

THE ALGERIA PARADOX

Will Bush or Kerry Learn a Lesson from Charles de Gaulle?

by Pierre Beaudry

The clearest exemplar of a modern national leader who was capable of realizing when not to “stay the course,” and acting forcefully on that decision, was French President Charles de Gaulle, who ended France’s bloody attempt to keep colonial control over Algeria.¹ De Gaulle realized that that course would have led to national destruction of France as a republic, and overcame right-wing resistance and a threatened coup to withdraw French forces. Pierre Beaudry examines the right-wing synarchist force which was responsible for the Algerian war—launched at virtually the same time as the French defeat in Vietnam at Dien Bien Phu—and the threat to France’s national existence.

There are two lessons to be drawn from the comparison between the present American counterinsurgency in Iraq and the French war in Algeria. One of them has been drawn by retired Army Colonel Andrew J. Bacevich in a *Los Angeles Times* column on April 8, 2004, in which he warned that “indiscipline, lawlessness, and the excessive use of force will not guarantee victory in Iraq; indeed, the reverse is true. The French experience in Algeria stands as a warning: Down that road lies not only defeat but also dishonor.”

The other lesson is exemplified by the role played by French President Charles de Gaulle in humbly accepting de-

feat, and in taking the necessary steps to disengage the French military forces from Algeria. The reader will discover that, for a paradoxical reason, de Gaulle’s defeat was actually a victory. Unless a George Bush, or a John Kerry, is able to provide leadership in taking similar measures immediately, they should step aside and bring in the Charles de Gaulle of America, Lyndon LaRouche, to do the job.

First and foremost, what must be understood is that it is the same enemy which is behind those two wars, and there will be no successful disengagement of United States troops from Iraq, unless there is an understanding of the “Beast-Man” nature of this enemy, which was and is deployed by international Synarchy in both cases.

The Beast-Man and the Algerian War

The Algerian War of Independence (1954-62) was a guerrilla war, which involved a synarchist faction of the French Army representing the fascist and colonial supporters of French Algeria (*Algérie française*) on the one side, and the *maquis* guerrilla fighters represented by the Algerian National Liberation Front (FLN) on the other. On the ground, it involved rogue elements of the French Army who were the fascist remnants of the French oligarchy—led by the Comte de Paris, Henri VII d’Orléans, and the leftovers of the Vichy regime.

In May 1942, when the French Vichy regime began to collapse internally, and after the Allies had landed in North Africa, a previously unknown Beast-Man made his appearance in the entourage of Gen. Charles de Gaulle. His name was Jacques Soustelle, and he became head of de Gaulle’s newly created secret service directorate, the General Direction of Special Services (DGSS), in November 1943. This

1. The French conquest of Algeria occurred under Napoleon III and lasted from 1848 until its consolidation in 1870. After the insurrection of Kabylia in 1871 and of Sud-Oranais in 1881, Algeria had become pacified, and considered as part of French territory. During World War II, the country was occupied by an Allied expeditionary force in 1942. From June 1943 to August 1944, the French Committee of National Liberation, which later formed a provisional government of free France, was headquartered in Algiers. French citizenship was extended to Algerians after the war, and an Algerian assembly was elected for the first time in 1948.

was like recruiting the fox to inform you of the situation inside the hen house. De Gaulle was always surrounded by enemies inside his own administration, some of whom he preferred to have close to him, so he could keep an eye on them. Soustelle was one of those. He was controlled from outside the government by the synarchist financier Pierre Guillaumin de Benouville, who was general manager for French businessman and financier Marcel Dassault during the 1950s, and had been party to France providing the nuclear bomb to Israel. Benouville cooperated with Allen Dulles, Nazi Swiss banker François Genoud, and Hitler's Economics Minister, Hjalmar Schacht, then out of Berne, Switzerland.

