

# **SYNARCHY MOVEMENT OF EMPIRE**

## **BOOK III**

\*\*\*\*\*

**THE SYNARCHY INTERNATIONAL**

\*\*\*\*\*

**by  
Pierre Beaudry**

**Leesburg Va. June 20, 2005**



**BEASTMAN FRANCO**

## **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 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.**

# **SYNARCHY MOVEMENT OF EMPIRE**

## **BOOK III**

\*\*\*\*\*

### **THE SYNARCHY INTERNATIONAL**

\*\*\*\*\*

#### **1.1 HOW THE SYNARCHIST INTERNATIONAL RAN THE SPANISH CIVIL WAR.....8**

- 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 BARCELONA TROTSKYITE EXPERIMENT: MAY 1937.**
- 9.2 THE AMBASSADOR'S REPORT TO WASHINGTON.**
- 10.2 THE TANAKA PLAN AND THE BEASTMAN OF JAPAN.**

#### **2.1 FRENCH SYNARCHIST CONSTITUTION.....54**

- 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**
- 6.2 THE SYNARCHIST EUROPEAN CONSTITUTION**

**3.1 FAILURE OF THE SYNARCHY EUROPEAN CONSTITUTION .....33**

- 1.2 WHY THERE COULD NOT HAVE BEEN A VICHY CONSTITUTION**
- 2.2 THE NEW SYNARCHIST EUROPEAN CONSTITUTION**
- 4.2 HOW OLYMPIAN GODS THREATEN TO DROWN EUROPE.**
- 5.2 THE FALSE UNDERLYING ASSUMPTION OF SYNARCHISM**

**4.1 SOME FRENCH SYNARCHIST ACTIVITIES AFTER WORLD WAR II.....98**

- 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 ANTI-AMERICAN SYNARCHY INTERNATIONAL ....103**

- 1.2 RADICAL EUROPEAN SOURCE OF ANTI-AMERICANISM**
- 2.2- THE PARTI COMMUNAUTAIRE NATIONAL (PCN)**
- 3.2 - BERNARD ANTONY OF CHRETIENTE ET SOLIDARITE**
- 4.2 CHRISTIAN 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 JEAN-FRANCOIS THIRIART: A DELPHIC MODEL OF LAROCHE'S EURASIAN POLICY**
- 9.2 GEOPOLITICS OF THE FOURTH REICH.**
- 10.2 A REVIVAL OF {MITHRAIC STOICISM}: THE PURE EVIL OF POWER**
- 11.2 A PERVERTED “PROMETHEAN-VOLUNTARIST” WAR AGAINST AMERICA.**

**6.1 MAKARENKO AND THE BIPOLAR PERSONALITY ....152**  
**by Irene 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.**

**7.1 TCHAKHOTINE AND THE RAPE OF THE MASSES .....164**

**1.2 INTRODUCTION**

**2.2 SYNARCHIST ACTIVITIES OF TCHAKHOTINE**

**3.2 THE RAPE OF THE MASSES: EXPERIMENTS IN  
CONDITIONED REFLEXES**

**4.2 THE PAVLOVIAN METHOD OF CONDITIONED REFLEXES.**

**5.2 TORTURE AS AN INSTRUMENT OF BEHAVIOR MODIFICATION.**

**6.2 THE CONFUSION OF FICTION WITH REALITY:  
THE INVASION OF AMERICA FROM MARS**

**\*\*\*\*\***

# **SYNARCHY MOVEMENT OF EMPIRE**

## **BOOK III**

\*\*\*\*\*

### **THE SYNARCHY INTERNATIONAL**

\*\*\*\*\*

## **Chapter I**

### **1.1 HOW THE SYNARCHIST INTERNATIONAL RAN THE SPANISH CIVIL WAR.....8**

#### **1.2 INTRODUCTION**

#### **2.2 THE POLITICAL BACKGROUND OF THE SPANISH CIVIL WAR.**

#### **3.2 HOW THE SPANISH SECOND REPUBLIC WAS DESTROYED.**

#### **4.2 THE SYNARCHIST LOOTING OF SPANISH RAW MATERIALS.**

#### **5.2 THE CONDOR LEGION OF HITLER IN SPAIN: 1936**

#### **6.2 THE NAZI SLAUGHTER OF GUERNICA: APRIL 1937.**

#### **7.2 THE BARCELONA TROTSKYITE EXPERIMENT: MAY 1937.**

#### **8.2 THE AMBASSADOR'S REPORT TO WASHINGTON.**

#### **9.2 THE TANAKA PLAN AND THE BEASTMAN OF JAPAN.**

\*\*\*

## 1.2 INTRODUCTION

The romantic view of the Synarchy International insanity of launching and running the Spanish Civil War of 1936 to 1939 was to create chaos, anarchy, and perpetual revenge conflicts that would lead to an interminable world war. The irrational belief behind this monstrous operation is that out of chaos was to come a New Order, out of revolutionary bloodshed was to emerge the Providential Man, the Napoleonic Beast-Man. That is the same irrational belief, which is behind the Iraq war today, or behind the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. The Synarchy International thinks that out of chaos will come the Messiah, or out of Armageddon will come the rapture. It is all the same myth of cleansing and purifying with the spilling of blood by manipulating *{the fire in the minds of men}*, as US President, George W. Bush has planned. That was the mission of executioner Hitler in Spain; which was, in fact, the mission of restoring the doctrines of the Beast-Men Tomas Torquemada and Joseph de Maistre. The launching of the Spanish Civil War was not decided in Spain as such. That war was part of a one world fascist dictatorship offensive led by the Synarchy International banking system based in London, and coordinated primarily among predatory oligarchies and plutocracies of central bankers, from the United States, England, France, Italy, Switzerland, and Germany.

In that context, it can be considered that the Synarchist controlled British Labor Party support of the Popular Front, in July 1936, followed by Hitler's deployment into Spain, six days later in support of General Francisco Franco's insurrection, marked the actual beginning of World War II in Europe; that is, an initial gearing up of the fascist war machine aimed at destroying republican forms of governments in Europe, on the one hand, and launching a two prong war against the Soviet Union, on the other hand.

The synarchist bankers were confident that by instituting fascist regimes in Italy, Spain, Portugal, England, and France, they could safely deploy Hitler against the USSR, after Japan had succeeded, with its *{Tanaka Plan}*, in capturing Manchuria, China, and south East Asia, under its imperial domination. Then, this East-West world Axis power could invade the United States of America and submit the entire world to their fascist dictatorship; the ultimate aim being to reduce world populations through wars and disease and take control over the raw materials of the world.



### **3.2 THE POLITICAL BACKGROUND OF THE SPANISH CIVIL WAR.**

Spain represents a very complex culture which could not be covered properly in only a few pages. That is why this report will only attempt to identify a few elements of the characteristic beast-man phenomenon, as they pertain to what came to be known as the Spain Civil War, and which are specifically characteristic of Spain as such. The reason I start with a short timeline is to emphasize the stretto-like quality of the beginning of the Spanish Civil War, showing a few highlights of an otherwise very complex social, political, and cultural situation, which is to be found nowhere else in Europe.

I emphasize especially two very significant singularities of foreign intervention: first, the fact that the Italian intervention into Spain was prepared as early as 1926 and was actually launched in 1934. In other words, it was like the situation of France in 1940: the Fascists and the Nazis were invited in. Secondly, the British Labor Party, which was led by the Fabian Society wing of the Synarchy International, joined the civil war on July 20, 1936, that is, six full days before Hitler officially entered the war! In that context, I will attempt to show that, on the one hand, it was the British Fabian Society that set up the POUM anarchistic conditions for the Barcelona insurrection, for the benefit of the Fascist Axis powers invasion of Spain, and that, on the other hand, it was the British « nonintervention » sham which guaranteed the Fascist success, by preventing an adequate European defense of the legitimate Spanish Republican government.

This Nonintervention Committee, which should have been called the « hypocrisy synarchist committee », was created out of the British Foreign Office on September 9, 1936. Though it included up to 27 European nations, the Committee's debates on non-intervention were reserved exclusively to the representatives of France, Britain, Russia, Germany, and Italy. The closely chosen few were the British financial secretary to the Treasury, W. S. Morrison, who was the chairman, the French ambassador to London, Charles Corbin, the fascist ex-foreign secretary of Italy, Count Dino Grandi, the Russian ambassador to London, Ivan Mikhailovich Maisky, and the up and coming Nazi Ambassador, Joachim Ribbentrop, with his assistant, Prince Otto Bismarck, the grandson of the Iron Chancellor. Ribentrop had a brief moment of black humor truth when he declared, at the Nuremberg trial,

that the Non-Intervention Committee should have been called the « intervention committee ». Add to this combination the fact that during the Spanish Civil War, the British ambassador to Spain, Sir Henry Chilton, was pro Franco and was openly advocating that a victory for Franco would be to the advantage of Great Britain. Chilton also used his embassy in Madrid to safehouse active members of the Franco Fifth Column.

\*\*\*

A short time-line:

1. 1926: King Alfonso XIII and Miguel Primo de Rivera sign with Mussolini a secret agreement for an Italian military intervention into Spain, in favor of the Spanish monarchy.
2. Jan 1930: Fascist Dictator Primo de Rivera resigns.
3. Apr 1931: Alfonso XIII goes into exile. Second Republic is created.
4. May 1931: Manuel Azana, Minister of War, makes large military cuts.
5. Dec 1931 : Niceto Zamora is elected President of the Republic.
6. Aug 1932: General Jose Sanjurjo leads a military uprising.
7. Jan 1933: Anarchist uprising in Saragossa, Seville, Bilbao, and Madrid.
8. Oct 1933 : Primo de Rivera creates the Falange Espanola.
9. Dec 1933: Anarchist uprisings in Catalonia and Aragon.
10. Mar 1934: Mussolini gives arms to Spanish Junta.
11. Oct 1934: Manuel Azana is arrested and jailed in Barcelona.
12. Sep 1935: Andres Nin and Joaquin Maurin create the synthetic Communist Workers Party called { *Partiso Obrero de Unificacion Marxista* } (POUM).
13. Jan 1936: Electoral pact between Socialist and Communist Parties.
14. Jan 1936 : Manuel Azana creates Popular Front.
15. Feb 1936 : Popular Front wins general election.
16. Feb 1936 : Cortes grants amnesty to all insurrectionists.
17. Feb 1936 : General Emilio Mola is relieved of his command and sent to the Basque region of Pamplona.
16. Mar 1936: Falange Espanola banned by Popular Front government.
17. Mar 1936: Primo de Rivera charged with illegal arms trafficking.
18. Apr 1936: Niceto Alcala Zamora is deposed as President of the Republic.
18. Apr 1936: Emilio Mola and Gonzalo Queipo de Liano prepare

- military uprising.
- 19.May 1936 : Manuel Azana is elected President of Spanish Republic.
  - 20.May 1936 : Civil Guards kill 19 leftists at the Yeste rally.
  - 21.Jun 1936 : One million workers go on general strike.
  - 20.July 1936 : General Jose Sanjurjo is killed in a plane crash.  
British Labor Party supports Popular Front government and triggers Spanish Civil War.
  - 21.July 1936: Luis Bolin flies Francisco Franco to Morocco to organize uprising. Successful military uprising in Seville.  
Franco issues manifesto. Series of revenge assassinations.
  - 22.July 1936: Prime Minister Jose Giral asks France for arms.
  - 24 July 1936: General Emilio Mola creates Fascist Committee of National Defense. Anti-Fascist Militia Committee creates Anarchist Brigade. Mola's forces capture Granada.
  - 26 July 1936: Adolph Hitler gives military support to Franco.  
Soviet Comintern joins International Brigades.
  - 28 July 1936: German airlift of rebel troops from Morocco.
  - 30 July 1936: 9 Italian airlift bombers arrive in Morocco.
  - 2 Aug.1936: Leon Blum announces France's policy of nonintervention into Spanish Civil War.
  - 24 Sept 1936: 24 bombers leave Sarzona, Italy, for Spain.
  - Dec 1936: George Orwell joins the POUM Barcelona militia...

\*\*\*

When one studies closely this short timeline, one is truck by how the unfolding of the events reflects a sequence of well-timed provocations that were tailor-made from the profiles of the Spanish government, the Spanish military command, the separatist and anarchist populations, and world political opinion. The opening moments of the Spanish Civil War were artificially set up to appear to be an ideological conflict between communism and rebel Spanish forces. That was a total lie peddled primarily by London and their chief asset George Orwell.

As the former Ambassador of the United States to Spain, Claude G. Bowers, demonstrated, « The Spanish temperament is not compatible with communism.» (Claude G. Bowers, {*My mission to Spain, Watching the Rehearsal for World War II*}, Simon and Schuster, New York, 1954, p. 319.) Furthermore, as early as June 1936, ambassador Bowers reported to U.S. Secretary of State, Cordell Hull, what the true elements behind this so-

called « civil war » were. Bowers itemized those internal elements as follows:

- « (1) The monarchists, who wanted the King back with the old regime.
- « (2) The great landowners, who wished to preserve the feudalistic system by ending agrarian reforms.
- « (3) The industrialists and financiers, who wished to put, and keep, the workers ‘in their place’
- « (4) The hierarchy of the church, hostile to the separation of church and state.
- « (5) The military clique that had in mind a military dictatorship.
- « (6) The Fascist element which was bent on the creation of a totalitarian state. » (Bowers, Op. Cit. p. 253)

As seen from the inside, those components make the Spanish Civil War look more like a fourth Carlist war. In substance, these were the « visible internal motives » behind the Synarchy International deployment called the Spanish Civil War. The less visible motivation, that Bowers discovered only as events began to unfold, was the German and Italian perpetration of a Beast-Man genocide experiment that was then invading Spain from the outside.

\*\*\*

Ever since the days of Isabella and Ferdinand, Spain had been artificially kept politically unified by the Catholic Inquisition of Tomas Torquemada, and the most backward hereditary and proprietary monarchical system of Europe, expressing the weakness of its culture especially through the rivalry between the Habsburg Carlists and the French Bourbons on the one side, and the rivalry between the Church and the Military on the other side. Unfortunately, the great geniuses of Servantes and Goya, and the limited but heroic efforts of Carlos III and Campomanes, were not sufficient to eradicate the millennial beast-man tradition of Spain. Thus, when Beast-Man Bonaparte invaded Spain in 1808, the already backward, uneducated, and superstitious character of the diverse agrarian populations of Spain was

reinforced to the point that a cultural unity of the nation became virtually impossible. Spain was ripe for a divide and conquer operation.

From that day on, the territory of Spain has been maintained in a divided and decentralized series of cultural entities, each demanding its own relative autonomy. So, in a way, it was the geo-political distribution of the backward populations of Spain themselves, which became the basis for defining a standard of political life at the turn of the twentieth century, and became the standard for population extermination by the Axis power of Hitler and Mussolini. The Synarchy International reasoning was: « If the proud semi-autonomous populations of Spain can be subdued under a fascist dictatorship, any other population of Europe can also be submitted to it. »

These semi-autonomous regions were the Northwestern parts of the Galicia region, the Asturia region, the Basque-Navarre region, and the Catalonia region. In the central area there are Castile and Aragon including the region of Madrid and Estremadura. In the south, there are the western latifundist region of Andalusia, with their master class of Castilian warriors and landless peasants, the southern region of Grenada, and the southeastern region of Murcia and Valencia. The exacerbation of all of these semi-autonomous regional entities became natural hotbeds for rivalries and conflicts, among themselves, in times of economic depressions such as the early 1930's. To epitomize the situation in his country, Spanish statesman and writer, Angel Ganivet, summed it up as follows: « Every Spaniard's ideal is to carry a statutory letter with a single provision, brief but imperious: 'This Spaniard is entitled to do whatever he feels like doing.' »

The characteristic precarity of this Spanish lack of political and cultural unity as a nation is exemplified by the three nineteenth century Carlist wars which set the cultural preconditions for the civil war of 1936. The Carlist wars (1833-1872-), involving Basques popular uprisings, put the political destinies of the country into the hands of the Feudal warlords of Military forces, and under the control of whoever became the most colorful and powerful general. A historian of the Spanish Civil War, Gabriel Jackson, expressed this fatal political situation succinctly as follows. He wrote: « The only method of changing governments was that of {*pronunciamento*}, a brief, and by common consent relatively bloodless, uprising by a general around whom the opposition forces had gathered as their only hope of change. » (Gabriel Jackson, {*The Spanish Republic and the Civil War*}, Princeton University Press, 1965, p. 4) So, in accordance with that profile,

and given a weak political and cultural national identity, Spain became an easy prey for the Synarchy International and the Axis power of Hitler and Mussolini took full advantage of the situation.

In a way, what was running through the cultural veins of the Spanish people was a feudal backwardness of pre nation-state characteristic, a middle age remnant of barony fiefdoms. Based on a centrifugal tendency of pulling apart from one another, the separatist inclinations of Seville, Bilbao, Barcelona, and other cities, reflected more the feudal character of keeping the foreigners out of one's region, as the inquisition had historically done with the Jews and the Moors, than a true expression of sovereign regional autonomy. In other words, Spain is a nation founded on separatism: the paradox of Spain is that it is a nation of different peoples who do not wish to come together to form a nation.

Since the centrifugal separatist tendencies of other-directedness have always been stronger than the centralizing will of the inner-directedness of national unity, Spain has not yet been able to reach the mature status of a modern nation-state. To this day, Spanish regions are still formed by closed xenophobic societies, like archaic tribes of extreme inhuman peasantry, refusing to change their ancestral behavior and open themselves to the rest of the world. (See Bunuel's motion picture, *Land Without Bread*.) This is the reason why, during the civil war, no region ever deployed militarily to protect the lives of people from another region. Everyone dug-in to defend their own parcel of sacred land, and to the bitter end.

This social, political, and historical situation creates the poorest preconditions for the defense of the nation in times of war. So, when war was declared on Spain, neither the government forces neither the rebel forces were unified. Ambassador Bowers, who was on location during the entire war, made that important point very clear:

« With the desertion of the army in the beginning, the government's problem of how to create an army of defense seemed hopeless. The one possible temporary solution was to utilize all of the anti-Fascist political parties and groups as a nucleus for the fighting force. Each party, union, or segment whipped its members into a fighting unit. These included, along with the democratic and republican parties, the communists and the anarchists. But, this did not create an army – it was a conglomeration of military units without a supreme head or co-ordination. Each group had its

commander, recognizing no superior. Each had its flag, and all of the flags were not those of the Republic. No one division was strong enough to undertake offensive action, and, in the absence of a supreme head, it was impossible to bring them all together in a crisis. Each group dug in where it was and performed miracles of valor in holding on; but if one was hard pressed and in need of reinforcements, the others did not move, and there was no supreme commander to make them move. The army itself was chaos.

« Azana, Barrio, Prieto, Negrin, knew what was needed and sought the unification of all groups into one, but for months the stubbornness of some made this impossible. How such an « army » as then existed was able for months to withstand the onslaught of the trained rebel troops, the Foreign Legion, the Italian Fascists and the German Nazis is one of the miracles of history. » (Bowers, Op. Cit., p. 312)

On the other hand, the Fascists forces were not unified either. The different motivations already indicated by ambassador Bowers show the confusion Franco had had to deal with. Bowers reported: « To end the confusion, Franco sprang another {*coup d'état*} toward the end of April 1937. He ordered the dissolution of all existing organizations, and the inclusion of all in one, under his autocratic control. When the unification of the Carlist and the Fascist militia was ordered, Manuel Hedilla, the then Fascist chief, who took himself seriously, demanded that he be made commander of the joint militias. This was a challenge to Franco's domination. When Hedilla appeared at Franco's headquarters demanding an interview, he was permitted to cool his heels and temper in the waiting room, and then arrested, with permission to leave the country. » (Ibidem, p. 356)

## **2.2 THE SYNARCHIST LOOTING OF SPANISH RAW MATERIALS.**

French intelligence historian, Roger Mennevée, reported that according to an official Italian government document, retrieved after the civil war, and dated from Rome, March 31, 1934, stated that Mussolini and Marshal Italo Balbo signed a secret agreement with the representatives of the Spanish traditionalist opposition, Don Emilio Barrera, Don Raphael Oisjabai, and Don Lizarza, to the effect that the Italian government was not

only « disposed to help and bring military assistance to the two opposition parties in their efforts to overthrow the Spanish Republic, » but also that Italy was to provide the rebel forces « immediately with 200,000 rifles, 20,000 hand grenades, 200 machineguns, and 1,500,000 pesetas in cash. » This aid was said to be only preliminary and would be followed by more substantial help in the future. This, of course was not going to be all free of charge. By 1946, Franco ended up with a war debt to Italy reported to be 5 billion pounds.

On December 26, 1936, an article in the French newspaper, {*Le Travail*}, entitled « *Way before the July Pronunciamento, a German-Italian consortium had been constituted for the Exploitation of the mineral wealth of the country, and General Franco was merely an executing agent of this group.* » It is worth quoting extensively from this Mennevée source, because it is one of the best-documented reports on the Synarchy International plan for raw materials grab in Spain in the 1930's.

According to {*Le Travail*}, « The plan was established during April of 1935 by the {*Metallgesellschaft*}, the great and powerful company located at Frankfurt-on-Main, whose president was one of the big industrial partners of Hitler, Dr. Alfred Merton. This financial society, which specializes in mineral resources, does not merely buy and sell titles, it is also involved, according to its status, 'in any other form (sic) of societies which is involved in the same business as our own.' In that capacity, it is a participant in practically all of the heavy German industries, and the chemical industry (I. G. Farben), and in the metallurgic industry. Its main subsidiary company is {the Swiss Company for the Value of Metals » which is located in Bâle, and which, through its Swiss administrators of the {*Société de Banque Suisse*}, is prominent in Italy – which is as we shall see very precious!} (And which sheds some light on the reasons behind the Swiss bourgeois press campaigns against Republican Spain.)

« In April of 1935, the great {*Metallgesellschaft*} put together a German banking and industrial consortium for the exploitation of Spanish mines. The first adherents to this consortium were immediately: the metallurgic group Kloennz (whose chief, Mr. Kloenne, formerly deputy at the Reichstag, and intimate friend of Mr. Hugenberg, had proposed, as early as 1929, that France (and Germany) create a common army in order to march against Russia), the great war producer Rheinmetall, from Dusseldorf (whose president, Mr. Von der Porten, was one of the partners of Hitler, and



a fervent partisan of the Franco-German military alliance against Moscow), the industrial group Siemens Und Heliko, the war factories of Vulkan and Krupp, from Hessen, and the chemical trust I. G. Farben. »

As for the Italian side of the arrangement, it was the representative of the Rockefeller group in Rome, Mr. A. Serras (spelling?), who brought together the high functionary of the Ministry of Transport, General Fagiani (spelling?), and Mr. Guido Mazolini, high functionary for the claims department of the Chiggi Palace. It was Serras (spelling?), the representative on the Rockefeller interests, who was the key intermediary to the fascist government of Mussolini. Those German-Italian accords for looting Spain were signed in Rome before the Republican Popular Front of Madrid had won the February election of 1936.

The article of *{Le Travail}* even goes into the details of the different regions of Spain which had been targeted by the German-Italian consortium, identifying at least 12 dossiers, including the extraction of iron ore of the Basques region, the asphalt and coal of Valence, the lignite of the High Aragon region, the pyrites of the Catalogne, the graphite of Toledo, the pewter from Gomesende, the copper from Montdava, the nickel from the Pico del Gallenera (spelling?), and so forth; The Spanish pyrite and mercury resources were said to be the most important mine-fields of all of Europe. *{Le Travail}* reported that by distilling the lignite, I. G. Farben was able to produce an essence which could replace benzene as airplane fuel.

The initial reports of these Spanish mineral and chemical analysis were made in Germany, as early as 1929, when the deal with Mussolini and the King of Spain, Alfonso XIII and Primo de la Rivera had been struck! During the King's visit to Mussolini, it was agreed that in case of a civil war, Mussolini would provide full military assistance in exchange for Italy taking over the Baleares Islands. Mussolini did, in fact, invade the Baleares Island during the Spanish Civil War. Thus, while the Spanish people were bleeding each other dry, the Axis powers were looting their resources dry.

Mennevée noted further that fascist dictator, Primo de la Rivera, was deposed in 1930 because of his refusal to deal with Royal Dutch Shell and Standard Oil. Primo had established an oil monopoly in Spain, and had gotten a better price with the Russians. So, immediately after his demise, the Spanish petroleum administration decided not to renew their contracts with

the Russians and signed an agreement with Royal Dutch Shell and Standard Oil, instead.

British historian, Hugh Thomas, confirmed Mennevéé's report: « In addition, the financiers of Europe and America not only expected the nationalists to win, but desired them to. The collapse of investments in Russia had occurred too recently to be forgotten. Thus the matter of oil was solved by the valuable long-term credit, without guarantee, accorded by the Texas Oil Company. Five tankers of the Texas Oil Company had been on their way to Spain at the time of the rising. They received orders from Captain Torkild Rieber, the strongly pro-fascist president of the company (who visited nationalist Spain to talk with Franco and Mola in August), to deliver their goods to the nationalists. These shipments continued. (note 2) The shipments were legal under the terms of the US Neutrality Act of 1935. After the US Embargo Act (see below, p. 558), some shipments were made by declaring that they were bound for France. The Texas Oil Company was fined \$22,000. It made no difference; 344,000 tons of oil was delivered in 1936, 420,000 in 1937, 478,000 in 1938, 624,000 in 1939. » (Hugh Thomas, {*The Spanish Civil War*}, The Modern Library, New York, 2001, p. 404.)

### **3.2 HOW THE SPANISH SECOND REPUBLIC WAS DESTROYED.**

The monarchists hated the democratic government of Manuel Azana because they wanted their privileges back, the Carlists denounced it because they had lost the political power of heredity and hierarchy, the large latifundists feared it because it was legislating sweeping agrarian reforms, the big industrialists resented the labor laws that Azana legislated in the footsteps of the United States, and the hierarchy of the church was leagued against the government because Azana had prohibited the teaching orders in the schools, and had enforced a separation of church and state. Out of spite, the Spanish Catholic Church unified the rich and the powerful against Azana and his government which represented essentially the hopes of the workers, of the poor, of a handful of intellectuals, and of millions of illiterate peasants.

As ambassador Bowers reported, Azana moved too quickly and too pragmatically in his reforms, and the masses of uneducated people did not know what was happening to them. Instead of educating the population on

the highest level of ideas of promoting the general welfare rooted in the natural law of man different from the animal, steeping them in republican principles, and bounding the different regions of Spain together as a single Federal Sovereignty, united by a common purpose to submit and consent to an anti-oligarchical representative republican principle, the Azana reforms were solely based on a pragmatic motivation of preventing the poverty and the misery of the peasants, which represented eighty-five percent of the country. The reforms were not aimed at elevating the peasants from the level of human cattle where they had been reduced for centuries. Bowers described the situation as follows:

« Agrarian reform was especially imperative in Andalusia and Estremadura, where more than five hundred huge estates owned by very rich men were not under cultivation. The law enacted confiscated without compensation the old feudal {*fundos*}. Uncultivated land and enclosed common land was assigned to the farm workers, but compensation was provided at the rate of five percent. Nothing more was proposed in Spain than had been done in France, but the French Revolution, aimed at feudalism, had made no impression on Spain. Thus, the agrarian reforms were a challenge to the persistent feudalistic society of the Spanish state. From early in the nineteenth century, Spain had been dominated by the landowners. There was no possible solution of a grave social problem without this reform. The landowners, naturally, were hostile, but the peasants themselves were not satisfied with the slow legal process. The Azana government had moved so rapidly over so much ground that it had not time to consolidate its position anywhere. » (Bowers, Op. Cit. p. 50.) A similar situation prevailed on the issue of labor laws. For the first time, the government had fixed legal hours for labor, unemployment insurance, maternity care, and contractual relations with employers, all conditions that already existed in other European countries, but were considered revolutionary in Spain. Whatever the reform, the government was invariably nagged as « communistic » by the industrialists and by the Church.

The most tragic situation of all, however, was on the education question. Bowers reported: « In the field of popular education, the Azana regime had acted enthusiastically, since the need was pressing in a country with an appalling percentage of illiteracy; where more than nine thousand communities were without a teacher and hundred of thousands of children were without schools. But the task was colossal and meant an enormous building program. Under the Ministry of Marcelino Domingo, much

progress was made, and under that of Fernando de los Rios, ten thousand schools were established. But for the public schools there was a dearth of teachers and little time for their training. Under the brief Ministry of Salvador de Madariaga, later, a serious attempt was made to provide training for teachers. Even so, when church schools were unhappily closed, the state was not prepared completely to assume the obligation. The laws against religious teaching mobilized the more devout Catholics against the liberal regime. There was no interference with religious worship; the great wealth in gold and silver in the treasure rooms of the cathedrals remained to be shown by priests to tourists, but the parish priests no longer were paid out of the public treasury, the maintenance of the machinery of the church was no longer the obligation of the state. The Jesuits had been expelled, on paper, though Catholic monarchs had done as much, but the suppression of what may be described in American terms as parochial, or church, schools aroused the fury of the devout, and the full force of the intensive organization of the hierarchy was turned against Azana and his allies.» (Bowers, Op. Cit., p. 51.)

Thus, the most tragic aspect of the internal Spanish disaster was represented, not by the failure of the Azana government, but by the total failure of the Spanish civil and religious institutions in providing a proper education to the millions of illiterate peasants, and especially in providing an education that would treat human beings as created in the image of God, instead of reinforcing the inquisition Beast-Man tradition of Tomas Torquemada.

## **4.2 CONDOR LEGION OF HITLER IN SPAIN, 1936**

The purpose of Nazi officers brought to Spain in the new Condor Legion Operation was to massacre innocent populations and monitor their reaction to a carefully planned fire bombing of cities, quarter by quarter. All of their bombings were filmed by Heinkel 70, to show Hitler the Nazi success with their new murdering innovations. In fact, William Shirer reported that Hitler was so enthusiastic about his Condor Legion that he wrote in his diary: « A big German film company completed last summer, at the cost of several million marks, a movie based on the exploits of the German Condor Legion...Hitler, Goering, Himler saw it and praised it. » (Bowers, p. 259) Bowers added that Hitler considered his German Condor Legion far more efficient than the Italian infantry because it also had the

capability to operate the artillery and logistics of the rebel forces. This logistical capability gave Hitler the definite edge on whether or not it was necessary to prolong the civil war.

In response to the first Russian tank attack against the rebel forces in Spain, which took place on October 29, 1936, Hitler wasted no time to send the Condor Legion on their mission. On the following day, the Foreign Minister of Germany, Constantin Neurath, sent a message to his intelligence chief, Admiral Wilhelm Canaris, urging him to instruct Franco of Hitler's intention. Thomas reported, « He (Neurath) therefore ordered Canaris to propose to Franco that Germany should send powerful reinforcements. If Franco wanted these, he would have to agree that they should be placed under a German commander responsible, solely to him, and guarantee that the war would be more systematically conducted. Franco accepted these rather insolent terms. On 6 November, the so-called Condor Legion, with Germany's 'most brutal-looking general' (as Hitler put it himself), Major General von Sperrle, as commander, and Colonel von Richthofen (cousin of the famous 'ace' of the Great War) as chief of staff, began to leave Germany for Seville under the code name Exercise 'Rugen Winter '. This force comprised about a hundred aircraft: a battle group of four bomber squadrons of twelve bombers each, a fighter group of the same strength, and a seaplane, reconnaissance, and experimental squadron. It would be supported by anti-aircraft and anti-tank units, and two armored units, of four tank companies, of four tanks each. This force amounted to some 3,000 men at the beginning, later to 5,000. Richthofen, one of the two assistants of the head of the technical department in the Luftwaffe, was one of the architects of the growing German air force. He was 'a man of vision and resolution.' » (Thomas, Op. Cit., p. 455.) The total Nazi involvement into Spain amounted to about 10,000; although there were 14,000 veterans who attended the Condor Legion celebration in Berlin in May 1939. Thomas estimated at 16,000 the number of Germans who helped the Spanish rebels, including civilian instructors.

Scherer also had an excellent sense of the larger East-West strategic picture. First, he estimated that by guaranteeing a Franco victory in Spain, Hitler would free himself to an early opening of the Eastern Front. Shirer reported: "It gave France a third unfriendly fascist power on its borders; It exacerbated the internal strife in France between Right and Left and thus weakened Germany's principal rival in the west. Above all, it rendered impossible a {rapprochement} of Britain and France with Italy, which the

Paris and London governments had hoped for after the termination of the Abyssinian war, and thus drove Mussolini into the arms of Hitler. » (William L. Shirer, {*The Rise and Fall of the Third Reich*}, Simon and Schuster, New York, 1960, p. 297)

Shirer went even further. He saw that, in Hitler's mind, the Spanish question was very much tied to his ability to launch an attack against the Soviet Union in collaboration with Japan: « Hitler's supposition for Case III ( Case III states that " If France is so embroiled by a war with another state that she cannot 'proceed' against Germany... ") was that France would become embroiled in a war with Italy – a conflict that he counted upon. That was the reason, he explained, for his policy in trying to prolong the Spanish Civil War; it kept Italy embroiled with France and Britain. He saw a war between them 'coming definitely nearer.' In fact, he said, he was 'resolved' to take advantage of it whenever it happened, even as early as 1938 – which was just two months away. » (Shirer, Op. Cit., p. 307.)

Scherer understood that Hitler was following a more farsighted strategy than just the European theater. He was preparing an anti-Comintern Pact with Japan which came into existence on November 25, 1936. Shirer was present when Hitler told the foreign correspondents that "Germany and Japan had joined together to defend {*Western*} civilization," and he emphasized the fact that the treaty with Japan included "a secret protocol, specifically directed against Russia. In case of an unprovoked attack by the Soviet Union against Germany or Japan, the two nations agreed to consult on what measures to take 'to safeguard their common interests' and also to 'take no measures which would tend to ease the situation of the Soviet Union.'" (Shirer, Op. Cit., p.299.)

Though Italy signed on to this Germany-Japan military agreement a year later, this three country Axis only lasted a short period and the Spanish Civil War had to be extended further because Hitler had reasons to believe that the potential confrontation between France and England against Italy was not decisive enough. As the German ambassador to Rome, Ulrich von Hassel, stated in December 1936: "The struggle for dominant political influence in Spain lays bare the natural opposition between Italy and France; at the same time the position of Italy as a power in the western Mediterranean comes into competition with that of Britain. All the more clearly will Italy recognize the advisability of confronting the Western powers shoulder to shoulder with Germany?" (Ibid. p.298.) Thus, the

Japanese anti-Comintern alliance was sacrificed when Hitler decided that he had to strike west first.

## **5.2 THE BEAST-MAN OF GUERNICA OF APRIL 1937**

In 1076, the unity of the Basque people, one of the most ancient cultural groups of Europe, did not survive the death of their King of Navarre, Santxo III, and the Basque province of Bizkaia was severed from Navarre and annexed to Castile. A century later, in 1200, a second Navarre province, Gipuzkoa, joined Castile, and a third province, Araba, was later annexed to Castile, in 1331. For more than 400 years the « Basque kingdom of Navarre » fought to regain its unity and independence from the kingdom of Aragon and Castile. It was the Castile Inquisition of 1512 that ultimately crushed the resistance of the Basques; The Euskal Herria Journal, the on line Basque journal of Navarre, reports on the following tragedy: « Pope Julius excommunicated the Navarrese, stripped Navarre's Monarchs of their kingdom, and ordained Castile as proprietor and Masrer of Navarre – already weakened by demographic decline (the plague of 1342), civil war, and economic disasters. » (Euska Herria Journal)

After the death of his father (1506), and of his two grandfathers (1516 and 1519), the new Habsburg Emperor of Dutch descent, Charles V, inherited, aside from the American colonies, Austria, the Lower Countries, and French Burgundy, the Kingdoms of Aragon and Castile, including the Basques region of Navarre. For Spain, this became a period of reconquest of Granada from the Moors, and of subjugation of Navarre, which kept fighting for its autonomy and became the model of resistance against the empire as well as against Castile.

Navarre was also the gate of France, through the pass of Orreaga, which was the Pyrenee corridor where the famous nephew of Charlemagne, Roland, met his destiny at the battle of Roncesvaux, on August 15, 778 AD. Up until that time, the Navarrene Basques had defended themselves vigorously and « successfully against the Visigoths, the Franks, and the Moorish invaders.» Although they spoke their own language, the Basques learned to survive as a divided people and have known periods of relative autonomy throughout history with respect to both France and Spain. However, when Hitler set his sights on the Basque people, with the view of

grabbing the iron ore resource of their region, his intention was nothing less than genocide.

During the period of the Spanish Civil War, the American Ambassador, Claude G. Bowers, gave a vivid and moving account of what can be called the genocide of the Basques people and why the Nazis wanted to get rid of the Basques. Bowers identified the two main reasons for the Basque genocide: « When the rebellion broke, the Basques instantly lined up with the loyalists (republicans)... And there was another reason – the iron ore of the Basque Provinces. Franco needed this ore to trade for arms and ammunition; {*and Nazi Germany needed it to prepare for its war against European democracy.*} The Basques were sending the greater part to England, and the pledge of the rebels to divert it to Germany had been given. Hitler had frankly announced in a public speech that his soldiers were in Spain because Germany needed the iron ore. » (Bowers, Op. Cit., p. 339.)

The Nazi plan began with an attempt to starve the capital of the Basques, Bilbao into submission. The rebel General Mola with the support of the German Air power, the Italian army, and the Moorish troops flown over from Spanish Morocco, led the operation against Bilbao.

The harbor of Salamanca was blockaded, and then it was announced that it was mined so that no ships could enter and use the port facilities. British Sea Dogs, however, called the bluff and sailed in and out of the port without any incidents. Then, Franco's offensive added to the blockade by including bombing of neutral ships and committing piracy on the high seas against any food ship destined to help the Basques population of Balboa. Franco even had his fleet shoot at British destroyers escorting food ships from London into Saint-Jean-de Luz, Bilbao, and Bayonne. Bowers reported that pro-Fascist Chamberlain would systematically use the Nonintervention Pact to complain about Franco's interference, but at the same time, he would discourage British ships from entering the ports of Bilbao. Chamberlain's position was that « British ships would protect British sailing on the high seas, but would not challenge Franco's rights to sink them in the harbor. » (Bowers, p. 342) Although some food would get through and be brought in by the British, the Basque people were more and more isolated, and were without reinforcement capabilities, without airplanes, and without anti-aircraft guns. They were like sitting ducks when the offensive began in March of 1937. No other region of Spain was deployed to help the Basque defend themselves.



The first massacre of the Basque population began on March 31, 1937, in the town of Durango. Ambassador Bowers reported is as follows:

« It was a peaceful and religious town, and many people were at mass in the three churches. The Nazi bombers, circling above the town, could be heard by worshipers in the ancient church of Santa Maria, in the church of the Jesuit Fathers, and in the chapel of Santa Susana, the nuns could hear the sinister roar of the planes flying very low. The Nazi aviators dropped tons of heavy bombs.

« One crashed through the roof of Santa Susana's chapel, and nuns were literally blown to bits, mingled with pieces of the holy images.

« Another heavy bomb smashed through the roof of the church of the Jesuit Fathers, and Father Rafael Billalabeita, who was officiating at the mass when the roof crashed in, died under the wreckage, along with others.

« Still another heavy bomb shot through the roof of the old church of Santa Maria just at the moment when Don Carlos Morilla was elevating the host, and he lay dead, with numerous worshipers with him. » (p. 343)

This bombardment of civilians in their churches during services was just the beginning of well-timed and precise targeting that the Condor Legion of the Nazis were officiating in the Basque region as a means of preparing for World War II. The most despicable slaughter of the Fascist Beast-Man, however, was the destruction of Guernica.

Guernica was the wholly city of the Basques people. This is the ancient capital which stood for centuries as the shrine of liberty and independence of the Basque people. Under its famous oak tree the assembly of the people would meet to make the law and take the oath to protect the general welfare of the people and its posterity.

This small town of seven thousand people was chosen by the Condor Legion as the first carpet-bombing exercise against a defenseless civilian population. This was a test exercise for the extermination of an entire population by incendiary bombing. Ambassador Bowers reported:

« It was a small town of no military value, and the massacre fell on a market day when the peasants were there with their livestock and produce. The market was at its fullest at about four-thirty in the afternoon, when suddenly, the sky was blackened by a great fleet of Hitler's bombing planes resembling a swarm of locusts; and, with cold-blooded deliberation, taking their time, since there were no defending planes, -- and « Nonintervention » had seen to that – the little town was peppered with explosive and incendiary bombs. Father Aronategul, the parish priest, was seen making his way through the debris with the sacrament for the dying, walking through the deserted street with the holy oil. He knew how, and by whom Guernica was destroyed, and he said so to me.

« When the Condor Legion was welcomed home by Goering, he said one reason the Nazis were in Spain was that « our air fleet burned to show what it could do. » It showed it at Durango and at Guernica. » (p. 344)

The atrocity was made deliberately to get humanity to recoil with horror and fear before the great might of the Nazi machine. When the Nazis realized that world opinion did not recoil in fear, but in disgust against the Hitler machine, the Gobble initiative began to get out the propaganda that the town had been burned down by the « reds. »

Bowers summed up the situation in a very clear fashion. He wrote: « It was now clear, after a year of horrors, that the rebellion was not a rising of the people against the democratic regime. Had this been true, the army, the Moors, the Italian and German troops would have triumphed within a month. It was just as clear that it was no « civil war » in the usual meaning of the term, but a war of aggression openly waged by Hitler and Mussolini. » (p. 354) And one might add that this war of aggression by the Germans and the Italians, in Spain, was being waged in tandem with the Japanese invasion of China; for as the savage German bombing of Guernica had proven to be a total success, the Japanese beast-man conducted a similar incendiary bombing of the civilian population of Shanghai, and Nanking a few months later, in July of 1937.

## **6.2 THE CATALONIA TROTSKYITE EXPERIMENT**

The Catalonia experiment was a British Intelligence-run experiment of revolutionary self-government whose primary goal was to act as a Fifth Column divide the military forces against fascism. The fabrication of an anarchist/Trotskyite self-government by the British Fabian Society in Catalonia Spain was one of the most barbarian Synarchist-Tavistock type of experiment of population control ever to be set up synthetically in modern history. This is why George Orwell was sent to Spain in 1936, in order to complete his training there, as a top British Intelligence asset, and report back on the Trotskyite experiment. Orwell's report can be found in his {*Homage to Catalonia*}.

