

[return to updates](#)

The Battle of France



Rommel and his men hunting snipe

by Miles Mathis

First published September 28, 2019

The question I asked today was “How could Germany defeat France in just five days at the start of WWII?” Is that at all believable? No. Everything we read about that makes absolutely no sense. Prime Minister of France Reynaud telephoned Churchill five days in, saying they were already beaten, and England decided to do. . . pretty much nothing. Churchill had been Prime Minister for how many days at that point? Five. Five days. Churchill was appointed Prime Minister May 10 and Germany attacked France via Belgium on May 10. Just a wacky coincidence, right? France was a country of 40 million people, but they had no more troops to send to the front? The Allies let France fall without an extended fight?

Remember, Germany won this “war” not by blitzkrieging Paris or other major French cities by air. No, it supposedly blitzkrieged by driving tanks through the mountainous and heavily forested Ardennes of Belgium. The “historians” at Wikipedia tell us the Germans won so fast by

trapping the bulk of the Allied forces in a cauldron on the Franco-Belgian border near Lille.

Really? And you believe that? You believe these German tanks drove all the way across Belgium, around the top end of the Maginot Line, over hills and rivers, and did that in less than five days? Have you ever watched a tank move? It is not a great vehicle for a blitzkrieg, since its top speed is something like 20mph. In the Ardennes, its top speed would have been about 5mph, at best. Actually, its top speed in the Ardennes would have been close to. . . zero, since tanks can't just drive through major rivers and forests. They have to use bridges, you know. The German tanks were neat and all, but they weren't submergible or amphibious. They also can't drive over entire forests. Yes, a tank can

drive over a small tree, but it can't just power through a forest of big trees. A tank has to drive around most trees. Also, that part about trapping the Allied forces in a cauldron near Lille? Why would the Allied forces all be hanging out in a small area near Lille? Are we supposed to think the cafes were just really top-notch there, or that all the officers were there drinking absinthe?


We are supposed to believe the Allies were caught off guard, and weren't prepared. But they had prepared the Maginot Line, hadn't they? The Germans had to go around that to the north, which means, logically, that line between Germany and France must have been well-defended somehow. Otherwise the mighty Germans would have just plowed right through it with their magical tanks, right? But if France and the Allies had the wherewithal to create that successful defense, how could they not have the wherewithal to defend further north? Once the German tanks left Germany and hit Luxembourg, say, why didn't the French shift their defenses north? Why didn't the Allied air forces attack the advancing German army?

As a measure of how absurd the history is here, we get the story about the French soldier committing suicide, but taking the time to write a postcard to the President of France, stating that he was brave and all, but he couldn't fight tanks with a rifle. That never happened, you can be sure. That's a made-up story if there ever was one. Do you think a soldier on the front needs to commit suicide? No, all he needs to do is run out into the field: he will be dead soon enough. And if he is going to do that, he isn't going to write a postcard to the President first.

How backward are we supposed to believe the French army was? Why not just tell us this soldier was armed with a bow and arrow? Do you really think the Allies had no tanks or other advanced weaponry? We are about five years away from the [\(fake\) atomic bomb](#) here, but we are supposed to believe France is still in the dark ages, I guess, fighting with breech-loaders or cannons. Next they will tell us the French lost because the wooden pins in their catapults had gotten eaten by termites.

Again, Reynaud's call to Churchill is highly suspicious, because by May 15, France wasn't beaten at all. Even if we believe the mainstream story, at that point Germany had only beaten parts of Belgium, so why would France think it was all over? That would be like the US surrendering because the Soviet Union had defeated Canada.

You may also want to ask yourself this nagging little question that no "real" historian ever asks: since the Germans had attacked west through Belgium and Holland both in WWI (1914) and the Franco-Prussian War (1870), why were the French and English so sure they wouldn't do it again in 1940? Why did they end the Maginot Line at Luxembourg, leaving the Belgian and Holland borders open?



Germany borders both Belgium and Holland, and some of Germany's largest cities are right there near the border, including Essen, Cologne, Bonn, Dusseldorf, Dortmund, Wiesbaden, Mainz, and Frankfurt. So why no Maginot line there? In fact, the German border north of Luxembourg is more than twice as long as the border south to Basel, so why would the Allies all but ignore that border? Because of the Ardennes, we are told. But the Ardennes blocked only about the southern quarter of that border with Germany, so the Germans could easily drive around it. You shouldn't be hearing about the Ardennes at all here, and the fact that it is mentioned so prominently is just proof this is all a lie.

If you ask this question [at Quora.com](https://www.quora.com/Why-did-the-Maginot-Line-not-extend-north-to-the-German-Dutch-border), you find this as the top ranked answer (by Joshua Millins):

The gaps were an allied neutral nation (Belgium), Then there was the seemingly impenetrable ardennes forest that was impassable to armored vehicles. Neither was thought to be of any use in another mass offensive from the east. But they discounted ingenuity and extreme aggression from the Germans.

You see the poor misdirection. First, ignore Holland. Second, call Belgium neutral, although they had been ransacked in WWI and knew they couldn't be neutral. Third, mention the Ardennes, which blocked only about ¼ of that long border. Fourth, pretend the Allies were shocked by the ingenuity of a German command that thought to stroll across a long unprotected border a few miles from their major industrial cities.

In the first paragraph in the Maginot Line page at Wikipedia, we find this:

Constructed on the French side of its borders with [Italy](#), [Switzerland](#), Germany, and [Luxembourg](#), the line did not extend to the [English Channel](#) due to the then alliance with [Belgium](#). Unfortunately when the [Second World War](#) began in the West on May 10th, 1940, [Belgium](#) had become a neutral nation in an effort along with the [Netherlands](#), to appease [Adolf Hitler](#) and his ever more aggressive [Third Reich](#).

You see why I am gagging on this? The line didn't extend north due to the alliance with Belgium?

Whose alliance are they talking about? It almost seems like they are implying a German/Belgian alliance, since that is the only way this makes any sense. If those two countries were allies, then Belgium wouldn't need a line of defense, right? But since Belgium had been chewed up by Germany in WWI and the Franco-Prussian War, it couldn't have been a German ally. In fact, it was an ally of England and France, as you would expect. Which means it *should have* built a line of defense against Germany. In fact, given the events of the previous century, it should have been far more scared of Germany than France was. Belgium should have been spending a large part of its GNP to build a Great Wall of China along that border, with huge subsidies from France and England to accomplish it. Same for Holland. Instead, we are told Belgium did almost nothing along that border, preferring to talk the Germans down with words of neutrality. Again, that makes no sense. It isn't credible, and so is just more proof this is all a lie. The very fact that Belgium, Holland, France, and England would leave that border completely open is all the proof you should ever need that this was staged from the first shot.