Benouville was brought in to de Gaulle's camp as an associate of Soustelle in May 1945, when Soustelle became Minister of Information and later secretary general of the first Gaullist party, the Rassemblement du Peuple Français (RPF). Then, in 1955, Benouville pulled Soustelle out from de Gaulle's reach. Soustelle had been nominated governor-general of Algeria (1955-56) at the initiative of synarchist operative François Mitterrand—a leftover of the fascist, freemasonic organization called the Cagoule, and of the Vichy regime—who was then Interior Minister in Pierre Mendès-France's government. In France, the Ministry of Interior is the office of the Grand Inquisitor, the potential controller of a police state. It was from this government function that both Mitterrand and Soustelle became instrumental in launching the Algerian War, which coincided with the defeat of the French military at Dien Bien Phu, Vietnam, on March 13, 1954.

The government of Joseph Laniel was riddled with synarchist elements such as Foreign Minister Georges Bidault. Bidault was an advocate of pre-emptive use of nuclear weapons as a "solution" to the Dien Bien Phu problem. Like Dick Cheney today, Bidault was a promoter of "nuking them" into submission to the Beast-Man. During the debacle at Dien Bien Phu, Bidault attempted to get Allen Dulles and company to use American nuclear weapons to save the French garrison that was defended by General de Castries.

Both Soustelle and Bidault later teamed up with affiliates of the French Secret Army Organization (OAS) in Portugal and Spain; especially, with former Nazi SS Commando and guerrilla warfare expert, Otto Skorzeny. It was Skorzeny who



Gen. Charles de Gaulle in Algiers in 1958, just before France's adoption of a Presidential constitution, and de Gaulle's election as President; at this time he began to speak of "self-determination" to prepare both the French and Algerians for the withdrawal of French forces. Algerian resistance had been underway since 1954.

trained the death squads of Ibero-America and terrorist insurgents in the Islamic world, including leading components of both the OAS and the FLN in Algeria.

The Set-Up of the Algerian Hostilities

On Nov. 1, 1954, the FLN guerrillas launched a series of attacks against French military installations and police posts throughout Algeria. The FLN then issued a proclamation of war over Cairo radio, calling on all Muslims of Algeria to join the fight for "the restoration of the Algerian State, sovereign, democratic, and social, within the framework of the principle of Islam."

The response from France was immediate and vicious. It was not given by the Minister of Defense, but by Minister of the Interior Mitterrand, who replied with an infamous apostrophe: "The only possible negotiation is war." This is how the Algerian war was set up.

On Nov. 12, Prime Minister Mendès-France stated before the National Assembly: "One does not compromise when it comes to defending the internal peace of the nation, the unity and integrity of the Republic. The Algerian departments are part of the French Republic. They have been French for a long

time, and they are irrevocably French. . . . Between them and metropolitan France there can be no conceivable secession.”² This *Algérie Française* colonial stand was also then the political position of President Charles de Gaulle, and would remain so until 1961.

What was being advocated on the FLN side of the equation was no less than total violent revolution. On the *Algérie française* side, there was right-wing fascist and colonial posturing. Otto Skorzeny and Frantz Fanon—the Martinique-born psycho-terrorist—were, respectively, the commando training officer and the theoretician of the FLN, both advocating “purgative violence” by horrible atrocities, as a means of achieving national liberation. On the *Algérie française* side there was Skorzeny (again!), and Aztec anthropophagy admirer Jacques Soustelle. The set-up was perfect on both sides. From Cairo, a collaborator of Skorzeny, Ahmed Ben Bella, represented the FLN and had taken the no-compromise route of eliminating all moderate factions.

In August 1955, the FLN was deployed to conduct the massacre of Philippeville, murdering 123 people, including women and children. Algeria’s Governor-General Soustelle ordered massive retaliation attacks, which, according to some estimates, killed 1,273 guerrilla fighters (the FLN reported 12,000 deaths). The truth is probably half-way, about 6,000 victims. The cycle of vengeance was on. Thousands of Muslims were tortured and killed in an orgy of bloodletting organized by the French Armed Forces and police. The idea was to unleash an unstoppable process of escalation of violence and retaliation. The Army and police were given exceptional powers, as will be demonstrated later, in the case of Paris Police Chief Maurice Papon.

Even though both the French military and the Algerian FLN were being manipulated and controlled by the Synarchy, they also had within them corrective factors that de Gaulle could count on. There were good elements of the FLN, which eventually became part of the new government of independent Algeria, in 1962. However, the war had first to be prosecuted for eight long years.

