinder's geopolitics together with that of the Royal Geographic Society in England, established a form of political alchemy based on the same idea that nations are defined by natural geographic borders. Mackinder's visceral hatred of Germany and of France propelled him to revise this synarchist imperial policy in a new form. He called it "geopolitics", the gist of which can be summed up as follows: he who controls the "rimland" (sea powers like France and Germany) controls the "heartland" (Russia), and he who controls the "heartland" controls the "world". This was also known as the "great game" strategy that was behind the Synarchist International plans for World War I, and World War II. That is also today, the basis of policy in US military schools, with the likes of Brzezinski and Huntington's fellow traveler,

Strausz-Hupe, who vigorously defended Mackinder in 1942, from charges that he had been the source of Hitler's imperial war plan.

Thus every single war that France had been involved in, from the Synarchist launching of the French Revolution of 1789 until the end World War II, in 1945, have been systematic attempts at undoing the Peace of Westphalia and at implementing a utopian dream of recapturing the ancient imperial territory of the Lotharingie.

2.2 THE NEW LOTHARINGIAN EMPIRE

When one looks back to Bastille Day, July 14, 1789, one discovers that a horrible terrorist act of *{purgative violence}* had been perpetrated against the population of France. Then, following this bloody event, a second scene of *{purgative violence}* had been scheduled to take place, only three days after, on July 17. The King of France was to be assassinated. On that day, Louis XVI, was travelling in his carriage in the direction of City Hall, and was about to receive the keys of the city of Paris, from its newly elected Mayor, Jean Sylvain Bailly. Just moments before receiving the keys, a rifle shot was fired and missed the King's carriage. We know of this assassination attempt, because records of the day show that a woman, by the name of Anne Felicite Jacqueline Duprateau, who had been standing in a large crowd to see the king go by, was shot dead. Reportedly, Fabre d'Olivet, assisted by his Jacobin friend, Thierry Ducloseau, was suspected of having been directly involved in this assassination attempt against the King. Had both of those moments of *{purgative violence}* succeeded, they would have opened the way for the Duke of Orleans, Philippe Egalite to become the new Jacobin Emperor of France. What has not been mentioned, however, is that Fabre D'Olivet was soon to become the acknowledged spiritual father of Saint-Yves d'Alveydre, the founder of the Synarchy movement in France.

With these historical events in mind, it is important to recall to the reader's attention, the three main objectives of the Bastille coup d'etat of July 14, 1789. They were to 1) prevent Jean Sylvain Bailly and General Lafayette from consolidating an American style revolution in France, which had already

successfully been initiated during the glorious day of June 20, 1789, by the National Assembly at the Tennis Court Oath; 2) to eliminate King Louis XVI, and replace him by the Duke of Orleans, Philippe Egalite, as the Jacobin Emperor, with Jacques Necker as his central banker and prime minister; and 3) to replace the Peace of Westphalia foreign policy with a {*New Lotharingian World Empire*} alliance between France, England, and Prussia.

This new triple {*Entente Bestiale*} called for expanding the French borders to the left bank of the Rhine River, a project that the Duke of Orleans, Philippe Egalite, had pursued with his British financial friends, as he was claiming to be a descendent of the Carolingian Empire of Charlemagne. This merely required the invasion of Luxembourg, and Belgium, primarily, because that entire region was a vast reservoir of coal, iron ore, and zinc, the crucial primary energy resources for the industrial control of any would be World Empire. <note> (Chapter XIII and XIV of {*Les Francais sur le Rhin*}, by Alfred Rambaud, go through "{*The violations of the German territory, and the New Carolingian Empire*}.")

Let us establish first the identity of the six main characters of those who played leading roles in this project that came to be known, during the French Revolution, as the {*New Carolingian Empire*} project:

- 1) The would-be New Emperor of France, the Duke of Orleans, Philippe Egalite (1747-1793), cousin of the reigning King Louis XVI;
- 2) Orleans' central banker, and would-be Prime Minister, Jacques Necker (1732-1804), a Swiss-British agent, working in direct collaboration with Lord Shelburne and Jeremy Bentham of the London Secret Service;
- 3) The deputy of Provence at the National Assembly, Count of Mirabeau (1749-1791), one of the most venal members of the National Assembly;
- 4) The venal controller of the Convention, Georges Jacques Danton (1759-1794), lawyer and terrorist Jacobin leader;
- 5) General Charles Dumouriez (1739-1823), Minister of Foreign Affairs, and military commander of the Northern Command;
- 6) The Jacobin Freemason, and occult source of the Synarchy Movement of Empire, Antoine Fabre d'Olivet (1768-1825), suspected of an attempted assassination of Louis XVI.

This author has already reported in EIR on the first two objectives cited above. <note> > (See Pierre Beaudry, {Jean Sylvain Bailly, {The French Revolution's Benjamin Franklin}}, EIR, January 26, 2001, and {Why France Did Not Have An American Revolution}}, EIR, January 18, 2002.) The third objective, has never been reported on, and has been known only to a handful of people within the European diplomatic circles as the {*Rhine border policy*}.

This French imperialist policy not only goes back to the beginnings of the French Revolution, but can be traced as far back as King Philippe Auguste, during the first Hundred Years War (1137-1238). It was also restored by Charles le Temeraire, under Louis XI, and later with Cardinal de Richelieu, under Louis XIII. It then became the center piece of the {*folie des grandeurs*} foreign policy of Louis XIV, with his lusting after the succession of the Spanish Habsbourg Empire. During the French revolution, this imperialist policy had become the centerpiece of the strategic utopian adventure of the Convention of 1791. <note> (Albert Sorel, who was undoubtedly the most authoritative French historian of the end of the nineteenth century, had, in his hands, all of the necessary evidence to demonstrate how the French revolution was nothing but a French imperial plan. This is extensively documented in his {*L'Europe et la Revolution francaise*}, Paris, Plon, 8 vol. 1889-1893. Although he did make a number of significant contributions by documenting the imperial nature of the French revolution, and by indicating its significance for Europe, Sorel's understanding of this fascist {*New Lotharingian Synarchy of Empire project*} was flawed essentially by his refusal to tell the truth, and his decision to go along to get along with the {status quo ante}.

Before going into the details of how this early {*Synarchy of Empire*} operated during the French Revolution, it is useful to give a summary account of historical precedents showing how the nation of France was almost destroyed several times by similar attempts to establish a French Empire. A short pause back to the Carolingian Kings will reveal how this imperial intention was already present in the {*842 Oath of Strasburg*}, and how this Oath can serve as a marker to indicate the characteristic bestial relationship that British Intelligence used to pit the two cousins, Louis XVI and the Duke of Orleans, against each other, and determining the entire outcome of the French Revolution.

3.2 THE OATH OF STRASBOURG.

Anticipating that his Empire would not remain intact after he died, Charlemagne (768-814) made use of a German tradition to split his domain into the most equitable manner possible between his three sons. It did not work out. Two of them died young and his last son, Louis Le Preux, inherited the entire Empire. On February 14, 842, two of Charlemagne's grandsons, Louis le Germanique and Charles le Chauve signed an agreement in Strasburg, which called for mutual colaboration and mutual assistance to the disadvantage of their older brother Lothaire II.

All three grandsons had inherited of approximately equal portions of their grandfather's Empire, but two of them wanted more. Lothaire II (855-870), had inherited a huge imperial domain that stretched from the Alps to the North Sea, including a large part of Switzerland, Burgundy (Franche-Comte), Alsace, Lorraine, the Barrois, the Palatinate, Luxembourg, Belgium, and the Netherlands. This was called the Lotharingie, which formed a buffer Empire between the Franc Empire and the German Empire, which were the domains of his two younger brothers, Louis le Germanique and Charles le Chauve.

The text of the {*Oath of Strasburg*} is significant in several respects, but for our purpose here, it can be considered in French diplomacy as the most despicable {*principle of hypocrisy*}, the evil principle underlying all of the French wars prior and after the Peace of Westphalia. If ever there was an anti-Westphalia principle, this is the one. The Oath reads as follows:

"For the love of God and for the Christian people and our common salvation, from this day forth, and as long as God shall give me knowledge and power, I shall help my brother Charles in all things, as a brother should be helped, in justice, under condition that he does the same for me, and I shall never hold any council with my brother Lothar that could become, of my own volition,

detrimental to my brother Charles."

^ This Oath has all the appearance of a beautiful commitment of mutual assistance and brotherly love, but, it is, in point of fact, by what it doesn't say, the most treacherous Treaty in the entire history of Europe. This is the founding principle of the {*Alliance Bestiale*}. This document contains, in germ form, the poison that infects even the members of the same family when animosity, hatred, lust and ambition takes over the souls of men. When its dark glow is brought to the light of day, it shows the source cause of every evil that crawled on French soil, during a thousand years, and which could only be neutralized, momentarily, by the Peace of Westphalia, in 1648.

The Oath shows clearly that this is a mean alliance, apparently to the advantage of Charles, but essentially made to guarantee the {*disadvantage*} of the older brother, Lothaire. The proof is in the pudding, as they say. This promissory note was actually put into writing, in the form of an official Treaty, for the whole world to see, and in order to buttress a war mobilization that was about to be unleashed. In fact, the Lotharingie Empire began to be torn to pieces when Louis and Charles defeated their older brother at Fontenay-en-Puisaye, today's Burgundy, on June 25, 842, only four months after the signing of the Oath. From that moment on, the entire Carolingian Empire fell apart.

4.2 THE CAPETIAN KINGS PICK UP THE PIECES

After the death of the last Carolingian king, Louis V (986-987), the bloodline of Emperor Charlemagne (768-814) was extinct, and Hugues Capet, Duke of France, became King of France, in 987. From that moment on, the Capetienne dynasty was to provide France with kings for 800 years. Two policy orientations were to dominate the entire history of France from that day on. The first, was a peace policy oriented toward securing the borders of the nation-state, and providing for the general welfare of its people. The other, was a war policy oriented toward increasing the power of the King by increasing the territory of his Empire. Even though the two policies were sometimes mixed, and at times difficult to distinguish one from the other, as the case of the French Revolution

demonstrated, the entire history of France cannot be understood without this clear distinction between those two irreconcilable political intentions of her governing bodies.

From very early on, the central task of the Capetien Kings had been to establish a political and territorial unity of France. In those feudal days, that territorial unity was not an easy thing to define, legally or otherwise. It was not yet clear, at that time, whether a given territory should represent the land of a people, or the domain of a King, since the people were considered the subjects of the King. Furthermore, the whole of France appeared to be a mish-mash of differing and conflicting hereditary family holdings. For example, on the one hand, King Louis VI (1108-1137) systematically fought the little lords for the benefit of the emancipation of the communes. This was the first French royalty that inaugurated public order and social justice against feudal warlordship. His son, Louis VII (1137-1180), on the other hand, had left his kingdom unattended for a few years in order to join King Conrad III of Germany into a most disastrous adventure known as the Second Crusade of 1147-1149.

A few years after his return, Louis VII was without a male heir to the throne, and consequently arranged for the annulment of his marriage with his wife, Alienor, heiress of Aquitaine, who, shortly after that separation, remarried Henry Plantagenet, Count of Anjou and Duke of Normandy, who was soon to become King of England, that is, Henry II, in 1154. With this disaster, Louis VII saw nearly half of the western part of France taken over by England. Henry II of England had become more powerful in France than the King of France himself. This led to a whole series of wars between the Capetians and the Plantagenets that lasted for hundreds of years.

After returning from the Third Crusade of 1190, King Philippe Auguste of France (1165-1223) had views of wars of conquest and expansion, and moved aggressively against England and Flanders. He was dreaming of not only regaining the French territories that were lost to England, but of reviving the design of Charlemagne by attempting to restore a New Roman Empire, again, with the idea of extending the borders of France all the way to the Rhine River. It is interesting to note that, each time France had attempted to be greater than her neighbors, she failed, and lost even the security of her own legitimate territory. Whenever she

tried to gain, she lost!

As we shall see in the following pages, throughout the entirety of French history, the idea of extending the limits of France to the so-called {*natural borders*} of the Rhine River, represented a {*casus belli*} going back to the days of Rome. It was the Roman Empire historian Strabo who had planted the very stupid geo-political idea that God's nature herself had provided for different peoples to mark the limit of their territories by means of natural borders. Strabo wrote: "*It seems that a tutelary divinity erected these mountain chains, brought these seas closer, traced and directed the course of so many rivers in order to one day make Gaul the most flourishing place on earth.*" This represents the insane imperialist geo-political view of final causality that France had used as a pretext for expansion during a period of over 1,000 years. In a very astute remark, French historian, Albert Sorel, noted in his book on {*Le droit des gens*}, that "*France had spilled an ocean of blood in order to conquer limits that were provided by a system of natural borders, yet she succeeded in acquiring them only for a brief moment before losing them again at the price of bloody disasters, while the most prosperous periods of her history were those when she did not have them.*"

It was Saint Louis, King Louis IX (1226-1270), who restituted the acquisitions of Philippe Auguste, and gave back to the King of England, Henry III, the provinces that Philippe Auguste had confiscated from King John of England. A friend of peace and justice, Saint Louis won a peace with England by the Treaty of Paris, in 1238, which ended the {*first Hundred Years War*}, and represented an equitable exchange of the territories that Louis VIII, the son of Philippe Auguste, had taken from Henry III, against the return to France of Normandy and Anjou. Saint Louis' peace initiatives gave France such a great preponderance that he was made the great arbiter of disputes between nations. Even inside of England itself, Henry III and his barons invoked the wise decisions of Louis IX in their own internal disputes. Saint Louis was at peace with his neighbors because he had properly defined the mission of France.

Later Philippe le Bel (1268-1314), who was under the control of a clique of jurists, pursued the same expansionist policy that Philippe Auguste had failed to establish, and turned against both England and Flanders. He wanted to create, on the basis of a new imperial legal system, a French Empire, also in the spirit of the

Carolingian dynasty of Charlemagne, whose Gaul had been marked by the so-called "natural limits" of the Rhine River. He had hired Pierre du Bois, a lawyer who wrote for him an *{Abridged Treatise on Wars and Court Cases}* to provide him with legal justification for grabbing the territories west of the Rhine River. Later, lawyers Robespierre and Danton studied closely Pierre du Bois' works in order to justify their own expansion policy during the French Revolution.

By 1328, Philippe VI (1293-1350) started another war of expansion, and his pretensions in foreign lands provoked the intervention of Edward III of England on the soil of France. Not that he needed any convincing, in 1337, Edward III lay claim to the crown of France, invaded, and started another Hundred Years War. Those were the first wars of liberation of France that came to an end, only after the successful mission of Jeanne d'Arc (1412-1431). During the third phase of this *{second Hundred Years War}*, corresponding to the reigns of Charles VI (1380-1422) and of Charles VII (1422-1461), the Burgundy threat became as significant a danger as the English threat.

5.2 THE DUKES OF BURGUNDY AND THE LOTHARINGIAN EMPIRE

In 1342, during the Hundred Years War, a new *{feudal apanage}* had been established in France under the new dynasty of the Dukes of Burgundy. Philippe le Hardi (1342-1404) inherited a huge domain, which included a large territory north of France, the territories of Holland, Belgium, and Luxembourg, that is, the entire region west of the Rhine River, at the exception of the German Palatinate, Alsace, and Lorraine. His territorial domain also included the east-central part of France, Burgundy itself, that is, the Franche-Comte, the Duchy of Burgundy and its dependencies. The Duke of Burgundy was considering separating himself politically from both the King of France and from the Austrian Emperor, and uniting his two domains by annexation of an intermediary piece of territory, in the Alsace-Lorraine region, thus, constituting an independent country between France and the Habsburg Empire. This was called the Lotharingian project.

This Burgundian threat to France, which the history books don't speak of much, was so extraordinary that it could have destroyed France completely.

However, when the king of France, Philippe VI, acquired the chatellenie of Vaucouleurs, in 1335, the commune where Jeanne d'Arc was to be born in 1412, he was far from realizing that he was actually securing this region of Lorraine against the Burgundian danger to come.

It was Jeanne d'Arc who put an end to this New Lotharingian Empire scheme, and caused the French people to remember the true mission of France and, in so doing, caused both France and England to stop their dynastic wars of imperial conquest. Thus, with the sublime courage of enthusiasm, Jeanne d'Arc liberated France, as Lazare Carnot put it, by going *{further than wisdom, and without exceeding its region.}* As a result, the English were forced out of France after Philippe le Bon, Duke of Burgundy, was forced to abandon his English alliance, and decided to join his forces with Charles VII. The Kingdom of France was restored at the Treaty of Arras, and Charles VII entered into the Paris capital, as the legitimate King of France, in 1437, putting an end to the Hundred Years War.

However, since the Dukes of Burgundy had managed to become the owners of Basse-Lorraine, the Burgundian danger remained a constant threat. When France was about to become the first sovereign nation-state, known as the *{Commonwealth}* of Louis XI, the new Duke of Burgundy, Charles le Temeraire, had been openly making plans to reestablish the Carolingian Empire of Lotharingie out of the Lorraine region, and create his own independent country by connecting Burgundy with Luxembourg and the Low Countries. The Duke came very close to succeeding, when his utopian dream was suddenly shattered during the siege of Nancy where he was killed, in January of 1477. On that day, Louis XI unified France, and put a stop to all ideas of conquering the West Bank of the Rhine River to create a New Carolingian Empire. This had been the most crucial turning point in all of French history. France had come to be within a hair's breath of disaster when, in a Shakespearean moment, she was suddenly transformed into the first sovereign nation-state.

Because of Jeanne's success, Louis XI (1423-1483) of France and Henry VII (1485-1509) of England were able to establish true nation-states based on the idea of the common good, the general welfare of the *{Commonwealth}*. Jeanne d'Arc had redefined the paradoxical mission of France along the lines of Saint Louis,

whereby {*France was to be sovereign only when she provoked her neighbors to become better than herself.*} That was a crucial breakthrough. Thus, at this point in history, after Jeanne d'Arc and Louis XI, it became easier to differentiate the projected shadows of two distinct and opposite groups of French leaders against the dimly lit wall of Plato's cave.

On the one hand, there is the humanist grouping who had been holding together the fabric of the French nation for a thousand years. They were: Saint-Louis, Jeanne d'Arc, Louis XI, Henry IV, Duke of Sully, Cardinal de Mazarin, Jean-Baptiste Colbert, Pierre Paul Riquet, Marshal de Vauban, Jean Sylvain Bailly, Lazare Carnot, Hanotaux, Charles De Gaulle. Each and all defended the sovereignty of the nation state from the vantagepoint of a foreign policy based on the principle of fostering the {*Advantage of the other*}.

On the other hand, the imperialist grouping were represented by Louis le Germanique, the Dukes of Burgundy, Duke de Guise, Cardinal de Richelieu, Louis XIV, Voltaire, the Dukes of Orleans, Count of Mirabeau, Jacques Necker, General Dumouriez, Napoleon Bonaparte, Louis Philippe, Napoleon the "putty", Marshal Petin, Alexandre Kojeve. Each and all form the {*Entente Bestiale*} committed to wars of expansion and domination, and followed a foreign policy based on extending the borders of France to the West Bank of the Rhine River, by following the principle of {*Taking Advantage of the other.*}

In a nutshell the significant elements of the history of France, can be summed up in the following nine periods of war and peace, totaling 1,016 years, from the beginning of the first Capetien King, Hugues Capet, in 987, until today's Synarchy subversion, in 2003.

THE HISTORY OF FRANCE IN A CAPSULE.

- 1- The period of 150 years of Capetien Kings, (987-1137);
- 2- The period of the first 100 years of private Wars (1137-1238);
- 3- The period of 99 years of Royal Dominion building (1238-1337);
- 4- The period of the 100 Years War of Liberation (1337-1437);
- 5- The period of the 74 years of Nation Building, (1437-1511);
- 6- The period of 137 years of Civil Religious Wars (1511-1648);
- 7- The period of 143 years of Peace of Westphalia (1648-1791);
- 8- The period of 128 years of Imperial Wars (1791-1919);
- 9- The period of 86 years of Synarchy subversion (1919-2005).

6.2 THE FRENCH REVOLUTION AND THE {ENTENTE BESTIALE}.

The modern project of the {*New Lotharingian Empire*} was aimed at establishing a {*One World French, English, and Prussian Empire*}, a Pan-European Union controlled by a central banking power sharing of Europe, a sort of early version of the Synarchy military-industrial complex. That new foreign policy was officially sanctioned by the French Convention, in 1792. This is why the nations of Europe were to become so confused about the so-called French Revolution. They did not understand why France was preaching {*liberty equality and fraternity*} while, at the same time, she was waging a war of conquest and domination against the nations of Europe. This is how Sorel put it, but without identifying the true nature of the {*Bestial Alliance*}:

" The [different European] peoples easily understood this language; they also understood the example that France had given them in 1792; what they no longer understood was that, with this language and the example she was setting, she was attempting to enslave and exploit them. They would not make the difference between her and the men that governed her; they were not seeking to find out by what phases the French revolution had gone through, and how the Republic had been transformed into an Empire; they only knew the Revolution under the form of the conquest." (Albert Sorel, {L'Europe et la Revolution francaise}, in Revue des etudes historiques, 1885.)

We cannot let escape the fact, here, that this French imperialist policy actually began with the Convention of September 1792, and not with the self-crowning of Emperor Napoleon, in 1804. In other words, the French {*Synarchy of Empire*} began with Mirabeau, Danton, and Dumouriez, while Napoleon merely became the Emperor that Philippe "Egalite" had failed to become.

As a result of not using a flexible American Revolution type of constitutional framework based on the {*general welfare*} of the people, and the Gottfried Leibniz principle of {*Love, Liberty, and the pursuit of Happiness*}, that Bailly and Lafayette had begun to elaborate during the first National Assembly, from 1789 to 1791, the French oligarchy kept seeking disguised forms of feudal constitutional framework, based on the John Locke's principle of {*right of property*}. That Lockean principle kept changing, depending on the interest groups, and parties, that were gaining power. That is why the French population was subjected to 11 constitutional changes within a period of 167 years. There have been no less than 11 different {*French Constitutions*} since 1789: namely in 1791, 1793, 1795, 1799, 1802, 1804, 1848, 1852, 1875, 1946, and 1958. This does not include the different internal constitutional modifications, which occurred in 1815, 1830, and 1852.

7.2 MIRABEAU'S {POLITICAL PHARMACY}

The reason for the success of the coup d'etat of the Bastille, as well as all of the other acts of terrorism, or counter terrorism, that have been deployed by

governments since 1789, resides in applying both a {*deception policy*} of lies and a {*purgative violence*} that causes fear in the population and keeps the terrorist government into place. This is precisely what happened during the reign of terror in France

The instrument of despotism that had been used throughout history, but more explicitly, since the terrorist actions of the Bastille, was first devised as a means of unleashing the furies of the people against an unpopular government. This is the policy of {*purgative violence*}. The British Secret Service first made use of it during the Gordon Riots of June 1780, in London, as a prelude to the momentous event of July 14, 1789, in Paris. Lord Gordon was later to be sent to France and join Count Cagliostro in his operations against Marie-Antoinette, and in the coup of the Bastille. This is what intelligence operatives call today {*gang counter gang*} tactics. Accordingly, a diplomat located in England, M. de la Luzerne, wrote from London, on May 31, 1790, the following instructive comment about this method:

"The British don't understand why we do not defend ourselves, and why our government does not respond to pamphlets. Lord North was telling me, just the other day, that he had seen many different administrations, since he has been in government; but that he had not yet seen one strong enough to rise above and withstand pamphlets, and that it was necessary to reply against everything, since in a very short period of time, the best administration could become unpopular, and that he could not imagine how the ministry of France could still exist, since it was continuously coming under attack, and was never defended. The ministerial principle here is, in general, to do {mod contre mob,} (in English in the original); that is to say, every time that the opposition attempts to bring the people to riot against the government, the government seeks to get the people to riot against the opposition." (Albert Sorel, {*Les plans politiques de Mirabeau in 1790.*}, in *Revue des Deux Mondes*, Paris, 1884, p.52.)

Such a tactical method, also used by the FBI, for instance, in the United States, is part of an arsenal of dirty tricks used by governments to control both sides of an explosive issue, such as Black Panthers vs KKK, for example, or the Israeli Sharon government controlling both the Israeli Defense Forces (IDF) and the Hamas Palestinian terrorists. During the French revolution, this method was

part of what Count of Mirabeau had dubbed his *{Political Pharmacy}*, playing on the paradoxical meaning of the Greek term *{pharmakon}* meaning both *{remedy}* and *{poison}*. Mirabeau did not hesitate to use such *{purgative violence}* to execute his plans. He even had made plans to use police state measures against the Jacobins. The following shows how Mirabeau was attempting to sell himself as a *{pharmakon}* to Louis XVI:

"We will only save ourselves if we have a plan that brings together external affairs and the affairs of the palace, the combinations of the statesman and the resources of intrigue, the courage of great citizens and the audacity of the scoundrel. We require a sort of political pharmacy in which only the leader, equally equipped with healing plants and poisonous ones, is able to proportion his compositions under the direction of his genius, and under the auspices of a total confident abandonment on the part of the patient." (Mirabeau, *{Correspondance}*, II, Dec. 27, 1790, p. 510.)

Historian, Albert Sorel, saw Mirabeau for what he really was. He wrote: *"...all of this great ministry out of which he had formed his plan, in the manner of Richelieu, ended up, in practice, giving direction to a secret police."* (Sorel, *Op. cit.*, p.55.)

8.2 THE FAVIER PLAN FOR FRANCE, ENGLAND, AND PRUSSIA.

The France of 1792 wanted to impose by force, its utopian ideas on Europe, and the means of achieving this objective was to enforce freedom and democracy on their neighbors. The plan was not new, but the opportunity to set off violence across France as a cover for the creation of a new empire was the most favorable circumstance for a few ambitious and utopian adventurers and admirers of the Roman Empire, to dress up the old foreign policy of Louis XIV's *{folie des grandeurs}* into the new garb of the *{grandeur de la Republique}*. The military task was going to be given to one of the most dangerous men of intrigues of the Louis XV period, General Dumouriez.

Charles Dumouriez was fifty years old when the Revolution began in 1789. He was ambitious, and callous, more of an intrigue creator than a negotiator. Sorel says about him that "*Among the survivors of the secret ministry of Louis XV, a few knew him and considered him to be a misunderstood genius. In the war rooms, however, he was considered as a schemer; in those of the foreign affairs office, as a man of fantasies, and a dangerous agent.*" (Sorel, Op. cit., p.303.)

Upon returning from Belgium, where he had been sent to study the terrain of his new conquest, Dumouriez was given the rank of Marshal, and the command of the French northern troops, which had been, until then, under the orders of General Lafayette. Lafayette was stripped of his Northern Command because he was following Carnot's orders, which were to protect the northern borders, not invade the Low Countries. Lafayette was then pushed into exile a few months later, on August 19, 1792.

The two ideologues behind the utopian scheme of General Dumouriez were two of the most venal characters, Count of Mirabeau, and Georges Jacques Danton. Although Mirabeau was a staunch royalist, while Danton was a Jacobin terrorist, the plan fitted both their different agendas. The scheme was orchestrated in three steps. The first was to have Dumouriez become a member of the Girondins faction (the strongest opposition against the Jacobins), and gain the trust of their leader, Jacques Pierre Brissot, a propagandist for an expansion war. Dumouriez' open hatred of Austria was his ticket for "republican" acceptance. The second step was to have the Convention accept to turn the victorious Carnot {*war of liberation*} into an {*imperial war of aggression*}. Thirdly, Dumouriez managed to intrigue his way into secretly gaining the favor of the King to be nominated Minister of Foreign Affairs on March 15, 1792. At that point, the New Carolingian Empire project was set to take off.

It is essential here to make the difference between those two different intentions of wars, even though they were being conducted simultaneously. At the onset of the French Revolution, Lazare Carnot (1753-1823) became both the commander in chief of the French army and a member of the Committee for Public Safety, the command center of the revolution, which was under the control of Robespierre and Danton, both of whom had total hatred of Carnot. However, Carnot's policy and responsibility was to mobilize the people and build an army of

{*citoyens- patriotes*} for the strategic defense of the nation, in the tradition of Marshal Vauban. Carnot became recognized as the {*Organizer of the Victory*} by completely revolutionizing the feudal military doctrine of his time. He transformed the French army in depth by changing the frontal federated form of attack and defense into a totally mobile {*Entschlossenheit*} form of field deployments. The engineers of the Ecole Polytechnique produced new mobile artillery capabilities that became the most technologically advanced in the world, at the time. His motto was {*No sitting in the barracks! Attack, Attack, Attack!*} His policy of rapid deployment of the infantry, backed up by mobile artillery, transformed completely the most disastrous army into the most feared war machine in all of Europe, within only four years. His secret weapon was: {*Flanking Enthusiasm*}

However, this strategic defense {*war of liberation*}, meant to secure the existing territory and borders of France, was countered by a {*war of aggression*}, which was aimed at extending the borders of France to the West Bank of the Rhine River. Each time Carnot tried to stop Dumouriez, he would he would be blocked by Robespierre, Danton, and Brissot, who had foreign policy control at the Convention.

On the diplomatic front, the foreign policy plan of jointly sharing the power of a new empire, which is the meaning of the verb συνάρχων, synarchy, which means {*sharing power*}, came from the doctrine of {*Conjectures raisonnees*} authored by Jean-Louis Favier (1711-1784), a fascist foreign policy diplomat of Louis XV. Favier was an open adversary of Austria, and was the person responsible for the disgrace of the Duke of Choiseul (1719-1785), the staunchest ally of both Austria and of the American Independence.

The plan of Favier required the substitution of the {*Austrian system*} for the {*Prussian system*}. In concrete diplomatic terms, this meant a total axiomatic change, a complete subversion of the Peace of Westphalia policy, which had guaranteed the security of Europe for a period of 144 years. This also meant the elimination of both the family pact of Louis XVI and Marie Antoinette, and the French-Austrian alliance, which had been secured at the Versailles Treaty, since 1756. This defined an axiomatic change for the whole of Europe. The Convention argued that since it was no longer the Austrians who ruled in Spain, but the Bourbons (with an Orleans ascendancy), Belgium would be an easy prey,

especially if Frederick II of Prussia were to have no philosophical objections, and if England agreed to share the booty with France. According to Favier's doctrine of {*Conjectures raisonnees*} Austria had to be considered as the pre-Westphalia enemy, while Prussia had to be made a natural and necessary ally of France.

Dumouriez followed the doctrine of Favier as the counterpart to the Peace of Westphalia. The imperialist logic was actually quite naïve and utopian in essence. First, France must incapacitate or ally herself with England. Since England was the only power that was capable of preventing France from expanding its empire overseas, or on the continent, she might be better off joining France as an imperial partner. Secondly, France must destroy Austria, her only "natural enemy" on the continent. The alliance concluded with Austria, with the 1756 Treaty of Versailles, has been the source of all of the limitations of French imperialism, and expansion. That was the {*sine qua non*} condition of Favier's entire imperial design: France must absolutely ally herself with Prussia, the historical enemy of Austria. That was the plan. However, it had only one defect. It had nothing to do with the real world. It was simply an abstraction applied to the statement of journalist, Antoine Rivarol, that said: "*Man will always choose as his friends, the enemies of his enemies.*" Nonetheless, this became the policy orientation that the Convention of 1791 used to launch its imperial drive for the West Bank of the Rhine River. As we shall see, this Rhine River policy will remain the imperial plan of conquest and domination for a quarter of a century, from Valmy to Waterloo, and beyond, regardless of who was in power.

In 1792, General Dumouriez managed to obtain the post of Minister of Foreign Affairs. As a military officer, Dumouriez was the opposite of Carnot. While Carnot was first and foremost, the {*Organizer of the victory*}, Dumouriez was the imperialist who turned the {*war of liberation*} into a {*war of aggression*}, by turning the {*Reasoned conjectures*} of Favier into a state doctrine. This is how the {*Reason of State*} was turned against the {*State of Reason*}.

Dumouriez acknowledged in his {*Memoires*} that Favier had been the "most skilful politician of Europe," and that "everything he had learned in politics came from him." In fact, it was from Favier that Dumouriez learned to despise the official school of diplomacy, and to acquire an instinctive and profound hatred for the principle of the Peace of Westphalia. His outlook was essentially that France

had to acquire the status of the first nation of Europe in terms of its military power and its economic power of federation.

Dumouriez reorganized entirely the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, and the embassies abroad, to match this utopian scheme and matched them with the ideas of Danton at the Convention. However, Dumouriez was not a Jacobin. He had adopted the principles of the Jacobin mob only to better subvert them, at a later date. Through the embassies, he promoted the paranoid lie that Europe was looking at France as verging on a state of decomposition, and that the immediate neighbors were going to take advantage of such a situation, invade France, carve it up, and dismember it, as it was done in the partitioning of Poland, in 1772. In anticipation, and as a preventive measure to avoid an eventual attack against France from its neighbors, Dumouriez prepared a preventive attack into the Austrian controlled Netherlands. " *I recommended an offensive war because I thought it was necessary in the Lower Countries: 1. In order to push the disaster and the confusion of a defense of a border which is a mere 50 lieues from Paris; 2. Because the people of Belgium seem to be waiting for our invasion of the Lower Countries, and are ready to embrace the cause of freedom;...3. Because I am counting on the courage of the French;...and 4. Because the rage of freedom will win over all of the mercenaries who will rub against us,* " <note> (Project of a letter to the president of the diplomatic committee, May 1. 1792. Quoted by Albert Sorel, { *Un general diplomate au temps de la révolution* }, Revue des deux mondes, I, Paris, Bureau de la revue des deux mondes, 1893, p.310.)

All that Dumouriez required was to provoke an incident inside of Belgium that would warrant an invasion. He prepared the advance propaganda that explicitly said to the Belgian people that the French intention was not annexation. Dumouriez was trying to avoid the resentment of the great majority of the population, which would have been as hostile against France as they were against the Habsburg Empire. Of course, the plan had to be perceived not as an invasion, but as liberation from the tyranny of the Habsburg oligarchy. Dumouriez had made preparations to put Belgium friends of France in power, and bring Belgium under the democratic protection of France through a sort republican federation. It was formulated in such a way that England could not refuse, and would be forced to agree in order to avoid an outright annexation.

The plan included a journalistic propaganda against the House of Habsburg, a call for {*liberty, equality, and fraternity*} to rally the population for an insurrection against the Austrian Empire and to be triggered at a chosen moment, somewhere in Belgium. Once the insurrection began, war was going to be declared against Austria, after having gotten the support from Prussia and England. Russia was too far away to intervene, and Dumouriez was convinced of the neutrality of Denmark and Sweden.