We are told the Germans defeated Belgium so fast due to air superiority. The *luftwaffe* allegedly destroyed Belgian resistance in less than a week, even though Belgium should have been backed up immediately by French and British air support. The question begged at this point is. . . if Germany was so superior on both land and air, why did they need to come in through Belgium? Why not fly right over the Maginot Line and attack Paris directly? Why not attack London directly on May 10? Why even bother with the stupid Belgians or Dutch? Even better, why bother building all those tanks at all? Why not spend all their money on the air force, and attack London and Paris directly with that? As soon as the Americans entered the war, Hitler should have flown to the US and firebombed New York and DC off the map. The US allegedly flew all the way to Japan just a couple of years later to complete a similar trick, so if we could fly all the way across the Pacific, don't you think Hitler could have flown across the much smaller Atlantic? So why didn't he?

Same reason Hirohito flew all the way across the Pacific, but for some reason decided to attack the nothing target of Pearl Harbor. Why not attack Los Angeles or San Francisco? When we attacked Japan, did we target some little island far off the coast? No, we allegedly attacked Tokyo and major military targets. But the Japanese were just confused, I guess. Maybe they had been told that Honolulu was the capital of the US.

But back to Europe. The Battle of Sedan began on May 12, just *two days* after the beginning of the Battle of France. We are told that by then the Germans were already closing in on Amsterdam and Rotterdam. Really? Note that they aren't telling us German planes had landed near there or something. They are telling us the German army, including tanks, were there. In Belgium the Germans were already near the Dyle river, just east of Brussels. So we are supposed to believe huge German armored divisions, including tanks, had travelled 150 miles through mountainous and wooded enemy territory in just two days?

Also remember that we are told the invading forces were divided into group A and B, with B being diversionary. Group A was the real invading force, moving south through Luxembourg and the Ardennes (which made the trip even longer, of course). Also, group A was composed of the heavier Panzer III and IV types, which were slower and less maneuverable. As such, they should have been *harder* to get through forests and over mountains and across rivers. Just so you know, there are thirty rivers in the Belgian Ardennes, and very few bridges over them that could support the traffic of 1,700 heavy tanks. So do you still believe all this happened in just two days? Even if the *luftwaffe* drove off all Allied air forces that would naturally be attacking this advance, there is still no way all these tanks could cross that area in two days.


We are told two competing stories to explain this. In the first, the French estimated it would take the German army two weeks to cross the Ardennes to the Meuse, and were just wrong by about 12.5 days. In the second, we are told General Pretelat ran some exercises in the Ardennes in 1938 with tank brigades, finding the French were not prepared for such attacks. According to Evans, the result was so bad “the wisdom of publishing it was questioned, lest it damage morale”. Again, that story sounds manufactured. It isn't believable at all. We are supposed to believe the French knew the Ardennes were easily penetrable, but didn't tell their Allies, didn't publish the information, and didn't extend the Maginot Line north to deal with it? They just left their northern flank open, because closing it would have been “bad for morale”? Who believes this stuff?

Remember, the French or Belgians wouldn't have had to fortify the entire Ardennes. All they would have to do is post a handful of people at important bridges with dynamite. They could have stalled the entire German army with nothing more than that. But they decided not to do that, because it would have been bad for morale.

You will tell me a traveling army can repair bridges on the run, which is true. But they can't repair them instantly, especially bridges that have to carry 1,700 heavy tanks. So the locals didn't need to fight German tanks with rifles. They only needed to destroy a few bridges. This is especially true regarding the Meuse. The German army should have never been able to get across the Meuse in that two-day time period, since while they were rambling through the Ardennes, the locals would have been blowing all the bridges across the Meuse. This wouldn't even require the French army to coordinate, just a few local people. So the idea the Germans would be all the way to the Dyle in two days is absurd. It is written for readers who don't know the first thing about. . . well, anything.

I will be told the Germans used pontoon bridges, but again, pontoon bridges don't put themselves up instantly. You don't just pull a cord and they inflate. You have to build them, and if you are building them on enemy territory, you are open to local fire. By their nature, they are even easier to destroy than real bridges. Amusingly, Wikipedia has a page on pontoon bridges, with sections on US, British, and Soviet bridges. Notice anything missing? No German bridges. Down the page we get a couple of pictures of German bridges during WWII, but they are from the battles of Kiev and Uman in 1941. Nothing from Belgium.

Plus, you may wish to remind yourself of a little thing called the Schlieffen Plan, by which the Germans began WWI by attacking France **from the north, through Belgium**. Yes, that was World War ONE. In the FIRST World War the Germans had done pretty much the same thing, using Belgium as a battle ground, coming in *through the Ardennes*. But we are supposed to believe that just 25 years later, the Germans snuck up on France and Belgium through the Ardennes? French generals thought the Ardennes were “impenetrable”, though the Germans had just penetrated them in 1914?



That's from the Wikipedia page on WWI. See all the red arrows going through the Ardennes? Do you still believe they don't think you are stupid?

So, as usual, we have no continuity in these war stories. They just make up stuff as they go along, with no concern for whether it makes any sense. This is what they do: they hire some writers to yap for a few hundred or thousand pages, since they no one will read it closely. Neatness doesn't count. It is a say-anything history for the logically impaired.

As more proof of that, see the Halder plan, which was pretty much the Schlieffen plan moved forward to 1940. But we are told this:

When Hitler raised objections to the plan and instead advocated for a decisive armoured breakthrough as had happened in the invasion of Poland, Halder and Brauchitsch attempted to dissuade him, arguing that while the fast-moving mechanised tactics were all well and good against a "shoddy" Eastern European army, they would not work against a first-rate military like the French.^[31]

See a little contradiction there? Even the Germans knew the French army wasn't just a group of natives with slingshots. German high command expected it to take *two years* to get into France. So how did it happen in five days? We are also told the French had 2,500 tanks on the line, which they used in the Phoney War leading up to the Battle of France. But I guess all these tanks got bogged down in the mud outside Metz? Later we are told the French armor was actually better than the German armor, even on

the tanks. But when Gouderian is racing ahead with his Panzers, that story is forgotten. The French fold up immediately.

The question of bridges being blown and stopping the German advance is supposed to be answered by the story of Fort Eben-Emael, but this is one of the stupidest of the whole war. Although the Fort was the most modern in the area and was manned by 1,200 Belgian troops, it was supposedly neutralized in a few minutes by 78 Germans in gliders:

On 10 May 1940, 78 [paratroopers](#) of the German 7th *Flieger* (later [1st Fallschirmjäger Division](#)) landed on the fortress with [DFS 230 gliders](#), armed with special high explosives to attack the fortress and its guns. Most of the fort's defenses were lightly manned and taken by complete surprise. Much of the fort's defensive armament was destroyed in a few minutes. The attackers were unable to penetrate inside the underground galleries, but the garrison was unable to dislodge them from the surface of the fort. The fortress surrendered one day later, when the paratroopers were reinforced by the German 151st Infantry Regiment. While 1,200 soldiers were authorized to be at the fort on any given day, only 650 were there, with an additional 233 troops six km away at the time of the German assault.

