

RHETORIC.

THE NEW TREASON OF INTELLECTUALS.

Abstract. The abysmal intellectual and moral mediocrity of the university or media-political classes, in short of all those who would feel bad at being a shepherd or a deep-sea fisherman in the Maritime provinces, a herdsman in the south of our beautiful country, even a plumber.

ODE FOR THE HIGH-KNOWERS.

Half of Mankind's woe comes from the fact that, several thousand years ago, somewhere in the Middle East, peoples through their language conceived spirituality OR MYSTICISM....

-Not as a quest for meaning, hope or liberation with the concepts that go with it (distinction opposition or difference between matter and spirit, ethics, personal discipline, philanthropy, life after life, meditation, quest for the grail, practices...).

-But as a gigantic and protean law (DIN) that should govern the daily life of men with all that it implies. Obligations or prohibitions that everyone must respect day and night.

Violations or contraventions of this multitude of prohibitions when they are not followed literally.

Judgments when one or more of these laws are violated.

Convictions for the guilty.

Dismissals or acquittals for the innocent. CALLED RIGHTEOUS PERSONS.

THIS CONFUSION BETWEEN THE NUMINOUS AND THE RELIGIOUS, THEN BETWEEN THE SACREDNESS AND THE SECULAR, MAKES OUR LIFE A MISERY FOR 4000 YEARS VIA ISRAEL AND ESPECIALLY THE NEW ISRAEL THAT CHRISTIANITY AND ISLAM WANT TO BE.

The principle of our Olloutouta was given us, long time ago already, by our master to all in the domain; the great Gaelic bard, founder of the modern Free-thought, who is usually evoked under the anglicized name of John Toland. There cannot be, by definition, things contrary to Reason in Holy Scriptures really emanating from the divine one.

If there are, then it is, either error, or lies!

Either there is no mystery, or then it is in any way a divine revelation!

There is no happy medium...

We do not admit other orthodoxy that only the one of Truth because, wherever it can be in the world, must also stand, we are completely convinced of it, God's Church, and not that one of such or such a human faction ... We are consequently for showing no mercy to the error on any pretext that can be, each time we will have the possibility or occasion to expound it in its true colors.

1696. Christianity not mysterious.

1702. Vindicius Liberus. Response of John Toland to the detractors of his "Christianity not mysterious."

1704. Letters to Serena containing the origin of idolatry and reasons of heathenism, the history of the soul's immortality doctrine among the heathens, etc. (Version Baron d'Holbach, a German philosopher).

1705. The true Socinianism * as an example of fair debate on matters of theology *. To which is prefixed Indifference in disputes, recommended by a pantheist to an orthodox friend.

1709. Adeisdaemon or the man without superstition. Jewish origins.

1712. Letter against popery, and particularly against admitting the authority of the Fathers or Councils in religious controversies, by Sophia Charlotte of Prussia.

1714. Defense of the Jews, victims of the anti-Semite prejudices, and a plea for their naturalization.

1718. The destiny of Rome, of the popes, and the famous prophecy of St Malachy, archbishop of Armagh, in the thirteenth century.

Nazarenus or the Jewish, gentile, and Mahometan Christianity (version Baron d'Holbach), containing:

I. The history of the ancient gospel of Barnabas, and the modern apocryphal gospel of the Mahometans, attributed to the same apostle.

II. The original plan of Christianity occasionally explained in the history of the Nazarenus, solving at the same time various controversies about this divine (but so highly perverted) institution.

III. The relation of an Irish manuscript of the four gospels as likewise a summary of the ancient Irish Christianity and what the reality of the keldees (an order half-lay, half-religious) was, against the last two bishops of Worcester.

1720. Pantheisticon, sive formula celebrandae sodalitatis socraticae.

Tetradymus.

I. Hodegus. The pillar of cloud and fire that guided the Israelites in the wilderness was not miraculous but, as faithfully related in Exodus, a practice equally known by other nations, and in those countries, not only useful, but even necessary.

II. Clidophorus.

III. Hypatia or the history of the most beautiful, most virtuous, and most accomplished lady, who was stoned to death by the clergy of Alexandria, to gratify the pride, the emulation and even the cruelty, of Archbishop Cyril, commonly, but very undeservedly, styled Saint Cyril.

1726. Critical history of the Celtic religion, containing an account of the druids, or the priests and judges, of the vates, or the diviners and physicians, and finally of the bards, or the poets; of the ancient Britons, Irish or Scots. In plus with the story of Abaris the Hyperborean, priest of the sun. A specimen of the Armorican language (Breton, Irish, Latin, dictionary).

1726. An account of Jordano Bruno's book, about the infinity of the universe and the innumerable worlds, translated from the Italian editing.

1751. The Pantheisticon or the form of celebrating the Socratic-society. London S. Paterson. Translation of the book published in 1720.

"Druidism" is an independent review (independent of any religious or political association) and which has only one purpose: theoretical or fundamental research about what is neo-paganism. The double question, to which this review of theoretical studies tries to answer, could be summarized as follows: "What could be or what should be a current neo-druidism, modern and contemporary?"

"Druidism" is a neo-pagan review, strictly neo-pagan, and heir to all genuine (that is to say non-Christian) movements which have succeeded one another for 2000 years, the indirect heir, but the heir, nevertheless!

Regarding our reference tradition or our intellectual connection, let us underline that if the "poets" of Domnall mac Muirchertach Ua Néill still had imbas forosnai, teimn laegda and dichetal do chennaib, in their repertory (cf. the conclusion of the tale of the plunder of the castle of Maelmilsothach, of Urard Mac Coise, a poet who died in the 11th century), they may have been Christians for several generations. It is true that these practices (imbas forosnai, teimn ...) were formally forbidden by the Church, but who knows, there may have been accommodations similar to those of astrologers or alchemists in the Middle Ages.

Anyway our "Druidism" is also a will; the will to get closer, at the maximum, to ancient druidism, such as it was (scientifically speaking). The will also to modernize this druidism, a total return to ancient druidism being excluded (it would be anyway impossible).

Examples of modernization of this pagan druidism.

— Giving up to lay associations of the cultural side (medicine, poetry, mathematics, etc.). Principle of separation of Church and State.

— Specialization on the contrary, in Celtic, or pagan in general, spirituality history of religion, philosophy and metapsychics (known today as parapsychology).

— Use in some cases of the current vocabulary (Church, religion, baptism, and so on).

A golden mean, of course, is to be found between a total return to ancient druidism (fundamentalism) and a too revolutionary radical modernization (no longer sagum).

The Celtic PAA (pantheistic agnostic atheist) having agreed to be the defense lawyer of ancient Celtic paganism and to sign jointly this small library *, of which he is only the collector, druid Hesunertus (Peter DeLaCrau), does not consider himself as the author of this collective work. But as the spokesperson for the team which composed it. For other sources of this essay on druidism, see the thanks in the bibliography.

* Socinians, since that's how they were named later, wished more than all to restore the true Christianity that teaches the Bible. They considered that the Reformation had made disappear only a part of corruption and formalism, present in the Churches, while leaving intact the bad substance: non-biblical teachings (that is very questionable in fact).

** This little camminus is nevertheless important for young people ... from 7 to 77 years old! Mantalon siron esi.

1) Do ratath tra do Mael Milsothach iartain cech ni dobrethaigsid suide sin etir ecnaide 7 fileda 7 brithemna la taeb ogaisic a crech 7 is amlaidsin ro ordaigset do tabairt a cach ollamain ina einech 7 ina sa[ru]gad acht cotissad de imus forosnad [di]chetal do chollaib cend 7 tenm laida .i. comenclainn fri rig Temrach do acht co ti de intreide sin FINIT.

druiden36lessons.com
<https://druiden36lessons.com>
<https://www.druiden36lessons.com>

INTRODUCTION.