On March 2, 1792, the Convention Envoy to England, Charles Maurice Talleyrand (1754-1838) (chosen by Mirabeau personally) wrote to the Foreign Minister, Dumouriez, from London, assuring him that England's neutrality was "undeniable." Lastly, Spain was not going to attack France, providing that England was going to remain neutral. The only delicate and crucial diplomatic question that remained to be solved appeared to be the objections of the German princes of Alsace in defense of the Treaties of Westphalia. However, since it was the feudal rights that were being contested, as opposed to the fundamental principle of the Peace of Westphalia, the German princes chose an equitable indemnity arrangement with the Convention, rather than risk a costly war. The fundamental principle of the Peace of Westphalia, the {*Advantage of the other*}, had all but been forgotten, and explicitly rejected, from all sides.

In the name of the Convention, Dumouriez' grandiose imperial plan was submitted to the British, as an invitation to form, with France, an {*Entente Cordiale*}; but, at the same time, it was a threatening scheme against Britain's joining the Austrian coalition. In March-April 1792, Dumouriez wrote a memorandum called {*Reflexions pour la negotiation d'Angleterre*} for his London Embassy staff, MM. Chauvelin, Talleyrand, and du Roveray. Dumouriez wrote:

"The victory of the coalition would cause the dismemberment of France. Austria would take Alsace and Lorraine; but she would not be the only one to grab territories; the others would demand compensations, there would be divisions in Germany, in Courland, in Turkey, in Poland; England would suffer from this. She must avoid that. Furthermore, if the coalition were to win, she would reestablish the old regime, and with it the Austrian alliance and the {family pact}. So much for the first hypothesis. The second hypothesis is the most realistic, thanks to the resources of the country, and to our patriotic thrust, it will be the

success of France, and following that, the development of its immense commercial wealth. France will come out of the struggle more powerful and more prosperous. England must choose: either impair this rise of power or support it. If she fights us, she will ruin our commerce, but she will ruin hers as well. Like during the Seven-Year War, she will be forced to hire German armies. What will she win? Our colonies? They are already devastated, in a state of anarchy, and furthermore, the English will encounter the Spanish and the Americans who will dispute the empire against them.

" In compensation, the French will keep Belgium, will establish themselves along the Rhine, and by the sole effect of proximity, will provoke a revolution in Holland. Before the evidence of such a stronger and larger France, would England prefer to have her as a friend or as an enemy? Would it not be an expedient to begin where we will come to end? That is, to put an end to these awful rivalries which separates our two nations made to love and understand each other? " (Sorel, Op. cit., p. 316-17.)

After receiving this dispatch from Dumouriez, Talleyrand goes even further in amplifying this twisted and perverted logic to his counterpart involved in the British-French negotiations of this {*Entente Bestiale*}. He wrote:

"Calculate what the loss of Holland will represent for you," said Talleyrand to his British counterpart, "the opening of the Escaut River, and all that you will have to fear of an added population of 5 or 6 million people, and of the loss of a rich and abundant country. Only you will have attacked our constitution, only you will have forced us to extend our power by propagating our spirit of liberty...You would have made us conquerors in spite of ourselves, because we would have been forced to keep these beautiful provinces as a security against what you would have taken from us...On the other hand if you were to remain neutral, we would be sure to dismember the league of our enemies, even-though they are numerous, but very frail. You can even help us contain the King of Prussia and Holland. In that case, you become our benefactors and our natural allies. Our rivalries come to an end, and we become jointly the referees of war and peace in the universe."

With this kind of documentary evidence, it is exceedingly difficult to decide which of the two casts the most perverse shadow: perfidious Albion, or perfidious

Talleyrand? What is clear, however, is that the idea of {*Synarchy of Empire*} is already on. Dumouriez went as far as wondering if "*the time had not come to form an alliance between France and England, with the addition, if necessary, of North America, and create a great combination which would open to these three great powers, the trade of Spanish colonies, in the South Sea as well as in the Atlantic.*" (Ibidem, p.317) Dumouriez even gave the British the assurance that the King of France was willing to give them back the Island of Tobago, which France had acquired from England by a former Treaty. Dumouriez wrote in a dispatch: "*His Majesty thinks that by offering it (Tobago) to England, providing the necessary acceptance of its inhabitants, this would represent a powerful pledge of the friendly disposition of the French nation, and of the wish she is making to have all traces of former misintelligence erased between herself and the British nation.*"

9.2 THE SHOCK OF EUROPE AND THE BATTLE OF VALMY.

On April 20, 1792, the French Convention declared war on Austria and invaded Belgium. Of course, the shock on Europe as a whole was terrible. The river of the French revolution had flooded over its banks, and Dumouriez was being carried in the northern directions by its uncertain flows. However, since he was trying to swim faster than the current, which was carrying him, he gave the illusion that he was directing its course. Thinking he was going to be able to implement his utopian political program, Dumouriez found himself in the middle of an uncontrollable imperialist paradox: {*How do you win a war by imposing liberty on another people?*}

The point to be made is that, the Belgium situation was bound to be out of control. Dumouriez' hopes of provoking a national uprising in Belgium had failed, as the demagogical methods of his Paris agents became more than obvious. His ambassador in Berlin, General Custine, also failed miserably to win over the Prussians. When Frederick-William of Prussia heard of the declaration of war against Austria, he immediately considered himself under attack, and allied himself with the Empire. Even the small Island of Sardinia joined the {*coalition of kings*}. England maintained a {*malicious neutrality*}, and Spain was going to follow England, nervously sniffing the bulldog from behind. Dumouriez feared

that if Holland were to join the coalition with Austria, England would defend Holland, and hide behind the Utrecht Treaty and the Convention of 1790, both of which guaranteed Belgium to the House of Austria. Sorel sums up this situation quite well:

"Dumouriez was attempting to untangle himself from a vicious circle. He had counted on the negotiations to facilitate a successful war, and it turned out that the declaration of war was impeding all of the negotiations. He had hoped that a brilliant limited war, followed by a glorious peace, would have increased the credibility of French power, and would have helped smother the demagoguery; but the impotence of power threw France to the demagogues, and the triumph of demagoguery transformed the war against Austria into a European war in which France, isolated against a formidable coalition, was gambling its destiny away." (Albert Sorel, Op. cit., p.329.)

On August 18, 1792, Dumouriez had left the Foreign Affairs, and had taken command of the troops of the Northern Army. King Frederick-William and Prince Brunswick were moving west with 42,000 Prussians, 6,000 Hessians, and 6,000 French emigres. These troops were backed up by 30,000 Austrians, 15,000 under the command of Clerfayt, on the one side, and 15,000 under the orders of Hohenlohe, on the other. The Duke of Saxe-Teschen was covering the Belgium flank leading to Lille, with another 25,000 troops. This represented a total of 109,000 troops against no more than 100,000 French troops scattered all along the northeastern border of France. Brunswick's plan was to force Dumourier away from Belgium, forcing him to come back south toward Valmy.

With total audacity, French artillery commander Kellermann took a defensive position on the mound of Valmy, positioning his 20,000 troops, and 40 cannons on a narrow ledge, between the enemy and the border, cutting off Brunswick from his supply line. Valmy was a huge semi-circular shaped elevation, facing southwest toward Paris. On the morning of September 20, the Prussian columns of 45,000 men marched in the thick fog with 80 canons. A furious canon battle began in the fog. By eleven o'clock, the fog lifted revealing the two armies facing each other. The Prussians, formed in traditional attack columns, expected that the French troops would break up and disperse out of fear before this huge living column marching toward them. But, the opposite occurred. Reporting on

location, the poet Goethe stated that the French troops were "in their ranks, forming an amphitheater, standing at ease and quite, unruffled." There was on both sides a sudden state of awe at the sight of each other, a paralyzing state of shock had struck both armies. Then, Kellermann raised his hat with the tricolor cocarde, holding it at the tip of his sword, trotted in front of the French troops who repeated a hundred times "Hail to the nation." Both armies started to march against each other. The Prussians were stunned to discover such an organized force before them. The émigrés had told them that the French army was in shambles, that it was made up of inexperienced {*sans-culottes*}, and that they could expect hardly any resistance on their way to Paris. Troubled by the number of regular forces, and the power of the French artillery, which had the reputation of being the best in Europe, the Prussians were shaken up by the firepower they were being hit with, in the middle of their marching columns.

For the first time in all of their campaigns across Europe, the Prussians army hesitated. Brunswick arrived on the battlefield, and after a quick examination, saw that the risk was too great, and ordered his troops to retreat. In total, the battle had cost 200 Prussian and 300 French casualties. Compared with other great battles in history, this was a mere skirmish. Dumouriez remained north of Valmy, and his troops had not even participated in the battle, although he personally took all of the glory for the French victory.

The Prussians felt they had lost, and the French considered they had won a moral victory. Goethe reported on the next day: "*On the morning of the 21st, we felt we were in a humiliating and desperate situation. We were on the edge of an immense amphitheater, and on the other side, on the high grounds above rivers, swamps and brooks, the enemy army formed an immense half-circle. As much as we were bellicose the day before, we conceded that an armistice was necessary, since the most courageous and the fiercest were forced to recognize that an attack would be the most reckless enterprise in the world.*"

This humiliating situation was also compounded by the facts that the Prussian army had been bogged down in the mud for days, because of the continuous rain; that they were suffering severe hunger and dysentery, while the Austrian troops, who were the real enemies of France, were safely behind, on the other side of the border; and, Brunswick and King Frederick-William did not hope

to gain much after this war was over, while they stood to lose much more by letting Russia's Tsarina, Catherine's troops enter into Poland, while they were in France. Thus, the amplified effect of the "cannonade of Valmy" had such a psychological impact on their already demoralized minds, that the Prussians not only stopped their march on Paris, but took to their winter quarters and gave the French troops the necessary respite they required in order to reorganize themselves. A few days of negotiations resulted in the complete retreat of the great Prussian army.

A number of contradictory situations should be noted in this context, which indicate how confused this moment of history was. First of all, this was not such a great French victory as a lot of accounts reported it to be. The situation was not simple. The most unbelievable confusions were being entertained on both sides of the battle line.

For instance, as they were invading France against the threat of a preemptive strike that Dumouriez intended to launch against Belgium, the alliance against France was very weak, and the *{Reason of State}* was different in each case. Ironically, even before the fighting started, the different leaders were all counting their shares of the indemnities of war. Austria was actually considering the possibility of exchanging Bavaria against ceding Belgium to the French, but with the provision that she could also add Anspach and Baireuth. Brunswick knew he would not gain any territory inside of France, and had second thoughts about leaving Poland behind at the mercy of the Russians. While Dumouriez had made the solemn pledge that he would not go to Belgium without "the necessary consent of the Belgium people themselves," Brunswick found himself tormented by the idea that he was invading the friendly nation France against his own better judgement. Brunswick wrote on Septembre 26, 1792: "*Our two nations are not made to be enemies. Is there not a way we could come to a friendly agreement? We know we don't have the right of preventing a nation from establishing its own laws, to determine its internal affairs; we do not want to stop that. Our only concern is the future of the king.*"

Moreover, the emigres had convinced Brunswick that the French population would welcome them as their liberators, that the cities would open their doors, and that the revolutionary *{sans-culottes}* would flee before them. The opposite

happened. The Prussians found, instead, a hostile population, which they treated as a conquered people. However, the most blatant paradox of all lay in the fact that Lazare Carnot had been creating miracles in organizing the defense strategy for the liberation of France, a {*levee en masse*}, while at the same time, Dumouriez had been pursuing his imperialist war of conquest against Belgium, and the Westphalia-Rhineland region on the west bank of the Rhine River, with the very same troops. In other words, the French troops fought bravely because they were fighting for their independence, and not because they wanted to invade Belgium and conquer German territory.

By October 6, 1792, Dumouriez, following his plan of conquest, resolved to march north toward Flanders with 30,000 men, while Kellermann took his 50,000 men to follow and contain the orderly retreat of the Prussians. By October 22, as the last Prussian soldier had left French territory, Dumouriez' imperial war of conquest was also just beginning. Dumouriez marched into Belgium on October 28, 1792. By November 14, the French troops had taken Bruxelles. The irony that was missed by everyone in this confusion was that the Imperial troops of Austria were brought in to defend the sovereignty of Belgium, while the French Republican troops were invading Belgium to impose liberty. Squeezed in between, the Belgium people did not know who to throw themselves against, the French or the Austrians, so they mostly barricaded themselves into their homes.

On November 6, Dumouriez won the battle of Jemmappes against the Austrians, and three weeks later, he had taken the whole territory of Belgium. On November 29, Dumouriez wrote to General Philippe Custine, commander of the French troops in the Rhineland cities of Mayence, Worms, and Spire:

"It is certain that we must not lay down our arms until we have guaranteed that the borders of the Rhine have been secured as the limits of our empire; either by the aggregation of free republics, under our protection, either by the acceptation of the peoples who will give themselves to us, and will join us to form the composition of the French Empire. The timid people will say that throwing ourselves into conquests is against our principles. All we have to reply to them is that there is a difference between conquering, which is an act of violence, and receiving in your bosom the peoples who willfully offer themselves, which is an act of fraternity." (Sorel, Op. cit., p.801.) And thus, French imperial ambition had

insinuated itself under the mask of generosity.

10.2 DUMOURIEZ' BELGIUM EXPERIMENT

Belgium was the theater of a terrible fascist experiment with the French use of *{la force prime le droit}* (might makes right). The population was considered to be second class Frenchmen, and Dumouriez had trained his officers to demonstrate their superiority over an inferior people. During the entire period of the French Revolution, Belgium had been invaded three times, once by the French under General Dumouriez, once by the Austrians, and a third time by the French again, under Napoleon Bonaparte. Each invasion was becoming more costly for the Belgium population, because the French and Austrian troops were living off of the local countryside, since it was impossible to supply them from the outside. The French authorities kept insisting that their troops were there as liberators. It had been a curious kind of liberation indeed, since the French troops had not only stolen from them their sustenance, but also a considerable amount of Belgian artwork. It is reported that a Lieutenant, who had come back with a chariot load of priceless paintings, reported to the Convention: "These masterpieces have been soiled too long by the condition of servitude."

On November 29, 1792, Dumouriez wrote to General Philippe Custine, commander of the French troops in Mayence, Worms, and Spire:

"It is certain that we must not lay down our arms until we have guaranteed that the borders of the Rhine have been secured as the limits of our empire; either by the aggregation of free republics, under our protection, either by the acceptance of the peoples who will give themselves to us, and will join us to form the composition of the French Empire. The timid people will say that throwing ourselves into conquests is against our principles. All we have to reply to them is that there is a difference between conquering, which is an act of violence, and receiving in your bosom the peoples who willfully offer themselves, which is an act of fraternity." (Sorel, Op. cit., p.801.) And thus, French imperial ambition had insinuated itself under the mask of generosity.

As for Lazare Carnot (1753-1823), his policy was not any different, in the main, as the strategic defense of the fatherland that Vauban had developed. He was totally opposed to the Dumouriez-Danton fascist incursion inside of Belgium, Holland, and the Palatinate, but being a minority of one inside of the Comite du Salut Publique, he could not force through the changes that were necessary to eliminate the New Carolingian Rhine border policy. Historian-diplomat, Albert Sorel, reported that Carnot tried to moderate the decision on the Rhine border policy by proposing to not go further north than the Moselle River.

In the end, Dumouriez' whole grandiose plan began to fail miserably just two years after he began to put it into action. In early March, 1793, the Convention ordered him to leave Holland and come back into Belgium, which was then in a state of revolt against the French authorities left behind. He had forgotten his advice to the British: *{providing the necessary acceptance of its inhabitants}*. Robespierre was suspicious of Dumouriez and had accused him of treason. On March 20, Danton visited Dumouriez in Belgium, tried to defend him, but it was too late. On March 29, 1793, Lazare Carnot and Lesage-Senault sent Dumourier a message warning him that he had to explain his conduct of insubordination. Dumouriez resisted and Carnot issued the order for his arrest.

Dumouriez had been negotiating with the Austrian enemy. He was attempting to get Prussian Prince Cobourg to join him into an invasion of Paris. That was his last attempt at creating an alliance with Prussia. Dumouriez had been preparing a coup d'etat against the Convention, which failed only because the Austrians and the Prussians would not trust him. Failing to get the necessary support from both his own troops and from the enemy, Dumouriez committed treason and deserted his own army. On April 5, he crossed over to the Austrian army. He was not arrested, he was simply rejected everywhere he went, in Valence, in Switzerland, in Cologne, finally, the Emperor ordered that he be expelled from Belgium. Dumouriez was finally forced to exile himself into England. On April 10, the Emperor wrote to Cobourg: "*The manner in which France had fallen on me by waging war against me does not permit me to care whether Dumouriez has proclaimed king the Duke of Orleans or Louis XVII.*"

11.2 IMPOSING "FRENCH DEMOCRACY" IN WESTPHALIA

Meanwhile, French democracy had already invaded Westphalia and the Rhine-Palatinate. In December of 1792, during the occupation of the Westphalia region, the Convention of Paris prepared a plebiscite, which demanded of the people of the Rhenan region to vote in favor of the annexation of their German region to France. However, the Convention took the precaution of defining before hand who the new *{Rhenan French citizens}* should be. The decree stipulated that "civil and military employees of the old German regimes, and all of the members of the privileged communities and corporations had no right to vote." <note> (Alfred Rambaud, *{Les Francais sur le Rhin}*, (1792-1804), Paris, Didier, 1872, p.243.) Furthermore, in order to be elected, the candidate had to swear allegiance to liberty and equality, and renounce all their privileges in writing. Those who did not swear to such an oath were excluded. The word circulated in Mayence that the Prussian authorities would punish anyone who took that oath. In order to reassure the population, the Convention further stipulated that "*all those who rejected freedom were to be treated as enemies of France.*"

It was under these newly created "democratic rules" that the plebiscite was held on December 17 and 18, 1792, and the results of the vote cast was: Mayence: a city of several thousand people, 260 votes; Worms: 250 votes, and Spire: a city of 5,000 people, 479 votes. Since not enough votes had been cast, the new *{French Constituent Assembly of Westphalia}* was established by acclamation.

12.2 TWO EMPIRES, TWO RESTORATIONS: "DU PAREIL AU MEME"

By 1795, after Dumouriez had failed to win over Belgium, Holland, and the Rhine Palatinate region of Westphalia, the Directoire led by the corrupt fascist controller of Napoleon Bonaparte, Paul Barras, formulated a decree calling for all of the territories west of the Rhine River to become French territories. Since the Duke of Orleans had failed to become the Jacobin Emperor under the Convention,

and his General Dumouriez had fled to the enemy camp, Barras and Pozzo di Borgo, extended the imperial mantle of bestiality to Napoleon Bonaparte (1799-1815), under the Directoire.

In 1799, Napoleon invaded Belgium and Holland one more time, and reestablished the Rhine policy after the victories of Bergen and Castricum. Upon becoming Emperor, Bonaparte revived the cult of the Carolingian Empire. The new empire was nothing else but a "Carolingian restoration," as historian Alfred Rambaud called it. In 1804, Napoleon had invaded the German territory to reestablish a plagiarized form of Charlemagne's Roman Empire. Napoleon went out of his way to acquire the costume, the crown, and the scepter of Charlemagne from Aix-la-Chapelle, and have them brought to Paris for his own self-coronation in Notre Dame cathedral. A year after the crowning, Synarchist mystical advisor, Fabre d'Olivet, was made commissioner in the Ministry of War, and reportedly became Napoleon's astrologer.

Another top Freemason, a professional terrorist by the name of Philippe Buonarroti (1761-1837), who had organized initially with Robespierre and the Duke of Orleans and their Carolingian Synarchy project, became an agitator with Babeuf during the Bonaparte period. Buonarroti was the instigator of the {*Cult of Equality*} from which Orleans had derived his name {*Egalite*}.

After becoming Emperor in 1804, Bonaparte's despotism plunged the whole of Europe into one nightmare after another, with his endless series of military adventures. No doubt following his {*good star*}, and whatever new {*purgative violence*} his astrologer would predict was awaiting his occult and divine power to rule over the world, Napoleon marched ahead in a mad frenzy until he was forced to abdicate, on April 11, 1814.

A few months earlier, in January 1814, Lazare Carnot, who had turned sixty, had accepted to reenter the service of Napoleon, one last time, after he had served him as First Consul, but had rejected him as Emperor. Napoleon named him Division Commander and Governor of the fortress of Antwerp. Napoleon saw Antwerp as the northern gateway of his Empire. Carnot saw Antwerp as a city that needed to be defended against the British Austrian coalition, and put himself under the Belgium Army Commander, General Count Maison. This was Carnot's

last heroic deed before going into exile in Magdeburg. Carnot mounted such an extraordinary defense of the Belgium city that, at the moment of leaving, the Town Council presented him with a testimonial salute that said of him: {*A gracious, knowledgeable and impartial man, severe with truth, but just.*} Lazare Carnot had used all of his knowledge in {*Defense of Fortifications*} that he had learned from Marshal Vauban. Today, there is a marble plaque in the Antwerp suburb of Borgerhout, commemorating Carnot. The plaque says:

***{This suburb has been saved from total destruction
by the most generous and most mighty of warriors}.
S. Exc. Le general de division, gouverneur d'Anvers
CARNOT
during the war of 1814.}***

After the bestial 1815 Treaty of Vienna, the two Restoration governments of France also took up again the Rhine border policy. Prince de Polignac, the key advisor of Louis XVIII (1814-1824) and of Charles X, (1824-1830) went as far as proposing to Russia the partitioning of the Ottoman Empire in exchange for Belgium. Similarly, the French author, Victor Hugo, had also advocated the very same imperialist policy, in his {*Lettres sur le Rhin*}.

Finally, Napoleon III (1808-1873), known as "the putty," continued this same fascist policy of expansion to the Rhine, but had completely misread the strategic signals of Bismarck. When Bismarck entered Paris with his Prussian army, in 1870, and William I was declared Emperor of Germany in the Chateau de Versailles, Napoleon III was deposed. Not only all chances of gaining Belgium, Luxembourg, and the Palatinate had vanished, but so did the French provinces of Alsace and Lorraine, which were to be returned to France only after the end of World War I, in 1919.

13.2 THE MISSION OF FRANCE

Today, the nations of the world have not yet learned that whenever mankind abandons the principle of the Peace of Westphalia, their aggressive foreign policy is bound to fail. The French Convention of 1792, the Directoire of 1795, the Empire of 1804, the two Restorations of Louis XVIII in 1814, and 1815, the reign of Charles in 1824, the reign of the Duke of Orleans, Louis Philippe, in 1830, and of Napoleon the "putty" in 1848, were the last French examples that demonstrated that fact. Even with the full force of the French armies, from Valmy to Waterloo, the fascist Rhine border policy was bound to fail, because the strength of the principle underlying 145 years of tradition of the Peace of Westphalia could not be weighed against an imperial design, based on the hypocrisy of *{la force prime le droit}*, especially not after the American Revolution had successfully established, for the whole world to replicate, the highest standard of principle of government for any nation-state, since 1776.

For over 1,000 years, too many French heads of State have unfortunately followed the stupid maxim that *{He, who wins nothing, loses}*, and this has now become the marker for the foreign policy pursuit of shareholder value today. "We must be competitive!" They say, with the hypocrisy of the Oath of Strasburg in mind. This kind of irony had not escaped Pascal, when he stated that *{Since right could not be transformed into might, might was going to be transformed into right}*. This is the reason why after having lived through so many centuries of imperial wars before the French Revolution, Germany was not about to accept a French Empire on its flank, and was not going to lay its arms down until France had been forced to return to *{acceptable boundary conditions}*. The reason for this truth is not to be found in any of the particular accounts of the history of France, or in any particular diplomatic demarches, or specific dispatch and actions of heads of State. The thread of Ariadne, which linked all of these wars of conquest across 10 centuries, during which this French fascist Rhine border policy was being imposed on Europe, represents an underlying principle of *{taking Advantage of the other}* which is, in itself, self-defeating because it simply undermines the course of human progress. In the very near future, hopefully, it

will be the wisdom of the {*Advantage of the other*} of the Peace of Westphalia which will show itself, again, to be the most enduring principle.

In the end, the truth about all of this is that fascism was not a German or an Italian invention of the twentieth century. Fascism is a French invention of the eighteenth century. The first synarchist fascists were Count of Mirabeau, General Dumouriez, Philippe Egalite and Danton. Mirabeau was the doctrinaire of the group with his {*political pharmacy*} and his method of {*purgative violence*}. Dumouriez had imported this poison inside of the French armies of Holland and Belgium, in order to fulfill the utopian dream of the New Lotharingian Empire. When that first plan failed, the totally corrupt Paul Barras passed the torch of the same fascist doctrine to Napoleon Bonaparte.

Given the current strategic situation where the United States has been momentarily taken over by an imperialist grouping of Straussian fascists, and given the fact that the Straussian French connection, represented by the {*Synarchy of Empire*} networks of Alexandre Kojeve, do not yet have a complete control of the French government, it is urgent that France take a bold diplomatic step and identify clearly that the French Mission of Foreign Policy, in direct collaboration with Germany, and with the assistance of Russia, is aimed at restoring its commitment to the principle of the Peace of Westphalia, principle that she has abandoned since the French Revolution Convention of 1791.

Furthermore, under the authority of the Peace of Westphalia tradition, and its principle of the {*Advantage of the other*}, both France and Germany have the means of jointly calling upon the European Union for a special application of the United States Monroe Doctrine, as an explicit form of peace time intervention to secure peace in the Near East against any form of imperialist designs from outside forces.

There already exists a precedent in which France has applied the {*Monroe Doctrine*} principle of military intervention, when she laid the siege of Antwerp, in 1832, in support of the Belgium revolution against Holland. Antwerp had been taken unlawfully by the French several times throughout its history; namely in 1642, 1692, and as we have just reported, in 1792, and 1794. However, Lazare Carnot heroically defended the city, in 1814. And, when the Dutch invaded

Belgium in 1832, France liberated Antwerp in a courageous act of friendship that consecrated Belgium's true independence. So, following both the principles of the Peace of Westphalia and the Monroe Doctrine, France today should therefore be given all of the diplomatic maneuvering room she requires so that she can restore and defend those necessary principles of international law, one last time. However, this will not be done until the truth about the cult of Napoleon Bonaparte is told.

SYNARCHY MOVEMENT OF EMPIRE

BOOK I

CHAPTER 4



BEASTMAN DE MAISTRE

CHAPTER 4

THE EARLY SYNARCHY MOVEMENT OF EMPIRE

**THE FRENCH REVOLUTION of 1789-1815:
A SYNARCHIST INTERNATIONAL EXERCISE
IN PURGATIVE VIOLENCE**

4.1 NAPOLEON BONAPARTE: THE MODEL FOR MODERN FASCISM

**1.2 THE MODEL FOR MODERN FASCISM.
2.2 THE RELIGIOUS SOURCE OF THE CULT OF NAPOLEON
3.2 THE POLICY OF LOOTING: THE ITALIAN MODEL
4.2 MEET JOSEPH DE MAISTRE THE SOPHIST CULT LEADER
5.2 DE MAISTRE 'S MISSION: REPLACE {AGAPE} BY {INIQUITY}
6.2 LOOKING THROUGH A GLASS DARKLY
7.2 THE POLITICAL RELIGION OF NAPOLEON BONAPARTE
8.2 JULIEN THE APOSTATE AND MITHRAIC STOICISM
9.2 THE GROTTA OF MATROMANIA
10.2 THE SYNARCHIST CULT OF THE MARTINIST ORDER.
11.2 MODERN MARTINISM AND SYNARCHY
12.2 SYNARCHISTS ON UNIVERSITY CAMPUSES**

1.2 THE MODEL FOR MODERN FASCISM.

The synarchist movement that was launched in France, under the cover of the French Revolution, was nothing but an attempt to stop the spirit of the American Revolution more generally, and more specifically, to halt the progress of Bailly and Lafayette, in their drive to establish an republican constitutional monarchy that would have been modeled on the American Constitution, and would have been welcomed, everywhere in Europe, and around the world, as early as 1789. This first synarchist deployment was a sabotage operation of that constitutional process more than an attempt at a financial dominating the world.

The Synarchy's successful sabotaging of this first attempt at creating a European { *government of the people, by the people and for the people* } was executed through the well-prepared coup d'Etat of Bastille Day, on July 14, 1789. It was run by the terrorists Philippe "Egalite" and Jacques Necker, and was immediately followed up, in 1791, by a double { *soldier-executioner* } terrorist experiment that launched simultaneously an external policy of war domination of Europe, conducted by General Dumouriez, Count of Mirabeau, and Danton, and an interior terror campaign, which was run by executioner Robespierre, the grand guillotine equalizer. This sequence of synarchist blows to the moral fabric of the nation of France led to the rise of the first synarchist attempt at establishing an Empire of criminality and looting across Europe, initiated during the summer of 1796, in Italy, by Napoleon Bonaparte.

The successful ultramontane capturing of the Papacy by Bonaparte in 1797 resulted, ultimately in the self-crowning of himself as Emperor of France in 1804, with the support of Pope Pius VII, giving his siting consent. Once the ultramontane blessing from Rome had been given, after the Jena battle of 1806, the grand looting domination of Europe was launched, a second time, by the synarchist controllers of Napoleon Bonaparte and his shock troops, until his final defeat in 1814.

Lyndon LaRouche has recently characterized this last period of Bonaparte as follows: *{ "Napoleon Bonaparte was a bandit and a thief. After 1806, in particular, after winning the Jena-Auerstedt battle, he went through Europe to steal. Now, what he would steal, things he could cart off from all countries that he raided, like a bandit. He would then sell what he had stolen, at discount prices to certain banking groups who would buy what he had stolen, this stolen property. These bandit groups, which were associated with Napoleon, at the beginning of the nineteenth century, are the core group of bankers, which gave you Napoleon III, in France; which gave you Mussolini in Italy; which gave you Hitler in Germany; Franco in Spain; and the Vichy government in France These are the same people. They are doing the same thing. "}* (Morning Briefing, June 25, 2003.)

This characterization is not only absolutely accurate, in describing Napoleon Bonaparte as the father of modern fascism, but it also goes to the heart of imperial economics typified by ancient Rome, the Rome of the Caesars. In the following pages, we will show how Napoleon Bonaparte modeled himself both on the pagan figure of the Roman Emperor, and with the hues of satanic characteristics brushed by the religious cult figure, Joseph de Maistre. The irony is that both fascist individuals, Joseph de Maistre and Napoleon Bonaparte made use of these characteristics under the guise of liberation. So, if, during a revolution, someone comes up to you and says: "I want to liberate you." Beware: he is either a Synarchist, or a Satanist, or maybe both.

2.2 THE RELIGIOUS SOURCE OF THE CULT OF NAPOLEON

When Joseph de Maistre wrote his defense of the monarchy, during the early years of the French Revolution, his books were aimed at defending the absolute power of Kings, and at avoiding at all costs the establishment anywhere in Europe, of a written constitution under any pretext. For de Maistre, a written constitution was nothing but the repudiation of the *{universal principle of iniquity}*, which had been the apanage of kings for centuries, and the universal law of Christianity, that he swore to defend with his life. For him, it was only the eternal justice of God, which could determine the power of kings, and sanction the necessary injustice in the world. A written constitution could only be an absolute

negation of the prerogative of royalty. "*Why do we need a constitution and the right of the people,* " asked de Maistre, "*when the right of the people is the duty of the King vis-a-vis God?*" This is how Joseph de Maistre became the most sinister anti-constitution organizer of the French Revolution. In the following pages, we will see how Joseph de Maistre became the mentor and controller of Napoleon Bonaparte.

It was during the summer of 1797, at the Mombello castle near Milan, that Napoleon Bonaparte began to clearly formulate his plan for the military invasion of Europe. The idea came to him before that, but it was at the beginning of his campaign of Italy that he began to surround himself with a court following that recognized him as the Julius Caesar of France. He had just finished reading Joseph de Maistre on his views on the Revolution and on the monarchy, published in 1796, and had entered Italy as a savior, the route having been prepared for him by the Martinist {"equality"} cult leader, Philippe Buonarroti.

Numerous books have glorified the fact that Napoleon had the vision of becoming a Caesar, namely the writings of Lanfrey, {*Histoire de Napoleon*} (1867), Lung, {*Napoleon et son temps*}, Guillois, {*Napoleon*}, Boulay de la Meurthe, {*Le Directoire et l'expedition d'Egypte*}, Joseph de Maistre, {*Considerations sur la Revolution francaise*}, Albert Sorel, {*L'Europe et la Revolution Francaise*}, Faguet, {*Politiques et moralistes au XIX e siecle*}, and Paul Barras, {*Memoires*}, etc., but, very few, however, have identified that the so-called {"great liberator"} of France was a bandit who had, in fact come to loot, pillage, rape, and kill everything in sight. The reader should be reminded that Napoleon hated the French, that French was not his mother tongue, and that France, like other countries afterward, was only the first country that he pillaged, raped, and destroyed out of pure satanic ambition, and for the benefit of European central bankers. Napoleon's Empire, was created to establish worldwide governments of criminality, in Europe as well as in the Americas. Our purpose here is not so much to give a detail accounts of his looting and murdering sprees, but to draw a certain epistemological portrait of the species characteristic that Napoleon embodied, and which became the model for modern fascist leaders.

There were two magicians who kept whispering in Napoleon's ear, during this early period, one from afar, the other from the inside of his government,

dictating to him what he wished the most to hear, and to be convinced of becoming. Those two controllers were the ultramontane monarchist, Joseph de Maistre and, the occultist, Fabre d'Olivet. Both of them succeeded in brainwashing Napoleon, each in his own way, with the idea that there existed only three powers on earth, the { *Will of man, Destiny, and Providence* }, and that he was going to become all three. However, Napoleon was also told that he needed to be very cunning and sophisticated in order to succeed in embodying all three powers.

On October 7, 1797, Bonaparte wrote to his ministers and to the Directoire: "It is only with prudence, wisdom and a lot of dexterity, that we can achieve great goals," at the same time, he wrote to Talleyrand, his most pervert and loyal confidant: { "*All of the great events merely hang from a hair. The clever man takes advantage of all opportunities, does not neglect anything on the subject of what can bring him some increased advantage; the less cunning man, sometimes, by neglecting a single detail, loses everything.*" } This was Napoleon's way of repudiating the principle of the { *Advantage of the other* } of the Peace of Westphalia.

As for the "Nothing" which can win everything, Napoleon thought he was it: a raving cunning, crafty, a completely monstrous gambler who was making believe that he was simply following his good star. He often talked about his good star, saying that his { "*destiny is to be a man of providence.*" } This is the effective whispering language of Fabre d'Olivet, his mystical advisor and astrologer, whom we shall report on, at another time. As if he were the instrument of a superior will, throughout his entire life, and especially near his downfall, Napoleon kept repeating to himself: { "*The greater you are, the less will you have; you become dependent on events and circumstances; myself, I have to declare myself to be the most enslaved of all men; my master has no entrails, and that master, is the nature of things.*" } These will be echoed further in the reverberations of Hegel and Kojeve.