Does that make any sense to you? Gliders? Why not come in on chicken wings and drop eggs? In other places we are told the Belgians knew the Germans were coming. The Allies had reconnaissance just like the Germans and saw all the massing of troops near the border on May 9. And yet here, we are supposed to believe only about half the soldiers were there, with many of them on picnic or something. Plus, the numbers don't add up. If 233 were out picking flowers and eating gouda, where were the other 317? On furlough in Antwerp, fondling hookers? And why couldn't this heavily armored and manned fort dislodge a few paratroopers from the surface? A single infantry regiment shows up and the Fort surrenders, because it had some gliders land on its roof? C'mon! And even if this happened, how does that allow the entire German army and its tanks to proceed on to Brussels and beyond? This fort is way to the north, not even on the path of the main division allegedly moving through Luxembourg and the Ardennes, so its fall doesn't even address the question. These divisions still needed to get across the Meuse, and we aren't told how they did that.

Next, they admit the Allies won battles against German tanks at Hannut and Gembloux, which again doesn't explain how the Germans got to Brussels so fast. We are told the Battle of Sedan explains it all, but it doesn't. I have already asked how the Germans got to Sedan in just two days, and there is no answer to that. Once we get to Sedan, the story doesn't start making sense, either. Instead, we get this fairy tale:

The French defences at Sedan were weak and neglected. [\[25\]](#) The French had long believed that the German Army would not attack through the Sedan sector as part of their concentrated effort, and only [Brigadier General Pierre Lafontaine's French 55th Infantry Division](#), a category B division, was allocated to this sector. The [Maginot Line](#) ended 20 kilometres (12 mi) east of Sedan at La Ferté, where Fort No. 505 constituted its most westerly position. Sedan was a part of the extended Maginot Line that ran north behind the Meuse river. Between Sedan and La Ferté lay the [Stenay gap](#), which was a stretch of unprotected terrain not covered by French defences or natural obstacles. This was the reason a significant number of French generals insisted on strengthening this sector, while ignoring Sedan. [\[25\]](#)

So those stupid Allies just missed by 12 miles, ending their Maginot Line there and not considering the Germans might notice that big hole. To answer this, we are again fed the strange story that the top French generals like [Hunziger](#) didn't think the Germans would attack through the Ardennes and over the Meuse. You mean like they did in WWI? No, they wouldn't try that old trick again. Plus, note the

name of that general. No one thought that was a red flag? A German general in the French army, eh? Nothing to see there. But of course the Belgians and French could not have overlooked Sedan, *since that is where the bridge was*. The history you are fed by the mainstream sidetracks you into twenty different stories, but everything centered on that bridge. It would have been knocked out before the Germans ever arrived, and the battle would have been over the pontoon bridge the Germans would have tried to erect. This would be almost impossible for the Germans to defend, since only one Allied plane could knock it out. The *luftwaffe* wouldn't just have to keep beating the Allies, they would have to continue a total win for days on end.

Next we get this:

On 13-14 May, the Germans were vulnerable. A strong attack at this point by the French armoured units could have prevented Guderian from breaking out of the Meuse bridgeheads and changed the outcome of the campaign. However, the French commanders, already deeply schooled and versed in the rather staunchly defensively-focused broad, generalized doctrine of methodological warfare, were located far to the rear, which meant they lacked a real-time and up-to-date picture of the battle. The French forces in the area were also hindered by mistaken intelligence-reports of which suggested that German tanks had already crossed the Meuse river, several hours before when the first German tank actually crossed the Meuse river. When intelligence did filter through, it was out-of-date. This was to prove fatal, especially coupled with the case of the matter that the French generalship at large was expecting a considerably more prolonged process of initial German assault phase and overall attack effort as a whole.

More ridiculous handwaving to explain why the French failed to do what any normal person would have done. The French commanders were located to the rear, so they didn't know what was going on? I guess they lacked radios. And telescopes. Maybe they were relying on smoke signals as part of their generalized doctrine of methodological warfare. It was windy and the smoke signals got blown away. That would make as much sense as this gobbledygook about out-of-date intelligence reports "filtering through". Filtering through what? Were the French commanders swimming in a vat of brie? You should be able to tell just by the style of writing here you are being snowed. No one telling you the truth writes like this.

Here's your next clue. By May 17, one week after the start of the Battle of France, Rommel had taken 10,000 prisoners with only 36 losses. Right. Guderian was so giddy, he allegedly ignored orders to stop and continued on, planning to drive his tanks to the English channel until they ran out of fuel. That would have been smart. And of course it begs the question: since the Germans *did* race on ahead, why *didn't* they run out of fuel? In the mainstream story, these big tanks just keep racing ahead, defeating more and more of the Allied army, ignoring orders, and racing on again. But remember, they couldn't just stop at a Belgian gas station and gas up. So again, the story breaks down. The writers, in their haste to get France to collapse as soon as possible, just keep yapping, taking no care to tell a believable war story.

Again, the call from Reynaud to Churchill on May 15 is such a huge red flag it is really the only clue you need that this was all managed and faked. Of course the people involved is the other gigantic clue. I have hit Reynaud before [in my paper on Obama's Genealogy](#). They don't admit he was Jewish, though he obviously was. His father had made a fortune in the **textile industry**, so Reynaud was from textile billionaires. After banking, textiles is Jewish trade number two. Reynaud had been preceded as Prime Minister by two other Jews: Edouard Daladier and Leon Blum. At least they admit Blum was Jewish. They tell us Daladier was the son of a baker. That is the usual joke. Just add an "n" and baker becomes. . . banker. Blum came out of the SFIO, the Socialist Party, which tells us all we need

to know about him. But all these Prime Ministers were basically fronts. They want your eyes on them so that your eyes are not on the real governors. Remember, the President of France remained the same during all these Phoney Prime Ministers: his name was Albert **Lebrun**. The Phoney historians tell you the President was a weak position in this decade, but that is just to keep your eyes off Lebrun. We can tell this just by looking at Lebrun's Wiki page, which is just a stub compared to that of the other players at the time. They don't want to tell you anything about him. He has almost no personal bio and his genealogy is not available. But the strange thing is that while the Prime Ministers and Parlement are sold to us as left and Socialist in the 1930s, President Lebrun was actually far right. So he needed these fake Socialists out front to fool the people into thinking France was progressive in some way. It never was and still isn't. It was and is run by trillionaire banking interests: the Phoenician navy.

Amazingly, they give you the clue on Lebrun's Wiki page, at the bottom, where they list all the **heads of state** of France back to the year 500. That list includes Clovis, Charlemagne, Philip I, Charles V, Louis XII, Henry VI of England, Louis XIV, and Napoleon. But they want you to believe the position is "weak". How could the head of state be a weak position? It is a clue because Lebrun is closely related to all these people.