A lot of strange things have happened in Spain during the civil war, but none more curious than the mushrooming of Trotskyism in the region of Catalonia. Nobody had ever paid any attention to this small fringe anti-Stalinist Communist Party called {*Partiso Obrero de Unificacion Marxista*} (POUM), which was formed very conveniently by two British Intelligence assets, Andres Nin and Joaquim Maurin, in 1935, and was based on the ideas of collective self-government and permanent revolution of Leon Trotsky. Within its first year of existence, this Party recruited 8,000 members, and by some unexplained miracle, a year later, in 1936, it had grown to 30,000 members with a militia of 10,000 soldiers. The POUM began by supporting Azana's Popular Front government until its leader, Andres Nin, confronted it and ended up being ousted from the government coalition.

Meanwhile, another strange thing occurred. Coming out of the most aristocratic college of Eton in 1917, and then, trained into Her Majesty's Own Indian Imperial Police force in Burma, from 1922 to 1927, British Intelligence agent, George Orwell, joined the POUM in London in December 1936. It seems that, in Great Britain this was the best way to learn everything there was to be learned about « socialism ». After his successful crash program on socialism in Burma, Orwell had been selected to « monitor » the « socialist activities » of the Trotskyite /Anarchist (POUM) experiment in the region of Catalonia, Spain. He was first sent to the quiet front of Grenade, in December 1936, where he was wounded and gathered his thoughts, and then, he was retired back to make an evaluation study of the behavior of the POUM army of Barcelona during the May days revolt of 1937.

Orwell joined the POUM army of Barcelona with his fellow Trotskyite, Bob Edwards, and twenty-five other British Fabian Society

affiliates who arrived in Barcelona on January 12, 1937. According to British historian, Hugh Thomas, whose history of the Spanish Civil War was a good cover story for the British synarchist operation. Orwell had reached Barcelona earlier in December and had joined « the Aragon front, with whom he stayed until April. He returned to the front (sic) a month later but finally returned to England in June. » (Hugh Thomas, {*The Spanish Civil War*}, The Modern Library, New York, 2001, p. 481.) Most of the POUM militiamen originated from the anarchist group of the {*Confederacion Nacional de Trabajo* } (CNT).

Anarchism in Spain has been experimented with and monitored several times throughout history. For instance, during the second half of the nineteenth century, an Italian supporter of Michael Bakunin, Giuseppe Fanelli, had brought anarchist ideas into Spain, and, as a result, the Spanish section of the First International was entirely formed of anarchists. In 1911, the Spanish anarcho-syndicalists of Spain formed the {*Confederacion Nacional de Trabajo* } (CNT). In 1927, a new group of « purists » was formed called the {*Federction Anarquista Iberica* } (FAI) , which ultimately took over the leadership control of the CNT. Their objective was to create chaos within the formation of the militia, the peasant revolt organizations, the seizure of industries, especially textile and building trades in Catalonia and Andulucia, under the cover of self-governed community controlled labor committees. Their apparent goal was to fight what the Trotskyite called the counter-revolution of the Stalinist tendency inside of the Spanish Communist Party and the United Socialist Party of Catalonia (PSCU). In reality, the Catalonia anarchist movement was nothing else by the extreme left wing of the Synarchy International, working in collaboration with the Fascists and Franco to destroy the Republican Popular Front of President Azana.

On the one hand, the systematic lie that Orwell was trained to report back from Spain was to say that the greatest fear of the Spanish people was not fascism but communism, and that the gravest danger was the conflict between the communists and the republicans inside of the Spanish government. As Orwell put it in {*Looking Back on the Spanish War* } : The broad truth (sic) about the war is simple enough. The Spanish bourgeoisie saw their chance of crushing the labor movement, and took it, aided by the Nazis and by the forces or reaction all over the world. It is doubtful whether more than that will ever be established. » (George Orwell, {*A Collection of Essays*}, Harbrace Paperbound Library, 1945, p. 196)

Of course, the idea of reducing the war to a conflict of interest between the bourgeois and the communists was a complete fallacy of composition because Stalin, whom Orwell hated more than Hitler, was still in control of the Spanish communist party, through the Italian-Argentinean Comintern representative, Vittorio Codovilla, and the Bulgarian professional revolutionary, Stepanov (S. Mineff), and was following the strategy of dropping the idea of the « revolution », because he considered that a fascist victory in Spain was going to be much more dangerous for the Soviet Union than the victory of a bourgeois government. Stalin considered he was able to deal with a bourgeois government, not with the fascists. So, Stalin was hoping against hope that if enough support were sent from Russia, France and England to the Spanish loyalists in alliance with the communists, they would win and that victory might even expand the war in which France, Britain, Spain, Germany and Italy would weaken each other, and the Soviet Union would eventually come out on top.

On the other hand, Trotsky himself, considered Stalin as the « liquidator and traitor of the Spanish Revolution, abettor of Hitler and Mussolini, » and his control over anarchists was such that he could easily manipulate them into a radical position of having to choose between « the state or permanent revolution. » That was the basis upon which Orwell had written his fallacies, and how the real Fascist Fifth Column turned out to be the POUM Trotskyites and the CNT and the FAI anarchists of Catalonia, and not the communists in coalition with the republicans.

Ambassador Bowers had seen through the same fallacies, when he wrote: « *To those outside of Spain who later were to take, hook, line, and sinker, the Fascist lie that the rebellion was to forestall a communist revolution, it may be surprising to learn that in three and a half years I had never heard such a suggestion from anyone, while all were talking confidently of a military coup d'Etat.* » (Bowers, Op. Cit., p. 214) However, if Bowers knew there was not a shred of evidence that a communist plot was at hand, by the end of March 1936, he was completely aware that a {*coup d'Etat*} was being prepared, and that entire Spanish cities were going to be under siege by a Fascist-Fascist permanent revolution.

By July 1936, the Trotskyites-anarchists had taken over Barcelona. According to historian, Hugh Thomas, there were reportedly 350,000 anarchists in control of the city radio station, eight daily newspapers, most of

the weeklies and periodicals, all of the industrial plants such as Ford Iberia Motor Company, public works companies such as El Fomento de Obras y Construcciones, and all of the main services, such as water, gas and electricity. « The main executive organ in Barcelona, and, therefore, in Catalonia, was the Anti-Fascist Militia Committee, which had been formed on 21 July and upon which, as has been seen, the FAI and the CNT were the most influential forces (...) Barcelona thus became a proletarian town in a way that Madrid never did. Expropriation was the rule – hotels, stores, banks and factories were either requisitioned or closed. Those requisitioned were run by committees of technicians and workers. Food distribution, milk-pasteurization, even small handicrafts, were all collectivized. » (Hugh Thomas, Op. Cit., p. 283)

The anarchist experiment in Catalonia was a Fifth Column aimed at dividing the Popular Front military alliance against fascism. Spanish President, Azana, described the experiment precisely as « a plot to anul the Spanish State ». This posed a serious problem because the advance of the Barcelona anarchists into the region of Aragon represented an enemy penetration deep within the defense capabilities of the central government.

In order to succeed, however, the anarchists had to deal with the semi-autonomous government of Catalonia, the {*Generalidad*}. This was the governorship-general of Catalonia which had been established as the home rule government since 1932, but which had no authority with respect to foreign affairs, defense, or border issues. The {*Generalidad*} comprised four provincial councils who acted as agents for the central government in matters public order, justice, education, communications, and public works. This Catalan government was already a local control administration and Azana feared that the Madrid central government would lose total control over it, and the anarchists would take it over.

Indeed, under the crisis situation the {*Generalidad*} became more powerful. «There were other changes given the weakness of the government in Madrid, the {*Generalidad*} was able to take over, without protest, the customs and the frontier guards, the railway and the docks, security at hydroelectric plants, the fortress of Montjuich and the Bank of Spain – even the right to issue money and pardons. All these powers, under the Catalan statute, belonged to Spain. Now, under the pretext that they were in danger of being usurped by the FAI, the {*Generalidad*} took them over. » (Idem, p. 287.) It is clear that the Bank of Spain could not have been taken over by

the local government unless the Synarchist bankers of Europe had agreed with the arrangement. In a very revealing statement, however, Azana stated that the {*Generalidad*} « took advantage of the military rebellion to finish with the state's power in Catalonia and then sought to explain everything by saying that the state did not exist. » In other words, the government of Catalonia was given to the anarchists by the Synarchy, and the state government was replaced by a Committee for the permanent revolution.

On the other hand, the formal policy of the communists, who were only too conscious of the dangers of the split within the loyalist Popular Front forces, was to prevent at all cost anything that would jeopardize the winning of the war against the Fascists. So, from that standpoint, the communists did not represent any threat for the central government and « political adjustments between comrades » would have to wait until after the victory.

Concomitantly, the anarchist takeover of the {*Generalidad*} was rigged to fail. The question of national defense was brought up and forced the question of choosing between a militia movement, favored by the anarchists of the POUM, the CNT, and the FAI, and a regular national « army system » favored by the communist-run {*Partido Socialista Unificado de Cataluna*} (PSUC) and the Socialist Trade Union {*Union General de Trabajadores*} (UGT). Meanwhile, the Barcelona UGT was being beefed up, and saw its ranks suddenly go from 12,000 on July 19, to 35, 000 by the end of the same month. This was very good timing because the powders were being set up to explode.

On July 31, Luis Companys y Jover nominated himself the head of the {*Generalidad*}, and invited three members of the PSUC to join him in a reconstituted Catalan government with former Catalan president, Juan Casanovas. The anarchists were so infuriated that they threatened to leave the Anti-Fascist Militias Committee then and there. The {*Generalidad*} reconsidered immediately and the anarchists were kept on their toes from that moment on. This was also the beginnings of attempts by the government to disarm the anarchists in Barcelona, realizing that they would soon have to fight the war against them. It will take another year before the explosion is decided upon.

Everything was held in check until March 1937, when the word came to Brussels, reportedly from the Spanish communist head of the loyalist

secret service that in Barcelona, « they're (the communists) getting ready to liquidate thousands of anarchists and the POUM militants ». The Spanish ambassador to Belgium, Ossorio y Gallardo, is also reported to have said, in March of the same year, « that the CNT and the FAI would soon be finally dealt with. » (Ibidem., p. 636.)

By April 1937, the communists in Barcelona had consolidated their position vis-à-vis the anarchists and were ready to move against them. According to Thomas, it was the thirteen agents of Franco in Barcelona who triggered the bloody outbreak of the May days. Thomas reports Franco saying, « ...he had judged the present moment right for the outbreak of disorders in Barcelona. The agent had succeeded, within some days of receiving such instructions, in having street-fighting started by three or four persons. » (Ibidem., p. 638) The city of Barcelona was divided into three sectors. The Government forces and the PSUC controlled Barcelona to the East of Rambla, the anarchists had control over the western part, and the CNT had control of the suburbs.

The conflicting reports about the May Days are not worth reporting on as such, because the whole affair was made to result into an obscure and chaotic brawl, with such confusion that no one could ever make any sense of it. The interesting point, however, is the report from George Orwell, who was on location as of April 26, and whose comments in defense of the POUM and on the nature of the war itself are more significant than his comments about Barcelona.

**[The story of Maydays, as viewed by Orwell, Thomas p. 635; Homage to Catalonia, p. 169.]**

May 1, quiet day UGT and CNT agreed to not hold processions.

May 2, telephone harassments.

May 3, chief of police of Barcelona went to the Telefonica building controlled by anarchists. Several anarchists open fire from the second floor. « The POUM, the Friends of Durruti, the Bolshevick-Leninists (a small group of real Trotskyites headed by a gifted journalist, Grandizo Munis), the anarchist youth, took up positions. Within a few hours, all of the political organizations had brought out their arms and had begun to build barricades. » (636) By nightfall, Barcelona was a warring city.



May 4, Barcelona was silent. All of the shops and houses were barricaded. Caught by surprise and realizing they had been set up, the anarchist leaders Garcia Oliver and Federica Montseny broadcast a call for their followers to lay down their arms and avoid fighting against the communists.

May 5, the Catalan government resigned and was replaced by a « provisional council » which was to include anarchists, the Esquerra, the PSUC, and the {*rabassaires*} each would be represented. Two Italian anarchists were mysteriously murdered. The Friends of Durruti announced the formation of a {*junta*}. The POUM feared the British destroyers in the port might fire into the city. (See Orwell)

May 6, a truce is proclaimed by the anarchists which was observed by all sides through the morning. In the afternoon, the general-secretary of the Catalan UGT, Antonio Sesé, and a member of the new council of the {Generalidad} were assassinated. All sides reinforce their positions.

May 7, CNT makes an appeal to return to « normality. » Assault guards keep the peace.

May 8, CNT broadcasts a call to bring down the barricades. The Barcelona riots were over. Thomas reports the estimate of 500 killed and 1, 000 wounded.

On the one hand, the results showed the deliberate impotence and lack of organization of the Trotskyites and anarchists, how their ministers and their leaders were in conflict with their troops and had lost their influence, and control over them. It demonstrated that a self-government of anarchists does not work, and that there could be no truce between the communists and the POUM. On the other hand, the government, the {*Generalidad*}, and the communists were unified behind their centralized command, and were capable of acting as one against any extremist movement. May 1937 marked the end of the experiment in Catalonia.

According to Thomas, Franco had a very extensive spying capabilities throughout Spain. Thomas wrote: « The nationalist command had also by this time a good intelligence section, headed by Colonel Jose Ungria, who had been on Miaja's Staff in Madrid until the war, and who had subsequently escaped from the capital. A student of the Ecole Supérieure de la Guerre at Paris, and military attaché there in the early 1930's, Ungria

brought together all the separate intelligence services of the nationalists, Fifth Columnists, and foreign agents into a single organization at first known as the SIM (Servicio de Informacion Militar), and then the SIPM (Servicio de Informacion y Policia Militar) established in November 1937. This concerned itself with counter-espionage as well as intelligence. By mid-1938, it had as many as 30,000 people working for it, with spies in the officer's school in Barajas in Madrid, as well as several spy rings in Catalonia, run by secret falangists and monarchists. Over a hundred people said later to have passed daily between Catalonia and France to give information. Cf. J.M. Fontana, {*Los Catalanes en la Guerra de Espana,*} (Madrid, 1951), pp. 161-2 for the spy rings of Luis Canos, Jose Maria Velat, Manolo Bustenga, and Carlos Carranceja ; pp.336-7 for the story of Clariana, the double spy, shot in Irun.» (Thomas, Op. Cit., p. 738.) Several thousand active members of the Fifth Columns, Franco's spy organizations, had a been secured inside several embassies including prominently the British Embassy in Spain. The POUM had been set up and railroaded by the Fifth Column of Ungria in Barcelona. Thomas reported the following story about it:

« In April (1937), the communist-controlled police in Madrid had unearthed a conspiracy by the Falange. One of the conspirators, named Castilla, was introduced to become an {*agent provocateur*}. Castilla prevailed upon another Falangists in the capital, Javier Golfín, to prepare a fraudulent plan for a military rising by the Fifth Column. Golfín did this, and he, and his plan, were then apprehended. Next, someone, probably the head of the Soviet espionage in Spain, Orlov, forged a letter purporting to be from Nin, a leader of the POUM, to Franco, on the back of Golfín's plan. At about the same time, another genuine falangist, José Roca, who kept a bookshop in Genora, was unmasked by the Catalan Communists. Roca's task in the Fifth Columns was to pass on messages to an hotelier in the same town, Named Dalmau. One day, sometimes in May, a well-dressed individual called at the bookshop, left some money for Roca, and a message for Dalmau, and asked if he could leave a suitcase in the shop for three days. Roca agreed to his request. Not long after, the police arrived to carry out the search. Naturally, they came upon the suitcase which, when opened, was found to contain a pile of secret documents, all sealed, curiously enough, with the stamp of the POUM military committee.

« It was upon these documents, the letter from Nin to Franco, and the suitcase found in Gerona that the communist case against the POUM rested.

All were forgeries. » (Thomas, Op. Cit. p. 681.) As a result, of course, Nin was arrested and POUM was shut down and dissolved.

Let us suppose, for a moment, that the sequence of this fabricated scenario corresponds to reality, as the account was originally related from Golfin and Roca themselves and told to the POUM leadership during their prison meeting. Moreover, let us suppose that those papers were not forgeries at all, but were concocted specifically as a means to pull Synarchist leader Nin out of the area and help him escape to a safer territory, after his mission had been accomplished. Why has this hypothesis not been investigated? The curious thing is that, although there was a widespread campaign, in Spain as well as abroad, to look for Nin, and to find him, dead or alive, Nin was never found and was immediately presumed dead by all investigative reporters and historians.

Since the Catalonia experiment had been a success, and Nin was a precious collaborator who had once been Trotsky's secretary, and had worked in Russia throughout the 1920's, he had become one of the most precious assets of the Synarchy International. There is no doubt that Nin could have easily been put on an early form of the « Rat's Line » transfer to France, or elsewhere. It is strange that an intelligent historian like Thomas did not make this hypothesis. However, Thomas did report the fact that « Negrin told Azana that Nin had been detained and freed by German agents within the International Brigades. » But, he discarded that statement as « novelesque ».

And then, there was also POUM member, George Orwell, who found himself having to cover his ass, in fear that all of this « treasonous » suspicion might stain his coattail. The story, here, is as murky as backtracking can become in the swamps of British Intelligence. In a letter to Frank Jellinek, the {*Manchester Guardian*} correspondent, Orwell made a 180-degree turn against the POUM in order to disassociate himself from the Catalonia experiment. Orwell wrote: « Actually I've given [in {*Homage to Catalonia*}] a more sympathetic account of the 'POUM' line than I actually felt, because I always thought they were wrong...But...I think there was something in what they said, though no doubt their way of saying it was tiresome and provocative in the extreme. » (Ibidem, p. 686)

## 7.2 THE PLAN TO TRADE FREEDOM AGAINST SECURITY

It is important to open a parenthesis, here, and establish briefly that the Catalonia experiment was not an anti-American operation simply because it subverted the idea of a « government of the people, by the people, and for the people ». Recall what Benjamin Franklin had said, during the American Revolution:

« *{He who sacrifices liberty for security, deserves neither!}* »

That was the heart of the matter in the Catalonia experiment, and of the role-played by British Intelligence, and George Orwell, in the whole affair. The experiment was made to disprove Benjamin Franklin. The question was: how far can you push anarchist *{liberty}* against the *{security}* of the general population? In other words, how long can you go on treating human beings as animals?

After his short five months training experiment in the Spanish Civil War, Orwell joined the BBC and later wrote two infamous books: one was *{Animal Farm}*, published in 1945, and the other was *{1984}*, published in 1949. The on-line introduction « *About the Book* » *{1984}* is very instructive, as it not only gives away the nature of what « Big Brother » is currently all about in the United States, but that it ascribes the Orwellian conception of government to the terrorist attack of « September 11, 2001 » in New York City. It is worth quoting the entire tongue-in-cheek introduction:

« Owing largely to progress in communications and other technologies, governments and businesses today have more power than ever to monitor and influence what we buy, where we go, what we watch or read, and what we believe. Recent terrorists attacks in the United States of America (most notably, the destruction of the twin World Trade Towers in New York and the Pentagon, and the delivery of Anthrax spores to public officials and the media in the U.S.A.) has *{most citizens more willing than ever to give up more individual freedom and privacy in exchange for the promise of greater security}* (emphasis added). Long denied the right to violate basic individual rights and freedoms and privacy, the world's law enforcement and surveillance communities and their governments are

seizing the day, and making rapid steps to pass relatively permanent legislation giving the government powers which – prior to the acts of September 11, 2001 – would have been considered by the general populace to be powers properly unleashed only for {*temporary*} periods of {*national emergency*}. }

« In the process, questions are being raised as to {*whether the surrender of individual freedom will actually result in greater security, or whether we, in giving up freedom for security, are satisfying the aim of the terrorists to begin with: to undermine individual freedom of choice, equality under the law, and the dignity of every individual.*

*«1984 has long been the first book to which we have turned for a vivid picture of a government that has used war to justify infringement on freedom; that has used speech codes to limit everyone’s ability to understand higher concepts or concepts that favor human individuality; that uses powerful media to build unwarranted consensus and rewrite history; and that has used technology to nip political opposition and individualistic or eccentric practices in the bud*}(emphasis added). Far from being a caricature, it insightfully and skillfully characterizes the tendencies and motivations of unlimited government power, and the horrifying, hopeless result of such government: humanity denied its freedom to think, to be rational, and to dissent...its freedom to be human. »  
[<http://www.mondopolitico.com /library/1984/1984.htm>]

The point to be made, here, is that Orwell’s {*1984*} is not warning against the dangers of such a government that might use war to justify curbing your freedom. He is telling you, cynically, that this is precisely what your current government is up to, and that there is nothing you can do to stop it. Following the script of Orwell, could a government like the Bush administration today resort to launching a terrorist act against its own people in order to start a preemptive crusade war against the Muslim world, and against Saddam Hussein in particular, and gain access to the oil reserves of the Middle East region as a by-product?

The way to read Orwell’s book, is to pierce through the cynicism of his politics of fear, his sophistry; that is, to realize that every time he says he is telling the truth, he is actually lying, tongue-in cheek. For example, take the three paradoxical slogans found in the first pages of {*1984*}. If anyone

wishes to describe George Shultz' big brother policy today in the United States, it perfectly applies to Orwell's three black humor paradoxes:

« WAR IS PEACE  
FREEDOM IS SLAVERY  
IGNORANCE IS STRENGTH »

In other words, three lying assumptions: 1) your peace depends on waging war on your neighbor; 2) your freedom is determined by Big Brother; and 3) your blind delusion is your guarantee of security. This is the model that Kissinger and Pinochet had come to agree on for the nation of Chili, a few years back. That is the live experiment that the Bush administration is imposing on Americans today with George Schultz and Dick Cheney.

Thus, under the guise of telling the truth, Orwell's {1984} was asking the American reader: can it be true that fantasy could replace reality, permanently, in a great part of the American population? What are the conditions under which a large portion of the American population can be fooled and entirely lied to all the time? Why did the majority of the American population not believe the truth about the infamy of Black Tuesday, Sept.11, 2001? And the answer is: because if you make the truth so unbelievable, it simply could not be accepted as such. (Remember the lie that said: "LaRouche says that the Queen of England pushes drugs.") So, today, the question is: "Under what circumstance would the American population accept that the US be turned into a Fascist police state, and that the U.S. initiate a clash of civilization by declaring war on the Muslim world, in order to cover up for its economic incompetence of the last 40 years? And the answer is: When the idea of a "police state" is turned into such ridicule that no one could believe it.

This is the sophistry used by Orwell when he ridiculed the fact that the Trotskyites of Catalonia were "disguised Fascists." The following example will show how the sophistry of Orwell attempted to confuse the reader by twisting the truth into something unbelievable. Orwell wrote: "The word 'Trotskyite' ('Trotsky-Fascist) is generally used to mean a disguised Fascist who poses as an ultra-revolutionary in order to split the left-wing forces. But it derives its peculiar power from the fact that it means three separate things. It can mean one, who like Trotsky, wishes for world revolution; or a member of the actual organization of which Trotsky is head (the only legitimate use

of the word); or the disguised Fascist already mentioned. The three meanings can be telescoped one into the other at will. Meaning No. 1 may or may not carry with it meaning No. 2, and meaning No. 2 almost invariably carries with it meaning No. 3. Thus 'XY has been heard to speak favorably of world revolution; therefore he is a Trotskyite: therefore he is a Fascist.' In Spain, to some extent even in England, {*anyone*} professing revolutionary socialism (i.e. professing the things the Communist Party professed until a few years ago) is under suspicion of being a Trotskyite in the pay of Franco or Hitler." And then, Orwell adds, tongue in cheek: "The accusation is a very subtle one, because in any given case, unless one happened to know the contrary, it might be true. A Fascist spy probably {*would*} disguise himself as a revolutionary" (George Orwell, {*Spilling the Spanish Beans*}, p.4) Well, why didn't he say that to start with?

Thus, although it may sound absolutely unbelievable, the events of September 11 had been prepared, long in advance, and leads had been fabricated, ahead of time, by the Trotskyites inside of the US government, and have been followed afterwards by the mass media barrage, to convince the American people that emergency measures were necessary for their security, as in the case of the Reichstag fire of February 1933. This is how the America people were made to believe that a war on terrorism was the only way to bring security to the people of the United States? Is it true that the curbing of American freedom can be considered to be a very small price to pay for security?

Furthermore, consider that George W. Bush wants to "privatize" Social Security because he was told, by the Trotskyites in his administration, that it was the only way to bring financial security to the population of the United States. Do you believe this to be true? This is quite a paradox: first you are forced to sacrifice your freedom for the sake of security; now you must sacrifice your security for a future of permanent war. Isn't it time to realize that what George W. Bush is actually telling the American people is that the pension plan of Pinochet is better than the pension plan of Roosevelt. Do you really believe that?

In summary, this is how British Intelligence successfully conducted their « crucial experiment » of population control in the region of Catalonia during the Spanish Civil War. The question was: « Are you more afraid of an anarchist revolution or a fascist dictatorship? » The terrible irony is that after the Spanish population had been put through the chaos of anarchy

during a period of three years of war, it was submitted to the fascist dictatorship of Franco during a period of 30 years, the result of which is the same chaos and anarchy.

After the death of Franco, French historian, Max Gallo, wrote: « January 24, 1969: The Madrid government, ‘ in order to combat the systematic efforts of a minority to disturb the peace of Spain ... and to plunge its youth into an orgy of nihilism and anarchy ‘ (Fraga Iribarne), decreed for the first time since the end of the Civil War a state of emergency throughout the country. » ( Max Gallo, {*Spain Under Franco, a History*}, New York, E.P. Dutton & Company, Inc, 1974, p. 364.) As everyone can see, the outstanding result of the Spanish experiment is that it is still going on today, and it is still generating chaos everywhere in Spain. In reality, British Intelligence could boast of success, because the purpose of the Spanish experiment was precisely a Trotskyite permanent revolution.

## **8.2 THE FRENCH GOVERNMENT AND THE SPANISH CIVIL WAR**

Roger Mennevée wrote a series of articles accusing the Leon Blum cabinet of « treason » with respect to the Spanish Civil War. He was wrong. Mennevée did not see that the pre-war Leon Blum government had been very much like the post-World War II Charles de Gaulle government: in both cases, France had good leaders, however, in both cases, the ministries were infiltrated and controlled at the highest level by the Synarchy International.

However, it is important to know that Pierre Laval had been kicked out of the government of Saraut, in 1936, because he had made too many compromises with Mussolini. In his issue of {*Les Documents diplomatiques et financiers*} Jan. 1937, Mennevée reported that under the Blum Cabinet, it was the same synarchist undersecretary of Foreign Affairs, Charles Rochat, who maneuvered the ship of state into a synarchist controlled noninterventionist position vis-à-vis Spain during the so-called civil war.

On the one hand, the reasoning was that, according to international law, the government of Madrid had the right to ask other nations for military and financial support, and the Blum Popular Front government had refused



officially to provide them with arms and ammunition. However, on the other hand, it was clear to the Synarchy International that if France had openly sided with the Spanish republican forces, Spain would have pushed back the rebel uprising within a few short weeks. (Must get Blum statement about the situation) Furthermore, any nation that claimed to be noninterventionist was considered to be favorable to the rebels.

## **9.2 FRANCO'S REVENGE AGAINST BARCELONA, MARCH 1938.**

Ambassador Bowers gave an extraordinary account of the Barcelona bombing by the Nazis and the Fascist air force. It is essential to give this account in its entirety because it was a repeat of what the Beast-Man Japanese Imperial Air Force had conducted against the civilian population of Shanghai a year before.

« And then, in early March, 1938, a miracle. The rebel fleet, the {*Baleares*}, the {*Canarias*}, and the {*Cervantes*}, was sighted by the fleet of the loyalist navy, and in the engagement that followed, Franco's flagship, the {*Baleares*}, was sunk. Two weeks later, in Barcelona, Franco took his revenge in the most bestial bombing of a white non-combatant population in the history of the world up until then. It was a Nazi rehearsal for the Second World War.

« The horror began on the night of March 16, 1938, and without warning. The bombers, German and Italian aviators, in German and Italian planes of the deadliest variety, could beplaster the pavements of the city of almost two million people with the blood of their victims within fifteen minutes after leaving their base at Palma de Mallorca. They flew at an enormous height, unseen, unannounced, until the death-dealing explosives struck the city.

« It was ten o'clock at night. Six Hydro-Heikel planes flew over the city at a speed of eighty miles an hour, at a height of four hundred meters, dropping bombs ; and at one seventeen A.M. six more came and repeated the bloody performance. And then, at seven forty A.M. six Savoie-Merchelliti bombers, sent by Mussolini, unloaded bombs of great size; and the Italian planes appeared again at ten-twenty-five with nine-thousand-kilogram bombs.

« The second night, at ten-seventeen, the Heikels returned for another indiscriminate slaughter; and at one-fourteen A.M. they came again. At six fifty-nine A.M. Mussolini's planes had their turn at experimentation, and again, at eight-thirty A.M. Then, at one-fifteen, the Junker planes from Hitler appeared for their tryout and they repeated the performance at three P.M.

« This detailed information came to me from General Fuqua, my military attaché, who was on the spot.

« That a city of nearly two million people was being used as a laboratory for testing new and deadly weapons of destruction was evident. A new type of explosive was being tried. It was described to me by Fuqua as insignificant in size, weighing no more than from fifty to a hundred kilos. It had little power of penetration, but its explosive and expansive force was tremendous. The effect was uncanny (...)

« Nothing on such an appalling scale involving the white race had ever been known before. The bombs were not aimed at military objectives. They were dropped designedly in the center, the most populous section, of the city, where people were dining, walking, sleeping in their beds. When these raids ended, nine hundred men, woman, and children, were mangled corpses, blown in many cases to bits, disemboweled. Forty-eight buildings were wrecked and seventy-five were partially destroyed.

« After each bombing, the hospital corps, assisted by volunteers, rushed into the streets carrying baskets into which they could cast chunks of dismembered bodies, fragments of human flesh, parts of arms, legs, heads. General Fuqua passed a sidewalk café where many had been blown to bits and the waiters were sweeping up small pieces of bodies into containers. He walked gingerly lest he step on a baby's hand. He saw a shoe with the ankle of a woman protruding. The correspondent of the London {Express} passed another outdoor restaurant where the sidewalk was covered with sticky human blood. Many saw a bus, filled with noncombatants, mostly woman and children, stop, in horror, as a bomb fell some distance in front of it, and a moment later another bomb made a clean hit on the bus, and the women and children were mere fragments of human flesh smeared on the pavement.

« On the sidewalk, bodies, not entirely dismembered, were laid out, one after another, for a long distance – woman and children of eight and nine, their eyes still open, staring with an expression of horror. Men feverishly were digging in the ruins of wrecked buildings for the dead and wounded. A few incendiary bombs were dropped, and here and there fires were blazing.

« The monstrosity of this bestial crime momentarily stunned the civilized world, and Chamberlain, whose policy had so righteously denied the government the right to buy anti-aircraft guns for the protection of the people, expressed himself as « horrified and disgusted; » I had no doubt at the time that the Axis was in training for London and Warsaw – {*as we now know it was.* }

« The chief sponsors of the « nonintervention » sham now protested in the name of humanity, and Franco was forced to take cognizance. Barcelona, thereafter, for a while, would be given a respite, but the bombers transferred their sadistic activities to Tarragona and small town and villages along the coast, where non-combatants could be mangled in the absence of the press correspondents. » (Bowers, Op. Cit., p. 375-377.)

## **10.2 THE AMBASSADOR'S REPORT TO WASHINGTON**

On April 15, 1938, it was reported all over the European press that U.S. Secretary of State, Cordell Hull, had opposed the lifting of the embargo on shipping arms to Spain. Under the circumstance of the ongoing genocide by the Axis powers in Spain, this news from the United States was taken very seriously by certain people in Europe as a sign of division within the United States itself over the issue of fascism. The Ambassador of the United States to Spain, Claude G. Bowers, was keenly aware of that division.

The French newspaper {*Le Temps*} reported a note by Secretary Hull saying that the US had been following a « calculated policy so as not to get pulled into a war. » There were no less than 27 European countries which took a so-called « Nonintervention » policy, as early as 1936. Hull reported to the European press that the US had also joined that group of nonintervention, « with a unanimous vote in the Senate, and a majority of 466 voices against 1 in the House of Representatives. » The US considered that the export of US arms to Spain would have been counter to that policy

of nonintervention. However, since this policy applied to all nations, but was not put into practice by Germany, Italy, and Portugal, the fact of avoiding war at all cost resulted in adopting a policy that had the effect of giving the fascists forces in Spain a virtual victory over the Republican forces. Bowers, knew that from the very beginning of the war, and reported the matter, as such, to President Roosevelt.

However, on March 1, 1939, Ambassador Bowers was summoned by Secretary of State, Hull, to travel back to Washington, for the first time since the beginning of the war. The reason for this « consultation » was due to the fact that the British Prime Minister, Neville Chamberlain, had just endorsed the fascist regime of Franco. Hull reported in his {*Memoirs*} that he then sent a wireless to Roosevelt, who was then at sea. The wire said: « I suggest that Ambassador Bowers, our representative to the loyalist government, be ordered home for consultation in order to free our hands for establishing relations with the Franco government. » (Hull, {*Mémoires*}, Vol.I, page 616).

The outline of the report of Ambassador Bowers to President Roosevelt was as follows. It said:

« (1) That after the first days of considerable confusion, it was plainly shown to be a war of the Fascists and the Axis powers against the democratic institutions of Spain.

« (2) That the Spanish war was the beginning of a perfectly thought-out plan for the extermination of democracy in Europe, and the beginning of a Second World War with that as the intent.

« (3) That the Nonintervention Committee was a shameless sham, cynically dishonest, in that Germany and Italy were constantly sending soldiers, planes, tanks, artillery, and ammunition into Spain without an interference or real protest from the signatories of the pact.

« (4) That Germany and Italy were using Spanish towns and people for experimental purposes in trying out their new methods of destruction and their new techniques of terrorism.

« (5) That the Axis, in preparation for the continental struggle, was using Spain to see how far it could go with the silent acquiescence of the

great democracies and to test their spirit, courage, and will to fight in defense of their ideals.

« (6) That the Axis powers believed that with the conversion of Spain into a Fascist state, it could, and would, be used as an entering wedge in South and Central America. I informed Washington of the open boasting of the Franco press of the determination to ‘liberate’ South America from ‘Yankee bondage and atheism.’

« (7) That the purpose was manifest in a book prepared for use in the schools bitterly attacking democracy in general and that of the United States and Britain in particular.

« (8) That the attacks, ridicule, and insults aimed at the United States and England by the Franco press left no possible doubts as to its position.

« (9) That while the Axis powers poured in armies, planes, tanks, artillery, technicians, and engineers for Franco, the Nonintervention Committee of the European democracies and our own embargo were making a powerful contribution to the triumph of the Axis over democracy in Spain; that whereas the war on China was being waged by the Japs alone, on Czechoslovakia by Nazi Germany alone, on Abyssinia by Fascist Italy alone, the first country to be attacked {*by the Axis – Germany and Italy together – was Spain.*}

« (10) That it was my opinion, long before Munich, that the next attack would be on Czechoslovakia, because of the bitter abuse of her, without apparent reason, by Germans and Italians who crossed the Spanish border for food in Saint-Jean-de-Luz and Biarritz.

« (11) I had informed Washington that our interests, ideologically, commercially, and industrially, were bound up with those of democracy in Spain, whose government we recognized as the legal constitutional government, and that the victory of Franco would be a danger to the United States, especially in South America.

« With these views constantly sent to the State Department for more than two years, I never received any comment from the department. Now we know that there was a cleavage there even in the higher strata. » (Claude Bowers, Op. Cit. p. 411-413.)

Bowers added: “ I found there was a sharp division in the State Department on our policy in Spain, though the pro-Franco element was more numerous, and strategically placed. » Bowers singled out especially Secretary Hull who admitted in his memoirs that « Bowers, himself a liberal, promptly took sides in the Civil War. He felt that the United States should make its policies conform to the vital interests of the liberal forces prosecuting one side of the war. He buttressed this view by frequent references to the assistance rendered by Germany and Italy to Franco. At the State Department, while recognizing that what Bowers had to say about Germany and Italy was true, we had to pursue a broader course, which recognized the grave danger that the civil war in Spain might erupt into a European war. » ( Bowers, Op. Cit. p. 415.)

« This goes to the very heart of the difference in opinion between me and members of the Department, » continued Bowers. « They went upon the theory that this was a ‘ civil war –so like the ‘ civil wars ‘ in Norway and Poland – and that the policy of appeasement, sponsored by Chamberlain, would prevent a World War; I, upon the theory that the Fascist states, would inevitably accept this policy of acquiescence or appeasement as evidence of weakness or cowardice and conclude that the hour had struck for an all-out effort to exterminate democracy throughout Europe, and that this would make a World War inevitable...Within six months after the troops of Mussolini and Hitler marched with a dash before Franco’s reviewing stand in Barcelona in celebration of the Fascist triumph in Spain, the World War came. » (Idem. p. 416.)

Bowers ended his report with a very telling meeting he had with President Roosevelt. He reported: « When I saw Mr. Hull he received me with his usual cordiality, but he seemed disinclined to discuss the Spanish situation, the solution of which had been determined upon when I was summoned home for « consultation » in order « to free our hands in establishing relations with the Franco government. »

« I found President Roosevelt seated at his desk in the White House residence, more serious and graver than I had ever seen him before. I got the impression that he was not happy over the course we had followed. Before I could sit down or utter a word, he said:

« We have made a mistake; you have been right all along. »

« He said more, in explanation, that I do not feel free to quote from my diary. He did say, however, that he had been deluged with contradictory information from many quarters other than from the ambassador to Spain. I knew, of course that the ambassadors of Chamberlain and Bonnet had given information in contradiction of mine; that our embassy in London reflected the views of Chamberlain; and that other American ambassadors, depending on the propaganda of Franco agents, had joined. I asked him if our minister in Iraq had sent him information « right out of the horse's mouth, » and for the first time he smiled as he put a cigarette in his long holder.

« It was then he said, with some vehemence, that he could see no reason to hurry about the recognition of Franco, that he would let him « stew in his juices for a while, » and that he would like me to remain in Washington for some time. He was leaving the next day for Warm Springs, and later, when recognition was accorded, I learned from two members of the Cabinet that on leaving he had given instructions that nothing is done until after his return.

« When I saw Sumner Welles he reiterated what the President had said about doing nothing for the time. » (Idem. p. 419.) Was the recognition of Franco's fascist government accelerated behind Roosevelt's back?

Bowers is very discrete about this question, since he, himself, avoided to answer the question of recommending recognition of Franco when it was asked of him from the Foreign Affairs Committee. He answered that he considered this to be a matter for the President and the State Department. However, Bowers did let out who were the higher ups involved in pushing for recognition of Franco. The « higher strata » that Bowers has identified included, Secretary Hull and his « advisor politically on western Europe Mr. Dunn. » As Bowers put it: « It was very clear, that the recognition of Franco had been determined upon. Mr. Dunn, on whose political judgment as to Western Europe Mr. Hull leaned, was clearly impatient for an immediate recognition. I told Mr. Welles that but for the fact that we had heavy investments in Spain that might suffer through Fascist resentment, I would never favor the recognition, but since the recognition was clearly indicated, I thought there should be three conditions in according it:

« (1) That there would be a positive pledge that there would be no interference with American interests in Spain.

« (2) That there would be a positive pledge that there would be no reprisals, political executions, and persecutions of the defeated democrats.

« (3) That the imprisoned loyalists should be given their freedom.

« Mr. Welles said:

« We have these assurances. »

« Just whence these assurances came, and through what intermediary outside Spain, he did not say. It was not until after the appearance of Mr. Hull's {*Memoirs*} that I learned that it was Mr. Bullitt who negotiated with the Franco agents in Paris for the recognition, and that no pledge was made against reprisals, executions, and imprisonments. Mr. Hull reports " in the full flush of victory, » the Franco government was not inclined to make any promise worth having. » And so, with that perfectly clear, we accorded recognition to Franco, and the « full flush of victory » was to last for at least ten years. » (Bowers, Op. Cit. p. 420)

The truth of the matter is that this war ended without a victory. The Spanish Civil War ended with everyone losing. Nobody had won the war, because nobody was able to win the peace. The Fascists were able to achieve a tactical advantage, but they were not able to win over the people. The Popular Front lost everything because they were unable to uplift and unify the general population. As a result, no one received the « mantle from heaven ». It is because no one was able to take the moral high ground and fight for morality and culture that the end of the Spanish Civil War kept the Spanish population into a terrible tragedy from which they have not been able to recover to this day. The only way for Spain to recover from this terrible circumstance is to join with the LaRouche forces in the United States today and embrace the principle of a Second Treaty of Westphalia.

\*\*\*\*\*





**BEASTMAN HIDEYOSHI**

## 11.2 ANNEX: THE TANAKA PLAN AND THE BEASTMAN OF JAPAN.

I am bringing up this question of the {*Tanaka Memorial*} in the context of the Spanish Civil War, because the timing of the Japanese expansion on the Asiatic Continent was coordinated with the Fascist and Nazi offensive in Spain. In other words, the 1936-1939 period of preparation for World War II was made to coincide with a staging effort that was to lead to a two-prong attack on the USSR from Germany and from Japan simultaneously, and Spain was the European staging ground for the German Eastward offensive, while Manchuria was the staging ground for the Japanese Northward and Westward offensive.

Only after that phase of the war was to be completed, the East and West axis powers would attack the United States. As the editor of the {*Tanaka Memorial*}, Carl Crow, put it; « Japan's attack on Manchuria set the pattern for the series of aggressions which followed by Germany and Italy. Japan had proven that she could safely defy the League of Nations and break treaties. Soon thereafter Japan, Germany and Italy entered into the so-called Anti-Comintern pact which was later strengthened and became the Axis alliance. Although the terms of these pacts were never made public, it is obvious to all that they were agreements for division of the world between these three powers, that, as a reward for her support, Japan would receive the hegemony of East Asia. » (Tanaka, Op. Cit., p. 68.) After the war, the American forces for the reconstruction of Japan were never able to find the war files of the emperor, nor those of the military command.

The Tenaka Memorial has been described by some as the {*Mein Kamp*} of Baron Giichi Tanaka, Prime Minister of Japan, during the first quarter of the twentieth century. That is a narrow view, but not an entirely wrong way of looking at world strategy. The {*Tanaka Memorial*} was nothing but a Synarchy International plan for central bankers to establish a fascist dictatorship worldwide and to capture the raw material wealth of East Asia.

This document is said to have been presented to the Japanese Emperor, on July 25, 1927, and a copy of it was made public by the Chinese

government as representing a master plan for Japanese world conquest, including the plan to attack the United States of America. The authenticity of the document has been officially denied by the government of Japan, however, the Beast-Man characteristic of the Japanese Imperial tradition that it reflects makes it entirely coherent with the Synarchy International fascist world domination.