As early as 1796, when Napoleon had just invaded Italy. Joseph de Maistre and his satanic freemasonic grouping had also just invaded Bonaparte. Traces of that can be found in the correspondence of Napoleon, when he wrote to his Minister of Foreign Affairs, in the summer of 1797: { "*The law of necessity is the master of inclination, will and reason.*"... "*We hold the balance of Europe; we*

shall make it tilt as we wish, and even, if {this is the order of destiny}, I do not see the impossibility of reaching, within a few years, these great results that the heated and enthusiastic imagination perceives, and that only a man extremely cold, constant and reasoning, will be able to achieve."} What is this "law of necessity," which is the master?

The "law of necessity" meant that the counter revolutionary program of de Maistre had to be launched on the totality of Europe; that is, after the {executioner-military} team of Robespierre-Dumouriez had succeeded, in shocking and destabilizing the whole of Europe with their murdering experiment of the early 1790's, it was time to implement phase two of the synarchist program: {depopulation-looting} of the whole of Europe. De Maistre was launching on a grandiose scale the two forms of barbaric justice that the social order of oligarchies had accepted until that point, and they were, the justice of the {executioner} and the justice of the {soldier}. De Maistre was operating strictly out of the Hobbsian {law of murder}.

Napoleon truly believed he had magical powers. His own destiny fascinated him. He was bewildered by it, and he considered his destiny to be a real enigma that he had to unravel, like a chess problem. {"Destiny commands, I have to obey,"} he would say. Thus, Napoleon willed himself into that destiny, accepted it, but he always had to {"guess right and understand his commanding role, otherwise, one small mistake, and that was it."} Otherwise, if he doesn't calculate correctly the murderous devastation he must accomplish, in the name of freedom, throughout Europe, he will not become the man of Providence, the awaited liberator. And so, the whispering of the words of faith, "{Will, Destiny, Providence}", kept singing in his ears.

This was the reason why Hegel, as well as Kojeve and Strauss after him, saw in Napoleon the end of history. Napoleon wrote: {"I conquered history more than I studied it, that is to say, less than I wanted to retain, since I hated the unnecessary, and so I grabbed what pleased me."} And, what pleased Napoleon, essentially, was the idea that force created right, that {"such a right was putting you above humanity,"} said the voice of de Maistre whispering. But, this new right demanded that humanity, as a whole, obey and serve the strong by submitting itself. This is why his fascist regime needed to have control over the Catholic

religion. It required a control over the Papacy, because: { "*Whoever controlled the Pope, controlled the Church, and whoever controlled the Church, controlled the World.*" } Such was the ultramontane calling of de Maistre.

As for the more enlightened people, their submission to a strong leader required a moral code of some sort, so that they not disturb the public peace. That called for a Legal Code. From that double control standard, Napoleon's Pantheon included what he considered to be, in his own interpretation of history, the action of Charlemagne forcing the submission of the Pope. So, under Napoleon's control, Pius VI had to become the guarantor of the faith, while the Roman Code had to become the guardian of civil order and morality. The rights of the Pope had been established by force, that is, the force that had sacrificed thousands of innocents in the Coliseum. So yes, sacrifices, we need more sacrifices. French historian, Albert Sorel reported on those voices in Napoleon's head, which said: { "*Charlemagne, master of Italy, master of Germany and of France, judge of the Pope, arbiter of Europe, came to Rome at the end of the year 799. Leon III proclaimed him Emperor of the Occident... There he was, the son of a servant, the son of one of those franc captains that Constantine had condemned to the lions, was elevated to the dignity of Constantine...*" } And, Napoleon kept repeating this oracle to himself, again, and again, and again.

3.2 THE POLICY OF LOOTING: THE ITALIAN MODEL

Napoleon wrote to Talleyrand: { "*Real politics is nothing else but the calculations of combinations and chances.*" } This is what you do when you are in the business of power and looting. French historian, Sorel, showed how this looting was legitimized: { "*It seems natural for him (Napoleon) that with the Revolution, by the Revolution, and for the Revolution, to invade, conquer, ransom, cut up, and dismember nations, reconstruct populations, just as it was natural for Louis XIV to dispute, to parcel out, and share the inheritance of kings. He applied to the new public right the same ends of State that the kings of France had applied, before him, and that other sovereigns continue to apply to the old public right"... "The first deals are made in Basel by involving the expropriation of German ecclesiastic territories, a second one is formed in*

Leoben, involving the partitioning of the Venetian territories, the papal State, and the Italian princes."... (as from Pope Pius VI) *"He demands the surrender of the Legations and of Ancone, the renunciation of Avignon and Comtat, the rupture of alliances with the enemies of the Republic, the closing of the doors to the English, the payment of 15 millions still due since the armistice, 15 more millions, horses, 200,000 pounds and an honorable fine for the murder of Basseville, the delivery of art treasures and manuscripts promised by the armistice, the maintenance of the French Academy, the commercial status of the most favored nation, the release to France of the Austrian general, Colli, and the banning of Cardinal Albani."* } (Sorel, {*De Leoben a Campo-Formio*}, in *Revue des deux Mondes*, Paris, Baillliere Tendal et Fox, 1895, p.491 and 297.)

Italy thus became the model both for designing the Empire, for looting Europe while assimilating it, and for creating new strategic diversions. For example, Napoleon started by making deals with Austria, the easiest power to deal with, because the greediest. {"*Heavy and misers,*" } writes Napoleon, {"*the Austrians are not dangerous for our internal business; they ignore our motivations; the wisest thing to do is to associate them with us.*" } Indeed, by joining France and Austria into a looting partnership of Italy, Napoleon created a favorable balance for his Rhine River policy. By abandoning Venice to the Austrians, Napoleon was using Prussia as a counterweight, thus reviving the ancient rivalry. When Berlin saw her rival Vienna take Venice, France had an open road to grab Belgium. By conquering the left bank of the Rhine River, the Comite du Salut Public had also struck a deal with Napoleon to launch a massive looting of Europe, starting with the invasion of Italy, then, isolate England, invade the port of Antwerp and grab Holland. Even before having taken power, Napoleon was given the road to power by the Comite. It was only later that the Directoire began to have second doubts.

Napoleon's global strategy included declaring war against England. Napoleon wrote: {"*The league of the European oligarchy being divided, France will have the opportunity to grab England directly, in Ireland, in Canada, in India.*" } On October 18, 1797, Napoleon wrote to Talleyrand, revealing his entire plan. {"*We declare war on England; this enemy is quite tough...England is getting ready to form another coalition...The English is generous, intriguing and active. It is essential that our government destroy the Anglican monarchy,*

or it has to expect to be destroyed by the corruption and the intrigues of its own people. The present moment is extremely favorable. Let us concentrate all of our activities against its navy, and let's destroy England. Once this is done, Europe will be at our feet." } The interests of the directors of the Directoire were not unified. French hero, Lazare Carnot was the only one who attempted to force Napoleon to act in accordance with the interests of the nation; Larevelliere-Lepeaux, who hated Carnot, voted with Paul Barras, and reported later, in his Memoires, that he never understood the fascist regime which was being implemented; Barras, who had launched the career of Napoleon, expected a lot of money from him, but ended up not getting it, and denouncing him (following report); Reubell expected lots of real-estate and lands from the Italian campaigns. In other words, the Directoire was nothing but an exchange bureau, a national transaction committee, for coordinating and dealing with the combinations of Bonaparte's conquests. In those days, reparation costs were considered indemnization and compensations.

Why was Napoleon thinking of going after England first? Because he wanted to secure an invasion of Belgium without British intervention? No. Because he wanted to have complete French hegemony throughout the entire Mediterranean region. If you think this is madness, you are right. This is the oldest French imperial design, going as far back as the crusades. Remember the motivation for the Napoleonic wars: looting, looting and killing. So, what is the richest region in Europe? The Mediterranean basin, And so, the door to the sea must be shut to the British. Gibraltar is a major obstacle, so retrieving it for Spain would give France access to Egypt. Sorel cites an author of the period expressing the mood of the day: *{ "Only one thing can compensate for the expenses of France...the possession of Egypt. Through Egypt, you then touch on India, by reestablishing the ancient connection through Suez, and we shall cut off the route through the Cape of Good Hope." }* This is the greatest loot to be grabbed in northern Africa. In fact Napoleon considered that Egypt was *{ "in and of itself worth more than everything that France had lost." }* In September of the same year, he wrote to the Directoire: *{ "The day is not far away when, in order to gain Egypt, we shall have to destroy England"... " Then why not take the Isle of Malta?" ... "Then Sardinia, and Genoa will be under our control...we would then be the masters of the entire Mediterranean Sea." }* Sorel had a precise mapping of what Napoleon had in his synarchist mind:

"{Everything starts with France and gravitates around her, like around Rome on a map of the Roman Empire. In France, he (Bonaparte) sees men, and they are everything; in Northern Italy, they are children, and they mean very little; in Holland, busy tradesmen, in Switzerland, mountain goat herders, who are worthless; beyond, in Spain, in Rome and Naples, in Germany, in Poland, human herds, parked inside of fences that their masters displace at will, ; a little further, in Russia, in Asia, they barely have souls, merely a human vegetation plastered against the soil, a sort of green ocean, dejected, indefinite, as far as the eye can see, where politics can only get lost. On this soil, the composite edifice, the confused and shaky gimcrack building of the States and their courts, incapable of uniting themselves, tearing each other apart with their rivalries and their jealousies, all of them greedy for land and for the riches of others. They would be invincible en masse, if they were to unite their forces in a common conquest, but I can beat them one by one, by dividing them through their greed; In fact they are easier to win over than to fight against. They are all mediocre princes, rampant ministers of routine. Bonaparte judges them with the total superiority of the French monarchy, which fascinates them, with the French Revolution, which troubles them, and most of all with his own conquering genius and his forceful enterprising. Their history, which he has read and has captured in a few very simple lines, which he has engraved for all times in his memory, is coming alive for the past year that he has been making trade with them, battle trading and negotiations. By analogy, he was implementing with everyone the Italian policy experiment that he has just undertaken.}" (Sorel, Op. Cit., p.492) The whole world, yes, thought Napoleon, but let's turn the Mediterranean Sea into a French Lake, first.

4.2 MEET JOSEPH DE MAISTRE THE SOPHIST CULT LEADER

Look at the period of Venetian controlled civil-religious wars in Europe, from the time of the Torquemada expulsion of the Jews from Spain in 1492 until the Peace of Westphalia, in 1648, first from the vantage point of decadent mind of

the Venetian oligarchy, and secondly from the standpoint of the epistemological effect the cult of death that Venice ran during those years has had on the French revolution afterwards, especially on Napoleon, and the synarchist cult matrix he was operating from. If you dig deeply enough into these centuries of violence and injustice throughout Europe, you will begin to see how, from the very nature of oligarchism, emerged satanic cults all across Europe. Synarchy was such a cult and the ultramontane program, that Joseph de Maistre has developed, and which Napoleon Bonaparte had embodied, was the most extreme application of the satanic {*principle of iniquity*}.

Historian, Albert Sorel, reported that when Napoleon read the first book of Joseph de Maistre, {*Considerations sur la Revolution francaise*}, published in 1796, the little Corsican believed that it was all about himself, and decided to live his life according to the script of de Maistre. The program conceived by Joseph de Maistre was nothing short of the road map of iniquity that Napoleon Bonaparte began to follow, starting in 1797. This is how Napoleon espoused the ultramontane view of the world by becoming the so-called "{*man of Destiny and of Providence.*}"

Count Joseph de Maistre (1753-1821) was a minister of the King of Sardinia at the court of Russia, Minister of State, and Regent of the Grand Chancellery, Member of the Royal Academy of Sciences of Turin, Knight Great-Cross of the Religious and Military Order of Saint Maurice and of Saint Lazare. He was a blueblood, ultramontane-catholic-and-absolute-monarchist, who was born with total visceral contempt for the common people. He believed that Malthus was the greatest genius. His family was of old Savoyard nobility, which descended from the hereditary nobility of royal administration. His administrative hereditary status makes him a patrician of a higher cast than simply the aristocracy or nobility, in general. He was part of a cast more than he was part of a class. He was subjected to the breeding of court appointees, as were all hereditary magistrates of European oligarchies of that time. Thus, Joseph de Maistre was in total reaction against the ideas of the eighteenth century, especially the American Revolution. He became the oligarchical champion against the ideas of representative government, against constitutional law, against the idea of man in the image of God, and therefore against the rights of man, and explicitly against reason. He wrote a book called {*Essai sur le Principe Generateur des*

Constitutions Politiques } which is an open denunciation of constitutional law.

However, if he was against all of these human values, it was not simply because he understood their danger for his aristocratic view of the world, and felt threatened by them. He was against these values out of the sophistry of his breeding, that is, from the animalistic-Aristotelian breeding that he had received when he was very young, and that he was fed in very measured portions by his mother, and which became so deeply ingrained that he completely believed in his own lies, and was even willing to die for them. Joseph de Maistre was the most passionate sophist and reactionary of the "émigré" aristocracy during the French Revolution and he became the uncontested ideologue of the oligarchy. In his { *Considerations on the French revolution* }, de Maistre advocated the power of the obscure, the irrational, the mystical, the spontaneous, the instinctual, as the basis for maintaining the heredity of absolute monarchical tradition. For example, witness how he captures and warps the idea of { *patriotism*. }

"It is patriotism which make the fatherland. But patriotism is not a selfish sentiment a little bit purified, like you believe in; it is not for me the respect of your rights in order that you may respect mine; it is not something which resides inside of each class of the nation, like a sacrifice made for the community, so that each class might gain some advantage. Patriotism understood in this fashion, is no longer a sentiment, it is a calculation; and your accounting system continues like this; it is not a nation that you create like this, it is a financial society. True patriotism cannot be calculated; it is {devotion}. It consists in loving your country because it is the country, that is to say, without knowing why. If we knew why, we would reason, we would calculate, and we would no longer love. As virtue is a sacrifice, that is to say, an immolation of all of the interests, an effacement of all reason, and an abolition of all motives, before an internal commandment which does not give any reason; similarly patriotism, far from being an association of the self to the whole, in order to gain some profit, it is an absorption of the self into the whole without any other end than the sacrifice. It is under these conditions only that it is powerful and fertile, that it creates something, which is living, and not a bank, but a fatherland.

"So, a patriotism of this kind is impossible in a democracy. The basis of democracy is selfishness; it is the constant worry of being sacrificed, of not being

duped, of limiting, of watching and of periodically suspending power to prevent it from interfering; that is to say, the power of always being able to pull out your bidding. In such a system, the citizen does not give of himself, he lends himself, and takes himself back all the time; he seems to be renting himself yearly. There might be a great self-respect within these procedures; but, meanwhile, it is the powerful conspiracy of all of the energies in the same way, it is the fatherland, which no longer exists.

*"You mock the monarchy; but the monarchy is the physical form of the fatherland, and the devotion to the monarch is the physical form of patriotism. It is a strong sentiment because it cannot be reduced to a calculation, profound because it is not susceptible of analysis, and unshakeable, precisely because it is irrational." (Joseph de Maistre, paraphrased by Emile Faguet, {*Politiques et moralistes du dixneuvieme siecle*}, Paris, Lecene Oudin et Cie, Editeurs, 1891, p. 12-13.)*

The reader should take the time to observe how the sophism of de Maistre functions; precisely like the bad syllogisms of Aristotle. First and foremost, de Maistre denies the existence of a {*government of the people, by the people, and for the people,*} because of his contempt for people. It is his patrician superiority, which leads him to adopt a warped and cynical definition of representative government. From that station, he reduces the idea of {*representation*} to the legal equivalent of a {*mandatory*} legal function.

What de Maistre sees in a {*representative*}, is a proxy, an authorized agent, a power of attorney, or a trustee, but it is never the constitutional voice of the nation. This is how he accused others of his own abuses. "*You have singular abuses of terms,*" wrote De Maistre, "*you confuse {mandatory} and {representative}. However, the representative is precisely a man who represents the one who cannot give a mandate. Everyday, in the tribunals, the child, the crazy man, and the absent are {represented} by men who hold their mandate only by virtue of the law; so, the people unite these three qualities perfectly, since they are always childish, always crazy, and always absent.*" He then denounces the {Rights of man} based on the sophist argument that "man" does not exist. "*During my lifetime,*" says de Maistre, "*I have seen Frenchmen, Italiens, Russians; and I also know, thanks to Montesquieu, that one can also be a Persian;*

but as far as man is concerned, I declare I have never met one, during my entire life; if he exists, it is beyond my knowledge.}"

Again, Albert Sorel is useful to read on this account in addressing the blood and soil ideology of de Maistre's notion of leader. After describing de Maistre as a Voltaire in reverse, but of the same cloth, Sorel showed how de Maistre abused of the sophist's fallacy of composition:

"{The State abandoned to the privileged few breaks up into anarchy; abandoned to the individuals, it gets dissolved and falls to pieces. There are no individual freedoms: the State allows only for a national freedom. The head of State is the living conscience of this diffused soul, which is the nation. He incarnates the fatherland. The devotion of his person is the physical form of patriotism. He carries, in his person, the traditions, the morals, the customs, the instincts, all of the obscure and permanent forces, which leads history. He applies them to the needs of the present situation; he dictates the laws, which respond to the desire of the masses, and expresses its will. He can say: "I am the people, I am the fatherland! Freedom is myself!}" (Sorel, Op. cit., p.504.) This is what the fascist creator of Action Francaise, Charles Maurras, later picked up in de Maistre, and implemented in his fascist program adopted by the Vichy government. There are, however, more profound principles that motivate all of de Maitres conception, and they come from his freemasonic association with satanic practices.

If you can imagine it, Joseph de Maistre was even more pessimistic than Frederick Nietzsche. He did not believe like Nietzsche that *{God is dead!}* He believed instead that *{God is evil!}*. De Maistre's mission was to turn Christianity on its head from the inside, and prove by his Gnostic experimenting with evil, which Napoleon Bonaparte had incarnated, that the iniquity of the world is the law of the universe, and that injustice is the most natural outcome of social interaction between men, because men are simply like animals. For de Maistre, humanity's life on earth is the reign of evil, and *"{evil is caused by the injustice of God.}"*

5.2 MAISTRE 'S MISSION: REPLACE {AGAPE} BY {INIQUITY}

In political and epistemological terms, Joseph de Maistre has made it his life's mission to destroy the principle of justice, of *{agape}* in the sense of Plato, and Saint Paul. As a Satanist freemasonic practitioner, he programmed the evil actions of any despotic ruler. In his book on de Maistre, historian, Emile Faguet, identified quite bluntly the philosophy of this real devil's advocate:

"In fact, he (Maistre) anticipated the objections that were brought against his social doctrine. He heard the protesting voices that said to him: 'Your political system is false, because it is unjust. Liberty, equality, rights of man are not inventions of pride or envy; they are different forms of justice. And your absolute king, no matter how honorably you might want to disguise him, is but a tyrant pure and simple. He is missing two things to be considered by reason as a legitimate magistrate: a foundation for his right, and a responsibility. Who does he take his authority from? And before whom is he responsible? ' De Maistre said to himself: This objection which is derived from the injustice of my doctrine, must be answered; this foundation of the royal authority and this responsibility of the king, I must justify. And here is what he responded.

"You complain that where there exists no government of the people and by the people, there is no justice. However, injustice is the law of societies, because it is the law of the world. The world is founded on an immense and universal iniquity. Nature is a terrible tyranny. If the strong did not massacre the weak, everything would perish, strong and weak. Unending murder is the very principle of universal life. Each life, vegetable, animal, human, is made up of millions of dead, without which it could not exist. Ever since the beginning of creation, blood has drenched the earth like a dew, and the atmosphere, which all beings breathe, is a vapor of blood. - And in the middle of this enormous carnage, here comes a being, so much superior to the others, who could, apparently, make exception to this law of murder. He massacres, as he wishes, all of the other species; he makes death roam all over the world, his tables are filled with cadavers, and there is no superior species who could do the same to him. Would he be an exception to the

law of the universe? Is such a disorder possible? No! Can you not hear the earth screaming and demanding blood?' How then will the law be carried out? What being shall exterminate the one who exterminates all of the others? - Him! It is man who is in charge of strangulating man.' Wherever stops the massacre of the weaker species by stronger species, {war} begins.'

"It is war which will accomplish the {decree}. War is the animal state of the human species.; it is a rule; 'human blood must be spilled without end on the globe here and there.' - Nothing more monstrous than war, agree; but why is there nothing more respected and glorious than the soldier, if it is not because we feel that he is the minister of the sovereign law of the universe, and that the eternal order comes to be through him."} (De Maistre paraphrased by Emile Faguet, *{Politiques et moralistes du dixneuvieme siecle}*, Paris, Lecene Oudin et Cie. Editeurs, 1891, p.33-34)

Clearly, this is a direct attack against the principle of *{agape}* that Plato developed in the second book of the Republic; a complete perversion of the notion of justice. However, these satanic principles are written precisely with the purpose of scandalizing reason, and Napoleon Bonaparte reveled in them, as he applied them to his own imperial and military conduct.

Like the principles of de Maistre, Napoleon's principles are very simple and subversive: strength creates right, and civil and military authority defines the means to exercise it. Pascal was right when he denounced the ultramontane principle of justice: *"Because right could not become might, then, might had to become right."* De Maistre pushed the idea of tyranny beyond simple injustice and murder. He is talking about injustice without reason, injustice simply for the pleasure of it.

"{However, injustice without necessity, without a cause, without a reason, without provocation and without profit, the injustice for the injustice itself and for the pleasure of being unjust, or rather, because the injustice has to exist. People do not notice enough that this is infinitely accepted among men. It is one of his (de Maistre) master ideas. {Sacrifices}, the bloodied victims, have always been considered by men like so many tributes to the mysterious law that presides over the destinies of humanity" ... "{Sacrifice} is the ideal murder, inspired by the sole

idea of doing what must be done, of associating oneself with the supreme law which rules us all; it is an act of faith to murder, it is blood spilled like a prayer. All men have believed in this necessary act of faith, and have religiously accomplished it." - "It is a terrible barbarity! - It is possible; but how was it possible for man to recognize this universal law if not by associating with it? And the fact that men were always associated with it in this fashion is the proof that they understood it as such. Injustice is the social law, it is the international law, it is law on earth: this is what men see. So, all religious idea being the confession of the law, and all religious act being the voluntary and disinterested execution of the law, with no other motive than to fulfill it, what do you want them to be thinking if not that the absolute injustice is a religious act?"} (De Maistre paraphrased by Emile Faguet, Op. cit., p.37)

This is how Napoleon was organizing his military campaigns, in Italy, in Belgium, in Germany. And the grenadiers followed him religiously to sacrifice millions, and be sacrificed, in the process. This is the glory of the soldier-murderer. The soldier is the only murderer who, said de Maistre, was respected and praised throughout history as a hero for doing what he did. And for him this is a proof that through war, through iniquity, man against man, people against people, humanity as a whole had "*{organized itself marvelously around the universal law of injustice.}*" The highest refinement of this idea of *{sacrifice}*, brought to an absolute level of universal injustice occurs when de Maistre sacrificed innocent victims. This is what has always been the underlying principle of the fundamentalist belief structure of the Synarchy's satanic sacrifice, from the French Revolution to Strauss, Kojève, Huntington and Cheney.

"{That an innocent should be sacrificed for the sake of the law of murder has no chance of being forgotten among men, it is in the order of things, because it is unjust. However, this innocent is only innocent to the extent that we do not know if he is guilty. It could be anybody. However, here, injustice is accomplished because the victim is not someone who has formally deserved to die; that is why it would be much more dazzling if it were an innocent who was chosen instead of a guilty, and especially if he is chosen to expiate for the fault of that guilty party}..." "The *{reversibility}* of faults and merits is a conception which has appeared natural to mankind. We have witnessed the innocent be punished, the criminal goes unpunished, and these two events have not been considered

separately, but connected; it was not said: the good dies {for} the criminal who succeeds. The law is expiation, but not necessarily expiation by the guilty party. We expiate for ourselves and for others.' 'David's statement is very striking indeed" Oh God, purify me of those prevarications of mine, which I do not know of, and {pardon me those of others!} (Emphasis in the original) (Emile Faguet, p. 29.)

This is how the satanic {"*universal principle of iniquity*" } is made the basis of the so-called "Christian fundamentalist" belief, that is, not only the roles of just and unjust has been reversed, but the core of the man-worm form of universal injustice holds, as ultimate consequence of its sophistry that God is to blame for evil. As de Maistre wrote:

{ "Evil is the injustice of God" "And if we look at the world and the history of the world, philosophically, we shall discover that mankind has never understood divinity otherwise than as being unjust. The proof is that men have prayed to him for that reason. To pray is to ask for a favor, to solicitate the judge." ... "There is no stronger conviction in mankind, nothing better established on the perception of things, than the belief in superior forces which have willed evil; and we should say more than evil, which is evil mixed with their pretense of good, that is to say, a greater disorder than absolute evil, a capricious and arbitrary evil, an evil that can be transformed into the appearance of a good, just to show that it could be corrected, if the divinity wanted it. This is the ingenious injustice, which amuses the divinity at the expense of the victim, which is more than evil. It is the malice of intent." } (Faguet, p.40.)

Such is the progression of Joseph de Maistre in the service of evil. There is nothing more repugnant to human and divine reason, yet to him, who is "speaking" as a Christian, this is simply the proof that the world is universally unjust and irrational. As he said: {"*The world is not reasonable; it is a system of profound, solid, and rigorous absurdities.*" } Thus, the objection against him, that his political system of absolute monarchy is not just, is null and void. His political system is absolutely unjust because it follows the universal law of iniquity to its ultimate conclusions. {"*The only truth is that we live in an unjust world,*" } he said. De Maistre makes a claim on this so-called "truth" because only this irrationality

of violence and injustice has the appearance of being so prevalent. {"Reason is not the mark of truth." }

This is how he justifies the sacrifice of Christ dying on the cross as the proof that evil is winning on Earth. Since Christ was crucified unjustly, according to his universal law of murder, this demonstrates that God the father was evil in permitting the sacrifice of his innocent Son, and by letting the servants of the prince of darkness, like Napoleon, get away with murder. That is how de Maistre must conclude that {"Evil is the injustice of God!"} Invariably, his sophistry results in admitting that the only way to prove the existence of God is by the presence of iniquity on Earth, and that {agape} could never exist among men.

Just as Plato's {Georgias} showed that eloquence was not an art but merely a theatrical form of {"perfumery"}, Joseph de Maistre's sophistry is not a {spiritual exercise}, as he publicly claimed it was. It is a deadly form of satanic experiment whose stench comes straight from the bowels of hell. In fact this type of synarchist hellish exercise, which has taken over the cult of evangelical fundamentalism in the United States today, and elsewhere around the world, is nothing but a process of digression of paralogical forms of the {Cretan lie}, which concludes with a shocking ending, and that only a pervert can take pleasure in. As Napoleon Bonaparte was listening to the voice of Joseph de Maistre, he knew he was not getting his marching orders from God, but from Satan, and since he enjoyed killing innocent people, he made believe that since the only justice man can ever get is in the after-life, the sooner he killed millions of soldiers across Europe, the more rapidly they shall be sent to heaven to get their just reward, and he would get his own reward by becoming the man of Providence.

6.2 LOOKING THROUGH A GLASS DARKLY

Finally, the issue of Napoleon Bonaparte, as the model for the modern form of fascism, comes down to the question of justice {agape}, as expressed by Plato in his ten books of the Republic, and as developed by Saint-Paul in 1,Corinthian, 13; that is to say: "Is the experiment of "looking through a glass darkly" a mystical-esoteric-masonic belief, or is it the true knowledge reflecting the

"complex domain"?"

The general fanatical Aristotelian argument against the Renaissance Man, is that he is proud and arrogant, a man who thinks he can *{replace God and religion by science and technology}*, who denies the existence of God in the universe, and who eliminates the role of God and religion altogether from within the political life of nations. Such were among the vicious attacks against the humanism of the Italian Renaissance more generally, and against Nicholas of Cusa, Leonardo da Vinci, and Raphael Sanzio, personally, as against Lyndon LaRouche, today.

Fanatics with such arguments have sought justification by means of manipulating the credibility of mankind through esoteric mysteries of Pagan Roman religion, with special emphasis on the non-accessibility of reason to the irrational domain of the divine ordering of universal principles. The initiate of the esoteric Martinist Order argues that as a result of original sin, man is a fallen creature and has, therefore, been condemned by God to access knowledge merely through his senses, and cannot know what lies beyond them. Man is therefore, incapable of knowing hardly any more than vague shadows of God's designs *{as if through a glass darkly}*. Such a fanatical outlook has been the basis upon which secret societies of freemasonic character have been instituted throughout history, as exemplified by the societies of High Priests of the Roman Empire, called the Eleusis Mysteries, and its modern version, the society of High Priests called, *{Elus Cohen}*, or *{Superieurs Inconnus}* of the Martinist Order, in which the occult, esoteric, mystical, and hermetic secret knowledge and their continuation of the oracles of Delphi can only be found beyond the understanding of human reason.

The following pages will investigate this source of the Martinist Order and their High Priests, Claude Louis Saint-Martin and Joseph de Maistre, and their *{religious influence}* during the period of the French Revolution, and will demonstrate that the Synarchist Martinist Order of both France and Germany and the Grand Orient Order of France, in alliance with the Scottish Rite freemasonry of Great Britain, were the main superior secret societies that ran the French Revolution, and the religious imperial cult of Napoleon Bonaparte, from as early as the Concordat of April 1802 until the defeat of the First Empire, in 1815.

Contrary to the Martinist Order satanic belief structure, this report will demonstrate that the {Renaissance Man} was, and is, very thankful for discovering that the proper Platonic knowledge of such shadows coming out of the Grottos of Ephesus, can be understood from the higher standpoint of the {complex domain}, and that, far from being a human defect and the result of the original fall of man, the knowledge referred to by Saint Paul of a higher reality which is perceived {*as if through a glass darkly*} is by no means a defect, but, in reality, the greatest gift that God has ever given to mankind: the gift of assimilating and imparting to others the discovery of universal physical principles, as Lyndon LaRouche has uniquely been able to do. This will confirm, as well, that those who are of the fanatical Aristotelian belief, are not Christians. They are, as Mexican President Echeverria once put it {Christians who are not Christians}. In reality, they are satanic worshipers.

7.2 THE POLITICAL RELIGION OF NAPOLEON BONAPARTE

In 1799, after establishing a temporary consular monarchy with the political theoretician, Abbot Sieyes, and the president of the Council of Five Hundred, Roger Ducos, Bonaparte established the new Constitution de l'An VIII. He then dumped his two assistant-consuls, and replaced them by the former Minister of Justice, ghostwriter of the {Code Napoleon} and Grand-Master of the {Grand-Orient} of France, Jean-Jacques Cambaceres, and by ex-member of the Council of Five Hundred, and financial advisor, Charles Francois Lebrun. With this new constitution, Bonaparte gave himself all of the powers of the monarchy, with a plebiscite that sanctioned his constitution with a large majority of popular support. In reality, it was a monarchy in republican disguise.

For the next fourteen years Napoleon Bonaparte became absolute dictator of France. This rule began with a repressive "pacification" that included the religious "pacification" of the Concordat, with the forced support of Pope Pius VII, who agreed to sit at his coronation and recognize him as a French Emperor, but who refused to recognize him as a "Roman Emperor". Bonaparte set out to completely reform the financial, judiciary and administrative institutions of France with a Civil Code modeled on the old Roman Empire, and which, in its main dispositions

is still functioning to this day, with or without the blessings of the Pope.

In his foreign policy, Bonaparte continued to wage war against the new coalition of Austria, Russia, and England. He occupied Italy for a second time before moving across the Alps. He forced the retreat of the Austrian forces at Marengo on June 14, 1800, and at Hohenlinden on December 2 of the same year. The Treaty of Luneville, on February 9, 1801, confirmed the take over of the left bank of the Rhine River, following the agreement of Campo-Formio, of 1797. Meanwhile, the British had succeeded in forcing the capitulation of the French expeditionary force that Bonaparte had deserted and left in the hands of General Klebert, in Egypt. A year later, on March 25, 1802, the British accepted the Peace of Amiens. This was the first time in ten years that France had been at peace with her neighbors, a peace that resulted in confirming the powers that Bonaparte had achieved by sheer thuggery and banditry.

The progression of dictatorial powers was as follows: the Consular monarchy of 1799 had given Bonaparte only one third of the power; the Constitution of l'An VIII had given him a First Consulate for a period of ten years; the Constitution of l'An X (1802), gave him the Consulate for life, with the exclusive right to decide war and peace, and to name his successor, also for life. In January of 1802, the Italian Republic was created with Bonaparte as its president. A year later, the British broke the Treaty of Amiens, and the war started again, and would not be stopped until the fall of Bonaparte in 1814.

On May 18, 1804, the {Senatus Consult} proclaimed the First Consul Bonaparte, Emperor of France. This established the new Constitution de l'An XII (1804), with the imperial title recognized as part of the old regime, including the heredity clause of male to male descendents, by order of the first born. Napoleon had invaded Italy and the German territory to reestablish a plagiarized form of Charlemagne's Roman Empire. Napoleon had gone out of his way to acquire the costume, the crown, and the scepter of Charlemagne from Aix-la-Chapelle (Aachen, Germany), and had them brought to Paris for his own self-coronation. On December 2, 1804, in the Notre Dame cathedral in Paris, Napoleon Bonaparte crowned himself the new would be Charlemagne, at the same time that he seated Pope Pius VII in an obviously secondary position, behind him. A year later, the Italian Republic was transformed into an Italian Monarchy (March 1805), of

which Napoleon became King.

Four coup d'Etats had led to the destruction of France during a revolution that lasted from 1789 to 1815: Bastille led to the Terror; Thermidore led to the Directoire; Brumaire led to the Consulate; and the Consulate led to the Empire. This process of fascist take over of France occurred step by step, methodically, as if each new degree were being introduced by clockwork. During this quarter of a century period of destruction and war, one of the most important, if not the most important, means of controlling the population, and of measuring what was called euphemistically the "{internal pacification}" of the country, was the transformation of religion as a political weapon, throughout France. Bonaparte's legal advisors put at his disposal a means of policing everything, including the different dissident groups such as Protestants, Royalists, Vendéens, or Chouans, by creating a Concordat agreement between the French Government and the Vatican.

The general statement of the Concordat Treaty appeared to be quite inoffensive, as it seemed to be aimed at merely describing a self-evident fact that said: "*{The Government of the Republic recognizes that the Catholic, apostolic, and roman religion, is the religion of the great majority of French citizens.}*" That was apparently very innocent, however, it was not at all. The significance of the Concordat Treaty was reflected in the fascist application of what was called its "Organic Articles."