Otto Skorzeny was, at that time, also reportedly providing assistance to the right-wing fascist Jabotinsky networks of the Israeli Mossad, through the services of James Jesus Angleton’s CIA operations in Spain in 1963; and to the Grand Mufti of Jerusalem, Haj Amin el-Husseini, a personal friend of Hitler. Throughout North Africa, Skorzeny, using training “experts” from the Waffen SS, had an evil input in all of the revolutionary movements, from Cairo to Tangier.

It is this Synarchist terrorist and commando training program, which explains the policy of systematic torture and bestial killings that went on in what was to become known as the “dirty war” in Algeria. Ritual murders, mutilations of

French military men, and systematic torture of Arab men and women, became the trademarks of the Algerian War. And that is why this excessive use of force could never lead to victory for France. An apparent pacification program had been turned into a colonial war. De Gaulle realized very early on that France could never win such a war. He was alert enough, and wise enough, to seek every possible means of disengaging the French military and police forces from Algeria. It is essential to emphasize this point because it was the demonic Beast-Man war policy of *Algérie Française* that caused the disaster, not the policy of President de Gaulle. In retaliation, the *Algérie Française* renegade military officers turned their war against de Gaulle himself.

De Gaulle’s Sublime Moment

The dramatic situation facing President George W. Bush in Iraq is very similar to what President Charles de Gaulle faced on April 23, 1961, when he was forced to make the crucial decision of putting a stop to the military insurrection in Algeria. Just as today’s quagmire in Iraq is run under the control of the Synarchy internationally, so too was the French Algerian mess of the 1950s. Until 1962, Algeria was legally part of France and was, paradoxically, and for all intents and purposes, a French province. That unnatural situation developed into an ulcer of war that had either to be cauterized, or it was going to kill the patient.

The issue was that either de Gaulle would give in to the plan of the Synarchy—whose purpose was perpetual war worldwide, and in which France would enter into a period of interminable wars throughout its African colonies, as per the script of the Martinist Saint Yves d’Alveydre—or, he would give Algeria its independence, abandon the centuries-old colonial looting of Africa, and begin a development policy for sovereign republican nation-states. The issue now before President Bush, is whether he is going to embrace or repudiate this principle of the Peace of Westphalia, established in 1648.

In September 1958, de Gaulle held a referendum on the Constitution of France’s Fifth Republic. There was a 96% approval for the new constitution. Five months later, in February 1959, de Gaulle was elected President of the Fifth Republic. He started to use the words “self-determination,” which he said was going to lead to independence, majority rule, and general welfare for a sovereign Republic of Algeria. He was right.

De Gaulle’s initiative was so powerful that it pushed the FLN to establish a Provisional Government of the Algerian Republic, the GPRA, which became the Algerian government-in-exile located in Tunis, headed by a moderate leader of the FLN, Ferhat Abbas. Abbas would later become the chairman of the National Constituent Assembly of Algeria, after independence. Tunisia and Morocco had already given their recognition to the GPRA. De Gaulle saw this “self-deter-

2. Speech made before the French National Assembly, Nov. 12, 1954.

mination” approach as the only policy that could bring peace and secure the general welfare of the people of Algeria. From the headquarters of the GPRA in Tunis, Abbas gave a public acknowledgement to President de Gaulle’s new policy, and recognized that this was the only basis for a settlement of the conflict, even though the French government had not yet recognized the GPRA as the official government.

In January 1960, a military insurgency of right-wing renegade generals and colonels of the French Army, commanding about 8,000 men out of a total of 400,000 troops (about 170,000 of whom were Muslim Algerians), started to mobilize the *pieds-noirs* (literally, “black-feet”) population of Algeria in support of a military coup against de Gaulle, and in favor of maintaining the colonial status of “Algérie Française.” The *pieds noirs* represented over a million French citizens whose families had lived in Algeria for several generations. They wished to keep their colonial heritage and maintain the native Arabs and Kabyls under French rule. The renegade officers and men were led, among others, by Gen. Raoul Salan and Gen. Jacques Massu, who became openly defiant against de Gaulle’s leadership. On Jan. 18, 1960, General Massu made a public announcement, in total opposition to the President, and said that he would “never abandon French Algeria.” On Jan. 24, De Gaulle fired him for insubordination. As a result, sedition began to grow inside the French Army.