The Lebruns are heavily scrubbed online, but they have been one of the top families of Europe since the time of Charlemagne. They have been running the country from behind the scenes since time immemorial. What is amazing is how *visible* Albert Lebrun allowed himself to be here. These people normally prefer to be far more in the shadows, but this Lebrun was a peacock.



He couldn't remain invisible, because he was so in love with his own reflection. But some digging tells us who these people were. [Burke's peerage tells](#) us on the pages for surname Oranmore that Godfrey Lebrun came over to England with William the Conqueror, being of the same family as the Counts of Marche. Later, Hugh Lebrun married Isabel of Angouleme, widow of King John. Their son William of Valence was created Earl of Pembroke by Henry III. These Lebruns also went to Ireland, where they became Brownes, later Barons of Oranmore and Browne. After the Civil War, the Brownes moved to Mayo, where they built Castle Macgarrett.

If we take this information to [thepeerage.com](#), we find Hugh Lebrun was AKA Hugues de Lusignan.

This links us to Guy de Lusignan, **King of Jerusalem** in 1186, who married the daughter of Almaric I. This takes us back to the Counts of Anjou as well as Morfia of **Armenia**—which of course takes us again to the Komnenes. See [my paper on the Crusades](#) for more on this. Anyway, these lines take us directly to the Capetian kings of France as well as the Plantagenet and Tudor Kings of England. They also lead us to the Earls of Derby, since Hugh XI Lusignan's daughter married Robert de Ferrers, 6th Earl. This leads us to the Beauchamps and Willoughbys, as well as the Stanleys, who of course later became the Earls of Derby. Remember, Thomas Stanley, 1st Earl of Derby third creation, married late in life Margaret Beaufort, mother of King Henry VII (whom Stanley had put on the throne). Her mother was a Beauchamp, which links us back to the Ferrers. So it is one big family, as usual. We are told Stanley married Beaufort for her own convenience, so that should could remain at court. Absurd, since the real reason he married her is to take her lands and other wealth.

So you begin to see who these Lebruns really were, and are. They weren't just artists (see Charles Lebrun and Elisabeth Vigee Lebrun). They were hidden aristocracy. Somewhat like the Stanleys, they existed in the shadows, letting others be dukes and kings. They hid out as lower ranked peers, usually under other names. But we can tell Albert Lebrun was instrumental in the quick surrender of France to Germany in 1940, since it is he who accepted the resignation of Reynaud and “enacted/promulgated” the Constitutional Law of 10 July, 1940, establishing the regime of Vichy and appointing Philippe Petain as *de facto* dictator. Just ask yourself why a President of France or a Parlement of France would vote into law such a thing. How does a President “appoint” a dictator? Does it make any sense? No, it goes against the very definitions of words and of positions. Presidents and Parlements do not create dictators, *by definition*. This effectively destroyed the French Constitutional Laws of 1875, ending that fake Republic. Petain was empowered to create a new Constitution. But again, dictators cannot create Constitutions, by definition. Constitutions are written as a protection *against* dictators, not as recipes *for* them. We are supposed to believe Petain was really appointed by Hitler, I guess, or that Lebrun and the Parlement were just doing the bidding of Germany, with a gun to their heads. But that isn't what history tells us, is it? You would expect the occupied French government to fold, and to be replaced by a German government of some sort. That is what happened when Germany fell, you know. The Allies didn't install a puppet and have the Reichstag pretend to pass laws. No, the Donitz government was arrested and the Allied Control Council took over. But in France, nothing like that happened. Marshal of France and WWI war hero Petain was appointed dictator by Lebrun, and Parlement authorized a new constitution. Very weird. Petain the French dictator sometimes seemed like a Nazi puppet and sometimes like a patriotic Frenchman doing his best, but no one to this day can really figure it out. If he had been a Nazi puppet, why wasn't he later executed for high treason? Why did he keep his rank? Why did Truman and England support him? If he was a patriotic Frenchman doing his best, why didn't the Nazis install one of their own people? Like the rest of this, none of it makes a bit of sense. It only makes sense if we choose door number three: Vichy France wasn't being run either by Petain or by the Nazis. It was being run by trillionaire bankers who were running some project or testing some theory. They wanted France to collapse in 1940, so it did.

This story of Petain fronting Lebrun is an exact analogy of the story we were told in Italy, where King Victor Emmanuel III created Mussolini as his dictator, though of course a King doesn't need a dictator in front of him. A King already is a dictator. Emmanuel was himself a front for more powerful people in his family, hidden behind him, so we have a series of fronts here. But it was the same families in either case, since Emmanuel was a Savoy and a Habsburg, taking us back to Jerusalem and Armenia again: the Phoenician navy.

We see the fake again on Lebrun's page, where we are told Petain replaced Lebrun as head of state, although **Lebrun never actually resigned**. The dissolution of the National Assembly left no one to

accept Lebrun's resignation. So on August 9, 1944, Lebrun suddenly popped up, said he was still legally President and always had been, and acknowledged de Gaulle's leadership. Very strange, as I think you will admit. Victor Emmanuel did the same thing in Italy about the same time, popping up at the fall of Mussolini and "resuming his full constitutional powers". Droll, since kings don't have constitutional powers. Constitutions were invented to *limit* the powers of kings, not to give them powers.

According to the mainstream lists, there was no President of France from 1940 to 1947, when Auriol took the position. I suggest Lebrun was President of France the whole time, which means he ruled France from 1932 to 1947. We just saw Lebrun himself claiming he was still technically President in 1944, so why not 1947? De Gaulle was never President during that time, being titled Chairman of the Provisional Government. As usual, very strange. We will look more closely at de Gaulle below.

Why would Lebrun need to acknowledge de Gaulle's leadership? Because, as I am showing you, it was all another conjob. Even the date is a clue, since it is August 9. The date of the Tate/Manson murders as well as the date of **Nixon's resignation**. Just a coincidence, right? No, there are no coincidences of that sort.

We are told that Lebrun was captured by the Germans in 1943, but that was three years after he allegedly fled to Vizille. Since he was probably at the Chateau de Vizille (below), giving orders from there, we have to say it was nice of the Germans to let him do that.



We are told he was in Itter Castle for a couple of months as a war prisoner, but we can be sure that never happened. I bet we don't have any pictures of him there.

Pétain was always just a front for Lebrun, and that is easy to see since although Pétain was later tried for treason, he was allowed to wear his Marshal uniform at trial. Although convicted and sentenced to death, the sentence was ignored and he went to Ile d'Yeu, a resort town. Like Lebrun, he was never stripped of his rank! He died a French Field Marshal. So although we are supposed to believe Pétain

was a puppet of the Nazis, he was actually a puppet of those behind the French government, including Lebrun. He was just following French orders from the beginning, as should now be clear. His trial wasn't just a show trial, it was a completely fake Hollywood trial. But so was his whole career. Like Hitler, he was just a guy in suit reading from cue cards. You may remember Petain didn't even sign the armistice—another clue in the same direction. Hunziger signed it for him. Hunziger, the French general with a German name.