In a groundbreaking article entitled *{Time to Destroy the mythology of Bonapartism,}* LaRouche associate, Jacques Cheminade, showed how Bonaparte's Concordat was reestablishing not only the Gallican Church as the successor of the Mithra Cult of the pagan Roman Empire, but also the Cult Sun King, Louis XIV. Cheminade wrote:

"{This is nothing but an extreme case of a {pagan church}, under a Roman Catholic or other disguise.

"Napoleon, together with his director of churches [Jean] Portalis (Minister of Religion) and his uncle Cardinal [Joseph] Fesch, in liaison with [Perigord] Talleyrand, was quite aware of building a "new church."

"Well, not so new.

"It is the church of the Emperor Constantine's heresy, when Constantine converted to Catholicism, on the condition that the Church agreed to be under the Emperor.

"It is also the Church of Constantine's heir, the French "Roman" King Louis XIV, the Sun King. It is the Gallican Church, the Church of England, or Ivan Grozny's Church.

"To establish that Church, Bonaparte inspired the 1801 Concordat to the pope, which makes Mussolini's Concordat appear nice and soft. Let's read what the Organic Articles of the Concordat had to say:

- *The First Consul, [After 1804 the Emperor], appoints the bishops;*
- *Bishops are forbidden to leave their diocese, without permission of the Emperor;*
- *The decisions taken in Rome need all, in all matters of Church ruling, to first be approved by the French government, to be applied by the French priests and bishops;*
- *Teaching in French seminaries has to be in absolute accordance with the Gallican doctrine of 1682 (under Louis XIV);*
- *The bishops are compelled to give an oath of fidelity to the empire;*
- *The Church has to renounce all goods and land seized by the Revolution;*
- *If priests learn about any political conspiracy, are compelled to report it to the government;*

The French government can condemn and castigate priests, if they commit any misdeeds "in the exercise of their mission," as priests.

"To this was added on, over time, that the Bulletins of the Great Army - brainwashing - had not only to be read in all schools, but also in churches, during mass.}" (Jacques Cheminade, {Time to Destroy the mythology of Bonapartism,} EIR, October 18, 1996, p.27-28.)

Gallicanism is a French political and religious doctrine, which refuses the Pope all spiritual authority over the French Kings, who were made the sole spiritual authority over the French subjects. Moreover, the French government had declared that, before the empire, the Consuls themselves were all Roman Catholics, that the Pope had given recognition to the French Republic, and that it had national

authority over the Catholic Church. This was the most outrageous form of Gallicanism, which had, for the first time ever, forced the Papacy under civilian rule; a sort of inversion of Joseph de Maistre ultramontane policy: *{He who controls the Pope, controls the Church, and he who controls the Church, controls the world}*.

The different bishoprics became identical with the administrative divisions of the State, and only the secular clergy, priests and bishops were given recognition. Both bishops and priests received salaries like state functionaries as Roman Emperor Julian had decreed. The First Consul himself, Napoleon Bonaparte, nominated the bishops, while the Pope merely instituted them. The bishops chose the priests based on their commitments to the revolution. However, the reader should know that the Holy See did not accept certain "Organic Articles," and that this Concordat of 1801 was applied in France only until the separation of the Church and State, in 1805.

This Bonapartist control of religion for political purposes was exemplary of the "integrist" type of ultramontane fundamentalist legacy coming out of the Spanish Inquisition: the purpose was essentially politically motivated, in that it was not established at all to stop heretics, but, in fact, to punish the politically undesirable people and to exclude, from the soil of Spain, those people of Jewish or Moorish descent. Similarly, the Bonaparte reconstruction of artificial Gallicanism within France, during the revolution, was merely a camouflaged operation covering up for a political control of the Chouans peasants of Bretagne, the Vendeens revolts, and the Royalists, in order to secure the "true believers", and prevent the flaring up of a counter-revolution.

Compare with the Concordat of Bonaparte with the original Articles of the Decree of 361 AD, by the Roman Emperor, Julian the Apostate (361-363):

"{Art. 1. The State shall be authorized to use the goods of the Galilean [Christian] churches to pay for the expenses of the Persian war.

Art. 2. The finances of the Empire shall provide a salary for the Christian bishops and the priests.

Art. 3. The bishops shall act from a council of priests who shall have common power.

Art. 4. Christian magistrates and others shall elect the Church leaders.

Art. 5 The Imperial Metropolis shall regulate Christian dioceses in conformity and uniformly with the political regions.

Art. 6. Christians will not be allowed to teach science and literature within the Empire. It is better for Christians to remain ignorant.

Art. 7. All of the bishops and priests must take the oath to maintain and execute this decree.}"

({Le Plagiat du Comite (soi-disant ecclesiastique) de l'Assemblee Nationale ou Decret de Julien l'apostat}, Antioche, De l'Imprimerie Imperiale, 1790, p.7-9.)

It took over two hundred years before French dictionaries and encyclopedias began to tell the truth about the brutality of the Bonaparte regime. A rare case in point is the *{Dictionnaire Encyclopedique Universel}* Quillet-Grolier, published in 1962, which had the courage to describe the regime of Napoleon 1st with the following characterization:

"{The assemblies which, according to the Constitution de l'An VIII, were considered part of the legislative work, were suppressed and annihilated. The Emperor ended up exercising practically the full legislative and executive powers by himself: it was the most absolute {personal government} that France had ever known. Personal freedoms were not respected any more than political freedoms. There was a huge police apparatus for surveillance, and to arrest anyone who was suspected of being hostile to the regime. Citizens were imprisoned without judgement, by a simple decision of the Emperor: this was a return to the arbitrary imprisonment and {lettres de cachet} of the old regime. Freedom of the press was also systematically suppressed. During the last four years of the Empire, there were only four newspapers that were authorized to be published in Paris, a single one in each of the other cities. Like under an absolute monarchy, there was a {censure of books}, and no one could be published without a {privilege}, that is to say, without an authorization from the government. Napoleon not only intended to have control over the minds of people under his rule, but also to mold in his fashion the minds of the future generations, and thus prepare his future obedient subjects. The {Imperial University}, instituted in 1808, was to take as the basis for its teaching "The precepts of the Catholic Church, the fidelity to the Emperor and to the Imperial Monarchy, depository of the happiness of the people."

"He established a monopoly for both secondary education and superior levels. The colleges and lycees, for one, and the faculties for the other represented in the mind of Napoleon the practical objective of creating a seed-bed for future educated subjects, who would become his officers and government functionaries. Napoleon wanted to make religion an instrument of his reign: among the duties of the Christian, the catechism of the duties to God came immediately before the duties to the Emperor. The heaviness of the imperial despotism and its contempt for freedoms, the weight of the ever increasing price of war, - and mostly the conscription - ended by creating a generalized discontent, and a sentiment of disaffection toward Napoleon."

Add to this the fact that Bonaparte had forced the papacy in Rome to be at his feet, and even went as far as kidnapping Pope Pius VII, in 1809, and had him prisoner, in Savone near Genoa, and then at Fontainebleau, for a period of four years.

From the moment that the so-called "civil equality" had been sacrificed to his power, his passion, and his despotism, Bonaparte had become the first modern fascist-monster beast-man, who had abused so many people, inside and outside of France, that after the 1810-1811 period, a systematic international opposition to his dictatorship had been mounting everywhere around the world. When he lost the Battle of Waterloo, in 1815, everyone had already abandoned him.

Treated as an {outlaw}, and as the "{the enemy, and disturber of world peace,}" Bonaparte was forced to abdicate on June 22, 1815. He attempted to escape to the United States, but was arrested by the British who exiled him of a minuscule rock lost in the middle of Atlantic, called Sainte Helene Island, where he lived six more years until his death in 1821. The French government had the very unfortunate and perverted idea of bringing his body back to France and exposed his coffin in the rotunda of the Invalides, in Paris. By that act of sacrilege, the French government was desecrating the memory of all of the patriotic soldiers who had given their lives for their nation.

The fact that the remains of Napoleon Bonaparte are still being preserved at the Invalides today, and that the worship of his person still goes on without

protest, in France, indicates the degree to which the French people have been manipulated into this collective national amnesia. This alone demonstrates that France is far from being liberated, and remains, in fact, a dormant fascist police state whose sovereignty will not be restored until the remains of Napoleon Bonaparte are taken back to Saint Helene, or to the Isle of Capri, properly buried in exile, and that everything, which has been attached to his reign is thrown into the dust bin of history along with the evil memories of the fascist Vichy regime, to be forgiven, but not forgotten.

8.2 JULIEN THE APOSTATE AND MITHRAIC STOICISM

The ultimate source of the political control of religion by Bonaparte is found in the Roman Emperor, Julian the Apostate (360-363 A.D.), who was one of the first Anti-Christ figures to come out of the Grottos of the Cult of Mithra in Ephesus, and on the Isle of Capri. Julian had written a book against Christianity called { *Contra Galileos* }, which was revived later in France by another Satan worshiper, the Jesuit educated Francois Marie Arouet, known by his pen name, Voltaire, which is a play on the words meaning "Veulent taire," (The one who they "want to shut up"). Voltaire considered Julian as "the greatest man that ever was." For Bonaparte, Julian was the roman imperial model for how to force the Catholic Church to submit to a temporal ruler, and how to go about looting the church treasures to pay for his wars.

British synarchist associate of Jacques Necker, Edward Gibbons, a close "watcher" of Napoleon Bonaparte, wrote a historical account of how Julian the Apostate had been declared Emperor by the Legions of Gaul, and how he had launched his Roman Legions of Gaul into the conquest of the East. As in the case of Napoleon, "His soldiers were the companions of his victory," said Gibbons. However, the secret of Julian's apostasy comes as a result of his training as a high priest of the Cult of Mithra, to which he had pledged to become the implacable enemy of Christ, and to return the Roman Empire to the Pagan Gods of his ancestors. Julian's favorite pastime, as a so-called "philosopher," had been to master sophistry, as a systematic form of fallacious denigration of Christian beliefs. Julian had devised a systematic fallacy of composition that turned all

Christian values into sarcasm. He would justify, for example, his stealing from the churches on the fact that Christ taught the Christians to be poor. "*{As to obedience to civil laws, 'Give to Cesar,' said Jesus, 'what is due to Cesar.' And, 'Obey your sovereigns, even if they are unjust,' said Paul.}*"

As a trained British intelligence expert, and a former student of Oxford, Gibbon was able to describe very precisely the role that the {Mithraic stoic}, Julian, had to play. "*{At every age, the absence of genuine inspiration is supplied by the strong illusions of enthusiasm and the mimic art of imposture. If, in the time of Julian, these arts had been practiced only by the Pagan priests, for the support of an expiring cause, some indulgence might perhaps be allowed to the interest and habits of the sacerdotal character. But it may appear a subject of surprise and scandal that the philosophers themselves should have contributed to abuse the superstitious credulity of mankind, and that the Grecian mysteries should have been supported by the magic or theurgy of the modern Platonists.}*"

At the age of fifteen, Julian had been molded by a so-called neo-Platonist called Chrysanthes, and an Arian heretic by the name of Eusebius; and at the age of twenty, Julian had been initiated into the mysteries of Eleusis, in the grottos of Ephesus, by the Master Theurgist, the Eleusinian Pope, Maximus, who also accompanied him in Gaul during his governorship, "*{for the sole purpose of consummating, by mystic rites and sacrifices, the great work of his sanctification.}*" (Edward Gibbon, {*The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*}, Vol. 1, in Great Books of the Western World, Chicago, 1952, p.347.)

"As these ceremonies were performed in the depth of caverns and in the silence of the night, and as the inviolable secret of the mysteries was preserved by the discretion of the initiated, I shall not presume to describe the horrid sounds and fiery apparitions which were presented to the senses or the imagination of the credulous aspirant, till the visions of comfort and knowledge broke upon him in a blaze of celestial light. In the cavern of Ephesus and Eleusis, the mind of Julian was penetrated with sincere, deep, and unalterable enthusiasm; though he might sometimes exhibit the vicissitudes of pious fraud and hypocrisy, which may be observed (that is, the truth of underlying assumptions piercing though the masquerade. P.B.), or at least suspected, in the characters of the most conscientious fanatics. From that moment on, he consecrated his life to the service

of the gods...}" (Ibidem.)

This Mithraic cult initiation was an ancient application of the same synarchist brainwashing that Maistre had used during the French Revolution, and that LaRouche pointed to in a recent report on {THE ROLE OF STRATEGIC DEFENSE IN THE SO-CALLED CARRASCO CASE,}, "*{The priest who no longer believes, but who continues to wear the habit while playing the part of an able sophist, with an explanation for anything but the emptiness, or worse, of his own implicitly Babylonian soul. Such is typical among those integrists I have met who have substituted the occult Ultramontane mythology of "The Donation of Constantine." As a substitute for the Platonic Christianity of such exemplary expressions as 1. Corinthian 13. That hollowed-out priest includes those who typify the creature of hate, a creature of the legacy of the religious wars of Europe, a behaviorism typical of those militant right-wing Catholics, or lunatic Protestant fundamentalists, one meets among the squadristi of the Synarchist's occult, Martinist freemasonic order today.}*" (a3:[325]A3325lar101;3 - RFS)

Before becoming Emperor, Julian had been the Roman Governor of Gaul, and had initially located his court in Reims and in Lutetia (Paris). During the short period of three years, when he became Emperor, from 360 to 363, Julian systematically plundered and looted the churches of France, in order to pay for his wars against Persia. Saint Gregory of Naziance made a public declaration against Julien the Apostate by stating:

"{No Cesar, these goods are not yours...The laws and the State permitted to the donors to express their intentions, under the sacred guarantee of the public faith. Do you think that those donors intended to make handsome presents to your soldiers, to your favorites, to these perfidious rascals, who sooner or later, if the sages are to be believed, will end up destroying the Empire? Thus, you violate all of the laws, by violating the wills of those citizens who have been consecrated by those laws...}"

During the 1790's, Napoleon Bonaparte was actually reading Julian as a political recipe book of "recommendations." The complete works of Julien the

Apostate had just been republished in 1790, and copies of his works were circulating everywhere in Paris, and in other major cities. During the same year, the National Assembly had publicly denounced Count of Mirabeau for having plagiarized the Decree of Julien, and having presented it as a "committee proposal" for the Constitutional Rights of the French Clergy. The Imprimerie Imperiale of Antioche published the document I have just quoted from, for the members of the National Assembly, in order to show the close parallel between Julien's factum and Mirabeau's plagiarism. Similarly, Joseph de Maistre had also gone back to the same source, but publicly playing his integrist posture by promoting the defense of the Pope against the French Clergy.

It is important to note that Emperor Julian the Apostate was also the synarchist model for the {*Cretan liar*} sophistry that synarchist Alexander Kojeve had adopted and had elevated to the "dignity" of the synarchist lie, in his Festschrift for Leo Strauss. Kojeve wrote:

"{No doubt, if Julian had wanted to be simply Emperor, he should and could have given up completely those mockings and stopped his subtle jesting. Having remained a philosopher, however, he could not abandon philosophic pedagogy; in addressing his writings only to a mature elite, he took care that the tradition of what was for him the (discursive) truth should not be interrupted. The camouflaged mocking which escapes the vulgar permits the selection of strong minds who understand such ironies without being shocked by them, and who thus reveal that they are not so enslaved by prejudices as to be unapt to receive, perhaps with some benefit, a philosophic instruction which will itself be given them only [between the lines](#) for the same reason of selection and secrecy.}"

(Alexandre Kojeve, {Emperor Julian and the Art of Writing})

9.2 THE GROTTO OF MATROMANIA

According to an unpublished report written by Umberto Pascali, entitled {*Capri from Tiberius to the Bolshevik Party School, the Historical Continuity of the Mithra Cult*}, his research led him to make the discovery of the location where

most of the fascist followers of the Roman Emperors had established their satanic cult of Mithra tradition. Pascali wrote:

"{In Capri, immediately after the crucifixion of Christ, Tiberius tried to collect, under the leadership of his secret advisors, the Caldean astrologer Trasillus and all of the cults of the Empire in order to establish a new religion based on the Cult of Mithra. There, according to Leonino da Zara, Pontius Pilatus married Claudia, the daughter of the Emperor. Capri was one of the first pieces of land donated, in the 6th century, to the Montecassino Benedictine Monastery, and there the monks settled, despite the opposition from the secular clergy and the support of Pope Gregory the Great. It was also on the Isle of Capri that the roots of the Bolshevik and Nazi revolutions took hold and were mixed in an amazing way, inside of the infamous {Grotta Di Matromania}, in the temple of Mithra where Tiberius sacrificed his much loved slave boy Hyppatus to the Gnostic god. There, during the entire period of the nineteenth century, the royal and imperial families of Europe settled especially around the Swedish-British oligarch, Alex Munthe, the reputed "Svengali of modern times." There also, General Goering attempted to buy Munthe's {San Michele Villa} for Hitler, a villa which had been built on the ruins of the private villa of Tiberius... who Hitler thought he was the reincarnation of... There also came Lenin and Pasternak's father, as well as other communist leaders...}" (p. 5)

The French revolutionaries made it a point of pride to use the Frigian Cap as the symbol of their terror operations. It is not a mere coincidence, however, that this Phrygian Cap was also the ceremonial headdress worn by the priests of the Cult of Mithra, during sacrificial rituals, on the Isle of Capri. The well documented report of Pascali also revealed that, during the Napoleonic wars, the Isle of Capri had come under the British Empire, and was controlled by Governor Hudson Lowe, the same individual who was later promoted the jailer of Napoleon Bonaparte, during the last years of the prisoner-emperor, on the Isle of Saint Helene.

Pascali further reported that sometimes after WWI, the last descendent of the "Sun King" Louis XIV and Madame Pompadour, Marquis Paul de Pommery de Lenormant d'Etoile, had been tried, in an Italian court, for an alleged ritual

human sacrifice that took place on the Isle of Capri, at the Marqui's { Villa Osiris }, in which he was accused of having replicated the Tiberius sacrifice of Hypatus in honor of the Sun God of Mithra. Pommery's money and political influence got him acquitted. Moreover, when the Bourbons regained power in France, Bonaparte's generals had exiled themselves into the United States, in order to continue their subversive mission. In a report titled { Napoleonic Generals in America } [A3-32-2/JLH001], Judy Hodgkiss made the astute observation that the estate ground of the Bonaparte property, in Bordentown New Jersey, was found to have grottos which might also have been used for "Mithra cult rituals."

Thus, the entire span of the French Revolution, from 1789 until today can be considered as a battlefield between the forces of the Synarchy Movement of Empire and the forces of the American System of Political Economy. The synarchist plan had been an explicit repudiation of the Peace of Westphalia, and an affront against the American Republic, based on the corrupt fallacy of composition that one of the modern synarchist founders, Saint-Yves d'Alveydre, had formulated in his { Mission des Souverains }. What Saint-Yves d'Alveydre's book comes down to is that it had hypocritically misinterpreted the general system of Europe at the Peace of Westphalia as "*{ an anarchistic Republic of powers armed against each other, and that the fundamental law of the sovereignty of force obliges, under penalty of death, to function in this fashion, until the abrogation and replacement of this law by a better one. }*" (p.272) This is precisely the view that the Peace of Westphalia had successfully abrogated in 1648, and had replaced by the principle of { agape }.

Obviously, Saint-Yves 's Synarchist intention was to destroy the principle of the { *Advantage of the other* } that had been established at the 1648 Treaty of Westphalia, and which represented the new principle replacing the old one of { *might makes right* }. It was that new principle, based on the Economic policy of Mazarin and Colbert, which had changed the { complex domain } of world politics that lead to the American Republic, and the American constitutional principle of { *Sovereignty, General welfare, and Posterity.* } This is what the Martinist synarchy has had the intention of destroying; and that is why the LaRouche forces, internationally, have committed themselves to root them out, once and for all.

10.2 THE MARTINIST ORDER AND BONAPARTE.

The fanatical proclivities of Napoleon Bonaparte, his paganism and his dictatorial policy came from the esoteric doctrines of the freemasonic cult of the Martinist Order founded on the "philosophy" of four of the most important cult leaders of the eighteenth century, Martinez de Pasqually, Louis Claude de Saint-Martin, Jean-Baptiste Willermoz, and Joseph de Maistre. Most of the themes that Joseph de Maistre developed in his 1796 {Considerations on France}, that is, the fall of man, the role of Providence, the reversibility of innocent victim paying for the guilty, are all taken from Saint-Martin's documentation in {The Ministry of the Man-Spirit}, which was published later, in 1801, and from Saint-Martin's {Lettre sur la Revolution francaise}, (1794). These books became the main reading material of Bonaparte.

It was Saint-Martin who initiated the French subversive theme of the {Man of Desire} (1790), and the "desire for recognition" which became the favorite theme of synarchist, and colleague of Leo Strauss, Alexander Kojeve, and the source of brainwashing of the Paris youth generation of the 1968 events, against the Charles de Gaulle government. Louis Claude Saint Martin is said to have had close contacts with Sir Francis Dashwood and the Golitzin family in Russia. When Saint Martin died in 1803, his influence lived on, especially in France, Italy and Russia. Papus (Gerard Encausse) wrote several books on Saint Martin, especially {Louis Claude de Saint Martin}, (1902) and {Martinisme, martinesisme, et franc-maconerie}, (1899). There is also a book by Franz von Baader on {Les enseignements secrets de Martinez de Pasqually,} (1900).

Jean-Baptiste Willermoz (1730-1824) was a pupil of Martinez de Pasqually, who became a mason in 1750. In 1753, he founded a lodge called "{La Parfaite Amitie,}" of which he became the Master. He worked with {Bacon de Chevalerie}, a Deputy-Grand Master of the {Elus Cohen}. Willermoz was introduced to the German Masonic Order of {'Strict Observance Templiere'}, in 1772, which is connected to the Weishaupt {Illuminati of Bavaria}, the most famous masonic order of Germany, during the French Revolution, to which

belonged Jacques Necker and Phillippe Egalite. In 1774, Willermoz founded a new lodge in Lyon France, called {"Loge Ecossaise Rectifiee 'La Bienfaisance,'} (Reformed Scottish Rite Lodge of Charity). This lodge was essentially oriented toward subverting the idea of {Agape}.

According to Emile Dermenghem, *{Joseph de Maistre Mystique}*, on September 4, 1774, JOSEPH DE MAISTRE (1753-1821) joined the Scottish Rite {Loge des Trois Mortiers} (Lodge of the Three Mortars) of Lyon, at the age of 21. He became a {Grand Orator}, and was operating directly under the authority of the Great Lodge of London. Four years later, on September 4, 1778, Maistre joined in both Lyon and Chambéry, the {Loge Ecossaise Reformee de la Sincerite} (Reformed Scottish Rite Lodge of Sincerity), which was dependent on the grand master the Duke Ferdinand of Brunswick, and was headed by Jean-Baptiste Willermoz. It is from these two lodges that Maistre was known to have conducted most of his secret activities.

Joseph de Maistre's lodge des {Trois Mortiers} had been created in 1749, by Joseph de Bellegarde, Marquis des Marches, and was the oldest lodge in Chambéry, capital City of the then Kingdom of Savoy. Out of the Lyon lodge, there were four great initiates of the highest grade {Grands Profes} of the {Masonic Knights of the Order of Charity of the Holy City} who were the key Martinist leaders covering the events of the French Revolution. They were: "*{Hippolyte, Chevalier de Ville, (a Castro), Senator, President of the {College Metropolitain de France} (Lyon); Marc Rivoire, senior, Bourgeois depository (a Leone alto); Joseph, Comte de Maistre (a Floribus), Attorney General, Senate substitute; Jean-Baptiste, Comte Salteur (a Cane), Attorney General, Senate substitute.}*"

Dermenghem reports that Maistre had an unpublished {Memoire au Baron Vignet des Etoles sur la franc-maconnerie} (Memoire on Freemasonry to Baron Vignet des Etoles), written in 1793, in which Maistre details how he had "spent a lot of time with these Gentlemen in Lyon." Maistre was also a member of the {Elus Cohen}, along with Willermoz, and Martinez De Pasqually. The story of how Maistre got initiated into his "Vengeance Order of Sincerity" against the French Revolution is worth telling. Let us examine a few of the shadows.

When Maistre was being prepared for his initiation to the {Elus Cohen} degree, Willermoz gave him several lessons on his {theory of conviction}. In one of his letters, Willermoz wrote: "*{The demonstration established through the efforts of the mind will never give the sentiment., while the sentiment, on the contrary, will lead to the conviction of the mind. In your case, the doubts that you wrongly erect as law has your mind bridle the sentiment, and therefore puts a stop to all of its effects, while if the sentiment should be left free to act, it would become a guide more certain since it would not be submitted to the prejudices which almost always restrains the other...When man gets rid of his prejudices, he opens his intelligence to all of its rights. He judges sanely everything that is of his recourse. But he who has not done that, in believing he sees everything, does not see a thing, because, by seeing and feeling everything with the material eyes, the facts remain hidden to his intelligence.}*"

Then, Willermoz gave the young Maistre the example of the "*{man who penetrates into a grotto without a light, and trusting only his own eyes, would not see anything, and could not believe in the existence of objects which another man who, with the help of a torch, would be able to observe. That torch is your sentiment.}*" Thus, Willermoz concluded: *{reason does not see any better than the human eye in the dark}*. It is very important to note here that everything that is taught in the masonic initiations always subordinates reason to the senses, that is, subordinates reason to the Aristotelian axiom of belief which says: "*{There exists nothing in the mind that has not first been seized by sense perception}*."

Willermoz introduced Maistre more and more on the question of Hell, the issue of good and evil, the idea of God's punishment, and the question of vengeance, including the "necessary salvation of the damned." These were not speculative questions. These lessons involved direct deployments into the terror. However, Willermoz thought that Maistre was moving too fast on the question of punishment, and wrote to him that he could solve "*{that important question only after having meditated and deepened his understanding of positive rights and the immense will power of all free individuals.}*"

Maistre was not satisfied and criticized Willermoz comparing his teacher's idea of the conduct of God to that of "*{an imbecile Admiral who, instead of*

destroying his enemies with the most powerful warship, he would send after them a hundred little boats to amuse them and get beaten.}" On this point, Dermenghem writes a very revealing footnote, which says: "*{According to the occult Martinist doctrine, Man had originally been created by God in order to repair the fall of the guilty Angels, and in order to triumph against the Perverse Being. Still not entirely initiated yet, Maistre had asked why God did not intervene directly. Later on, quite to the contrary, Maistre will attach a great importance to the superior intelligences who are distinct from God, and who are the intermediaries between the Divinity and nature.}*" (Emile Dermenghem, {Op. Cit.,} p.59) Such "intermediaries" represent the men of Providence, such as himself and Napoleon Bonaparte.

During the fall of 1784, and the winter of 1785, Maistre was also in contact with Savalette de Langes and the Marquis de Chefdebien d'Hericouthe, who were two {Philalethes} masons from Paris, the equivalent of the {Elus Cohen} of Lyon. Those were the direct overseers of the events that were being prepared in and around the coup of the Bastille. It was in the late 1780's that the lower level Martinist organizers such as Mesmer, Cagliostro, Cazotte, Dupont de Nemour, Count of Saint Germain, Fabre d'Olivet, Senancour, and others, were being deployed into the Bastille operation of Paris, and collaborated with Robespierre, Marat and Danton, in the {purgative violence} of the Terror.

At the beginning of 1788, Martinist Cazotte, who had come to Paris from the heights of Fourvieres in Lyon, made a remarkable intervention, during a dinner before members of the Academie Royale des Sciences, at the home of duc de Nivernais. After the main course, Cazotte stood up and made a chilling {self-fulfilling prophecy} that the pro-American faction, sitting at the table, namely the Marquis de Condorcet and Jean Sylvain Bailly, among others, were going to be executed within the next few years. Cazotte announced that Condorcet was going to die in a jail cell, and Bailly was going to die on the scaffold. The {Elus Cohen} of the Martinist Order of Lyon had whispered those words, made to sound prophetic, in Cazotte's ear.

Similarly, after having had meetings with the Scottish Rite Mother Lodge in London, the infamous Cagliostro published a {Letter to the French}, dated June 20, 1786, in which he made the "prophecy" that *{The Bastille shall be completely*

destroyed, and the land upon which it had been erected shall become a promenade area."} One does not need to be a clairvoyant to realize that the Bastille coup d'Etat of July 14, 1789, had indeed been "magically" prepared in the London dependent Lodge of the Martinist Order of Lyon, at least three years before the event occurred.

Other freemasonic lodges had been promoting the restoration of outright paganism and the cult of the stars. Among some of the less hidden individuals involved in the masonic subversion of France, one must include the father of Robespierre, who had created a British controlled Scottish Rite Lodge in Arras, where the idea of the {Incorruptible} had been featured. Also, Dupont de Nemours had published a {Philosophy of the Universe} based on the "hierarchy of the celestial spirits."

This theme of {hierarchies of celestial spirits} or, {hierarchy of souls} has been at the very center of the issue of {belief versus knowledge}, throughout the entire history of mankind. The Gnostic method is intended to brutalize the minds of the youth with {Mithraic Stoicism}; that is, through an experimental indulging in sadistic {purgative violence}, which the Martinist magicians have dubbed "initiations." The result of this process of brainwashing, is the total destruction of human thinking and emotional capabilities. Those who keep up the appearance of having made it through such "initiations," with a stiff upper lip, become soulless walking dead, and the higher level they can sustain in this stoic endurance warfare, the higher their position will be in the {hierarchy of celestial spirits.}

This is a special version of John Locke's {pleasure and pain principle}. {In this case the pain is that of the other, the pleasure is yours!} In other words, this is the secret process of discovering higher levels of your own resistance to the pains of others, that is the highest degree of the {*Disadvantage of the other*}, the higher the degree of merit you shall acquire in the {hierarchy of souls}.

This evil power-training system, is precisely the inversion of the degrees of Plato's {bronze, silver, and golden souls}. This initiation of {satanic virtues} is entirely opposite to the {principle of higher powers} developed by Plato in the {Meno} dialogue, and has become the Martinist Synarchy's main instrument of recruitment of young technocrats for the purpose of banking, political, cultural,

and religious control of population worldwide. This is the old idea of the {One-World Government.} "Pambasileia" is the term used by Aristotle in his *Politiques*, 3, 15,1., meaning absolute sovereign, or Emperor of the world, which had been recognized by Roman Emperor Julien, and Emperor Bonaparte, as being totally {Contrary to nature}. This is why it "cannot be spoken of, except in artful and obscure terms," as through the art of lying of Leo Strauss.

This is also the process of government control that the Constitutional Republic of the United States had sabotaged in 1776, by instituting the Leibnizian principle of {*pursuit of happiness*}, and this is the reason why the Martinist Order of Joseph de Maistre assassinated Jean Sylvain Bailly, Condorcet as well as Antoine Lavoisier, and neutralized the mission of Marquis de Lafayette, Lazare Carnot, and other pro-American forces in Paris during the French Revolution. This is, finally, the reason why Lyndon LaRouche has provoked the youth of today in discovering the knowable universal principle developed by Carl Gauss, in his 1799 {Theorem of Algebra}.

As for the Martinist Synarchy, this question takes them back to the raging battle of the 9th century between the Christian faction and the Gnostic faction in the Charlemagne Empire. This was the war that confronted the Platonic-Augustinian forces of Alcuin against the Aristotelian-Mithraic magicians of Count Hugo de Tours. The Martinists have never forgotten, nor pardoned Charlemagne for having executed Count Hugo, and having joined forces with Alcuin. They have been seeking revenge ever since. The French Revolution has been such a historical revenge.

At the end of his chapter on Joseph de Maistre's relationship to the Martinist order, Dermenghem teases his reader on this issue of {belief versus knowledge}, by asking the provoking question: "{*Would it not be seductive to believe that, at the age of forty, Maistre discovered that during his entire life until that point, he had followed the wrong principle, that he had erred and sinned into audacious researches to which he had dedicated himself, and that the order in the bosom of which he had been working with such zeal was nothing but a hypocritical and subtle instrument of Satan?*}" Here, Dermenghem is toying with the truth of the matter, but without admitting that Joseph de Maistre was an outright Satanist.

When, in 1793, the French Revolution disbanded Masonic Lodges, and the French army invaded Savoy, the {Lodge of Sincerity}, in Chambéry, was "officially" closed, all of the masons, including Joseph de Maistre, were officially forced into exile.

12.2 MODERN MASONIC ORDER OF MARTINISM AND SYNARCHY

GERARD ENCAUSSE (1865-1916), otherwise known as PAPUS, is the modern "founder" of the Martinist Order. "L'Ordre Martiniste," as it is called, was founded by Papus in 1888, as {L'Ordre des Supérieurs Inconnus.} S.I. (Order of Unknown Superiors). Papus founded the new Order with his companion Pierre-Augustin Chaboseau (1868-1946). Henry Dellage had initiated Papus, and Chaboseau was initiated by his Aunt Amélie de Boise-Montmart. Both established a hermetic school in France, called {L'Ecole Hermetique}, which taught Arabic, Sanskrit, Greek and Latin, and Hermetic Studies, with emphasis on Spiritism, Magnetism, Magic, Astrology. Papus was striving toward the "unification of all occult orders". In 1889, the first periodical of the Martinist revue was published, called {L'Initiation}.

Under Papus, and his close collaborator, Saint-Yves d'Alveydre, the Martinist order had a great expansion in France and internationally including Russia and the United States. They both followed very closely in the footsteps of Joseph de Maistre, Louis de Bonald, and Fabre d'Olivet. By 1916, there were 160 Martinist lodges in the World. The United States Martinist Order was created by an {Elus-Cohen} named Dr. Edward Blitz who became the {General Delegate of the Supreme Council of the Martinist Order of the U.S.A.}, in 1896. Sister Margaret B. Peeke later replaced him. Charles Detre (Teder) and Victor Blanchard who brought the Martinist headquarters back to Lyon after 1918, succeeded Papus. They only admitted 3rd degree Master Mason of any rite to join them. These were initiated into the highest degree of {Supérieur Inconnu} S.I., also known as the {Unknown Philosopher} degree in memory of Louis Claude Saint Martin.

During an International Convention of Martinists in Brussels in 1934, Victor Blanchard was elected unanimously the Universal Sovereign Grandmaster of a new Martinist Order that was called {Ordre Martiniste et Synarchique.} This created a split among Martinists. Augustin Chaboseau split from Blanchard, which resulted in the creation of a third martinist order. There were then three distinct Martinists Orders.

1- The {ORDRE MARTINISTE} of Lyon headed by Chevillon; 2- The {ORDRE MARTINISTE ET SYNARCHIQUE}, headed by Victor Blanchard; 3- The {ORDRE MARTINISTE TRADITIONNEL} headed by Chaboseau.