In the very first introduction pages of the book, the editor, Carl Crow, identified the Japanese Beast-Man character as follows:

« One of the famous sights in the beautiful Japanese city of Kyoto is a conical mound which is known as the {*Ear Hill*}. Until about twenty-five years ago, it was pointed out to tourists by every Japanese guide, who told the story of Hideyoshi, the great national hero of Japan conquered Korea after a war, which lasted seven years. At the conclusion of the war, thousands of ears and noses of the vanquished foe were sent back, pickled in wine, to be entombed here as visual evidence of Japanese might. According to Japanese history, they were cut from the bodies of 38,000 Chinese and Korean soldiers who had been slaughtered in the last week of the war. This conflict had lasted much longer than the Japanese anticipated and the noses and ears were intended to show the desperation of the struggle. The inscription on the mound records this great battle as having taken place in October of 1598. » (Baron Giichi Tanaka, {*Japan's Dream of World Empire: The Tanaka Memorial*}, Ed. with introduction by Carl Crow, Harper & Brothers, New York, 1942, p.5) Thus, imperialist Beast-Man Hideyoshi became the model that the Synarchy International used in Japan for their pre-World War II deployments against Manchuria, Mongolia, and China.

In his general considerations to the Emperor, Tanaka explained very clearly what the Manchuria and Mongolia objectives were: « The term Manchuria and Mongolia includes the provinces Fengtien, Kirin, Heilungkiang and Outer and Inner Mongolia. It extends an area of 74,000 square miles, having a population of 28,000,000 people. The territory is more than three times as large as our own empire not counting Korea and Formosa, but it is inhabited by only one third as many people. The attractiveness of the lands does not arise from the scarcity of population alone; its wealth of forestry, minerals and agriculture products is also unrivalled elsewhere in the world. In order to exploit these resources for the

perpetuation of our national glory, we created especially the South Manchuria Railway Company. » (Tanaka, Op. Cit., p. 17.)

After a lengthy diatribe against the Nine Power Treaty, signed at the Washington Conference of 19??, and which left Japan holding the short end of the stick, Tanaka concluded that the Emperor had to launch an all out war of expansion: « Japan cannot remove the difficulties in Eastern Asia unless she adopts a policy of Blood and Iron. But, in carrying out this policy we have to face the United States which has been turned against us by China's policy of fighting poison with poison. In the future if we want to control China, we must first crush the United States just as in the past we had to fight in the Russo-Japanese War. But in order to conquer China, we must first conquer Manchuria and Mongolia. In order to conquer the world, we must first conquer China. If we succeed in conquering China, the rest of the Asiatic countries and the South Sea countries will fear us and will surrender to us. Then the world will realize that Eastern Asia is ours and will not dare to violate our rights. This is the plan left to us by Emperor Meiji, the success of which is essential to our national existence. » (Tanaka, Op. Cit., p. 21.)

## ON HOMAGE TO CATALONIA

On April 25, 1937, a prominent communist figure of Barcelona, Roldan Cortada, was assassinated, presumably by the anarchists. That set the fire to the powder. The city of Barcelona had been literally put into the hands of the anarchists who had no government, but simply a local control 'defense committee'. The anarchist strategy had always been, ever since the Paris commune of Prudhon in 1871, to eliminate the administration of a city government as such, and replace it by collectivist communes. As Orwell wrote in his {*Collected Essays*}, Vol. I, p. 269: « The fact which these papers ({*News Chronicle*} and {*The Daily Worker*}) have so carefully obscured is that the Spanish government (including the semi-autonomous Catalan government) is far more afraid of the revolution than it is of the fascists. » Orwell was attempting by all means to toe the line that it was impossible to have a coalition between the bourgeois republicans and the communists. Thus, this total outburst of rage: »Hence, in the face of such a blatant reactionary as Franco, you get for a while a situation in which the worker and the bourgeois, in reality deadly enemies, are fighting side by side. This uneasy alliance is known as the Popular Front (or, in the

Communist press, to give it a spuriously democratic appeal, People's Front). It is a combination with about as much vitality, and about as much right to exist, as a pig with two heads or some other Barnum and Bailey monstrosity. » (« *Spilling the Spanish beans* » -- an Essay by George Orwell from {*New English Weekly*}, 29 July and 2 September 1937, p. 1-2.)

The reader might think that Orwell is really attempting at getting at the truth. Think again. Orwell's task is to create maximum confusion, maximum chaos. That is why, in the end, he concludes: « On the whole, a deadlock seems the likeliest thing. »

\*\*\*\*\*

# **SYNARCHY MOVEMENT OF EMPIRE**

## **BOOK III**

\*\*\*\*\*

### **THE SYNARCHY INTERNATIONAL**

\*\*\*\*\*

#### **Chapter II**

#### **2.1 FRENCH SYNARCHIST CONSTITUTION.....54**

- 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**
- 6.2 THE SYNARCHIST EUROPEAN CONSTITUTION**

\*\*\*\*\*

**THE DEFECTS OF THE FRENCH CONSTITUTIONS**, since the Bastille coup d'etat of 1789, and it is about to receive the biggest blow ever with the unraveling financial crisis. The primary cause of this tragedy is attributable to the lack of a *{true universal Republican Constitution}*. The only true French exceptions had been the Constitution founded during the Tennis Court Oath of June 20, 1789, by the first President of the French National Assembly, Jean Sylvain Bailly, and the Charles de Gaulle 5<sup>th</sup> Republic; both of which were established in the spirit of the American Constitution. However, the people of France rejected their first Constitution and adopted instead, in 1793, a Jean Jacques Rousseau style of tyrannical democracy based on the fraudulent idea of *{equality}*.

Today, the Synarchist leader, Valery Giscard d'Estaing, who has officially proposed a European Constitution, to the European Union, in Thessaloniki, Greece, on June 20, 2003, is still pursuing this fraudulent idea of *{equality}*; that is, the fascist *{equality}* of politically herding people like European cattle into the central banker's slaughter house. The good news about this is that the French people have overwhelmingly said "NO" to this constitution in the recent referendum of Sunday May 29, 2005.

Giscard d'Estaing had chosen to launch his project in Thessaloniki, Greece, not only because it is the location of the Aristotle University, but also because it was in ancient Thessaly that experiments were done on how to model human behavior following the herding principle of animals, which became known as the Thessalikos method of "*{political herding}*." (See Plato, *{The Statesman}*, 264C.)

The sort of treason that Giscard d'Estaing is committing today is not new in France. It had actually been officially sanctioned, as early as 1790, when the contradictions began to appear between the constituents of the National Assembly and the interests of Europe as a whole. The new "revolutionary" government of France could not conciliate their own self-interests with those of the rest of Europe, as if the new Republic were unable to carry the universal mandate of freedom in the manner that Marquis de Lafayette had identified, during the American Revolution, when he likened the American Constitution to a *{"Beacon of Hope and a Temple of Liberty for all of Mankind."}* Why did France chose to get involved into *{political herding}* instead, and fail in that task of national sovereignty? The short

answer is that France had been taken over by central bankers. A longer answer, however, is required as it pertains to the constitutional framework of the Nation-State of France and the shortcomings of the people.

This constitutional question is not easy to answer and requires some thought. After the demise of Jean Sylvain Bailly and of Marquis de Lafayette, the French National Assembly became unfit to solve the crucial constitutional French paradox of the *{Monarchy within the Republic}*. As a result of not using a universally valid American Revolution type of constitutional framework, based on the *{general welfare}* of the people, and on the Gottfried Leibniz principle of *{Love, Liberty, and the pursuit of Happiness}*, that Bailly and Lafayette had begun to elaborate during the months of June and July of 1789, the French oligarchy kept seeking disguised forms of feudal constitutional frameworks, based on the British subversions of the John Locke principle of *{Life, Liberty, and Propriety}*. That Lockean principle kept changing, every few years, depending on the interest groups, and depending on the inclination of the parties, and the bankers that were backing them up.

As a result, the French population has been subjected to 12 different Constitutions within a period of 167 years, since 1789, including the fascist-synarchist constitution of the Vichy regime, in 1940. The different constitutions were established in 1791, 1793, 1795, 1799, 1802, 1804, 1848, 1852, 1875, 1940, 1946, and 1958. This does not include the different internal constitutional amendments, which occurred in 1815, 1830, and 1852. Today, synarchist leader, Valery Giscard d'Estaing, has abandoned the French Constitution to its own demise, and is promoting a European Constitution, instead, which is based essentially on the same defects.

In his book on *{Europe and the French Revolution,}* nineteenth-century French historian, Albert Sorel, had correctly perceived the anomaly of the French constitutional framework, as well as its potential dangers, but he was too much of a coward to denounce the fraud before the French population, and make it a life or death issue of it, for the sake of his nation. Sorel preferred to sacrifice the *{welfare of the people}* for the *{Reason of State}*, when he wrote:

*"In order to measure precisely the scope of the first enterprises of 1790, it was necessary to change the point of view, go over the border, and penetrate inside of the these cabinets where reason did not reason as in*



*France, and where law was founded on opposite rules. What is going on in Paris shall appear, on the day when people shall make the discovery of it, as something, which is simultaneously very singular and very threatening. In reality, France does not rip up the treaties, which would be very simple; she converts their obligations, transforms their cause, and modifies their object. The treaties accepted by kings no longer bind her, since she possesses, and from now on acquires, (a status) by virtue of a public right that kings do not know. However, these treaties continue to bind foreign States, because they still live under the same rule, as in the time when these treaties were signed. {They are obliged to abide by the treaty of Westphalia, because this treaty is in accordance with their rule; but they are not founded in claiming that France should abide by it, since she no longer admits of its principle}. (Emphasis added). (1)*

There you have it, in black and white, and that is precisely the point at issue, in Europe, again today: the European powers were "*not founded in claiming that France should abide by the Treaty of Westphalia.*" That was precisely the problem. The Treaty of Westphalia needed to be re-enforced. It was a question of political courage, and Sorel knew it. The French Revolution had renounced the constitutional application of the universal principle of the Peace of Westphalia, and every nation in Europe had the right and duty to remind France of that.

France would no longer abide by the Peace of Westphalia principle of the {*Advantage of the other*}, which was the principle upon which the American Bill of Rights and American Constitution had been built on, since 1776. What Sorel did not say, and should have said, is that this rejection of the Peace of Westphalia principle was unlawfully replaced by the rule of {*La force prime le droit*} (*Might makes right*), through the lying principle of {*Equality*}. What Sorel should have objected to was that the new {*Reason of State*} was a fraud, because it had been turned stupidly against the {*State of Reason*}. However, Sorel chose to remain silent, and so did the rest of the French population.

The tragic irony is that it was precisely the fall of the French Monarchy that destroyed the hope of a successful French Revolution, and precluded the establishment of a true Universal Republic. Had the French people kept their legitimate King on the throne of France, after 1789, and maintained the 1648 tradition of the Peace of Westphalia, as the basis for

their foreign policy, the French Revolution would have been a complete success, and the other nations of Europe would have embraced its principle. The truth of the matter is that the French monarchy had never been, per se, in opposition of principle, against the Republic. Louis XI had established the first Republican Nation-State, because it was based on the principle of the *{General Welfare}* of all of the people, the *{commonwealth}*. Henry IV would have established a coalition of Sovereign European Republics, based on the same principle of the common good, if he had not been assassinated in 1610. The only prerequisite for a French *{Republican Monarchy}*, was for France to establish a series of constitutional check and balance provisions, between the legislative, executive, and judicial branches, provided they were established on the basis of the *{general welfare}*, as in the American Constitution.

Granted, the King would no longer have been all-powerful, as he would have been made to accept a higher national authority, before God, and that was, the authority of a Sovereign Constitutional Rule, based on Natural Law. This provision was made explicit in the Bailly Constitution of 1791: "*{Art. 1. Sovereignty is one, indivisible, inalienable and indefeasible. It pertains to the Nation and no portion of the people, nor any individual can lay claim to the exercise of it. 2. The Nation, from whom all powers derive, can exercise them only by delegation. - The French Constitution is representative: the representatives are the legislative Body and the King.}*" (Title III, Art. 1 and 2.) That is to say, no aristocracy and no single Sovereign shall be the exclusive representative of the people. This was a direct repudiation of Louis XVI's silly provocation, which he tragically proffered before the National Assembly of June 23, 1789, when he said:

"You have just heard the result of my dispositions and of my views: they are in conformity with the living desire that I have of accomplishing the public good; and if, by a fatality that I exclude from my mind, you were to abandon me in such a beautiful enterprise, then, alone I shall accomplish the good for my people, alone I shall consider myself their true representative... Think it through, Gentlemen, that none of your projects can have force of law without my special approval. Thus, I am the natural guarantor of your respective rights, and all of the orders of the State can rest on my equitable impartiality.... I order you to separate each other immediately..." (Jean Sylvain Bailly, *{Mémoires}*, Tome Premier, Paris, Bédouin et Frères, 1821, p.213.) This was the first official rejection by Louis XVI of the authority of the newly created National Assembly.

Similarly, Louis XVI refused to recognize the legitimate existence of the National Assembly, the sovereign principle of the Nation, as well as the higher authority of Constitutional Law, during the celebration of the Federation at the Champs de Mars, on July 14, 1790. In so doing, and by attempting to save his single Royal Authority, at all cost, the King destroyed the French Monarchy. From that moment on, France went from tragedy to tragedy. Since that period of time, France has been unable to define itself as a constitutional Sovereign Nation-State. Before attempting to define what, in the specific historical case of France, has prevent it from defining itself constitutionally, let us examine the general conditions that might be required to define a Nation-State.

## **2.2 BOUNDARY CONDITIONS OF A NATION-STATE?**

In a first approximation, one might be tempted to define a nation, as a union of a majority of people who have the same language, the same religion the same historical traditions, and the same culture. However, such a definition is far from satisfactory, because it can be applied to a people who do not form a nation, such as the population of Quebec, for example, and yet, it does not necessarily apply to a true sovereign nation-state, such as the United States of America.

Secondly, one might be tempted to define a nation as a union of people which has organized itself within a given territory, based on common customs and tribal traditions, established a government, and maintains regular relations with neighboring populations, who live outside of their recognized and accepted borders. American Indian tribes have had nations corresponding to that definition, yet they have not succeeded in forming a sovereign nation-state, in the modern sense of the term.

Thirdly, one might even be tempted to define a national system as made up of different States in which the stronger ones assimilate the weaker ones to form a nation. In which case the annexation might become the *{sine qua non}* condition for maintaining the very existence of the nation-state itself, such as the case of Italy in 1860, and of Germany in 1866. There is no doubt that many nations have been formed by such a process of willful assimilation by annexation, but the fact that this is being recognized

historically does not mean that it could be construed as a right of nations. Otherwise, there would be no way to prevent a stronger State from giving itself the right to take over a weaker State, for the simple reason that it happens to be sitting next to its border. This has been the central anomaly of French history.

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 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 at the expense of its neighbors, during a period of over 1,000 years.

Attempting to establish the definition of a nation-state from these geo-political, or religious-socio-cultural categories should be seen, indeed, as nothing else but an obvious exercise in futility. And the reason why all of these categories fail the test of defining the sovereign nation-state is because they all represent {*objective boundary conditions*} of past historical circumstances. Yet, as civilization progressed toward the future, beyond the shores of Europe, peoples of different languages, of different religious beliefs, and of different historical pasts, had left Europe and decided to "*join themselves together to form a more perfect union*," in America, because Europe was incapable of establishing a true Republican nation-state. As will be shown below, the issue of {*boundary conditions*} of a sovereign nation-state is a subjective question. This is the reason why the United States of Europe today could never represent the same kind of sovereignty as that of the United States of America.

The European nation that was the closest to satisfy these subjective boundary conditions was the France of 1789 - 1793. But she failed miserably after a true Republican Monarchy had been constitutionally initiated during the first French National Assembly, established by Jean Sylvain Bailly and General Lafayette, during the Oath of Constitutional Union that became the founding moment of a Constitutional Monarchy, on June 20, 1789.

However, because the tragic little people of France chose to follow the *{vox populi}* of synarchist ideologues such as the Duke of Orleans, Philippe Egalite, and Jacques Necker, two British agents of Lord Shelburne and Jeremy Bentham, France was turned into a fascist dictatorship of terror and violence beginning with the Coup d'Etat of Bastille Day, of July 14, 1789. This is the primary reason why France failed to become a true sovereign republican nation-state. There are other, more profound reasons.

In his dialogue, *{The Statesman}*, Plato showed that only true statesmanship can weave the web of the State, by bringing the complex plane of the many minds of men, composing the nation, into an enduring union which reflects the common good of all. That is why Plato insisted in making the difference between man and the beasts. He was opposed to the King-herdsmanship idea of ruling over a State. The *{herd-equality}* principle of the French Revolution was precisely what Plato had rejected, as he exemplified by his reference to the "flocks of tame cranes and tame geese in Thessaly." The infamous clause of *{equality}* of France has been maintained in practically all of the French Constitutions, since 1789. To make a long story short, it essentially means that everyone has the right to be herded.

With the communistic Constitution of 1893, the idea of *{equality}* was used as a pretext for terrorizing the countryside with the Buonarroti slogan "*{Take from those who have too much, and give to those who have nothing.}*" With the Bourbon restoration of 1814, the Constitutional Charter, written for Louis XVIII, proclaimed in its very first article: "The French are equal before the law no matter what title or rank they may have." And Article 3, states: "They are all equally admissible to civil and military employment." The true meaning of the constitutional idea of *{equality}* became exceedingly clear under the Vichy regime. Marechal Petain gave this following message to the nation on October 11, 1940: "The new regime shall establish a social hierarchy. It will no longer be based on the false idea of natural equality between human beings, but on the necessary idea of equality of chances given to all Frenchmen to prove their ability to serve." Just to show how some people were a little less equal than others, during the Vichy regime, all of the lawyers were excluded from public functions, and all Jewish people were excluded from civil and military functions. It is real irony of history that the *{Equality}* Principle should turn out to be an unjust lie, and that the only just constitutional principle should turn out to be unequal, because it is the principle of the *{Advantage of the other.}*

The true borders of a nation-state are defined by the very constitution of that nation-state, and her extension is limited by the principles that govern its people, not by the limits of its physical borders. A nation is great not because of the {*grandeur*} of its territory, but because of the {*grandeur*} of its soul. The reason why France has not yet achieved the status of a true sovereign republican nation-state is because its feudal oligarchy, represented today by the synarchist Valery Giscard d'Estaing, has prevented it from having a true constitutional framework. As a result, the French population has been subjected to a total of 12 different Constitutions, during a period of 167 years. This ranks France as the first nation in history to have achieved the world's record for the highest number of constitutional disguises hiding the face of imperial oligarchical rule. And now Giscard d'Estaing is coming out with constitution no. 13, just to tease the devil.

When France rejected Bailly and Lafayette, in 1791, it rejected, by the same token, the legacy of the American system of political economy, the legacy of Cardinal Mazarin and Jean Baptiste Colbert, of Gottfried Leibniz' principle of {*agape*}, the {*charity of the wise*}, that is, the principle of the {*Advantage of the other,*} of the Peace of Westphalia, which had been embodied in the 1776 Declaration of Independence, as well as in the Preamble of the American Constitution of 1789, establishing the three principles of sovereignty of the nation, the general welfare of the people, and the dedication to posterity. Those principles represented the true {*boundary conditions*} of any sovereign Republican nation-state. Now let us examine some pertinent circumstances of French history with respect to these principles.

### **3.2 THE POLITICAL FUNCTION OF REPRESENTATION.**

As a rule of thumb, and in order to focus the **{attention on the intention}**, with respect to French history, the American reader should bear in mind that, whenever the national interests of France is turned inwardly, that is, toward exclusive self-interests, and not outwardly, toward the **{Advantage of the other}**, fascism takes over either in the form of tyrannical democracy **{Egalitarianism, or Jacobinism}** or, in the form of dictatorship **{Monarchism, or Bonapartisme}**. This is the reason why, in 1900, one of the fathers of modern fascism, and leader of "Action Francaise," Charles Maurras, wanted to have France return to a Monarchical system: **{*"The monarchy,"* he wrote, *"is the form of government that is the most efficient and enduring; the others, like democracy and dictatorship are too temporary by nature."*}** What kind of **{efficiency}** or **{enduring}** is Maurras talking about? What kind of **{representation}** can a King provide for his people? What sort of **{guarantee}** was Louis XVI willing to provide with his **{equitable impartiality}**? In other words, what sort of **{equality}** can a constitution provide? The answer to all of these questions is none! Because the **{political function of representation}** has been totally misunderstood. ~~Hostile Representation of representation~~ **{representation}** get so skewed and misunderstood in France? The only true meaning of political representation is what Leibniz called **{agape}** the charity of the wise. If one pays attention to all of the efforts of conciliating personal interests with the interest of the Nation, it will become noticeable that the framers of these French constitutions slid imperceptibly into the fallacy of composition, which opposed "freedom" to "authority," while they ignored the three fundamental principles of **{Sovereignty, General Welfare, and Security for Posterity}** of all of the people. How was this done?

First of all, and as a matter of course with the bill of rights, the first framers of the French Constitutions skewed the real issue of principle by resorting exclusively to either J.J. Rousseau or Montesquieu, and since both of these authors were hostile to the idea of **{representation}**, a true representative government was impossible. The framers of the constitutions who came after them made the mistake of using the same fallacious basis. For example, take Rousseau's statement against the idea of representation:

***"Sovereignty cannot be represented for the same reason that it cannot be alienated; it consists essentially in the general will, and the general will cannot be represented: it is itself or it is another; there is no***

*middle ground. The deputies of the people are not and cannot be its representatives; they are merely commissioners; they cannot conclude anything definitely. Any law that the people in person have not ratified is nul; it is not a law.*" (*Le Contrat social* }, Book III, Chap. XV.)

Then, Montesquieu was also hostile to the idea of representation:

*"Since in a free State every man who has a free soul must be governed by himself, it were also necessary that the body of the people should have the legislative power. However, since this is impossible within large States, and is subjected to much greater inconveniences in small ones, it is necessary that what the people cannot do by itself, should be done through its representatives."* (*L'Esprit des Lois*}, Livre XI, chap. VI.)

In other words, neither Rousseau, nor Montesquieu have had a notion of how *{a government of the people, by the people, and for the people}* should be governed. Such a notion never entered in any of the 12 French constitutions of France since 1789. In France, it seems that the question of *{representation}* had never been understood, and the reason it was never understood is derived historically from the fact that the constitutions were never written with the purpose of the *{general welfare}* in mind, that is, the principle of the Peace of Westphalia, the *{Advantage of the other}*. Quite to the contrary, the constitution was construed to conciliate different interest groups, which was first represented by the division of National Assembly between those who sat on the right of the President, that is, representing the interests of the monarchy, and those who sat on the left side of the President, representing the interests of the people. That was called French political representation. That is the reason why, in his book on the Vichy government, the synarchist Oliver Wormser concluded that the only way to resolve the question of *{representation}*, was to seek a conciliation between *{authority}* and *{freedom}*, that is, between *{monarchy}* and *{democracy}*. This is the reason the *{President de la Republique}* had been nothing less than a parliamentary monarch.

The elaboration of a constitution requires the grounding of principles, and not simply the setting of legal conditions to conciliate the *{authority}* of an elite with the *{freedom}* of the masses. A good example of this was the case of the synarchist constitution of the Vichy regime. In his address to the nation on October 11, 1940, Marshal Petain made the following statement:



"History is made up of alternating periods of authority, which degenerated into tyranny, and periods of freedom, which engendered license. The hour has come for France to substitute to these painful alternatives a harmonious conjunction of authority and freedoms."

During the same year, 1940, synarchist banker Emmanuel Monick, former governor of the Banque de France, and Honorary President of the Banque de Paris et des Pays Bas, asked his synarchist associate, former French Ambassador to Moscow, Oliver Wormser, to write him a legal brief on how to constitutionally safeguard and maintain the legal status of bankers under the fascist regime of Marshal Petain, as well as under a new regime that could be established if there were to be a liberation. Monick had just been nominated General Secretary of the French Protectorate in Morocco, in North Africa, where Wormser was stationed. Monick asked Wormser:

***"Is there in our history, and especially in our constitutional history, some precedents which would permit to slow down the arbitrariness of Vichy?"***

Wormser's obliged Monick by writing a book, which became a justification for the fascist policy of Charles Maurras. His investigation took him back to the 1789. Here is his apparently reasonable answer to Monick's question:

***"Ever since 1789, France had been in search of a constitution. Sometimes the principle of popular sovereignty had triumphed; sometimes the need for authority had prevailed. The systematic constitutions, both the authoritarian ones as well as the democratic ones, have collapsed rapidly, or have not been able to be put into application. The constitution of June 24, 1793, respected so well the principle of popular sovereignty, that it was not applicable...Neither did the authoritarian constitutions survive much longer than the fortune of those who inspired them.... On the contrary, the constitutions which have been able to conciliate the rights of the people and the necessities of Government, under which a protection was equally provided for the masses and for the elite... such constitutions, molded on common sense, have endured. Neither the principles of popular sovereignty, nor the monarchical principle, have provided in and of themselves the necessary guarantees against tyranny.... In truth, they have to be combined with a third principle, that of the separation of powers." (2)***

How can a third principle be good when it is added to two other principles, which are no good? This is the condition of constitutional impotence in which France still finds itself to this day. Where did Wormser find his synarchist constitutional ideas?

## 4.2 MAURRAS AND THE IDEOLOGY OF VICHY

At the very heart of the Synarchy and of the Petain fascist regime of Vichy, during the 1940 to 1942 occupation period, can be found the fascist ideas that Charles Maurras had developed 40 years earlier, in Action Francaise; that is, the political reaction and opposition to parliamentary democracy, the reaction to the Jacobin anarchy of 1789, the reaction against the Code Napoleon. In 1900, Maurras wrote a book called *{Enquete sur la Monarchie}* which called for the elimination of the "Republic" and for the reestablishment of the Monarchy.

The first public statement of Action Francaise, however, was a lie. It did not act according to the monarchical principles that it purported to represent. The first public action chosen by Maurras, in 1898, was to launch an anti-Semitic, anti-Protestant, and anti-Freemasonic campaign that would polarize all of France. He founded a group of right wing intellectuals that polarized itself against the left, and spewed their venom on the Dreyfus affair. Their first line of combat was a campaign against the "Dreyfusards."

Henri Vaugois, Maurice Pujo, and Francois de Mahy, who were not royalists, but "republicans", had founded the initial group of Action Francaise. Maurras was the only royalist of the group. During the first two years, 1898-99, Action Francaise went through some transformations, and after Maurras published his *{Enquete sur la monarchie}* (*Inquiry on the Monarchy*), in 1900, the movement adopted the monarchist ideology of Maurras. From that moment on, the group included: Maurice Barres, Paul Bourget, Henry Bordeaux, Jules Lemaitre, Francois Coppee, Lucien Moreau, Jacques Bainville, Louis Dimier, Sully Prudhomme, Forain, and others.

In his *{Enquete sur la monarchie}*, Maurras called for a return to 1789, a return to undo the past and restart anew with the monarchy: "This idea that there has been a misdeal, that the Revolution had pulled the Nation

in the wrong direction, and that it was necessary to come back to the starting point to rectify the error" ... " In one word, said Jules Lemaitre, "the monarchists only wished to redo 89 as it should have been done." (*Enquete sur la monarchie*}, p.382) According to Oliver Wormser, a synarchist who fully endorsed Maurras on this question, the return to the monarchical system does not necessarily mean a the return to an actual king, as such, but the return to a single strong leader who rules for life.

This was also the explicite policy of the Vichy Minister of Justice, Raphael Alibert, who wrote in 1939: "*The problem of public freedom is thus transformed; it is not dominated any longer by ideologies, but by political, social, and economic phenomena, which will either kill those freedoms or, to the contrary, will give them all of their latitude, depending on their evolution within anarchy or within order... The neo-revolution that we are witnessing guarantees that public freedom shall reside within an authority. And this is not a paradox, because when the authority is understood properly, it liberates us from hostile coalitions, it becomes the guardian and arbiter of free activities, and is also as far from dictatorship as from the weaknesses of formal democracy.*" This is how fascism was being smoothly introduced and made to be accepted.

Olivier Wormser, wrote his book on Vichy, {*Les Origines Doctrinales de la Revolution Nationale* }, based on a request made by a synarchist banker, Emmanuel Monick, about the existence of a legal precedent that would justify the Vichy regime. The book was written personally for Monick, and for internal circulation among bankers, during the October 1940 to March 1941 period of the war, and was only published in 1971. The legal advice that Wormser gave to Monick was entirely based on the fascist-monarchist ideology of Charles Maurras, and his book {*Enquete sur la monarchie* }.

Wormser opens his book by quoting Marshal Petain in the speech of October 11, 1940, quoted above, stating that the Third Republic "was heading for a political revolution that the war and the defeat merely accelerated."

Interestingly enough, the so-called "Third Republic" was the only Parliamentary Democracy that France had, and its constitution lasted the longest since the Revolution of 89, that is, during a total of 65 years. It had also gone through several crises, namely in 1877, and in 1939. As early as

1900 with the infiltration of Action Francaise, the Government began to be systematically undermined by fascist anti-parliamentary democracy. Then in 1930, with the first Pan-European synarchist movement of Coudenhove-Kalergi and Aristide Briand, the system began to develop further serious weaknesses, and then the economic crisis that came from 1932 to 1938 brought in the Synarchist revolution. Different regimes succeeded one after the other, from Gaston Doumerque, Pierre Laval, and Edouard Daladier. The system was being undermined from within, since 1922, when the fascists had entered Rome and the Synarchist Movement of Empire was founded in France.

The Vichy Synarchy was run, top down, by the Lazard Bank of Jean Frederic Bloch Laine, the Banque Worms of Jacques Barnaud, and the Credit Foncier de l'Ouest Africain, and the Credit Foncier d'Indochine of Edmond Giscard d'Estaing, father of Valery Giscard d'Estaing. The synarchist father Edmond, was also Directeur des Finances du Haut Commissariat Francais during the nazi occupation. His other son, Olivier Giscard d'Estaing, is currently president of the Comite d'Action pour un Parlement Mondial (COPAM). (Action Committee for a World Government.)

## **5.2 A GLIMMER OF LIGHT AFTER THE MERRY-GO-ROUND.**

The very first attempt at establishing a true Republican Constitution in France was a constitutional monarchy voted on September 3, 1791. It had begun to be elaborated as early as June 1789, by the Club of 89, namely by Jean Sylvain Bailly, Marquis de Lafayette, Condorcet, and others. It was the only attempt at establishing a real system of check and balance between the Executive Power, the King, the Legislative Power, 745 members of the National Assembly, and a Judicial Power of elected Judges, including a public control of the nation's credit. The constitution was sabotaged by central banker Jacques Necker and the Jacobin terror, even before it could provide the constitutional means of solving potential conflicts between the King and the Assembly.

In 1793, a so-called "Girondine Constitution" was established on the principle of popular sovereignty. It was a terrorist democratic regime based

on the principle of {*Equality*} that had been introduced by members of the Weishaupt Bavarian Illuminati Freemasons, such as the Duke of Orleans, Philippe "Egalite", and Philippe Buonarroti. Inspired by the "noble savage" of J.J. Rousseau, this {*Equality*} form of fascism had no foundation in law, not in natural law, nor in constitutional law. Only the declaration had been voted on by the Convention of Marat, Danton, Robespierre, Saint Juste, Desmoulins, Brissot, etc. For all intent and purposes, this Constitution of June 24, 1793 was inapplicable, and was never applied.

Then, after the decapitation of Bailly, Orleans, Louis XIV, and of Robespierre himself, in 1793, a series of authoritarian regimes were incapable of providing a solution to the conflicts between executive and legislative powers. The Constitutions of 1795, 1799, 1802, 1804, and 1814-1815, that is, six different constitutions inside of 20 years, were all the result of coups d'Etat by or against Napoleon Bonaparte. These Napoleonic and Restoration Constitutions were simply despotic and dictatorial institutions.

After 25 years of insoluble conflicts and the savage violence of the Bonaparte regimes, the Bourbons were twice restored (1814 and 1815). A constitutional Charter was introduced to mark the return to the old privileges. The new bourgeoisie and the old aristocracy were defining their interests in concert with their central bankers. A new Chamber of Peers was introduced, unlimited and hereditary. A similar situation prevailed under the Duke of Orleans, Louis Philippe, (1830-1848). Then, the socialist revolution of 1848 merely introduced a social democracy to fight off the issues of property against the bourgeoisie, which led to the return of Bonapartism, under Napoleon III, the "putty", who managed to destroy both the social democrats and the republicans. Thus, the second Republic has failed, and a second Empire (1852-1879) was ushered in. This explains the multiples Constitutions of 1830, 1848, and 1852.

Then, was established the longest lasting Constitution in the whole history of France; the 1870 Constitution of the Third Republic lasted 65 years. This was the first parliamentary republic, which inaugurated the head of the executive power as the "President de la Republique." This was the most flexible constitution up to that time, but still tagging along, behind the banker's coat tails, without real constitutional principles. The second generation of synarchists destroyed the Third Republic by introducing the fascist regime of Petain, in 1940.

After four years of fascism, from July 1940 to September 1944, that represented four years of French defeat and the German occupation, France became known as "**{l'Etat francais}**" under a fascist regime of the Synarchy run top down by the Banque Lazard and the Banque Worms. Since the end of World War II, two new Constitutions were submitted to a referendum. The constitution of 1946, otherwise known as the Union Francaise, or the union of France and her colonies, gave a preponderant role to the National Assembly, and a secondary role to the Council of the Republic. The collapse of the Union Francaise and the events of the Algerian crisis contributed to giving the President of the Republic more power than before, leading finally, through the Fifth Republic on September 28, 1958, out of a period of darkness, there comes a glimmer of light: the Fifth Republic of Charles de Gaulle. In 1952, President Charles de Gaulle redefined the national sovereignty of France along the lines established by Jean Sylvain Bailly, in 1789, and in the spirit of the American Constitution. Furthermore, its preamble asserted the principle of national sovereignty for all of the French colonies. The first Title on "Sovereignty" states:

***"{France is a Republic, indivisible, laic, democratic and social. It assures equality before the law for all its citizens without distinction of origin, of race or religion. It respects all beliefs. Its principle is that of a 'Government of the people and by the people.'}"***

This is the Constitutional framework which is still current in France today, and that Valery Giscard d'Estaing wants to quietly supercede by the Synarchist European Constitution. However, any revision of this Fifth Republic Constitution must be subjected to a referendum.

# **SYNARCHY MOVEMENT OF EMPIRE**

## **BOOK III**

\*\*\*\*\*

### **THE SYNARCHY INTERNATIONAL**

\*\*\*\*\*

#### **Chapter III**

\*\*\*\*\*

#### **3.1 FAILURE OF THE SYNARCHIST EUROPEAN CONSTITUTION**

**1.2 WHY THERE COULD NOT HAVE BEEN A VICHY CONSTITUTION**

**2.2 THE SYNARCHIST EUROPEAN CONSTITUTION**

**3.2 HOW OLYMPIAN GODS THREATEN TO DROWN EUROPE.**

**4.2 THE FALSE UNDERLYING ASSUMPTION OF SYNARCHISM**

\*\*\*\*\*

### **3.1 THE FAILURE OF THE SYNARCHIST EUROPEAN CONSTITUTION**

On June 20, 2003, when the news media announced in France that Valery Giscard d'Estaing had introduced his project for a new European Constitution before the European Union, both Great Britain and Spain made a call for a referendum on the new constitution. It was not a mere rhetorical gesture. On June 27, Le Monde noted that the presidium of the Convention on the future of Europe, which was presided by President Valery Giscard d'Estaing, had come to an agreement on the additional article 192 concerning the functioning of a Common Foreign Policy for Europe. "This addition stipulates that the future Minister of Foreign Affairs of the European Union, whose principle has already been accepted, will be able to 'rely on a European service for external action' which will work with the collaboration of the diplomatic services of the Member countries." In other words, the Foreign Affairs decisions of the different nations will be channeled through a supra national Ministry controlled by private bankers.

This comes a year after the European Common currency, the euro, had superceded all of the national currencies of Europe. Moreover, synarchist Robert Mundell, of the Monte dei Paschi Bank of Siena, has been promoting a single World Central Bank, with a single world currency, the "DEY", which will be imposed on the world after having created a worldwide inflationary flooding of the dollar, of the euro and of the yen. This is like the recasting, on the world scale, of the ancient story of the Thessaly flood by the gods of Olympus. As Herodotus recounts it.

*"{There is a story that in ancient times, Thessaly was a lake, being shut in on all sides by huge mountains. For the parts of it to the East are shut in by Pelion and Ossa, which here join their lower spurs; to the north, Olympus shuts it in, and, to the west, Pindus, and to the south and the south wind, Orthys. In the midst of these aforementioned mountains lies the vale of Thessaly. Many other streams flow into it, but the five most notable ones are the Peneus, the Apidanus, the Onochonus, the Enipeus, and the Pamisus. These flow from the mountains surrounding Thessaly and then joining into one stream, they issue into the sea through a single passage (and that a narrow one). As soon as they all mingle their waters into the same channel, the Peneus masters the others with its name and renders them nameless. In the old times, it is said, this channel and*



*passage to the sea did not yet exist, and so these rivers and, besides the rivers, the Boebean lake, which were not even named then, but flowed with no less volume than now, by the course of their waters, made the whole of Thessaly one vast sea. The Thessalians themselves say that Poseidon made the channel through which the Peneus flows. Their suggestion is very natural; for anyone who thinks that Poseidon shakes the earth and that the earthquake's splits in the earth's surface are the god's work - anyone, looking at this, will say that Poseidon did it. It is the action of an earthquake, as it seems to me - this split between the mountains."* (Herodotus, {The History}, 7.129.)

As one can understand readily, when this story is applied metaphorically to today's European financial situation, the arrogance of today's Olympian gods become clear: the future of Europe lies in abandoning the sovereignty of Nation-States, and of their sovereign currencies, to a single privately owned central bank, which dominates all of the others, and channels the different national interests of Europe into a single flow, safely guarded by Poseidon, the god of world liquidity. This is the great illusion that Giscard d'Estaing and Company have created in Europe, the illusion that private central banking is the only possible way out, or the only way in for Europe. The reader should be reminded that when Xerxes invaded Greece, he did not choose to enter through the mouth of the Peneus River at Mount Olympus. He used a flanking maneuver through Macedonia. Similarly, the American system, with its constitutionally based public credit system, is the only way to flank such a Synarchist central banking scheme.

Last month, the Spanish Government had asked the French Government if it would respond to this European Constitution by a referendum. The French Ministry of Foreign Affairs responded on June 2, "The procedures for national ratification are governed by the constitutions of the member states. These may or may not require a referendum. I have just heard about the Spanish proposals and I have no particular comment." In other words the French Government has no intention of calling for a referendum. On July 3, British journalist, Pfaff, wrote in the International Herald Tribune, that the "Giscardian constitution...threatens to become a mortal danger to the United States." He was right about the mortal danger, but to all of Europe.

The final session of the Convention on the European Constitution will be held in Thessaloniki, Greece, on July 10, after which Giscard d'Estaing is to bring the new Constitution to Rome, on July 18, for Italian European Council President, Silvio Berlusconi, to accept, as the rotating leader of the European Union. The question is: "Will the Italian President go with the constitutional subversion of the European central bankers, or will he pursue the "New Deal" proposal of the Finance Ministers of the European Constitution that can help us answer that question. The draft text of the European constitution states in Article 1-1:

***"Establishment of the Union***

***"Reflecting the will of the citizens and the States of Europe to build a common future, this Constitution established the European Union, on which the Member States confer competences to attain objectives they have in common. The Union shall coordinate the policies by which the Member States aim to achieve these objectives, and shall exercise in the Community way the competences they confer on it." (Draft Constitution Vol. I: The European Convention, Brussels, 26 May, 2003. Or. Fr.)***

When translated into American English, this text actually means to say: "Regardless of the will of the citizens and the Nation-States of Europe to build a common future, this Synarchist Constitution established the European Union, on which the Nation-States gave up their sovereignty in order to attain objectives they have not been able to address individually. The Union shall determine the policies, whose aim the Nation-States have been unable to achieve, and shall exercise in a Supra-national way the competences they confer on it."

Furthermore, there is the {***Central Bank proposal***}:

***Article 1-29: the European Central Bank***

1. *"{The European Central Bank shall direct the European System of Central Banks, of which it alongside the national central banks, forms part.*
2. *"{The primary objective of the Bank shall be to maintain price stability. Without prejudice to the objective of price stability, it shall support general economic policies in the Union with a view to contributing to the achievement of the Union's objectives.*
3. *"{The Bank shall define and implement the monetary policy of the Union. It alone may authorize the issue of the Union currency, the euro. It shall conduct other Central Bank tasks according to the provisions of Part two of the Constitution.*
4. *"{The Bank shall have legal personality. In the exercise of its powers and for its finances, it shall be independent. Union institutions and bodies, and the governments of the Member States, shall undertake to respect this principle.*
5. *"{The Bank shall adopt such measures as are necessary to carry out its tasks in accordance with the provisions of Articles [...] to [...] of Part Three of the Constitution, and with the condition laid down in the Statutes of the Bank and of the European System of Central Banks. In accordance with these same provisions, those Member States, which have not adopted the euro, and their central banks, shall retain their powers in monetary matters.*
6. *"{Within its areas of competence, the Bank shall be consulted on all proposed Union acts, and all proposals for regulation at national level, and may give an opinion.*
7. *"{The organs of the Bank, their composition and operating methods are set out in Articles [...] to [...] of Part Three, as well as in the Statute of the Bank.}" (Draft of European Constitution.*

Although the European Constitution lies out rightly, by claiming it is not superceding the authority of the Nation-States of Europe, its ratification, in reality, establishes national subsidiary of constitutional, political, military and economic sovereignty vis-a-vis an illegitimate supra-national institution.

It is also due to a total disregard for National Sovereignty that, while the French "right" and the "left" herds are bickering today over the "privatization" of the French pension system, one finds Synarchist leader, Valery Giscard d'Estaing, selling the constitutional rights of the French citizens to the central bankers of the Pan-European oligarchies.

It is therefore with great anticipation and hope that this synarchist constitutional treason should soon be countered by the spirit of Lyndon LaRouche's New Bretton Woods project, and that the sovereign nations of Europe should bypass the Maastricht arrangement following Italian Finance Minister, Guido Carli's FDR type of "New Deal" proposal for public credit investment into large scale infrastructure development projects, which has just been put before the leaders of the European Union by the Italian Prime Minister Silvio Berlusconi, on July 1, 2003. This is definitely the {*punctum saliens*} moment of this period of history.