In all the societies, it is noted that the individuals have very unequal powers, rights and standards of living and different tasks. It is there the fundamental phenomenon of the division of labor.

The ruling classes practice determined functions, in virtue of prejudices or of habits having force of law. The fact of belonging to be a member of the ruling classes is often only the result of the chances of the birth, of the favor 1) or of the seniority 2). What they represent or what they have is more important than what they are. The role and the powers that the function confers are more important than the man, more important than the human qualities 3).

The elite, on the contrary, does not practice a function de jure, its situation is a state de facto. It consists in the fact that certain people have capacities or aptitudes without equal, and that they improved them or increased them by appropriate work. To be a member of an elite, it is at the same time the result of natural gifts and efforts. The capacities as well as the works contribute to it.

The elite does not exercise a power, it profits only from a reputation. In addition, the elite is not treated on a hierarchical basis.

Its number is not limited. It comprises the most remarkable persons in all the professions and specialties. The reputation of the members of an elite increases generally with the difficulty of each trade, each art or each science. It is more difficult to be a great artist, a great scientist, or a great philosopher, than a great plowman 4).

In short, the elites comprise the men who invent, discover, and create. They exercise the poetic function.

Prestige or fear 5) on the other hand are attached to the members of the ruling classes. According to the times and the fashions, the historical episodes and the forms of political organization, the first place and the major authority belong to priestly hierarchy, courtiers, military chiefs, civil servants, investors, police officers... 6) The ruling classes are those who manage, who controls or who have. They use men and goods.

The reputation is the reaction which is developed around the elites. It also varies according to fashion and social environments. Very often, this reputation is developed only tardily, after death, and is attached only to works. The ruling classes leave after them memories and episodes, the elites leave works.

The Saint-Simonian School, which studied much the problem of elites in France, had summarized the difference between elite and ruling class in a famous apologue which brought legal proceedings to Saint-Simon. He compared the loss which would result from the sudden death of a dozen high-ranking persons, for the nation, with that it would undergo by losing its principal scientists. The Saint-Simonians wanted to show in this way that as the civilization develops, the role of the elites becomes more important than that of the ruling classes 7). It is therefore necessary, they esteemed, to make them coincide, or at least to put them in close contact" (Gaston Bouthoul. Treatise of sociology II. Fourth part).

COMMENTARY OF PETER DELACRAU.

1. Or of the lack of even elementary scruples and altruism, we will add. The means of progressing in the hierarchical order in reality did not change for millennia: systematic courting of the superiors (vulgarly called crawling) systematic and permanent denigration of the others, sabotage of their achievements, systematic overestimation, on the other hand, of one's own work, conformism, etc.

2. It is frequent, but is not obliged, that seniority goes with experience. It is extremely possible to be old, but stripped of any experience. The case must be rare, but possible. On the other hand, it is by definition impossible to be very young and equipped at the same time with a great experience.

3. Than the man or than the woman, of course. Female human beings have nothing to be ashamed of in comparison to the baseness of the males in this field.

4. Let us not disparage manual work. To plow well (i.e., to trace a perfectly rectilinear furrow) is not so easy than that, the contests of tilling show it. There do not exist stupid trades, there exists only stupid people. There is more true nobility to fish or to make oranges grow even to make shoes (in short to be a producer of wealth); than to spend one's time misleading others in order to live at their expense, i.e., being an executive or a divorced wife.

5. And money, of course, standard of living, swimming pools, private planes, good tracks for the children...

6. The new master race in our society of today is that of the executives. What characterizes it is neither the instruction nor the intelligence (though it is not completely deprived from it), but the lack of scruples and of humanism, even the lack of courage. They are persons in charge who take no responsibility. Or in any case, who never assumes them. They are, on the other hand, remarkable underlings, that is undeniable, and they can do very well to their subordinates, what they do not want people to do unto themselves. The most obvious case was that of the French firm of the beginning of the 21st century called "La Poste" (and the confusing intellectual or moral mediocrity of its executives, more worried by their career than by the interest of the nation).

7. We express nevertheless the strongest possible reservations in connection with some of the examples proposed by the parable of Saint-Simon worked out in 1819; which seems to us at times more falling under the social hierarchical order than under a true elite (its 50 bankers, its 50 ironmasters, its 200 traders).

THE RHETORIC.

The rhetoric is the art of presenting the ideas in the most persuasive way by resorting for that to various processes.

To argue in this case it is to use the most effective strategy, most skillful for...

- To make known one's position, one's thesis.
- To make it admitted by a reader or an audience.
- To shake opponents, to make an adversary doubt, to make the undecided ones turn.
- To contradict an opposed thesis, to criticize contrary or distant position.
- To show with rigor, order and progression.
- To emphasize oneself.
- To serve a cause, a party, a faith...
- To mark the minds by some effects of logic, presentation, perspective, oratorical processes...

All these isolated or combined purposes give rise to a variety of forms and tones which make each argumentation very original and resorting sometimes to processes difficult to distinguish.

Since it is a double-edged sword, it is therefore important to warn our readers against the diverting of its use in the media.

The emotional vocabulary contributes to moving the reader, the choice of the words is therefore fundamental.

Choice of the vocabulary: the choice of such word rather than such other influence necessarily the journalist in first therefore the reader the listener or the viewer then. So it is essential to be vigilant as for the selected vocabulary. The words are not always neutral and it is enough to use a meliorative or, on the contrary, pejorative term, to draw attention.

The euphemism: (gr. euphemismos, use of a favorable word) is for example the softening of an expression considered too crude, too shocking. By euphemism, some people say "to be no longer young," instead of "to be old" or "he left us" for "he died." Or "marriage for all" instead of "homosexual marriage."

The irony is a *reductio ad absurdum*, which tries to allure the reader by a call for his intelligence. Indeed the reader must understand that he has to distance himself from the rough formulation and that he must reverse the assertions of the author. It is a subtle, fascinating, game, but which can produce an effect contrary to the one which is expected if the reader accepts all at face value. Case of certain anti-racists.

Irony is an essential weapon of the argumentative strategy because it makes the receiver accomplice, because it forces him to traverse half of the way in the agreement with the thesis. The opinion of certain speakers is dissimulated indeed behind a strictly opposite formulation; so the reader/listener must be attentive and react to the clues which indicate it to him.

- An absurd logic : it consists in connecting a given cause and a consequence without links with it. The marked nonsense of this relation hurt the reader.
- The caricature pushed up to the cynicism: the reader is informed by the enormity of the remark or its frankly vile nature.

When the argumentative speech calls on the feelings or the emotions of the recipient, it seeks to persuade.

It is then for the speaker a question of exploiting common values and cultural reference marks. Every argumentation brings into play, in an explicit or implicit way, a system of thought.

Thus the defense of a thesis will be based it on universal principles or at least theoretically shared by the majority: the Truth, the right to pursue happiness, the equity, the sincerity... or on the values admitted by a given social group: honor, courage, probity, work, patriotism...

Rhetoric is also based on common cultural references which give rise to a complicity favorable to adherence: play on words, flashes of wit, intertextuality, connotations, shift, allusions...

The speech will be done at the same time expressive and impressive, it will try to convey strong emotions, to impress the recipient to act on him.

The speaker must involve his recipients, to make them considering that his thesis is also theirs, that they share the same fights and the same interests.

He is thus led to often use the "thou" or "you," sometimes the "we" which create a community of interest. The speaker calls them as witness by means of oratorical interrogations to which he does not expect true answers. These rhetorical questions or false questions are simply intended to liven up the speech and to vary the mode of the assertion.