After Chevillon, Sovereign Grandmaster of the [ORDRE MARTINIST] of Lyon was assassinated, in 1944, he was succeeded by Henry Dupont (?). Augustin Chaboseau died in 1946. When his son, Jean Chaboseau was not confirmed as successor, the {ORDRE MARTINISTE TRADITIONNEL} was dissolved and shut down, in 1951. After this controversy, one branch was left in the U.S. headed by Ralf Maxwell Lewis Lewis, who was Regional Grandmaster for "California and the United States."(sic) The Martinists shut out this branch as well. By 1953, Victor Blanchard, Sovereign Grandmaster of the {ORDRE MARTINISTE ET SYNARCHIQUE} died and was succeeded by Dr. Edward Bertholet from Switzerland. It is Bertholet who instituted the {Grand Lodge of England}, headed by Sar Gulion, who maintained the synarchist continuity. In 1958, Henry Dupont, Sovereign Grandmaster of the {Ordre Martiniste} de Lyon, along with Phillipe Encausse and Robert Ambelain, formed a Federation called the UNION DES ORDRES MARTINISTES} located in Paris. In September 1959, the British Grand Lodge of the ORDERE MARTINISTE ET SYNARCHIQUE} joined the {Union des ordres Martinistes} representing Great Britain and the Commonwealth. A year later, Great Britain joined the Federation.

The internet also identifies a significant number of Russian affiliations of the Martinist Order dating back to the founder, Louis-Claude de Saint-Martin. Here is the main chain of transmission:

*"{Louis-Claude de Saint-Martin, who received it in 1780.
Prince Kourakine, diplomat in France, who received it.
Nicolas Novikov, writer and publisher, and one of the principals responsible for
French Masonry and the Rose+Croix in Russia, received it.*

Gamaleï, poet, who received it.

Posdëer, who received it.

Pierre Kasnatchëv, who received it.

Serge Marcotoune, lawyer, whose mystical name was Master Hermius, received it in 1930.

Master Raymond Panagion, Grand Master of the Order and Patriarch of the Apostolic Rosicrucian Church until his transition to the Eternal Orient, in 1994.

"Besides this affiliation, the Order is equally the depository of the affiliation with Papus, and of the Russian Martinist affiliation of Robert Ambelain, an affiliation which, likewise, dates back to Nicolas Novilov, but by another route." }

As for the United States, there are {Rose+Croix Martinist Order} Lodges reported in 14 different States: California, Oregon, Nevada, Arizona, Utah, Wyoming, Colorado, New Mexico, New Jersey, Maryland, Delaware, Virginia, West Virginia, and Pennsylvania. During the early 1980's The Grand Master of the Martinist Order of Amsterdam, Maurice Warnon, of the {Ordre Martiniste des Pays-Bas}, conferred the complete initiation of {Superieur Inconnu} S.I. to the controversial head of the {Gnostic Orthodox Church of America}, Abbot George Burke (Basileus), and to an American Literature Professor from the University of Southern Illinois, Lloyd Worley (Trophimus). Both are members of the "{American Supreme Council of the Martinist order and Synarchy}".

Worley is a {De Molay Chevalier} and a member of the Century "Blue Lodge" #190 in Greeley, Colorado. In 1989, Lloyd Worley, successfully petitioned the British Grand Master, Sar Gullion, to authorize him in creating an "Independent branch" of the {Martinist order and Synarchy}, in Colorado, and he became his president. Lloyd Worley is a Catholic priest ordained in 1776, and is currently Rector and Parish Priest in Greeley, Colorado. In 1991, Worley, under the pseudonyme of Trophimus S.I.I. wrote a book called {A Martinist Treasury}, Published by The Martinist Information Service at Greeley, Colorado, U.S.A.

One of the more interesting features of Lloyd Worley, is that when you type his name into a Google search, you get a fascinating story of an American Oligarch, who calls himself the Duke of Maxalla, and who has been professor at the Universities of Southern Illinois at Carbondale in 1979, at the Pennsylvania

State University, and now at the University of Northern Colorado. He was made a Baron in 1993 by a Russian Sovereign Highness, by the name of Prince William de Alabona-Ostrogojsk et de Gamara, for having initiated Polish Nobility into the freemasonry of the Byzantine Roman Empire, and for having served ten years as {Sovereign Grand Master of the Religious and Military Order of Knights of the Holy Sepulchre of Jerusalem}. In the same year, Baron Worley of Christy received a citation and commendation from the State Senate of New Jersey, for his "work in the field of Chivalry."

Worley became Duke of Maxalla in 1996. His biography states: "When his Holiness Pope Shenouda of the Coptic Orthodox Church visited Denver Colorado, Duke Lloyd Douglas [Worley] was invited by the Coptic Pope to a private lunch and audience." They have been good friends ever since, and the Duke has accepted an invitation to visit the Pope in his palace in Alexandria, Egypt.

However, the web site on Martinism reports that even though Worley had received the proper initiations of the {Martinist Order of the Netherlands} through its Grand Master, Maurice Warnon, he was expelled from the order because of breach of promise." Worley is also listed in {Who's Who in America.}

The reason I have given the pedigree of Worley in such detail is because all of this Nobility and Chivalry nonsense is nothing but a disguise, a façade, behind which is hidden the {universal species characteristic} of Satanism. Worley is the world's leading advocate of the Dark Age Romanian Prince, Vlad Dracula the Impaler, who had been falsely represented, by Hollywood of course, as a fictional vampire. Again, I ask the reader to pay attention to the shadows that are projected on the dimly lit wall of Plato's cave, and to notice that in certain cases, the light that is shed on an object might project a different shadow on the wall. You should not be surprised to discover here that the projected image of Lloyd Worley casts the shadow of Joseph de Maistre's executioner, mixed with his self-portrait. As he put it in his own words, Worley's interest in Vlad Dracula is "*{focussed on his use of the unspeakable torture/execution methods known as impaling, by the thrusting of a long stake or shaft through the anus, through the intestines to the diaphragm muscle. The naked victim was then hoisted up and the pole fixed in the ground. Subsequent writhing eventually forced the stake upward to pierce the heart, causing death (if the victim had not already died of shock or blood loss). Even after death, the impaling process continued with gravity finally causing the stake*

to exit through the mouth.

Impaling was a slow and horrible death designed to strike fear and loathing into the observer.}" (Lloyd Worley, {Impaling, Dracula, and the Bible}, 1997.)

Worley further expresses his world view in another article called "*Loving Death: Male Sexual Impotence in Vampire Literature.*" This piece is also perfectly in keeping with the oligarchical-satanist-sodomite worldview, which dominates the Martinist Synarchy Movement of Empire. In this last article, Worley admits that "*the concept of the dead arising from their graves to feed upon the blood of the innocent and the beautiful is not a macabre, but a voluptuous idea.*"

The question that must be raised is: why did the New Jersey Senate of 1993, decided to contravene the Constitution of the United States, and gave Worley a public recognition of his nobility title? Describing the motivation for awarding Worley a Citation from the State Government, the document states: "*Just as the duty of the ancient Knight was to protect Society through force of arms, so the Count believes that the modern Knight should protect Society through service to others.*"

In conclusion, here is the list of the known Martinist Orders that have been established since the French Revolution, and those that still remain in existence today. Note below that the dominance of the Anglo-Dutch Martinist Orders correspond to the current Anglo-Dutch form of monetary-financial system of central banking.

- 1- {L'Ordre Martiniste} of Papus created in 1888. Headed by Emilio Lorenzo, since 1979.
- 2- The {Federation of the Martinist Orders} founded in 1958 by Philippe Encausse. Disappeared.
- 3- {L'ordre Martiniste-Martineziste}, founded by Charles Detre in Lyon, 1916. Disappeared.
- 4- {L'Ordre Martiniste et Synarchique} of Great Britain. A very secretive order. No known history. No known members in England. Several groups

exist in Canada. Among them, {The Rose+Croix Martinist Order}, founded in Ontario Canada in 1982, is headed by Mike Revisto.

5- {L'Ordre Martiniste Traditionnel} created by Augustin Chaboseau in 1888. Is headed today by Maurice Warnon. Gary Lee Stewart created a {Traditional Martinist Order} in the U.S.A. in 1990.

6- {L'Ordre Martiniste Traditionnel of the AMORC}, reserved exclusively to the members of the {Ancient and Mystic Order of the Rose and the Cross} (A.M.O.R.C.)

7- {L'Ordre Martiniste Initiatique}, created by Jules Boucher. Disappeared.

8- {L'Ordre Martiniste Belge}, created at the request of Philippe Encausse in 1968. Currently headed by Brother Loruite.

9- {L'Ordre Martiniste des Pays-Bas}, also created at the request of Philippe Encausse in 1975. The order is currently active in the Netherlands, Belgium, France, England, Canada and the United States of America.

There are also Martinist Order Lodges reported in Luxembourg, Italy, Spain, Brazil, Chile, Peru, Argentina, Mexico, and Costa Rica.

13.2 SYNARCHISTS ON UNIVERSITY CAMPUSES

Lloyd Worley is not the first University Professor whose mission is to "protect" your children on University campuses. During its original founding years, the Martinist Order made the claim that its outlook was consistent with the Catholic and the Judaic faiths. Why should we not believe them? Numerous references to that effect are found in Joseph de Maistre and Louis Claude de Saint Martin. In his book on {Joseph de Maistre Mystique}, as if to dispel any shades of evil spirits, Emile Dermenghem constantly returned to the "Catholic orthodoxy" of Joseph de Maistre. This is the epistemological basis upon which Joseph de Maistre has argued that Priests of the Theology Faculties should lead Universities around

the world.

The point that de Maistre had made was that religious teaching, in the Universities, was the key to capturing the youth of a country and making sure that their Faculties "*would not become corrupt*," i.e. would not get dominated by reason, and corrupt by science. This is one of de Maistre's favorite *{Cretan lies.}* In his *{Essay on the Generative Principle of Political Constitution,}*, de Maistre argues as follows:

"{XXXVIII- ...The question is frequently asked: {why there is a school of theology attached to every University?} The answer is easy: {It is so that the Universities may subsist, and that the instruction may not be corrupt.} Originally, the Universities were only schools of theology, to which other {faculties} were joined, as subjects around their Queen. The edifice of public instruction, placed on such a foundation, has continued to our day. Those who have subverted it among themselves, will repent it, in vain, for a long time to come. To burn a city, there is needed only a child or a madman; but to rebuilt it, architects, materials, workmen, money, and especially time, will be required."

*XXXIX. "Those who are content to corrupt ancient institutions, while preserving the exterior forms, have done as much evil to the human race. Already the influence of modern Universities on manners and the national mind, over a considerable portion of the continent of Europe, is perfectly well known. * I will not allow myself to publish notions which are peculiar to me, however precious they may be; but I believe that it is lawful for everyone to reprint what has been printed, and make a German speak on Germany. A man whom no person will accuse of being infatuated with old ideas, thus expresses himself on the Universities of his country. 'All our German Universities, even the best, have need of great reform, in respect to morals...The best, even, are a gulf where innocence, health, and the future well being of a multitude of young people are irretrievably lost; and from whence go out beings ruined in body and soul, more burdensome than useful to society, etc. ... Would that these pages might be a preservative for young people! Would that they might read over the gate of our universities: {Young man! It is here that many of thy equals have lost happiness with innocence.}' " ' } (M. Campo, {Recueil de Voyages pour l'instruction de la jeunesse.}*

Sounds innocuous enough, doesn't it? Well, all of this is merely a delphic introduction to the defense of the British University sodomite system of Oxford and Cambridge. Then, de Maistre adds this final twist:

*"{The English Universities have preserved, in this respect, more reputation than the others, perhaps for the reason that the English know better how to be silent, or to praise themselves at the right moment; perhaps, also, because the public spirit, which has an extraordinary power in that country, has been able to defend, better than elsewhere, these venerable schools from the general anathema. However, they must succumb, and from the misgivings of Gibbon, we have obtained certain strange disclosures on this point. *(See Gibbon's {Memoires}, in which he renounced Oxford as his {alma mater}.)} In short, not to go out of generalities, if we do not return to the old maxims, if education is not restored into the hands of priests, and if science is not every where placed in the second rank, the evils which await us are incalculable: we shall become brutalized by science, and this is the lowest degree of brutality." (pp. 112-15)*

There is a long history of fascism in the University system of France, notably, the very first French University of Paris, founded in 1150 by the Bishop of Paris, was an Aristotelian scholastic Faculty of Theology. It was those same professors of the University of Paris who founded the Universities of Oxford, and Cambridge, in England. It was also this same University of Paris, which had been the center of the Great Schism in the Church during the fourteenth century, and which had played the leading role in the condemnation and execution of Jeanne d'Arc, in 1431. It is in such Theology Faculties that the French oligarchy had fabricated their Anti-Christ scenarios throughout history. During the French Revolution of 1789, all of the Universities of France were suppressed, and were replaced by the Imperial University of France, in 1808, by order of Napoleon. Not surprisingly, this was also one of the principle recruiting ground for Guiseppe Mazzini's youth movements of mid-nineteenth century Europe.

SYNARCHY MOVEMENT OF EMPIRE

BOOK I

CHAPTER 5

CHAPTER 5

THE EARLY SYNARCHY MOVEMENT OF EMPIRE

**THE FRENCH REVOLUTION of 1789-1815:
A SYNARCHIST INTERNATIONAL EXERCISE
IN PURGATIVE VIOLENCE**

5.1 BONAPARTE BEASTMAN OF PROVIDENCE

- 1.2 JOSEPH DE MAISTRE: A SATANIST GUIDE
- 2.2 THE DISMEMBERMENT OF THE AUSTRIAN EMPIRE.
- 3.2 NAPOLEON BONAPARTE: THE "MAN OF PROVIDENCE."
- 4.2 THE SATANIC FUNCTION OF THE EXECUTIONER
- 5.2 THE PROSTITUTES OF THE DIRECTOIRE.
- 6.2 THE CURIOUS POST SCRIPTUM OF BARRAS.
- 7.2 ROMANTIC ENTHUSIASM VS MORAL ENTHUSIASM:

1.2 JOSEPH DE MAISTRE: A SATANIST GUIDE

The imperialist tendency within the French oligarchy does not begin with Napoleon Bonaparte. The son of the great Louis XI, Charles VIII, had initially fallen into the trap of wars of conquest in Italy, in 1494. Such an invasion stemmed from a romantic belief in the Roman Empire, an infatuation with grandeur, that Ludovico il Moro, and the Venetian Fondi, had used to lure King Charles into conquering Naples and Constantinople, the same folly, which was to be later displayed by the Mithra cult deployment of the "Sun King", Louis XIV. Of course, such imperial designs failed. Similarly, a little more than three hundred years later, Napoleon Bonaparte engaged in the conquest of Italy, under the romantic guise of Caesar in French garb. His personal ambition was to realise a warped vision of the empire of Charlemagne, with the added feature of an ultramontane design to control the papacy. Similar to the other Mithra Cult figure, Emperor Julian, in 360 AD, Bonaparte wanted to recreate a New Pagan World Order, under the control of synarchist bankers, who bankrolled Bonaparte's operations, to establish a central banker's dictatorship over Europe as a whole. One might ask: "What caused such projects to fail, every time?"

In a first report, I attempted to give an epistemological characterization of Bonaparte. In this second report, I shall attempt to identify the curious circumstances under which he came to power, and the reason for his failure; that is, to show that the real cause of the defeat of Bonaparte did not come from any tactical mistake of command decision on his part, or because the synarchist bankers decided to pull the plug on him. The cause of the strategic defeat of Bonaparte lay in the character of the French people and the French soldiers, as was expressed by Lazare Carnot's poem on {ENTHUSIASM}. Soldiers will fight with total enthusiasm and passion for their sovereignty, the general welfare of their nation, and for posterity, because they {*know*} their war of liberation to be right, and will not long {*believe*} in a war of aggression against their neighbors. Even

the treacherous Richelieu had to admit, however reluctantly, that the desire for conquest was missing in his own soldiers, when he said: "*If their valor had been accompanied by that quality, the universe itself would not have been large enough for their conquest.*" (Joseph de Maistre, {*Considerations on France*}, Cambridge University Press, 1994, p. 362.) When Bonaparte entered Italy, he refused to acknowledge this {*strategic reality*}, and ended up committing {*immense aberrations*}. First, let us look at the historical context in which Bonaparte emerged as a monster-warrior.

2.2 THE DISMEMBERMENT OF THE AUSTRIAN EMPIRE.

During the late 1790's, the Comite de Salut Public and the Directoire, in Paris, had both agreed that the war should be ended only when the borders of ancient Gaul were to be reassigned to France, that is, when the so-called "natural borders", which included the entire left bank of the Rhine River, all the way to the sea were to provide the opportunities for a massive, continent wide, looting party. However, these new borders required to be officially recognized by the German Body of principalities and by Austria. These territories were to be transferred peacefully to France following the agreements of the Treaty of Campo-Formio, which had been signed between France and Austria, in 1797.

According to that Treaty, the Habsburg Empire had secretly agreed to cede the Spanish Netherlands, and a great part of the German territories of the Left Bank of the Rhine, in exchange for securing Bavaria and the Venetian Republic. Prussia, on the other hand, had already made an agreement with Paris, in 1796, proposing considerable financial compensation for an eventual exchange of its territories of the West Bank of the Rhine. The Directoire had a number of Treatises which had been signed separately by different members of the German body, and Austria, prior to advent of Bonaparte, namely: the series of Treaties with Hesse-Cassel on August 28, 1795, with Wuttemberg, on September 25, 1795, with Baden, on July 25, 1796, with the Swabian Circle, on July 27, 1796, with the Francovian Circle and Wittenberg, on August 7, 1796, with Bavaria, on September 7, 1796, and finally the Campo-Formio Treaty, with Austria on October 17, 1797. These divide and conquer treaty arrangements were the preparatory steps

organized by the central bankers of the Synarchy International to the advent of the Bonaparte Empire.

In strategic terms, the Treaty of Campo-Formio of 1797 was, in fact, an absolute repudiation of the Treaty of Westphalia of 1648, and a satanic parody of peace in Europe. Central bankers based in Paris, Geneva, and London, and run by British agents all over Europe organized this Synarchist conspiracy. It was explicitly designed against the principle of the Peace of Westphalia, and was aimed at building a European coalition that would create a rampart against the United States preventing anyone in Europe from establishing a form of Constitutional Republic. This was a central bankers' European Union before its time.

The central command of banking, in Paris, had been organized by the Swiss-British asset, former finance minister, Jacque Necker, and was centered around the banker of rich aristocrats, Swiss born, Count Alphonse Perrégaux, who became Napoleon's banker, after the Terror period. According to historian, Olivier Blanc, a {*Foreign Office*} coded letter dated from Whitehall, September 13, 1793, showed that banker Perrégaux was the main conduit through which British agents residing in France were being paid. <note> [Olivier Blanc, {*Les hommes de Londres*}, Paris, Albin Michel, 1989, p. 41.]

Napoleon Bonaparte was measuring his strength against the Directoire that deployed him. Everybody did not support him, and he needed the vote of the majority, especially the most difficult, which was the vote of Lazare Carnot. On the other hand, for most of the members of the Directoire, Bonaparte was considered both an embarrassment, but also indispensable. The nation was broke and the wars were very costly. So, the bankers were willing to put money up front only for someone who could impose himself politically and militarily everywhere in Europe, and who was also capable of serving the banker's arithmetic and their looting schemes. Bonaparte was the only French General who fitted that profile. He was a trained accountant who would rather choose to melt his cannons to the size of English ones, so he could loot the enemy's reserve of cannon balls, rather than win victories through a new expense for advanced technology.

The Congress of Rastadt in Bade, (1797-99) was for Napoleon the real launching pad of his rise to power over Europe. He came out of those few days of negotiations with the understanding of how he could manipulate exchanges, establish rivalries, seal barter and indemnity arrangements, arrange to hire mercenary armies, negotiate for the confiscation of abbeys and bishoprics, how to secularize them, etc. His marching orders officially came from the Directoire, which was run by five directors who were headed by Paul Barras, who themselves received their orders from the banking houses of Jacques Necker and Perrégaux. Jacques Necker daughter, Mme de Stael, and Perigord Talleyrand, were also very much involved in pulling the strings of the Directoire and had control over Bonaparte with respect to their own looting projects. As for the Germans, Bonaparte preferred to deal with them on a money basis, being told that it were better to win your enemies over as financial partners, rather than having to fight them at a great expense. There were never any principles involved in these negotiations. All of it was based on manipulating the various degrees of greed and lust for power on the part of the German princes, and Austrian plenipotentiaries.

By December 2, 1797, the apparent negotiation positions of Rastadt were firmly put on the table. Napoleon took the strong French position and put forward: "***The Republic will make peace only with the limit of the Rhine.***" The Germans took what they considered to be their strong position with Metternich, the Imperial Commissioner, and that was: "***The peace will only be discussed on the basis of the integrity of the Empire.***"

And then, Metternich made use of postponement tactics for a number of days, until the fifth day, when an envoy of the Emperor, named Lerhback, made the official announcement that the Austrian troops were ready to leave Mayence and go back to Vienna. Everyone was taken by surprise, except Metternich and Bonaparte. It was as if the Emperor had decided to pull the plug on his own Empire. This created total confusion among the Germans, who cried treason on the part of Austria. All of the negotiating positions of the German princes had to be changed. The empty debates on words were over. The Empire was about to be dismembered, and be devoured by its own children.

The Prussian delegation, representing the new King Frederick William III, came in last but was not impressed by the decision of the Emperor, and remained

in their usual policy stance of "*Lucrative neutrality.*" Prince Heinrich of Prussia, and the King, Frederick William III, were both members of Weishaupt's secret society, the Martinist Illuminati, of which Jacques Necker was also a member. The Prince would not ally openly with France against Austria. However, if the Empire were to be willing to divest itself, as she appeared to be doing, then, arrangements could be made for discussing some form of association with the French.

On the political propaganda side, the Directoire was offering the German population of the Rhine Valley a French styled liberation from the old regime, with a second rate French citizenry identity called "Franc". The propaganda piece read: "*No more clergy, no more nobility! Reunited into a single country, repel the deceitful sign of division. You are no longer different peoples of Mayence, of Palatinate, subjects of Deux-Ponts, you are Francs, members of the great nation which has liberated the Belgians, the Batavians, and the Italians. The Rhine now represents the limit between freedom and tyranny.*" "Franc" was the name of their Lotharingian ancestors after the death of Charlemagne.

All of this was for public opinion consumption. The reality was that a secret arrangement has been struck, between the Emperor, the King of Prussia, and the French Directoire, with the legerdemain manipulation of the banking community, and according to which, the Empire would be dismembered, and a great sacrificial feast was being prepared for the vultures. Some delegates pointed to Bavaria as the first region to be divested. Others were discussing Italy and the Papal States. Some even mentioned the possible dismemberment of the Ottoman Empire. Napoleon had his eyes on the Mediterranean, especially Egypt, but never said a word to anyone there, in Rastadt, that he was about to invade Egypt in the coming year. Austria also showed some interest in Bosnia and Serbia. The German Princes only had a protocol of interest in the Empire. Their prime concern was to augment their benefits and diminish those of others. From all sides, the Peace of Westphalia was dead, and the whole Congress had begun to divest the whole of Europe and Near East, as if they were about to go through a great sacrificial purge.

This was not a Congress, this was a Super-Execution Day and a great dismemberment feast after an imperial foreclosure. Everyone came to find

bargains, the bankers, their emissaries, the courtiers, the plenipotentiaries, were all over Rastadt, open for business. How much is this piece of land worth, that county, that village, that local museum, those artifacts, these icons, the gold and silver of the churches? The Germans were willing to sacrifice the left bank of the Rhine, as long as the indemnities were sufficient, and providing the money they got was not employed in building an army against France. Everyone measured all of the square areas, the fields, the grapes of the Rhine valley, the good land and the bad land, the good wines, the bad ones. They counted the inhabitants, the number of young men, women, children; they computed and evaluated the abbeys, the chapters to be secularized, and even including the values of old ruins, the historical values of cemeteries, the tombstones, everything. This was the greatest Scavenger's Auction of the millennium. But, let us look into how this monster was created.

3.2 NAPOLEON BONAPARTE: THE "MAN OF PROVIDENCE."

In his first book { *Considerations on France* }, a book that is still considered forbidden in France by some French authorities, author Joseph de Maistre wrote:

{ "It cannot be repeated enough that it was not men who led the revolution, it was the revolution, which made use of men. They are right those who said: 'it goes all by itself.' This meant that the Divinity had never shown itself more clearly in any human event. If it made use of the vilest of instruments, it is because it was punishing in order to regenerate." }

From the standpoint of this self-fulfilling prophetic belief, Joseph de Maistre became the champion of the European oligarchical reactionary movement for the entire duration of the 25-year of the Synarchy French Revolution (1789-1815), and beyond. He made sure that this revolution would not lose the momentum of its apparently providential character; that is to say, he made sure that no one, except Napoleon Bonaparte, the "man of Providence," would be allowed to ride its rising crest until the wave broke, at which point the Bourbon restoration would be brought in, under the control of a banker's dictatorship. This was the first Synarchy Movement of Empire set up by the European central

bankers and the European oligarchy, as early as the Bastille coup of July 14, 1789.

Central bankers had found their ideologue among the founders of the Martinist Illuminati, Claude Louis de Saint-Martin, and his itinerant Satanist-fascist, Joseph de Maistre, who had devised a fictitious political {*right/left system*} that opposed the royalist defenders of the monarchy on the right against the anarchist defenders of democratic equality, on the left. In 1789, this became the basis for dividing the room of the French National Assembly into two synarchist factions, one sitting to the left, the other to the right of the president. The two factions might as well have been called the {*synarchist left*} and the {*synarchist right*}. Both of these synarchist ideologies were sponsored by French based Swiss central banker Jacques Necker, and Geneva based associate banker, Mallet du Pan, who both financed the left-wing terror of Marat/Robespierre, as well as the right-wing terror of Bonaparte, as the double punishment of Providence brought about by the sins of the French oligarchy and of the French people, and that only "God could put an end to," with the restoration of the Bourbon monarchy, in 1814.

This program was brought about through the secretive operations of the Martinist Order, led principally by the "Superieurs Inconnus", Joseph de Maistre, and his financial acolytes, French Minister of Finances, Jacques Necker, the Duke of Orleans, Philippe "Egalite", and the leader of the Directoire, Paul Barras. [note In his book on {*Joseph de Maistre mystique*}, Emile Dermenghem established that the founder of the Martinist Order, Louis Claude de Saint Martin (1743-1803), had developed his {*Ministry of the Man-Spirit*} of 1801, from the fundamental ideas found in Joseph de Maistre {*Considerations on France*} of 1795. What Dermenghem refers to, specifically is that "{*the theories of the fall, of Providence, of the reversibility of the providential role of the Revolution (Meaning it was favorable to the monarchy), etc., These ideas are common to all of the Christian mystics, or must inevitably present themselves to all contemporary authors who have the same mind frame and the same formation.*}" (p. 36) Dermenghem spends a fair amount of ink trying to establish that Maistre did not plagiarize Saint-Martin, that they never worked together, and they only met in the virtual domain of the philosophical conclusions of their writings.

Two other authors, however, M. Frank (1880), and M. Ferrez (1889), on which I shall report later, claim that Maistre borrowed his ideas from the {*Lettre sur la Revolution francaise*} written by Saint Martin in 1794, in which are found all of the themes that Maistre developed in his {*Considerations on France.*} Joseph de Maitre's {*Memoire to Brunswick on Freemasonry*} (1782) is also an early proof of Maistre's dabbling into Satanism. Maistre himself stated in the {*Evenings of Saint Petersburg*}, that "{*Very few men are more capable than myself of giving you satisfaction on the question of knowing what an Illuminati is about. I have seen them often, I have copied their writings with my own hand...*}"

The founders of the Martinist Order, Martinez De Pasqually (1727-1774), Jean-Baptiste Willermoz (1730-1824), and Louis Claude de Saint Martin (1743-1803) directly worked with Joseph de Maistre. Martinez was the Martinist leader of the Lodge of Lyon, where Maistre was affiliated, and became highest degree freemason, at the age of twenty-six. Martinez was the occultist, Willermoz was the active recruiting freemason, and Saint-Martin was the mystic of the group. The Lodge of Lyon also included Frederick Antoine Mesmer, who Jean Sylvain Bailly and Benjamin Franklin succeeded in discrediting in Paris, in 1784, when they established a Royal Commission of Inquiry into Mesmer's {*Animal Magnetism*}. Two other lower level operatives of the same Lodge were Count Cagliostro, who had been the perpetrator in the {affaire du collier}, and Jacques Cazotte, who had predicted the beheading of Bailly, during a dinner meeting. Fabre D'Olivet, who allegedly participated in the assassination attempt of Louis XVI, in July of 1789, was also part of this group. The group also included Charles Nodier (1780-1844) who had been a member of the Jacobin Club, and had reportedly written a "parody" of Bonaparte published anonymously under the title,{*A History of Secret Societies in the Army under Napoleon*}.]

The main objective of the Synarchy International was the dismemberment of the Habsbourg Empire, and the sharing of its spoils with a new empire under Napoleon. As German historian, H. Huffer, noted upon commenting on a Brochure published during the 1797 Congress Rastadt, entitled, the "Passion": "{*And here it is. Bonaparte accomplishing these things: the High Priests, the Scribes, and the Pharisees assembled in a city which was then called Rastadt, where they held council, and where they deliberated on how they would capture, by ruse, the*

Holy Empire, and put it to death...}" This event was, indeed a grandiose mockery of the Jerusalem execution of 33 A.D., perpetrated by the Isle of Capri cult of Mithra, from whence Roman Emperor, Tiberius, dictated to his son in law in Jerusalem, Ponce Pilatus, the decision of his Gnostic High Priests to kill Christ.

It is with the same satanic motivation that the Martinist followers of the cult of Mithra chose the Congress of Rastadt for the sacrificial immolation of the Austrian Empire. [<note> See Albert Sorel, {*L'Europe et le Directoire*}, I, II, III, IV, in {*Revue des Deux Mondes*}, Paris, 1895. Also, {Archives Nationales, Archives des Affaires Etrangeres}, and H. Huffer, {Der Rastaller Congress, Bonn, 1878.}]

Joseph de Maistre's {*Considerations...*} were published in 1796, with only one purpose. It was to fulfill the need for a man of Providence. "***Every nation, like every individual, has received a mission that it must fulfil. France exercises over Europe a veritable magistracy that it would be useless to contest and that she was most culpably abused."... "And so, since she had used her influence to contradict her vocation and demoralize Europe, we should not be surprised if she is brought back to her mission by terrible means."... " We groan to see illustrious scholars fall beneath Robespierre's axe. Humanly, we cannot be too sorry for them; but divine justice has not the least respect for geometers or physicists.***" (The English editor notes that the original French text had identified Bailly and Lavoisier as the two physicist victims who had been decapitated, in 1793.)

During his "Freedom and its Betrayal" series of talks on BBC radio, on December 3, 1952, British author, Isaiah Berlin, made the following accurate connection between Maistre and Bonaparte: "***Maistre was fascinated by Napoleon, just as Napoleon was rather fascinated by Maistre, and each wished to meet the other, except that the King of Sardinia was, of course, horrified by any such idea. He was a pensionary of both England and Russia and a victim of Napoleon, and the thought of one of his diplomats meeting the destroyer of mankind plunged the court of Sardinia into absolute terror. Maistre replied with distinct sadness, saying that of course he would not meet Napoleon, if the King did not wish him to, but nevertheless, he thought this a wrong and shortsighted policy. He said: "I see that you regard my proposal as very surprising. Well I***

shall serve you to the end of my days, for I believe that the throne is more important than its occupant. As for not surprising you - I cannot promise that.}" (Joseph de Maistre, {*Considerations on France*,} translated and edited by Richard A. Lebrun, with introduction by Isaiah Berlin, Cambridge University Press, 1994, p. xxxii.). In 1959, Berlin wrote a book entitled {*The Crooked Timber of Humanity*}, in which he included a chapter on {*Joseph de Maistre and the Origins of Fascism.*}

If Napoleon had so much fascination for Maistre, it was because he considered himself to be the man of Providence that Maistre talked about in his books. Maistre wrote: "*{You say that some of the guiltiest would be chosen and all of the rest would obtain pardon. This is precisely what Providence did not want. Able to do all, Providence disregards these pardons produced by impotence to punish. The great purification must be accomplished and eyes must be opened; the metal of France, freed from its sour and impure dross, must emerge cleaner and more malleable into the hands of a future king.}*" (Or Emperor, whichever came first.)

After the assassinations of Bailly and of Louis XVI in 1793, Maistre is reported to have spent some time at the House of Jacques Necker and Madame de Stael, in Lausanne, in the company of British historian, Edward Gibbon and Geneva banker, Mallet du Pan. This was the ideal company with which to set up the synarchist plans for Bonaparte. More will have to be said about these meetings. Now, let us investigate the function of the executioner from the right wing side of the French Revolution.

4.2 THE SATANIC FUNCTION OF THE EXECUTIONER

The function of the executioner as Maistre describes it below, has a characteristic of pure evil attached to it. However unbelievable it may appear to many, it is very real, and its social function represents for him, as well as for satanic practitioners more generally, the {*nec plus ultra*} value of pure irrationality, which is at the foundation of any belief structure. Unless someone is able to willfully make discoveries of principles, as Lyndon LaRouche has been

teaching methodologically how to do, for the best part of the past 40 odd years, this issue will remain obscure to many readers, because the issue is not whether the question is believable or not, but whether it is knowable or not.

This is an important point, which I will attempt to develop in a following segment of this report, with the help of poetry. I wish to mention this now because, people refuse to consider that pure evil does exist. In fact, some people actually take great pleasure in making and seeing other people suffer. If you want to know why the death penalty is a barbaric form of retribution and vengeance, the following pages of Maistre should make that issue exceedingly clear.