When a revolt broke out in the capital city of Algiers, and 24 *pieds-noirs* were killed, for which the French Army was blamed, De Gaulle decided to address the nation in very stark terms. On French national television de Gaulle said: “So! My dear and old country, we are again facing a heavy ordeal. By virtue of the mandate that the people have given me, and because of the national legitimacy that I have embodied for 20 years, I ask each one of you to rally to me, and to support me regardless of what might happen.”³

During the Spring of 1960, the rebel army officers of *Algérie Française* kept challenging de Gaulle. Many of those officers had been trained, personally, by Otto Skorzeny and his Belgian synarchist associate, the rexist fascist of Mexico, Léon Degrelle, who, at the time, was living in Tangier. In France, the OAS was using the terrorist capabilities of the proto-Nazi organization of Jean-François Thiriart, “Young Europe,” under the leadership of Capt. Pierre Sargent, one of the masterminds behind the assassination attempts against de Gaulle.

On Dec. 9, 1960, President de Gaulle took a decisive step toward freeing Algeria from the colonial policy of the synarchists, and destroying the political forces that had control over *Algérie Française*. His plan to disengage France from its centuries-old colonial policy in Africa was launched

by a referendum in which the entire Algerian population was to choose between the *status quo ante* and independence.

Address to the French Nation

De Gaulle understood that he could not accomplish this important mission without the full support of the French people. And so, he called directly on French citizens to support him, in what he called the creation of an *Algerian Algeria*. On Jan. 29, 1960, he made a televised address to the people of France wherein he said: “Women and men of France, as you know, it is to me that you must answer. . . . Since the situation is really difficult, in order to succeed, I must have a national consent—in other words, a majority—which must be in proportion to the challenge. But, also, I need, yes, I *need* to know where you stand in your minds and in your hearts. That is why I am turning to you over the heads of all of the intermediaries. In truth—and who doesn’t know it—the whole thing is between each one of you and myself.”⁴

This kind of call on French citizens always was a very special moment for de Gaulle, which most political analysts have generally misinterpreted. De Gaulle needed to know if there were a light lit in the hearts of the men and women of France in times of national emergency, a light that was burning for the love of their fellow citizens and for their country. If the people did not respond to his call in a positive way, he would leave power and go back home to Colombey les Deux Eglises, and start smoking again, simply because there would no longer be any reason to stop smoking. This was de Gaulle’s way of testing the strength of the principle of the Peace of Westphalia within the population, that is, the principle of the *Advantage of the Other*.

In December 1960, President de Gaulle travelled to Algiers and made an extraordinary statement in favor of independence. He proclaimed, before hundreds of thousands of Algerians cheering him in the public plaza: “France is resolved to bring you its support and cooperation in the great task of development, which is beginning in your country. Long live Kabylia! [the name for the mountainous Berber tribes that had not converted to Islam—ed.] Long live Algeria! Long live France!”⁵ This was the beginning of the end for *Algérie Française*. Ultimately, this meant, in no uncertain terms, that the French military and police had to leave Algeria. However, that was going to be the most formidable task of his political career.

De Gaulle’s referendum on Algerian self-determination took place on Jan. 8, 1961. The results gave de Gaulle a resounding 75% “yes.” In calling the referendum, de Gaulle understood that universal suffrage represented the only means of having the people participate in saving the nation during

3. PBS television documentary: “De Gaulle and France.”

4. Jacques Lacouture, *De Gaulle, 3. Le souverain*, Edition du Seuil, Paris, 1986, p. 143.

5. PBS television documentary: “De Gaulle and France.”



Right-wing synarchist Jacques Soustelle, who became a powerful figure in de Gaulle's party and government, but was controlled by financiers outside the government, became de Gaulle's deadly enemy. Soustelle was instrumental in launching the Algerian War, simultaneous with the French military defeat at Dien Bien Phu, Vietnam, in 1954.