The speaker must cause a phenomenon of identification with his views. The sought adherence is more visceral than thought out. Gustave Le Bon showed it. The speaker is strongly involved in his statement, he develops his judgments by the recourse to meliorative or pejorative terms, to adverbs of intensity, to images which hurt or make us dream. He generally takes a chance on primary reactions: joy, fear, sadness or anger...

To persuade his reader or his audience, the speaker will exploit the strong emotions that are indignation or enthusiasm. He can stir the pity for the victims, the indignation in front of the unacceptable one, the revolt against the injustice. This kind of speech resorts frequently to the pathetic register.

This will to persuade at all costs can, of course, sink into the manipulation : the speaker seeks to get the control of his audience by throwing it into a panic (by exploiting its atavistic fears, its reflexes of exclusion, of mobilization against the common enemy: racism extreme right-wing, Fascism...) or on the contrary by flattering it, by making thoughtless promises, by caricaturing...

Examples the alternative: white or black, your money or your life, pack your bags or go home in a coffin. The call to the higher values. The importance of the selected point of view. "The use of the tobacco is not dangerous only for the consumer, but for all those who are poisoned passively in his entourage. To stop smoking in a public place is therefore not only a question of good manners, but even more of good citizenship and public health."

Main rhetorical figures.

The calling to witness. Research of the agreement of the recipient. "Do you see other means that the prohibition of the publicity for the cigarette brands?"

The reification (treatment of an abstract concept as if it were a concrete object): "There is no democracy in this country, it would be necessary to export in it a little of ours ."

The metonymy. A very frequent figure, because it makes possible a short and gripping expression.

The metonymy or synecdoche consists for example in replacing a proper noun or a common noun by another with which it is associated, by an implied logical link: the cause for the effect, the container for the contents, the artist for his work, the city for its inhabitants, the localization for the institution which is installed there (Washington example for America, Paris for France)... "Paris is cold Paris is hungry." In this line of verse, Paris does not indicate the city which, in itself, cannot suffer from cold or hunger, but the whole of its inhabitants.

The hasty generalization (also called "hasty conclusion"). Sophisms whose premises do not justify the conclusion. .

$A = B$ and since $B = C$ therefore $A = C$.

When A is not strictly equal to B .

Even that B is not either strictly equal to C .

An example of hasty generalization starting from one or two examples: "The French are trilingual: yes, I met a French who spoke three languages."

The sample size is too small, too not very important, to be able to support a general conclusion. This fallacious argument is often found in the partisans and salesmen of pseudo-medicines where the number of "guinea pigs" is ridiculous to be able to draw a conclusion from it .

The hasty generalization is a sophism by which one claims to demonstrate a universal proposition starting from particular cases.

Example:

- When I was in Paris, a French stole me my wallet, all the French men are thieves!

- My father and my mother say that the herb tea containing goose excrement is excellent for the headaches. This herb tea is therefore effective against the migraines.

-The civil servants are lazy people. My brother-in-law is a civil servant, and he never does something.
-The politicians all are corrupted: look at X, Y, Z.

-The reasoning of the type "No true Scotsman...." or the art always to be right. A category of sophisms thus named according to a work by Antony Flew. The reasoning of the type "No true Scotsman" is a fallacious rhetorical process used to reaffirm a generalization which, however, was refuted, by denying the validity of the counterexample. It affirms that the counterexample given is invalid because it does not belong really to the category that you tried to generalize. That can be limited to the only counterexample in question, in what case the argument is not necessarily incorrect: it is possible that the counterexample is not valid indeed. But in more extreme cases the process can be used to dismiss any imaginable counterexample automatically.

The process is fallacious because it modifies arbitrarily the definition of the terms of the statement. The word "true" and its equivalents involve that the membership in the mentioned category is judged according to criteria or a definition which are not clarified. In the best of the cases, there is confusion between the interlocutors about the definition of the terms. If they were clarified, it would become evident that the statement is a tautology or a self-evident truth teaching nothing on nothing.

"All the Scotsmen are red-headed. "

"My uncle Angus, who is Scot, is not red-headed. "

"Ah yes, but all true Scotsmen are red-headed. "

The implied definition is that a "true Scotsman" is (at least) a Scot who is red-headed.

Other fallacious arguments usually used in politics and in the media.

Ad personam arguments or attacks. Not to mix up with the argument ad hominem. The argumentum ad personam targets the person himself and not the coherence of his remarks. They are generally insults. Corresponds to the 38th and last stratagem listed by Schopenhauer in his book about the art of controversy.

The arguments ad hominem circumstantiae, ad hominem tu quoque.

The argumentum ad hominem strays from the merely objective object to stick to what the adversary said or conceded about, whereas in the ad personam attack you abandon the object completely and you direct your attacks on the person of the adversary. This kind of argument is expressed against the very person who supports a thesis, and not against the thesis itself.

On the other hand, an argument ad hominem is not always a personal attack, as the following example shows it: "John claims that a man can kill in anger, but it is not possible: he never loses his coolness."

The argument ad hominem such as it was defined is a sophism only if it is used to show the falseness of the presented proposition. On the other hand, it is a tool used daily advisedly if it is used to judge the credibility of this proposition. It is, of course, difficult to distinguish these two uses.

Let us suppose that a judge has in front of him two witnesses.

The first (having no conviction in the past) affirms A.

The second (without criminal records) affirms B, incompatible with A.

In the absence of irrefutable evidence in a direction or the other (what is the most frequent case), who this judge will believe? Probably the second one.

It is necessary nevertheless to use with prudence this kind of argument.

The argument ad hominem is a strategy which consists in opposing to an adversary his own words or his own acts. It is a question of showing the contradiction between the remarks and the wrongdoings.

It is the highlighting of the "Do what I say and not what I do."

An argument ad hominem is built according to the following diagram.

So-and-so defends such position.

However So-and-so is not credible (for reasons relating to his words, to his acts).

Therefore this position is false.

The arguments ad hominem circumstantiæ are therefore those consisting in highlighting the facts relating to the past or the convictions of a person in order to discredit his point of view. They often consists in affirming that the personality of the speaker biases the argument: "John is wrong when he claims that God does not exist because he is a former prisoner ."

The argument of the Tu quoque or of the moral disqualification.

Tu quoque means in Latin "you too." It is a question of throwing the opprobrium on the very person of the opponent because of things that he did or said in the past, by revealing an inconsistency of his acts or former propositions with the arguments he defends:

"Hannah Arendt is not a philosopher to whom we can refer because she had a relation with a Nazi: Martin Heidegger."

"This lecturer preaches the individual mobilization to fight against the climate warming but he came by car in the conference ."

"You love the dogs? Hey, like this bastard of Hitler! That should not be a chance. "

A type of reasoning also called *Reductio ad Hitlerum* or Godwin's law.

Reductio ad Hitlerum is an ironic expression indicating, in the form of a Latin phrase, the rhetorical process consisting in disqualifying the arguments of an adversary by associating them to Adolf Hitler or to any other despised character of the past. More generally, the process consists in comparing the opponent or his arguments to hated ideas, philosophies, ideologies, for example by calling them Nazis Socialist or Fascists.

This rhetorical tactic aims at excluding the adversary from the polemical field by avoiding the debate on the content. With other rhetorical techniques, like the argumentation *ad hominem*, the *reductio ad Hitlerum* appears generally when the adversaries have exhausted all the rational evidence and arguments.

The expression appeared for the first time in 1951 in an article of the philosopher Leo Strauss. It was re-used later by the philosopher specialist in Shoah George Steiner. It found its outcome with the "Godwin's law," which states that "As an online discussion grows longer, the probability of a comparison involving Nazism or Hitler approaches 1."