(1) Albert Sorel, {*L'Europe et la Révolution française*}, Deuxième Partie, Paris, Plon, 1885, p. 107. 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."

(2) Oliver Wormser, {*Les Origines Doctrinales de la "Révolution nationale" Vichy: 10 juillet 1940 - 31 mars 1941*}, Paris, Plon, 1971, p.177-78.

\*\*\*\*\*

## **1.2 WHY THERE COULD NOT HAVE BEEN A VICHY CONSTITUTION**

When Charles de Gaulle established the Constitution of the Fifth Republic of 1958, he consciously returned to the initial Bailly-Lafayette constitution of 1789, and completed the initial constitutional effort that had been abandoned back during the French revolution, by choosing, wisely, to follow the example of the American System, and established the new

constitution based on "***a government of the people, by the people, and for the people***," as opposed to a government for the Right or for the Left. These words, now permanently enshrined in the Constitution of the Fifth Republic, represent the only chance the French people have had, since 1789, to establish a true Constitutional Republic outside of the Right and Left Cartesian system. In retrospect, this de Gaulle Constitution provides the reason why there could not exist a Vichy Constitution. Such a notion was a contradiction in terms. Why?

In France, the question of ***representative government*** had never been understood, and the reason it was never understood was derived historically from the fact that the constitutions were never written with the purpose of the ***general welfare*** in mind, that is, with the principle of the Peace of Westphalia, ***the Benefit, the Honor, and the Advantage of the other***. Quite to the contrary, the French constitutions were construed to conciliate different interest groups, which was first represented by the division of National Assembly between those who sat on the right and on the left of the President, that is, representing the interests of the oligarchy on one side and the interests of the people, on the other. That was called French political representation.

During the period of late 1940, synarchist banker Emmanuel Monick, former governor of the Banque de France, and Honorary President of the Banque de Paris et des Pays Bas, asked his associate, former French Ambassador to Moscow, Oliver Wormser, to write him a legal brief on how to constitutionally safeguard and maintain the legal status of bankers under the fascist regime of Marshal Petain, as well as under a new regime that could be established if there were to be a liberation. Monick had just been nominated General Secretary of the French Protectorate in Morocco, in North Africa, where Wormser was stationed. Monick asked Wormser:

***"Is there in our history, and especially in our constitutional history, some precedents which would permit to slow down the arbitrariness of Vichy?"***

Wormser's obliged Monick by writing a book on Vichy, ***Les Origines Doctrinales de la Revolution Nationale***, which became a justification for the fascist policy of Charles Maurras. His investigation took him back to the 1789. Here is his apparently reasonable answer to Monick's question:

*"Ever since 1789, France had been in search of a constitution. Sometimes the principle of popular sovereignty had triumphed; sometimes the need for authority had prevailed. The systematic constitutions, both the authoritarian ones as well as the democratic ones, have collapsed rapidly, or have not been able to be put into application. The constitution of June 24, 1793, respected so well the principle of popular sovereignty, that it was not applicable...Neither did the authoritarian constitutions survive much longer than the fortune of those who inspired them.... On the contrary, the constitutions which have been able to conciliate the rights of the people and the necessities of Government, under which a protection was equally provided for the masses and for the elite... such constitutions, molded on common sense, have endured. Neither the principles of popular sovereignty, nor the monarchical principle, have provided in and of themselves the necessary guarantees against tyranny.... In truth, they have to be combined with a third principle, that of the separation of powers." <Note> (Oliver Wormser, {*Les Origines Doctrinales de la "Révolution nationale" Vichy: 10 juillet 1940 - 31 mars 1941*}, Paris, Plon, 1971, p.177-78.)*

How can a third principle be good when it is added to two other principles, which are no good? This is the condition of constitutional impotence in which France found itself at Vichy. But, where did Wormser find such an idea?

In his book on the Vichy government, the synarchist Wormser concluded that the only way to resolve the question of {*representation*}, was to seek a conciliation between Right and Left, that is, between {*authority*} and {*freedom*}, between {*monarchy*} and {*democracy*}. This is why the chair of the President of the Third Republic had become interchangeable with the throne of a king, which meant that the president had been considered as nothing less than a parliamentary monarch. Even the idea of voting was considered as faulty. Synarchist leader, Jacques Weiss went as far as saying: "Voting, in itself, is an act of divorce, by which the elector separates himself from his authority." (Weiss, Op. Cit., p.82)

The elaboration of a constitution required the grounding of principles for all of the people, not for two different types of people. There lies the anomaly of the French constitutional system. Ever since 1789, the French political elite has been racking its brains in order to discover how to

establish a constitution that would accommodate the {*ruling elite*} and the {*ordinary people*}. This anomaly broke down with the Vichy regime: how can you establish a constitutional framework which attempts to conciliate the {*authority*} of an elite with the {*freedom*} of the masses? It simply cannot be done.

In his address to the nation on October 11, 1940, Marshal Petain made the following statement: "*History is made up of alternating periods of authority, which degenerated into tyranny, and periods of freedom, which engendered license. The hour has come for France to substitute to these painful alternatives a harmonious conjunction of authority and freedoms.*" This, as everyone could see, was the big lie, because a fascist leader does not need institutions to relate to the people. The dictator relates directly on the basis of his personal authority and strength to stare down his enemies, including the people. That is the stare of the beast-man Hitler, Laval, Cheney, and Schwarzenegger.

## **2.2 THE NEW SYNARCHIST EUROPEAN CONSTITUTION**

After four years of fascism, from July 1940 to September 1944, that represented four years of French defeat and the German occupation, France became known as "*l'Etat francais*" under a fascist regime of the Synarchy run top down by the Banque Lazard and the Banque Worms. Since the end of World War II, two new Constitutions were submitted to a referendum. The constitution of the Fourth Republic of 1946, otherwise known as the Union Francaise, or the union of France and her colonies, gave a preponderant role to the National Assembly, and a secondary role to the Council of the Republic. The collapse of the Union Francaise and the events of the Algerian crisis contributed to giving the President of the Republic more power than before, and to the creation of the Fifth Republic on September 28, 1958.

Finally, throughout the tragic 167-year constitutional crisis period of France, there comes a glimmer of light: the Fifth Republic of Charles de Gaulle. In 1952, President Charles de Gaulle redefined the national sovereignty of France along the lines of true {representativity}, originally established by Jean Sylvain Bailly, in 1789, and in the spirit of the American Constitution. Furthermore, its preamble asserted the principle of national

sovereignty for all of the French colonies. The first Title on the "Sovereignty" states:

***"{France is a Republic, indivisible, laic, democratic and social. It assures equality before the law for all its citizens without distinction of origin, of race or religion. It respects all beliefs. Its principle is that of a 'Government of the people and by the people.'}"***

This is the Constitutional framework, which is still current in France today, and that Valery Giscard d'Estaing wants to quietly supersede with a European Constitution. However, any rejection or revision of this Fifth Republic Constitution requires that it must be subjected to a referendum. Spain and Great Britain have both sounded the alarm on this question.

It is true that the Nation of France has never been so unstable and tormented, since the Bastille coup d'etat of 1789 and it is about to receive the biggest blow ever with the unraveling current financial crisis. As we have seen, repeatedly, the primary cause of this tragedy is attributable to the lack of a ***{true universal Republican Constitution}***. However, today, synarchist leader, Valery Giscard d'Estaing, who has officially proposed his personal European Constitution, to the European Union, in Thessaloniki, Greece, on June 20, 2003, is still pursuing the fraudulent idea of the 1789 idea of ***{equality}***; that is, the fascist ***{equality}*** of politically herding people like European cattle into the central banker's slaughter house.

Giscard d'Estaing chose to launch his project in Thessaloniki, Greece, not only because it is the location of the Aristotle University, but also because it was in ancient Thessaly that experiments were done on how to model human behavior following the herding principle of animals, which became known as the Thessalikos method of "***{political herding}***." (See Plato, ***{The Statesman}***, 264C,)

The sort of treason that Giscard d'Estaing is committing today is not new in France. It had actually been officially sanctioned, as early as 1790, when the contradictions began to appear between the constituents of the National Assembly and the interests of Europe as a whole. The new "revolutionary" government of France could not conciliate their own self-interests with those of the rest of Europe, as if the new Republic were unable to carry the universal spirit of freedom in the manner that Marquis de Lafayette had identified, during the American Revolution, when he likened



the American Constitution to a *"Beacon of Hope and a Temple of Liberty for all of Mankind."* } Why did France get involved into *{political herding}*, and fail in that task of national sovereignty? The short answer is that France had been taken over by central bankers. A longer answer, however, is required as it pertains to the constitutional framework of the Nation-State of France.

This constitutional question is not easy to answer and requires some thought. After the demise of Jean Sylvain Bailly and of Marquis de Lafayette, the French National Assembly became unfit to solve the crucial constitutional French paradox of the *{Monarchy within the Republic}*. As a result of not using a universally valid American Revolution type of constitutional framework, based on the *{general welfare}* of the people, and on the Gottfried Leibniz principle of *{Love, Liberty, and the pursuit of Happiness}*, that Bailly and Lafayette had begun to elaborate during the months of June and July of 1789, the French oligarchy kept seeking disguised forms of feudal constitutional frameworks, based on the John Locke principle of *{Life, Liberty, and Propriety}*. That Lockean principle kept changing, every few years, depending on the interest groups, and depending on the inclination of the parties, and the bankers that were backing them up.

As a result, the French population has been subjected to 12 different Constitutions within a period of 167 years, since 1789, including the fascist-synarchist constitution of the Vichy regime, in 1940. The different constitutions were established in 1791, 1793, 1795, 1799, 1802, 1804, 1848, 1852, 1875, 1940, 1946, and 1958. This does not include the different internal constitutional amendments, which occurred in 1815, 1830, and 1852. Today, synarchist leader, Valery Giscard d'Estaing, has abandoned the Fifth Republic Constitution to its own demise, and is promoting a Synarchist European Constitution.

In his book on *{Europe and the French Revolution,}* nineteenth-century French historian, Albert Sorel, had correctly perceived the anomaly of the French constitutional framework, as well as its potential dangers, but he was too much of a coward to denounce the fraud before the French population, and make it a life or death issue of it, for the sake of his nation. Sorel preferred to sacrifice the *{welfare of the people}* for the *{Reason of State}*. Sorel wrote:

*"In order to measure precisely the scope of the first enterprises of 1790, it was necessary to change the point of view, go over the border, and penetrate inside of these cabinets where reason did not reason as in France, and where law was founded on opposite rules. What is going on in Paris shall appear, on the day when people shall make the discovery of it, as something, which is simultaneously very singular and very threatening. In reality, France does not rip up the treaties, which would be very simple; she converts their obligations, transforms their cause, and modifies their object. The treaties accepted by kings no longer bind her, since she possesses, and from now on acquires, (a status) by virtue of a public right that kings do not know. However, these treaties continue to bind foreign States, because they still live under the same rule, as in the time when these treaties were signed. {They are obliged to abide by the treaty of Westphalia, because this treaty is in accordance with their rule; but they are not founded in claiming that France should abide by it, since she no longer admits of its principle}." (Emphases added). <Note> (Albert Sorel, {*L'Europe et la Révolution française*}, Deuxième Partie, Paris, Plon, 1885, p. 107. Sorel added 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. They have it, in black and white, and that is precisely the point at issue, in Europe, again today: the European powers were "**not founded in claiming that France should abide by the Treaty of Westphalia.**" That was precisely the problem. The Treaty of Westphalia needed to be enforced. It was a question of political courage, and Sorel knew it. The French Revolution had renounced the constitutional application of the universal principle of the Peace of Westphalia, and every nation in Europe had the right and duty to remind France of that.*

France would no longer abide by the Peace of Westphalia principle of the {*Advantage of the other*}, which was the principle upon which the American Bill of Rights and American Constitution had been built on, since 1776. What Sorel did not say, and should have said, is that this rejection of the Peace of Westphalia principle was unlawfully replaced by the rule of {*La force prime le droit*} (*Might makes right*), through the lying principle of {*Equality*}. What Sorel should have objected to was that the new

{*Reason of State*} was a fraud, because it had been turned stupidly against the {*State of Reason*}. However, Sorel chose to remain silent, and so did the rest of the French population.

The tragic irony is that it was precisely the fall of the French Monarchy that destroyed the hope of a successful French Revolution, and precluded the establishment of a true Universal Republic. Had the French people kept their legitimate King on the throne of France, after 1789, and maintained the 1648 tradition of the Peace of Westphalia, as the basis for their foreign policy, the French Revolution would have been a complete success, and the other nations of Europe would have embraced its principle.

The truth of the matter is that the French monarchy had never been, per se, in opposition of principle, against the Republic. Louis XI had established the first Republican Nation-State, because it was based on the principle of the {*General Welfare*} of all of the people, the {*commonwealth*}. Henry IV would have established a coalition of Sovereign European Republics, based on the same principle of the common good, if he had not been assassinated in 1610. The only prerequisite for a French {*Republican Monarchy*}, was for France to establish a series of constitutional check and balance provisions, between the legislative, executive, and judicial branches, provided they were established on the basis of the {*general welfare*}, as in the American Constitution.

### **3.2 HOW OLYMPIAN GODS THREATEN TO DROWN EUROPE.**

On June 20, 2003, when the news media announced in France that Valery Giscard d'Estaing had introduced his project for a new European Constitution before the European Union, both Great Britain and Spain made a call for a referendum on the new constitution. This was not meant to be a mere rhetorical gesture. On June 27, Le Monde noted that the presidium of the Convention on the future of Europe, which was presided by ex-President Valery Giscard d'Estaing, had come to an agreement on the additional article 192 concerning the functioning of a Common Foreign Policy for Europe. "This addition stipulates that the future Minister of Foreign Affairs of the European Union, whose principle has already been accepted, will be able to

'rely on a European service for external action' which will work with the collaboration of the diplomatic services of the Member countries." In other words, the Foreign Affairs decisions of the different nations will be channeled through a supra national Ministry controlled by private central bankers.

This comes a year after the European Common currency, the Euro, had superseded all of the national currencies of Europe. European nations no longer have their sovereign currencies. Moreover, Giscard's synarchist associate, Robert Mundell, of the Monte dei Paschi Bank of Siena, has been promoting a single World Central Bank, with a single world currency, the "DEY", which they intend to impose on the world after having created a worldwide inflationary flooding of the Dollar, of the Euro and of the Yen. This is like the recasting, on the world scale, of the ancient story of the Thessaly flood by the gods of Olympus. These would be new gods of Olympus pretend they can keep this flooding under control. As Herodotus recounts it.

*"{There is a story that in ancient times, Thessaly was a lake, being shut in on all sides by huge mountains. For the parts of it to the East are shut in by Pelion and Ossa, which here join their lower spurs; to the north, Olympus shuts it in, and, to the west, Pindus, and to the south and the south wind, Orthys. In the midst of these aforementioned mountains lies the vale of Thessaly. Many other streams flow into it, but the five most notable ones are the Peneus, the Apidanus, the Onochonus, the Enipeus, and the Pamisus. These flow from the mountains surrounding Thessaly and then joining into one stream, they issue into the sea through a single passage (and that a narrow one). As soon as they all mingle their waters into the same channel, the Peneus masters the others with its name and renders them nameless. In the old times, it is said, this channel and passage to the sea did not yet exist, and so these rivers and, besides the rivers, the Boebean lake, which were not even named then, but flowed with no less volume than now, by the course of their waters, made the whole of Thessaly one vast sea. The Thessalians themselves say that Poseidon made the channel through which the Peneus flows. Their suggestion is very natural; for anyone who thinks that Poseidon shakes the earth and that the earthquake's splits in the earth's surface are the god's work - anyone, looking at this, will say that Poseidon did it. It is the action of an earthquake, as it seems to me - this split between the mountains." (Herodotus, {The History}, 7.129.)*

As one can understand readily, when this story is applied metaphorically to today's European financial situation, the arrogance of today's Olympian gods become clear: the future of Europe lies in abandoning the sovereignty of Nation-States, and of their sovereign currencies, to a single privately owned central bank, which dominates all of the others, and channels the different national interests of Europe into a single flow, safely guarded by Poseidon, the god of world liquidity. This is the great illusion that Giscard d'Estaing and Company have created in Europe, the illusion that private central banking is the only possible way out of the current worldwide financial crisis.

The reader should be reminded that when Xerxes invaded Greece, he did not choose to enter through the mouth of the Peneus River at Mount Olympus. He used a flanking maneuver through Macedonia. Similarly, Lyndon LaRouche has proposed to replace this bankrupt central banking system with the American system, based on constitutional public credit, as the only way to flank and replace such a Synarchist world dictatorship scheme.

On June 1, 2003, the Spanish Government had asked the French Government if it would respond to this Giscard d'Estaing European Constitution by a referendum. The French Ministry of Foreign Affairs responded on June 2, "The procedures for national ratification are governed by the constitutions of the member states. These may or may not require a referendum. I have just heard about the Spanish proposals and I have no particular comment." In other words the French Government has no intention of calling for a referendum, at this time. On July 3, 2003, British journalist, Pfaff, wrote in the International Herald Tribune, that the "Giscardian constitution...threatens to become a mortal danger to the United States." He was right about the mortal danger, but to all of Europe.

The final session of the Convention on the European Constitution was held in Thessaloniki, Greece, on July 10, 2003. After several additional corrections, the European Constitution was finally submitted to a referendum in France and in the Netherlands. The great majority of more than 65 percent of the French population said "No" on May 29, 2005, and the Netherlanders said the same, a few days later. These European decisions coincided with the saving of the American Constitution by the American Senate, which, on May 23<sup>rd</sup>, recovered their constitutional prerogative of

“advice and consent” from an attempted coup d’Etat by Vice-President Dick Cheney and his financial controller of the Bush Administration, George Pratt Schultz.

Now, let us examine briefly some elements of this European Constitution. The text of the European constitution states in Article 1-1:

***"Establishment of the Union***

***"Reflecting the will of the citizens and the States of Europe to build a common future, this Constitution established the European Union, on which the Member States confer competences to attain objectives they have in common. The Union shall coordinate the policies by which the Member States aim to achieve these objectives, and shall exercise in the Community way the competences they confer on it." (Draft Constitution Vol. I: The European Convention, Brussels, 26 May 2003. Or. Fr.)***

When translated into American English, this text actually means to say: "Regardless of the will of the citizens and the Nation-States of Europe to build a common future, this Synarchist Constitution established the European Union, on which the Nation-States gave up their sovereignty in order to attain objectives they have not been able to address individually. The Union shall determine the policies, whose aim the Nation-States have been unable to achieve, and shall exercise in a Supra-national way the competences they confer on it."

Furthermore, there is the {*Central Bank proposal*}:

***Article 1-29: the European Central Bank***

***"{The European Central Bank shall direct the European System of Central Banks, of which it alongside the national central banks, forms part.***

8. *"{The primary objective of the Bank shall be to maintain price stability. Without prejudice to the objective of price stability, it shall support general economic policies in the Union with a view to contributing to the achievement of the Union's objectives.*
9. *"{The Bank shall define and implement the monetary policy of the Union. It alone may authorize the issue of the Union currency, the euro. It shall conduct other Central Bank tasks according to the provisions of Part two of the Constitution.*
10. *"{The Bank shall have legal personality. In the exercise of its powers and for its finances, it shall be independent. Union institutions and bodies, and the governments of the Member States, shall undertake to respect this principle.*
11. *"{The Bank shall adopt such measures as are necessary to carry out its tasks in accordance with the provisions of Articles [...] to [...] of Part Three of the Constitution, and with the condition laid down in the Statutes of the Bank and of the European System of Central Banks. In accordance with these same provisions, those Member States, which have not adopted the euro, and their central banks, shall retain their powers in monetary matters.*
12. *"{Within its areas of competence, the Bank shall be consulted on all proposed Union acts, and all proposals for regulation at national level, and may give an opinion.*
13. *"{The organs of the Bank, their composition and operating methods are set out in Articles [...] to [...] of Part Three, as well as in the Statute of the Bank.}" (Draft of European Constitution.)*

Although the European Constitution lies out rightly, by claiming it is not superceding the authority of the Nation-States of Europe, its ratification, in reality, would establish national subsidiary of constitutional, political, military and economic sovereignty vis-a-vis an illegitimate supra-national institution of central banks.

It is also due to a total disregard for National Sovereignty that, while the French Right authorities and the Left herds are bickering today over the "privatization" of the French pension system, one finds Synarchist leader,

Valery Giscard d'Estaing, selling the constitutional rights of the French citizens to the central bankers of the Pan-European oligarchies.

It is therefore with great anticipation and hope that this synarchist constitutional treason should soon be eliminated by the spirit of Lyndon LaRouche's New Bretton Woods project, and that the sovereign nations of Europe should bypass the Maastricht arrangement following Italian Finance Minister, Guido Tremonti's FDR type of "New Deal" proposal for public credit investment into large scale infrastructure development projects, which was put before the leaders of the European Union by the Italian Prime Minister Silvio Berlusconi, on July 1, 2003. This is definitely the *{punctum saliens}* moment of this period of history.

## 4.2 THE FALSE UNDERLYING ASSUMPTION OF SYNARCHISM

The false underlying assumption of Saint-Yves d'Alveydre's Synarchy scheme was that he considered human beings as animals, and, as a result, he estimated that, according to the Hobbsian animalistic rule of *{survival of the fittest}*, the Left had to be subordinated to the Right, as *{power}* had to be subordinated to *{authority}*.

During the late 1880's, Papus (aka. Gerard Encausse) reorganized the Martinist order of Martinez de Pasqually, Jean-Baptiste Willermoz, and Joseph de Maistre, and gave it a socio-economic-political form that he called Synarchism, a term chosen by his associate, Saint Yves d'Alveydre, in an attempt to fill the gap created by the systematic failures of French Constitutional divisions of the Right and Left political system, since 1789. As d'Alveydre's teacher, Frederic-August Metz, had told him:

*"{France will be infinitely grateful if you find the law that unites Right and Left}."*

Saint Yves d'Alveydre knew that he could not solve the riddle and resorted to the only way he knew how to go around the difficulty, which was to exacerbate both the Left and the Right, and then subordinate the Left to the Right. That is how the Vichy form of fascism was born. However, for the purpose of edification of the Martinist believers, d'Alveydre claimed that such a law could only be found in the form of a world government ruled by



an initiated elite of technicians, led by "Holy men" who had discovered the secret of God's social law of governing societies. This synarchist theocracy was to have been mastered in ancient times by the "council of God" in a region of the Himalayas, called Agartha (the Aryans), and which was to have lasted in continuing peace and happiness, for thousands of years.

The truth of the matter, is that Saint Yves d'Alveydre's synarchy was inevitably built to fail, because it was explicitly attacking the governing principle of the Peace of Westphalia, the *{Advantage of the other}*, which represented the true ecumenical principle of *{agape}*, as expressed by Saint Paul in his Corinthian I, 13. The principle not only had been proven to be a valid personal *{governing principle}* for centuries, but also a social

*{governing principle}*, as was proven to be a functioning physical principle by the *{general welfare}* clause of the American Constitution. This was deemed unacceptable for d'Alveydre, and Papus, because the principle of *{self-government}*, embodied in the American Constitutional Republic, excluded the authority of the oligarchy.

There resided the core of the whole problem of Synarchism. The French parliamentary system of the Third Republic had become dysfunctional, because it had rejected an American type of Constitutional Republican self-government, and had adopted a "House of Lords" type of Senatorial institution, instead of an "advice and consent" sort of Senate. Thus, a new form of power relationship between political Right and Left was bound to fail, one more time. D'Alveydre proposed to replace the Cartesian political dual, *{Right and Left}*, by another Cartesian dual *{Authority and Power}*.

Concretely this called for the establishment of a series of permanent or hereditary corporatist councils advising government, along the lines of the old feudal divisions of Nobility, Clergy, and Third Estate, that is, the authority of the corporatist fascist scheme of the General Estates that existed before the French Revolution, and had been destroyed by Jean Sylvain Bailly, on June 20, 1789. The reader should take note that the "check and balance" American constitutional structure of the Senate implicitly brings a solution to this Cartesian type of dual structure, by rotating permanently one third of its membership by popular vote, every two years. In other words, the American Senate has a built-in principle of change, while it is sitting on a

permanent basis. Thus, the American Constitution had established a government of permanent change!

D'Alveydre's idea was not aimed at solving the conflicts of the two synthetic forms of political interests between the Oligarchy and the People, but was aimed at legitimizing it by separating {*authority*} from {*power*}. These are the shadows cast on the irregular and dimly lit wall of Plato's cave by the Right and Left political system of France. But, this was like separating, instead of mixing, the regulating function of blood circulation from the heart of a living organism. The living creature of government could not survive.

According to Jacques Weiss, the post World War Two leader of the Synarchy, the so-called law that Saint Yves d'Alveydre had based his idea of synarchy on, was that of sex differentiation within the household; that is:

"It is the wife who has the AUTHORITY and the husband who holds the POWER. It is the responsibility of the husband to choose his profession, to establish the home, to regulate the budget, to reign on the domain of external intelligence. It is the responsibility of the wife to inspire the couple, to form the character of the children, to teach them indulgence and goodness, in one word, to take care more specifically of the domain of the soul." <Note> (Jacques Weiss, {*La Synarchie, L'Autorite face au Pouvoir*} (The Synarchy, Authority in opposition to Power), Les Editions Adyar, 1955, p. 31.)

This simplistic household division of labor became the model for a social division between the teaching profession {*authority*} and the governing profession {*power*}. But, in its social form, the two had to be kept separate, like the Leo Strauss type of academic fascist had to be separated from the Dick Cheney type of government fascist. In reality, this was merely a cover for the parliamentary separation between the financial oligarchy {*authority*} and the government {*power*}. This is how the Martinist cult believed they could establish a utopian curve fitting formula between home schooling, academics, and government. The issue of the conflict between {*authority*} and {*power*}, however, could not find a resolution in this form of infantile Cartesian opposition. As we have seen throughout this report, this had to lead to fascism!

On the other hand, the art of maintaining a harmonic congruence between {*authority*} and {*power*} can only function properly as a derivative

of the principle of the Peace of Westphalia of 1648, the principle of the {*Advantage of the other*}. This principle, which is not only a political condition for the sovereign nation state, that is, the basis for the triple principle of {*Sovereignty, General Welfare, and Posterity*} of all of the people, as explicitly stated in the Preamble of the American Constitution, but is also a living principle informing the physiological condition of the {*internal developing autonomy of living organisms*}, as well as the general orientation for seeking a solution to the crippling problem of aging of tissues.

On the one hand, when an organism is ill and requires medical attention, the elements composing it can become parasitical predators and attempt to grow separately by destroying life around them, as does a cancer cell, which ends up killing itself along with the patient. On the other hand, the elements composing the organism can elevate their action to a higher level of {*force free*} functioning and subordinate their function to the advantage of other elements, for the general welfare of the entire organism.

The errors of d'Alveydre and of Papus lay in the fact that they had applied the physiology principle of Dr. Claude Bernard to the oligarchical worldview of Thomas Hobbes who believed that society was the battle field of "each against all," where only the fittest survive, in accordance with the false assumption that reduces man to becoming an animal. Thus, the social principle of {*agape*} was replaced by the Hobbsian perversion of "{*every man regards not his fellow, but his own business.*}"

As early as 1671, Gottfried Leibniz had already resolved this social anomaly of {*authority*} and {*power*} with respect to {*agape*}. In terms of a government of the people, by the people, and for the people, Leibniz showed that belief in justice could not rely on faith alone, but had to be based on knowledge, that is on an active harmony and proportionality of human understanding within society. Let us look at this more closely, one more time. Leibniz wrote:

"{*All beauty consists in a harmony and proportion; the beauty of minds, or of creatures who possess reason, is a proportion between reason and power, which in this life is also the foundation of the justice [agape], the order, and the merits, and even the form of the Republic,...*}"

On the one hand, when physiologist Claude Bernard discovered, during the 1850's, that certain physiological functions directed certain bodily phenomena without producing them, and that certain physical agents could also produce phenomena that they did not give direction to, he had discovered beauty in the form of harmony and proportion between living processes and political processes, which he likened to the **{Legislative}** authority and the **{Executive}** power of human physiology. For Bernard, this represented harmony not merely of the **{internal environment}** of living beings but also harmony of the microcosm within the macrocosm, as was reflected in the following wonderful Vernadsky idea of harmony between the non-~~living and the living~~ ***living and the being does not constitute an exception in the great natural harmony which adapts all things to each other; it does not break any harmony; it is not in contradiction, nor in a struggle with the cosmic forces in general; far from it, it is part of the universal concert of things, and the life of the animal, for example, is but a fragment of the total life of the universe.***" (Claude Bernard, **{Leçons sur les phénomènes de la vie communs aux animaux et aux végétaux}**, Paris, Vrin, Leçon II, 1966. See also the excellent article of Agnes Farkas, **{La méthode expérimentale de Claude Bernard pour sortir de l'impasse génétique}**, Fusion, No. 97, septembre-octobre 2003.)

On the other hand, that consideration became, for Martinists like Papus, a magical formula that they began to apply to their oligarchical-Hobbsian animalistic view of the world. What Bernard had understood in this correspondance was the Leibnizian proportionality between **{reason}** and **{power}**, as expressed in precisely the terms cited above by Leibniz, that is, precisely within the context of "social justice" **{agape}**, as Leibniz had formulated it. But, let us complete Leibniz's thought on this question.

***"{... That each may understand of what he is capable, and be capable of as much as he understands. If power is greater than reason, then the one who has that is either a simple sheep (in the case where he does not know how to use his power), or a wolf and a tyrant (in the case where he does not know how to use it well). If reason is greater than power, then he who has that is to be regarded as oppressed. Both are useless, indeed even harmful.}"*** <Note> (Leibniz, **{Outline of a Memorandum: On the Establishment of a Society In Germany for the Promotion of the Arts and Sciences. (1671),}** in **{The Political Economy of**

*the American Revolution* }, Executive Intelligence Review, New York, 1977, p.215-216)

This is precisely how the proportionality of free will and necessity must be exercised in a true Constitutional Republic. Let those who discover such an understanding apply it proportionately to the advantage of others, and give them the opportunity to ponder and discover its beauty and its profound implications. Whatever congruent combination one may find some joy with, let it be understood that such proportionality was precisely what was missing in France, during the entire period of the French Revolution, through the period of the Third Republic, and which became destroyed during the Vichy regime. Power without reason caused the population to act sheepishly and the authorities to act tyrannically, like wolves.

Only when the sovereignty of a nation state is oriented toward promoting what is best in other nations does the Peace of Westphalia truly reflect its purpose within the entire group of {*United Nations* }, and in no other way. This means that the principle of the {*Advantage of the other* } must, of necessity, be implemented throughout all sovereign nation state simultaneously: each one being understood as a {*closed self-subsisting-internal-economic environment* } and secured by protectionist measures, against all forms of external aggression. As Bernard had shown, "{*The fixity of the internal environment is the condition for free life* }." As soon as these conditions are satisfied, the principle of {*pursuit of Happiness* } is guaranteed for all peoples of the world.

Moreover, the reason why all of the world's nations must satisfy that requirement is because the principle of the Peace of Westphalia is an efficient universal organizing power of the universe as a whole. It is not the exception in the universe. However, it is not produced either in a random, statistical or anarchistic manner. Each and all of the elements of a society can only be free and sovereign when the proportionality of {*reason and power* }, expressed in each case, is subordinated to the general welfare of the whole. Again, the flaw of Saint Yves d'Alveydre lay in refusing to recognize that every human being had that capability of harmonically conjugating {*reason and power* }, as Leibniz had shown. Only with respect to the public good, in which one's joy is the happiness of others, does the beauty of the minds of different peoples reflect the proportionality of a true World Republic. Those Leibnizian parameters should always serve as guidelines of

good government in the {*pursuit of happiness*}, and preserve us from ever falling into fascism again.

\*\*\*\*\*



Hulton Deutsch

## BEASTMEN HITLER AND MUSOLINI

# **SYNARCHY MOVEMENT OF EMPIRE**

## **BOOK III**

\*\*\*\*\*

### **THE SYNARCHY INTERNATIONAL**

\*\*\*\*\*

#### **Chapter IV**

\*\*\*\*\*

#### **4.1 SOME FRENCH SYNARCHIST ACTIVITIES AFTER WORLD WAR II**

**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**

**6.2 BRITISH LAZARD BROTHERS LEVERAGE OVER FRENCH  
FINANCE**

\*\*\*\*\*

## 1.2 RESEAU VOLTAIRE

According to RESEAU VOLTAIRE, the most important post World War II synarchist movement has been continued by "PATRIE ET PROGRES" and "ALLIANCE POPULATION ET AVENIR," both established with the collaboration of PHILIPPE ROSSILLON, JEAN-PIERRE CHEVENEMENT, and arch-synarchist ALFRED SAUVY.

During the heydays of the Synarchy, SAUVY had worked with the FONDATION FRANCAISE POUR L'ETUDE DES PROBLEMES HUMAINS created by ALEXIS CARREL, and which had as the vice-president of its executive committee, ALDOUS HUXLEY. Their main purpose was to establish the means of transforming human beings by surgical or chemical "behavior modification." As I will develop in a moment, it was PHILIPPE ROSSILLON of PATRIE ET PROGRES, the successor of SAUVY as head of ALLIANCE POPULATION ET AVENIR, who became the key French terrorist link to the FRONT DE LIBERATION DU QUEBEC (FLQ), making the secessionist movement of Quebec a synarchist operation of the first order.

JEAN-PIERRE CHEVENEMENT seems to have started his monarchist-synarchist career at an early age. When he graduated from the Institut d'Etudes Politiques (IEP), he wrote his memoir on {THE NATIONALIST RIGHT WITH RESPECT TO GERMANY.} His paper was written with special thanks to PIERRE DEBRAY, royalist and militant Orleanist, editor of the royalist rag "L'Insurge" (The Insurrectionist).

CHEVENEMENT'S explicit work with the Synarchy goes back to his study days at the Ecole Nationale d'Administration ENA (STENDHAL promotion), during which time he was linked with {PATRIE ET PROGRES}, a national-socialist group of elite technocrats founded by the ENARCHISTS, PHILIPPE ROSILLON, RENE SEYDOUX and



GENEVIEVE SCHLUMBERGER. According to RESEAU VOLTAIRE, their publications were headed by JEAN-DIDIER LECAILLON (ICTUS), PHILIPPE BOURCIER DE CARBON (FRONT NATIONAL), YVES MULLER (OPUS DEI) and EMMANUEL TREMBLAY, (President of LAISSEZ-LES VIVRE), who, RESEAU VOLTAIRE said, in an attempt to slander, was "close to JACQUES CHEMINADE."

CHEVENEMENT is said to have been close to the royalists such as PHILIPPE DE VILLIERS, PHILIPPE DE SAINT-ROBERT, and the group called ROYALIST INSURECTION. CHEVENEMENT is the brother-in-law of HERMAN GRUNBERG, director of credit at LAZARD FRERES.

## **2.2 CURRENT SYNARCHIST, THEOCRATIC, AND ARISTOCRATIC FAMILY GROUPS OF FRANCE.**

On the theocratic side of the French Synarchist movement, the most important group is OPUS DEI, which is very secretive and has its Gnostic tentacles everywhere, including several Cardinals of the Roman Curia. Connected to OPUS DEI, there is also the group called ICTUS, which is an offshoot of the FEDERATION NATIONALE-CATHOLIQUE DU GENERAL DE CASTELNAU. This was the ACTION FRANCAISE apparatus behind MARSHAL PETAIN, which after the war became grouped around about forty bishops of the French Church that created ICTUS. XAVIER VALLAT was the first director of ICTUS. After he died in 1972, JEROME LEJEUNE replaced him.

Up until 1997, according to RESEAU VOLTAIRE associate, THIERRY MEYSSAN, ICTUS was presided by JACQUES TREMOLLET DE VILLIERS, along with PAUL TOIVIER. They worked very closely with JEAN MARIE LE PEN and his FRONT NATIONAL. MEYSSAN noted in a paper he wrote on {L'extreme droite au-dela du front national}, that "...the French Episcopate, which presented this week (last week of September 1997) its regrets for its involvement during the Second World War, did not take the opportunity to condemn those who, today among its own ranks, wish explicitly to renew the experiment." On November 16, 1997, ICTUS changed its name to [CENTRE DE FORMATION A L'ACTION CIVIQUE ET CULTURELLE SELON LE DROIT NATUREL ET CHRETIEN], which is now directed by an OPUS DEI associate, JEAN-MARIE

SCHMITZ. MEYSSAN reported that the most significant extreme right wing political parties, which interface with the Front National of JEAN MARIE LE PEN, were as follows [the figures shown below are from the 1995 Presidential Election]:

- 1- The MOVEMENT POUR LA FRANCE, (412 candidates, and 600,000 votes) which is run by PHILIPPE DE VILLIERS.
- 2- The CENTRE NATIONAL DES INDEPENDENTS, (86 candidates, and 100,000 votes), which is run by OLIVIER LEVEVRE D'ORMESSON.
- 3- The PARTI NATIONAL REPUBLICAIN, (73 candidates, and 17,000 votes).
- 4- The PARTI DE LA LOI NATURELLE, (95 candidates, and 12,000 votes), headed by Church leader, YOGI MAHESH MAHARISHI.
- 5- The PARTI POUR LA LIBERTE, (51 CANDIDATES, and 6,000 VOTES).
- 6- The PARTI HUMANISTE, (89 CANDIDATES, and about 8,000 VOTES), headed by the Church of the SILO movement.

These groups represent a total of 791,726 votes, that is, 20.9 % of the votes that went to the FRONT NATIONAL during the Presidential election of 1995.

The current synarchy movement also includes a few aristocratic Clubs such as the CLUB DE L'HORLOGE DU COMTE DE LESQUEN DU PLESSIS CASSO, directed by Euro-Deputy, YVAN BLOT, and general delegate, JEAN ANTOINE GIANCILY, which promotes ultra-liberalist economics and a dictatorial national administration. Both are associated to the FRONT NATIONAL. Other personalities are GEORGE BERTHU, Comte YVES THIBAUT DE SILGUY, and ERIC RAOULT.

Another Club is the CERCLE RENAISSANCE DU COMTE MICHEL DE ROSTOLAN. ROSTOLAN is a former FRONT NATIONAL Deputy, and leader of the current support committee of JEAN MARIE LE PEN.

Among the leading aristocratic FAMILY GROUPS are found the family of PHILIPPE PETAIN; JACQUES BICHOT heads the Familles de France, the Confederation nationale des associations familiales catholiques, headed by JEAN FRANCOIS CHAUMONT, and which is subordinated to the Pontifical Council for the FAMILY OF CARDINAL ALFONSO

LOPEZ-TRUJILLO. All of the above "familles" are financed by tax payers money for the restoration of the Vichy moral order.

### **3.2 THE SYNARCHY INTERFACE WITH FLQ TERRORISTS.**

As an example of the 1960's synarchist activity in North America, there is the FRONT DE LIBERATION DU QUEBEC (FLQ) terrorist movement of Quebec. According to an intelligence report from one CARLOS ROLDAN, {Operation Ascot: France's betrayal of Canada}, PHILIPPE ROSSILLON, who, as I said, succeeded synarchist leader ALFRED SAUVY at the head of the ALLIANCE POPULATION ET AVENIR, was deployed to be the key French controller of the FLQ terrorist movement in Quebec, during the 1960's. ROLDAN wrote: "Jacques Foccard, France's Chief of Intelligence, dispatched agents of the Service de Documentation, d'Enquete et de Contre-Espionnage (SDECE), Philippe Rossillon, Edgar Chaumette, Jean-Luc Gaillardaire and Tom Bailby to Quebec, with the specific purpose of developing and fomenting the growth of separatist movements such as those of Adrien Arcand, Pierre Bourgault's (Raliement pour l'Independence Nationale) RIN, and the (Front de Liberation du Quebec) FLQ." A report released in 1969 shows that when Prime Minister, PIERRE ELLIOT TRUDEAU, had brought up the issue of the FLQ separatists in the House of Commons, he identified, specifically, the name of PHILIPPE ROSSILLON as a "secret agent" of the SDECE.

The CARLOS ROLDAN report further stated: "SDECE agents in Paris sheltered and even financed FLQ members, arranging further training in terrorist camps in Algeria, Jordan, Turkey, and Eastern Europe. Philippe Rossillon acted as a conduit for the coordination of such activities. Recruited back in Quebec by Philippe Rossillon, Francois Dorlot and Louise Beaudoin sheltered Francois Mario Bachand at their home in Paris up to a few days before his assassination. Bachand was scheduled to depart for terrorist camp training, but never made it. Police investigation of his murder was thwarted by SDECE to the point that the RCMP insisted the matter be handled through Interpol and not the French police."

According to former independentist Quebec Premier, JACQUES PARIZEAU, synarchist oligarch, VALERY GISCARD D'ESTAING, had endorsed this separatist project. PARIZEAU wrote: "It was during that trip

(official visit to France in January 1995) that Valery Giscard d'Estaing, raised an important issue that until then, I had not fully understood. The drift of what he said was that it was necessary, in the hours or days that followed a YES victory in the referendum, for Quebec to make a solemn gesture to proclaim its sovereignty. Without that, no foreign country could provide speedy recognition that is to say, within a week or ten days." (Excerpted from {For a Sovereign Quebec}, 1007.) What the naive independentist Prime Minister of Quebec was not told, however, was that this synarchist plan was part of a larger Balkanization of North America, which was to be broken down into separate synarchist communes or regions. The new European constitution of VALERY GISCARD D'ESTAING corresponds precisely to such a synarchist division of communes and regions, without Nation-States.

#### **4.2 COMMUNISTS, ANARCHISTS, AND ENARCHISTS.**

During the first part of the 20th century, the synarchists established three brainwashing schools for the youth using variations of JOSEPH DE MAISTRE'S indoctrination by "purgative violence (which, in fact, goes back to Aristotle's theory of catharsis, out of which came the "Cathars" of Southern France in the Middle Ages): 1) the COMMUNIST school in the Isle of Capri, the "High School of Revolutionary Technique for the Scientific Preparation of the Propagandists of Russian Socialism" directed by MAXIM GORKY from 1906 to 1913; 2) the ANARCHIST College of Sociology run by GEORGES BATAILLE, from 1937-39; and 3) the ENARCHIST School of URIAGE at the CHATEAU BAYARD in SAINT MARTIN D'URIAGE near GRENOBLE, run by EMMANUEL MOUNIER on behalf of the Vichy government from 1940-42 . MOUNIER was replaced by LAVAL from 1942-44, transforming the URIAGE School into a NAZI militia. The URIAGE VICHY STAFF COLLEGE was the forerunner of the ECOLE NATIONALE D'ADMINISTRATION (ENA), which has been training government cadre since WW II.