Also remember that Queen Mary, the Duke of Windsor, Truman, and Franco all asked for Petain's release. You really need to ask yourself if that fits other parts of the story. I guess we can see why Franco would speak out for Petain, since murdering dictators stick together. But why would Truman petition for Petain, or Queen Mary? Shouldn't that have conflicted with the mainstream story of Petain, or tarnished Truman and Mary? In hindsight, we can see what these petitions were all about: they confirmed the story of Petain's "incarceration". We are supposed to believe he was incarcerated by the French at Ile d'Yeu, as if he was held in chains somewhere. When the truth is he was just walking on the beach, sunning himself at the cafe, or playing golf.

Here's another bold contradiction, paraded in plain sight at Wiki:

France had spent a higher percentage of its GNP from 1918 to 1935 on its military than other great powers and the government had added a large rearmament effort in 1936.

Hmmm. So how was France beaten in a matter of days? To explain it, the next sentence mentions the hollow years in France, where population fell. [But that ended in 1919](#), twenty years earlier. By 1920 France was already back to pre-war levels, going from 31 million in 1919 to 39 million in 1920. France's population was actually very steady from 1885 to 1950, when it began climbing. So the only hollow years were 1914 to 1919. [The strange statistics come from Germany](#), which had a population of about 70 million in 1940.

← → ↻ 🏠 www.populstat.info/Europe/germanyc.htm

GERMANY

historical demographical data of the whole cou

population	year	population	year	population	year	population	year
19608,0	1700	56356,2	1900	65300,0	1930	72674,0	1960m
20409,0	1740	56870,0	1901	65420,0	1931	73300,0	1961m
21031,0	1770	57770,0	1902	65720,0	1932	73939,0	1962m
21715,0	1800	58630,0	1903	66031,6	1933	74544,0	1963m
21890,0	1805	59470,0	1904	66410,0	1934	74963,0	1964m
22110,0	1810	60641,5	1905	66870,0	1935	75647,0	1965m
23103,2	1816	61150,0	1906	67350,0	1936	76214,0	1966m
26294,0	1820	62010,0	1907	67830,0	1937	76368,0	1967m
26646,0	1828	62860,0	1908	68072,0	1938	76584,0	1968m
29520,0	1830	63720,0	1909	69622,5	1939	77134,0	1969m
28237,0	1834	64926,0	c1910	70747,0	1940	77709,0	1970m
30010,7	1837	65360,0	1911	71916,7	1941	78341,0	1971m
32828,0	1840	66150,0	1912	72620,0	1942	78740,0	1972m
33610,0	1843	66980,0	1913	71400,0	1943	78967,0	1973m
34620,0	1846	67180,0	1914	70539,0	1944	78996,0	1974m
35397,0	1850	67849,0	1915u	69677,0	1945	78697,0	1975m
33413,0	1852	67580,0	1916u	68817,0	1946	78360,0	1976m
35334,5	1858	67155,0	1917u	67956,0	1947	78184,0	1977m
37747,0	1860	64565,0	1918u	67365,0	1948m	78106,0	1978m
37804,0	1864	60324,7	c1919	68080,0	1949m	78126,0	1979u

We are told at Wiki that France had barely half the population of Germany, but someone doesn't know how to do math over there. France had 57%, which is not barely half. If we included the Benelux countries with France, we just about have a wash. But what is strange is that Germany's population *barely fell* during WWII. It was actually **steady** from 1940 to 1944, only falling from 1945 to 1948. That doesn't make any sense, given the story we are told. Given just those statistics, you would think very few people died during the war, but a lot of people emigrated *after* the war. Also, those statistics don't match the statistics we are given at Wiki, [in the tables for WWII deaths](#). Germany is listed as having over 7 million deaths there, or about 10% of its population. But the population statistics don't show that. [In the Netherlands](#), we find a steady **climb** in population both during the war and after it. That also doesn't compute. In Belgium, we find one small drop from 1940 to 1941, but that is about it. Belgium had a total drop in population of only 1.9% from 1940 to 1944, and had replaced that loss by 1946. [France had a 6.8% drop in the same period](#), but had already been losing population before the war started. From 1938 to 1940, France saw a 7.6% decline, which couldn't have been due to the war. Or, it wasn't due to casualties: it may have been due to people fleeing the upcoming war. Looks like someone knew France was going to lose and didn't want to stick around. But again, you really need to ask yourself how France lost more people (as a percentage) before the war than during it. That is another smoking gun.

Speaking of things not adding up, it is interesting to visit the Jewish Virtual Library, which tells us over 6 million Jews were killed by the Nazis in WWII. However, [if we go to their own maps](#) for Jewish populations in Europe in 1933, we find that Hitler could have killed **every single** Jew in Germany, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, France, Belgium, Netherlands, Austria, Italy, Spain, Portugal, and Romania, and still not have killed 6 million people. Also, if Germany's total population of Jews was only .8% of the total, why were they so consumed by the Jewish question? That's about the total of the Native population in the US, for comparison. You may be worried about Hispanics or Blacks or even Asians, but I doubt you are worried about Natives taking your jobs or overcoming you by their birthrates. [Hitler's only real fear of Jews was that one would take his acting job](#).

Given what I have discovered above, why has no one in France ever put forth a stab-in-the-back theory? It looks to me like France was sold out in 1940 by the usual suspects, with the war as excuse and cover—just like with Germany in WWI. So how is it that I am the first to have noticed? No one ever thought it was suspicious that France collapsed in about one month in 1940, just because the Germans drove some tanks through the Ardennes? Germany only took one month to occupy Paris, and no one found that the least bit suspicious? No one in France wondered if their own generals and leaders had sold them out, at the request of the industrialists? No one questioned the miraculous build-up of Germany, or the [absurd story of the rise of Hitler](#), or the role of England in all this? No one questioned the refusal of the US to aid France, although France had aided the US at its inception? No one remembered the old Statue of Liberty, given us by France? No one found it curious that Paris wasn't liberated until August of 1944? It took more than four years of fooling around for the world to liberate Paris? While Germany was moving east against Russia in 1941, the combined forces of France, England, the US, Sweden, Belgium, Holland, Canada, and Australia couldn't make any progress on the Western Front? We are supposed to believe Sweden (and Switzerland) just sat there while Germany occupied the rest of Europe, never wondering if they were next? The fall of Paris didn't concern them or worry them?

Again, I say none of this makes sense as long as we maintain the belief these countries were independent, run by either elected governments or by local monarchies. The World Wars only make sense once we realize all these countries had been occupied centuries earlier by the Phoenician navy,

and that their agents ran all these countries for a few international families. We already know that is true, since they admit all these countries are and always have been run by close cousins. They want you to think the wars are the result of these cousins squabbling for power, but I have shown you that isn't the case. The wars aren't about sharing power, they are about consolidating power, and hiding it. The wars are run as a cover for seizing worldwide treasuries and other treasures, including land, minerals, and even art. They are used to clear slums and rebuild cities. They are used to test weaponry and test theories of control. They are used to hide crimes.