Politicians and media misuse this kind of argument, and therefore contribute to lowering the debate by conflating the ideas and the persons. It is indeed vicious to conflate the veracity of a position and the integrity of a person. In a lawsuit, on the other hand, the revelation of contradictions behind which a defendant takes refuge to refuse his responsibility or to claim he is right, can appear useful for the discernment of the truth. The argument *ad hominem* relates then on an explanation of the motives and not on the validity of the content of the pled thing. In the same way, an argument *ad hominem* is not always a personal attack, when it is restricted to refer to the particular situation of a person (legal rights, moral authority...).

The attack in question can relate to multiple elements of the person as his character, his nationality, his relation with the subject in question or his religion.

Example:

- You are not qualified to discuss with me about this subject because you are a little too young.
- You don't practice the traditional medicine therefore you are not qualified to speak about it.
- You never took homeopathic medicines; therefore you are not in a situation to speak about it in a critical way.

The argument *ad hominem*, or *ex concessis*, is the 16th stratagem listed by Arthur Schopenhauer in his opuscule *the art of controversy*: "When your opponent makes a proposition, you must try to see whether it is not in some way — if needs be, only apparently — inconsistent with some other proposition which he has made or admitted, or with the principles of a school or sect which he has commended and approved, or with the actions of those who support the sect, or else of those who give it only an apparent and spurious support, or with his own actions or want of action. For example, should he defend suicide, you may at once exclaim, "Why don't you hang yourself?" Should he maintain that Berlin is an unpleasant place to live in, you may say, "Why don't you leave by the first train?"

An argument *ad hominem* is a priori valid, putting the opponent in front of a contradiction between his acts and his words, on the one hand, and his argumentation, on the other hand.

But to distinguish it from the illegitimate personal attack, Schopenhauer calls *ad personam* attacks those which relate directly to the adversary as a person, and not to the coherence of his thesis or the compliance of his words with his acts.

-*Argumentum ad odium*. The use of a caricature of the argument which you want to counter, or "straw man" (reference to a mannequin of training to fight, "weakened" version of the adversary, and not in the meaning "a manipulated person" or person behind whom somebody hides). It is the making odious or unacceptable the arguments of the opponent through a presentation with pejorative connotations).

One of the easiest processes of rhetoric as old as the hills consists indeed in attributing to one's adversary an idea which is not or which is no longer his (see that he never had), or who is well his but by caricaturing it, and therefore in winning the listeners viewers automatically.

Rhetorical process also known as of the scarecrow which consists therefore in formulating an easily refutable argument then to allocate it to one's opponent).

This logical "mistake" takes place when, either it is voluntary or not, a person tackles an argument different from what his opponent presented. The original argument is distorted, exaggerated or simplified and is replaced by another different, often weaker and easier to be discussed. "You do not want to develop this construction program of aircraft carriers, I do not understand why you want to leave our country without defense ." (The proposition "I am against the construction of an aircraft carrier" was diverted in "I am against the defense of my country," argument much easier to invalidate.)

Many people use this "technique" with an aim of thwarting their opponent and of making him considered as an idiot or in order to take him in fault.

Another example:

-the evolutionists say that the life on Earth appeared by chance. Nonsense! How a human being or an elephant could appear in this way?

- Call for the ridicule one (ridiculing the arguments of the opponent to make them more easily refutable): "If the theory of evolution were true, that would mean then that my grandfather is a gorilla."

-The excessive comparison. The combination of facts without direct links (conflation).

- The argument of ignorance, or argumentum ad ignorantiam (to affirm that a proposition is necessarily true because nothing proves that it is false or conversely that it is false because nothing proves that it is true). "I cannot explain what this witness saw in the sky; therefore that must be an alien spaceship visiting our planet." "I cannot explain how the life appeared on earth, therefore it is surely God who made it."

This mistake occurs when it is supposed that because it was not proved that something is false, it is inevitably true. Conversely, such an argument could suppose that as long as it is not proved that something is true, it is obligatorily false.

This rhetorical process is therefore used when somebody makes a statement from something he is unaware of, while then requiring of his adversary that he explains it (reverse of the burden of proof).

Example:

- The object that I saw in the sky was not a plane, neither a sounding balloon, nor a helicopter, it can be only a spaceship. If you do not believe me, well, explain to me what it was!

- After having drunk diluted urine from an ostrich, my cold disappeared, and I did not take something other, if you do not believe in the effectiveness of this remedy so explain to me how I could be cured.

This rhetorical process is often found among the upholders of paranormal, occult and supernatural, as among the believers.

Example.

- Since nobody was able to prove that the UFOs do not exist, they have to exist.

- I believe in God, and if you do not believe in him, then prove to me that he does not exist.

This kind of reasoning is, of course, fallacious because the person who affirms is precisely that one who must provide the proof, the pieces of evidence, supporting one's assertion. The person who doubts does not have to explain something, more still, it is even sometimes impossible for him to give an explanation as long as he did not see himself the phenomenon.

But attention: this case of sophisms should not be mixed with an invalidation of the technique of the reductio ad absurdum. Here, so that it is not a sophism, it would have to be shown that the proposition "God does not exist" is absurd. However, if the person to whom it is asked to show that God does not exist, does not succeed in it, you demonstrate nothing. Because the absence of a demonstration that God does not exist, is only a mandatory condition, but not a sufficient condition of the reductio ad absurdum. More simply: not to be able to demonstrate that God does not exist is not a demonstration that "God does not exist" is an absurd proposition.

A short flashback in history shows how much this kind of reasoning is erroneous. Before the epilepsy is known and is explained, people of the time believed that the epileptics were victims of a diabolic possession. It is easy to imagine a debate between a skeptical person and a believer of the time: The skeptic: "I don't believe in the diabolical possessions, there is no proof of that. Moreover, there exists no proof of the existence of the devil."

The believer: "But if you do not believe in it, well prove therefore that the attacks of epilepsy are not caused by a diabolical possession."

What the unhappy skeptic of the time was, of course, unable to do considering the state of the medical science at the time.

Nowadays we know what causes the epileptic seizure, efficient ways of treatment exist, and that it is not a possession.

Where there does not exist explanation for a given phenomenon, the only thing that we may say, and most reasonable, is: "We do not know yet." A lack of proof is not a proof.

- The argument from authority or Argumentum ad verecundiam (as well as the call for the proverbs and the "folk wisdom"). Schematically summarized, very schematically summarized: "The chief is always right."

It is referred to a recognized and expert political, moral, scientific, authority. For example: To smoke is dangerous for health, it is what the report about health written by the professor So-and-So shows us ...

The mistake consists in supposing that something is true because an authority says that it is true. It can be a political, religious, or scientific, etc. authority.

The mistake is common when the authority is not qualified on the discussed subject, or when this one is not recognized and is not accepted by his peers. In the field of science, this mistake is frequently found. There exist high level scientists whose theories are not accepted by their peers. They refuse to present the data which could support and confirm their declarations, and in spite of that, many people take into account their word and their position of scientist as proof of the veracity of their declarations.

In certain cases, however, the only word of an authority can indeed be taken seriously, more especially if this authority is recognized by the majority of its peers as being qualified in the field in question. But at the end, only the arguments mean. Even authorities can make mistakes.

When Jimmy Carter was not yet president, he saw lights in the sky and announced to have seen UFOs. Later when he reached the rank of world authority as a president of the USA, his only word, added to the fact that he was regarded as somebody clear-headed and moral, was enough for the fans to UFOs to confirm their belief saying that the aliens had come to visit the Earth. Would his status of the president of the USA, his qualifications and his honesty have suddenly made him an expert in the identification of lights in the sky?