The common emphasis of all three schools was to form societies based on myths, romanticism and rituals as a means of controlling them. For instance, GEORGES BATAILLE, ROGER CALLOIS, AND MICHEL LEIRIS founded the COLLEGE OF SOCIOLOGY in order to continue MAISTRE'S fundamental project of the application of the theory of sacrifice based on studies of religions, ethnology and anthropology. As part of this, the BATAILLE group profiled how irrational forces (such as fascism, for

instance) impacted rationalized democracies in the West. BATAILLE asserted that sacrifice was "the key of all human existence," that it, in fact, was a political category because the practice of sacrifice created not only social unity, but rid man of his identity as "productive." According to BATAILLE and company, religion and myth are nothing other than "a matter of suppressing that obstacle between the world and us that is created by labor." The aim is: "the profane world must, in turn, be destroyed as such; that is to say, everything inside capitalism that is given as a thing that transcends man and dominates him must be reduced to the state of an immanent thing by a subordination to consumption by man." BATAILLE called for the "total world of myth, the world of being," that was to be realized by "small numbers of men bound to each other by deep emotional bonds." This was to be the new religion. As CALLOIS put it: a "virulent religious organization, new and uncouth from head to toe, one sustained by a spirit incapable of servitude." Thus was born the ideology implemented in the 1960's with a vengeance, of man as an aggressive consumer rather than man as a producer.

The "literary" applications of MAISTRE'S perversions were the theory of symbolism and the creation of myths and rituals. MAISTRE'S perversion of Plato's Laws, in particular, is expressed in the idea that to control the masses one needs rituals, dances and songs as a way of casting spells on the population. Just as British agent JEREMY BENTHAM banned metaphor, so the SURREALISTS not only replaced metaphor with symbolism but also destroyed the very idea of cognition and meaning what so ever. Thus was born structuralism and allied perversities.

All three schools were aimed at preparing youth cadre for a FASCIST or COMMUNIST form of government, and a TERRORIST component institutionally attached to them that would serve the aim of both forms of dictatorship. URIAGE and the COLLEGE DE SOCIOLOGIE must be seen together with the COMMUNIST CAPRI SCHOOL of MAXIM GORKY and ANTON SEMENOVYCH MAKARENKO, because all three were explicitly based on the CULT OF MITHRA.

Lastly, I want to emphasize the MARGARET THATCHER British intelligence outfit called the BRUGES GROUP, which has been recently waging an all out fight against these French fascists, but who refuse to identify them as synarchists, because they, themselves, represent the British side of the same fascist-synarchist coin. A reporter from this BRUGES

GROUP, called JOHN LAUGHLAND, wrote a fascinating book entitled {The Tainted Source, The Undemocratic Origins of the European Idea}, Little Brown, London, 1997, on which I shall report later. His outlook is that all drive for dirigist economics in Europe, such as FRIEDRICH LIST, is evil and must be put into the same bag as DR. BERNARD BENNING, who headed the Bundesbank during WWII. For the BRUGES GROUP, all those oriented toward European Unity are characterized as fascists.

LAUGHLAND pulled together some links between the Synarchist-run youth movements in Belgium and France, especially a "Todtnauberg youth camp at Zoute Belgium, 11th - 19th July, 1936, "which were also replicated in France under the organizations of ORDRE NOUVEAU, JEUNE EUROPE, AND ACTION FRANCAISE. These youth groups were organized by notorious synarchists such as the Swiss fascist ideologue, DENIS DE ROUGEMONT, made famous for his 1933 letter to HITLER - "Your work is courageous, it has grandeur"-, HENRI DE MAN, and HENRI SPAAK - of the 1956 SPAAK REPORT on post-WWII European unification - and organizer of the Belgium railway strike that sabotaged the Belgian defense plans at the time of the May 1940 German invasion.

LAUGHLAND also reports extensively on the URIAGE VICHY STAFF COLLEGE, which had been taken over under the OTTO STRASSER plan, and EMMANUEL MOUNIER, under the cover of what they called PERSONNALISM, which was a Dominican run catholic front to recruit cadre for the Vichy government. The Journal ESPRIT was reportedly secretly funded by RIBBENTROP funds, through LES EDITIONS DE LA TOISON D'OR. This URIAGE group was also linked to ALEXANDER MARC and his THIRD WAY COMMUNITARIANISM, on which I will write my next report. According to LAUGHLAND, "Mounier dined with Goebbels and Himmler, and published a pro-Hitler book in February 1939. In 1940, Mounier was in pole position, and 'Esprit' became a key Vichyite publication." More later on this synarchist "KLEINSTAATENGERUMPEL" operation run by BARONESS THATCHER, DR. BRIAN HINDLEY, LORD LAMONT OF LERWICK, and LORD HARRIS OF HIGH CROSS, whose BRUGES GROUP is nothing else but an intelligence outpost for the SYNARCHIST MOUNT PELLERIN SOCIETY.

## **5.2 CONCLUSION**

As a consequence of the destruction of the institution of the French THIRD REPUBLIC, and as a result of the GENOCIDAL policy of the Synarchy against the French people, during the four years of infamy that France was submitted to under the Vichy regime, the French baby-boomer generation, otherwise known as the Bohemian Bourgeois (BoBos), has become, and still is, a totally politically impotent generation, which has accepted the gag-rule of silence, and lies, imposed on them by their fathers and relatives who had lived through the horror of this infamy, but, who swore, out of cowardliness, never to tell their children the truth of what this treasonous genocide was all about. There exist no redeeming factors on this question of treason, not even the excuse, or pretext of having belonged to the resistance. The resistance itself was a hotbed of treason and romantic delusion. For anyone in France today who cherishes EMMANUEL and MOHONIER, not wish to see a repeat of the same synarchist evil repeat itself during the immediate coming weeks and months ahead, it is imperative that the truth be made about this infamy, and that its lessons be taught, far and wide, so that the mental chains that the French people had imposed on itself be shattered, and the next generation of French citizens be freed from such evil enslavement, once and forever.

\*\*\*\*\*

**SYNARCHY MOVEMENT OF EMPIRE**

\*\*\*\*\*  
**BOOK III**

**THE SYNARCHY INTERNATIONAL**

\*\*\*\*\*

\*\*\*\*\*

**Chapter V**

\*\*\*\*\*

**5.1 THE ANTI-AMERICAN SYNARCHY INTERNATIONAL**

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).
- 3.2 - BERNARD ANTONY OF CHRETIENTE ET SOLIDARITE
- 4.2 CHRISTIAN 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 JEAN-FRANCOIS THIRIART: A DELPHIC MODEL OF LAROCHE'S EURASIAN POLICY
- 9.2 GEOPOLITICS OF THE FOURTH REICH.
- 10.2 A REVIVAL OF {*MITHRAIC STOICISM*}: THE PURE EVIL OF POWER
- 11.2 A PERVERTED "PROMETHEAN-VOLUNTARIST" WAR AGAINST AMERICA

\*\*\*\*\*

**1.2 RADICAL EUROPEAN SOURCE OF ANTI-AMERICANISM**

When U.S. President Wilson set the conditions for the Versailles Treaty of 1918, he totally played into the hands of the Synarchy International establishing the condition for the creation of German national socialism, and Russian national bolshevism, both of which came out of the



radical frustration created by the pillage of Germany and of Russia by Synarchist Commercial Bankers.

The first manifestation of national bolshevism appeared in Berlin in 1919, with the first doctrinal proclamation by Berlin professor of law, Paul Elzbacher. It was Karl Rudek of the Komintern who then proposed an alliance between the revolutionary national socialists of Germany and the Communists of Russia. Rudek declared in November 1919: " This is why the honest nationalists like Elzbacher proposed the union with Soviet Russia, which we call National Bolshevism, have remained, to this day, completely isolated because they were revolted against the Peace of Versailles."

Such was the original gestation of agreement of national bolshevism between Leninist communism and German Social Nationalism, which was soon to become the common political ground for a new geopolitical and geo-economic idea of Eurasia. This began in Hamburg with two soviet revolutionaries Heinrich Laufenberg and Frederich Wolfheim. The communist revolt took place on November 6<sup>th</sup> 1918, and nominated Laufenberg as the President of the Provisionary Council of Workers and Soldiers. In 1922, Wolfheim and Laufenberg called for the international Bolshevik to set up a German Red Army to fight against the forces of the Treaty of Versailles.

After the victory of Hitler in 1933, a number of structures of the national Bolshevik were kept intact and were integrated within the Third Reich. Among them was the {Fichte-Bund} created by professor Kessemaier in the University of Hamburg. This is when the Belgian optometrist student, Jean Thiriart, came in contact with Ernst Niekisch, the most famous of the German national Bolshevik leaders of the time

Almost half a century later, the same Jean Thiriart singled out Lyndon H. LaRouche Jr., personally, during an interview in which he vented his hatred of America. Thiriart said:

*"{The time for petty politics has come to pass: the next century will usher in the struggle for universal domination -- the obligation for politics on a grand scale (cf. 78. P.127). This means that if Europe does not unite on the basis of the 'Germanic spirit,' it is Russia that will do it.'"*

*“Nietzsche’s prophecy is being fulfilled. Germany failed to create Europe because of Hitler’s narrow-minded nationalism. Now...It is Russia that will do it! (Nietzsche) It is fortunate that your compatriot (the American Fakir and cultist, ed.) Lyndon H. LaRouche does not read Nietzsche. It would be a pity.”*

The anti-Americanism policy of Jean Thiriart and his Front European de Liberation (FEL) is nothing but a guerilla type of militarized terrorist force deployed against the United States in Europe. As early as 1967, Thiriart had called for the creation of "European Brigades", which would be committed to fight on the side of Arab revolutionaries, against both Israel and the United States. In 1985, Thiriart’s secretary and successor, Luc Michel, wrote an extensive historical document entitled {From Young Europe to the Red Brigades}, in which he called for a military struggle against America modeled on the "International Brigades established by the Comintern during the Spanish Civil War of 1936-39. These 'European Brigades', controlled by militants of 'Young Europe', would have played the role of the 'Cubans of Europe', instigating the anti-American struggle everywhere."

According to Internet site, FTR#380 - {Between Iraq and a Hard Place}, Part III, 9/30/2002, while he was traveling to several Arab countries, including Iraq during 1968, Thiriart was attempting to recruit a guerilla army that would attack the interests of the United States in Europe. Thiriart then became acquainted with George Habbash and his Swiss banker, Francois Genoud. According to Luc Michel: "Habbash gave money to {La Nation Europeenne}, and Thiriart supported Habbash in this magazine." (Ibid., pp. 180-181) It is clear that Thiriart' and Michel's operations should be looked into very closely against the background of September 11, 2001.

After the September 11, 2001 events, the right-wingers and the Thiriart groupings split over which attitude to take vis-a-vis America. Jean-Marie Le Pen and Bruno Megret supported the President of the United States, while the Front Europeen de Liberation (FEL) re-enforced their anti-American stance. In an open letter to the Nouvelle Resistance and to the French extreme rightwing, the FEL wrote the following warning: "What does Thiriart say? That we must militarily expulse the United States from Europe, and from the four continents, that we must strike them here and at home. Without pity and without concession. Including at the time when 'an

insurrectional and liberating military action' will be required. We represent the opposite of the Megret 'sympathy' or of the Le Pen 'condolences'! “

**A TIME-LINE OF THE NATIONAL COMMUNAUTARIAN PARTY  
(PCN-NCP)  
AND AFFILIATED EXTREME RIGHT WING TERRORIST GROUPS  
AROUND THE FRONT NATIONAL OF JEAN-MARIE LE PEN.**

The following time line is provided by a few website reports, among which those from Luc Michel, the political heir of Jean Thiriart. It is essential to emphasize the role of such individuals, because they represent the current 'Neither Left nor Right' leadership of the deployable right-wing terrorist capability of the Synarchy International in France and in Europe more generally. These networks are closely knitted from both so-called left and right wing political and religious tendencies: on the political side, from the radical National Bolshevism to the National-Socialism, and on the religious side, from the Integrist Catholics to the Satanist-Martinist types of Freemasons. For purpose of identification, the key leadership of those networks is represented by Jean Thiriart and Luc Michel for the political networks, and by Bernard Antony and Christian Bouchet for the religious networks.

It is important to note that the extreme religious right fanatics are represented on the one hand by the Integrist types, such as the Lefebvrist and the followers of the Contre Reforme Catholique [CRC] of Abbe de Nantes, and on the other hand by the Aleister Crowley-Satanist variety. Both are Gnostic in character and must not be foolishly identified with the Catholic Church or the Vatican. These are the 'Christians who are not Christians,' who, for centuries, have been associated with some rotten elements of the Dominicans, the Benedictines and the Society of Jesus, as well as elements of other nominally Catholic groups, among which a group of prelates inside of the Roman Curia.

\*\*\*\*\*

**2.2- JEAN THIRIART AND LUC MICHEL OF THE PARTI  
COMMUNAUTAIRE NATIONAL (PCN), OR EUROPEAN  
COMMUNITARIAN PARTY.**

1961- The Algerian crisis caused Jean-Francois Thiriart to create in Belgium, the European organization called Young Europe. The group presented itself as anti-American, and anti-capitalist. In 1960, Thiriart had deplored the colonial loss of Congo and of Algeria, not on the basis of the traditional narrow colonialism, but on the basis of a worldwide recolonization of the Synarchy International. He wrote then: "France and Belgium, yesterday united in the victory, today in the ordeals. Algeria and Congo are two wars conducted by the same enemies, by the enemies of Europe" (*Belgique-Afrique*, 1960). In opposition to the "imperialist" approach of OAS imperialism, which he rejected because of its narrowness, Thiriart was calling for a greater European imperialism (i.e. universal fascism) in which the Arabs and Africans would become integrated. This was the ideological spin of the Young-Europe movement. As Thiriart wrote in 1962: "In my view, there are more than possibilities so see emerge within 25 years the following bloc formation: the two Americas [I will come back elsewhere on the wish to see Latin America saved from the Yankees], the China-India Asiatic bloc and the Europe-Africa-USSR. This would permit us to no longer print 'from Brest to Bucharest', but 'from Brest to Vladivostok.'"

During the early 1960's, Thiriart put all of his eggs in the single basket of the Organization de l'Armee Secrete (OAS), and Young-Europe became a terrorist arm of the French Military revolt in Algeria and in France. The magazine "Young Europe" became in France the main propaganda bulletin for the OAS and the tenants of Algerie Francaise. However, on January 31, 1961 the "Journal Officiel" of the French government published an interdiction from the Minister of Interior against the sale and distribution of "Belgique-Afrique," "Europe-Afrique," and "Nation Europe", three magazines that were supporting the Algerian military Putsch against President de Gaulle's government. Luc Michel reported: "After the military failure of the Algerian putsch, the organization of Thiriart, which had become 'Young Europe' at the end of 1961, and active in many countries, was oriented toward providing an important support to the last partisans of Algerie Francaise organized around the OAS, the 'Secret Army Organization'. 'Nation Europe' publishes the communiqués of the OAS and 'Young Europe' is used as a rear base for those who are fighting on the metropolitan territory." Jean Thiriart was working directly under the command of the top terrorist leader of Metropolitan OAS, Captain Pierre

Sergent, one of the masterminds behind the assassination attempts against President Charles de Gaulle.

In the 'Jeune Europe' issue of November 2, 1961, Thiriart made the following call: "The current political role of JEUNE EUROPE within the 'French networks' is the hardening of all of the groups that are favorable to Algerie Francaise. The current political role of SOUSTELLE and BIDAULT is to present a façade of petit-bourgeois respectability, of good republicanism, and of authentic democracy. Infiltrate all of the organizations which are favorable to Algerie Francaise, however moderate they might be." Thiriart also worked with the collaboration of Dominique Venner, the leader of 'Europe Action' and of the 'Federation des Etudiants Nationalistes.' This group, however, ended up rejecting the anti-American bias of Thiriart.

The official terrorist link between Young Europe and OAS was reportedly created under the code-name "France 3", which had the role of organizing logistical support of all of the OAS activities on the territory of France, under the authority of the head of the OAS, General Raoul Salan. As it was revealed in the court case of would be assassin, Jean Bastien Thiry, both Valery Giscard d'Estaing and Henri, Duke of Orleans, were interested parties with respect to the political assassinations run by the OAS.

\*\*\*

1963. After the debacle of Algerie Francaise, the French government shut down the publication of Jeune Europe and of 'Europe Afrique' in France. Thiriart and his collaborators were arrested. Some of them spent some time in jail. From Belgium, however, Thiriart kept publishing under the new cover name of 'Europe Combatante,' which was also be shut down shortly after. Twenty-five years later, Thiriart, himself, bragged about his role during that period, admitting: "I have known the captains, and colonels of the OAS very well. It was I who made the announcement on radio Luxembourg, and before everyone else, that Sergent had replaced [Antoine] Argoud. I made the announcement a few hours after the kidnapping of the latter in Germany. The decisions had been taken close to Brussels...A little to the south...Jeune Europe was, to a great extent, the external life-support system of the OAS."

\*\*\*\*\*

1963-64. Thiriart was attempting to recruit on the University campuses, especially around the Federation des Etudiants Nationalistes (FEN) of Dominique Venner. Thiriart created a new organization called the 'Federation Générale des Etudiants Europeens (FGEE) in order to counter the influence of FEN. In fact, the FEN ended up supporting American troops in Vietnam and the alliance with Thiriart broke down. The 'Cahiers Universitaires' of the FEN were not only celebrating the victories of the US Marines, but were also calling for "an all white western empire from Vladivostok to San Francisco." The FGEE of Thiriart was forced to abort by August of 1964. Luc Michel claimed that the American Embassy in Belgium and in France was financing student groups who were against Thiriart.

\*\*\*\*\*

1964. Thiriart created the 'Centre d'Etudes Politiques et Sociales Europeennes' (CEPSE), which operated out of Belgium, France and Spain. The constant fight was to recruit extreme right wing nationalists to the Greater European ideas. When that failed, Thiriart tried to rally them to the cause of communitarism or anti-Americanism.

\*\*\*\*\*

1965. The CEPSE participated in the Congress of European Federalist Movement, of October 2, 3, 1965, in Cannes. They had 35 representatives from France and Italy, under the leadership of Gerard Bordes for France, and Pierfranco Bruschi for Italy. A new publication was created by Thiriart called La Nation Européenne. A similar newsletter appeared in Italy under the name of La Nation Europea. The first publications of CEPSE Information came out in 1965.

Simultaneously Thiriart created the 'Parti Communautaire Européen (CPE). This was considered the mature phase of Thiriart's work, who then began to travel to Iraq, Algeria, and Egypt. Thiriart entered in contact with the FLN of Algeria, his old enemy, seeking a new outlet for a new revolutionary situation.

\*\*\*\*\*

1968. Thiriart's Bolsheviks of the PCE and Jeune Europe joined the Marxist-Leninist-Maoists of Italy during the upheavals of summer 68. Thiriart kept feeding his troops with this new illusion that a revolutionary situation can prevail in Europe. After the fizzling out of the 1968 events, under the pretext that his optometrist business was going bankrupt and that he became incapable of adapting his 'revolutionary instincts' to a relatively untroubled period of the seventies, Thiriart left the political scene of militantism from 1970 until 1980.

\*\*\*\*\*

1970. Thiriart was reconverted into taking up a European Union leadership for European optometrists. The Synarchy International went into a massive reorganization of its street level deployments. The idea was to recruit as many new troops as possible from the left into the New Right at the leadership level, that is, at the {*intermediary secret society*} level. The next major crisis was going to be run top down by the New Right, and all of the street level activists on the left were going to be sacrificed, again, as in 1940. All of Thiriart's previous organizations were taken apart. This is the period during which Mr. Synarchy himself was in power, in France, that is, Francois Mitterand. Thiriart's Italian group, Giovane Europa, fell apart as well. Without the support of Thiriart, the different national Bolshevik groups and the French communitarists were fractionalized deliberately, and their leadership was kicked upstairs.

A faction was created by the name of Organization Lutte du Peuple (OLP) with an Italian equivalent Lotta di Popolo. Similar groups are created in Spain, Germany, and Switzerland. The German groups are called Nazionale-Revolutionar Aufbau Organisation (NRAO), also known as Sache des Volkes. All of these fractions reflected different aspects of the Bolshevism of Thiriart and of Maoism. In one word, these were a sort of cocktail of extreme right mixed with extreme left. The injurious name for them was Nazi-Maoist, which was nothing else but an aborted form of national-Bolshevik.

\*\*\*\*\*

1972. At the beginning of 1972, the editor in chief of the newspaper {Minute} Francois Brigneau convinced Jean-Marie Le Pen to lead a new political formation, which would assemble all of the extreme fractions of the

so-called right wing under a single political party. The idea of the Front National was born. On October 5, 1972, representatives of the fragmented extreme-right assembled in Paris to create the Front National pour l'Unité Française (FNUF). Jean-Marie Le Pen was elected president, Francois Brigneau, vice-president, and Alain Robert, secretary general with Roger Holeindre, assistant general secretary.

\*\*\*\*\*

1981. Following the exemple set by the French Front National, a Belgium Front Nationalist was created in Charleroi. For the first time this national-revolutionary organization presented electoral lists for elections in Belgian communes, in 1982. It lasted until 1984 under that name. The spirit of Thiriart is everywhere revived in those groups, even if Thiriart never wanted to run for office himself, for fear of being contaminated. This is the period of the Euro-missiles crisis. The nuclear boogiemans are out of the bag and the Greens are created. The first 'Grunen' begin to come out of the ground around the national-Bolsheviks of the Belgium Front Nationalist.

Left wing Maoists and right wing National Socialists are getting together to form a new political party, the PCN. The Parti Communautaire National (PCN), which also has affiliates in Barcelona under the leadership of Quadrado Costa. The potential for activation of those terrorist networks inside of the United States, through Italy and Spain should not be underestimated. These networks of anti-American hate groups should be looked into for possible intersection of conflict situations caused by manipulation of illegal transient Mexican workers into the United States.

\*\*\*\*\*

1984. The Parti Communautaire National (PCN) is reborn. Jean Thiriart comes out of his retirement and becomes a political advisor to the new group, which is now run by Luc Michel the new guru of the Communitarians. While the right has been heavily dominated the Jeune Europe, the second generation of the PCN is totally open to communists, marxist-leninists as well as national-socialists. A new publication is put out called Conscience Europeenne.

\*\*\*\*\*



1985. After the American intervention in Libya, the PCN launched a major anti-American offensive in Belgium and France. The slogan was a perfect Thiriart statement: "American imperialism, Zionism: the single enemy of the European nation."  
\*\*\*\*\*

1986-89. Thiriart's associate, Thierry Mudry, created Le Partisan Europeen in Beziere. This is a "new right" group, which has joined Thiriart's national-Bolsheviks in attacking the Americans in the Gulf War. At this time, a new left-right- green coalition is beginning to form around the strategy of the Partisans Europeen. They consider that the division allies/enemy of the system has to replace the traditional left/right division.

\*\*\*\*\*

In 1991, out of a reaction to the Front National of Le Pen, the Parti Communautaire National (PCN) created the group Nouvelle Resistance, (NR), which was run by an Aleister Crowley and Satan worshiper, Christian Bouchet. In 1996, Bouchet linked up with Le Pen and formed the pagan wing of the Front National with the collaboration of Nazi skin-heads, Satanists, and metal-rock groups. Bouchet is the owner of a skinhead-punk-rock music CD-company.

\*\*\*\*\*

1992. Two new groups Partisan Europeen and the Belgian 'Groupe de base de Brabant' become integrated into the PCN. Starting in 1990, the PCN published a new revue called Nationalisme et Republique, which is run by Michel Schneider, Yves Bataille, and Thierry Mudry. It is, in essence, anti-American, anti-imperialist, anti-Zionism, and is aimed at recruiting national-Bolshevik tendencies within the Le Pen Front National. In August of 1992, Schneider and Thiriart went to Moscow to meet with their national-Bolshevik affiliate Guenadi Ziouganov, the leader of the PCFR. The PCN also became allied with the extreme right group GRECE, which is run by anti-American Alain de Benoist. GRECE: Groupe de Recherche et d'Etude sur la Civilisation Europeenne was created in the 1960's in order to replace the failure of the OAS. They are today very close to Bruno Megret's pagan MNR wing of the Front National and the monarchist Club de l'Horloge.

Within the periphery of the Front National there is also the radical Christian fundamentalist grouping known as Chretiente-Solidarite (Christian Solidarity). One of the former organizers of GRECE, Pierre Vial a former hard core national-revolutionary from the {Volkisch} now is an editor of {Identite}, the journal of Chretiente-Solidarite, which is run by Bernard Antony. This is a wing of the FN, which is drawn around Bruno Megret, a potential candidate to replace Jean-Marie Le Pen. The National Bolshevik (NBS), the Parti Communautaire National (PCN-1984), and the Nouvelle Resistance (NR), the Front Europeen de Liberation (FEL-1993) of Jean Thiriart and of Luc Michel are different forms of National-Socialism turned into a European National Bolsheviks with the exclusion of Karl Marx.

\*\*\*\*\*

In 1996, the PCN created the Front Europeen de Liberation (FEL) as the coordinating body of those different European National-Bolshevik Movements. Also in 1996, the Front Europeen de Liberation joined the Front-Noir-Rouge-Vert (Black-Red-Green-Front) a nazi-communist-environmentalist organization run under the Parti Communautaire National (PCN), which had become the umbrella organization of all of those groups. The Swiss Nouvelle Resistance joined the PCN in August of 1997, at the same time as the Spanish, German, Polish and Italian groups.

### **3.2 - BERNARD ANTONY OF CHRETIENTE ET SOLIDARITE**

The Integrist side of these terrorist networks, called Chretiente-Solidarite (Christian Solidarity), is run by Bernard Antony (alias Romain Marie). Antony is a new Christian Crusader. He is the co-founder of Chretiente Solidarite with Thibault de la Tocnaye, who attended the Blas Pinar meeting in Madrid, in 199?. [See Irene's report [Blas Pinar's Friends in France].

Formerly with Algerie Francaise, Antony was one of the terrorists of the OAS-Metro-Jeune during the Algerian War run by Captain Pierre Sergent. Antony created the monthly review Present in 1975, the Centre Henri et Andre Charlier in 1979, and the Comite Chretiente-Solidarite in

1980 with the collaboration of Madiran and Francois Brigneau. In 1982, he launched a new monthly magazine called RECONQUETE, and created the Alliance Générale Contre le Racisme et pour le Respect de l'Identite Francaise et Chretienne (AGRIF), in 1988. (AGRIF), which seems to be the French equivalent of the Anti-Defamation League and is used as an anti-Muslim crusade under the pretext of defending the French and Catholics. Antony also created the Comite Clovis in 1995. Chretiente Solidarity has a para-military capability and reportedly sent anti-Muslim mercenaries to fight "Communists" around the world. This is the French side of Baroness Cox mercenary operations in Africa.

Antony's organizations regroup all of the catholic integrists and the right wing nationalists of France. He has been a candidate for the Front National since 1983, was elected as a Front National candidate at the European elections of 1984, and got reelected in 1989 and 1994. Antony was elected head of the Front National for the southern French region of Midi-Pyrenees.

Bernard Antony is the French right arm continuation of the Spanish Falange leader, Jose Antonio Primo de Rivera. He also claims an affiliation with Corneliu Zelea Codreanu, the founder of the Iron Guards of Romania. This is a straight Joseph de Maistre type of Synarchist. He is co-president with Jean Pierre Cohen of the Cercle d'Amitie Francaise Juive et Chretienne: straight Saint-Yves d'Alveydre stuff. He has apparently quit the Front National in 2003 because he found the party was becoming "excessively pagan."

Antony's associate, Thibault Bougrenet de la Tocnaye is the son of Alain Bougrenet de la Tocnaye, former OAS who participated in the assassination attempt against Charles de Gaulle with Jean Bastien Thiry on August 22, 1962 outside of Paris. Born in Algeria, Thibault fought as a Contra mercenary in Nicaragua and with the Phalangist Samir Geagea in Lebanon. Thibault also runs the Chretiente Solidarite Central America. Thibault de la Tocnaye is an official to the Le Pen Front National and a businessman in Provence for a company called Apageo Segelm, a producer of geotechnical material.

#### **4.2 CHRISTIAN BOUCHET OF NOUVELLE RESISTANCE.**

It is very interesting that those so-called Catholics would be deployed alongside of the networks of Nouvelle Resistance (NR), which is a Satanist operation run by Christian Bouchet. Bouchet's affiliation to Aleister Crowley and the Eglise Gnostique Catholique puts him also at the center of the street level deployments, or slightly under, of the Ordre Martiniste et Synarchique. Nouvelle Resistance is the French branch of the Front Europeen de Liberation to which are also associated the British group Third Way, the Milanese newspaper, Orion, the Polish Przelon Narodowy, the Belfast independentist Ulster Union, the Spanish magazine Tribuna de Europa, the Belgian PCN of Luc Michel, the musical skinhead Fraction Hexagone (Dark/Black Metal), (Including Raven's chats [Toulouse], Kunst [Strasbourg], Requiem gothique [Rennes], Napalm rock [Aix en Provence], and Omega [Upper-Rhine]), as well as the Eurasian groups of Alexander Dugin and of Edward Limonov. Bouchet had also created a web-site of Unite Radicale with the idea of the Front National, a paganist, and extreme right connection to the nationalist-revolutionary and National-Bolshevik groupings of Jean Thiriart and Luc Michel. Bouchet is a National Bolshevik. In an interview made by the magazine Reflechir & Agir, Christian Bouchet admitted himself that he was an infiltrator of different movements. He said he "had joined the OLP [Organisation Lutte du Peuple] in 1973 and has never left the pro-Thiriart and the nationalist-revolutionary current since then, even if he had participated in different infiltrations, which is one of the characteristic actions of the Thiriart groups of partisans."

As an example of this kind of nefarious networking, in France today, there are reportedly about 3,000 or so national-revolutionaries, neo-nazis, neo-fascists who form small right-wing extremist groups that orbit around Unite Radicale (UR), created by Christian Bouchet in 1998. The Ministry of Interior shut down Unite Radicale, in 2003, after it was discovered that a young militant of the movement, Maxime Brunerie, had made an assassination attempt on the life of French President, Jacques Chirac, on July 14, 2002.

Unite Radicale was created at the time of the break between the MNR party of 'pagan' Bruno Megret and the Front National of Jean-Marie Le Pen. UR was a federation of the 'ultras' of extreme right activists from the Groupe Union Defense(GUD) alias Union et Defense des Etudiants d'Assas, of Jeune Resistance and of Union des Cercles Resistances . Gerard Longuet

created the GUD when OCCIDENT was shut down in 1969. It is a white racist radical organization in the national-revolutionary tradition of Bruno Megret. After it was shut down, Unite radicale was replaced by Jeunesses Identitaires, which was then run by Guillaume Luyt, Philippe Vardon, and Fabrice Robert.

Bruno Megret likes to be perceived as a "respectable" low profile right wing parliamentarian who began his career as a Front National candidate. After the 1997 election, when the Front National won 15% of the vote for the presidential election, Catherine Megret, wife of Bruno Megret, won her election as mayor of Vitrolles in the Hautes-Alpes. As of that time, it has been estimated that when Le Pen retires, his replacement as leader of the Party will either be Bruno Gollnisch or Bruno Megret.

The relationship of Christian Bouchet and Aleister Crowley is very important. On the web-site of the Front Europeen de Liberation, there is a lengthy article entitled {Generation Thiriart} which goes out of it way to disassociate the name of Thiriart and Michel from that of Bouchet. The interesting part is the connection of Bouchet to the Satanic OTO [Ordo Templi Orientis], which was created by Aleister Crowley at the turn of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. This is the British run Masonic operation that deploys the skinheads all over Germany, France, Belgium, Italy and Spain. It seems that Bruno Megret's party the MNR and the FN are both very highly controlled by OTO. This also includes the British controlled French networks of the Luciferian, Satanist, Odinist, Celtic and Wicca cults.

The marching orders of the OTO are run through the Paris Masonic Groupe de Thebes, a very selective and secretive society of high-level freemasonic initiates who works in collaboration with the Grand Orient of France (GOF) and is headquartered in their Paris office. The Group of Thebes is functioning as a headquarter of top Martinists and Synarchists, a sort of International Assassination Bureau. The formal head of the GOF is the Duke of Orleans.

According to Peter-Robert Koenig, {Ein Leben fuer die Rose (Arnoldo Krumm-Heller)}, who is also a follower of Crowley, these Masonic groups deploy neo-nazi groups like 'L'Assault', which is the Belgium section of the German "Europaische Bewegung" run by the grand master of the German section of the OTO, Michael Kuhnen. Koenig wrote: "Kuhnen also found another expression for his will to power, his mysticism and his

sexuality: he created a secret society in Germany, the Thelema lodge of the Ordo Templi Orientis (OTO). It is a Luciferian sect which seemed to have practiced (in Germany) a number of orgies including collective rapes of children and human sacrifices."

Koenig also showed the connection between Bouchet and the Memphis-Mishram order in Spain. Gerard Kloppel, who is the world grand master of the Memphis Mishram Lodge [7,000 members] is apparently the eminence grise behind Christian Bouchet and his Satanist deployments. It would be interesting to pin down the connection between Kloppel more precisely with the Duke of Orleans. Bouchet reportedly attended meetings at the Groupe de Thebes in Paris where Kloppel bragged that a number of highly placed police officials of the Direction de la securite du Territoire (DST) were also in attendance, but he did not say if they were under cover or under his thumb.

According to Reseau Voltaire, this European Movement is an international neo-nazi organization, located in Germany, but with sections of {L'Assault} in France, the Netherlands, and Denmark. It has created two satanic extensions, which are reportedly run by Michel Caignet, in Nice, and Christian Bouchet, in Nantes. Caignet is also a grand master of OTO and has been condemned in several pedophile scandals in France. The 'Europaische Bewegung' that he leads in France is a renowned "pedo-nazi" front. The Front Europeen de Liberation also reports that a close friend of Bouchet, the ecologist candidate of Pau for the Green party in 1990, Luc Bianchini is the leader of the satanist neo-templar lodge called OTO-EGG-AA. Recently, Bianchini became one of the candidates of the MNR list of Bruno Megret.

According to a website article by Miguel Martinez, the Groupe of Thebes include the following list of members:

- Massimo Introvigne, "Catholic scholar" and director of the Centro Studi Sulle nuovi religioni (CESNUR), Study Center for New Religions.
- Remi Boyer, Rosecrucian (AMORC), "advisor" to the French Ministry of Justice.

- Jean-Pierre Guillemin, world Grand Master of the Order of Myriam, Metaphis Ordre Nouveau, and Troisieme voie, related to Third Position.
- Jean-Marie Vergerio, leader of the Templars of Circe.
- Triantaphyllos Kotzamanis, world Grand Master of Universal Orient of Traditional Rites.
- Christian Bouchet, leader of Nouvelle Resistance, member of Crowley's OTO.
- Paolo "Salamina" Fogagnolo, leader of Agape Lodge of OTOA, and of the Chiapas Collettivo. [Miguel Martinez, {*Some odd friends of Introvigne*}].

Furthermore, Serge Faubert reports in {L'evenement du Jeudi 4 novembre 1993}, esoextreme2, that the Group of Thebes was associated with the International Center of Martinist Research and Studies (CIREM), and its magazine "L'esprit des choses."

## **5.2 THE OAS ASSASSINS OF DE GAULLE AND THE FRONT NATIONAL**

A little known but important connection to make is the fact that the Front National is nothing else but the recruiting base for the assassins of the Organisation de l'Armee Secrete (OAS) of the oligarchical Algerie Francaise. For example, the founder of the OAS with General Raoul Salan, in 1960, was Jean-Jacques Susini. During his exile in Italy, Susini was responsible, with the complicity of Gilles Buscia, for the attempted assassination of De Gaulle at the Toulon memorial of Mont Faron, on August 14, 1964. The explosive device, hidden in a flowerpot, was drowned, inadvertently by the local gardner, when he watered the plants a few hours before De Gaulle was to arrive. The Front National has recruited both Susini and Buscia within its ranks. Buscia has been a close collaborator to the Front National during the 1990's and Le Pen promoted Susini to the political bureau of the Front National in 1999.

On September 8, 1961, an 8-pound bomb was hidden in a sand heap on the side of National Route 19, at Pont-sur-Seine. The device exploded as President de Gaulle's car went by. The would be assassin was Dominique Cabanne de la Prade who has been a Front National municipal counselor for six years at Saint-Jean-de-Brave [Loiret]. The person responsible for all of these assassination attempts against de Gaulle was Captain Pierre Sergent, who was the top OAS chief for Metropolitan France in 1961. A journalist for {Le Point}, Christophe Deloire reported in his article, {Les ennemis de De Gaulle}, that when he died in 1986, Pierre Sergent had been a FN elected deputy, and was a political advisor at the political bureau of the Front National. [[www.lepoint.fr](http://www.lepoint.fr)]

On May 23, 1962, Operation Chamois: Charles de Gaulle was shot at on the footsteps of the Elysee Palace by a rifleman located on the first story of 86, rue du Faubourg-St-Honore. This was followed two days later, on May 25, by another attempt at the Pouzets, near Argenton-sur-Creuse, at which explosives were discovered before the passing of the presidential train.

The assassination attempt of August 22, 1962 is probably the most spectacular of all. The attempt known as the {Petit-Clamart} involved a commando of 14 members of the OAS, including Lieutenant Louis de Conde who has been a member of the Central Committee of the Front National, secretary of the Party in the Allier, and a legislative candidate for Vichy. Deloire wrote: "At the Petit-Clamart, Alain Bougrenet de la Tocnaye was hiding inside of a Citroen D-19, acting as a "second wave". The author of {*Comment je n'ai pas tue de Gaulle*}, was also inserted into the Front National, said his son, even if "he might not be up to date in his dues." The son, Thibault de la Tocnaye, was municipal counselor for the FN in Avignon. Today, as a member of the political bureau of the LePenist party and national delegate for studies and argumentations, Thibault de la Tocnaye remembers that 'Le Pen went to pray on the tomb of Jean-Marie Bastien-Thiry'. Bastien-Thiry was the chief military engineer of the Petit-Clamart commando. He was executed in March of 1963 at Fort Ivry." Deloire further noted that Jean-Marie Le Pen was at the Mutuality meeting of the OAS on November 16, 1961 when the crowd was clamoring "OAS! OAS!" Le Pen took the floor and stated: "Starting tonight, the struggle has begun. The declaration of war [against de Gaulle] has been declared!"



On February 15, 1963, the Plot of the Ecole Militaire was the attempt that inspired the book of Frederick Forsyth, {Chacal}. Georges Valin (1923-94) who escaped to Switzerland and took refuge in Paraguay made the assassination attempt. He was sentenced to death in absentia. [The above six attempts against the life of President de Gaulle are also reported in {Quid 04}.] Maxime Brunerie, who shot at President Jacques Chirac with a 22caliber riffle at the Champs Elysees, on July 14, 2002, had been a candidate for the 18<sup>th</sup> arrondissement of Paris, during the municipal election of 2001. He had the seventh position on the MNR list of candidates of Bruno Megret. Brunerie was also tied to the lawyer of the German NDP neo-Nazi group, Horst Mahler, formerly a member of the Baader-Meinhof gang. In an homage to the old SS of the Charlemagne Division, Mahler and Brunerie celebrated together the summer solstice of 2002 at Montsegur (Ariege), the old fortress of the Templars, a favorite spot of the Martinists.

All of the above represent essentially the French terrorist deployment capabilities of the Synarchy International at the street level, worldwide. These are the arms and legs of individuals who are sympathetic to the Duke of Orleans, today known as Henry, Comte de Paris, and official pretender to the Bourbon throne of France. The three levels of the Synarchy International secret societies are here represented: At the highest level, there is the Duke of Orleans, who is the leading French royalist high priest of the cult of GAIA, and who is also a candidate for the European election of 2004, and, in reality, the up and coming new Beast-Man of France. As theoreticians of the Synarchy, Jean Thiriart and Luc Michel, represent the intermediate level. The lower level is represented by the likes of Bernard Antony and Bruno Megret, including the sewage level represented by Christian Bouchet and his crawling perverts. As ugly as this potential terrorism represents, for our own organization as well as for our allies, it is the bond that holds them together, which is the real menace.

The real danger in French society, and this is also the element that prevents this people from making real progress, is that it has been made socially acceptable by tradition, and legally acceptable by social contract, that the leader of the nation can be removed by abduction, or even by way of assassination, when he is considered to be a tyrant by a certain class of fanatical people. For them, any idea of giving up Algeria represented treason. Consequently, it is socially acceptable to have assassins walking the

streets of French cities with their heads high, and flaunt the truth. This is a stupid tradition, which goes back at least to the assassination of Henry IV, and as far back as the Crusades. This is the type of romantic sophistry that was made to prevail throughout the trial of Jean Bastien Thiry and Alain de la Tocnaye, in February of 1963.

For example, just listen to the tone of arrogance when la Tocnaye declared in court: "I know that a certain way to hold your head is not diplomatic; but my family, which has given France crusaders, chouans [royalist insurgents] and officers, has never bowed down in the face of what its conscience considered perjury, felony or dishonor, and I have the right to listen to my ancestors who always have defended holy causes..."

This is precisely the "right of being stupid" that must be ridiculed to high heavens, in the courts and the streets of France. The issue here is not a legal matter, nor even a French matter, it is simply a human matter. As long as such fallacy of composition is made to be socially accepted in any society, the truth will never have its day in France, and France will never have a positive role to play in the world at large.

This is the more profound and significant terrorist danger represented by the Le Pen phenomenon today, that is: blackmail disguised into oligarchical honor. If this kind of insanity is not derided publicly, if this trash is not ridiculed everywhere for the stupidity that it represents, then the Beast-Man of Bonaparte, or of Laval, will rear its ugly head, again, in the animalistic form of the Duke of Orleans, this time. If this dirty piece of oligarchical garbage cannot be extirpated entirely from the soil of France, at least the truth about its real bestial nature can keep it in check and prevent it from dominating. Let the truth prevail over false honor!

## **6.2 BLAS PINAR'S FRIENDS IN FRANCE**

What we have here is a glimpse of the current Synarchist assassination and brainwashing capabilities in France. Lawfully, it is the continuation of the MARTINIST cult and the assassination capability known as ORGANISATION DE L'ARMEE SECRETE (OAS). This is written for the purpose of providing some investigative leads into current operations targeting the LaRouche movement.