Which brings us back to the beginning of this paper, and Churchill. Who appointed Churchill Prime Minister on May 10, 1940? That would be King George VI, who just happened to be related to royal lines in Belgium, the Netherlands, Prussia, Sweden, Denmark, Russia, Italy, Spain, and other places. If you are a yank like me, you may think the British Prime Minister is elected by Parliament, but you would be wrong. You may think the British King or Queen is now just a figurehead, but you would be wrong. That is what they want you to think, but the Prime Minister was and still is appointed by the Monarch, who is the head of state of the UK. So, as I said above, it was no accident or coincidence that Churchill was appointed Prime Minister by the King on the same day Germany began its move west. It was all coordinated, from way above the head of Hitler. Hitler was just an actor-front for those running Germany and the war. And who was that? The same family running England, the US, France, Italy, Denmark, Belgium, Spain, Sweden, Russia, etc. In other words, **the family of King George VI**. George was just a front for his family, sort of like Bill Gates or George Bush is for his: they put their dopiest scion forward, to keep you off the scent. But King George VI, unlike Hitler, was taking orders from a close relative. Some aged grandfather, High Admiral of the Phoenician Navy, was running this whole thing from some ivory tower, though I can't tell you who he was or where the tower was. These things are kept well hidden from those such as you and me. All we know is that he was from the ancient lines of Stuart/Levy/Kohen/Komnene/Stamley/Murray, or whatever respelling or restatement of that name that may exist in the shadows. As such he was some hidden great-uncle or something of King George and Albert Lebrun and Franklin Roosevelt and Victor Emmanuel and Gustav V, etc etc. He was the great spider at the center of this web, spinning all these events for maximum chaos and maximum profit—as his successor still is.

Which brings us back to de Gaulle, to finish this current paper off. Who was he?



Oh no, not another Phoenician! Note the Lennon nose and the McCartney eyes, which are a dead giveaway. Scary, really, how much he looked like Francisco Franco, but of course they too were cousins.



Franco does look a bit more Turkish, I admit. It is the Marrano blood, of course, which is just another word for Phoenician.

Anyway, de Gaulle's father was a **Jesuit** college professor who later founded his own school (which Wiki does not name). His mother was from a family of rich merchants of Lille, supposedly of the name Maillot. More research finds they were Kolbs, which is not a French name. They go back to Baden, and are related to Zollers, **Kiels**, Schofers, and Heydts. In my last update, we saw that Gwyneth Paltrow is a Kile/Kiel. Also remember Kiel Naval Base, where the mutiny that ended WWI allegedly took place.

In Lille these Kolbs were major tobacco distributors. De Gaulle's brother married a Gourdon, which no doubt links us to the Gordons, Dukes of Gordon. On his mother's side (Delannoy), de Gaulle is a Macartan, which is astonishing seeing that I just jokingly compared him to Paul McCartney. I have previously shown McCartney is from the peerage, with a previous spelling of Macartney. So if you think there is no connection between Macartan and Macartney, I don't know what to say. You may want to check your dosages. You may also want to check de Gaulle's eyes one more time:



Also remember that the Macartneys are related to the Gordons in the peerage. De Gaulle also has a Hayez in his recent ancestry, which is again not French. Probably Spanish/Marrano, compare to Salma Hayek. And another thing: given that Hitler was considered one of the most evil men in history by the late 1940s, why did people like de Gaulle, Franco, and even Englishmen like Orwell maintain that awful little mustache? Franco we might understand, but de Gaulle should have wished to look nothing like Hitler. And yet he wore that Hitler mustache. It is another clue, my friends.

Amusingly, de Gaulle's Wiki page mentions early on that his mother cried as a child when she heard of the French capitulation to the Germans at **Sedan** in 1870—reminding us that this story repeats not once but twice. The Germans didn't just come through Belgium in WWI and WWII, they also came through in the Franco-Prussian War, another 40 years earlier, making all the same stops. So the French generals who couldn't imagine Germany crossing the Meuse at Sedan must have forgotten their war history. Napoleon III was captured in the defeat at Sedan. This just indicates to me the European history writers couldn't think of anything new and just kept repeating the same story over and over.

De Gaulle's army career started with the **33rd** infantry unit, of course. They had to get that numerology in there. This reminds us he was born **November 22**, the day Kennedy allegedly died. Anyway, that unit just happened to be led by Col. Petain. In WWI we get our first ridiculous de Gaulle story:

De Gaulle's unit gained recognition for repeatedly crawling out into [no man's land](#) to listen to the conversations of the enemy in their trenches, and the information brought back was so valuable that on 18 January 1915 he received the [Croix de Guerre](#).

Right. Note the date: 1/18. Chai. Aces and eights.

The next stupid story is that he was captured, kept as a POW, and tried to escape many times. One time he tried to escape by dressing as a woman. The problem? He was 6'5", so it is doubtful anyone would mistake him for a woman.

Which tells us de Gaulle's entire military history is probably faked. He was likely too tall to meet height requirements of the time, and was simply another actor from the Families chosen to play this

part. We find many other hints of that in the history books, like here:

“Was he a great statesman or a conjuror on a huge scale, a true founding father of present day France, with lessons for the world, or a Wizard of Oz manipulating a great machine of illusions?” This is the central question posed in Jonathan Fenby’s fascinating *The General: Charles de Gaulle and the France He Saved*.

The idea that de Gaulle saved France is ridiculous on the face of it, and although Fenby tries to sell the idea de Gaulle was a great statesman, all the evidence points to the conjuror conclusion. Looking back, we can see that he—like Hitler and Mussolini and Franco—always **acted like an actor**, telling us that is probably what he was.

Like Custer, de Gaulle was never really a general. He retired from the army in 1940 as a colonel, but since he had been promoted to brevet brigadier general just prior to that, for some reason he was allowed to wear a general's uniform the rest of his life. Like the rest of this, it makes no sense.

At the start of the Vichy government, de Gaulle fled to London, where he gave radio broadcasts for the BBC. So, more acting. Here we are reminded this was the date of Churchill's “Finest Hour” speech, which again makes no sense. France had just fallen to Germany and England had done very little to prevent it, so this was far from England's finest hour. Wiki prints a portion of that speech that fits well into my argument here:

In casting up this dread balance-sheet, contemplating our dangers with a disillusioned eye, I see great reason for intense vigilance and exertion, but none whatever for panic or despair. During the first four years of the [last war](#) the [Allies](#) experienced,...nothing but disaster and disappointment, and yet at the end their morale was higher than that of the [Germans](#), who had moved from one aggressive triumph to another. During that war we repeatedly asked ourselves the question, "How are we going to win?" and no one was able ever to answer it with much precision, until at the end, quite suddenly, quite unexpectedly, our terrible foe [collapsed before us](#).