After counting the millions of victims of the French Revolution, and weighing the blood that was spilled, as the result of the Man of Providence, Bonaparte, Maistre finally was forced to admit that "*all of the monsters born of the Revolution have, apparently, labored only for the monarchy.*" In other words, he was happy with his work. Thanks to these horrors, the Bourbon dynasty will ultimately be restored, he thought, "*perhaps with an increase of power.*" Thus, once the executioners, Robespierre and Bonaparte had accomplished the first left-wing/right-wing phase of the bloodshed, the royalist counter-revolution became possible, but only if peace were to be secured inside of France. It is fascinating to hear Napoleon make the very same argument, during the same period of 1796-97. It is the dismemberment of other territories, and other countries, which will bring internal peace to France. But this peace will have to be achieved at a very great cost, and by the most feared man of society, the terrible "*inexplicable being*", the executioner. The reader should know that the following famous excerpt of Maistre on the executioner, speaks of Maistre himself and of Bonaparte personally:

"{So who is this inexplicable being who, when there are so many pleasant, lucrative, honest, and even honorable professions in which he could exercise his strength or dexterity to choose among, has chosen that of torturing and putting to death his own kind? ...He is created as a law on to himself. Consider how he is viewed by public opinion, and try to conceive, if you can, how he could ignore this opinion or confront it. Hardly has the authorities assigned him to his proper dwelling-place, scarcely has he taken possession of it, when others remove their homes elsewhere so they no longer have to see his. In the midst of this

desolation, and in this kind of vacuum formed around him, he lives alone with his female and his offspring, who acquaint him with the sound of the human voice. Without them he would hear nothing but shrieks of agony. -A dismal signal is given. One of the lowest menials of justice knocks at his door and tells him that his services are needed. He goes. He arrives in a public square where people are crowded together with faces of expectancy. A poisoner, a parricide, a man who has committed a sacrilege, is flung at his feet. He seizes the man, stretches him, ties him to a cross, which is lying on the ground, raises his arms, and there is a terrible silence. It is broken only by the sound of the crushing of bones under the blows of the iron mace, and the screams of the victim. He unbinds the man, he carries him to the wheel; the broken limbs are twined round the spokes and the head hangs down; the hair stands on end and from the mouth - open like the door of a glowing furnace - there come at intervals only a few broken syllables of entreaty for death. The executioner has finished his task; his heart is beating, but it is with pleasure; he is satisfied with his work. He says in his heart: "No man breaks on the wheel better than I." He comes down from the scaffold and holds out his bloody hand, into which, from a distance, an official flings a few gold pieces. The executioner carries them off between two rows of human beings who shrink from him with horror. He sits down to table and eats, he goes to bed and sleeps, but when he awakes next morning, his thoughts run on everything but his occupation of the day before. Is he a man? Yes. God allows him to enter his shrines and accepts his prayers. He is no criminal, and yet no human language dares to call him, for instance, virtuous, honorable, or estimable... Nevertheless, all greatness, all power, all social order depends upon the executioner; he is the terror of human society and the tie that holds it together. Take away this incomprehensible force from the world, and at that very moment, order is superseded by chaos, thrones fall, society disappears. God, who is the source of the power of the ruler, is also the source of punishment. He has suspended our world upon these two poles, 'for the Lord is the lord of the twin poles, and round them he sets the world revolving.'

{(Maistre, {Joseph de Maistre, {St-Petersburg Dialogues, Montreal, McGill-Queen's University Press, 1993, p. 19.)

What you have just read is not simply the fantasy of a dilettante aristocrat in search of violent sensations. This is the ritualistic meditation, a *{satanic spiritual exercise}*, which has inspired human ritual sacrifices in Freemasonic Satanist

Cults around the world since Maistre wrote them. And, Maistre wrote this with them in mind, and for them, and for the purpose of initiating high degree members into the satanic degrees! This is similar to what American kids are brainwashing themselves with, when they play Nintendo games today, with or without dismembered body parts, as recommended by Peter Huntington's and Dick Cheney's war-game "educationals." This is what the soldiers of Bonaparte had to go through, as Maistre explains the difference of degree between the executioner and the soldier. He wrote:

"{As for soldiers, there are never enough of them, for they kill without restraint, and they always kill honest men. Of these two professional {killers}, the soldier and the executioner, the one is greatly honoured, and has always been so honoured among the peoples that up to the present, have inhabited this planet to which you have come. The other, on the contrary, has just as generally been declared infamous. Can you guess on which one the condemnation falls?"

"Surely this traveling spirit would not hesitate for a moment; he would accord the executioner all the praise that you could not refuse him the other day, Count, despite all of your prejudices, when you spoke to us of this {gentleman} AS Voltaire would have said. 'This sublime being,' he would have told us. 'is the cornerstone of society; since crime has become habitual on your earth, and since it can only be arrested by punishment, if you deprive the world of the executioner, all order will disappear with him. Moreover, what greatness of soul, what noble disinterestedness must necessarily be assumed to exist in a man who devotes himself to functions that are undoubtedly worthy of respect, but which are so trying and contrary to your nature! For, since I have been among you, I have noticed that it distresses you to kill a chicken in cold blood. I am therefore persuaded that opinion surrounds him with all of the horror that he needs and that is justly due to him. As for the soldier, he is, all things considered an agent of cruelty and injustice. How many obviously just wars have there been? How many obviously unjust? How many individual injustices, horrors, and useless atrocities? So, I imagine that opinion among you has very justly poured as much shame on the head of the soldier as it has poured glory on that of the impartial executor of the judgement of sovereign justice.'" {St Petersburg Dialogues,} p.207.)

In the last section of his {St-Petersbourg Dialogues,} Maistre has an essay on {Sacrifice in General, and on Human Sacrifice}, which is, in fact, a justification for ritual murders of the Mithra cult. Emphasizing that there existed "***an occult and terrible law demanding human blood.***"... "***Nothing was better known in antiquity than the cult of Mithra with its {sacrifices of bulls} and its {sacrifices of animals}. These sorts of sacrifices were supposed to achieve a perfect purification, effacing all sins and procuring a veritable spiritual rebirth for man. A pit was dug into which the person to be initiated was put: placed above was a kind of plank pierced with a great number of tiny openings, on which the victim was immolated. The blood flowed onto the {penitent} as a kind of rain, which he received on all parts of his body, and it was believed that this strange baptism wrought a spiritual regeneration.***" } (Op. Cit., p.359)

Emphasizing the universality of the bloodletting cults and of not only the existence of human sacrifices, but the recommendation of human sacrifices, Maistre established that "***In the face of this impelling dogma, reason remained as powerless as feelings*** }." Maistre admits that he found the justification for his "universal law of murder" in two sophisms.

"***Two sophisms, it seems, led men astray; first the prominence of the subjects to be freed from anathema. They said: {To save an army, a city, even a great sovereign what is one man?} The particular character of the two kinds of human victims already pledged under civil and political law was also considered; and they said: {What is the life of a criminal or an enemy?}***"... "***Unfortunately, once men were convinced of the principle that {the efficacy of sacrifices was proportional to the prominence of the victims}, it was only one step from the criminal to the enemy. Every {enemy} was a {criminal} and equally unfortunately, every {foreigner} was an {enemy} when they needed victims.***"(p.366) This is precisely the irrational impulse behind Napoleon Bonaparte. The choice of the number of victims is proportional to the amount of looting that can be taken from his victims, within a period of about twenty five years of war throughout Europe.

In the following pages, we shall demonstrate that in order to accomplish Joseph Maistre's self-fulfilling prophecy of punishment of the French people, and of Europe, it was required to have an extensive control of the government and the

military leadership of France, through a selection of the most evil and secretive freemasonic group of criminals in France, England and Switzerland.

5.2 BARRAS AND THE PROSTITUTES OF THE DIRECTOIRE.

There is something quite unsettling about a man who, in his most intimate moments, reveals himself to be a depressive suicidal and impotent individual, and, in his public appearances, reveals himself to be a bully and a monstrous serial killer. In order to discover who Napoleon Bonaparte really was, it is essential to examine a little more closely what gave rise to his false claim to fame, in the first place. Among the documents of the period, the {*Memoires*} of the leader of the Directoire, Paul Barras, are probably some of the most instructive about who Bonaparte really was, and how he managed to usurp his great power. This is also where the expression “French political whores” took its fullest employment.

First of all, Barras makes a direct comparison between the leftist Jacobin terrorist, Jean Paul Marat, and the right-wing neo-con type, Napoleon Bonaparte. Barras wrote that "*the ferocity of Marat was more violent or expressive, and was less personal and more disinterested than that of Bonaparte. One can judge by the facts, and the sum total can be measured, both in intensity and in numbers, as to which of the two has been the most guilty of crimes against humanity, and who was the most destructive to society and liberty.*" ({*Memoires de Barras*}, Introduction, notes et biographie de Paul Vergnet, Paris, Chez Guy Le Prat, Editeur, 1946, p.126)

Barras was a scoundrel in his own right, a gambler and a regular customer of the Directoire {*lupanarium*}, and if he seemed to have acted with "courage" several times in the face of deadly situations, it was because he was highly rewarded by his bankers, who knew both his strength and weaknesses, and how to control him through both. He became a freemason at the instigation of his Provençal leader, Count of Mirabeau, and was instrumental in Mirabeau's {*Political Pharmacy*}. Both were holding meetings at the house of the singer Sophie Arnaud, in Chaillot, where Benjamin Franklin had lived before the revolution.

Barras first entered politics by winning a seat to the National Assembly, as the deputy of the Var, in Provence, and was one of the key individuals who participated in the decision to execute Louis XVI, in 1793. The Assembly of Thermidor 9 (July 27, 1794) nominated Barras Commanding Officer of the Paris army, which brought Robespierre to the guillotine. Secretary General, then President of the Convention, Barras soon became a member of the Comite de Surete Generale, then finally head of the Directoire. Throughout his life he was known as "General Barras."

During the difficult days of 12 and 13 Vendemiaire (October 3 and 4, 1795), Barras got from Lazare Carnot a list of generals who could assist him in keeping the peace from the dangers of the Royalist take over of the Paris Convention. The name of {Buona-Parte}, as it was then written and pronounced, was on it, and Barras chose him to become his second in command of the Paris Militia. Bonaparte was the one responsible for the artillery massacre of the insurgency on rue St-Honore, at that time.

Bonaparte was a known Jacobin and Robespierriest, a murderer and a bandit. That was his job. Like Robespierre, he was an executioner. He had been denounced as such in Antibes and had even been arrested and detained at Fort Carre, in Antibes, for some violent crime. After his liberation by friends of Robespierre, he travelled to Paris, looking for military employment, and was happy to find Barras, one more time, who had given the artillery captain his first chance, and a clean uniform, during the siege of Toulon, in 1793. In Paris, Barras had to clean him up again, and gave him a job as a topographer at the Comite de Salut Public. Napoleon's {*Memoires*} written at Saint Helene, falsified the events of that period, by ignoring the role of Barras, in launching his carrier, and by taking all of the glory of Vendemiaire. But, the archive documents demonstrate that it was Barras, who picked up the {Buona-Parte} from the street gutters of Paris at Vendemiaire, and launched him in his murderous career.

Both Barras and Bonaparte's destinies were to be tied together, most closely by Josephine de Beauharnais. After the Thermidor events, Josephine became the mistress of Barras. Barras's wife lived as a recluse with her mother-in-law. Bonaparte came under the charms and influence of Josephine, along with a

number of other prostitutes, in and around the Directoire, namely, Madame Theresia de Tallien, a famous high society "fille de joie" known as "Notre Dame de Thermidor", the daughter of Finance Minister, Jacques Necker, Madame de Stael, known as the "Ugly Beauty," and her two male-toys, Perigord Talleyrand and Benjamin Constant, among others. Those were the main prostitutes of the Directoire, who were involved in finding the suitable general, and general staff, that would lead the Synarchist Empire. That was their specific deployment.

Josephine went bed hopping with every general she could put her hands on. Her husband, General Alexandre Beauharnais, who had been a slave owner in the West Indies, was executed for not securing Mayence in 1794. General Lazare Hoche, the youngest general at the age of 26, was one of Josephine's favorites, but he died young of tuberculosis in 1797. Josephine also became intimate with General Bernadotte, whose wife was the sister of the wife of Joseph Bonaparte. Then came Napoleon, captain of artillery, who was her prize captive. And of course she had a permanent affair with General Barras.

On March 9, 1796, Josephine, married Napoleon Bonaparte and both Barras and Tallien were their witnesses. It was a "menage a trois", but only two of them knew about it. The Bonaparte family then degenerated further into having two children, one of whom later became Emperor of the Second Empire, Napoleon III, the "Petty." For all we know, he could also have been the son of Barras. In any event, that was how Bonaparte was brought into the inner-sanctum of the great game, off the streets of Paris, and into the beds of the lupanarium. The bankers had made their choice: the synarchy was going to go with Bonaparte. From that moment of decision, things happened very fast. On march 2, Bonaparte was nominated Commanding Officer of the Italian Army. On March 9th, he got married, and two days later, on March 11, he was sent out to Italy. Later in that month, Bonaparte's banker, Hamelin, also travelled to Italy to arrange shares in different companies, for both himself and Josephine. The looting had begun.

French historian, Albert Sorel, reports that one of the most important part of the looting was the stealing of Italian artifacts, which were brought to Paris with fanfare and parade, reminiscent of the Roman Empire. "***The spoils would arrive by boats and would be unloaded in Charanton. Loads of trunks, which contained them were loaded on carts with teams of richly ornate horses. In the***

first carts were the manuscripts and the books; then the minerals and the fossils; then lions, tigers, panthers came in steel cages on top of which were hanging palm branches; then the boxes containing the paintings, with name tags on them such as {Transfiguration by Raphael}, the {Christ by Titian}; then statues dressed up on chariots, sitting in the midst of laurels and flower crowns: the {Belvedere Apollo}, the {Antinous}, the {Laocon}, the {Gladiator}. In front of each section of this encyclopedic parade, there were people marching, representing the Institutes; choruses were singing cheerful songs. At the Champs-de-Mars, the five members of the Directoire were standing near the altar of the nation, and were welcoming this splendid offering from the genius of man to the glory of the Republic by the French armies.}" (Albert Sorel, {Revue des Deux Mondes}, June-July, 1797, {L'Europe et le Directoire}, Vol. II. Paris, p.859.) One of the commissioners of the Directoire, Daunou, reported in his financial report that in addition, Bonaparte had siphoned from Italy alone, a grand total of 77, million francs, including the 35 millions provided by the Pope.

Once the Directoire had been established, Barras was more or less the leading business manager of the looting operation, and the greater part of his time was taken to assure the accounting for his own business, and that of his associates. Bonaparte was told to "**{bring back a lot of money}**," and he did. Things were moving very quickly, because the looting had to keep up with the momentum of the revolution. Whenever the momentum slowed down, then, it was time to announce that the nation was in danger, that changes had to be made, that there was too much corruption among certain factions of the government, and that the government was about to collapse. Those were the times when different coups d'Etat were organized, and were given those calendar names, such as Thermidor, Fructidor, Brumaire, etc., each time with a new Constitution, which meant that a new interest groups came in to participate in the spoils of war.

Meanwhile, while Bonaparte was busy at war, Josephine was hopping back into bed with Barras, who had just bought for himself the superb Chateau de Grosbois, the richest property of Boissy-St-Leger, which had been previously owned by financier Samuel Bernard, and the Count of Provence. Barras had offered himself and his prostitutes a royal domain. Where did all this money come from? From bankers of course, but also from foreign diplomats in the Paris Embassies of the Republic of Venice, Portugal, and Naples, who were said to have

paid large sums of money to bribe Barras for his favorable votes in favor of their countries, during the deliberations of the Directoire.

Madame de Stael, known in the Directoire circles as the "{Ugly Beauty}," (la "belle laide") prostituted herself, not merely to buy cheap pleasures to corrupt oligarchs, but she also sold herself as an intellectual prostitute working unceasingly to bring into France the British Parliamentary system. One of her deeds, in this field of activities, was to bring in the most corrupt politician and British agent of the times, her pimp, Perigord Talleyrand, under the watchful eye of her father, Jacques Necker, who was the number one British agent in France. Barras himself reported an extraordinary scene in which de Stael threw herself at his feet in his home, willing to do anything, pleading for the life of Talleyrand, saying that "***unless he were made Foreign Affairs Minister, he would drown himself in the Seine River***", and that he might have done it already. The entire soap opera sequence occurred while Talleyrand was waiting for the answer of Barras, in his carriage downstairs. When de Stael came down with the news that Barras had accepted, Talleyrand kept repeating: "***We have taken the fort: we are going to make an immense fortune, an immense fortune, an immense fortune.***" (*Memoires de Barras*}, p. 269)

Bonaparte's army suppliers made their business at the Chateau de Grosbois, where Barras signed their supply orders to get their hundreds of carts filled with fresh food and with military supplies, and have them return from Italy with artifacts and religious articles stolen from abbeys and churches during the campaign. This was like Dick Cheney's Haliburton system of those days, except the company was owned by a financier by the name of Collot, who was the purveyor of meat for Bonaparte's Italian army. Collot was told by Bonaparte to steal for about 4 million francs worth of mercury from Italian mines, and got a share of 7 million after he sold it on the black market. Other bandit groups, like the Godin Company and the Flachet Company, in which Josephine had shares, were also involved in this systematic campaign of trafficking stolen property. When Bonaparte returned from his first campaign of Italy, people accused him of waging war strictly for the money. Bonaparte defended himself by retorting: "***I just returned from Italy with no more than 300,000 francs to my name. I could have easily brought back 10 to 12 millions.***" The truth came out when his secretary, Bourienne, reported that, on that day, Bonaparte had brought back 3 million

francs.

Barras's colleague at the Directoire, La Revelliere-Lepeaux gave characterization of what Barras was like: "***{Barras surrounded himself with the chiefs of the most debauched anarchy, the most corrupt aristocrats, prostitutes, ruined individuals, mistresses, pederasts. The most infamous debauchery was the rule in his house.}***" (p.37) But the most authoritative and surgical characterization came from another associate of Barras at the Directoire, Lazare Carnot, who judged him clinically as "***{Perverse, dissolute, hiding under the bark of a false thoughtlessness the ferocity of a Caligula.}***"

By the time of the expedition in Egypt, in 1798, Barras had bought for Josephine, the Malmaison chateau that Bonaparte had refuse to give her, and Josephine had no longer any interests in Napoleon. At that point Bonaparte knew that Josephine was unfaithful, and Bonaparte was considering a divorce. When the Bonaparte clan got together and decided to force a separation between Napoleon and Josephine, she became desperate since she realized she was about to lose everything. It was Barras who manage to get Josephine and Bonaparte back into bed together.

Meanwhile, Barras's Directoire was being shaken up by one coup d'Etat after another, in 1797, 98, and 1799. Even though Barras and Bonaparte hated each other, Barras was forced to defend Bonaparte's actions before the Directoire, every time someone wanted to put a stop to his murderous campaigns.

At the end of August 1799, Bonaparte broke the quarantine, deserted the army of Egypt, without the permission of the Directoire, and secretly came back to France. Some wanted to have him arrested and have him court-martialed. During this short debate over the issue of Bonaparte's desertion, a member of the Assembly, Boulay de la Meurthe, interjected: "***{If we decide that he is against the law, then it doesn't matter how he is executed; either guillotined, shot, or hung.}***" Of course, none of this happened, because Bonaparte had been recalled by the bankers to lead a coup d'Etat against the Directoire.

On the 18 Brumaire (November 9-10, 1799), and without bloodshed, or without even a simulacra of a fight, Barras, who was at the height of his power as

the uncontested leader of the Directoire, signed a prepared letter of resignation demanded by the envoys of Bonaparte, Talleyrand and Bruix. The rumors circulated that a deal had been struck and that a great power change was about to take place. The rumors were right. The bankers had just begun to buy themselves an Emperor. The synarchist plan was following its course. Upon his arrival, Bonaparte began immediately by stating that ***{it is necessary to make some changes inside of the government,}*** and went about looking for the faction to blame, warning about the multitude of dangers. As Barras put it: "***{With his pretension of wanting to save everything, it was essential to say that everything was lost, and to act as though he believed it. When you are in a false position, it is necessary to put the blame on others.}***"

In an agreement with the renowned constitutional expert, Abbot Sieyes, whose vanity Bonaparte flattered, because Sieyes wished to lead a new constitutional reform, Bonaparte seized the opportunity to quickly topple the Directoire in a one-day coup. The entire plan rested in the use of an apparently insignificant constitutional provision, which resided in the fact that the Council of the Elders had the right to transfer the legislative body outside of Paris, which had the effect of paralyzing the legislative Council of five hundreds.

For this to work, Sieyes made sure the elders would respond to an immediate danger, and would support a savior. The fear of the executioner was put in the balance against the patriotism of the military. Sieyes permitted the Council of the Elders to violate the Constitution of 1795, and the Committee, headed by Cornet, voted illegally for Bonaparte to become the commanding officer of the Paris Militia, and of the national guards, after which they decided to transfer legally the powers of government from Paris to Saint Cloud. "***{You are the head,}***" said Bonaparte to Sieyes, "***{I am at most, your right arm.}***" Sieyes believed him, of course.

Even the timing had been set to the minute. During the night of November 17th to 18th, deputy Cornet had the mission of preparing the decree for the translation of power, provided by the constitution, and chosen for one purpose only: to put the council of 500 before the fait accompli. All of the shutters of the meeting room were closed and the windows of the Council's meeting were covered so as not to arouse any suspicion about the burning of the midnight oil. The

Council of Elders was called to meet at seven o'clock in the morning, and vote the new decree without debate, before the meeting of the Council of five hundreds, which had been called for 11 o'clock. The decree had to be ready and signed before the meeting of the five hundred was to be held. As historian Sorel put it: "*Since all deliberation had been forbidden by the constitution, from the moment that the decree of translation had been promulgated, this very promulgation was closing the tribune of the five hundreds in such a way that any embarrassing discussion was being avoided.*}" This tactic also included necessary delays in the mailing of letters of convocation, such that the undesirables got their mailing after the decision had been taken.

Meanwhile, in Paris, the soldiers of the brother of Napoleon, Lucien Bonaparte, had been posted strategically in order to be able to disperse any group of opposition, and a Consulate, run by three Consuls, Napoleon Bonaparte, Abbot Sieyes, and Roger-Ducos was established as the new government. In a few days, a new Constitution was going to be ratified. It was Collot, the financier who had stolen the mercury from the Italian mines, who had brokered the coup d'Etat.

What was strange, for a lot of observers, however, was the fact that Barras did not fight back at all. The question was raised as to why the toppled head of the government would accept his resignation so passively. The answer was to be found in the fact that Barras was given a huge amount of money in exchange for both his resignation, and his silence. However, Bonaparte was not satisfied with that, and required better guarantees. To show his gratitude, after the coup had succeeded, Bonaparte provided Barras with a royal escort of a dragoon squadron, which took hi back to his Chateau of Grosbois, where he was to retire and write his memoires. Josephine was sent to Grosbois, supposedly as a consolation price, but, in fact, to spy on Barras.

Friends of Barras, who were not in on the deal, were extremely upset. General Bernadotte called for Bonaparte's assassination. In one of the meetings with the friends of Barras at Grosbois, Bernadotte yelled out at one point: "*This is a sublime moment. This is a situation worthy of antiquity. Caesar, it is Caesar who must be killed! ...but, I don't think I would have the courage.*}" Bonaparte did not trust Barras close to Paris and had Talleyrand go to Grosbois with

diplomatic passports for Barras to leave for Spain, on a special mission. When Barras refused, Bonaparte expected trouble, and sent his police chief Fouche to force Barras into exile. Barras was forced to leave for Brussels, where he lived from 1801 until after the coronation, in 1805.

On the next day, November 10, Bonaparte walked into the assembly room to speak before the Council of five hundred in Saint Cloud, but he seemed not to be able to remember anything he had prepared to say, and he just stood there. Clearly, he was in a state of confusion and disorientation. Reportedly, he could not find the words of his prepared speech. He fumbled and became completely incoherent. He appeared to be completely confused, as the members of the council began to demand explanations about the "dangers to the nation." Bonaparte began to stutter and did not answer the question. Instead he replied: "I will tell you everything." But he said nothing more. The crowd of deputies became restless, and voices cried out "Outlaw!" The whole room began to fill up with noise, people getting up, screaming: "Down with the tyrant! And "Kill! Kill!" - "Is that why you have vanquished?" yield Destrem. Bonaparte became frozen in front of this hostile assembly. He was about to lose his coup d'Etat. He was pulled away by his brother Lucien, who brought a picket of grenadiers inside of the room. Sieyes tried to move Bonaparte and said to him: "They are declaring you outlaw, but they are the ones who are outlawed." Finally Bonaparte trying to recompose himself, went to the window and cried out to his soldiers "To arms!" The grenadiers hesitated. The word was circulating among the soldiers that some miserable group of British agents had attempted at the life of Bonaparte, but there was no real evidence.

Suddenly, Bonaparte got out of control and started screaming hysterically "Follow me! Follow me! I am the god of the day! If they resist you, kill, kill!" The Corps of Grenadiers was stupefied and refused to move. The soldiers began to realize that Bonaparte was out of control and had lost it. Lucien intervened and told his brother to shut up, pulled his sword and held it over his head to divert the attention away from Napoleon. Generals Murat and Leclerc saw the gesture of Lucien Bonaparte and did the same and began to move forward. They drew their sabers, entered the room at the head of the grenadiers who followed them with their bayonets lowered. Murat cried out: "Citizens, you assembly is dissolved." The soldiers pushed ahead, and everybody scrambled toward the open windows to jump out. Within ten minutes, the room was emptied of the five hundred deputies.

During that evening, Lucien rallied about 50 deputies from among the five hundreds, and met with them in the Orangerie in order to establish the future government. A provisional government was proposed, composed of three Consuls: Sieyes, Roger Ducos, and Bonaparte. A commission of twenty-five members was created to support the consuls in their new duties, and by prepare for a new constitution. After having salvaged the day for his brother, Lucien Bonaparte made an absurd, but revealing comparison, as though an echo of the cranes of Ibis, by saying: "If freedom was born in the Tennis Court of Versailles, it was consolidated in the Orangerie of Saint Cloud."

It was only on November 12 that Bonaparte was finally able to pull himself together. He made a proclamation which stated: "Frenchmen, the Republic, consolidated and restored in Europe to the rank that she should never have lost, shall see the realization of all of the hopes of her citizens, and shall accomplish their glorious destinies." Everybody in France believed him. "The marvel," added Quinet, "was the complicity of everyone to blind themselves."

Barras took his political demise as a personal affront and swore vengeance, which explained his antagonism against both Josephine and Bonaparte, throughout his {Memoires}. In order to get Barras out of his way, Bonaparte had all of his papers taken by the Police Chief, Fouche, confiscated his chateau de Grosbois, and gave it to his associates, Moreau, and then Berthier. Barras later attempted a coup against Bonaparte, with Moreau and Murat, but without success. This is how Bonaparte became the first Consul of France and established his first dictatorship. The next step was to become Emperor. I shall report on that period of Bonaparte's life at a future date.

In 1816, after the fall of Bonaparte at Waterloo, Barras had been rehabilitated by Louis XVIII, in recognition of the fact that it was he, Barras, who had attempted to save the dying child, Louis XVII, at the Temple, back in 1795. If Brumaire had not brought in Napoleon as first Consul, and then as Emperor, Barras would have had the task of putting the Bourbons back on the throne of France. Ironically, but not accidentally, it was Count of Barras who was to serve Louis XVIII as head of the interim government, even though he had been a regicide, in 1793. He was given 10 million francs for his new services, before the

official return of the King to power, in the first Restoration of 1814.

Thus, the synarchist program of Maistre, Necker, and Mallet du Pan had been completed: 1) the purgative violence of the Robespierre Terror had accomplished the necessary evil of eliminating the "danger" of the American Revolution on the continent with the assassination of Bailly and of Louis XVI, the two close friends of Benjamin Franklin; 2) the dismemberment of the Empire by the Man of Providence, Bonaparte had been a success, and the synarchist bankers were satisfied with their looting of Europe; and 3) the restoration of the Bourbon monarchy had brought to a close, the bloodiest revolution in history. All had been at the service of the banker's synarchy. In a nutshell: Bastille was the end of Bailly; Thermidore was the end of Robespierre; Brumaire was the end of Barras; and Waterloo was the end of Bonaparte. The common thread that weaves all of these events together is the central banking of the Synarchist International.

6.2 THE CURIOUS POST SCRIPTUM OF BARRAS.

Although Barras had been a willing but silent participant in the Brumaire Dictatorship of Bonaparte, he nonetheless wrote him a very revealing letter denouncing his tyranny. Reproduced below are some excerpts for the record.

Grosbois, le 20 Brumaire. (November 12, 1799.)

"...{You have just toppled the government established by the will of the nation and sanctioned by the consent of Europe. This government might have lost the means of guaranteeing the Constitution that it had instituted: this required reinforcements, but it was not a reason to commit the outrage that you have executed the day before yesterday, by recruiting the enemies of the Republic, and of yourself; such enemies against whom the Directoire gave you protection, when they were attacking you. You have compromised your glory, you have authorized the most sinister presentiments against the friends of liberty, by toppling, more than people, the institutions. The ambitious whose wish is to restore a throne would only grant an ephemeral pleasure; ...It is for the conservation of the Republic that Washington had attached his glory to it.

My determination of not returning to State affairs is irrevocable: my last wishes are that the Republic come out of this political crisis, triumphantly: the honor is reserved to those who founded the freedom of nations, disgrace to the tyrants and to slaves. Can there be any doubt for a soul that has some elevation?}"

Barras.

Barras gave this letter to Police Chief, Fouche, who reported to Barras, a few days later, that when Bonaparte read the letter, and saw the name of Washington, he became very serious and disdainful. Bonaparte replied: "***{ What does Washington have to do with this affair? What is Barras talking about? There is no other means to establish a government than to grab it, and not let go once you have it. Barras is always in his republican ideas: he is rambling like an old woman. }***"

Then Barras entered this last political comment, as if a post scriptum for the future:

"{A month after making this discourse, Washington died: Bonaparte had his funeral oration done by M. de Fontanes. This was only the beginning of the hypocrisy of this character!}"

It might appear strange that the last political thought of such an evil character as Barras, in ending his *{Memoires}*, was addressed to the memory of George Washington. However, it is not so strange when you think that, the false republican Barras loved to twist maliciously the knife into Bonaparte, by reminding him that the only true Republic for the Synarchy International to destroy was not France but the United States of America.

7.2 ROMANTIC ENTHUSIASM VS MORAL ENTHUSIASM

The two different wars that the French Revolution had been engaged in, since 1791 projected two axiomatically opposite kinds of enthusiasms: the *{moral*

enthusiasm,} reflected by the character of republican scientific and technological progress represented by the Ecole Polytechnique of Monge and Carnot, and the synarchist {*romantic enthusiasm*} reflected by the character of Bonaparte's Ecole Polytechnique, based on Saint-Simon and August Comte. How did French soldiers know which one to chose and operate from? It is important to internalize what the revolutionary soldier is going through during that period of history.

By the end of 1794, the character of the war of independence had been completely transformed. The liberation war that Lazare Carnot had conducted for four years had been a war of independence, a great patriotic war, in its own right, fought for the very survival of the nation of France, and its internal security. After 1794, the war was being waged entirely outside of the borders of France. The soldiers were transformed into professional killing machines, like trained executioners. They were no longer recruited to do their patriotic duty, but for ambition, or simply because they would not get any other employment in their hometowns, and needed to send the money home to their wives and children. This was a war of the {folie des grandeurs} in the manner of Louis XIV, where every soldier participated in the ambitious glory of Bonaparte, the glory of bringing to other people the liberty they were themselves abusing, by imposing their exalted crusade on others. After having saved France internally, the soldiers were "saving France" in Italy, in Holland and in Germany, etc.

This form of historical degeneracy occurs when a certain type of men believe themselves to be superior to others, and decide to increase their power, their borders and their treasures at the expense of others, under the guise of liberating other people, and for their greatest good. Thus, the Napoleonic army of professionals had become the sole means of existence for the youth of the countryside and of the cities, which could not provide jobs. War was their only future. Young men also joined because the blood of the first years of the terror was not enough. They wanted more excitement, stronger sensations, more killings, more blood.

Compare the two following poems of Heine and of Carnot, and you will be able to tell the difference between the two different armies of the French Revolution. One stemmed from love of mankind, {agape} or what the Peace of Westphalia had established in the principle of the {*Advantage of the other*}, and

the other was pure selfishness, greed, and ambition, based on the principle of {*taking advantage of the other*} which is reflected in the feudal and barbaric Oath of Strasbourg, and also the Decree of "Justice" by Roman Emperor, Julien the Apostate, against the Christians in 361 AD.

THE GRENADIERS
by Heinrich Heine

*{Two grenadiers were returning to France,
From Russian captivity they came.
And as they crossed into German lands
They hung their heads in shame.*

*Both heard there the tale that they dreaded most,
That France had been conquered in war;
Defeated and shattered, that once proud host, --
And the Emperor, a free man no more.*

*The grenadiers both started to weep
At hearing so sad a review.
The first said, "My pain is too deep;
My old wound is burning anew!"*

*The other said, "The song is done;
Like you, I'd not stay alive;
But at home I have wife and son,
Who without me would not survive."*

*What matters son? What matters wife?
By nobler needs I set store;
Let them go beg to sustain their life!
My Emperor, a free man no more!*

*Promise me, brother, one request:
If at this time I should die,*

*Take my corpse to France for its final rest;
In France's dear earth let me lie.*

*The Cross of Valor, on its red band,
Over my heart you shall lay;
My musket place into my hand;
And my sword at my side display.*

*So shall I lie and hark in the ground,
A guardwatch, silently staying
Till once more I hear the cannon's pound
And the hoofbeats of horses neighing.*

*Then my Emperor'll be passing right over my grave;
Each clashing sword, a flashing reflector.
And I, fully armed, will rise up from that grave,
The Emperor's, the Emperor's protector!}"*

If the reader has taken this poem by Heine seriously, he has been fooled entirely. Heine's poem is a very sharp irony on the enthusiastic romanticism of the Napoleonic soldier.

ODE TO ENTHUSIASM
by Lazare Carnot

*{Sublime soaring of generous souls,
Enthusiasm, love of Beauty!
Principles of noble flames,
Enlighten me with your torch.
Oh ray of divine essence!
It is from your celestial origin*

*That I wish to derive my songs:
Already my voice has sprung forth,
Purify, expand my thoughts,
Give life to my accents.*

*You are not raving drunkenness,
You are not cold reason:
You go further than wisdom,
Without exceeding its region.
Delicate instinct which anticipates,
Both the council of prudence*

*And the calculations of judgment
Instructed by simple nature,
Your course is always quick and sure,
And your guide is sentiment.}*

During the early part of the French Revolution, all of the French soldiers were made to believe they were fighting not just for their own country but for all of humanity. Consequently, they were submitted to a real test of patriotism: all were engaged in the fight to save the nation of France and liberate it, and all were told they were required to invade other countries, in order to liberate them as well.

Lazare Carnot, the "{Organizer of the Victory}" told the French soldiers: "*You are not raving drunkenness,/ You are not cold reason;/ You go further than wisdom,/ Without exceeding its region...*" Carnot told his men that the only way to understand this truth, was to construct it themselves; that is, to know it first hand, from their own personal moral enthusiasm, their own "{*inner god*}," not because someone told them so. (1) On the other hand, Joseph De Maistre and Bonaparte told the French soldiers: "{*France has a mission from God: she is the principle instrument of good and evil on earth.*}" If you had been a soldier in the French Revolution, which enthusiasm would you have chosen?

Let me develop the same hypothesis, but in a different context, for purpose of comparison. How do you know the difference between belief and knowledge? Let's take an example that all of you are familiar with. What happened when you joined the LaRouche Movement? You believed you had the right to tell anybody the truth about the necessity of creating a New Just World Economic Order, right? How do you know you were not simply repeating what Napoleon's soldiers were doing? Was that true enthusiasm, or simply religious fanaticism? What is the difference? And, how can you make that difference intelligible for others? Can you know that difference as a scientifically provable truth, or do you simply believe it is true, because what you are being told appears to have all of the right things you wish to believe in? These are the questions that you have to be able to answer when you encounter a {*man-beast*} like Joseph de Maistre. If you cannot make this crucial difference, you can easily be recruited by the synarchy, without your knowing it!