severe moments of crisis. A few days after the vote, de Gaulle made the following reflection: "One million votes of the communists were for the 'yes.' More than a million votes have answered 'no' at the behest of the extreme right. This was the floating mass, which is always for something different than what exists. They go to LaRocque, to Poujade, to Soustelle. [a few of the so-called right and left synarchist extremists—ed.]. . . . It is the most alive people of France who have voted 'yes'; those who believe in the future, from areas where there are many children, as opposed to the 'no', which was strongest in the departments that vegetate."⁶

The more de Gaulle called for self-determination of Algeria, the more the synarchists called this move a "dismemberment of the national territory"—that is, a dismemberment of the French Empire. They decided that the only way to deal with de Gaulle was to kill him. The synarchists were represented inside de Gaulle's government primarily by Jacques Soustelle and Georges Bidault, who were both staunch supporters of *Algérie Française*. Soustelle had been Governor-General in Algeria since January 1955. He was kicked out of government on Feb. 3, 1960 and, soon after, Bidault was forced into exile and ended up in the United States.

Later, it was discovered that both Soustelle and Bidault had pronounced the "death penalty" against de Gaulle. Jean Lacouture, a biographer of de Gaulle, reported the infamous words of their OAS associate, Antoine Argoud: "Regardless of all that has been said and written, the physical suppression

of the head of State poses no moral problem for any of us. We are all convinced, Bidault the practicing Catholic, Soustelle the liberal, as well as myself, or the *piets-noirs* of the group, that de Gaulle had a hundred times merited the supreme punishment."⁷

The Coup in Algiers

In response to the Jan. 8 referendum, and as a last-ditch effort, the colonial French military faction launched even more terrorist violence. On April 22, 1961, Generals Maurice Challe, André Zeller, Edmond Jouhaud, and Raoul Salan carried out a coup and took power in Algiers. This danger was so serious that de Gaulle ordered tanks to patrol the streets of Paris, to pre-empt a paratroopers' coup in the capital city, threatening to take over the French government buildings. This was the *punctum saliens* for Algeria as well as for the future of

France and the leadership of President de Gaulle.

On Sunday, April 23, 1961, de Gaulle went on French national television and did something that had never been done before. He resorted to Article 16 of the French Constitution, which gave him full emergency powers. De Gaulle presented himself before the nation in full military dress, stating in a dramatic and stern voice: "An insurrectional power has been established by military pronouncement. That power has an appearance. It has a reality: a quartet of retired generals and ambitious and fanatical officers. Now the nation is challenged, it has been humiliated, our position in Africa is compromised, and by whom? Alas, alas, alas, by the very men whose duty and whose honor it was, and whose reason for being it was, to serve and obey. In the name of France,

7. Jacques Lacouture, *op. cit.*, p. 272. It is important for the reader to know certain historical considerations with respect to French ideology. The real danger in French society 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 assassination, when he is considered a tyrant by a certain class of fanatical people. For them, any idea of giving up Algeria represented treason. Consequently, it was socially acceptable to have assassins walking the streets of French cities with their heads held high. This stupid tradition goes back at least to the assassination of Henry IV in 1610, 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 Thierry and Alain Bougrenet de la Tocnaye, during February-March of 1963, when they were accused of the assassination attempt against de Gaulle.

This social contract was not only encouraged by the French oligarchy, but also by the wing of the French Catholic Church known as the "rat line." For example, during the Thierry trial, a prominent Dominican priest, father Jean Ousset, stated: "It is not only a right but a duty to assassinate a tyrant."

6. PBS television documentary, *op. cit.*.

I order that all the means, I repeat, all the means be taken to block the way to these men, until we reduce them. I forbid every French citizen, and most of all, every soldier to execute any of those orders. . . . Men and women of France, think of the risk for the nation. Men and women of France, help me.”⁸

Aside from his June 18, 1940 call to resistance against the Nazis, this was the most sublime moment in the entire political life of Charles de Gaulle, as well as for France and Algeria.

De Gaulle had made the right decision and struck the right emotional chord. He was able to mobilize the entire nation with a two-minute speech. On the next day, everywhere across France, thousands of citizen brigades were formed, spontaneously, to resist the military coup and give their support to their President. Within one week, Generals Challe and Zeller were arrested, with about 200 other officers, and the Algiers rebellion was quashed. Generals Salan and Jouhaud, however, remained free and, in retaliation, created the Organization of the Secret Army, the OAS, which pursued the claims for *Algérie française* with even more violence. This time, the decision was made to launch terrorism inside France itself.