THIBAUT DE BOUGRENET DE LA TOCNAYE represented France at the Falange celebration in Madrid that Blas Pinar had organized on November 16-17, 2002. LA TOCNAYE is co-founder and co-director of CHRETIENTE SOLIDARITE, which is the political arm of the CENTER HENRI ET ANDRE CHARLIER, founded by BERTRAND ANTONY and modeled on CHARLES MAURRAS's ideas. CHRETIENTE SOLIDARITE furnishes aid (including paratroopers) to armed Christian movements and to anti-communist movements in places like Croatia, Nicaragua, Poland, Indochina and Lebanon.

CHRETIENTE-SOLIDARITE, CENTRE HENRI ET ANDRE CHARLIER, COMITE CLOVIS and a series of magazines and newspapers, such as PRESENT, RECONQUETE, MINUTE, ITINERAIRES, (all founded by BERNARD ANTONY) are all committed to fighting "genocide against France and the French", that means, against immigration and against Islam. CHRETIENTE SOLIDARITE's motto is: "That France, that Christianity continue. Against communism that massacres; facing the outbreak of Muslims, facing the subversion of totalitarian cosmopolitanism."

After Marcel Lefebvre was kicked out of the Catholic Church, CHRETIENTE SOLIDARITE was careful to insist on its fidelity to the Pope. However, they are still listed on the St. Pius X website of Lefebvre.

THIBAUT BOUGRENET DE LA TOCNAYE is today an elected regional member of LePen's party, the Front National. He is a businessman in southern France, in Provence, director general since 1995, of Apageo Segelm, a company that specializes in geotechnical material.

La Tocnaye's father, Alain Bougrenet de la Tocnaye, was a member of the ORGANISATION DE L'ARMEE SECRETE (OAS) and collaborator of Jean Bastien-Thiry in the attempted assassination of General Charles de Gaulle on August 22, 1962 in Petit-Clamart. He was sentenced to death along with Bastien-Thiry and Marcel Prevost. De Gaulle commuted Prevost's and la Tocnaye's death sentence to life imprisonment, but Bastien-Thiry was executed March 11, 1963.

THIBAUT DE LA TOCNAYE, who was born in Algiers, apparently followed in his father's footsteps: he fought as a mercenary in Croatia, with the Contras in Nicaragua, and with Phalangist Geagea in Lebanon

Reportedly, CRETIENTE SOLIDARITE has the support of many bishops in the Curia in Rome. It is in the tradition of the SOLIDARISTS of the 1970's. In 1997 (and likely still today), CHRETIENTE SOLIDARITE had networks around the world:

1). FRANCE-LEBANON was headed up by JEAN KAYANAKIS and CATHERINE RENOULT; it was founded with the collaboration of PHILIPPE MALAUD (CNI) and GUY GUERMEUR (RPR). It supports the MARONITE militia. In the 1970's, THIBAUT DE LA TOCNAYE, JACQUES ARNOULD, and FRANCIS BERGERON fought on the side of the phalange of SAMIR GEAGEA in Lebanon. Reseau Voltaire says that these links continue: the phalange is regularly invited to participate in days of "amitie francaise" and inversely, CHRETIENTE SOLDIARITE sends emissaries to Lebanon, for instance, OLIVIER D'ORMESSON in 1986.

SAMIR GEAGEA's lawyers were BIAGGI, SAINT JUST and PATRIMONIO, of AGENCE GENERAL CONTRE LE RACISME ET POUR LE RESPECT DE L'IDENTITE FRANCAISE ET CHRETIENNE (AGRIF) -- a sort of ADL of the rightwing -- also set up by BERNARD ANTONY.

JEAN-BAPTISTE BIAGGI, is president of honor of THE CLOVIS COMMITTEE, also founded by BERNARD ANTONY. He is former deputy in Paris, regional counselor for Corsica, and former officer of commandos of France. BIAGGI is an old comrade of SOUSTELLE. Some have even suggested that he was somewhat of a controller of Soustelle. Was member of the RAF (Rassemblement pour l'Algerie Francaise).

2). CHRETIENTE SOLIDARITE PAYS DE L'EST was headed up by JEAN-MICHEL RUDENT, who led groups in POLAND, LITHUANIA, and ESTONIA. But, says Reseau Voltaire, like the Front National, they have never been able to get a foothold in Russia.

3). CROATIA-SOLIDARITY, headed up by CHRISTOPHE BOUQUIN (editor of L'EPERVIER) organized convoys to SLAVONSKI BROD where they run an orphanage. But, under cover, CHRETIENTE SOLIDARITE supplied fighters to the CROATIAN DEFENSE FORCE (HRVATSKE ORUZANE SNAGE - HOS) to fight against the "serbo-bolcheviks".

4). CHRETIENTE-SOLIDARITE CENTRAL AMERICA, directed by THIBAUT DE BOUGRENET DE LA TOCNAYE, supported the ultras of the contra antisandinistas and is said to be linked closely to the government of El Salvador.

5). The INDONESIA section, under the direction of ALAIN SANDERS, supports the KARENS (catholic national minority in Burma) supplying them with military uniforms.

SANDERS is an interesting case. He was born in 1947 in Morocco, son of a police officer that was part of the security for Mohammed V. SANDERS was educated in Rabat. He was a student activist in ultra right winger DOMINIQUE VENNER'S operation, FEDERATION DES ETUDIANTS NATIONALISTES DE FRANCE in Aix en Provence. Later he joined the rightwing nationalist movement in France with BRUNO GOLLNISCH (FN), PATRICK BUISSON, and BERNARD LUGAN. He became a royalist. In 1970 he created a military type of royalist group close to ORDRE NOUVEAU, called the COMBATTANTS ROYALISTS POUR UN ORDRE NOUVEAU (CRON. He taught in Nigeria (1972-1974), at the Vietnamese university Quang-Da in Danang (1974-75), at the Regional Pedagogical Center of Oujda in Morocco (1977-83). He joined the editorial board of PRESENT in 1983. SANDERS is a member of Bernard Antony's AGRIF (legal bureau) and is head of the South East Asia sector of Chretiente Solidarite. He is a prolific journalist who uses many pseudonyms.

The founder of CHRETIENTE-SOLIDARITE is BERNARD ANTONY.

BERNARD ANTONY alias ROMAIN MARIE, born 1944, became a militant in the Algerie Francaise movement very early on, escaped arrest at age 15 for having links to OAS-METRO-JEUNE (youth branch in France of the OAS). He joined the TIXIER-VIGNANCOURT committee. (TIXIER-VIGNANCOURT was the defense lawyer of many of the Vichyites and of BASTIEN-THIRY and his collaborators, in the attempted assassination of de Gaulle in 1962). In 1966, ANTONY joined the solidarist JEUNE REVOLUTION movement. In 1978-84 he became director of Pierre Fabre's pharmaceutical laboratory in Castres, where he became elected municipal counselor from 1989-1995. Pierre Fabre was himself very active in the extreme right.

ANTONY launched the monthly paper PRESENT in 1975, created the CENTRE HENRI ET ANDRE CHARLIER in 1979, the CHRETIENNE-SOLIDARITE COMMITTEE in 1980. In 1982 PRESENT became a daily paper and ANTONY retired from it to found another publication, the monthly RECONQUETE. In 1988 he founded ALLIANCE GENERAL CONTRE LE RACISME ET POUR LE RESPECT DE L'IDENTITE FRANCAISE ET CHRETIENNE (AGRIF) which has its own newspaper, GRIFFON. ANTONY joined Le Pen's CLOVIS COMITE in 1983. He left it in 2003, reportedly, because it had become too pagan for him. In the 1997 FRONT NATIONAL Congress, 13 members of Antony's COMITE CLOVIS were elected to the central committee of the FRONT NATIONAL. They were:

BRUNO GOLLNSICH (3E)  
ROGER HOLEINDRE (4E)  
YVAN BLOT (7E)  
CARL LANG (9E)  
JEAN MARIE LE CHEVALLIER (12E)  
GEORGES-PAUL WAGNER (16E)  
BERNARD ANTONY (26E)  
THIBAUT DE LA TOCNAYE (37E)  
JEAN-ROMEE CHARBONNEAU (54E)  
JACQUES COLOMBIER (57E)  
MAURICE GROS (64E)  
HUGUES PETIT (71E)  
SERGE LAROZE (94E)

In addition, MICHEL BAYVET of AGRIF and three former members of the solidarist movement were elected. They were:

MARIE-FRANCE STIRBOIS  
CHRITIAN BAECKEROOT  
MYRIAM BAECKEROOT.

CHRETIENNE-SOLIDARITE's COMITE CLOVIS holds summer schools in the small village of Barroux near Carpentras. BARROUX not only has a monastery but also a chateau where the schools are held. The monastery's prior, Dom GERARD reportedly is a tough who has participated

in anti-abortion demonstrations and in May 1<sup>st</sup> demos in Paris.  
CHRETIENNE-SOLIDARITE's emblem is: DIEU, FAMILLE, PATRIE  
(GOD, FAMILY, NATION).

In attendance for the end of the summer school celebration in 1997,  
there were:

- LE CHEVALLIER, mayor of Toulon and 10 year member of CHRETIENNE-SOLIDARITE.
- DE BOMPARD, mayor of Orange, FRONT NATIONAL member.
- MACARY, lawyer and FRONT NATIONAL candidate in Carpentras.
- FERNAND TEBOUL, municipal counselor of Sorgues.
- BERNARD ANTONY, alias ROMAIN MARIE.
- THIBAUT DE BOUGRENET DE LA TOCNAYE.

In the CHATEAU DU BARROUX, the CENTRE HENRI ET  
ANDRE CHARLIER organized the COMITE CLOVIS SUMMER  
UNIVERSITY in 1995.

Speakers at the event were:

- BERNARD ANTONY
- JEAN LOUIS DE CAMARET
- JEAN MADIRAN, director of the magazine PRESENT
- ALBERT GERARD
- CELINE MAGRINI, from University of Aix en Provence
- JEAN DE VIGUERIE, professor at the University of Lille, president of the French society of religious history and history of ideas.
- JEAN-CLAUDE ABSIL, president of CERCLE DE VERSAILLES
- MARIE-GENEVIEVE ANTONY, wife of Bernard I presume.
- GERARD DE GUBERNATIS, delegate of COMITE CLOVIS for the Alpes Maritimes.
- LOUIS STEIN, ex-commander of camp 111 and author of Soldats Oublies (Forgotten Soldiers).
- JOE SOHET, ex-under officer of 11<sup>th</sup> Choc, and president of the CERCLE ALGERIANISTE.
- XAVIER MARTIN, professor of history of law in Angers.
- JEAN DUMONT, writer and historian.

- **FRANCOISE MARIE ACGOUD**, honorary lawyer, honorary president of **COMITE NEOWIS, LA CITE VIVANTE**, regional counselor for Corsica, ex-officer of commandos of France, OAS-SOUSTELLE associate.
- **YVAN GOBRY**, professor at the University of Reims.
- **DANIELLE MASSO**, professor of "Khagne" at the Salon de Provence Lycee.
- **GEORGES-PAUL WAGNER**, ex-deputy of Paris for the FN, co-honorary president of AGRIF, director with Jean Madiran of the magazine PRESENT.
- **JUDITH CABAUD**, writer.
- **THIBAUT DE BOUGRENET DE LA TOCNAYE**, engineer, director of an enterprise, regional counselor in Provence, vice-president of CHRETIENNE-SOLDIARITE, ex-Contra, director of CHRETIENNE-SOLIDARITE AMERIQUE CENTRALE.
- **ROGER TEBIB**, professor of sociology at the University of Reims.
- **WALLERAND DE SAINT-JUST**, lawyer, regional counselor for Picardie.
- **ALAIN SANDERS**, journalist, editor of magazine PRESENT, vice-president of CHRETIENNE-SOLIDARITE.
- **JEAN MARIE LE CHEVALIER**, European deputy, regional counselor for Provence.
- **SERGE DE BEKETCH**, director of LIBRE JOURNAL DE LA FRANCE COURTOISE, director of the program at Radio-Courtoise, Libre propos.

Following the trail of THIBAUT DE BOUGRENET DE LA TOCNAYE led me to a group of paramilitary organizations involved in the 1990's in Croatia.

According to REFLEX (RESEAU D'ETUDE, DE FORMATION, DE LIAISON CONTRE L'EXTEME-DROITE ET LA XENOPHOBIE), radical left wing magazine, at the end of 1991, French mercenaries joined the CROATIAN BLACK LEGION, the anti-terrorist special brigades, led and financed by MLADEN, alias Mladen the Black. Mladen reportedly had lived for 7 years in Sweden before returning in 1990 to Zagreb, Croatia where he set up a travel agency and an export-import business. He sold all of this to finance his military group.



Some of the French involved in the Croatian Black Legion were activists from the nationalist-revolutionary organization NOUVELLE RESISTANCE. The French NOUVELLE RESISTANCE was founded by fascist Satanist CHRISTIAN BOUCHET (see Pierre's report) modeled on RED BRIGADE MEMBER RENATO CURCIO's movement of the same name. The NOUVELLE RESISTANCE leader from Grenoble, ANDRE-YVES BECK, arrived in Croatia in the fall of 1991. Nouvelle Resistance has maintained a presence in Croatia since 1991 even though their activists remain only for a few months.

In the late 1990's BECK became the aid in charge of communications for the Front National's mayor of the city of Orange in France, JACQUES BOMPARD. BECK had been a militant of the youth branch of the FN from 1983-86. In 1986 he became a member of TROISIEME VOIE (third positionist) led by JEAN-GILLES MALIARAKIS, of which he became first a regional cadre member and then a national cadre member. In 1991, while one section of the Troisieme Voie joined Le Pen, another group, hostile to FN, led by CHRISTIAN BOUCHET, created the NOUVELLE RESISTANCE in France (see Pierre's report). BECK was one of the leaders of NOUVELLE RESISTANCE. His job was reportedly, specifically to infiltrate the ecologists. That same year, 1991, accompanied by two others from Grenoble, he went to Croatia to fight against the Serbo-Communists in Zagreb. BECK reportedly liked to laugh at the nationalist integristas such as la Tocnaye and Bernard Antony because they were handing out medicine and rosaries.

In 1995 BECK rejoined the FN and was offered the job of director of communications for the FN mayor of Orange.

Spanish and Italian third positionist militants were also in Croatia including ALEMANO, the former secretary general of the YOUTH FRONT and a partisan of the RAUTI tendency in Italy. According to Reflex, a daily newspaper called LA TRUFFE found in autumn 1991 that Italian mercenaries were using classified ads to recruit militants. The recruitment was organized by NATIONAL RENAISSANCE led by Italian convicted rightwing terrorist ANDREA INSABATO.

In Croatia also, ostensibly for humanitarian relief, were two leaders of FORUM PROVENCE and of ALLIANCE REGIONALISTS DE

PROVENCE, THIERY MUDRY and his wife, CHRISTINE PIGACE who teaches at the Institute for Political Studies in Aix-Marseille. In 1987 Mudry was the French correspondent for THIRIART'S PARTI COMMUNAUTAIRE NATIONAL EUROPEEN, led by Thiriart's successor, LUC MICHEL. It was Mudry who arranged for Thiriart to participate in some kind of forum in Marseille. In 1993 Mudry organized relief convoys to take out the injured via the association SECOURS AMBULANCIER DE FRANCE. He reportedly also organized the association BOSNIA which participated in the summer of 1993 in operation MIR SADA (PEACE NOW) with the group from Lyons, EQUILIBRE.

THIERRY MUDRY has been part of a cult watch group, L'OBSERVATOIRE DE RELIGIEUX, since its founding in Aix en Provence in 1992 by BRUNO ETIENNE. In addition to monitoring cults, they put out books like "Being Jewish Today in France", "Being Muslim Today in France", etc. MUDRY intersects both with CHRISTIAN BOUCHET founder of NOUVELLE RESISTANCE in France (see Pierre's report) and with Italian cult watcher MASSIMO INTROVIGNE.

MASSIMO INTROVIGNE (see Claudio's last section on Strategy of Tension) reportedly was one of the only 15 founding members of the secret "GROUP OF THEBES" which used to meet at the French Grand Orient (GOF). One of the members of the Group of Thebes was CHRISTIAN BOUCHET. According to cult watcher Miguel Martinez's website, Bouchet was a prominent speaker at several of Introvigne's CESNUR (CENTER FOR STUDIES IN NEW RELIGIONS) events. Director of the Italian based cult watching organization CESNUR, Introvigne claims to be a sociologist but, in fact, is a patent lawyer. CESNUR claims to be an objective resource on religions and cults. In fact, according to Martinez, CESNUR is linked to ALLEANZA CATTOLICA, the ideology of which is based entirely on the teachings of PLINIO CORREA DE OLIVEIRA, the Brazilian founder of a "crusade" against agrarian reform and "Communism". This "crusade" is TRADITION, FAMILY AND PROPERTY (TFP). In 1985 Introvigne hooked up with TFP.

The fact that Bouchet is an intimate (both are reputedly homosexuals) of Introvigne and of TFP should make the case that these are "Christians who are not Christians": Bouchet is an Aleister Crowley follower, member of the OTO, punk rocker, and fascist (see Pierre's report).

In 1991, according to Reflex, MICHEL FACI turned up in Croatia with his German sidekick, NICOLAS PEUCELLE, alias MULLER. Reflex reports that PEUCELLE was born in 1963 in Berlin. He was one of the first people to enter the presidential palace in Bucharest after the fall of Ceausescu in December 1989. One year later he left for Iraq with Faci and then returned without being involved in any fighting. In February 1991, he and Faci set up the association FRIENDS OF IRAQ. Reflex reports that Peucelle has two great passions: Thor and weapons. Peucelle went to fight in Slovenia and came back as a POW in 1991. Even though he was charged with illegally holding weapons and explosives, he nevertheless was released from prison very quickly and in November 1991 joined his friend Faci in Croatia. In Croatia, FACI and PEUCELLE made contact with the CROATIAN PEOPLES' PARTY (HSP) and its army, the CROATIAN DEFENSE FORCE (HOS -- HRVATSKE ORUZANE SNAGE). The HSP is run by DOBROSLAV PARAGA, imprisoned several times under Tito's regime. The HSP is reportedly the continuation of the USTASHE movement.

FACI, PEUCELLE and other Frenchmen went to Vinkovei as part of the unit of TOMISLAV MADI, alias MAJOR CHICAGO because he had lived in Chicago. This unit of 60-90 men was called the CONDOR BRIGADE. German, Austrian, Belgium and British paramilitary made up the unit. FACI set up a special group which he called the JACQUES DORIOT BRIGADE, named after the former leader of the French Communist Party who in 1936 founded the PARTI POPULAIRE FRANCAIS, and then in 1941 he founded the LEGIONS DES VOLONTAIRES FRANCAIS CONTRE LE BOLSHEVISM which was integrated into the SS DIVISION CHARLEMAGNE in early 1945. FACI was in Croatia from the autumn of 1991 to the winter of 1992. He was injured in December 1992.

As part of FACI's brigade's logistics was an association called SLAVONIE LIBRE based in La Garenne-Colombes, France. This organization was run by FACI, his brother THIERRY, BRUNO RENOULT, an old friend of FACI's, and JEAN-MICHEL GATEAU. GATEAU is the brother of GEORGES-ALAIN GATEAU, who like FACI, is a member of FANE (FEDERATION d'ACTION NATIONALE ET EUROPEENE). Later GATEAU was a member of the PNF and then the MOUVEMENT NATIONALISTE REVOLUTIONARE (third positionist). Reflex says that he is close to something called CERCLE FRANCO-HISPANIQUE.

In 1993, Croatian president Franjo Tudjman cracked down on Paraga and the HOS, liquidating the whole operation. The foreign mercenaries were integrated into the CROATIAN NATIONAL GUARD (HVO).

DOMINIQUE GAY, French extreme rightwing mercenary, member of the Edelweiss group, died fighting in this group in 1992.

At the end of 1991, the first platoon of foreign mercenaries was formed, commanded by EDUARDO FLORES, alias EDOUARDO ROZA RUNTOFLORES, who was, according to Searchlight magazine, born in Santa Cruz, Bolivia of a Spanish Catholic mother and Hungarian Jewish father. Flores spent many years in Budapest, active in the Young Communists before doing his military service as a border guard at Budapest airport. In 1988-89, he began to work for the correspondent of a rightwing journal in Barcelona, la Vanguardia, RICARDO ESTARRIOL, member of OPUS DEI. ESTARRIOL and FLORES reportedly visited the Vienna Opus Dei office regularly. FLORES's beat for the journal was Hungary, Albania, and Slovenia. In 1990 FLORES joined the HVO in Croatia. He was billeted in an area near the Serb border populated by mainly people of Hungarian origin. With an American Croat, JOHNNY KOSTIC and a Hungarian villager Flores set up the international brigade in October of 1991.

Many foreign mercenaries joined such as: the Portuguese sniper ALEJANDRO CUNAN FERNANDEZ, the Spanish sabotage and explosives expert ALEJANDRO HERNANDEZ MORA, and the Welshman STEPHEN HANNOCK, formerly of the French Foreign Legion. Reflex says that reportedly Flores and Hannock were suspected of having murdered two journalists: the Swiss Christian Wurtenberg who was investigating the links between Flores and drugs and weapons trafficking, and the British Paul Jenks who was investigating the death of Wurtenberg.

Reflex says that Le Pen's Front National (FN) also was interested in Croatia: humanitarian aid was organized with the association CROATIE LIBRE based in Cagnes-sur-Mer, France and led by DANIEL PERRIER, a local FN organizer in Cagnes-sur-Mer, and a lawyer, MARIE-JOSE BERTOZZI.

Other mercenaries who went to Croatia with the cover of humanitarian aid is ALAIN SANDERS, member with THIBAUT DE LA TOCNAYE, of CHRETIENTE SOLIDARITE. SANDERS is also on the editorial board of the magazine "PRESENCE" with THIBAUT DE LA TOCNAYE, JEAN MARIE LE CHEVALIER, and JACQUES BARTHELEMY were all regular travelers to Croatia. They met with PARTAGA and MILE DEDAKOVIC of the HSP. CHRETIENTE SOLIDARITE sponsored children and the injured in Croatia. They also held a summer school from July 17, 1993 at CRIKVENIKA.

Front National member and elected official MARIE-FRANCE STIRBOIS went to Croatia in 1992. In November 1992, FN members in Vaucluse, France, DOMINIQUE BLIN, from Orange, BRONZONI from Carpentas, and SERGE MICHEL of Vacqueras, organized a humanitarian convoy which, on their return was stopped at the Slovenian border because they had a cache of weapons, kalishnikovs and grenades.

REFLEX reports that French author Rene Monzat in his book "Sur la droite extreme", 1992, wrote that 10 Catholic nationalist students of the CERCLE SAINT LOUIS in St-Nicolas-du-Chardonnet, France, went to Croatia at the end of September 1991. This was supposedly for humanitarian aid but Monzat said that some of the students were thinking of remaining there to join the combat. Monzat said that the CERCLE SAINT LOUIS was a scouting movement that included parachute training by a former OAS member, COLONEL CHATEAU-JOBERT.

## **7.2 THE INTERFACE WITH SPAIN**

The radical antifascist magazine, REFLEX (Reseau d'Etude, de Formation, de Liaison contre l'Extreme-Droit et de la Xenophobie) in Paris, France, reported on March 25, 2004 that on January 26, 2003 FRENTE ESPANOL was constituted in the Congressional Palace in Madrid. The usual delegations were in attendance: the NPD from Germany represented by UDO VOIGT, FORZA NUOVA from Italy represented by ROBERTO FIORE, and le FRONT NATIONAL represented by DOMINIQUE CHABOCHE. There were also delegations from PORTUGUAL, POLAND AND BULGARIA.

FRENTE ESPANOL is the federation of the following groups: FALANGE ESPANOL/LA FALANGE, FUERZA NUEVA ESPANA 2000, the FNT syndicates of VALENCE AND OF VALLADOLID, and other political groups.

In his speech BLAS PINAR deplored the moral decadence of Spain. He criticized the POPLUAR PARTY (PP) for legalizing the "day after" birth control pill. PINAR, according to REFLEX, charged that the PP is turning Spain into the first homosexual state on the planet. He referred to a homosexual police officer who had been granted authorization to live in the barracks with his boyfriend.

REFLEX reports that the Spanish fascist youth movement is composed in part of skinheads and of soccer fans. They report that the biggest Spanish soccer team, the REAL MADRID, is reputed to have young fans that are of the extreme right.

Spanish professor at the UNIVERSITE NATIONALE D'EDUCATION A DISTANCE (UNED), SPAIN AND AT LOGOS UNIVERSITY, Jacksonville, Florida, CESAR VIDAL published a summary of right-wing parties on the internet. He reports the following:

With the 1996 victory of the right-wing POPULAR PARTY under JOSE MARIA AZNAR, grandson of a FRANCO supporter, the right wing ended 14 years of socialist government in Spain. However, since they won by a slight majority they had to ally with the nationalist BASQUE Party (PNV) and CATALANIAN Party (CiU).

In 1996, the right wing in Spain launched a campaign to turn Spain into a republic either following BLAS PINAR'S recipe in his VERS LA TROISIEME REPUBLIQUE or following the ideas of GARCIA TREVIJANO whose articles appeared in the very democratic EL MUNDO newspaper. In fact, TREVIJANO, it turns out, is closely tied to members of the nazi CEDADE organization, according to a Spanish TV A-3 program.

VIDAL says that the nostalgic FRANCISTS are attempting to alter their image. For instance, the Catholic integrists represented by the CATHOLIC MOVEMENT OF SPAIN, is totally subordinated to the ALLIANCE FOR NATIONAL UNITY (AUN) led by RICARDO SAENZ

DE YNESTRILLAS, to the point where the CATHOLIC MOVEMENT is likely to be fully absorbed by the AUN. The AUN is closely linked to Le Pen and to HAIDER.

VIDAL says that extreme right-wingers are closely linked to the PP. For instance, S. ERIK NORLING, former member of CEDADE and author of a recent apology for the Finnish SS, BLOOD IN THE SNOW, is closely linked to the PP mayor of Malaga, CELIA VILLALOBOS. Also, had the press not exposed it, a former member of the fascist FUERZA NUEVA Party would have been named councilman for the Community of Madrid by its president, a RUIZ GALLARDON. And, AZNAR'S aid, FERBANDO SANCHEZ DRAGO, who accuses the Jews of having provoked the Holocaust, has brought in a number of important fascists into AZNAR'S entourage. VIDAL says rather prophetically, that only the future can tell what such connections will do in a dangerous situation. VIDAL reports that the SKINHEADS are fully indoctrinated into anti-Semitism.

Under the subtitle "Formation of Paramilitary Groups," VIDAL reports that in 1996, the number of violent incidents caused by Skinheads increased. However, he says, more disquieting is the military training that the Spanish right wing gets in East European countries, the coordination of these activities by the chain of stores called "SOLDIERS," and the appearance of paramilitary training camps (presumably in Spain). He says that just in Madrid alone violence from these paramilitaries increased since 1991.

The two groups that are potentially the most important are the AUN (Alliance for National Unity) led by RICARDO SAENZ DE YNESTRILLAS, son of a putschist who had been assassinated by ETA, and DEMOCRACIA ESPANOLA.

AUN is the result of a coalition of the MSE (SOCIAL MOVEMENT OF SPAIN); the MCE (CATHOLIC MOVEMENT OF SPAIN) which is an Integrist group obsessed with the Jewish-Masonic conspiracy; the FAN (NATIONAL ALTERNATIVE FRONT), many members of which came from the NATIONANAL FRONT which was dissolved in 1994; the NACION JOVEN group, openly anti-Semitic run by EDUARDO ARIAS; and the FNT (NATIONAL LABOR FORCE), a minuscule fascist union run by JAIME ALONSO.

AUN, says VIDAL, works closely with LE PEN'S NATIONAL FRONT while the DEMOCRACIA ESPANOLA (DE) which is led by JUAN PELIGRO, follows more the model of GIANFRANCO FINI, looking to get a good main fascist DE's agenda being moderate appeal. The organization which announced its dissolution in November 1993, but that not only still exists and elects new members, but continues to have close contact with nazi groups in Germany, Austria, Switzerland and other countries.

Other phalange groups that are political parties: FE of JONS (NATIOANAL SYDICALISTS OFFFENSIVE JUNTA); SPANISH PHALANGE of JONS; FEI: PHALANGE ESPANOLE INDEPENDANTE; and FEA: AUTHENTIC SPANISH FALANGE.

December 1996 the PDE was created from former members of the PP who were disappointed by AZNAR'S politics. The PDE occupies the same place in Spain as LE PEN in France and FINI in Italy.

Right wing groupuscules that cooperate with other right wing outfits are the BBAA (AUTONOMOUS BASES) made up of skinheads and hooligans and considered very dangerous, operating in many Spanish cities. Also the AR (RADICAL ACTION) group of skins who are in relation with similar British groups. At the end of 1995, both Spain and France had collaborated in a fight against Islamic extremists groups such as the GIA.

#### PRINCIPAL RIGHT WING PARTIES OR ORGANIZATIONS:

- FALANGE ESPANOLA
- REGENERACION NEO-FALANGISTA
- FALANGE ESPANOLA NACIONAL SINDICALISTA
- FALANGE ESPANOLA INDEPENDIENTE
- ALIANZA POR LA UNIDAD NACIONAL
- DEMOCRACIA NACIONAL
- PATRIA LIBRE
- MOVIMIENTO EUROPEO NACIONAL SINDICALISTA



## **8.2 SYNARCHIST NAZI-COMMUNIST JEAN-FRANCOIS THIRIART: A DELPHIC MODEL FOR LAROUCHE'S EURASIAN POLICY**

The Eurasian orientation of the Synarchy International for a United States of Europe is currently represented by the geopolitics of a Belgian optometrist by the name of, Jean-Francois Thiriart (1904-1992). Thiriart, who was a national socialist in 1945, created the Mouvement d'Action Civique (MAC) in 1960, became the founder of Young Europe in 1962, instituted the Parti Communautaire Europeen (PCE), in 1965, and the Parti Communautaire National-Europeen (PCN) in 1984, which Luc Michel considers to be a "Historical Revolutionary Party" in the footsteps of Lenin. Of all of the synarchists characters that I have examined so far, Thiriart represents the most explicit Delphic imitation of Lyndon LaRouche and his policy for the Eurasian Land Bridge.

Thiriart represents the Synarchy International's continuation, "beyond Left and Right," of the different national bolshevisms and national communists of Germany and Belgium, during the 1930's. The main import of Thiriart is the introduction of the greater European nationalism fighting against what he considered the petty nationalism of the independent nation-states of Europe. Thiriart is reputedly the primary promoter of the creation of a Eurasia empire, from Reykjavik to Vladivostok.

The fantasy of Thiriart is the creation of the empire of Eurasia as the only power to win a war against the United States. As reported by Jeff, in the lead of the Morning Briefing of April 21, 2004, "Western Europe, with massive cheap labor shop in Central Europe and the territories of the former Soviet Union, will replace the United States, after the crash, as the world's last superpower standing." This is precisely and specifically the Synarchist International line that Thiriart adopted with his cohort of followers centered around the radical networks of the European communitarians, who also call themselves Nationalistes Revolutionnaires et Solidaristes. Their web-site is at [www.voxnf.com](http://www.voxnf.com).

The synarchist strategy of Jean Thiriart, can best be expressed by the short statement that one of his followers, Carlo Terracini, made when he wrote: "The major reasons for the Algerian tragedy were not understood by

the anti-Gaullist militants who fought for French Algeria. They did not understand the geo-political stakes of the business at hand or how the victorious powers of the Second World War (especially America) intended to redistribute the cards to their own advantage. How many of these militants for French Algeria understood exactly which power was the principal enemy of France and Europe? How many of these fighters understood that, on the historical level, the loss of Algeria, preceded by the loss of Indo-China, just like the collapse of all of the European colonial systems, were direct consequences of the European military defeat of 1945? The Belgian, Jean-Francois Thiriart, was the one who saw this.” (Carlo Terracini, {*Jean Thiriart: Prophet And Militant: Part One*}. ) It is interesting to note here how close this geopolitical view is close to the position of the European Synarchist oligarchy represented by Count Coudenhove Kalergi, Valery Giscard d'Estaing, and the Duke of Orleans.

In that perspective, Thiriart is supported by his Russian counterpart, the leader of the Eurasia party, Alexandre Gelyevich Dugin, who also represents the Delphic-fascist version of the Eurasian policy of LaRouche, with his publication, the Dyenn (The Day) Newspaper in Russia. Their correspondent in Rome is the Italian newspaper, Rinacista. Thiriart was considered by his own entourage as the “Lenin of the European revolution.” The explicit aim of this radical movement is to wage war against what they call “{*Yankee thalassocracy*} (control of the seas), that is, wage war against both American imperialism and Zionism.”

In an interview conducted in 1987 by an American, Gene H. Hogberg, Jean Thiriart made a number of prepared statements with respect to a “European-wide Rapallo pact,” and with respect to Lyndon LaRouche personally. He also made some significant statements relative to the strength of Spanish influence in the United States, and the Americas, more generally. The following are excerpts from Jean Thiriart, {*Responses to 14 Questions*}.

QUESTION 3: “You advocate a rapprochement, a new Europe-wide Rapallo pact, embracing a united Europe and the Soviet Union. What advantages would there be for both sides in such an arrangement? Would Moscow, for example, give greater freedom to the Eastern European nations in return for economic help from Western Europe?”

ANSWER: [...] “Today, [1987] I see something far greater than an enlarged Rapallo pact. A book to be published under the title {*L'Empire*

Euro-Sovietique de Vladivostok a Dublin [The Euro-Soviet Empire from Vladivostok to Dublin] will answer all your questions. [...] Militarily, the USSR is constantly on the defensive - a costly defensive. On its western side, the USSR is not yet complete. NATO in Europe and the Sixth Fleet in the Mediterranean are a real nightmare for the Soviets; it's an awful position of weakness. The USSR needs European industry to develop Siberia. Siberia, Russia's Far-East, is experiencing an interesting but very sluggish economic growth when viewed in connection with the industrial possibilities of Western Europe. The development of Siberia would be five times faster if it could tap into the industrial potential of Western Europe, and Western Europe's integration with the USSR would signal its own autonomy in terms of energy. There is so much mineral and energy between Kiev and Vladivostok that absolute and total autarchy would become a point of fact."

Thiriart's policy for Eurasia is essentially geopolitical strategy of world war, which necessitates the creation of a Eurasian empire, along the lines of Arthur Koestler's ideas. It is an anti-American project, to counter "American Imperialism." Thiriart makes a caricature of LaRouche's Eurasian Land Bridge project, without naming it, but as he saw it through the eyes of Arthur Koestler's character, {*Bernard*}, which he quotes as follows:

"{United Citizens of a Gigantic New European Fatherland. Well, first of all forget at least half of our official propaganda stuff. We have to beat the drum to get the people going: if we told them the truth, they wouldn't understand. What we really believe is that with the rapid development of science and technology, mankind has entered the phase of its puberty, a phase of radical, global experiments with total disregard of the individual, his so-called rights and privileges, and other liberal mumbo-jumbo. The laws of orthodox economy, custom, currency, frontiers, parliaments, churches, vested sacraments and institutions, marriage, ten commandments - all mumbo-jumbo. We start from scratch. I'll tell you how...Close your eyes. Imagine Europe up to the Urals as an empty space on the map. There are only fields of Energy: hydropower, magnetic ores, and coal seams under the earth, oil-wells, forests, vineyards, and fertile and barren lands. Connect these sources of energy with blue, red, yellow lines and you get the distributive network. Blue: the joint electric power-grid stretching from the Norwegian fjords to the Dnieper Dam; red: the controlled traffic-stream of raw materials; yellow: the regulated exchange of manufactured goods. Draw circles of varying radius around the points of intersections and you get the

centers of industrial agglomerations; work out the human labor required to feed the net at any given point and you get the adequate density of population for any district, province, and nation; divide this figure by the quantity of horsepower it introduces and you get the standard of living allotted to it. Wipe out those ridiculous winding boundaries, the Chinese walls, which cut across our fields of energy; scrap or transfer industries, which were needlessly built in the wrong places; liquidate the surplus population in areas where they are not required; shift the population of certain districts, if necessary of entire nations, to the spaces where they are wanted and to the type of production for which they are racially best fitted; wipe out any disturbing lines of force which might superimpose themselves on your net, that is, the influence of churches, of overseas capital, of any philosophy, religion, ethical, or esthetical system of the past..."Including those totem-poles and tribal forces which you were so fond of using." [Jean Thiriart, *Responses to 14 Questions*], Part Two.

If this description by {*Bernard*} seems to be a little harsh for the local tribes that get sacrificed and destroyed for the sake progress, what of it, says Thiriart. He considers that {*relative population density*} must be kept under control. He does not think in terms of human progress, but in terms of anti-American progress. Thiriart is attempting to think big: nations used to be cities, then countries, now nations must become continents. That is the nation of Europe. Thiriart's thinking is that simplistic.

The advantages Thiriart sees for Russia are primarily that Siberia will develop five times faster than otherwise, that the Russian Army will be relieved between the Baltic and the Black Sea, that the Russian Navy will finally have access to warm water ports, and that the Euro-Soviet Fleet will become the number one fleet in the world. And even if there were to be sea-lane problems, he adds: "Any war that might cut off the South Atlantic, the Indian Ocean or the Eastern Pacific would be of little consequence. The united bloc from Vladivostok to Dublin would be able to do without commercial traffic by sea for decades and decades." Not to mention that this would give this Eurasian bloc the ability to fight a two front war, which only America was able to sustain until now.

As for advantages in Europe, Thiriart considers that France, Belgium, Portugal, and Spain will be able to recover the African colonies they lost during the 1954-1965 period. However, surprisingly, this new Europe will not be made by Europe, but will be "made by the USSR." Thiriart even

predicts that this Nietzschean program will be implemented through terrorism. It was Nietzsche who considered Russia as "the only contemporary nation with the hope of any staying power, able to bide its time and still hold promise for the future."

"In 1987, as I look as a means to speed things up," said Thiriart, "the only way seems to be through armed conflict. My present and future writings must serve the same purpose as a 'particle accelerator' in experimental physics. The perspective must be historical rather than political. And the only possible way to bring this about is through armed conflict with the United States. Not with Atomic bombs; in this case a .45 automatic is all that is needed. In my interview with university students in Paris, in 1975, I said that 300 Americans 'assassinated' in occupied Europe would both shatter your complacency and provoke a heated reaction. And this would cause you to finally give us the martyrs we need. I am exasperated by the courageous but intellectually absurd struggle of the Red Brigades In Italy, the Direct Action in France, the Fighting Communist Cells in Belgium, and the Baader-Meinhof gang in Germany. While their strikes are very often impressive from a technical point of view, their goal, unfortunately, cannot be taken seriously; a type of pre-1848 communism. None of these groups has thought of unifying under a common European title, and of having a single common enemy: the 'odious enemy', the American. I shall close by saying that armed conflict would change the perspective from political to historical. It would also change from trivial to tragic."

What Thiriart envisages, in point of fact, is a total war against the United States, a war to the finish, the result of which will mean total victory for the United States of Europe. Then, after quoting Nietzsche extensively from the pages of a French book by Soviet professor, Stepan Odouen, {*Par les sentiers de Zarathoustra*} (Through the Meanders of Zarathoustra), Thiriart has this abrupt, and very calculated conclusion in which he quotes Odouen saying:

"In the works of his last period, Nietzsche speaks a good deal about the need for the political unification of Europe. But he never conceived this unification as an uncontrolled phenomenon, unfolding on the basis of a consensus between European powers; and he was never tempted, nor did he tempt others on this score with a vision of pacific Utopias. He infers the inevitability of unification from the will to power, that is to say, from the

struggle between the present and future claimants for the domination of this zone of the planet. Therefore, the unification of Europe must be preceded by a great war...Forging its own will by means of a new caste reigning over Europe, a formidable, far-reaching will, capable of setting goals for millennia. And so Europe will once and for all be finished with the too-long protracted comedy of being divided into small states; her divergent dynastic and democratic whims and impulses will be over. The time for petty politics has gone: the next century will usher in the struggle for universal domination -- the obligation for politics on a grand scale (cf. 78. P.127). This means that if Europe does not unite on the basis of the 'Germanic spirit,' it is Russia that will do it." Thus Nietzsche's {will to power} provides the cement between National Socialism and National Bolshevism. Then, Thiriart's surprise ending:

“Nietzsche’s prophecy is being fulfilled. Germany failed to create Europe because of Hitler’s narrow-minded nationalism. Now...It is Russia that will do it! (Nietzsche) It is fortunate that your compatriot (the American Fakir and cultist, ed.) Lyndon H. LaRouche does not read Nietzsche. It would give him insomnia.”

## **9.2 GEOPOLITICS OF THE FOURTH REICH.**

Thiriart states that he took his European geopolitics from Dietrich Von Bulow and Frederich List. Thiriart wrote: "In 1799, he (Von Bulow) published {Der Geist Des Neueren Kriegssystems} [The Spirit of Modern Warfare]. Von Bulow had fully realized that because of the modern military system (the sudden appearance of the new style of warfare introduced by the massive revolutionary armies of the First French Republic) the age of small states was over."

However, Thiriart considered that the most important geopolitician of modern times was Frederich List, with whom he said he identified fully. On this point Thiriart does not hesitate in turning List into a Nietzschean. He wrote: "For List and for myself, power comes before wealth. In fact, wealth is useless without the unity and the power of the nation. The ability of a nation to make war is measured according to its ability to produce wealth. He wanted a greater Germany, a Germany absorbing Denmark, Holland and Belgium. As an individual, I have put List's theories into practice. During

the 1940-45 war, I was a member of 'The Friends of the Great German Reich' [AGRA] organization. List wanted to see England no longer able to lay down the law in the Mediterranean. He announced the eventual fall of England and the coming of American supremacy - a good century ahead of time. List was also the spiritual father of the Berlin-to-Baghdad railroad project." And almost in the same breath, Thiriart looked at himself as the new Hitler of the Forth Reich. He stated: "Today, I am one of the most resolute opponents of any kind of 'German reunification' proposed outside the state-controlled bonds of a European nation. This title of my German book {*Das Vierte Reich: Europa*} [The Fourth Reich: Europe] accurately symbolizes my thought: There will never be another German Reich. The Fourth Reich (Das Vierte Reich) will be the whole of Europe this time."

Thiriart also put the geopolitician Haushofer in the same bag as de Gaulle and Hitler, because of their "narrow nationalism." He wrote: "Haushofer has sometimes written things as stupid as those we find in the archaic thought of de Gaulle. He envisages a European 'Confederation' in which each member would keep his own language (sic). He does not want a 'rape of the souls.' How can this be called scientific study - the soul (sic) of a people? " [The (sic) are in the original. P.B.] Thiriart also said he got his idea of recolonizing Africa and reintegrating it into Europe from Anton Zischka who wrote the book, {*Afrika, Europas Gemischtaufgabe Tummer*} [{Africa, Complement of Europe}].