We can also consider that there is a misuse of an argument from authority in the case of the remarks of a victim of a train accident about the policy to have as regards public transport, which will not carry greater weight than that of another fellow; or of the position of a famous singer/actor about his political options and his preferred candidate, which will not be an authority more than yours.

- The call for humility is another form of the argument from authority. The call for humility consists in validating the argument from authority by the simple fact that the opponent is ridiculous or unimportant, compared with the authority called as a witness.

Example: Kepler said that to reject astrology without knowing it is madness with three dimensions. It is not Mr. Smith who said that, it was Kepler!

- Argument by the faith: "It is inevitably true, since it is written in such or such a sacred book (Bible, Quran....)"

-The begging the question (petitio principii). The begging the question is a false demonstration, where one claims to demonstrate the reality of a thing whereas in fact one already supposed it originally (without saying it). Example: "It is enough to look at a roasted chicken to see that a chicken is not a living being" (indeed, once cooked ...); very useful in politics: "it is enough to open the legal/tax/medical /etc. archives to see that they (to put here an unspecified group) are some litigants/rich/sick/etc. persons" (check the appropriate box). The petitio principii is only the exploitation

of a bias of selection; on the other hand, it does not involve a circular reasoning: it is not because the chicken died that it is ipso facto roasted.

Less obvious.

-The Bible is the proof that God exists, and the Bible cannot lie nor to be mistaken because it is the word of God.

- If you criticize the veracity and the divine inspiration of the Bible it is that you are incited by the devil to make it because it is the Bible which says it and the Bible is the book of God.

-The tautology or circular reasoning (undemonstrable postulate).

A rhetorical process or stylistic mistake (pleonasm) consisting in repeating an already expressed idea, either in identical terms. Example: to predict in advance.

The tautology can be only a figure of speech connected with a redundancy or an emphasis.

But a tautology, because it is true, can also be used to make pass false ideas, by benefitting from the impression of truth and of obviousness that it releases.

The circular definition brings nothing more to the debate, it is a definition which contains the term which must be defined like being part itself of the definition.

Example: "A book is regarded as pornographic if and only if it contains pornography."

Admittedly admittedly, but what's pornography?

Examples of tautologies: "Fifteen minutes before his death he was still alive!" (French lapalissade).

Many of our readers know the problem of the negative hasty generalizations, generally illustrated by the famous anecdote of the English landing in Calais and who, seeing a red-headed Frenchwoman passing in front of him, notes carefully in his diary: Frenchwomen are red-headed."

The problem of the POSITIVE hasty generalizations is generally less known.

It comes most of the time from the fact that, the media-political class which controls our opinions being so poor, it believes relevant to adopt the opposite view of the negative hasty generalizations systematically.

But the positive hasty generalization is quite as dangerous because it can result in underestimating the seriousness of certain dangers. It is not indeed because there is (were) deeply human members of the Nazi Party who helped the Jews, like Schindler, that the Nazis had this moral fiber. In fact, you must be able to see the forest for the trees. If not we manage from there to treat the symptoms rather than the causes.

-The removal of relevant data (lie by omission).

- The focused choice of the examples.

It is a bad use of the statistics to support an assertion. It occurs only when the cases supporting the assertion are kept in the statistics, and those which refute it rejected or forgotten.

This mistake is often found among those who believe in the premonitory dreams or in the "signs." This mistake of reasoning is also frequently found in the trial and error technique, a specialty of the famous Patrick Jane in the television series the mentalist. The "failures" are statistically much more numerous than the "successes," but the person who is a customer of a session of clairvoyance for example, is so involved emotionally that she will remember only the successes (which are often not so exact than that, but only approximate), and will forget the many slips, ending up in believing that the clairvoyant has really psychic powers.

-The mixing up between chronological succession and relation of cause and effect (post hoc ergo propter hoc). Or reverse of the cause and effect. Non causa pro causa. The mistake consists in believing that because a phenomenon A took place before the phenomenon B (or that B took place after A) therefore A is the cause of B (or that B is the consequence of A). This reasoning remains erroneous as long as the causal relationship was not rigorously studied, documented and understood.

Example:

-the earthquake struck the town just after we broke a 10-year-old record of temperature; therefore heat is to be an important starting factor of the earthquakes.

- After having a drink of macerated toad slime, my cold disappeared, the toad slime is therefore very effective against the cold.

- Argumentum ad consequentiam (Call for the terror: "If you keep your point of view, there will be terrible consequences"). Known also as slippery slope or domino effect. This rhetorical trick consists in declaring a proposition unacceptable by maintaining that some (often bad or disastrous) unavoidable

consequences will follow, without for all that arguing about this “inevitability.” It is an inappropriate and illegitimate use of the phrases “if... therefore...” and “if... so...”.

Examples:

- If we legalize the divorce, then the fundamental unit of the society, that are the couple and the marriage, will explode, chaos and anarchy will prevail then everywhere in the world, and it will be the end of the civilization.
- If the religious symbols are banished from schools and administrations, then freedom of worship itself will be touched and it will be the end of the democracy in this country.
- The call for the “law of numbers,” or argumentum ad populum. Also called “reason of the majority.” Takes place when an idea or an assertion is accepted as true because a significant number of people regard it as true. Once again, history shows us how much this idea can be false. It was a time when everyone thought that the earth was flat, that the earth was in the center of the universe... Example: “God is to exist since the majority of the human beings believe in him for millennia.” The argumentum populum is also used by many tradesmen and companies, in order to place their “products” in the general public, even if they are completely useless, ineffective or some shameful swindles, through the “consumer surveys” or the various existing seals of approval (“product of the year ,” etc.). The call to popularity is the other name of what is called the phenomenon of social proof or social legitimation.

- The forced-choice or closed question.

Two items without any report are joined together and discussed as the same proposition. The reader or the audience is supposed to accept or refuse the two points together when in reality one is acceptable while the other is not.

It is therefore an illegitimate use of the operator “and.”

Example.

- Are you for the abortion and against the life?
- Are you for the liberalization of the sales of weapons and for freedom?

-The false dilemma (either this...or that).

It occurs when only two choices of explanation of a given phenomenon are presented or proposed, whereas in reality there are more. The mistake here is the inappropriate use of the preposition “or.”

Examples.

- Jupiter is a gaseous or telluric planet. However, Jupiter is not telluric; therefore it is gaseous.
- If you do not pray before a meal, it is that you are atheistic.

-The false analogy. It takes place when the elements used to make an analogy are not comparable in their importance, their significance, their range.

Example.

- If you accept a certificate of a salesman authenticating that George bought this bicycle, then you must accept that a certificate signed by a witness having seen a UFO is a proof that the aliens have well visited our earth “.

- The call for emotion.

This fallacious reasoning is similar to the argument from authority. It supposes that every argument causing a positive emotion can only be true, or that its opposite is combined with negative emotions.

- The call for pity (argumentum ad misericordiam) is an itemization of the previous one. Let us point out that, as opposed to what the French media- political class repeated ad nauseam in the beginning of September 2015 in connection with the drowning in Turkey of the little Aylan Kurdi, the empathy is not the first of the emotions, the first and strongest of the emotions is THE FEAR.

Below still pell-mell some examples usually used in the media by the committed politicians or journalists.

-The sophism of the Texan marksman: to select random events having common characteristics in order to deduce from them a causal relationship.

-The wrong track (called technique of “red herring” by Mill, because of one of the techniques used to lose the dogs). The diversion or smoke screen. You can't see the forest for the trees. Common in the media.

- To be right by withdrawal of the opponent: “Did you read the 38,000 references which I have just quoted to you? No? Well, I consider then that you have nothing to bring to this debate. ”

-The excessive simplification of the causality.

ART OR SCIENCE ? THE LIMITS OF RHETORIC.