Churchill is giving us a strange outline of WWI, admitting the whole thing made no sense. How could Germany win the war for four years and then collapse for no reason—[or just because some soldiers mutinied on Halloween?](#) See my paper on the Beer Hall Putsch for more on that mystery. Of course we can ask the same about WWII: how could Germany be so dominant on land and air that they could defeat France and Poland in a matter of weeks, and yet lose the war once again? Even Churchill pretends not to understand it. This is because it is incomprehensible until you understand it was a planned fail. It was scripted. All of the 20th century was scripted, and most centuries before that.

On de Gaulle's page, we are actually told that “Liberation of the French capital was not high on the Allies' list of priorities as it had comparatively little strategic value.” Really? The capital of France had no strategic value in a war? I guess that is why Hitler made sure to capture it in the first month of the war.

After the liberation of Paris, de Gaulle returned to France and was made Chairman of the Provisional Government. How and why? We are told that when de Gaulle arrived in Paris, he was greeted as head of state by the Committee of Liberation. How and why? When he left France for England in 1940, he was a colonel, and had been appointed Under-Secretary of State for Defense. At the time, they admit Gen. Weygand objected, calling him a mere child. Petain also laughed at the appointment. We are told that on June 11 de Gaulle offered Hunziger the position of Commander-in-Chief, although Weygand currently filled that position. How did an Under-Secretary have the authority to do that? He

didn't. Reynaud refused to fire Weygand, so it was a moot question. On June 16, de Gaulle was no longer a minister at all, since Reynaud had resigned. De Gaulle was no longer a general, either, since with the armistice, the war with Germany was over. His brevet status should have ended, making him a retired colonel.

Colonel de Gaulle apparently didn't know much about the state of the war, and wasn't even privy to good information, since he soon announced on air that the French navy was to be handed over to the Germans. This was not true, but it is a curious question. Why indeed was the French fleet still independent, and why didn't we hear more about it in the previous months, especially when Germany was taking over the ports in Holland? Nonetheless, on June 28, Churchill recognized de Gaulle as head of the Free French. How and why? De Gaulle was just a colonel and there were many French generals in North Africa and elsewhere (Catroux, Giraud, or Leclerc for instance). Obviously because de Gaulle was their local BBC actor and they were in full control of him.


I will get back to the de Gaulle as head of state question, but for the next senseless story, we have to pause for the Battle of Mers-el-Kebir. This is where the British fleet attacked the French fleet near Algeria. The British claimed they were afraid the French fleet had been turned over to Germany, but shouldn't they have waited for some confirmation of that? The absolute last thing England needed was to be at war with France as well. And they had been assured the fleet had *not* gone over to the Axis. The Battle was again fishy, and it now looks like it was staged to drive a further wedge between England and France. That alliance had to fail in the early part of the war in order to explain the success of Germany. It would also create a stalemate on the Western Front so that Germany could concentrate on the Eastern Front. This would draw out a war that was moving way too fast. The men behind the curtain wanted France to fall as soon as possible, but they didn't want Germany moving on to England, occupying London just as fast, and ending the war by August with the utter defeat of the Allies. Short decisive wars are of no use to these people, you understand.

[But it should lead you to the next begged question, another one never asked or answered by the "real" historians. If Germany had just beaten France in under a month, what was keeping it from moving on England? The US wasn't in the war yet, so there were no other major Allies left standing at that point. England was just sitting there ready to be taken, but Hitler preferred to look East? I will be told England was protected by the Channel: Hitler couldn't get his magic panzers across that. With the French fleet he could have. As conqueror of France, the fleet should have been his, along with all the Dutch and Belgian (and Danish and Polish and Spanish) ships he could fill. Nothing was stopping him. If the French fleet refused to surrender, he could have just started destroying French cities until they gave the ships up. Remember, Franco offered to join Germany in 1940, so Hitler could have had those ships as well. With a little pressure from the French and Spanish fleets, he would have had the Portuguese fleet as well. The British navy was strong, but it couldn't have stood long against the combined Spanish, French, German, Danish, Polish, Belgian, and Dutch fleets. You will say Hitler didn't have enough sailors to man all those ships, but he could have hired mercenaries: retired Spanish navy men, retired Turks, Argentines, Greeks, Albanians, whatever. You will say he couldn't pay them, but he had just conquered France: he should have had access to their treasuries, along with those of Belgium and Holland and Poland. So the mainstream story is a farce. We are told the Nazis were ferocious, but they were actually acting like kittens. They did nothing you would expect them to do, instead leaving their conquered France pretty much alone, ignoring the French fleet, ignoring an offered alliance to the needed Spanish fleet, and refusing to fully use a *luftwaffe* on England that had just destroyed Belgium, Holland, and France in under a month.

You see, the British were either strong or they weren't. It can't be both ways. If their navy and air

force was too strong for Germany, then Germany would have never attacked Belgium and the Netherlands. The Brits should have been able to keep the Germans off the ports of Holland with their navy. But they didn't. They should have been able to keep Germany from racing through Belgium with their air force. But they didn't. So the speed with which Germany won in the first month should have been a signal that *both* France and England were weak. So why did Germany leave England alone? England *should* have been worried about the fall of France, for the reasons I just gave. Germany should have fattened itself on France, taking its navy, its munitions factories, its fuel, its ports, and its treasuries. But it didn't do any of that. Why? The fall of Paris should have thrown terror into Churchill and England. But it didn't. Paris was dismissed as a nothing target, of no strategic value. This is proof the war was managed.]

In Mers-el-Kebir, we are told the French had about 1,300 dead, with one battleship sunk and four others damaged. The British lost two men and six aircraft. Wow, this was really not France's year! It was said to be so bad for the French because they did not expect to be attacked and were just sitting in port. So, if true, this wasn't really a battle, it was just murder by an ally—the most cowardly thing possible. But it cannot have been true, since 1) despite being completely successful, it didn't achieve anything the British wished to achieve. It didn't come near destroying the French fleet, since it concerned only nine French ships. The French fleet was far larger than that, of course. 2) If it had been true, the huge French fleet would have retaliated. Being neither under French legal orders, nor German, they could have done what they wished, and they would have wished to punish the cowardly British. 3) Most of the deaths [1000 out of 1300] were on the *Bretagne*, and this is the picture we get of that:



OK. That's what we needed to know. So that never happened. Back to de Gaulle.

On August 7, 1940, Britain began funding the Free French. Silly, as usual. Why didn't they fund the French or the Belgians back in January, then they could have avoided all this? In August it was a bit

late to be funding the Free French. This is just indication this part of the conjob was being run out of England.