Another geopolitician, that Thiriart trained his Young Europe students with, was a personal friend of his, General Jordis Von Lohausen. Lohausen published the book {*Mut zur Macht - Denken in Kotinenten*} [The Courage to Power - Thinking On A Continental Scale], which was dedicated to Thiriart. The book was translated into French by an associate of Thiriart, Madame Elfriede Popelier. Thiriart claimed that he had been influenced by Ortega Y Grasset during the war, and that both Grasset and Thiriart had influenced Lohausen, who began to speak about the "unity of the continent from Madrid to Vladivostok." He also mentions the national-communist Niekisch who wrote on the same subject, calling it 'the Great Space Vlissingen-Vladivostok.' These are all of the key sources for his Greater Eurasia program. This is the idea that he is trying very hard to sell to Americans as a sort of geopolitical {*fait accompli*}. As if he was doing this interview for an American audience, and with LaRouche in the back of his mind, he stated:

"First and foremost, the American reader should be made aware of the unity of thought of four geopoliticians: Haushofer, Niekisch, von Lohausen and myself, Thiriart: The Soviet Union is an intrinsic part of our territorial concept. It is a 'Eurasian' Europe, a Very Great Europe, the New Rome. Eurasian Europe, as opposed to Lesser Europe, which is von Lohausen's terms, is called 'Frankish' Europe. I have attached my letter 'Karte 5', which shows the West-Franken-Reich and the Ost-Franken-Reich around 850, after the death of Charlemagne. It is my belief that from a strictly scientific point of view, all American teachers of geopolitics are bound to accept this "Vladivostok to Dublin' (or rather 'to Reykjavik') concept. By 1961, I had already excluded the concept of Europe {*against*} the Soviet Union. Now Europe {*without*} the Soviet Union is excluded from my thinking. Geography dictates it. From von Lohausen's book, I cite the following extremely important passage: "For Russia, there are four possible Europes: a hostile Europe, a subjugated Europe, a devastated Europe, and an allied Europe (associated) by mutual consent. An independent Europe, allied by mutual agreement with its neighbors, is the only Europe that counts. For the Russians, only such a Europe dispenses with the need for a military presence either of a supervisory nature or in order to weld it together. Only such a Europe is an all-around winner." (Jean Thiriart, *{Responses to 14 Questions, Part One.}*)

However, for Europe to be the winner, the United States has to be the loser. In the future world war against the United States, Thiriart predicted: "The 1939-45 war killed 40 to 45 million men. The next war would kill 400 million. The white race would be eliminated from history. It is the American authors, thinkers, polemicists and military men who are most dangerous at the moment. War has hardly ravaged the United States. Here in Europe, Germans and Russians know what war is all about. Europeans are mature, Americans immature, in this area. So modern geopolitics must help to defuse some dangerous mines: the American Fleet in the Mediterranean, Soviet influence in Cuba, the Soviet presence in Indochina, Chinese claims to the north and so on."

In the back of his mind, Thiriart keeps thinking about LaRouche and his Land Bridge policy for Eurasia. He thinks that LaRouche has the right economic program for technological development, but the wrong military strategy. For Thiriart, the vitality of the state depends on its military, and the military depends on industrial economic growth. For the same reason, he



would probably think that the Cheney neo-cons are right in their military strategy but wrong in their economics. What Thiriart defended as the defining character of the nation-state is the "common political will," that is, the Nietzschean will to wield power and dominate others. That is how he explains that, throughout history, city-states were swallowed by nation-states, and nation-states later swallowed by continental-states.

Here is Thiriart's conception of the nation-state: "The political state as opposed to the ethnic state. In the French dictionary 'Le Petit Larousse' it is written that the condition of uniformity for an ethnos are its language and its culture. For the purpose of this analysis, I will give my own extended interpretation of this concept, having said that the unity of the ethnic state has its roots in the unity of race, religion, language, common imageries, common memories, common frustrations or fears. The concept of the political state (as an open, expanding system) is fully opposite to the concept of the ethnic state (as closed, fixed system). The political state is the expression of the will of free men to have a common culture." The point that Thiriart is driving at, here, but without saying it, is that the first has to be destroyed at the expense of the other. Rather, he will say:

"The political state, or more precisely the political nation-state - of which I am considered the modern theorist, after Ortega-y-Gasset - allows the individuals to preserve their personal individuality (please forgive this barbarous, rough pleonasm) within the framework of society. Less than two months ago [June 1992] I stated my opinion about the importance of the concepts of Imperium and Dominium. Since 1964, I never stopped developing this concept of Roman origins."

Thiriart went on justifying his pitiful condition by stating: "Marx and Engels knew absolutely nothing about this fundamental dichotomy Imperium/Dominium; this is why they wrote 'The German Ideology', addressed against Max Stirner. Stirner's vision of Imperium (free federative choice, the right to secession, and so on) will always remain utopical and inapplicable. On the contrary, his vision of internal freedom, of the sphere of Dominium, will always be interesting. I am Bolshevik, Jacobin, Prussian, Stalinian, whenever the speech goes about Imperium and its civil discipline, but my taste and intellectual interest concerning my private life, my life within the framework of Dominium, they go to Odysseus, the champion in imitating the Cynics, to Diogenes, who in reply to the question: 'Can you see a good man in Greece?', - answered 'Nowhere; but I see some good lads in

Lacedemones...' It is known that Diogenes and the other Cynics admired the Spartan system because the Spartans were partisans of discipline and austerity and enemies of luxury and laziness." [Jean Thiriart, {*Europe as a Far as Vladivostok*} (1992)]

This is how Thiriart rejected the personalism of Alexander Marc Lipiansky and adopted a "status of unshakable individualist", that is, the status of a cold-blooded Kantian-Nietzschean-Beast-Man of geopolitics. For that very reason, Thiriart considered that "In the political state there can be no 'minorities', as these deal only with individualities, while collectivity deals with the Imperium." This is the kind of stuff that comes out of the caves of {*Mithraic Stoicism*}.

## **10.2 A REVIVAL OF {MITHRAIC STOICISM}: THE PURE EVIL OF POWER**

Thiriart is a self-declared Stoicist and cynic in the footsteps of Epictetus and Diogenes. Thiriart wrote: "My position in the 'search for my ancestors' is in favor of the Ionians and resolutely against the Eleatics. What is one to say about the gibberish of purely verbal German philosophy: philosophy of confusion! Aristotle has also had a great deal to do in misdirecting the development of intelligence. Plato and Aristotle bear the responsibility for having paralyzed the development of scientific thought for so long. If stoic logic had won the day, Western thought would have taken a completely different track. This logic is that of implied premisses adapted to the study of the way in which causes and effects are linked together in determining one's destiny. The stoics had formalized this logic and were clearly aware of its originality compared to that of Aristotle." (*Responses to 14 Questions, Part 6.*)

For Thiriart, this is the self-fulfilling prophecy pronouncement of an Ionian positivist like Anaximandre and Anaximemes, who opposed the Eleatics like Parmenides and Zenon, because they oriented Greek philosophy towards empiricism and idealism, in the likes of Aristotle and Plato, who he considers to be equally bad and hated both with a vengeance. The pretext for Thiriart's hatred is that the Eleatics claimed there was only two forms of knowledge: that of sense perception, which is illusion, and that given by reason alone, which is another illusion. For the Ionians, the only truth must be based on experience and rationalization of mythologies. This is

the best example of {*Mithraic stoicism*}, or what is otherwise known as the Martinist art of {*suffering in silence*}, with a stiff upper lip.

Thiriart, who was an optometrist by profession, and a Pavlovian physiologist by preference, added: "So my intellectual ancestors stem from Thales, Anaximander and Anaximenes. An unbroken thread connects them to our time; after the Ionian Physiologists, the strain continues in antiquity with the atomists, sophists and skeptics, and in the Middle Ages, it is further perpetrated by the nominalists and tenninists. The closer to our times, empiricists, idealists, positivists, and finally, the logicians of modern times. Today Anaximander, Thales and Anaximenes make use of the data of basic physics and of directed and controlled biology. He who holds knowledge possesses power. To what purpose will this power serve? That is for me to tell you at a later time." Indeed, how far can {*Mithraic stoicism*} be from {*Nazi doctoring*}? Thiriart makes no mention of modern times logicians, but they are, undoubtedly for him, characters like Bertrand Russell, Norbert Wiener, and John Von Newman.

## **11.2 A PERVERTED "PROMETHEAN-VOLUNTARIST" WAR AGAINST AMERICA**

What does the Algeria War have in common with Dien Bien Phu? Jean Thiriart obviously has no understanding at all about the warning that General Eisenhower gave to Admiral Arthur W. Radford in 1953, on the subject of a war between Asia and the United States: "Gain such a victory, and what do you do with it? Here would be a great area from Elbe to Vladivostok, torn up and destroyed, without government, without its communications, just an area of starvation and disease. I ask you what would the civilized world do about it? I repeat there is no victory except through our imaginations." The point here, is that the question is never how to win the war, but how to secure the peace after the war. For the Synarchy International, however, once the idea of {*preemptive war*} is accepted as a rule of law, there cannot be any end to war. Since this is a given, then Thiriart speculates as to how he can create fifth-columns inside of the United States for that purpose. This is what he considered to be {*Promethean*}. The reader should read the following with the thought of the shadowy presence of terrorist Blas Pinar leading a movement of flagellants on the screen of his imagination.

QUESTION 8: “Spain is now a member of the European Community. It represents the mother culture of much of the New World. Will a united Europe have strong links to Latin America? Do you foresee such ties conflicting with the interests of the United States in the Western Hemisphere?”

ANSWER: “First of all, let me remind you that I was a close friend of Peron during his exile in Madrid. By this time Skorzeny had made a new life for himself in Spain as a civilian. He was an importer of industrial equipment. [...] We formed a friendly threesome, meeting together frequently either in Peron’s magnificent villa or in the Hoher restaurant in Madrid, which for two of us was a reminder, as well as a somewhat romantic symbol, of ‘the good years’ – ours of course. Early on, Peron got into contact with me when he learned of my anti-American stance through Skorzeny. I have published letters and interviews with Peron (at your disposal), When it came to discussing the United States, we were definitely on the same wavelength.”

[...] “If Europe has to take a tough military stance against the stubbornness of the United States, the establishment of the Senegal-Brazil offensive axis is a foregone conclusion. If the unification of Europe comes about in the context of worldwide political realignments then this would alter everything. No one can, or does, know what the future holds.

“The sensible non-radical solution would be as follows: on the one hand the United States (this time sincerely for a change) would help in the industrialization of a great South-American Common Market; while Europe, on the other hand, would peacefully devote its energies to develop Africa and industrializing Siberia, the idea being to restore the world’s political balance. In such a case, Europe would not attempt to exercise hegemony over Latin America.

“The revolutionary solution would be for Europe to unify in a death struggle with the United States. In such a case, for us Europeans, Brazil would fulfill a similar role to that played by Sicily for the Romans, when they were engaged in the destruction of Carthage. This brings me back to our discussion in the Hilton library. The political solution for a United Europe: would be for it to adopt Spanish as a lingua franca. Spanish, in both Moscow and Paris. Everywhere. The adoption of the Spanish language for

the future Europe would immediately allow it to be at the gates if not in the antechamber of the United States. A Europe officially speaking Spanish would immediately be in the suburbs of Los Angeles and Miami!" [...]

This is not simply scenario spinning. Thiriart is thinking in terms of a hundred of years from now and following the bestial perspective of the will to power as opposed to the power of ideas. He is caught in the Bonaparte inversion whereby: Whenever reason cannot establish its will, then the will must establish its reason.

No matter how long it takes.

QUESTION 13: "The English-speaking culture, especially that of the United States seems so appealing to others, especially, to young people, with its pop music, food, fashions and other forms of consumerism. Some even use the term 'cultural imperialism.' Do you agree, and if so, how can Europe regain control over its own cultural development?"

[...] "The type of European culture that has spread around the world and been adopted by it for more or less the last four centuries is that of the Renaissance, that of the ancient Greco-Roman world. To be sure, here in Europe differences of opinion exist as to the emphasis or orientation given to this worldwide European culture. Some would have it be more Judeo-Christian. Forgive me for having to tell you that I am strongly opposed to this tendency. Others, like, myself, would like to see it turn more toward a type of neo-stoicism, that is toward self-discipline and self-control. For when one succeeds in mastering oneself, it is easy to master others. [...] My system of values is inspired by Stoicism as far as personal discipline is concerned, and by Prometheanism for the 'homo novus' that is to say when it comes to man's interaction within the context of society."

QUESTION 14: "A final personal question. You trace your family down through the 150 years of the independent Belgian state. Is the family name 'Thiriart' a typical Walloon name? Or was it originally German since one of your grandfathers was German? I believe you also mentioned that your family history goes further back to Danish Viking stock. Am I correct on that? "

After referring to a few foolish Viking cousins, Thiriart said the following:

“My position in the ‘search for my ancestors’ is in favor of the Ionians and resolutely against the Etruscans [of] prometheanism based on Epictetus and his French professor Jean Baechler, {What is Ideology?} Baechler relates prometheanism with voluntarism. He said: “Collectivism is reached painfully through the coexistence of radically differing populations. Statism implies in its very logic a continuing growth until the whole humanity is absorbed. Finally, voluntarism has its Promethean side, which necessarily rejects all limitations on technological and economic expansion. Socialism, by its very principles, cannot be autarchic since it aims at abundance.” But this is a “technological illusion,” said Baechler.

“The technological illusion which began to take root from at least the time of the Renaissance has triumphed in the West since the 18<sup>th</sup> century. It can be defined as a conviction in the artificial nature of human societies and human existence. Human matter is therefore a primary matter with which we can do as we see fit. We can improve on it and usher in a state of perfection and happiness. This basic conviction stems from an obsession with progress and with the instrumental nature of discoveries and has two major facets. One of these implies that all research and discovery must lead to practical consequences ensuring collective happiness. The other presupposes that all problems can be resolved rationally – and therefore perfectly – provided that they are clearly stated. Social problems just like scientific and technical problems have only one correct solution. All the others are wrong and result from ignorance, stupidity or malice. The technological delusion of the Enlightenment hasn’t disappeared but rather has been applied to ever wider fields. When public opinion becomes aware of the negative consequences of certain criminal acts, of drugs or of pollution, specialists invariably come forward to isolate the problem, enumerate the causes, to propose radical solutions and then regularly fail to solve the problem. Serious scholars are convinced that violence in international relations can be eliminated by science and good will.” (Jean Baechler, {What is Ideology?})

One would think that such problems of technology would be resolved by the power of reason. Not at all. This is where the true nature of the irrational synarchist Beast-Man comes into play.

\*\*\*\*\*



BEASTMAN MAKARENKO

# **SYNARCHY MOVEMENT OF EMPIRE**

## **BOOK III**

\*\*\*\*\*

### **THE SYNARCHY INTERNATIONAL**

\*\*\*\*\*

#### **Chapter VI**

##### **6.1 MAKARENKO AND THE BIPOLAR PERSONALITY .....152**

**by Irene Breaudry**

##### **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**

\*\*\*\*\*



## **1.2 "DE TE FABULA NARRATUR" The Purloined Letter, Edgar Allen Poe.**

In the 1960's, a method of intervention was made popular in the United States amongst leftists. It was the method of self-criticism, so well perfected in the period of Stalin, in the Soviet Union, and under Mao Tsetung, in China. The tactic was to induce the victim to confess to crimes that he never dreamt of committing, but that in the paranoid environment created around him, were crimes he could have committed – or at least thought he could have. It is no coincidence that public self-confession is also the hallmark of born-again “christians” who commit sin with abandon, only to confess, and repent in public, after the fact. This purgative tactic goes back to Aristotle's theory of catharsis. Cathartic experiences, as exemplified by the cult of the Cathares of Southern France during the Middle Ages, are pure satanic evil, because they are based on the assumption that man is a wretch. That is, in essence, that man is guilty until proven innocent. (See the many references that LaRouche makes to that evil “hymn” of Amazing Grace).

Maybe poor bipolar, Al Gore, was forced to submit to those kinds of humiliating public confessions. The feelings of shame, guilt, and humiliation quickly give rise to rage: from the Uriah Heep-like propitiation of authority, the confessing victim quickly becomes a vengeful enraged Iago. An instructive example of the disease of bipolar personality dysfunction, complete with purgative episodes, can be found in the pedagogical method of the Soviet educationalist Anton Semenovych Makarenko, the protege of practicing satanist, Maxim Gorky.

The purpose of this report is to bring to light the underlying ideas that produce such a disorder, and to contrast those ideas with ones that produce the opposite effect. The contrast, I think, is very useful because it will show how, very deliberately, the one was suppressed in order to bring the other into being.

Lyndon LaRouche has indicated the urgent need to identify this personality syndrome that is quite wide spread in the United States, and is, furthermore, being deliberately incited, particularly within the prisons, for

the purpose of producing a population of psychotic robots. BIPOLAR PERSONALITY DISORDER produces a cringing, frightened, but, at the same time, enraged individual. At the least provocation, such an individual lashes out in enraged fury, while at other times is painfully propitiatory. Charles Dickens's character, the ingratiating Uriah Heep, is the classic example of such a personality disorder.

The project to "re-create man" from being made in the image of God, into being made in the image of Satan, was a persistent obsession with the oligarchy throughout history right up to today, as, for instance, can be seen in Prince Philip's evil assault on Judeo-Christian principles. Nowhere is there a better example of this obsession, however, than in Soviet Communist educational policy.

The communist project began, appropriately, on the isle of Capri at the site of Emperor Tiberius's palace. There, from 1906 to 1913, on the site of Tiberius's palace from whence the emperor gave the order for the crucifixion of Jesus Christ, the Russian author, Maxim Gorky (whose pen name means "bitter", in order to express his bitterness toward man), conducted the "High school of revolutionary technique for the scientific preparation of the propagandists of Russian socialism".

According to Gorky, the highest activity of mankind is to create gods, to create superior persons into gods. His credo was: "the only truth is the truth of hate. The rest is a lie. The class hate is the most potent creative force." In his Confession, he wrote, "My heart was full of pain and I was outraged with God." (1)

The makers of the Russian Revolution, Lenin and later Stalin, came to Gorky's school. Gorky administered not only the epistemology, but, also, the funding for the revolution. However, the Isle of Capri was not only the site for the Bolsheviks. Fascists and communists mingled together on this island. Kings, princesses, dictators of all stripes, came to worship at this ancient pit of hell. Later, Hitler would come to Capri, believing himself to be the reincarnation of the historical figure Landulf, the count of Acerra. (2)

The philosophy of hate that Gorky refined at the Isle of Capri was put into practice by his protege, Anton Semenovych Makarenko, in 1920, in Soviet Ukraine. Makarenko, himself a victim of bipolar personality disorder, was perfect for the job that Gorky wanted carried out.

Makarenko's method of pedagogy became the foundation for educational policy not only throughout the Soviet Union, but also in such Soviet "colonies" as countries in Africa, where the brutal ideas of Frantz Fanon dominated, and in Latin American countries where Aztec rituals have been revived. Even today, Makarenko is still heralded as a great pedagogue. (3)

## **2.2 THE GORKY COLONY**

The experiment that Makarenko carried out, under Gorky's directions, entailed taking homeless children and placing them in colonies newly established under the joint direction of Lunacharsky, commissioner of Education, and Dzershinsky, head of the secret police unit, the Cheka, both of whom had gathered at Capri to study under Gorky. Dzershinsky had been made president of an Extraordinary Commission set up by the Party Central Committee to deal specifically with the problem of homeless children.

These homeless children, or "besprizornye" as they are known (meaning no one to cling to), became a special problem during the 1921-23 famine in Ukraine. These destitute and desperate children were treated as juvenile delinquents, because in order to survive, they stole food, lived in abandoned houses, and lived by begging, prostitution, and theft. (4)

In 1920, the Ukrainian Commissariat of Public Education entrusted Makarenko with the social rehabilitation of the homeless children. He set up the first colony for homeless children a few miles from the Ukrainian city of Poltava, and appropriately, named it the GORKY COLONY.

In accordance with Gorky's philosophy that "only in suffering is the human soul beautiful," Makarenko ruled over this colony of misfortunate children with an iron fist: "I held a pistol in my pocket... I resolutely decided to be the dictator."

He believed that "cruelty is the highest form of humanism, because it forces an individual to change in spite of his own will." He believed that the individual must be made entirely the product of the collective, totally negating the primacy of the individual. He called this "paradoxical individualism". Makarenko's biographer, Holowinsky, adds that this idea of "paradoxical individualism" is reminiscent of "ideas expressed in the

nineteenth century by Sechenov, who claimed that it should be possible to condition the development of a 'new person'. He maintained that it would be possible to 'construct' people with 'non-free will' in the sense that they would be conditioned to "serve people, create good, and offer themselves for humanity." (5)

Makarenko described one of his methods of resolving conflict within a collective: "Explosion" ("Vzryv") occurs in situations where there is no possibility of compromise between individual and society. Here is what Makarenko wrote about such 'explosions' with one of the young colonists:

"I hurled heavy objects from my desk toward the head of Osadchy. He ducked, I missed. The object hit the wall and fell to the floor. Completely absentminded I looked for something heavy on my desk. Not finding anything, I grabbed a chair and rushed toward Osadchy."

Makarenko recounts in his writings, that an incident such as this one of violence, was the turning point in his ability to impose his will on the children. He said that the boys were so impressed by this demonstration of human fury because it demonstrated to them that someone cared.

Makarenko wrote: "I had ventured to question the correctness of the generally accepted theory of those days, that punishment of any sort is degrading, that it is essential to give the fullest possible scope to the sacred creative impulses of the child, and that the great thing is to rely solely upon self-organization and self-discipline. I had also ventured to advance the theory, to me incontrovertible that as long as the collective, and the organs of the collective, had not been created, so long as no traditions existed, and no elementary labor and cultural habits had been formed, the teacher was entitled – nay, was bound! – to use compulsion. I also maintained that it was impossible to base the whole of education on the child's interests, that the cultivation of the sense of duty frequently runs counter to them, especially as these present themselves to the child itself. I called for the education of a strong, toughened individual, capable of performing work that may be both unpleasant and tedious, should the interests of the collective require it.

"Summing up, I insisted upon the necessity of the creation of a strong, enthusiastic – if necessary an austere – collective, and of placing all hopes in the collective alone. My opponents could only fling their

pedagogical axioms in my face, starting over and over again from the words, 'the child'." (Bowen, Op.Cit. p. 83)

In addition to physical violence and the threat of its unpredictable use, Makarenko used the threat of expulsion from the colony as an educational principle. His maxim was "give me any punishment you like, only don't expel me from the colony." Makarenko was able to use the threat of expulsion very effectively. Conditions in the GORKY COLONY were hideous. But, if a child were caught stealing food, as routinely occurred during the famine, he would be punished with three days and nights, in an isolation cell on dry bread and water, or banished from the colony, which at the height of the famine was the worse punishment. A child had no choice but to steal and run the risk of being re-arrested, or die from hunger. Many children resorted to suicide.

In 1923, Makarenko wrote in a local newspaper: "In the summer, colonists did not even have a slice of bread, although they worked in the fields from sunset to sundown. In the winter they cut wood in the forest, frequently without clothing or footwear." (Footnote: compare conditions in the prison for juvenile delinquents in New Orleans today, where the inmates were not given shoes, could not get clean underwear, etc.)

### **3.2 THE CREATION OF CAPOS.**

Makarenko realized that the only way to control these boys was not only through shaming them, or even threatening expulsion, but to instill in them a sense of belonging to an elite corps -- a sense of "us" versus "them". He structured his colony so that he was able to mobilize his colonists against outsiders or undesirables. For example, Makarenko obtained a warrant to search some peasant dwellings for illegal stills. His boys took great delight in becoming the oppressors rather than always being the oppressed.

Control over the colonists was based on a system of rewards and punishment. The control is achieved in the group by encouraging propitiation of the authority in order to create a secondary leadership of CAPOS, whose function is to police the rest of the group, and especially to inform on the delinquents. Makarenko was of the conviction that, in the collective, for an action to be validated, it had to be subjected to approval or disapproval by some leadership. He further believed that the individual had

meaning only through the collective:

"In the Soviet Union a personality cannot exist outside the collective, and therefore there can be no isolated personal destiny, no personal way and no personal happiness which are opposed to the destiny and happiness of the collective"... "We must graduate from our schools energetic and ideologically firm members of socialist society who are capable of finding at every moment of their lives, unwaveringly the right criterion of their conduct and who are capable of demanding the right conduct from others."

He wrote that every young person "should at every moment of his life be prepared to do his duty without waiting for instructions and orders; initiative and creative will are expected from him." (6) The "good behavior" of an individual was evaluated according to a "correct logic" which the child had to express instinctively, with respect to himself or to others.

Here is what Makarenko wrote about the Cheka: "the cheka collective was rich in those very qualities which I had been trying for eight years to instill into the collective of the colony... At last I say and felt for myself that precious substance for which I could find no better name than 'social adhesive' - that feeling of common perspectives, that awareness of each other at any stage of the work, of all members of the collective, the perpetual consciousness of one high common goal, a consciousness which never degenerates into mere pedantry and garrulity." (7)

"Sentimentality, tender languor, the need to take pleasure in a good action, to cry over a good deed, without thought where such sentimentality will lead us - this amounts to the greatest cynicism in practical life. These remnants are still with us. This one is kind. That one forgives all. This one is too convivial, and that one too tender. The true Soviet citizen understands that all these are manifestations of a weak ethics of 'the good' and contradict our revolutionary work ...we must not speak of ideals, of the 'the good,' of the perfect personality, or of the perfect deed. We must always think in a prosaic sort of way in terms of the practical requirements of today and tomorrow... Our ethics should be prosaic and businesslike, adapted to our normal everyday behavior." (8)

Makarenko considered that these old values and ideas, derived from Christianity, as so many obstacles to the creation of the new man. Those

who harbored them were "usually sincere Soviet people who do not even know the enemy they carry within themselves."

These colonies (with echoes of what later became concentration camps) were the laboratories to train a terrorist police force. These young men became, in later years, the hard cruel enforcers of Stalin's terror during yet another famine. Eleven years later, in 1932, during Stalin's famine in Ukraine, those young men who had suffered so horribly the effects of the 1921 famine, became, as a result of the brainwashing of Makarenko, the CAPOS who searched town and village homes confiscating the tiniest piece of grain or morsel of food.

#### **4.2 REPLACING COLLECTIVE CONTROL BY WILLING NATURE.**

Whereas the method of education developed by Makarenko aims at destroying the individual for the so-called good of society, Friedrich Schiller and Alexander Von Humbolt's method aimed precisely on developing the individual to the fullest for the betterment of all mankind. Nowhere is there a better study of this paradox than in Schiller's play Don Carlos.

The Marquis of Posa's aims could not be purer: freeing the Netherlands from the despotism of Spain's King Philip. His instrument is his best friend and Philip's son, Don Carlos. He could not have had a better instrument, for Don Carlos was as much a lover of freedom as was Posa. But Carlos also was smitten by an impossible love, and Posa, anxious to get on with the task of freedom, not only betrayed his best friend, but also betrayed his true self by becoming a despot!

Schiller is very careful to portray his characters in the highest best possible light. The audience is quite seduced first with Carlos and then with Posa but this seduction is soon revealed to be utterly dangerous. Posa is revealed as one so devoted to the cause of freedom that he thinks nothing of violating an individual's rights.

Perhaps the starkest contrast between the bipolar personality and Schiller's beautiful soul is seen when an individual is confronted with a crisis. In the concluding portion of his last letter 27, on the AESTHETICAL EDUCATION OF MAN, Schiller wrote that, at the point of crisis, "The stern voice of necessity, duty, must change its reproaching formula, which

only resistance justifies, and honor willing nature through a nobler confidence.” Whereas the beautiful soul acts to intervene in history, acting wherever the need arises, as Schiller's example of the Good Samaritan demonstrates, the bipolar personality is roused into action only at the point of crisis, and attempts to be rid of the crisis as fast as possible. Whereas the beautiful soul sees each crisis point as an opportunity for betterment, the bipolar personality reacts with anger and impatience at the need to change course. This is seen as not only an imposition but also an irritation. Indeed, because the Makarenko personality bases his entire theory of education on the morbid misconception that man is, at the base, evil, therefore, at the point at which a flaw erupts in a person, that is when Makarenko springs into action with his infamous "explosion," in order to shock the person back into what they were before the flaw erupted, as though a catharsis, or an exorcism.

By contrast, the Schilleresque Artist is not only able to detect the flaw even before it erupts in the open, but attempts to use the recognition of the flaw in that person, by that person, to bring him into a position of resolving the flawed part of his personality. This is the essence of all Classical Tragedy. Again, an eruption is seen as an opportunity not only for the person but also for mankind as a whole.

Schiller loves man because he is flawed, whereas Makarenko hates man precisely because of that flaw. (Footnote: for instance, Pope John Paul II's famous: "O what a wonderful sin that gave us such a Great Redeemer.") Whereas Schiller is eager to learn everything he can know about the axioms underlying flawed ideas, and force a surgical change by means of beauty, Makarenko will violently provoke the flaw to flare up in the open, only to punish the person as soon as it erupts. One believes in education; the other in "training," or "grooming."

At this point, it is most useful to look at the case of household pets. Even the most loving of owners makes the mistake of training animals, rather than educating them.

## **5.2 TREAT ANIMALS AS IF THEY WERE HUMAN BEINGS**

When you show profuse love to animals, and avoid all 'pavlovian' training of your pets, such as the use of rewards and punishment, you will actually produce, not only very well behaved and obedient cats, and dogs,



but also much more intelligent animals than normal; they will tend to become in the image of human beings.

Typically, even the best-intended person will lash out at an animal, out of impatience. He "permits" himself this display because, after all, it is only an animal, and not a human. But that same person will find himself acting precisely in the same brutal fashion with a child. A whack on the behind or a blow to the head, the shock is the same to the child, or to the animal. The rationalization, of course, is to "shock" the child (or animal) out of some irrational behavior. In fact, the child will be shocked, but also enraged at such violent behavior, and at the same time, will become increasingly anxiety ridden for fear of being subjected to similar blows in the future.

Educated animals are not "anxious to please", as though to avoid the whip, but rather, eager to please because they live in the dignity, and confidence that they are loved. Dogs are notorious for propitiatory behavior, but when treated this way, will also be much calmer, and be confident of being loved.

If this is true with animals, how much truer must it be with children. Irrational beings do not become less irrational with irrational behavior. Indeed, they become bipolar personalities, cringing, frightened creatures, anxious to please, and, at the same time, enraged at having become so degraded. Their rage will tend to explode at the least provocation. Thus, the irrational behavior of parent is passed on to the child.

In fact, the method of using "shock therapy" to deal with irrational states of mind, or behavior, stems from the same misconception of human nature, whether in the case of the Zen Buddhist master who beats his students with a stick to "shock" them into awareness, or the typical Russian ballet master who hits the student with his cane to make her lift her leg higher, or the person who deliberately says something brutally shocking to "unblock" someone in a state, or Makarenko with his "explosions". The assumption is that the targeted person is an irrational beast and not, in that instant, capable of reason. In fact, the more shock is applied, the less rational the targeted person will become.

Schiller's "spieltrieben" (play instinct) is not merely man's tendency to create beautiful art, but also, the playful celebration of being human. Such playfulness cannot originate from the conception of man as a wretch, as in

the Protestant creed, but only from the love of man for his potential for perfectibility, and at the same time, his imperfections as in the nature of man.

## 6.2 IN CONCLUSION

During the period of Abraham Lincoln's war to defend the principles of human freedom, the British launched the Karl Marx project to counter directly the ideas of what came to be known as the American System. Communism, in essence, was deliberately concocted to suppress the ideas of the American Revolution.

Over the course of the last thirty years, "leftist" ideas, in particular, have molded an entire generation, even if individuals of that generation do not see themselves as leftists. The 1960's culture, in America, is imbued with such leftist ideas. This is especially true in education. There is no conception whatsoever that man is made in the image of God, even among the so-called Christians, and even less so among the born again variety.

On the other hand, the existentialist idea that life is absurd is, in fact, the revolt against the communistic Kantian imperative. The two are the two sides of the same coin: the Kantian imperative is the fear of letting oneself go, and the suicidal existentialist is the inverted fear of being reined in. Each is the inverse of the other, and both are, at bottom, the same.

The leftist movement of the 1960's was dominated by the offspring of communist tainted parents who, themselves, were the wretched beaten offspring of peasants from the "old world" - the victims of the Gorky inspired Makarenkos. These suicidal baby boomers ran into social causes and movements, sacrificing their individual sovereignty and contemplating even the possibility of killing, or being killed "heroically" for the cause. These, socially conscious, latter day Posas, betray their own cause by their own paradoxical actions. In their haste and anxiety to attain the aim of freedom for all, like Posa, they ironically trample the individual freedom of those very people who they make use of for the attainment of their goal.

Schiller could not be more explicit on this matter: "Show me, dear friend, from any number of countless examples, only one case --- name me the founder of an order, or even the fraternal order itself - who, with the purest aims, and with the noblest impulses - has always kept clear of

arbitrariness in practice, who has refrained from VIOLENCE against the freedom of others, from the spirit of SECRECY, and from the LUST FOR POWER? Who, in the execution of their actions, can claim not to have made some compromise with the freedom of their moral purpose, even though they imagined this objective to be self-subsisting, and desirable in its purest form, as it appeared to their reason; who can claim not to have executed without consciousness, some violation in the freedom of others, failed to respect other's rights, which were otherwise always the most holy to them, and often have fallen into the most arbitrary despotism, without deviating from the goal itself, and without having to admit to some corruption in the pursuit of their motives?" (9)

## NOTES

- 1) Maxim Gorky, *The Confession*, Frederick A. Stokes Co., New York, 1909, p. 63.
- 2) See unpublished manuscript, Umberto Pascali, *CAPRI FROM TIBERIUS TO THE BOLSHEVIK PARTY SCHOOL*, The historical continuity of the Mitra cult.
- 3) Just before his death, Makarenko was awarded the Order of the Red Banner of Labor for outstanding literary achievement. On March 29, 1940, a directive of the Party Central Committee commemorated his services to Soviet education. Nearly all teaching textbooks in the Soviet Union refer extensively and reverently to Makarenko. In addition, an institute devoted to research on Makarenko has been established at the Academy of Pedagogical Sciences. In 1933 a Soviet-made film based on Makarenko's book, "Road to Life", was released internationally. John Dewey gave the opening remarks, saying, "You will also see an educational lesson of the power of freedom, sympathy, work and play to redeem the juvenile delinquent; a lesson from which we too may learn." In James Bowen, *SOVIET EDUCATION ANTON MAKARENKO AND THE YEARS OF EXPERIMENT*, U. of Wisconsin press, 1962.
- 4) The number of homeless children was estimated to be as many as seven million. By way of comparison, in Tsarist Russia in 1910, the number was two and half million. These homeless children were as much the result of war and famine as they were of the Bolshevik emphasis on free love and

criticism of the family as a "bourgeois vestige." Compare the experiment conducted on American youth in the 1960's and 1970's, which encouraged children to run away from home, and become street children, flower children as they were then called. These young runaways were given shelter in specially established youth clinics to deal specifically with this problem. There, they were given all manner of drugs, and either "freaked out", in which case they were sent to specially set up sectors in psychiatric wings of hospitals, where they were heavily drugged with tranquilizers or, if they adapted to the streets, they usually went on to live in a commune. The shock of a series of assassinations of revered figures (Kennedy and Martin Luther King), then the war in Vietnam and more assassinations (Bobby Kennedy) created the right environment for such mass psychosis. The vast majority of these runaways were from middle and upper middle class families.

5) Ivan Z. Holowinsky, RENOWNED EDUCATOR OR APPARATCHIK? in School Psychology International, Sage Publications, 1989, Vol. 10.

6) Quoted from Das Erziehungsziel, APS p. 168-169, by Frederic Lilge, A. S. MAKARENKO AN ANALYSIS OF HIS EDUCATIONAL IDEAS IN THE CONTEXT OF SOVIET SOCIETY, University of California press, 1958, p.34.

7) James Bowen, Op. Cit., p. 131.

8) Quoted from Kommunistisches Vospitanie I Povedenie, OKV, P.104, by Frederic Lilge, Idem. p.41.

9) In Friedrich Schiller, WERKE IN DREI BANDEN, Band I, Carl Hanser Verlag Munchen, 1976, Briefe uber Don Carlos, p.552-553.

\*\*\*\*\*

# **SYNARCHY MOVEMENT OF EMPIRE**

## **BOOK III**

\*\*\*\*\*

### **THE SYNARCHY INTERNATIONAL**

\*\*\*\*\*

#### **Chapter VII**

\*\*\*\*\*

**7.1 TCHAKHOTINE AND THE RAPE OF THE MASSES (26/01/2006)...164**

**1.2 INTRODUCTION**

**2.2 SYNARCHIST ACTIVITIES OF TCHAKHOTINE**

**3.2 THE RAPE OF THE MASSES: EXPERIMENTS IN  
CONDITIONED REFLEXES**

**4.2 THE PAVLOVIAN METHOD OF CONDITIONED REFLEXES.**

**5.2 TORTURE AS AN INSTRUMENT OF BEHAVIOR MODIFICATION.**

**6.2 THE CONFUSION OF FICTION WITH REALITY:  
THE INVASION OF AMERICA FROM MARS**

\*\*\*\*\*

## 1.2 - INTRODUCTION

After the Nazi victory of 1933, a young Bolshevnik revolutionary by the name of Serge Tchakhotine had been redeployed by the Martinists from Germany to Denmark, and then to France, in order to devise a system of sophistry by means of which the French synarchist elite would be able to establish fascism throughout France, and thus prepare the country for the invasion of Hitler, in May-June 1940. In 1937, Tchakhotine was deployed into the psychological warfare section of the French {*Synarchist Movement of Empire (S.M.E.)*} of Jean Coutrot and Aldous Huxley, the {*Centre d'Organisation Scientifique du Travail*} (COST), and the {*Centre d'Etudes des Problèmes Humains*} (C.E.P.H.), in order to apply his experimental method of Pavlovian behavior modification on the French population, for the benefit of the synarchy International. Tchakhotine was supervised by the British Fabian Society, most specifically, by H. G. Wells.

During the 1930's, the role of Tchakhotine was to complete a study of behavior modification, using drugs, electroshocks, and surgical interventions as means of committing physical and psychological rape on masses of people, monitoring their behavior as human Guinea pigs, and codifying their ability to resist the up and coming new fascist program of Hitler in France. We still have to established to what degree American neo-cons have made use of the Tchakhotine methods today, especially since its introduction to the business community at the Harvard Business School during the 1960's . The key to Tchakhotine's method is precisely what LaRouche has been warning against, that is, to make sure that truth would never be the standard of popular behavior, but that the behavior of the masses would become animalistically based on what is acceptable from public opinion. Thus, from 1939 to 1945, the French population, with only a few exceptions of the Gaullist resistance, was made to experiment this new sophistry of Pavlovian reflex conditioning established by the regime of Vichy, as the least painful choice of accepting fascism.

Under the guise of establishing a scientific experiment in so-called « Pavlovian psychology », and classifying it under the rubric of an « exact human science », Tchakhotine fabricated the ways and means by which the synarchy could manipulate the masses of the people into going against their own self interest and into doing the bidding of the international bankers. Tchakhotine's « plan » for mass population control was not only directly

worked out in collaboration with synarchists such as Jean Coutrot and Dr. Alexis Carrel in France, but it was also done in collaboration with his personnel friend and collaborator from London, H. G. Wells, who had written his own piece of sophistry, {*The Open Conspiracy*}, during the previous decade. The opening paragraph of Serge Tchakotine's book: {*Le viol des foules par la propagande politique*} (The Rape of the Masses by Means of Political Propaganda) is a quote from the leader of the French Synarchist Movement of Empire (S. M. E.), Jean Coutrot, who wrote:

« The time lapse we witness today as the source of contemporary disequilibria is caused by a disquieting retardation of Human sciences, which, [if it were to be caught up with] would give man the mastery over himself, with respect to the sciences of nature, which gave him the power over things, in the last three centuries. Since after having transformed his environment, man is beginning to realize he can act on himself, and in fact does act, the question arises: how can we be sure this action will be inoffensive, and possibly fruitful. » (Jean Coutrot, { *Entretiens sur les Sciences de l'Homme . Document n° 1. Collection du Centre d'Etude des problèmes humains* }, Paris, Hermann, 1937., quoted by Serge Tchakhotine, {*Le viol des foules par la propagande politique*}, Paris, Gallimard, 1952, p. 19.) Aside from establishing the tone for the entire brainwashing project of Tchakhotine, the false hope of this statement also explains why Coutrot committed suicide.

Tchakhotine dedicated his book to both Pavlov and Wells and explained why he was attempting to do the equivalent of what Norbert Wiener was doing with machines. As Tchakhotine explained, « the following characteristic of machines is that they contain 'organisms which produce, not energy in action, but instructions commanding the activation of energies' [...] Wiener indicates that when a machine does not work well, he must either let it rest, or agitate it, or give it a violent electrical chock, or otherwise, disconnect the « sick » part. These are the well known psychiatric treatments: rest, electroshock, and psychosurgical intervention. » (Tchakhotine, Op Cit. p. 517) Such was the Tchakhotine program in a nutshell.

Half of Tchakhotine's book is used to justify the practice of Nazi doctoring, especially experimentations of Pavlovian lobotomy, practiced on human beings who Tchakhotine calls « higher animals ». Such practices were later taken up by Dr. John Rawling Rees at the Tavistock Clinic in

England, by William Sergant of the CIA-MK ULTRA project in the United States, and by Dr. Cameron of the Allen Memorial Clinic in Montreal. The second half of the book is focused on the use of his method of « psychological propaganda » used for political organizing.

## **2.2 - SYNARCHIST ACTIVITIES OF TCHAKHOTINE**

Tchakhotine was identified, early on, as an important synarchist operative by forces inside of the French Government, because his book on the « Rape of the Masses » was initially banned in Germany and officially banned by the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the French Third Republic, Georges Bonnet, and two months before the French-British declaration of war against Germany in 1939. His book was not banned because it was bad; it was banned because it was too much of a precious tool to be circulating freely among the targeted population, especially at the time that his method was being implemented. The British, however, did not hesitate one minute; they immediately published Tchakhotine's book in London through the editor of the Labor Party, that is, under the patronage of the Fabian Society. It was only after the war, in 1952, that Gallimard published it in France, after extensive surgical interventions were made to correct the overtly crude and sadistic original copy. I have not been able to find an American translation of this book, yet, and it is rarely found in French libraries.