The issue here is how do you choose between the synarchist rule by fear and blind belief as opposed to the rule by constitutional principles and knowledge, when the difference is so apparently thin, and not perceptible? The difference is that the {*romantic enthusiast*} is only too eager to believe blindly in the existence of a mysterious invisible force of justice beyond sense-perception, and for which he is not responsible; while the {*moral enthusiast*} knows that what lies beyond sense-perception is knowable, and takes responsibility for it, because it is based on well ordered principles of justice. The first case is tragic, the other is sublime. Ask yourself: why does such a distinction exist?

First of all, believing is easy. You don't have to think. In a way, faith is simply the blind acceptance that you trust in the goodness and justice of God, but you tragically leave it to Him to decide the future of mankind. My point, here, is that it is a satanic practice to trust blindly in the justice of God in this way. Man is different from the beast and, therefore, has the ability to know the justice of God by discovering universal physical principles, as direct expressions of love of mankind (agape), and thus, participate in deciding the future of humanity. Otherwise: how do you know that God is not unjust and evil, like Maistre says?

Secondly, if your faith and your reason are not one, you risk being recruited by the synarchy. The art of all of the sophistry of Maistre, like that of Kant,

ultimately resides in the simplistic fact that he makes believe that *{beyond sense perception, there can exist only an irrational, romantic, and Gnostic knowledge of God.}* From that standpoint, God is unknowable. That is simply and flatly false, and this is why LaRouche has been using the appropriate "theological pesticide," when he launched his epistemological warfare against such reductionists of sense perception. The point is that God is knowable, but only beyond sense perception casting shadows on the dimly lit wall of Plato's cave. Furthermore, the greatest enthusiasm and passion that can be attached to this process resides in the discovery of the true indicative powers of such shadows.

Thus, it is about time that man stopped chasing after shadows, as if they were realities, and stopped seeking beyond them, some mysterious and irrational God. It is time to re-discover the importance of Plato's metaphor of the Cave. The re-discovering of the principle of Plato's cave is provably the greatest gift of knowledge that man can share with his fellow man, because there cannot be a greater proof of God's glory than man's understanding and sharing of the wonderful power to see, as Saint Paul said: "*as if through a glass darkly*."

FOOTNOTES.

(1) Note how Carnot develops the complex domain thought-object of enthusiasm by using verbal action. "*You are not raving drunkenness,/ You are not cold reason;/ You go further than wisdom,/ Without exceeding its region...*" This raises the question as to why, in the modern French language, it is often difficult to develop thought-objects. The difficulty lies primarily in the Cartesian habit of the French language of giving priority to naming things, as opposed to first using verbal action. Take the following example: "How would you say in French:

Verb	Adj.	Verb	Noun	Adj.	Noun
{An underlying harmonic ordering principle of physical discovery.}					

After a moment of mental juggling, the French might come up with something awkward like:

Noun Adj. Noun Adj. Adj. Adj.
{Un principe fondamental de decouverte physique ordonne et harmonique.}

Note how the English thought-object begins with the verbal action {*underlying*} and {*ordering*}, and ends with the noun {*discovery*}. On the other hand, the French thought-object starts with two nouns (*principe*) and {*decouverte*}, and is missing the verbal action. This is the reason why the French have a hard time with Riemann, Schiller, and LaRouche. One of the better ways to change this state of affair is to restore the thinking and verbal action to the French language with the use of the great Francois Rabelais's deconstipation measures.

SYNARCHY MOVEMENT OF EMPIRE

BOOK I

CHAPTER 6

CHAPTER 6

THE EARLY SYNARCHY MOVEMENT OF EMPIRE

**THE FRENCH REVOLUTION of 1789-1815:
A SYNARCHIST INTERNATIONAL EXERCISE
IN PURGATIVE VIOLENCE**

6.1 BONAPARTE THE MODERN TORQUEMADA OF SPAIN

1.2 INTRODUCTION
2.2 THE BRITISH EMPIRE CONTROL OF THE SEAS
3.2 BONAPARTE'S FIXATION WITH GREAT BRITAIN.
4.2 BONAPARTE'S PLAN FOR SPAIN AND PORTUGAL
5.2 THE TALLEYRAND TREASON OF ERFURT.
6.2 THE CLAW OF SATAN
7.2 THE BLOODBATH OF THE BEASTMAN BONAPARTE
8.2 THE BLOOD CULT OF {LOS HERMANOS PENITENTES}
9.2 CONCLUSION: HOW RUSSIA VANQUISHED THE BEAST-MAN

1.2 INTRODUCTION.

"The more Bonaparte succeeds, the more it is difficult to maintain his success."

{ The Bonaparte paradox }
Albert Sorel.

If the French Revolution was a disaster for mankind, it is because a deliberate confusion had been created between French rights and human rights, the same confusion which exists today between American Democracy and world security. The failure resides primarily in the repudiation of the Peace of Westphalia. In fact, the entire history of the French Revolution has been a repudiation of the principle of the *{ Advantage of the other }*, and consequently, it has been nothing but the history of the first modern form of fascism. However, such a history of early fascism would not be complete without going through the role of Napoleon Bonaparte's invasion of Spain.

Many a times, during his looting campaigns of Europe, Napoleon Bonaparte looked toward Spain and lusted for the continental peninsula. His lust cost the Spanish people a bloodbath and an extortion of 6 million francs a month, and this from a country that could barely feed its own people. However, the painful irony was that, after he had conquered it, he could not understand why his intervention had become such a total failure.

Special advisor to Napoleon, and Grand Chamberlain, Perigord Talleyrand, always willing to give his master the only councils that would flatter his vanity, but who was secretly working for the British Secret Service of Jeremy Bentham, had ultimately convinced Bonaparte that "without a Prince of his Imperial House sitting on the throne of Spain "the system of the Empire would not be complete." (Albert Sorel, *{ L'Europe et la Revolution francaise, }*, Paris, Librairie Plon, 1903. P. 220.)

French historian, Capitaine A. Grasset, reported that during Bonaparte's exile in the Island of Sainte Helene, Spain had become his nightmare. "***He (Napoleon) spoke of the purity of his intentions, saying that he had wished to 'regenerate' this backward country, and concluded that his only error had been to believe himself to be too powerful, that he regretted having acted as Providence, ' which cured the evils of mortals by means of her choices, sometimes violent, and without seeking advice. '***" (Capitaine A. Grasset, {*Napoleon et l'Espagne*}, La Revue de Paris, p.492.)

Leaving aside for a moment, the so-called "purity of his intentions," let us not forget that it was Bonaparte's bestial character which led him to commit the most heinous crimes everywhere he went, even though he always attempted to console himself cynically with the illusion that most of his failures would not have been injustices, and posterity would have considered them as virtues, had he succeeded. The point is, Bonaparte failed miserably, and we shall report here why this is an exemplary lesson case of history that Dick Cheney and the current Bush administration must learn not to stupidly repeat.

2.2 THE BRITISH EMPIRE CONTROL OF THE SEAS.

When William Pitt the Younger (1759-1806), Count of Chatham, got into power in England, the British-Martinist collaboration against Bailly and Lafayette, and their American system had already been launched by Prime Minister, Lord Shelburne, and Secret service head, Jeremy Bentham. The entire subversion of France was financed through London and Geneva 's Martinist collaboration between Jacques Necker, Philippe Egalite, Mallet du Pan, via Lyon's Count Cagliostro and Joseph de Maistre, while William Pitt represented, from "Chatham House," the leading military arm of the anti-French {coalition of Kings}. Pitt was the soul of the military coalition against France from the beginning of the Revolution to the beginnings of the Empire. The military coalition against France was so much identified with this Minister of George III, that {*Pitt et Cobourg*} became the popular French expression designating the enemy as a whole.

Pitt's strategic plan was to lure Catherine II of Russia and Joseph II, of Austria (and Leopold after him) into a grand alliance against France, with the pressing idea of establishing the greatest Maritime Power in the world, while keeping Bonaparte busy on the continent. As French historian Olivier Blanc has documented in his book, *{Les hommes de Londres}*, both the French Terror and the Empire were essentially controlled through the agencies of William Pitt the Younger. In his *{Mission des Souverains}*, synarchist founder, Saint Yves d'Alveydre, confirmed that Pitt was the secret source of money behind Shelburne and Bentham against France, and that, in the short term, London was to first break the maritime power of Spain, the ally of France, and, in the medium term, build an invincible maritime power for the British Empire. This confirms in spades what LaRouche has been saying about the expansion of the British Empire, from 1763 on.

The point to be made here is that the strategy of the seven coalition wars against France, from 1793 to 1815, resided not in the land forces that Britain was coordinating, and funding, but in building up, indirectly, its maritime and world trade Empire. In fact, William Pitt had bought off the entire coalition with huge amounts of money to secure all of the continental cabinets, Austria, Russia, Prussia, Spain, Italy, Piedmont, Sardaigne, Holland, and succeeded in breaking all of the {natural alliances} on the continent, while creating {unnatural alliances}, such as the Austrians joining the Prussians, Italy, including the Pope, joining England, and even Madrid allying itself with London.

It was the London Central Bank of Walpole, which was providing the credit for the 500,000 men army of the coalition. However, Pitt's real military objective was naval in character, that is, securing the blockade of all French ports and confiscating all neutral ships, carrying goods to France, including pirating and recruiting American sailors. Meanwhile the British East India Company was taking care of the Empire's interests in the Colonies.

On the one hand, the extraordinary defense of France by the {levee en masse} of Lazare Carnot had demonstrated the superiority of a true liberation war, and of the application of the principle of the Peace of Westphalia, as opposed to

the imperial design of William Pitt. On the other hand, no matter how badly he might be loosing the war on the continent, Pitt was not concerned with the victories of France against his own land coalition forces. His idea was to keep the French busy with the coalition on their borders, or beyond, as long as Britain was the sole ruler of the seas. Pitt stated before the House of Parliament: "***So many defeats does not endanger our power. We have taken ships and colonies which guarantees us the empire of the seas.***" Indeed, Pitt's navy had taken Corsica, Guadeloupe, Martinique, Saint Nicholas and Port-au-Prince.

Synarchist founder, Saint Yves d'Alveydre, reported that the British Parliament was so happy with Pitt's work that he "***{obtained, from the two Houses, the continuation of such a profitable war, including 115 million pounds for Austria, 215,000 men for the British Army, 100,000 men for the Navy, without mentioning the pay for the émigré regiments, arms for the Vendee, and gold for the required open and occult diplomatic operations, inside of France as well as on the continent.}***" (Saint Yves., *{Mission des Souverains}*, Paris, Nord-Sud, 1948, p. 293.)

The British victory of Admiral Nelson against Napoleon at Trafalgar, on October 21, 1805, was a decisive battle for the British control of the seas. The French Navy never got over that defeat, and from that moment on, Napoleon became absolutely fixated and powerless against the British on the seas. Lord Chatham considered that the key to British policy was to do the opposite of the Peace of Westphalia, that is, ***{take advantage of the other}***. Chatham stated pompously: "If we were to be loyal for only one day, we would not survive a year."

It was ultimately the Peace of Reichenbach, on June 15, 1813, between England, Russia, and Prussia, and then also between Petersburg and Stockholm, which ensured the full control of the seas by Great Britain. Pitt got the British government to spend another one million pound sterling for the general war effort, plus 500,000 pounds, for the maintenance of the Russian fleet in English ports, under the command of the British admiralty, in exchange for the Russians to fund the expansion of the House of Hanover. Thus, diplomatically and militarily, London was master of the Seas, during the entire period of the French Revolution. The idea of Pitt was to keep the French busy militarily, on the continent, chasing

after British shadows, even acceding to the delusion of Napoleon, in keeping the British out of Europe, with his "ineffective continental blockade."

3.2 BONAPARTE'S FIXATION WITH GREAT BRITAIN.

The so-called "great military strategist" Napoleon Bonaparte was nothing but a beast-man, like his predecessor, Louis XIV; and, like him, he was thinking of declaring the Spanish crown forfeited, and usurp its power. Napoleon was aiming at putting his brother Joseph on the throne of Spain. However, this could only be accomplished by striking terror in the heart of the Spanish people. This is the price the beast-man was willing to pay, in order to get four Bonaparte rulers controlling Europe: Napoleon in France, Louis in Holland, Jerome in Westphalia, and Joseph in Italy, and later in Spain. That is the complete imperial system of the Bonaparte family.

As early as 1805, Napoleon had already prepared his brother Joseph: "Learn to speak Spanish," he told him. At the same time, he imparted to General Jourdan that Spain was essential to his plans "for the purpose of reestablishing the Western Empire, and consolidating his dynasty and the salvation of France."

As he always did, in past expeditions, Napoleon looked at Spain as an arsenal, a military capability of men, ships, cannons, and money. But there was an extra incentive in the case of Spain: the culmination of his imperial fantasy into a real bloodbath! This was going to be his most bestial conquest. If Italy was his first prestige, Spain was going to be the finishing touch of his glory, the completion of the Empire. Moreover, Bonaparte's plan to invade Spain was more than the crown of Spain. Bonaparte thought that once he had the throne of Spain, he also had control over the colonies of the Americas. That was how the Spanish and Portuguese colonies of the Americas came into his sight. And that is why, Bonaparte thought there was only one problem with his plans: the British had control over Portugal, and they were everywhere on the continent, and on the seas. The only power that stood between Bonaparte and the Americas, was the British Empire. William Pitt played this profile of Bonaparte close to perfection, and knew all of his steps ahead of time.

The beast-man, who had been promoted and was kept in power by the likes of Paul Marrat, Jacques Necker, and Talleyrand, through the British Secret Service of Jeremy Bentham, had become a Frankenstein monster who turned against the British {invisible hand}, which had launched the first French Revolution. <note> (Madame de Stael relates that during meetings she was holding at the British Ambassador's house, in Switzerland, in 1802, all of the "spies" of Talleyrand were there, Benjamin Constant, the Minister of Finance under Joseph Bonaparte, Pierre Louis Roederer, another advisor to Joseph, Andre Francois Miot. All were getting their marching orders from the British Ambassador, which was coordinated with their financial backer in Paris, the {Friends of England} group, namely: Ouvrard, Laborie, Montrond, and the business agent of Talleyrand, Vannelet, and *{l'Ami de Paris}*, d'Antraignes, Czartoriski. All were placing their money in London. <note> (Albert Sorel, *{L'Europe et la Revolution Francaise}*, Paris, Librairie Plon, Vol 5, p.123, 350., Vol. 6, p.220, and *{Lectures Historiques, une Agence d'Espionage sous le Consulat}*.) See also Leonce Pingaud, *{Un Agent secret}*, Appendice, p.368, 395. Sorel notes that "When they (the British) launch enterprises, they never mix together the head and the machine. The head always remains intact, isolated, {without any physical possibility of compromising it}." Vol. 6. p.223.)

Bonaparte swore the British would not do this to France again, under his revolution. From as early as Campo-Formio, in 1795, to Bonaparte's victory at Iena, on October 14, 1806, and until his complete defeat of 1814, the supreme {raison d'Etat} of the Bonaparte Empire had been to create a total Continental blockade of England across Europe. As Napoleon wrote: "Our immutable objective: war to the death against England." The day after Campo-Formio Bonaparte wrote to the Directory: "Before you decide to rest, turn your sights on England!" That became the constant war cry: "Expel the British from the continent" ... "close, to our enemies, the doors of the European continent, from Gibraltar to Texel" ... "Cut off from these openings, and worked up by internal revolts to follow, England shall become embarrassed with her colonial and Asiatic armies. The unsold goods shall reach low prices, and the British shall be ruined by abundance, like they wanted to vanquish France by starvation." And after Iena, Napoleon went on: "England wanted to use Prussia against France, push the emperor and France to the brink. Well, she has led Prussia to its ruin, procured the

Emperor a greater glory, gave France a greater power, and the time is near when we shall declare England in a state of {continental blockade}." (Albert Sorel, Op. Cit. Vol 7, p.104.)

4.2 BONAPARTE'S PLAN FOR SPAIN AND PORTUGAL

In his usual manner, Bonaparte applied his favorite invading tactic in Spain: {*take advantage of the other*} by dividing and conquering his victims; that is, take advantage of the weaknesses of the Spaniards, the ignorance of the people, the fanaticism of the clergy, the greed of the court, and the political weakness of the royal leadership. His policy was to use a few specific intrigues to create plots and rivalries within the Spanish court, and then, leave them to their own devices to fight each other, and self-destruct: a perfect Martinist {*modus operandi*}.

A quick survey gives the following picture of the key players that Bonaparte manipulated into the game of intrigue called {*who is going to do what to whom*}. The Bourbons, in Spain as in France, were his enemies, but they were weak and could be taken advantage of. Bonaparte always considered that it was less costly to fight an enemy than to win him over for his own benefit. The old Bourbon king Charles IV was seventy years old and senile. His doctors had advised him not to hunt more than six hours a day. Manuel Godoy, his Prime Minister, and favorite lover of Queen Marie-Louise, had influence over the court, and a definite ascendancy vis-à-vis the royal family, through his sister-in law. The wife of Godoy, Maria-Theresa de Villabriga, was the daughter of Don Luis de Bourbon, uncle of Charles IV. It was the young sister of this princess that Godoy wanted to marry to the son of Charles IV, Ferdinand. Then, the hopeful to the throne, Ferdinand, enemy of Godoy, who, as he said "would prefer to remain a widower for the rest of my life rather than become the brother-in-law of Manuel Godoy." Ferdinand was only too eager to please the French Emperor, and was a sort of Duke of Orleans of Spain, a conspirator who was attempting to elevate himself by inviting Bonaparte to come to his rescue, that is, invade.

Two diplomatic signals were to become critical in launching the Bonaparte expedition into Spain. A year after Bonaparte's victory in Iena, Ferdinand wrote a

letter to Napoleon, dated October 11, 1807, in which he called for his "paternal protection" against the plots of Godoy. The other signal was the apostrophe of October 15, when Napoleon publicly targeted the Ambassador of Portugal in Paris, and announced arrogantly: "I will not suffer to have a single British envoy in Europe. I shall declare war against any country, which, in two months time, will still harbor one within its borders. I have at my disposal 300,000 Russian troops and, with this powerful ally, I can do anything... If Portugal does not do as I wish, the house of Braganza will no longer rule in Europe in two months." Then Napoleon turned to the Danish Minister and said: "The events of Copenhagen are a disgrace, and the declaration of the King is an infamy." Then, turning next to the Hanseatic Ministers: "How are things in your place?" - "Bad, Sir." - "Then, things will get even worse," replied Bonaparte, "Bremen and Hamburg are English cities: I shall deal with them accordingly." Metternich got a whiff of the outburst, and Napoleon demanded that the British Ambassador to Vienna be expelled from Austria by December first.

By October 17th Portugal had obeyed Bonaparte's wish and had declared war against Britain, Napoleon declared war against Portugal on October 20th. However, a month later, Napoleon had 40,000 troops ready to travel across Spain and to invade Portugal in order to stave off a British invasion. The Paris Empire controlled {*Monitor*} newspaper announced then, that "The regent prince of Portugal had lost his throne...", and that "The fall of the House of Bracanza was the tangible proof that anyone who is attached to the British shall inevitably perish."

There was another objective, more insidious, more terrible, and more personal, that Napoleon had been contemplating, in silence. The experiment of the beast-man, the Joseph de Maistre lesson of taking joy in the suffering of others. Napoleon knew that he was dealing with a backward population, a flagellant cultist people who had been practicing self-mutilation, since Saint Anthony of Padua had initiated the flagellant movement in Italy during the early thirteenth century. Bonaparte counted on the fanatical and cultist impact that the inquisition had caused for centuries. For him, the Spanish conquest was going to be a blood bath of pure sadistic enjoyment. As Bonaparte wrote: "The Spanish people is vile and cowardly, somewhat like what I have found with the Arabs...At the first sign of retreat, they will shoot at you." So, the role of the executioner was to strike

swiftly, with precise blows, and enjoy the blood bath. However, for the posterity reading his memoirs, Napoleon wrote that his purpose was to "liberate Spain and abolish both feudality and the inquisition..." However, before invading Spain, Napoleon needed to have an alliance with Russia against England.

5.2 THE TALLEYRAND TREASON OF ERFURT.

On October 12, 1808, Napoleon decided to do what the British wanted him to do, through the services of his grand chambellan, Talleyrand. On October 14, Minister of Foreign Affairs, Jean-Baptiste Champagny, announced to the Portuguese Minister: "The emperor has decided to throw caution to the wind with respect to England; this power being the sovereign power of the seas, the moment has come where the emperor will be the master of the continent...In agreement with Russia, he no longer fears anyone; the dice have been cast." (Sorel, Op. Cit., Vol. 7. p.217.) It was only a year later that Napoleon sought a peace with the emperor of Russia, Alexander I.

The agreement between the two emperors was to guarantee peace for Russia, and a continental blockade against England, for France. Thus, the creation of two empires which would the whole of Europe. The question remained which of the two empires shall ultimately govern the other? From that standpoint, the Treaty of Tilsit was not any better than the Treaty of Campo-Formio: They both reinforced the destruction of the Peace of Westphalia.

Napoleon was more pompous than usual: "I wish, before beginning," said Napoleon to Talleyrand, "that emperor Alexander become dazzled by the spectacle of my power." After Napoleon had his private meeting with Alexander, and both decided to send a joint communiqué to London, Talleyrand was getting ready for his great moment. On October 3rd after a concert given at the castle of Princess Turn und Taxis, Alexander asked Talleyrand "Have you spoken with the emperor, in these last days?" - "No," replied Talleyrand, but "If I had not met with M. de Vincent, I would have believed that the Erfurt meeting was merely a pleasant party." "What did M. de Vincent have to say?" asked Alexander. - "Sir, some very reasonable things, since he hopes that Your Majesty will not let himself be

dragged by the Emperor Napoleon into menacing measures against Austria; and if Your Majesty permits me to say, that I agree with him." Talleyrand had just taken an extraordinary stand against Napoleon Bonaparte, and wanted Alexander to avoid putting Austria in the alliance treaty between France and Russia. Why? What prompted Talleyrand to change camps, all of a sudden?

It was not in the character of Talleyrand to risk everything, especially at a time when Napoleon was at the height of his glory. There was no political gain in sight that could have justified this sudden move. Something else was motivating him. In fact, Talleyrand was too much of a propitiating coward to stand on his own, and the venal side of him always dictated his conduct. In retrospect, any student of history can recognize that Talleyrand never hesitated to betray his masters, but only in order to secure his financial interests. One thing was certain with Talleyrand: his strongest attaches had always been with London. No matter where he went on the continent, the smell of his footprints always traced him back to England. Therefore, his betrayal of Napoleon meant that the decision had to come from the invisible hand that controlled his financial lifeline, and that was the London bankers. On the next day, Talleyrand further insinuated to Alexander that the time had come for Napoleon to be disposed of, and that Russia was the only civilized power that could "stop Napoleon, and save Europe."

Alexander liked the idea and accepted. He understood that, as long as Napoleon was kept busy in Spain, and was running after the shadows of British trade representatives across the continent, there would be momentary peace in Europe. Napoleon was completely duped. In the end, Alexander told Napoleon: "No one has the right to intervene in the measures of a foreign sovereign. Austria has no better friend than I, and, on my honor I am engaged to preserve her from any harm." That was it. Don't touch Austria. The agreement was signed between the two emperors on October 12, and both directed their alliance against England, "the common enemy, and the enemy of the continent".

Napoleon returned to the mess he had started in Spain, Alexander was happy to have increased his friendship with Austria, and Talleyrand had become an official British-Russian agent, with the collaboration of Fouché and Metternich in Paris, Stein in Germany, and another British agent and enemy of Napoleon, Pozzo di Borgo, in Vienna, and later Minister of Alexander, in Saint Petersburg. In

his memoires, dated December 4, 1808, Metternich wrote the following conclusive comment on the Erfurt meeting: "The very interest of France requires that the States which are capable of standing up to Napoleon get together to form a barrage against his insatiable ambition. The cause of Napoleon is no longer the cause of France; finally Europe can only be saved by the intimate union between Austria and Russia." It was in that strategic context that Talleyrand had been preparing the restoration of Louis XVIII.

When Napoleon fell, Talleyrand had already opened his arms to all of his previous enemies, especially the Bourbons. Talleyrand was such a corrupt flatterer that he even thought he could succeed in caressing an ill wind in his favor. During the period of the Erfurt meetings, Talleyrand explained to one of the Bourbon loyalists, M. de Boisgelin: "So!" exclaimed Talleyrand, "I am all in favor of this thing [the restoration of Louis XVIII], and, at this time you can count on me. Let us work at liberating the country from this furious [Napoleon]... We must speak loudly of his errors, of his lack of faith in all of the commitments he had made during his reign on France. We must not hesitate to pronounce the words of nation, right of the people..." These last words were not really what a "legitimist" wanted to hear, but Talleyrand was being cautious, because he was secretly the head of the party which was actively organizing the demise of Bonaparte, and was keeping all of his options open, while preparing the restoration of the Bourbons.

The question was not merely the death of Napoleon, but how to manage the end of the Empire. Baron de Vitrolles who was working with Talleyrand was the information agent for Russian diplomat, Charles Nesselrode, the Minister for Baden, Baron of Dalberg. This was the secret services apparatus called {the Russians friends}, who were also the {English friends}, since there was a joint effort to help the British destroy Napoleon. Talleyrand was also considering that if Napoleon were to die, his "legitimate" heir would be the King of Rome, with the regency of his mother. If Talleyrand did not play his cards right with his British masters, this whole affair could create a terrible clash of dynasty between two contending "legitimist" regimes.

When British Ambassador, Hawkesbury, made the point to Prince Woronzof that England had to pull all the stops and use all good means possible to stop Napoleon, he brought the point to the only moral conclusion he could think of

and added: "It would be a sin before God; it would be a shame before humanity and posterity, if Britain As Fiodor Rostopchine, the Russian general who defended Moscow against Bonaparte in 1812, declared: "As it stands, the British system will always be to destroy France, as its only rival, and then reign afterwards as a despot on the whole universe." (Sorel, Op. Cit., Vol. 7, p.261)

6.2 THE CLAW OF SATAN

After an easy invasion of Portugal, Napoleon left for Madrid, on February 28, 1808, and prepared to send 50,000 men to the Spanish capital, in the hope that there would be no immediate hostility. At the same time, his armies invaded Rome, for the purpose of securing the Pope in his papal quarters. As was to be expected, the sequestering of the Pope in Rome caused a most violent reaction in Madrid and Spain, more generally.

Bonaparte took advantage of the family division between the King of Spain, Charles IV, and his son, Ferdinand VII. <note> (The reader should be reminded that, during its entire history, the Spanish people never had a chance to liberate themselves from the Venetian-Habsburg control, except, momentarily, when Spain joined France against England to win the American War of Independence. Spain then came under the "enlightened despotism" of the first Bourbon King, Charles III (1759-1788), and some of his best advisors, namely Aranda, Florida Blanca, and Campomanes succeeded in establishing some significant social and economic reforms. This is a period of growth for agriculture and industries, and a beginning of religious tolerance, starting with the expulsion of the Jesuits, in 1767. During that period of development, the general population jumped from 7 million to 11 millions. This was, for all intent and purposes, the only time that Spain had played a positive role in the world.)

After receiving the welcoming message of Ferdinand, and a similar offer from the King, his father, Bonaparte played a diabolical game of cat and mouse with both, with his idea was to put his own brother, Joseph, on the throne of Spain.

On March 17, 1808, a riot was staged in Aranjuez, where the royal family

was located. The palace of Prime Minister Godoy was invaded and the next day, Godoy was arrested. Charles IV was in total despair and feared for his life, thinking that he should rather abdicate, than be killed by the partisans of his son. The King called to him the French Ambassador, Beauharnais, brother in law of Josephine, and decided then and there to abdicate. On March 20, Ferdinand wrote a note for Napoleon to his brother-in-law, Joachim Murat, telling him that "Divine Providence had called upon him to govern his people." At the same time, the King asked Murat for the protection of Napoleon. The development of the situation was such that all of Spain was being put on the plate of Napoleon.

On March 21, Charles IV had a change of heart and revoked the abdication in favor of his son. He wrote a note to Napoleon, stating that his son "is an outrage to the nation and to the throne, is not dignified to wear my crown"..."This crown so brilliant can only be held by an extraordinary genius...Filled with confidence in the genius and magnanimity of a great man, I have taken the resolution of putting it myself to your entire disposal..." It was not clear as to how the court of Spain was going to welcome Bonaparte as their new King. However, Ferdinand was in a furious state, and wanted to initiate court proceedings against his own father.

Meanwhile, by March 26, Napoleon proposed the Spanish crown to his brother Louis, who although in serious trouble in Holland, refused. On April 7, the same day that he had the Pope sequestered in Rome, for "security reasons," Napoleon called Ferdinand to him in Burgos. Ferdinand thought Napoleon was going to recognize him as the new King, but Bonaparte had prepared a deadly trap for him. He wrote him a diabolical note, probably composed by Talleyrand, in which he deterred him from launching a court case against his father: "The result would be deadly for your crown," stated Napoleon, insidiously, "Your Highness has only the rights that your mother has transmitted to you; if this case should dishonor her, Your Highness will be tearing up all of his rights." Later, Martinist controller, Joseph de Maistre, enjoyed this diabolical maneuver so much that, upon reading this note, he commented: "I don't think that Louis XIV could have written a better one...The passage on the queen was written...with the claw of Satan." (Albert Sorel, p.262) [Annex I: Biography of Joseph de Maistre]

On April 30, Charles IV traveled to Irun to meet with Bonaparte. The King was willing to give him the entirety of Spain, providing his son Ferdinand was not

made king. Bonaparte was still thinking of putting his brother, Joseph, on the throne. A report of the Minister of External Affairs (read the British Home Office), Champagne, dated April 24, summed up the policy: "It is the work of Louis XIV which has to be restored...Politics require it, justice authorizes it, the troubles of Spain impose its necessity. Your Majesty must see to the security of the Empire and save Europe from the influence of England." Napoleon's mind was made up.

On May 5, impatient to hear the news from Madrid, Napoleon received from Murat the announcement that an insurrection had been going on for several days, against the French troops in Madrid. "French soldiers were being massacred by the population in arms, patients were slaughtered in their hospital beds. The repression was quick, merciless," reported historian Sorel. (Sorel. P.265.) Totally exhilarated by the bloody events, Bonaparte announced to his personal advisor-controller, Perigord Talleyrand: "This tragedy is now in the fifth act; the outcome is about to be unraveled." Sorel was emphatic about the fact that the Madrid massacres were timed like clockwork and controlled like the scenario of a play. Sorel wrote:

"{This outcome, following the classical rules, was being dictated by destiny, that is by the implacable logic of passions and the blindness of the actors who will drive themselves into the catastrophe where they will destroy themselves all together. It was fate, but this fate was ignominious. The Bourbons debased themselves; Napoleon diminished himself. He was preparing an immense and spectacular coup d'Etat, in the manner of Corneille; maybe even more, a role play of God Himself, in the manner of Bossuet: 'I wanted to act as Providence, who remedies human ills by the means of her choice.'}"
(Sorel. V.7. P.265.)

By May 10, the Council of Castile was brought together, and Napoleon wrote to his brother Joseph: "The Spanish nation, through the organ of its Supreme Council of Castile, is asking me to provide them with a King. It is to you that I destine this crown." Of course, that was a lie, pure and simple. The truth of the matter is that the Council had flatly refused and Napoleon was forced to call on the {Etats Generaux} to come to Bayonne on June 15, and settle the matter. About 40 out of 150 Cortes showed up for the {Etats Generaux}, and Napoleon proclaimed Joseph Bonaparte, king of Spain. Everybody found themselves in the

same paradox that Louis XIV had been in, when his grandson, Philippe V, became King of Spain in 1700. On the one hand, if Joseph wished to be a true Spanish King, he had to repudiate Napoleon. On the other hand, Napoleon wanted the "regeneration", that is in reality, a bloodbath of Spain for the completion of the French Empire. Between the two, the Spanish population was being sacrificed altogether, for {family, tradition, and property}.

7.2 THE SPANISH BLOODBATH OF BEASTMAN BONAPARTE

The Bonaparte "liberation" of Spain sparked an explosive mixture of nationalism and of irrational religious fanaticism within the Spanish population, and a systematic "guerilla" war was launched against the Bonaparte invasion. This is where the expression "guerilla warfare" got its name. Following the script, the Spanish population was thrown into total anarchy. The priests, the monks, the nobility, the bourgeois and the peasants took up arms, everywhere. Every town, every village was up in arms. Insurrection groups got organized all over the countryside, mixed with bandits, erring knights, adventurers, etc. Both Joseph and Napoleon were considered as heretics for having sequestered both King and Pope.

This "guerilla" war had become the strangest religious beast-man ritual, a war in which everyone killed and got killed as if it were decreed by destiny, like the blood-cult rituals of the Flagellant {*Penitentes*} during their secret processions of Holy Friday. An entire nation had been driven mad. When a people has been fanaticized for so many centuries of Inquisition, and self-degradation, the very soul of the nation becomes brittle, and is turned into a hellish instrument of revenge. In Spain, Bonaparte had trampled on everything that was sacred, and even the most wretched king-killer had become the staunchest defender of the divine rights of a Spanish King. This was like Don Quixote's worse nightmare come true.

The Spanish population turned its warriors into executioners, thus, liberating the foul function of the executioner beast-man that Joseph de Maistre had promoted, as "the terror of human society and the tie that holds it together." Here the extremes met in a state of confusion, and without resolution. This is how,

in Spain, a fanaticized order was replaced by chaos and insanity, how the defense of the Spanish monarchy, however degenerate it was, became the symbol of defending the faith, and God, just like the communistic French Revolution had become the religion of the fanatics of egalite. What both situations had in common was that the blood lust of the beast-man had to be spilled for the sake of "purification," for what Bonaparte kept calling cynically the "regeneration" of Spain.

At the very moment that the French troops were being butchered everywhere across Spain, Bonaparte was fantasizing about future victories, and how he was going to make England pay. He wrote to Admiral Denis Decres, Minister of the Navy, on Mai 12, 1808: "I think you have understood my war system. This year, England has borrowed a billion. We must harass her with expenses and fatigue." He made up a long list of armaments for all of the seaports of France, Holland, Spain, Italy; with new ship building everywhere. He already had in the Mediterranean Sea, 16 French and Russian vessels, and he calculated that the British would have to bring in 25 vessels, and 10 more in Cadix. He calculated an expedition of 77 French and allied vessels for Brest, by 1809, and called for a flotilla to carry up to 30,000 men in Boulogne. "I want to give a great blow before the season ends," he said to his Lisbon Commander, Andoche Junot, who was soon forced to repatriate his army of 25,000 men, and fell into disgrace before the British, on August 30, 1808. Napoleon wrote him a note asking him "if he thinks the port off Lisbon can hold 50 war vessels and 100 transport vessels?" Furthermore, Napoleon considered sending 6,000 troops to impress the Moroccan King, threatening him that if he did anything against France, he would "pass over 200,000 French and Spaniards into Africa."