Here is where Wiki mentions the Cagoulards, which is apropos since de Gaulle obviously came from the same place. They were a fascist group funded by billionaires, including Eugene **Schueler**, head of *L'Oreal*. Again, another German posing as a Frenchman. Schueller was one of the group of crypto-Jews funding this farce from both sides. Although Schueller is sold as an anti-Semite, his granddaughter Francois Bettencourt married Jean-Pierre Meyers, a prominent Jew of that old family. We are supposed to believe his grandfather was a rabbi who died in Auschwitz. You may believe that, but I don't. Meyers has worked for L'Oreal, Nestle, Societe General, Clemene, and Tethys.

The Cagoulards didn't like the Third Republic and so staged a lot of fake terrorism to undermine it. That terrorism peaked with the invasion of Germany and the fake takeover of Paris. Wikipedia takes the time to debunk the claim de Gaulle was "surrounded by" Cagoulards, Royalists, and other right-wing extremists, which must mean it is true. We know he was surrounded by the fat Churchill, which is proof enough in that direction. Here is more proof:



That's de Gaulle with Churchill, Sikorski, and McNaughton. David Irving later claimed Churchill had Sikorski murdered, which indicates it is NOT true.*

Here is something interesting:

Churchill: He [de Gaulle] had to be rude to the British to prove to French eyes that he was not a British puppet. He certainly carried out this policy with perseverance.

Which is as much to admit it was all an act.

We also learn on de Gaulle's page of Roosevelt's plan to rule France and French Indochina as an occupied territory. He didn't abandon that plan until late in the war. This tells us much about what was really going on in France. How could anyone think the Allies would takeover France after the war? France had been beaten and occupied by Germany, not by the US or Britain. So on what grounds could the Allies take it as an occupied territory? Does that make any sense at all? Well, apparently it made sense to Roosevelt, since he knew something we don't. I suggest what he knew is that this was the plan all along. France *wasn't* beaten by Germany, it was sold out and given away by England, the US, and **by its own leaders.**

I also suggest France *was* ruled as an occupied territory after the war, and still is. But the hidden governors found they couldn't do that openly. They couldn't just waltz in and take over France as a territory of the Allies, in the way England had taken over India, for instance. They had to be very clever about it, or they would have found themselves in possession of a country of 40 million French people in constant revolt. They had to install their man de Gaulle and make everyone *think* France was independent again.

Of course they did a similar thing in Germany, with somewhat less finesse. Germany was more obviously an occupied territory for a long time, dotted with US military bases. But of course it still is. People think that because Germany doesn't speak English or trade with dollars, and has its own TV programs, it is independent. It isn't. Neither is Poland or Belgium or Holland or the rest of Europe. Russia was occupied in WWI and didn't need to be re-occupied. It just needed to be bled a bit more. The US has been occupied since its founding, and England has been occupied since 1066.

In support of my view of de Gaulle as a puppet of England, we find General Giraud of Algiers thought the same thing. Of course Giraud found he was right when this colonel de Gaulle was allowed to "squeeze him out" of the French Committee of National Liberation, de Gaulle appointing himself sole Chairman.

So when Wikipedia tells us de Gaulle was welcomed in Paris by the Committee of Liberation, they mean he was welcomed by his own reflection. Basically, de Gaulle was created and inserted by the Allies as a local front, meant to convince the French people it was being led by a Frenchman. But the truth was that France was being run by AMGOT [Allied Military Government of Occupied Territories], and the people behind AMGOT (the Phoenician navy). They manufactured some squabbles between de Gaulle and AMGOT for the papers, but that was all theater. De Gaulle even claimed he threw AMGOT out of the country. Right.

And of course de Gaulle brought the rich Jews back into the government, including Gaston Palewski, Claude Mauriac, Jacques Soustelle, and a cast of hundreds of fake Socialist intellectuals and circus performers. Palewski was a lover of Nancy Mitford, remember, linking us directly to Hitler. Her two sisters were devotees of Hitler, and her father was the Baron Redesdale. She had previously been engaged to Hamish Erskine, son of the Earl of Rosslyn (related to the FitzRoys, Dukes of Grafton). Her maternal grandfather was Thomas Gibson Bowles, publisher of the magazine *Vanity Fair*. His first wife had been a **Gordon**, which name we already saw in de Gaulle's ancestry. Mitford's uncle was

William Evans-Gordon, a pretend anti-Semite who led that fake opposition in Parliament. They pretty much admit that now, since Wikipedia admits he was a Zionist and friend of Chaim Weizmann. This is because Gordon was Jewish himself, just like his cousin Lord Byron (George Gordon).

De Gaulle also brought Jules Jeannenay back into the government, despite the fact that he had, as President of the Senate, voted for Petain and the Vichy government in 1940. So that makes no sense. De Gaulle also brought in Georges Pompidou. His picture tells you everything:



He had previously been a literary academic—so, another fake Socialist clown—but he later worked as an investment banker at Rothschild. He was hired by Guy de Rothschild personally. Strangely, Pompidou's own Wiki page doesn't mention he joined de Gaulle's government back in 1944. There we are told he didn't come in until the 1960s.

So, in conclusion. . . we have the Jews fronting themselves in the past century. They hire some kids from the Families to pretend to be Socialists, and they act as fronts for their hidden fascist fathers and grandfathers. Most times they don't even bother to pick the most Gentile-looking kids anymore, or bother to change the names, or anything. They think so little of your intelligence they present you with a guy named Cohen with a hook nose and tell you he is a poor Catholic whose father was a truck driver and whose mother was possum trapper. They tell you both parents then died young and left him with his sister who he thought was his mother, and his dog who he thought was his cat. He was then adopted by his step-turtle, where he lived in a cardboard box for seven years, until he was discovered by Senegalese missionaries going door to door. Feeling much sympathy for his wan and confused state, they paid his tuition at Columbia, where he was immediately discovered by Einstein's grand-nephew and sent to the London School of Economics on a hardship scholarship. From there he went on to own a Google subsidiary and several military sub-contractors, until he was tapped by a janitor at the Brookings Institution to be a Vice-President at GoldmanSachs. In his spare time he heavily practices philanthropy by hiding ten-thousand-dollar notes in new brassieres at Walmart and subsidizing all feminine hair removal. Although he has donated \$100 billion to the State of Israel for lawn chairs and table umbrellas, he wishes it known that he does not support US foreign policy in the Outer Hebrides. His son has questioned the Holocaust as well as Holography and his daughter is a lapsed Scientologist now lecturing on transgenderism at the Berkeley School of Dipso-psychology.

And to answer your inevitable question. . . yes, I *do* think that was a fitting wrap-up for this paper.

*Since the pilot of this plane crash miraculously escaped death and even serious injury, and many of the eleven passengers claimed dead were either not found or not positively identified, best guess is this crash was managed. Most likely *all* the deaths were faked, including those of Sikorski and his daughter. It is most suspicious that Victor Cazalet was said to be on this plane. Also, it is never explained why Sikorski was returning from the Middle East, but died in Gibraltar. Gibraltar of course is not on the way from the Middle East to Poland.