Strategy of Tension of the Secret Army

On Oct. 17, 1961, thousands of Algerians were brutally attacked by French police in Paris. The French police were not only reputed to be in favor of *Algérie française*, but both the French police and the French national security forces, the Direction of Territorial Surveillance (DST) were secretly collaborating with the OAS.

The Paris Police Chief, Maurice Papon, ran the terrorist operation personally. In 1998, Papon was found guilty by a French court of crimes against humanity, on the grounds that he had deported 1,690 Jews, including 223 children, to Nazi Germany in 1943. Papon had been the Vichy government official for Jewish Affairs in Bordeaux during the war. In October 1961, Papon worked in collaboration with SS Commando leader Otto Skorzeny, and was responsible for killing at least 200 Algerian civilians in Paris, when he ordered his police to club them to death and throw their bodies into the Seine River. This was reported as an act of reprisal for the killing of 30 policemen by the FLN, whose leadership had also been tampered with by Skorzeny during his 1953 visit to Cairo. According to Seán MacMathúna, Papon told his police that they should not hesitate to commit any atrocious act, because “they would be protected against any excessive violence.”

In his article on Papon, MacMathúna wrote: “These were not the last controversial deaths caused by police under Papon’s responsibility. Four months later, in February 1962,

Papon went too far even for French President Charles de Gaulle, when police killed five white French citizens at a Communist-led demonstration against the war in Algeria. 700,000 people marched at the funeral of the five protesters while a general strike shut down Paris. However, while the five killed in February 1962 became prominent martyrs for the Left, little was done to raise the issue of the 200 Algerians murdered by Papon’s men in October 1961.⁹

In 1999, Maurice Papon went into hiding in Switzerland. After he was discovered and arrested by Swiss authorities, he was sent back in France to serve his ten-year sentence for crimes against humanity. However, he was never tried for the 200 Algerian killings.

The French police system working under Papon is the same police-state apparatus which is, today, working in collaboration with American Attorney General John Ashcroft, with the compliance of the French Ministry of Justice.

During 1961, the OAS ran systematic terrorist actions all across France, under the Metro leadership of Pierre Sergeant, who bragged that the actions that struck simultaneously in Strasbourg, Lyon, Paris, and Bordeaux were meant to show that the OAS had enough power to force the government to its knees. Sergeant was later sent to Brazil as an “advisor” to the Condor operation, a military-intelligence counterinsurgency coordination which was part of the synarchist “dirty-war” scenario against several South American countries in the 1970s.

The Synarchy had underestimated de Gaulle’s courage, as he was more determined than ever to accelerate the timetable for Algerian self-determination, a policy that rapidly developed to his advantage. On March 18, 1962, the Evian accords were signed between the FLN and President de Gaulle, who announced on television that the ratification of the cease-fire would be effective the next morning. Then, the synarchist Beast-Men of the OAS attempted one last terror charge out of desperation. It was widely reported that the worst carnage in eight years of war occurred in that period, during which OAS terrorists set off over a hundred bombs a day during the month of March alone. They even targetted hospitals and schools.

On March 23-26, the OAS organized the insurrection of Bab-el-Oued, a neighborhood of Algiers, where 47 people were killed. On April 8, de Gaulle called for another referendum, for which he won 91% support of the French citizens in favor of the Evian Accords. That was the last blow for the OAS. The French population had never given such support to any of its leaders before.

On April 20, Gen. Raoul Salan was arrested in Algiers. Ultimately, terrorism had failed in its objectives, and the OAS and the FLN concluded a truce on June 17, 1962. On July 1,

8. PBS television documentary, *op. cit.*.

9. Sean Mac Mathuna, *Papon and the killing of 200 Algerians in Paris during 1961*. <http://www.fantompowa.net/Flame/algerians.htm>.

some 6 million out of a total of 6.5 million Algerian voters cast their ballots for independence. On July 3, 1962, Algeria proclaimed its independence.