According to Walter J. Ong's study on this subject, Ramus (1515-1572) was one of the first modern intellectuals to question Aristotle's logic, by developing the three rules that form the foundation of any scientific construction, which he recalls in his *Scholae physicae*: first of all the principle of the perfect and universal evidence, then the principle of the limitation of the object of each particular science, and finally the apodictic deduction of particular terms from universal terms.

An important part of Ramus' work is his grammars: his Latin grammar, published in 1559; his Greek grammar (1560), which a hundred years after Port-Royal still praised; and finally his French grammar published in 1562.

A characteristic trait of Ramus' reform was that he was very much concerned with the forms, he liked the elegance of language and the brilliance of style. In his teaching, at the Collège de France - and this was one of the reasons for his success - he sought to combine eloquence with science. In this way, he deserves to be considered as one of the initiators of higher education, if higher education implies not only the breadth and depth of knowledge, but also a certain talent for speaking. One of the grievances most often renewed against him by his enemies was that he explained the poets and orators of antiquity with great dignity of gesture and language. At a time when it was customary to limit oneself to quoting Aristotle and reading tedious philosophical notebooks, he was wrong to be eloquent, to break with the drought and barbaric jargon of the Middle Ages, to give back to science a little flame and life.

It was already a useful fight against the Middle Ages and scholasticism to renounce the insipid dialectic and subtle formalism of old philosophy. But Ramus served even better the cause he loved, by proclaiming before Descartes the principle of free thought. "It is the reason, he says, which must be the queen and mistress of authority (*ratio auctoritatis regina dominaque esse debet*). Moreover, he was not content to simply claim the rights of reason: he used it. He did not only attack Aristotle, the old idol of the Middle Ages: he also attacked the young idols of the Renaissance, the authors found after a long oblivion, and whom, in their enthusiasm, the scholars of the sixteenth century put on the altars in the place of Aristotle. In 1547, he attacked Cicero; in 1549, Quintilian. He was well, not the servant of a new superstition substituted for Aristotle's superstition, but the man of free examination, of independent and personal research.

For Ramus all mental activity was divisible into discontinuous entities, identifiable on a plane, and used in history, philosophy, grammar, rhetoric.

It was therefore an ordered presentation of any subject according to an order that starts from general principles to specific divisions, from the universal to singular things. This ordering is done with the help of successive bipartitions.

His two best-known works are the *Aristotelicae Animadversiones* and the *Dialecticae partitiones sive institutiones* (1543). In the former, he criticized Aristotelianism; in the latter, he made suggestions for a single discipline, dialectic (or logic).

Ramus' criticism of the then sovereign Aristotelian dialectic was that it was not suitable for students, sometimes very young, in its conception. This dialectic was artificial, unnecessarily complicated and, contrary to its purpose, was not an introduction to scientific thought: it had taken on the appearance of an independent discipline. In order to make what was being taught more relevant to the personal experience of the beginners, Ramus proposed radical simplifications, not to teach the rules of logic in the abstract, but to illustrate them with concrete examples from texts, scientific demonstrations or even poems. The essential was to be simple, understandable and concrete.

In order to be concise, Ramus liked to explain the text with the help of tables, diagrams or charts.

"Few precepts and much use" was Ramus' favorite maxim, and the principle he tried to apply in his *Dialectic and Grammar*. His books, thanks to their novelty, were a great success, especially abroad: in Spain, where the famous grammarian Sanctius was inspired by his methods; in England, where Milton, one hundred years later, published a *Logic* revised and arranged according to Ramus' method; in Germany, finally, where his doctrine found so many adherents that it received a name: Ramism.

For many Germans, Ramism served as the starting point for an encyclopedic approach to science. His works were frequently republished in Frankfurt and the surrounding area, in Hanau and Herborn. Marburg and Herborn became important centers of Ramism.

The connection between Rasmus, which emphasized the clear representation of concepts and saw the mechanical arts as a source of new knowledge, and mechanistic philosophy, which saw nature as a mechanic, was established by the Zealand theologian Isaac Beeckman (1588-1637), who was also a candle maker, pedagogue and physicist. Beeckman studied in Leiden between 1607 and 1610 and attended the classes of Snell, who advised him to study ramist works for mathematics. Thus, Beeckman became familiar with Rasmus, which left a double mark on his mechanistic conception of nature: on the one hand, the emphasis placed on clarity in the explanation of natural phenomena (Beeckman took the liberty of challenging many Aristotelian explanations), and on the other hand, the openness to the findings and experience of the craftsmen.

When Descartes - who was still young and marked by a scholastic education, but was already looking for new principles - arrived in the Netherlands, Beeckman was the first philosopher he met. The conversations he had with him in Breda were decisive for the further development of his philosophy. It is impossible to understand Descartes' mechanistic ideas if one ignores the part that belongs to the mechanist Beeckman, who was directly influenced by Snell's ramism. It is certainly not reckless to maintain that the rapid success of Cartesianism in the United Provinces must be attributed at least in part to the wide diffusion that Rasmus had previously enjoyed in the Netherlands. The seed of Cartesianism fell into duly prepared ground.

Leibniz as a young man had dreamed of a perfect language or endowed with an almost mathematical rigor inspired by Chinese ideograms, the universal characteristic (see his *Dissertatio de arte combinatoria* of 1666). The grammar of this "universal characteristic" was to make invalid reasoning impossible.

But his project did not go much further.

Alfred Korzybski was born in Warsaw on July 3, 1879. He was a member of a family of the Polish nobility of the clan (Herb) of the "Abdank" (Armorial of the Polish Nobility) which included many mathematicians, scientists and engineers.

However, this researcher demonstrated that no human language could correspond to the dream of Leibniz. Human languages are not mathematical equations.

While Aristotle wrote that a true definition gives the essence of the thing (in Greek *ti ên einai*, literally "the what it was to be"), general semantics denies the existence of such an 'essence.' In this, general semantics purports to represent an evolution in human evaluative orientation. In general semantics, it is always possible to give a description of empirical facts, but such descriptions remain just that—descriptions—which necessarily leave out many aspects of the objective, microscopic, and submicroscopic events they describe. According to general semantics, language, natural or otherwise (including the language called 'mathematics') can be used to describe the taste of an orange, but one cannot give the taste of the orange using language alone. According to general semantics, the content of all knowledge is structure, so that language (in general) and science and mathematics (in particular) can provide people with a structural 'map' of empirical facts, but there can be no 'identity,' only structural similarity, between the language (map) and the empirical facts as lived through and observed by people as humans-in-environments (including doctrinal and linguistic environments).

ARISTOTELIAN LOGIC THUS DOES NOT HAVE THE MATHEMATICAL INFALLIBILITY ATTRIBUTED TO IT.

"Two logicians traveling by train are looking out the window at the landscape. - Here, says one of them, is a herd of sheep that has just been sheared. - On our side, in any case," replies the other."

This caution is excessive! We also need, for our normal functioning, to play on observations and inferences; in most cases, our inferences prove to be correct: a sheep will have four legs, the package will contain the object we are waiting for, and so on. This kind of inference is the most common, as we

can see in everyday life. More often than not, we refer to personal experiences in order to decipher the information that reaches us.

At the silent levels, inferences are used to anticipate behaviors, movements, grasping objects, sometimes to guess character traits (intuition: "I don't feel it," "I believe in it as hard as I can," etc.).

Generally, confusing observations and inferences only results, at worst, in ephemeral surprises without major consequences. However, in order to avoid making BIG errors of judgment, it is important to remain aware of the difference between observation and inference, so as not to mistake one for the other and vice versa.