Meanwhile, Talleyrand kept playing up to Metternich in Paris, while keeping his role of reassuring the Emperor that his Spanish expedition was a complete success. During the same period of April-May, 1808, when the Spanish situation was so terrible, Talleyrand kept sending message after message to Napoleon telling him the "everything was going to be fine in Bayonne," and that he wouldn't have to intervene outside of France. "The affairs of Spain interest everybody but moves no one. Everybody is in expectation, confident and interested, as if they were attending some great representation. Everybody has admired the course that events have taken naturally, such a happy course that it is

impossible to hope for better." (May 2, and 8th, 1808) In Paris, however, a real ferment of Bonaparte opposition was brewing among both the "Friends of England} and the {Friends of Russia.} Operation grand deception had begun. The Spanish enterprise was portrayed everywhere in Paris, and in all of the Embassies, as "ridiculous and criminal fruit of Napoleon's ambition and of the greed of his family."

On November 5, Napoleon invaded Vitoria and was incapable of winning against an enemy that doesn't want to submit. Sorel described the situation on the ground: " Every little house became a fortress. The army is exhausting itself in so many assaults, so many useless and enervating sieges that the advance requires the bombing of every shanty in Spain. All of the trails must be occupied, every road crossing has to have a watch post, every convoy has to be protected, each courier has to be secured...the French army is getting exhausted in these unending skirmishes; the military genius of the emperor is being used up in this war without strategy...the emperor witnesses the extermination of every part of his great army being harassed, taken to pieces, turned to impotence. This insurrection of an entire people was functioning like a fever which attacks everywhere at once, dissolves man after man, step by step, along every road, in each town, in every hospital, more destructive than canons: the entire {Grande Armee} is collapsing without water, without cover, without sleep." (Sorel, Op. Cit., Vol. 7. p.326.)

On February 2, 1808, Napoleon wrote to his newfound friend and ally, Alexander I, about his recurring utopian fantasy, his {folie des grandeur} of destroying the British Navy. "A Russian-French army, maybe also Austrian, could be directed into Asia, via Constantinople. It would have England tremble before arriving on the Euphrates River, and would force her to kneel before the continent."

By that time, Bonaparte realized, a little too late, that it would have been easier for him to invade England directly than to win over the Spanish clergy. This led him to a miscalculation of the religious factor, but not as the Martinist advocate, Hilaire Belloc, had speculated about. Napoleon did know how to deal with the {religious question} in Spain, contrary to what Belloc believed. Bonaparte had caused a successful bloodbath, as any good student of Roman Emperor Julian and Diocletien would have done. However, he did not realize that

he had been entirely fooled by his British controlled, Foreign Affairs advisor, Talleyrand, and that while he was losing hold of what he had gained from the Austrians and the Italians, on the continent, he was also losing heavily to the British, on the high seas. By being forced to abandon certain territorial gains, he was restoring to the former powers the very means they were to use to defeat him; he was giving them the means of his own downfall.

Bonaparte was running out of steam, and was beginning to have a breakdown. He was, shall we say at least, "confused," as he was giving contradictory orders to both his brother Joseph, and to his Minister of Defense, at the same time. In early February 1813, he wrote to Joseph: "The time lost is irretrievable; the whole thing is going to turn sour." However, on February 9, he also told his Minister of Defense, Henri Clarke: "Always be ready to take the offensive, to threaten the take over of Lisbon and to conquer Portugal, if the British were to weaken their army in Spain." Sorel also noticed the paradox and did not miss to report on the madness of the moment: "Paradoxical order, order of a sinister irony addressed to a king who is in despair, who has lost three thirds of his kingdom, who enters in his capital and comes out of it again; like a bad sailor who, under contrary winds, brings his badly beaten ship to the shore, gets off of it then gets back on again, ready to go out." (Sorel, Op. Cit., V.8. p.83.) This is the end of the road for the Bonapartes in Spain. Napoleon has no more combinations, he began to contemplate the recall of Joseph back to France, and returning Ferdinand VII to take Spain back.

8.2 THE BLOOD CULT OF {LOS HERMANOS PENITENTES}

It was during this period, from 1810-1811 that the Spanish colonies of the Americas rose up against Spain and, one nation after another began to proclaim its independence. After Joseph Bonaparte was made king of Spain in 1808, the French army was decimated and was thrown out of Spain. In 1814, Ferdinand VII (1814-1833) was put back on the throne to restore the absolute monarchy of the "ancien regime", including the Inquisition with its ferocious reactionary persecutions. The return of Ferdinand to power meant that the bloodthirsty beast-man was put back in its cage, until yet another time, when peace would become

disturbed again. Such is the peace of the Beast-Man: the quietness that is imposed after the terror by blood letting.

An example of such a feared beast-man potential is the currently "contained" Catholic blood-cult of the {***Hermanos Penitentes***}, which is one of the models of {***executioner-victim***} that Martinist, Joseph de Maistre had considered, and in which one takes pleasure in admiring someone suffering and enjoy ones own suffering at the same time. Such blood-cults still exist today throughout Spain, Portugal, and the Americas.

Today, there exists in the southwest of the United States, particularly in New Mexico and Colorado, a blood-cult called {***Los Hermanos Penitentes del Tercer Orden de Franciscanos***} (The Flagellant Brotherhood of the Third Order of Franciscans). The cult might also be related to {***La Cofradia de Nuestro Padre Jesus, Nazareno.***} (The Fraternity of Our Father Jesus of Nazareth). The {***Hermanos Penitentes***} is a blood-cult, which carries out flagellation practices and crucifixions during Holy Week, in the remote mountains of New Mexico. Since 1889, the Roman Catholic Bishop of Santa Fe had officially condemned the practice, which still persists in the remote villages of New Mexico, and Colorado.

According to Historian Dorothy Woodward, "The sect appeared in Italy as early as 1210. Although sometimes credited to the preaching of the Franciscan, St. Anthony of Padua, he seems not to have founded any of the flagellant groups." (Dorothy Woodward, {***Penitentes***}, p.124.) The order is reported to have been founded, some 400 years ago, in Spain, and has been reported in other European countries and the Americas. In 1539, this Inquisition brotherhood was banned in France and a Royal Edicts of Henry IV called for "disarming and dissolving" the group, in 1585. The first occurrence of self-flagellation in the United States has been recorded in 1598, in a Franciscan congregation of New Mexico. (Martin Saint Leon, {***Histoire des Corporations de Metiers***}, p.284.)

According to the Catholic Encyclopedia, The Hermanos Penitentes [Brotherhood of the Penitents] is a group of catholic lay men who practice violent and bloody rituals of flagellation and crucifixion to atone for their sins. "***The ceremony of the initiation, which takes place during Holy Week, is simple, excepting the final test. The candidate is escorted to the {morada} (abode), the***

home, or council house, by two or more Penitentes where, after a series of questions and answers consisting in the main of prayers, he is admitted. He then undergoes various humiliations. First he washes the feet of all present, kneeling before each; then he recites a long prayer, asking pardon for any offence he may have given. If any one present has been offended by the candidate, he lashes the offender on the bare back. Then comes the last and crucial test: four or six incisions, in the shape of a cross, are made just below the shoulders of the candidate with a piece of flint."... "Fifty years ago the Hermanos Penitentes would issue from their {morada} (in some places as Taos, N.M., three hundred strong), stripped to the waist and scourging themselves, led by the {acompanadores} (escorts), and preceded by a few Penitentes dragging heavy crosses {maderos}; the procession was accompanied by a throng, singing Christian hymns. Other modes of self-castigation were often resorted to; on Good Friday, it was the custom to bind one of the brethren to a cross, as in a crucifixion. At present, no "crucifixions" take place, though previous to 1896, they were annual, in many places in New Mexico and Colorado.}" [Catholic Encyclopedia]

This blood-cult has reportedly reached its peak during and after the Civil War, from 1850 to 1890. This is also the period when the Bonaparte Clan and their generals were most active in the Americas. After several attempts made by Archbishop Salpointe of Santa Fe to abolish the flagellation and crucifixion practices altogether, in 1886, the resisting Penitentes were ordered to disband, by 1889. As a result the centrally controlled society was weakened but remained active. "*In Taos, Carmel, San Mateo, and a few other places, they are still numerous and continue their barbarous practices, though more secretly.*"

In an undated article entitled *{The Penitent Brethren}*, Chas. Lebebyre reported that in 1930, a reporter by the name of Carl Taylor was murdered by what the author suspected to be members of the Blood cult of the Penitentes. Taylor was an investigative reporter attempting to write the story of this blood cult, and was found shot after he had been probing too deeply in their secrets. Lebebyre reported that "*In the secret depths of the mountains [near Casa Loma and Los Alamos. P.B.], which still conceal the truth about the Seven Cities of Cibola and the legendary "Cities That Died of Fear." The Brotherhood in Blood is dedicated with extreme religious fervor to the virtues of agonizing pain and preserving its*

secrets with blood. The Penitent Brothers of the Blood of Christ of the Order of Literal Penitents were first founded in Spain centuries ago."... "Even in 1930, they were rumored to number thousands in their ranks, mainly composed of the proud descendents of Spanish-American stock as opposed to the indigenous Indian peoples."

Lebebyre made the following description of the blood ritual practice of a Penitentes Crucifixion based on what he found in Carl Taylor's notes. He wrote:

"{Their forty-day penitential begins each Ash Wednesday and every Friday night during the Lenten period. Grimly black-robed gunmen merge with the shadows along the mountains to guard the processions which wind up towards the peaks. First come the pipers leading the black-robed marchers, then the torchbearers, and finally the most macabre figure of all - the Chosen One...El Cristo, staggering beneath the weight of the gigantic cross which he bears alone upon his naked body. The cross, constructed from the heavy wood of the mountains, is sometimes thirty feet long. The Christ - El Cristo - stumbles and slithers on the blood which streams from his body. But never once does he drop his cross as he staggers on to meet his destiny on El Calvario.

"Behind him comes another masked figure, wielding a many-lashed whip with which he flays the Chosen One. And following in the rear come the "faithful", also masked, muttering prayers and singing songs of praise that yet another man has been chosen for the greatest honor of all, this Oberammergau, in which a living man is nailed to the cross in complete emulation of Jesus.

"It is up to the individuals present how much self-inflicted pain they lay upon themselves at the climax of all of this on Good Friday, but as their Cristo is pinned to the cross by his hands and feet exactly as Jesus Christ was, the most fanatical have been known to strip the very skin from their backs and chests in a frenzy of adoration.

"Once the nails are driven into the Cristo's hands and feet, a crown of cruel barbed yucca thorns is pressed onto his temple until the blood flows. And often the sacrificial flint blade is used to carve yet another cross upon the flesh of the crucified chosen one.

"For twenty four hours, the Cristo hangs there while the "faithful" scream, sob, and lash themselves throughout the night in atonement. Finally, if the Cristo has survived, he is gently lowered from the cross and carried off amid great acclamation, showered with gifts and honor and wined and dined for the rest of Easter.

But often he dies. Then his corpse is stowed away in a secret burial place which, for hundreds of years, has been known only to the "Elders" of the cult.}" (p.155-56.)

Such practices of so-called "purification" are nothing but satanic practices of {*atonement by self-sacrifice*}. These are the satanic practices that Bonaparte had revived on a grand scale in Spain, and across Europe, and that the Synarchist/Martinist Cheneyacs are preparing to unleash under the guise of {*purgative violence*} against the world population today.

The Martinist plan of Joseph de Maistre, during the French Revolution, was identical with the Spanish Inquisition deployments of the {Penitents}. The nations had to save their honor for the day of the {*monarchist regeneration*}, that is, for the return of Louis XVIII in France, and the return of Ferdinand VII, in Spain.

For this "regeneration" to be successful, the ruins of the old regimes had to be eliminated and a new "restoration" had to be built for the future monarchy. This meant the elimination of aristocratic privileges, and the establishment of a {*theocratic authority*}, a synarchy in which the apocalypse of terror was to be the cleansing prelude for the magnificent return of God's glory on earth.

For the beast-man of Maistre, Providence permitted that the blood of the suffering innocent be spilled, especially for the sins of the guilty. The miseries of the Revolution were the atonement for France's lack of Christian leadership in Europe. In Spain, the atonement was reflected in the expiation for the "greed of the people, and their excessive pride." The bloodshed could only be stopped when "the genius of the people decided to return to the Catholic Mission." As Joseph de Maistre put it: "I don't know toward which great unity we are marching! ... France shall preach religion to Europe, and never we shall have seen such great

propaganda in the matter." Saint-Yves d'Alveydre answered that it was toward a unity of all nations of Europe, under a single theocracy, bringing together science, religion, the State, and the Church under a single Catholic Orthodox Pope.

However, according to Maistre, if nations do not accept this higher purpose dictated by the "synarchist authority of God Himself," then the Martinists predict that a terrible punishment shall befall their populations. All nations shall become fanaticized to accept their "regeneration" in the manner that each of their tradition and religion requires it; be they Jews, Christians, Muslim, Hindus, etc. In Spain, the {*Penitentes*} were the model for such self-inflicting atonement, as an entire population increased its merit by proportionately increasing its suffering in the sacred horror of blood. This had been the synarchist program initiated by the beast-man Bonaparte.

9.2 CONCLUSION: HOW RUSSIA VANQUISHED THE BEAST-MAN.

For Joseph de Maistre, Napoleon Bonaparte, and all of their Martinist followers, there was a visceral hatred of the Peace of Westphalia of 1648, primarily because the principle of the {*Advantage of the other*}, established by that Treaty, not only forgave the sins of the past, but also destroyed the satanic principle of {*atonement by self-sacrifice*}. It is also very ironic that certain cynical sophists would have you believe that the advantage of the other is a form of self-sacrifice! It is precisely the opposite, which is true. The Russian strategy vis-a-vis Bonaparte demonstrates that most vividly.

From this vantage-point, thinking that his actions were so evil that he thought people would admire him and worship him out of fear, the Bonaparte beast-man became, himself, taken by the greatest fear; that is, the fear that a Satanist has of love and forgiveness. This is how, by pardoning the sins and eliminating the very principle of {*atonement by self-sacrifice*}, the optimism of the Peace of Westphalia became, for the synarchists, the most terrible axiomatic enemy in the history of warfare. From that optimistic vantage point, it is worth remembering what Pope Jean Paul II said about {*atonement*}: "{*Oh wonderful sin that gave us such a Great Redeemer.*}"

The sublime moment of the Russian people and the tragic defeat of Bonaparte's {*Grande Armee*}, during the winter of 1812, reveals one of the most important truths of history. No other spectacle in the history of warfare has ever been so moving, no unraveling of events has been so grandiose and predictable in its fate, and nowhere has a strategic defense shown a more powerful force of the nature of the Peace of Westphalia principle in action.

The {*Grande Armee*} of Napoleon Bonaparte was standing firm and ready, in all of its terrifying might, before a Russian Army that could not be defeated, like the English army standing before the invincible Jeanne d'Arc at the siege of Orleans, in 1430. The power of the {*Grande Armee*} had been rendered completely ineffective and impotent by the lack of a target that would fight back.

This was the typical case of an inferior geometry having no effect whatsoever on a superior geometry. Bonaparte simply could not understand why the Russians would not respond to his invasion by counter attacking him according to the "usual rule of engagement." The Russian strategy was to not attack the {*Grande Armee*} until winter had created such impossible conditions that the French were forced to retreat. Thus, the Beast-man's "liberating" idea was no longer working, not even his Satanic principle of {*atonement by self-sacrifice*}, which had worked so well in Spain, was not working in Russia. As a matter of fact, it was precisely the idea of the victim being its own executioner that caused Bonaparte to destroy himself.

The Russians refused to fight Bonaparte at his own game, and had changed the rules of war on him. They decided to flank the invading {*Grande Armee*} by burning their own cultural center, Moscow, their own towns, their own wooden houses, their own cattle, their own grain reserves, and gave the appearance of a mass suicide, by burying themselves in the depth of winter, as if in desperation, with only the Icons of their faith to keep them hoping. If the reader thinks this was a replay of the human sacrifice of Spain, think again. This was not a war of desperation, this was a triumph of the Peace of Westphalia against the pillage and raping of the Beast-man. Once the sources of looting were emptied, the Russian people knew that the enemy invader was going to perish. They knew that, when the first fire was lit in Moscow.

Here the Russian people were united, in spirit, with the original French national policy of Lazare Carnot's strategic defense. It was the brother-in-law of Frederick Schiller, W , who had proposed this strategy to Czar Alexander. The Russian national spirit became an expression of the principle of the {*Advantage of the other*}, that is, by eliminating self-interest, the source of Bonaparte's lust, the patriotism of the Russian people demonstrated the superiority of the just war in defense of the nation-state. Bonaparte's {*Grande Armee*} was about to perish from his leader's greed and ambition. Bonaparte had met the destiny of his own paradoxical fate; the paradox by which all imperial designs must inevitably fail against the power of {*agape*}; because the {*Advantage of the other*} leaves all of its adversaries before a promise land which is empty! This is why the conquering force of an invader cannot destroy the superior force of a strategic national defense.

Thus, the beast-man of war, Napoleon Bonaparte, was swallowed in the void of his own futile attempt at conquering an enemy which was not there to fight him back; and the entire conquering twenty five year effort of the French Revolution ended there, fruitlessly, at the doors of Moscow. It was the French Revolution itself, which appeared in its nakedness, and all a once, as a completely wasted failure. Ultimately, with the inexorable winter coming in, the flowing back motion of the {*Grande Armee*} folded on itself, and engulfed itself in its own {*folie des grandeurs*}.

SYNARCHY MOVEMENT OF EMPIRE

BOOK I

CHAPTER 7

CHAPTER 7

THE EARLY SYNARCHY MOVEMENT OF EMPIRE

**THE FRENCH REVOLUTION of 1789-1815:
A SYNARCHIST INTERNATIONAL EXERCISE
IN PURGATIVE VIOLENCE**

**7.1 JOSEPH DE MAISTRE, JACQUES NECKER,
AND MALLET DU PAN**

- 1.2 INTRODUCTION**
- 2.2 THE PROBLEM OF THE BALANCE OF POWERS**
- 3.2 THE NON-EXISTING BRITISH CONSTITUTION**
- 4.2 APPENDIX I. SHORT BIOGRAPHY OF JOSEPH DE
MAISTRE**

1.2 INTRODUCTION

In his official capacity as correspondent of the Ministry of Foreign affairs from Sardaigne to Lausanne, Switzerland, Senator Joseph de Maistre became personally acquainted and involved with Geneva bankers, Jacques Necker, and Mallet du Pan, and began to write against the idea of a Constitutional framework for European countries, such as was established by the United States of America, in 1789. The intent of those three British agents was to have France adopt a British Parliamentary system.

These attacks against the idea of an American constitutional form of government were obviously aimed at sabotaging the Constitution framework that Jean Sylvain Bailly and Lafayette had introduced in the French National Assembly, as early as 1789, which had the intention of implementing a {public credit based} American type of Constitutional Monarchy. The 1789 creation of the American Constitution had become, everywhere in Europe, the political event of the century, and the central bankers swore to never have anything similar be implemented in Europe, and especially not in France.

The {Revue des Etudes Maistriennes}, no. 3, 1977, by Jean Louis Darcel, {Joseph de Maistre et la Revolution Francaise}, established a direct crucial connection between Joseph de Maistre, Jacques Necker, and Mallet du Pan, in Lausanne, Switzerland, after April 1793. Darcel's documentary sources are based on a book by R. Triomphe, {J. de Maistre}, Droz, 1968, which I don't have access to. Triomphe is said to have identified "how Joseph de Maistre, substitute senator (1780-1788), then senator (1788), is judging the events that the French financial and political crisis portended."

Other references from Darcel on the Necker-financial question, include: {Etudes Maistriennes} no. 1, Chambery, 1975, see pages pp.11, 16, 23. See also Henry Grange, {*Les idées de Necker*}, Paris Klincksieck, 1974, p.397, containing a letter which "{REVEALS THE ENTHUSIASM OF J. DE MAISTRE FOR THE GENEVA BANKER.}" The letter was published by Francois Descostes in {Necker ecrivain et financier}, Chambery, 1896, p.11. Descostes, who is

considered the no. 1 expert on Maistre, has also published {Joseph de Maistre inconnu}, Venise, Cagliari, Rome, Paris, Champion, 1905; {Joseph de Maistre pendant la Revolution}, Tours, Alfred Mame, 1895; {La Revolution Francaise vue de l'etranger}, Mallet du Pan a Berne et a Londres, Tours, Alfred Mame, 1897.

During the period preceding the establishment of the American Constitution, from about 1783 until 1789, the European enemies of the United States, especially the two Geneva bankers, Jacques Necker and Mallet du Pan, in association with the British Government of Prime Minister Shelburne, were seeking out oligarchical specialists, who were trained in law, to look into the means by which, European nations would be capable of countering the mounting popularity of the American Constitution which had just been made public in 1789.

Joseph de Maistre was approached by those two Geneva bankers, in Lausanne, to provide them with some constitutional arguments that would prevent revolutionary France, especially, from adopting a constitutional framework, which, like the Americans had done, would incorporate in its Constitution an explicit article, calling for the authority of government to issue {public credit}, and thus, take that decisive authority out of the hands of central bankers. Maistre accepted, and, from 1784 to 1788, he had written two {Memoires}: one {on Parliaments}, and another on the {Venality of Charges}. Both remained unpublished to this day.

During early 1789, Mallet du Pan himself had written a series of articles entitled {Sur la Constitution de l'Angleterre} (On the British Constitution), and {Sur la Declaration des droits} (On the Declaration of Rights). These works advocated the absolute necessity for France to adopt the British parliamentary system, institute a {balance of power} between the people, the nobles and the crown, and create an intermediary body of advisors, such as the {Privy Council}, which must assure that the authority over the issuance of credit were to be controlled and maintained strictly in the hands of central bankers. In his article on {Joseph de Maistre et la Revolution francaise,} in {*Revue des etudes maistriennes*,} #3, 1977, Jean-Louis Darcel confirmed that Joseph de Maistre had a "very sustained relationships with Mallet du Pan," especially since April 1793 in Lausanne.

2.2 THE PROBLEM OF THE BALANCE OF POWERS

The central issue that Maistre undertook was to find legal ways and means to circumvent the problems represented by the separation of powers; that is, between the executive and legislative powers within a constitutional monarchy. In other words, will the keys of the King's Treasury be in the hands of a Minister of his choice, or will they be in the hands of a legislative body, such as the National Assembly. Necker and Mallet du Pan saw, only too clearly, that leaving the control of {credit extension} in the hands of the National Assembly, as Bailly and Lafayette had made an explicit requirement in their constitutional proposal, meant that a massive purge of {venal public office} would have to take place, and that the bankers would lose their central banking prerogative of credit issuance at usurious interest rates.

On the other hand, if the monarchy were not reformed and the venality of public office were to persist, there would be a popular revolt, and the National Assembly would adopt the American system of {public credit.} Maistre agreed that some kind of Monarchical reform had to be undertaken. Necker was totally opposed to giving the reins of power to the National Assembly, but also saw the danger of continuing the regime of absolute monarchy. All three, Necker, Mallet du Pan, and Joseph de Maistre finally agreed that France had to adopt the British parliamentary system. That meant establishing legal means for the creation of what Maistre called an {intermediary body} between the King and the National Assembly

In his promotion of the British parliamentary system, published in {*Mercure de France*}, January 17, 1789, Mallet du Pan argued for the establishment in France of the {balance of power} of the English system, including a Commons, a House of Lords, and the Crown. Mallet made the claim that John Adams, former Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States in London, during the Peace Negotiations of 1783, had “written three volumes proving the correctness and the excellence of the principles of the English Constitution.” And Mallet du Pan added: “It is not an insignificant singularity to hear this apology in the mouth of one of the most enlightened authors of the last Revolution in

America.”

3.2 THE NON-EXISTING BRITISH CONSTITUTION.

In the preface of his book entitled {*Generative Principle of Political Constitutions*}, Maistre makes it immediately explicite that he is against the American Constitution, and in favor of the British system of government. His main argument resides in the extravagant idea that a "constitution should not be written," and he goes to David Hume to buttress his argument: "*It is the circumstance in the English constitution, (the right of remonstrance) which it is most difficult, or rather altogether impossible, to regulate by laws; it must be governed by certain delicate ideas of propriety and decency, rather than by any rule or prescription.*" (Hume, {History of England}). On the other hand, says Maistre, "*Thomas Paine is of another opinion, as it is well known. He pretends that a constitution does not exist unless one can put it into his pocket.*"

In his opening remarks Maistre cannot help but reveal the perverse nature of his intention. He shows how the principles of the Political Economy of a Constitutional Nation-State is entirely dependent on the {Invisible Hand} of free trade. Witness how the following questions and answers are an explicite attack against the three fundamental principles of the American Constitution; that is, {*Sovereignty, General Welfare, and Posterity*}.

"{How do you go about establishing a powerful State? '*It is required first and foremost to favor population growth by all means possible.*' - *On the contrary: any law tending to favor increases in population, without including other considerations, is wrong. It is even necessary to establish inside of the State, a certain moral force, which tends to diminish the number of marriages, and tends to make them less premature. The advantage of the births over deaths, established from calculations, tend to demonstrate only the high rate of miserable people, etc., etc. French economists started to demonstrate the truth of this fact: the beautiful work of M. Malthus brought it to its rightful conclusion.*"

"How do you go about preventing scarcity and famines? - 'Nothing simpler. You must forbid the export of grains.' - To the contrary, you must offer a premium to those who export them. The example and authority of England have forced us to swallow up this paradox." (Joseph de Maistre, {Essai sur le principe generateur des constitutions politiques et des autres institutions humaines}, Paris, A la Societe Typographique, 1814, p. ij.)

These two statements against **{population growth}** and against economic **{protectionist measures}** show only too clearly the evil intention behind Maistre's choice of policy. The **{invisible hand}** is the master of human destiny, and national leader must respond primarily, not to the needs of the people, but to the needs of the **{little green men}** under the floor boards of the stock markets. Thus, Maistre's preference for the British parliamentary system as the best of all possible world.

Maistre admires the British constitution primarily because it holds together only by default. ***"It stands only by its exceptions."*** Comments Maistre, ***"The {habeas corpus} for example has been so often suspended and for such a long time, that it is permitted to doubt if the exception has not become the rule."*** (p.7) It is not very difficult, indeed, to show the weaknesses of the British Constitution, since England has never had a real constitution, and that is why Maistre like it so much.

The reason for Maistre's preference of the British parliamentary system to any other system, it is because it is run by secrecy, by a **{Privy Council}** of the King. In fact, the British Government is able to solve all of the problems that the French constitutional system was unable to solve, because the **{Privy Council}** decides on all possible conflicts between the King and the House of Commons, between the executive and the legislative.

One example should suffice to make the point. On June 26 1807, the issue of the King's ability to dissolve the Parliament in Session came up during the "séance" of the House of Commons. The objection came up immediately calling for the **{Constitutional Law}** that gave the King such a right. There was no such law, of course. After long debates it was finally decided that the King had that

right when the question was of some importance, and was agreed upon and decided by the Body of the {*Privy Council*}. De Maistre noted that "*a Member made the observation that {England is governed by a Body (the Privy Council) that the Constitution ignores, but that she lets be.} There you have it, in this wise and justly famous England, a Body which governs and does everything in truthfulness; but that the constitution ignores.*"... "*The real {British Constitution} is that public spirit, admirable, unique, infallible, above all praise; which runs everything, which conserves everything, which saves everything. - What is written is nothing.*}"

But why does de Maistre insist that the {*Privy Council*}, the real governing Body of England, is superior to the American constitutional framework? It is for the same reason that the fundamentalist neo-conservatives believe in their Armageddon theory. The issue is blind belief that {Man is inherently evil} and that "only God can establish a constitution." As long as people believe that, the little green men under the floor boards will continue to have their way. De Maistre explains:

"To this general rule, {that no constitution can be made or written, à priori,} we know of but one single exception; that is, the legislation of Moses. This alone was cast, so to speak, like a statue, and written out, even to its minutest details, by a wonderful man, who said, Fiat! Without his work ever having need of being corrected, improved, or in any way modified, by himself or others. This, alone, has set time at defiance, because it owed nothing to time, and expected nothing from it; this alone has lived fifteen hundred years; and even after eighteen new centuries have passed over it, since the great anathema which smote it on the fated day, we see it, enjoying, if I may say so, a second life, binding still, by I know not what mysterious bond, which has no human name, the different families of a people, which remain dispersed without being disunited. So that, like attraction, and by the same power, it acts at a distance, and makes one whole, of many parts widely separated from each other. Thus, this legislation lies evidently, for every intelligent conscience, beyond the circle traced around human power; and this magnificent exception to a general law, which has only yielded once, and yielded only to its Author, alone demonstrates the Divine mission of the great Hebrew Lawgiver...."

"But, since every constitution is divine in its principle, it follows, that man can do nothing in this way, unless he reposes himself upon God, whose instrument he then becomes. Now, this is a truth, to which the whole human race in a body, have ever rendered the most signal testimony. Examine history, which is experimental politics, and we shall there invariably find the cradle of nations surrounded by priests, and the Divinity constantly invoked to the aid of human weakness....

"Man in relation with his Creator is sublime, and his action is creative: on the contrary, so soon as he separates himself from God, and acts alone, he does not cease to be powerful, for this is a privilege of his nature; but his action is negative, and tends only to destroy....

"There is not in the history of all ages a single fact which contradicts these maxims. No human institution can endure unless supported by the Hand, which supports all; that is to say, if it is not especially consecrated to Him at its origin. The more it is penetrated with the Divine principle, the more durable it will be.}" (Joseph de Maistre, {*Essay on the Generative Principle of Political Constitutions*}, (Boston: Little, Brown, 1847), pp. 41-42, 93-95, 129-130,

It is important to study these statements well, because they represent the core justification of all British and otherwise European attacks against the American Constitutional Republic, from 1789 until today, including the current internal sabotage of the American Constitution, under the guise of the {*Patriot One*} and {*Patriot II*} legislative proposals by Attorney General, John Ashcroft. It should not be surprising to anyone to realize that synarchist Ashcroft is a fanatical follower of Joseph de Maistre ideas.

4.2 APPENDIX I: SHORT BIOGRAPHY OF JOSEPH DE MAISTRE

The following short biography of Joseph de Maistre is extracted from The book of Robert Triomphe, {*Joseph de Maistre, Etude sur la vie et sur la doctrine d'un materialiste mystique,*} Geneve, Librairie Droz, 1968.

Joseph de Maistre was born on April 1, 1753, in Chambéry, Savoy, which was a French language territory, which was governed from Turin by the King of Sardinia. His father was a magistrate for the Senate of Savoy who married Christine Desmots, and had fifteen children. Joseph was the third child and was originally educated by Jesuit preceptors, and later by Catholic secular priests at the Royal College of Chambéry.

He entered into freemasonry, in 1773, and was initiated as a freemason at the Three Mortars Lodge. In 1778, he left the Three Mortars Lodge and joined the Lodge of Sincerity. He became highly influenced by Claude Louis de Saint Martin and joined him, with Jean Baptiste Willermoz, the disciple of Martines de Pasqually, in Lyon.

After the invasion of Savoy by the French troops in 1792, Maistre moved to Lausanne Switzerland, and was employed by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Turin, as correspondent in charge of secret service information bureau of Savoy. Maistre was involved in the preparation of an Austro-Sardinian offensive against France, which failed in 1793. In 1795, he participated in another failed coup, the Quiberon plot, and was involved in the union project of Savoy with Switzerland. In a sense he was a Swiss agent working with his close friend Mallet du Pan. Mallet du Pan helped Maistre publish his first works.

In Lausanne, Maistre became a disciple of the British reactionary Edmund Burke. He began to form a strong ideal of theocracy, and from a Gallican that he was, Maistre became an ultramontane. He published his first book in 1797, the

{ Considerations on France }.

At the beginning of 1797, he moved from Lausanne to Turin, then to Aoste, and finally ended up in Venice on a false passport. The victories of Souvorov brought him back to Turin where he became regent of Sardaigne in Cagliari, in 1800. After three years on the Island, he was sent away from his wife and children, as the Sardinian Ambassador to Saint Petersburg. The King of Sardaigne had become dispossessed and was forced to live in Rome on a pension from the British Government, and the Tsar of Russia. Thus Maistre was both a British and a Swiss agent. Maistre's only official function as Ambassador was to maintain the flow of funds for his King's pension, on which he was himself, living. He spent fifteen years in Russia, writing, listening, and profiling the orthodox population. This is where Maistre wrote most of his works.

Maistre had also been the key promoter of the Jesuits in Russia. In 1812, when he thought he was going to have a great impact on the policy of the Tsar, he was first isolated, then pushed out of Russia along with the expulsion of the Jesuits. He then returned to Turin, in 1817, where he was nominated the head of the Grand Chancellery, with the title of Minister of State. His last book, *{The Pope}* and the *{Evenings of Saint Petersburg}* became the political doctrine for the restoration of Louis XVII in France. Maistre died of paralysis on February 26, 1821.

In the preface of his book, *Triomphe* lists the most famous French ideologues who followed in the footsteps of Maistre. They are:

- Lamennais,
- Montalembert,
- The disciples of Saint Simon,
- Auguste Comte,
- Sainte-Beuve.
- Ernest Psichari,
- Mareshal Foch,
- Freemasons, Georges Goyau, Emile Dermenghen, Francois Vermale, Paul

Vuillaud.

- Albert Camus {L'homme revolte},

Some of Maistre's critics, like Albert Blanc, {*Memoires politiques et correspondance diplomatique de Joseph de Maistre (jusqu'en 1810)*}, Paris, 1858. Blanc accused Maistre of "jacobinism."

Surprisingly, Triomphe had begun his investigation into what he called the "Maistrarian legend" by establishing the truth, as only a student of the Jesuits was able to do, that is, in the manner of a typical sophist. Triomphe wrote: "Knowing full well that it was dangerous to expose his views publicly, especially when one pretends to only be seeking the public good, and the greatest glory of the Church, he (Maistre) worked very hard at giving to the aspirations of his vanity the appearance of virtue." In one word: Maistre was a no good liar. However, both Maistre and his biographer Triomphe were of the opinion that the more you wear the mask of virtue, the more the virtue itself has a chance of entering inside of your soul. However doubtful this may be, at least the entire generation of baby boomers does believe that.

END OF BOOK I