The desperation of the Synarchy was so great that the OAS had been ordered to launch a series of assassination attempts against de Gaulle. The first attempt failed on Sept. 8, 1961; a second occurred on Aug. 22, 1962. According to William Torbitt's *Nomenclature of an Assassination Cabal*: "A French Colonel, Bastien Thierry, commanded the 1962 group of professional assassins who made the actual assassination attempt on De Gaulle. Colonel Thierry set his group of assassins up at an intersection in the suburbs of Paris in his final attempt in 1962 to kill De Gaulle. The gunmen fired more than one hundred rounds . . . but General De Gaulle, travelling in his bullet-proof car, evaded being hit, although all of his tires were shot out. The driver increased the speed and the General was saved. Colonel Bastien Thierry was arrested, tried and executed. . . . General De Gaulle's intelligence, however, traced the financing of his attempted assassination into the FBI's Permindex in Switzerland and [into] Centro Mondiale Commerciale in Rome, and he complained to both the governments of Switzerland and Italy causing Permindex to lose its charter and Centro Mondiale Commerciale to be forced to move to Johannesburg, South Africa."¹⁰

Torbitt further indicated that Permindex had been "a NATO intelligence front using remnants of Adolf Hitler's intelligence units in West Germany." Torbitt was referring to *The Spider* networks of Otto Skorzeny and of former SS intelligence Chief, Reinhard Gehlen, who were both in the employ of the Dulles brothers. It was the same Permindex apparatus that had successfully assassinated President John Kennedy.

Skorzeny and the Perpetual War Policy

"What was the motivation behind the synarchist operation in Algeria? What is the motivation of the Synarchy in Iraq today? What is their purpose, their intention? Is it greed? Is their ultimate goal to capture the raw materials of North Africa and of the rest of the world?" No satisfactory answer can be given to those questions until the reader investigates the nature of the demonic Beast-Man that Lyndon LaRouche has been prompting the readers of *EIR* to look into. It is only by investigating the profound nature of the difference between man and animal that an appropriate answer can be given to those questions. The ultimate objective of the Synarchy is nothing but the pure power of evil, and the means of achieving this aim has never been stated more clearly than by the demonic Otto Skorzeny himself. The broader historical and strategic picture will help bring this Beast-Man question more precisely into focus.

10. William Torbitt, *Nomenclature of an Assassination Cabal* <http://www.bilderberg.org/kennedy>.

The deal struck at the beginning of World War II, whereby international Synarchy prevented Hitler from annihilating the British troops of Operation *Dynamo*, during the invasion of France in June of 1940, was revived and reversed in 1945. This was done to guarantee the safe conduit of Nazi generals from Germany into the Americas, the Middle East, and Africa, with the collaboration of *Die Spinne* (The Spider) network organized and run by former Nazi SS Commando leader Otto Skorzeny.

The purpose for reviving the Nazi generals at Oberammergau was not to train so-called "special forces" against communism. That was merely a cover. The purpose was to build the world-wide revanchist power of the Synarchy International, and restore the ideology of the Roman Empire, headquartered, this time, in the United States; that is, within the only power in the world that could sustain a perpetual "two-front world war." The terrorist deployment of Sept. 11, 2001 represents merely the final phase of this synarchist attempt to take over the United States and the world.

The mind-set of today's Synarchy, and of Otto Skorzeny and the Dulles brothers who retooled him after World War II, is very simple. It is the old policy of the British Empire's own Thomas Hobbes. According to them, war is the normal state of the world; it is peace that interferes and interrupts this successful progress of affairs. Peace is merely a momentary cessation of hostilities, a moment of cease-fire. The shorter the historical periods of peace, the better the business of world domination will become.

This post-World War II Nazi arrangement was made on the basis of a multilateral agreement between the German, Switzerland, French, British, and American synarchist leadership of bankers; namely, between the former Economics Minister of Hitler, Hjalmar Schacht; Swiss banker François Genoud; André Meyer of Lazard Frères; Montagu Norman of the Bank of England; and J.P. Morgan, Harriman and the Dulles brothers in the United States; with the idea of destroying sovereign nation-states and grooming a new Roman Empire-styled generation of cold-blooded killers in preparation for perpetual world war. How was this arrangement organized?