Serge Tchakhotine was born on September 13, 1883, at Prinkipo, near Constantinople, the son of the Russian consul, Stephan Ivanovitch Tchakhotine, and of Alexandra Motzo of Greek origins. His father was a Russian « old believer » of very severe observance, and Serge's education was exceedingly strict, making him a likely bi-polar personality victim of the Makarenko variety, a form of psychological terrorist education that most Baby Boomers were subjected to at a young age. (See Irene Beaudry, {*Makarenko, Speaking of Bipolar...*}, in [99-01-2/ib\_001].)

1902- While a student at the university of Moscow, Tchakhotine joined the anti-tsarist movement in a demonstration, and was jailed for subversive activity at the prison of Boutyrki, from which his father got his liberation providing he left Russia. Serge left for Germany and went to Munich with his mother. There, he enrolled in the Faculty of Medicine and met friends who introduced him to the social democratic movement. He was



first a Lenin Bolshevik, and then shifted to become a Trotsky Menshevik, joining the group of Plekhanov and Axelrod.

He left Munich to join the clinic of Professor William Henry Erb, the famous nervous system specialist, and his assistants Dr. Otto Bütschli and Dr. Salmanoff, teaching at the faculty of sciences of Heidelberg. Erb was already working on political and social movements at that time.

Around 1905, Tchakhotine joined the terrorist cell of Alexander Zavadsky, a collaborator of Dr. Bütschli and of Yvan Azeff, who was the underground leader of the Revolutionary Socialist Party (R.S.P.) in Villefranche-sur-Mer, in southern France. Under the cover of receiving tanks of nitric acid and glycerin for medical use, they fabricated explosives to be shipped to Russia for the revolution against the Tsarist regime. It was the leader of this terrorist group, Venetian double-agent Yvan Azeff, who participated in the assassination attempt by Kaliaieff, on February 17, 1905, against Duke Serge Alexandrovitch, in Moscow.

In 1909, Tchakhotine managed to travel to Odessa where he prepared his aggregation in medicine. His thesis consisted of elaborating a system of files which became the basis for establishing his method, called « Time-Mass » (TM.). This is a very important document that I have not been able to find traces of anywhere, but which was brought to the president of Columbia University, Nicholas Murry Butler, in 1945. He also published a brochure on « Esperanto » for this « scientific documentation. »

In 1912, Tchakhotine met with Dr. Pavlov in Saint Petersburg. Pavlov hired him to be his assistant of research at the Laboratory of Physiology at the Academy of Sciences of Saint Petersburg, where he worked for three years. This was three years of training in « Mithraic Stoicism » from which Tchakhotine graduated « summa cum laude. »

In 1915, Tchakhotine created an {*Organization Bureau*} which was joined with the {*Imperial Society of Russian Technique*}, both of which were fused together to form the {*Committee of Military Technical Aid for United Technical and Scientific Associations*}, (KOVOTEP). This group became the third largest public organization in Russia during the revolution, after the {*Committee of Military Industrial Production*} and the {*Committee of United Rural and Municipal Organization*}. The Tchakhotine-run Committee had a considerable role to play during the revolution of 1917; It

was the Tchakhotine KOVOTEP which organized the first revolutionary police system of the Bolsheviks.

In 1917, the Tchakhotine Committee was located at the Mariinsky Institute, and was changed into the { *Committee of Social and Political Education* }, which was run by the « grand-mother of the revolution », Brechko-Brechkovskaya. The new Committee became part of the extreme-left wing of the social-democrats in the party of Plekhanov. Suspected of being a « bourgeois intellectual » by the Bolsheviks, Tchakhotine was arrested briefly, then released

In 1918 Tchakhotine was deployed in the operation of Cossack General Krassnoff, but soon denounced him to the authorities in Moscow for having negotiated arrangements to get the independence of the Don region from Russia, with the collaboration of German forces in Ukraine. However, Krassnoff won the support of the Ukrainian parliament and Tchakhotine was forced to flee. He left for Ekatorinodar, in the region of Kouban, where he then joined General Alexeieff, who headed the Voluntary Army. After meeting with General Dragomiroff, Tchakhotine was nominated to head an information section of the army propaganda unit called OSVAG (OSV meaning information, and AG meaning agitation) .

In 1919, after the First World War was over, Tchakhotine went to Paris, and by a not so strange coincidence, this communist-imperialist went to work for Prince Albert of Monaco, a zoologist who offered him a job at his Oceanographic Museum.

In 1921, Tchakhotine was chosen to be on the committee of direction of the Yugoslavian newspaper { *Nakanune* }, which was a socialist paper with pro-Bolshevik leanings. From Zagreb, Tchakhotine went to Genoa to work with professor Benedicenti, and where he met Chitcherine, the People's Commissar, at an international conference in which the Russians participated for the first time. He also met with Vorosky, Ioff, Litvinov, and the Berlin director of the Soviet Commercial Representation, Krassine, who recruited Tchakhotine to Berlin where he wrote a book titled: { *Organization, Principles and Methods for industry, commerce, and public and political administration* }, which was a rationalization of slave labor methods, following the model of the American, Frederick Winslow Taylor. This form of rationalization of labor called « taylorism » was a sort of precursor to the Jean Coutrot synarchist rationalization of labor. A friend of Tchakhotine,

Abram Samoïlovitch Gallop, who was the head of INOTORG, had been using the same orientation.

In 1924, Tchakhotine was fully rehabilitated with the Soviet regime. He got his Russian citizenship restored and became a full member of the Soviet Commercial Representation. He contributed to the technique of administrative organization of the five year plan, and became a member of the German Society of Organization (G.F.O.).

In 1930, he returned to work with professor Benedicenti in Genoa, and through this Venetian agent, he got a three year grant from the New York *{Research Corporation}* to pursue his research on his manual computer, « Mass-Time » at the *{Kaiser Wilhelm Gesellschaft}* of Heidelberg.

In 1932, Tchakhotine's medical work was interrupted by the rise of Hitler, and he was deployed against the Hitler regime. He joined the Russian Social-Democrat leader Alexander Mikhailovitch Chiffrine, the editor of a newspaper in Manheim, and affiliated himself with the para-military group of the *{Eiserne Front}* (Bronze Front) for which he organized a program of propaganda attacks against Hitler. As synarchy watcher, Yann Moncombe, put it: « He (Tchakhotine) prepared for the party an entire organic program to combat Hitler, by proposing a new technique, based on scientific data; which consisted in creating among the passive masses a conditioned reflex by using political symbols that were nothing else but conditioning stimulants inspired by the works of Pavlov. He succeeded so well that Höltermann promoted him to propaganda chief of the *{Eiserne Front}* and he was given the nickname of the « Red Goebbels. » » (Yann Moncombe, *{Du Viol des Foules à la Synarchie ou le Complot Permanent}*, Edition Faits et Documents, Paris, 1983, p. 18.)

Tchakhotine had invented a new symbol of three arrows for the Hesse election campaign, organized by Mierendorff, and the Social Democratic Party officially endorsed his rallying cry « Freiheit », accompanied with a clenched fist above the head, in opposition to the Nazi salute and the rallying cry « Hail Hitler ». The words were different but the method was the same.

The military marches of the Social Democrat Bronze Front included 6 points: 1) create a ferment of revolt and make the crowd suffer; 2) provoke excitation and enthusiasm among the marchers; 3) create a tone of mockery

among the spectators, to balance against Nazi enthusiasm. 4) Call for the fraternity of the peoples of all nations; 5) have a cortege of beautiful young girls marching to indicate the freshness of victory; 6) excite the crowd into a state of disassociation by running a noisy group of motorcycles non stop around the spectators. All of these techniques were used during the rallies of 1932.

Tchakhotine claimed that this method succeeded against Hitler in Hesse, however, after the government of Hindenburg-von Papen banned all militaristic demonstrations, Tchakhotine complained that he had lost his advantage. At that time, in Germany, Tchakhotine was working with the deputy of the British Labor Party, the top leader of the Fabian Society, Ellen Wilkinson, who was monitoring the success of the Pavlovian method on location in Hesse.

By July 20 1932, the Social Democrat Minister Severing, the leader of the *{Banner of the Reich}* gave up the fight against Hitler. Though Hitler did not win the election of July 31, the Social-Democrats lost one million votes. So much for Pavlovian propaganda techniques. Tchakhotine was sacked by the party and he went to Rome to meet up with his master Professor Pavlov to find out what went wrong. He was told to play low profile and to get new marching orders from his Venetian controller, Benedicenti, in Genoa. Upon returning to Heidelberg, Tchakhotine was told to leave Germany for Copenhagen where he stayed with Mme Xenia Jacobson, the widow of the *{Carlsberg Brewery}* fortune whose insignia had also been the « *{Svastika}* ». »

Near the end of 1932, Tchakhotine was sent to Denmark to be retooled by the Martinists. Mme Jacobson and Tchakhotine had a mutual friend who was a Satanist worshiper and theosophist, Charlotte Weigert, who belonged to the theosophical order of Rudolph Steiner, secretary of the theosophical society of Berlin with doctor Hubbe Schleiden, who was also secretary general of the German Theosophical Society and president of the Black Templars and the Rosicrucian Order. Tchakhotine became an avid reader of Steiner. Steiner was in constant contact with the Martinist Order, the Golden Dawn, and the Ordo Templi Orientis (OTO). While in Copenhagen, Tchakhotine also met with the leader of the School of Copenhagen, the grand pessimist of the « theory of quanta », Niels Bohr.

In 1937, Tchakhotine participated in the Paris Universal Exhibition and joined the first Esperantist Congress, the «*Rassemblement Universel pour la Paix*», and the *{International Congress for Documentation}*, organized by Paul Otlet, the founder of the World Palace, where Tchakhotine met H. G. Wells, for the first time. It was Wells who recruited Tchakhotine to the synarchist grouping at the *{Centre d'Organisation Scientifique du Travail}* (COST), where he was introduced to Jean Coutrot, the leader of the secretive *{Mouvement Synarchique d'Empire}*, (S. M. E. ). Coutrot, as I have documented in my report *{Synarchy Movement of Empire}*, was also the founder of the *{Centre d'Etudes des Problèmes Humains}* (C.E.P.H.), the synarchy brainwashing center where Tchakhotine worked intensely in collaboration with Dr. Alexis Carrel and Aldous Huxley, on methods of behavior modification using propaganda, drugs, and lobotomy. This was the context in which Tchakhotine wrote his infamous book on the psychological rape of the masses by political propaganda, *{Viol des Foules par la Propagande Politique.}* In that context, Tchakhotine also met with Doctor Arthus who had just created the *{Institut of Applied Social Psychology}* (I.P.S.A.) another synarchist experimental clinic where Tchakhotine worked along with Doctor Martiny and Doctor Mondain, who had both invited Tchakhotine to transfer his activities to the French Bellan Hospital, where he could make experiments on human guinea-pigs.

On December 6 1938, French Foreign Minister, Georges Bonnet, signed an accord with Ribentrop, and that very evening, Bonnet had a dinner with Daniel Serruys, the top synarchist of the Banque Lazard Freres of Paris. This long established relationship between Lazard Frères, the Nazis, and French Government may explain why Bonnet refused to publish the book of Tchakhotine a year later. By at least 1937, the synarchy had decided to have Hitler invade France, because the French were unable to establish fascism without such a foreign military intervention. And, since the Tchakhotine book was warning in advance of the Pavlovian-Hitler experiment, the timing of the publication of that book would have been definitely counterproductive. The decision probably came from Tchakhotine's primary controllers, themselves, who were mostly synarchists, such as Jean Coutrot, H. G. Wells, Henri de Man, and Stafford Cropps, head of the Fabian Society. If Tchakhotine's book is practically nowhere to be found today, it is because it demonstrates how precisely the psychological rape of the masses works.

French writer, Moncomble saw the connection between H. G. Wells and Tchakhotine as extremely intimate and important. Tchakhotine wrote:

« Ignorance is therefore the best milieu to form the masses that will easily serve our method of suggestion. We always knew it, but thanks to Pavlov, we are today in a position to understand the psychological reason of that crucial fact in both the social and political domains. » (Tchakhotine, Op. Cit. p. 45.) As Moncombe put it, « this comes down to saying that a small group will have total control of the psychic manipulation system of the masses. H. G. Wells, a great admirer of the Tchakhotine ideas, said it himself that, in order to lead the popular masses on that track (Socialism with a human face!), this could only be ‘the work of a new Order of men and women, animated with the same combating spirit, religiously devoted to the idea, who will attempt to establish and impose a new form of life for the human species {*The Shape of Things to Come*}.’ » (Moncombe, Op. Cit. p. 28)

H.G. Wells wrote the following appraisal of Tchakhotine’s book : « It is the most complete and insightful exposé of contemporary social psychology. This book treats the subject fully and from all sides. He (Tchakhotine) analyses the historical process in light of the most modern critical standpoint and the diagnosis of the events we are living leads him to convincingly establish the measures to be undertaken. I am proud to assert how much I am in agreement with the ideas exposed in this book which is as authoritative as it is modern. » (Moncombe, Op. Cit. p. 32)

In 1941, Tchakhotine was arrested in Vichy France for being a Russian citizen, and was incarcerated at the war camp of Compiègne-Royallieu, where he was introduced to an American Doctor, Dr. Morris B. Sanders, who later played an important role in {*Science, Action, Libération*} (S.A.L.), and COFORCES, and was a Council member of {*Carnegie Endowment*}. Two things worth noting about this convenient meeting. The Nazis knew perfectly well that Tchakhotine was a leader of the {*Eiserner Front*} and the author of an anti-Hitler book, yet, he was liberated with Sanders, on January 23 1942, and both returned to Paris together. The other interesting thing was about this « coincidental » meeting with Sanders, who was, conveniently, a member of the O.S.S., working with Jerome S. Bruner, director of General Services, and Marguerite L. Richard of the same American Information Service.

In Paris, Sanders got Tchakhotine in contact with the synarchist, François Perroux, director of Dr. Carrel’s institute. Tchakhotine moved his laboratory equipment to the Institute, where he pursued his post World War II work with Pierre Girard, a Rothschild agent and the creator of the {*Institut*

*des Sciences Economiques Appliquées*} (I. S. E. A.) In September of 1944, this synarchist umbrella organisation created the group {*Science-Action-Liberation*} (S. A. L.) which included five directors, namely : the theosophist Martinist, Monod-Herzen, the synarchist François Perroux, the Carnegie Endowment representative, Morris Sanders, and the Pavlovian, Serge Tchakhotine.

After the war, in 1945, Sanders got Tchakhotine in touch with Vannevar Bush, the director of the U.S. Office of Scientific Research and Development, who was the inventor of a calculating machine that worked based on the same principle as the {*Mass-Time*} file system that Tchakhotine had invented. Bush wrote an article for {*The Scientist Looks at Tomorrow*}, which M. Weeks, director of the {*Atlantic Monthly*}, published, showing the extraordinary coincidence between the work of Tchakhotine and Bush. The {*Mass-Time*} file of Tchakhotine was also put in the hands of Dr. Gregg of the {*Rockefeller Foundation*}. After Gregg met with H.G. Wells, ostensibly to get his approval, Tchakhotine was then introduced to the New York synarchist network of M. Waldemar Kaempffert, director of « Sciences » at the {*New York Times*} and of {*The Scientist Looks at Tomorrow*}, professor Clyde Miller (Columbia University), founder of the {*Institute for Propaganda Analysis*}, and the prominent American Nazi, Nicholas Murray Butler, director of {*Carnegie Endowment for International Peace*} and of {*Pilgrims Society*}.

American Kantian-Nazi, Nicholas Murray Butler, became the key synarchist in the United States to adopt Tchakhotine 's ideas and plan. As president of Columbia University (1901-1945), Butler was J. P. Moragan's man in American education. According to Carroll Quigley's {*Tragedy and Hope*}, « J.P. Morgan and his associates were the most significant figures in policy making at Harvard, Columbia, and Yale, while the Whitneys and Prudential Insurance Company dominated Princeton. » Quigley also quoted Butler as saying: «The world is divided into three classes of people: a very small group that makes things happen, a somewhat larger group that watches things happen, and a great multitude which never knows what happened. » In the same vein, William Manchester wrote in {*The Glory and the Dream, a Narrative History of America*}: « Nicholas Murray Butler told his students that totalitarian regimes brought forth 'men of far greater intelligence, far stronger character, and far more courage than the system of elections' ... » One of Butler's closest European synarchist associate was Koudenhove Kalergi. It was Butler who wrote the foreword for the American edition of

Kalergi's book on {*PanEuropa*}. Today's Harvard Business School is totally based on the Tchakhotine strategy of aggressiveness in business, as exemplified by the Boston Consulting Group (BCG).

I bring special attention to the book of one of the senior vice-presidents of BCG, Philip Evans, {*Blown to Bits*}, Harvard Business School Press, 2000. According to president of Ford Company, Jacques Nasser, « In the new economies of information, industries will be deconstructed, but not destroyed...» {*Blown to Bits*} is a general call to arms for the destruction of the physical economy across the board in the United States and in the rest of the world.

Sanders also got Tchakhotine in contact with Thomas H. Mahoney, director of the {*Massachusetts Federation for World Peace*}, president of the {*Catholic Association for International Peace*}, and executive member of {*United World Federalist*}. It was Lewis H. Larson, president of the international division of the {*United World Federalist*}, working out of the University of Minnesota, who wrote to Tchakhotine to ask him « if he could provide him with a list of students and professors of universities and secondary schools as well as the names and addresses of student political groups which would eventually be interested in working for the establishment of a world government. » (Moncomble, Op. Cit. p. 37.)

In 1946, the international synarchist activities of Tchakhotine really took off with the new journal of COFORCES. This new organization became the umbrella organization for a World Government. A total of 30 French scientific, economic, cultural, social and political organizations joined the COFORCES in Paris. Science, Action, Liberation and COFORCES were also joined by the British {*Fabian Society*}, and the {*Association of Scientific Workers, Federal Union*}, the American {*World Federalist*}, the {*Carnegie Endowment for International Peace*}, the {*Rockefeller Foundation*}, and the {*World Peace Foundation*}, as well as the French {*Fédération des Organisations françaises pour l'Economie*}, the {*Fédération des Organisations Françaises pour la Paix*}, and the {*Fédération des Organisations françaises pour la Puissance Publique*}, and the {*Fédération des Organisations françaises pour l'Education*}. All of those groups, were overseen by secretary general Tchakhotine who organized a series of international congresses from 1946 to 1950.



In 1950, Tchakhotine was forced to dissolve his organization because of internal frictions and divisions. COFORCES was openly against the creation of a European Federation by Coudenhove Kalergi prior to the creation of a World Government structure. The whole project of Tchakhotine began to fall apart over the decision of the Belgian banker, Baron Allard, and Paul Henri Spaak, the agent of Kalergi of *{Paneuropa}* and of Prince Bernhard and Joseph H. Retinger of the *{Bilderberg Group}*. This is the period of take over of the synarchy program by the *{Bilderberg Group}*, the *{Council on Foreign Relations}*, and the Belgian equivalent of the C.F.R., the *{Institut Royal des Relations Internationales}*. All of these organizations became hostile to COFORCES and promoted a step by step process for the establishment of a European Federation before the establishment of a world government.

Moncomble summed up the case of COFORCES in the following manner:

« Adolph Ferrière, last president of COFORCES, Henri Laugier and Alfred Sauvy, of the S.A.L. were also members of the *{Centre d'Etudes des Problèmes Humains}* (C.E.P.H.).

« On the other hand, François Perroux (S.A.L. and COFORCES) belonged to the *{Centre d'Information Interprofessionnel}* (C.I.P.) – the transmission belt of the *{Institut de Psychologie Appliquée}* (I.P.S.A.) whose big boss was no one else but the synarchist Gerard Bardet, and to which belonged also the one worldist, Robert Buron, who later became vice-president of the *{European Federalist Movement}* with François Mitterand.

« All of these organizations had the same common denominator: they were directed by Jean Coutrot, identified in the *{Shavin Report}* as the organizer, if not the true leader of the *{Synarchique Movement of Empire}* (S. M. E.). » (Moncomble, Op. Cit., p. 85.)

Moncomble had also provided a closer scrutiny of the Martinists involved inside of SAL and COFORCES presided by Tchakhotine. According to Moncomble, Tchakhotine did not seem to be aware that he was under the scrutiny of top Martinist synarchists. After identifying the key banking institution behind the S. M. E. as being the Banque Worms, run by Gabriel Leroy-Ladurie, Moncomble added that « Around 1920, the ideas of Saint-Yves d'Alveydre were taken over by a few members of the Martinist

loges, notably Vivian du Mas and Jeanne Canudo, and were translated into a document of theurgical inspiration called {*Scheme of the social Archetype*}, which itself inspired, in the middle of the 1930's, a group of young theosophists who were promoting the convening of a series of General Estates (for youth and for women, etc.) I got this information from one of its editors: the famous « golden document » exposing the means and ends of the famous « Mouvement Synarchique d'Empire » which did not result from the conjunction and reflexions of a few technicians of X-Crise, but of the speculations of these young theosophists, themselves, who had no economic or political powers at all. » (Moncomble, Op. Cit., p. 158.)

This confirms what I had written in a previous report that it was the theosophist, Jeanne Canudo, who had been the author of the Synarchy Pact document with the collaboration of Vivien Postel Du Mas. The interesting point that Moncomble added to this fact is that the Martinist theosophist, André Gauthier Walter was an active member of the S.A.L. and of COFORCES, as well as a member of the {*Union Democratique et Socialiste de la Résistance*} (U.D.S.R.), run by René Pleven and François Mitterand. He was also the president of the theosophical society called {*Kurukshetra*} where Canudo was deployed from. Another member of S.A.L., Martinist Bishop, André Sébastien, was also a member of the Supreme Martinist Council whose Grand Master was Constant Chevillon, who was working directly with Gerard Encausse (Papus), and Victor Blanchard, head of the {*Ordre Martiniste et Synarchique*}, and all of whom were personal friends of Saint-Yves d'Alveydre. Blanchard was a government official while Chevillon was a President of the Chambers of Deputies.

In 1958, after this major setback, Tchakhotine returned to the USSR where he got a job at the Institute of Cytology attached to the Academy of Sciences of Leningrad. In 1960, he was promoted head of laboratory of the Institute of Biophysics of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR, and from there, he kept in close correspondence with Bertrand Russell and the peace movement. Moncomble estimated that the failure of Tchakhotine was « due to the fact that he was making use of his science by exposing it, while the people he was surrounded with operated from the principle that they wanted to use his science, but without exposing it. They wanted to determine the mentalities the way they wished, but without saying they were manipulating them. » (Moncomble, Op. Cit., p. 76.) Tchakhotine died in Moscow on December 24 1973, at the age of ninety.

### 3.2- THE RAPE OF THE MASSES: EXPERIMENTS IN CONDITIONED REFLEXES

Once the British Synarchy had lost control of their man, Adolph Hitler, they required an opponent who would play by the same rules of the game. So, they planted Tchakhotine within the Social Democratic opposition in Germany. This crucial right-left experiment in Nazi-Communism was part of a long standing synarchist attempt at controlling the political oppositions in European politics. The reader should remember that this was also the old dream of Saint-Yves d'Alveydre. For this form of Hegelian negation to succeed, however, it had to be established on the same « intention » that both opponents used, that is, the control of the mass of human beings as virtual human cattle. So, this Pavlovian propaganda war was launched, and became the science of manipulating the masses by the typical British Intelligence method of {*gang-counter-gang*} control of opposing forces based on synthetic ideological sloganeering of one group clamoring for « order », and the other for « freedom. » The winner of the contest was going to get all of the funding he required from the synarchy bankers. The loser was going to be exiled and retooled.

The 1932 political campaign in Germany was the crucial experiment in social control of the population. What the Nazis did, in the science of manipulating the masses, the Social Democrats claimed they could do better. Thus, to counter the fearful swastika of the Nazis, Tchakhotine invented the symbol of the three arrows of the Social Democrats, striking against the swastika. The symbol had to be explicitly aggressive in accordance with Tchakhotine's pulsion No 1 of aggressivity. (Figure 1. Three arrows.) Three arrows across the swastika were aimed at turning the fear of the enemy into ridicule, thus creating a symbol of counter intimidation. This example shows how symbols were used as means of psychological influence on the general population. This sort of opposition of contraries had no intention of elevating people out of their ignorance, but was aimed at manipulating the masses into rallying behind one or the other alternative of a fabricated contradiction, a fallacy of composition, behind the sophistry of one group competing against the sophistry of the other, and ultimately eliminating the other. In such a setting, the German people were given no other choice but to choose whichever side they were most comfortable with, or the one they were less disfavorable to. The choice of the truth was out of the question,

because the intention was not to change people's axioms, but to play with popular obsessions. The same manipulative logic underlying the fabrication of public opinion and publicity stunts was used by both sides. Tchakhotine described the « intention » in the following manner:

« First, this information aspect of the publicity is aimed at « striking » rather than convincing, at suggesting rather than explaining. It targets the obsessions appealing to the different tendencies. It even aims at creating the need in the targeted person. We use the same technical rules that we have discussed in the case of training animals, however, since we have to deal with human beings, we use the system of conditioned reflexes at a higher level, and naturally, we play on the entire gamut of tendencies and their derivatives. » (Tchakhotine, Op. Cit. p. 129.)

This is also true of how the enemy image of the fundamentalist Muslim terrorist was chosen and fabricated by fascist international and Venetian synarchist operatives like Michael Ledeen, and how it was promoted in the United States, since September 11, 2001, to be pitted against their dumb opposition, the fundamentalist Christians, in alliance with the Zionists in Israel.

Compare this form of manipulation with the sort of ironies that LaRouche and the LYM have been using in their organizing polemics, and through which the population is elevated by means of laughter rather than manipulated by stick and carrot. The difference is that Rabelaisian laughter always elevates people, because it causes one to recognize that a hidden incontrovertible truth can be addressed in the form of a paradox. This also shows the difference of effect between the « intention » of a metaphor and the « intention » of a symbol.

Tchakhotine insisted that graphic symbols had to play a crucial political role. To wit, he showed the following seven symbols, numbered in their order of simplicity: 1) the cross; 2) the three arrows; 3) the swastika; 4) the hammer and cycle; 5) the Islamic crescent; 6) the Roman imperial faggot; 7) the imperial insignias of the eagle, or the lion. (Figure 2. Seven political symbols.) According to him, the simplest ones are the most effective. It is interesting to note that the second simplest one, Tchakhotine's own three arrows, has been the least known of all. It should be noted that the silly French socialists had adopted the three arrows as their symbol until it was replaced recently by a more confusing symbol of the fist holding a rose,

which was a poor emulation of the silly American hippie symbol of flower power.

These symbolic techniques were also aimed at creating fear among enemies or impotence among one's own ranks. But, Tchakhotine devised a cartoon whereby the three arrows were chasing after Hitler who was portrayed as running scared with his entire Nazi Party. (Figure 3. The three arrows chasing after Hitler.) In 1932, during the Mierendorff political campaign in Hesse, Tchakhotine made use of these newly developed Pavlovian techniques of conditioned reflexes for the masses and claimed the Social Democrats did better than Hitler in that election. A year later, however by February 1933, Tchakhotine admitted that Hitler had won that propaganda war because he had better financing.

#### **4.2- THE PAVLOVIAN METHOD OF CONDITIONED REFLEXES.**

In the superior form of human nervous activity, Tchakhotine estimated that there existed a « shock of two antagonistic tendencies » that political propaganda should make use of, if the political elite wished to keep control of its population. On the one hand, there is the tendency to conserve the learned habits that form a certain type of behavior. The other tendency is to change the comfortable state of that habituated behavior and force the individual to adapt to new conditions. Most political organizations have recognized the existence of both tendencies and have manipulated them by means of Pavlovian conditioned reflexes.

« In human life, » wrote Tchakhotine, « these two tendencies also play an important role and determine the forms of our behavior. It is easy to conform to habituated ways of living according to a certain order, which eliminates worries, when an activity automatically triggers a new one, that is to say, when, thanks to the connections established under the form of conditioned reflexes, some ' chain reactions ' are activated, which are produced in rapid succession and may be repeated from one day to the next. These chains of conditioned reflexes help us in each step, when we execute familiar motions, habituated working actions, personal daily routines, forms of familiar relationships with other people, objects, elements of nature, etc. This is what constitutes our habits, our usual activities, our *{ vital*

*stereotype*}; this mechanism prevents us from making any great efforts, and produces an economy of energy expenditure.

« On the other hand, we often fight against the subjugation of these servile habits. An adult man cannot conform to all of these forms of behavior which he got used to since his early childhood. During his entire life, a transformation of his relationships are transformed into new conditioned reflexes, sometimes even into some of opposite nature. The old reflexes are then inhibited, but one only needs to lessen the tension of one's nervous system, to become ill, or to gobble up a certain quantity of alcohol, in order to see reappearing certain childhood habits, mannerisms, manners of joking, etc. These phenomena are also well known in psychoanalysis. »  
(Tchakhotine, Op. Cit. p. 30.)

Tchakhotine did not realize that he had the right diagnostic insight, but the wrong method for the cure. Indeed, it is so easy to miss the fine point that a great number of political activists apply Tchakhotine's method without realizing its detrimental effects. The misuse of such a mechanistic application of change, its artificial application in constant mobilization, or in view of some permanent change, is obviously detrimental to the human personality, when it is based on the idea of control, as opposed to fostering the creative process. Behold, here, the difference between man and animal.

This is the mechanistic treatment of behavior on which Tchakhotine based his entire brainwashing method. His work consisted in finding what social mechanism would be able to force a change of behavior, that is, establish a definite behavior modification. Remember that according to Tchakhotine, this method is effective with 90 percent of a given population from which most of the individuals accept to remain ignorant and let themselves be treated as animals. So, the controlling mechanisms he is looking for are to be found in purely animalistic reaction formations. Tchakhotine added:

« We now arrive at another group of phenomena which are in close relationship with the first ones, and which are of an extreme importance for understanding all of the complexities of « psychic » acts. Here is the crucial fact – lets form a conditioned reflex: for example, a determined sound produces salivation in a dog. Put a picture of a cat in front of him, at the very moment he perceives the sound: his salivation does not take place, or, if it started to salivate, it suddenly stops. The role of the cat can be played by any

other excitation factor, if it is strong enough. This is the phenomenon called {*inhibition*}. » (p. 30)

The maximal use of {*inhibition*} or {*desinhibition*} factors, internal or external, became the basis for the entire manipulative procedure of the Pavlovian method of conditioned reflexes for animals. The point of interest, here, is not to train docile dogs, but to train docile human beings, as if they were dogs. However, even for Pavlov, there is a shortcoming in all of this, and that is the temporary nature of these so-called relationships of {*inhibition*}. In other words, after a certain amount of time, the mind has the ability to delete and eliminate totally the effects of such conditioned reflexes. Tchakhotine added: « Pavlov shows the existence of antagonistic mechanisms which control and delete, actively with time, all superfluous conditioned reflex structure, or those that have become useless, and thus, they free the organism from the danger of an overactive disorder. The activity of forgetting is founded on the same mechanisms. It is precisely the significance of the process of inhibition.» (Tchakhotine, Op. Cit., p. 31) This shortcoming, however, did not stop Pavlov, or Tchakhotine, in their quest for discovering how to cause permanent behavior modification in human beings. The next step was to investigate additional mechanisms determining, physiologically, how the central nervous system operated in such situations.

This is where Pavlov discovered the function of what he called « analyzers, » which are « particular devices of the nervous system, each having a peripheral extremity in a sense organ, a centripetal nerve which is attached to it, and a terminal for this nerve inside of the cortical neurons. The analyzers are closely linked to the generating mechanism of conditioned reflexes. The details of the analyzers can be mostly studied by the method of the partial destruction of the central or peripheral extremities or these analyzers. » (Tchakhotine, p. 34) In other words, the way to go around the psychological defensive mechanisms against the practice of conditioned reflexes is with a surgical intervention.

Tchakhotine, then goes on describing lobotomizing procedures, as if he were cutting up slices of salami, only to conclude that « experiments have shown that after the ablation of the forward half of the hemispheres and a large lesion of the posterior half, the zone that remained intact, even though it was very small, was nonetheless able to maintain a superior nervous activity. The principle of vicariance of organs thus plays an important role,

which demonstrated that, from the standpoint of the general mechanism, all of the hemispheric regions were equivalent, a point that Munk had already insisted on. » (Tchakhotine, Op. Cit. p. 33) In other words, each part of the human brain is like a Monad, it retains the functional dynamic of the whole brain. Thus, conclusively, unless the brain of the victim is totally dead, in which case the human being no longer exists, the method of lobotomy proved to be a total failure.

This admission of failure is significant, but it did not stop these nazi doctors from continuing their experiments on human Guinea pigs up until today. The point to remember, however, is that even after the worse case of lobotomy, the victim is still a human being and cannot be reduced to the sum total of a mechanistic system of so-called Pavlovian reflexes or nervous reactions of an animal. Even physiologically, the difference between man and animal is maintained.

## **5.2- TORTURE AS AN INSTRUMENT OF BEHAVIOR MODIFICATION**

For Tchakhotine, the ultimate goal of the political fight was to control and channel the combative instinct of the masses. This goal is reached when one has successfully induced fear into a population. In America, September 11, 2001 was an exercise in such a method of inducing fear in the American population, and the terror politics of Dick Cheney are precisely of that fabric. The example that Tchakhotine gave was very crude because he considered it to be a « perfect analogy » of behavior by comparing a dog and a man

Tchakhotine singled out the instinct of combativeness as No° 1, with children who develop it by fighting, especially boys of the age of 10 to 13, who use tooth and nail, fists, sticks, throwing of rocks, etc., which they will later replicate as warriors. The point that he focused on is that the conditioned reflexes acquired by this instinct of dominating others must be carried through into adulthood. The secret of their controlled behavior lies in the fact that « during the fights for possession, there emerge new feelings, a hostile emotion against the adversary, the desire to make him suffer, and the enjoyment of seeing him suffer. » (Tchakhotine, Op. Cit. p. 194)



So, by necessity, Tchakhotine associated cruelty with the combative instinct that is found in the perverse pleasure that children have in torturing insects, for example. However, such behavior is quite acceptable for Tchakhotine who justified this cruelty in the following manner: « Then, the child rips the wings off of the fly, the legs off of the spider, etc. But, we would be wrong to attribute this behavior to cruelty, it is, in reality, an insensitiveness, by lack of representation and imagination, where the desire to learn dominates exclusively, therefore it comes from the action of a No° 4 parental pulsion which comes into play when sublimated. ‘ All passionate tendencies (Bovet, {*L’instinct combatif*}, Paris Flammarion, 1928, p. 78.) captures the exclusive attention of the mind to the point of rendering us insensitive to everything else that is not our object of interest, and therefore inattentive and blind to all of the sufferings that we may be causing. Curiosity, scientific ardor, create that effect, but also the love of gain and greed, sensual pleasure, confessional zeal, etc. Thus, primitive instincts of hunting and warring can also render a human being insensitive to the sufferings he causes to others. » (Op. Cit. p. 196.) Tchakhotine treated the questions of sadism and masochism in the same manner. As is also the case for the Vice President of Torture, Dick Cheney, the policy of torture is not for the purpose of securing better intelligence about the enemy, it is simply for pleasure.

## **6.2 THE CONFUSION OF FICTION WITH REALITY: THE INVASION OF AMERICA FROM MARS**

There are several population control experiments that Tchakhotine participated in with H.G. Wells. The most extravagant and most successful one was the rise of Hitler in Germany and the imposition of Vichy fascism in France. However, there were other less brutal experiments, but no less fearful. One case to which Tchakhotine refers specifically, is the Orson Welles’s radio rendition of H.G. Wells’s {*The War of the Worlds*}, which had broadcasted, as real, the occurrence of a fictitious invasion of Martians, on the national radio station, Columbia Broadcasting System. According to American professor, Clyde R. Miller, this experiment showed that « the two great combinations in persuasion are security and hope: insecurity and fear. » (Clyde Miller, {*The Process of Persuasion*}, Crown Publishers, New York, 1946, p. 28.) The quick change from one state to the other can be demonstrated by the efficacy with which the communication

channels can disseminate, with lightning speed, an emotionally charged piece of news that could transform the greatest hopes into the greatest fears. This is a case of being able to make the difference between belief and knowledge. The success of the experiment was based essentially on the underlying assumption that the great majority of the population (90 % according to Tchakhotine) will not react intelligently and will have no resistance to the crisis. People will think that belief is knowledge. In other words, the assumption was that the general population could not make universal discoveries of principle, and that the majority of people, therefore, would remain in an animalistic state as long as they did not make an axiomatic change. This is the type of experiment that is currently being pushed on the Senate of the United States with the nomination of Samuel Alito, in preparation for the coming global financial blow-out. Thus, it is the fear of breaking with the other-directedness of popular beliefs, not the conditioned reflex that brings about the tragedy.

The fiction of Wells, {*The War of the Worlds*}, dramatized by Orson Welles, was made to sound so real that approximately 2 million out of a possible 6 million American listeners panicked and propagated the outrageous lie throughout the entire nation. Tchakhotine reported that « The contagion propagated the persuasion that the entire population was of the same mind. Those who were of the less economically favored, like the unemployed, represented the largest contingent of credulous and fearful people. The feeling of general insecurity, caused by the circulating apprehension of an imminent war, increased the disposition to believe in all sorts of dangers. » (Tchakhotine, Op. Cit. p. 218.)

The targeted population was primarily from the state of New Jersey, and the scenario was directed by the {*Princeton Radio Project*}, funded by the Rockefeller Foundation and headed by Dr. Paul Lazarsfeld of the Tavistock Institute, Dr. Frank Stanton, director of research and future president of CBS, Theodor Adorno, director of music, Gordon Allport, representative of the Tavistock Institute in the United States, and professor Hadley Cantril, Princeton psychologist. The population had been prepared for an invasion by radio broadcast from the Munich crisis earlier in the year.

In his book, {*The Invasion from Mars*}, Hadley Cantril, monitored closely both functional and dysfunctional responses to the controlled experiment. On the one hand, the response to « How do you feel? »

represented total confusion where « people all over the United States were praying, crying, fleeing frantically to escape death from the Martians. Some ran to rescue loved ones. Others telephoned farewells or warnings, hurried to inform neighbors, sought information from newspapers or radio stations, summoned ambulances and police cars. » (Quoted by Clyde Miller, *Op. Cit.* p. 29.) On the other hand, some were paralyzed with fear and became totally dysfunctional. Cantril reported the following account from a housewife: « I was terribly frightened. I wanted to pack and take my child in my arms, gather up my friends and get in the car and just go north as far as we could. But what I did was just sit by one window, prayin', listenin', and scarred stiff, and my husband by the other (window) snifflin' and lookin' out to see if people were runnin'. Then when the announcer said 'evacuate the city', I ran and called my boarder and started with my child to rush down the stairs, not waitin' to catch my hat or anything. When I got to the foot of the stairs I just couldn't get out, I don't know why. » (Miller, *Op. Cit.* p. 30.)

Tchakhotine further reported that out of 100 percent of those who were psychologically distressed, 18 percent had a superior education, 36 percent had a secondary school degree, and 46 percent had only an elementary degree. The conclusion that Princeton University author, Hadley Cantril, came to in his study of this population control operation was that « the best means of preventing against such panic resides in education. » (Hadley Cantril, *{The Invasion from Mars}*, Princeton University Press, 1940.) In other words, if you destroy the education system, like it has been done in the last four decades, and brainwash the population by *{reality-television}* fantasy scenarios, you can have the majority of the population struck with fear and play on their total sense of insecurity. After evaluating seven factors explaining the panic, that is, « insecurity, phobias, worries, lack of self-confidence, fatalism, religiosity, and frequency of church attendance, » Cantril concluded his evaluation by acknowledging the factor of *{other-directedness}* as opposed to *{inner-directedness}*, but without emphasizing its dominant characteristic:

« The individual is unable to rely on his own resources to see him through. He feels relatively helpless and believes his own best efforts at a better adjustment are insufficient. This means, furthermore, that the individual believes his life and his fate are very largely dependent on some forces outside himself – on chance, on economic conditions far beyond his control, or on the whim of some supernatural being. All this adds up to an intense feeling of emotional insecurity, one which is likely to be augmented

as the situation surrounding the individual appears more and more threatening. His own standards of judgment either predispose him to regard his efforts as inadequate or dependent on outside forces or else his emotional insecurity makes him lose faith easily in any appropriate standards he may have. The net result is that the individual will be highly susceptible to suggestion when he is face-to-face with a situation that taxes his own meager self-reliance. His emotional insecurity is pervasive and dynamic. It steers his judgment and behavior. The events reported by this broadcast clearly threatened personal security, called for personal resourcefulness, and confidence in personal evaluation. Our analysis has demonstrated that these combine into a trait of personality which must be definitely regarded as an additional factor to be used in explaining the panic. » (Cantril, Op. Cit., p. 138-39.)

It becomes obvious that this conclusion can only be drawn from the behavior of the individual who has spent most of his life avoiding a confrontation with the truth, and who has never developed a capacity for being « street wise. » Even for a Tavistock agent of influence like Cantril, the insurance against panic behavior lies in the ability to develop an educated population with a sense of « critical ability » with respect to the truth, that is, to be { *inner-directed* } as opposed to { *other-directed*, } or being submissive to sense perception of general public opinion.

## CONCLUSION

The conclusion of Tchakhotine is straightforward. Since according to him 90% of the population are sheep and 10 % are immune against the psychological rape of the masses, it is essential to recruit that small minority as the leadership for the synarchy and train it for the purpose of controlling the « propaganda of popular culture. » In fact, this is precisely what the Congress of Cultural Freedom did, after World War II, and continues to do today. I will let Tchakhotine conclude for himself: « We have already said that the propaganda for popular culture must take into account the fact that, in order to maximize its efficiency, it requires the system of the combative pulsion No 1: then, it will not only have a chance of stubbornly opposing other hostile propagandas, and which could use the same principle, and therefore, threaten to bring it down, but it will be able to permeate the souls of those it is destined to address and become what introspective psychology

used to call the « master-idea », that is to say, the psychologically conditioned structure, which would trigger, at the chosen moment, the socially viable behavior that is profitable for the moral and social progress of the human collectivity. But, we have already seen that, in the system based on the combative pulsion No 1, it is fear that is the corner stone; it is therefore on the basis of fear that the entire psychological action must be calculated. » (Tchakhotine, Op. Cit., p. 553.) And Tchakhotine added, « if the threat is not followed by sanctions, then, the fear will weaken and disappear. » However, Tchakhotine did not say if such a « master-idea » or « Fuhrerprincip » of induced fear « at the chosen moment » should be followed with sanctions as those that Hitler imposed on his political opponents after the Reichstag fire.

### **END OF BOOK THREE**