The principles we will develop below should therefore be handled with care. Deducing certain inferences from our observations is not the ultimate impassable of science but is the first step of its staircase. Inference is the basic intellectual operation of all reasoning. It consists of moving from one or more premises to a conclusion. Everyone makes inferences, almost all the time.

PRINCIPLES OF ELEMENTARY LOGIC.

I n-óenchurp atá. Imgeib guin immoamgeib gabáil. All the men are mortal. Cuchulainn is a man. Therefore Cuchulainn is mortal (he can be captured, wounded queen Medb says more precisely about him in the most famous of the Irish sagas).

In ancient Greece, the sophists, whose name is at the origin of the word sophism, taught the eloquence and the art of persuasion. And it is to uncover their sometimes fallacious rhetoric that the Greek druids laid the rudiments of the logic. Since the sophisticated Refutations of Aristotle, many philosophers thus tried to establish a general classification of the sophisms for, generally, protecting oneself against them (John Stuart Mill, but conversely other authors, like Arthur Schopenhauer in the Art of being right, defended the use of the sophism for its dialectical effectiveness).

The word sophism derives from Latin *sophisma*, itself resulting from the Greek: "skill," "clever invention," "misleading reasoning." This Greek word is formed starting from *sophía*: "wisdom," "knowledge," and designates as of Greek Antiquity the type of speeches made by the sophists (literally "specialists in the knowledge"), prestigious speakers and professors of eloquence (or more generally of rhetoric), of which the goal was especially to persuade the audience (in the assemblies or the courts), very often with no regard for the truth itself. Socrates and Plato discussed much with the sophists to try to uncover their misleading and built on a not-rigorous logic reasoning but it is especially Aristotle who invented the science of Logic to classify the types of reasoning (or syllogisms) and to show rigorously which is the fallacious "logic" at work in a sophism.

Examples.

- All that is rare is expensive.
- A cheap horse is rare.
- Therefore a cheap horse is expensive.

What is idiotic!

- The More there is some Emmental, the more there are holes.
- The More there are holes, the less there is some Emmental.

Therefore more there is Emmental, less there is Emmental.

What is absurd!

- A problem comprises always at least a solution.
- Therefore if there is no solution
- There is no problem.....

BUT NOW OR SINCE ALWAYS THERE ARE ONLY REASONINGS OF THIS KIND IN POLITICS EVEN IN ANY OTHER DEBATE.

The sophism, or argument with a fallacious logic, is therefore a reasoning which tries to appear rigorous but which in reality is not valid from the point of view of logic (even if its conclusion is true however). Contrary to the paralogism which is an unintentional mistake in reasoning, the sophism is fallacious: it is used with the intention to mislead so, for example, to take the advantage in a discussion. Sophisms often take the appearance of a syllogism (based on insufficient or not-relevant premises or which proceeds by enthymeme, etc.). They can also be based on other psychological mechanisms playing for example with the emotion of the audience, the social upper hand of the

speaker (argument from authority) or cognitive biases. Not counting the pure and simple bad faith of the media-political circles.

John Stuart Mill, in his work *System of Logic, Ratiocinative and Inductive* (1843), studied sophisms. He proposes a classification, which is made with four groups. The last classification gathers all those which have their source, not so much in a false appraisal of the value of a proof, that in the vague, unspecified and indecisive conception of what the proof is. At the top of these sophisms, there are the multitudes of fallacious reasoning resulting from the ambiguity of the used words, when a thing is true in the particular meaning of a word but that it is argued as if it were true in another sense.

LIVING LANGUAGES NOT STOPPING TO EVOLVE AND THE MEANING OF THE WORDS ALSO, OR THEN BEING BADLY MASTERED WRONGLY UNDERSTOOD, HAVING CONSIDERABLY CHANGED OF MEANING DURING AGES, IT IS VERY OFTEN THE SOLE AND ONLY CAUSE OF A DISAGREEMENT (except in the case of lies and bad faith, which cannot be excluded a priori because they are always possible).

Now by contrast let us say a few words about the right, logical, and rational, reasoning.

The deduction is an inference leading from a general assertion to a particular conclusion.

Induction is on the contrary the mental operation which consists in going up from the facts to the law, from generally singular or special given cases, to a more general rule.

If each time I meet a human being in various areas of the world, I note that he has two ears, I do not need to check it on several billion other specimens to conclude from it that all the human beings have two ears.

It is spoken of ampliative induction when you pass from a very small number of cases to a general assertion.

A journalist speaking about a movie will say readily: "This sequence is particularly moving" whereas intellectual honesty would impose a formulation of the type: I was very moved...

The arguing from analogy is reasoning by association of ideas, combination and synthesis. The strict definition of analogy is A is to B as C is to D.

It is to be noticed that in analogy A is to B as C is to D, neither A, neither B, neither C, nor D need to be explicitly defined, only their respective relation counts. An analogy does not express the relation between notions explicitly, but indicates the existence of an identical relationship simply. The nature of the relation appears only in the idea of the one who looks into it, not in the literal expression. It is therefore on the understanding that analogy calls.

Analogy is often used in science and philosophy, even in the field of the religion because it makes it possible to transfer the results which are known in a first field towards a second field, this efficiently. It is indeed enough to apply in a parallel way the same logic, to replace A by C as well as B by D accurately to get results undoubtedly correct in the relation between C and D. From this point of view, the analogy is a perfectly rational operation. It is a simple calculation made in a parallel way. If the substitution gives erroneous results, it is that the analogy is false.

The syllogism is a mode of reasoning made explicit 2,500 years ago by the Greek druid Aristotle. This reasoning consists of two propositions from which a third is deduced; it is usually based on one of the two following principles, where there is no possible mistake.

-What is suitable for the idea of a generality is suitable for each individual composing this generality.

-What is not suitable for the idea of a generality is suitable for none of the individuals composing this generality.

The first two propositions of the syllogism are called premises; most general of the two premises is said major; the least general, usually the second, is said minor. The third proposition deduced from both others by a, legitimate or illegitimate, consequence, is named conclusion.

When the premises are true and the consequence legitimate, i.e., contained in the premises, the syllogism is materially and formally valid.

Example:

1. Every living being is mortal (major premise).

2. I am a living being (minor premise).
3. Therefore I am mortal (conclusion).

If the premises are true, the conclusion is also true, provided that the consequence is legitimate. So that if somebody admits the premises, he can deny the truth of the conclusion only by considering it as illegitimate. To get a legitimate consequence, there are certain rules to follow.

The conclusion of the syllogism must be contained in the major premise; the minor one is used to show it.

Example:

1. All the men are mortal;
2. All the kings are men;
3. Therefore all the kings are mortal.

The kings are mortal because they are men the conclusion is contained in the major premise, and the minor one makes it be seen.

In a simple syllogism, there are only three propositions, and consequently three subjects and three attributes. To express these three subjects and these three attributes, only three different terms are used; thus in the previous syllogism the three terms are....

- All the men (the middle term).
- Mortal (the major term).
- All the kings (the minor term).

One of these terms is twice in the premises, it is called middle term; it must be taken at least once generally. Here the middle term is man, it is taken in his general meaning in the major one.

Though the syllogism contains three propositions, each one formed of two terms (what gives six terms in all), there are in reality only three terms, each term being repeated twice. The example quoted in the first rule shows us...

- The middle term in the two premises.
- The minor term in the conclusion and a premise.
- The major term in the conclusion and the other premise.

The major premise is that which contains the major term and the middle term. The minor premise contains the minor term and middle term.

One of the premises, either the first, or the second, must be a general proposition; you can conclude nothing from two particular propositions.

Example...

1. Some irreligious people are French.
2. However, some French are courageous.

You may conclude from there, neither that all the irreligious people, nor even as several irreligious people, are courageous.