What the American victory of Midway, in 1942, had demonstrated was that America had become the only force in the world capable of winning a two-front war; and that, as a consequence, the loser of the Western front—that is, Nazi Germany—had to make a deal. Thus, an evil agreement was arrived at between the American synarchists, the Dulles brothers, and Skorzeny in order to save what was left of the Nazi machine and prepare for wars to come. The deal had the apparent purpose of fighting communism, but in reality, was made to institutionalize on a worldwide scale, a policy of revenge, a return to the Thirty Years' War policy that destroyed Europe before the Peace of Westphalia. The pretext used by Skorzeny was that there existed no Hobbesian legal framework that could deal with the losers who were going

to be sacrificed at the altar of a human rights tribunal.

Skorzeny revealed this horrific truth when he was interviewed by the *Agence France Presse* (AFP), in Cairo on Jan. 30, 1953, shortly before the Algerian war in which he was a moving force, began. It is worth quoting the entirety of the text, as it reveals, without holding anything back, the true nature of the synarchist intention of the demonic Beast-Man. Skorzeny said:

War is inevitable, and this time, it will be truly world wide. It will unravel everywhere and there will be no limit to its battlefields. The condemnations of Nuremberg will be one of the main reasons, which will cause this war to be a conflict whose horror will be unparalleled. These condemnations gave birth, in fact, to a new conception which makes the victor a hero and the vanquished an odious criminal.

By this fact, each leader will wage war like a demon in order not to be the loser and become, consequently, a criminal. All the atrocities that can be imagined by man, will be committed during this next war, in order to prevent the enemy from acquiring victory.

What I have just said, I have repeated to the American representatives and I have warned them that all of the mothers of the entire world will one day curse America.¹¹

This “curse” of Skorzeny is no mere idle threat. This is precisely what the Synarchy International has in store for the world at this present time, unless LaRouche is in the White House in 2005. This is the policy which is being imposed on George W. Bush by his synarchist Vice-President, Dick Cheney, as of this writing.

The intention of the Algerian War policy of the international Synarchy was to destroy the French and Algerian leaders’ capacity to make decisions for the general welfare, and to weaken primarily the resolve of the President himself, to the point that his government would become run by the fear of horrendous reprisals against the French people by these terror specialists. So too, the same Synarchy International has



Nazi special forces leader Otto Skorzeny, at the center of surviving post-war Nazi networks, had veteran SS specialists training the Algerian and other Islamic guerrilla movements—but also advised the right-wing French officers’ Secret Army Organization!

targeted President George W. Bush for a similar treatment.

However, George W. Bush is so dumb that he might not even understand this Algeria paradox. The question is, therefore: Will Senator John Kerry find the resolve, and search for the love of his country in the hearts of his citizens, like De Gaulle did, and decide to debate Lyndon LaRouche on the real issues of the financial collapse and of bringing American troops out of Iraq,¹² before the American people face a situation a hundred times more difficult than the Algerian war? That is the Algeria paradox that President Bush or Senator Kerry must resolve today, by making a direct and truthful appeal to the people. The solution to the paradox is simple: “If you lose, you win!”

12. There is a statement of support by President John F. Kennedy to General De Gaulle with respect to his policy toward Algeria, which can be found in State Department Bulletin Vol. XLIV 1141 (May 15, 1961). The document, which this writer has not seen, reportedly reflects an admiration similar to that Conrad Adenauer had for De Gaulle, whom he considered the “Wiseman of the West.” Adenauer wrote: “I made the observation that de Gaulle underestimated the influence of France and his own. . . . General de Gaulle was highly regarded in the United States [where] France was loved and esteemed . . . maybe even more than in England. I had the conviction that Americans needed Europe. Kennedy’s wish was to have councils from us . . . I urged de Gaulle insistently to take advantage of all of the opportunities offered to him. The personal influence was obviously not capable of changing everything, but it could act on the orientation of world affairs.” Quoted from Jean Lacouture, *op. cit.*, p. 307.

It was President Dwight Eisenhower who stopped any attempts coming from America to destabilize de Gaulle. De Gaulle and Eisenhower had been friends during World War II.

11. Article in *Le Monde*, entitled *Les Condamnations de Nuremberg seront responsables de l’horreur de la prochaine guerre, affirme Otto Skorzeny*, AFP wire dated Cairo Jan. 30, 1953.