One of the premises must be affirmative; you can conclude nothing from two negative propositions.

Thus you could not say...

1. Neither gold nor greatness makes us happy.
2. However, Philemon and Baucis had neither gold nor greatness.
3. Thus they lived happy.

On the other hand, you can say very well and most logically in the world...

1. The poor have neither the wealth nor the honors of the world.
2. However, many of the poor are happy.
3. Therefore man can be happy without having neither wealth, neither honors, neither gold, nor greatness.

All the men are mortal. (First premise, A = "man," B = "mortal.")

Cuchulainn is a man. (Second premise, C = "Cuchulainn.")

Therefore Cuchulainn is mortal (he can be captured, wounded queen Medb says more precisely about him in the most famous of the Irish sagas). It is the Conclusion.

The same reasoning was followed besides by the Jewish authorities having arrested the Nazorean Jesus. If they had been convinced not to deal with a simple human being, but with the (adoptive?) son of God, or with the Messiah, they would never have acted thus towards him.

The syllogism. All men are mortal. (First premise, A = "men", B = "mortal").

Cuchulainn is a man. (Second premise, C = "Cuchulainn")

So the Hesus Cuchulainn is deadly (he can be captured, wounded says more precisely Queen Medb about him in the most famous Irish saga). This is the Conclusion.

So it is not therefore enough to find or determine the rules of logic, you must also use them correctly. The syllogism gives good examples of traps to be avoided.

As we have already had the opportunity to say it, the principle wants you to state a universal or general assertion on the level of the first premise, kind "A = B." In the second premise, you consider an individual who joins together or not the conditions expounded in: "C = A" or "C is not equal to B." Each time, a little concentration is enough to deduce the conclusion which is required .

It is unanswerable as reasoning... except when you say nonsense. What happens most often when there is not a strict equality between the different terms of the equation, when A is not strictly equal to B or when C is not strictly equal to A etc. The vocabulary used therefore is to have perfect precision and relevance, but this is not always the case, which gives us therefore what is following.

-The sophisms, which are voluntarily false reasoning intended to deceive.

-The paralogisms, which are syllogisms made false by the ignorance of the rules or by lack of attention.

The informal paralogisms are paralogisms not involving a mistake of the formal reasoning, but a property of the language (the polysemy for example), the way in which one calls upon a fact (analogy metaphor metonymy...). The paralogisms of composition and division consist in attributing a property of the whole to the part, or a property of the part to the whole.

It is possible to form the following formal paralogisms.

Affirming the consequent;

All the men are mortal (A = B).

A donkey is mortal (C = B).

Therefore a donkey is a man (C = A).

The second premise is true, but you cannot draw from it the conclusion (it would have been necessary it is "All the mortals are men" that is to say B = A and not A = B).

Denying the antecedent.

All the men are mortal (A = B).

A donkey is not a man (C = not A)

Therefore a donkey is immortal (C = not B)

Here still, the second premise is true, but you cannot draw the conclusion from it. You can draw a conclusion only from the denying the consequent, reasoning called by contraposition (or modus tollens): only the reasoning "if A = B, then not B = not A" is correct. Here below an example of correct contraposition:

All the men are mortal (A = B).

A stone is not mortal (C = not B).

Therefore a stone is not a man (C = not A)

Inconsistency or non sequitur argument is the type of argument where a conclusion is drawn starting from premises which are not logically connected. For examples.

- "If million people believe in God, it is well that God exists."

- "Thousands of people saw lights that they could not identify in the sky, what proves that aliens exist."

Partisans of UFOs often fall into this mistake, particularly when they affirm that the spaceships result from such an advanced technology that they are invisible for radars. But at the same time they affirm that the radar detection is a proof of the existence of these UFOs.....

EXAMPLES OF RHETORIC.

Since rhetoric is not a science but an art, the retired mailman carrier that I am, like the mailman Cheval in his time, will take the liberty of presenting this essay not in a very conventional way, but in a much more disjointed way, let's say as an amateur.

I apologize to the honorable professors who discuss spirituality in the work of the fourth caliph, or the fifth, the taliq father of the Prophet's grandson's executioner, or even in the work of the Prophet's favorite wife.

Dialectics is the art of convincing the opponent in front of you with tools of reason; it is well suited to restricted circles, to art circles; but rhetoric is the art of convincing and persuading by all means, and is therefore consubstantial to democracy.

One of the most powerful springs, and of all times of the rhetoric, is the pathos, the recourse to the feeling, to the emotion, for example today by staging children, persecuted innocents, scorned loves... Nothing of such to make cry in the cottages and to open the nest eggs. But this has nothing to do with philosophy and, above all, it does not solve any of the causes in a permanent way, it only gives fish instead of teaching how to fish!

Resorting to pathos does not only engage the audience's emotions, but also makes the audience able to identify with the speaker's arguments.

As reason has little place in the debates regarding certain taboos of our society, and what prevails on the contrary in the media on this subject has nothing of a serene dialectic, it is never useless to come back to some of the "big tricks" used to fool us or to extract from us not really enlightened consent. There is nothing new under the sun since Julius Caesar in this field. The example of the speech of Critognatus 1) proves that the general did not neglect the rhetoric nor the ornamenta oratoria in the speeches he attributes to his enemies.

Book VII chapter LXXVII.

"I shall pay no attention to the opinion of those who call a most disgraceful surrender by the name of a capitulation; nor do I think that they ought to be considered as citizens, or summoned to the council [cf. Schopenhauer's stratagem number XXXII: the Principle of the degrading association. When confronted with an assertion of the opponent, there is a way to quickly dismiss it, or at least to stigmatize it by placing it in a pejorative category, even if the association is only apparent or tenuous]. My business is with those who approve of a sally: in whose advice the memory of our ancient prowess [see Plato's Gorgias: it is to flatter the public] seems to dwell in the opinion of you all. To be unable to bear privation for a short time is disgraceful cowardice, not true valor. Those who voluntarily offer themselves to death are more easily found than those who would calmly endure distress [beginning of the climax which will culminate in the evocation of cannibalism]. And I would approve of this opinion (for honor is a powerful motive with me) [here again flattery of the public], could I foresee no other loss, save that of life....., if eighty thousand men were butchered in one spot, supposing that they should be forced to come to an action almost over our corpses? Do not utterly deprive them of your aid, for they have spurned all thoughts of personal danger on account of your safety 1).... Do you doubt their fidelity and firmness because they have not come at the appointed day? What then? Do you suppose that the Romans are employed every day in the outer fortifications for mere amusement? If you cannot be assured by their dispatches, since every avenue is blocked up, take the Romans as evidence that their approach is drawing near; since they, intimidated by alarm [petitio principii] at this, labor night and day at their works. What, therefore, is my design? To do as our ancestors did in the war against the Cimbri and Teutones [exemplum technique], which was by no means equally momentous who, when driven into their towns, and oppressed by similar privations, supported life by the corpses of those who appeared useless for war on account of their age [peak of the climax begun a few lines above], and did not surrender to the enemy: and even if we had not a precedent for such cruel conduct, still I should consider it most glorious that one should be established, and delivered to posterity [flattery of the audience again]. For in what was that war like this? The Cimbri, after laying Gaul waste, and inflicting great calamities, at length departed from our country, and sought other lands; they left us our rights, laws, lands, and liberty. But what other motive or wish have the Romans than, induced by envy, to settle in the lands and states of those whom they have learned by fame to be noble and powerful in war, and impose on them perpetual slavery? For they never have carried on wars on any other terms" [again the spectre technique, for this Roman colonization also brought many positive things to the country].

It should be noted in passing that the indigenism and decolonialism in fashion today, into which everyone rushes, are not new, there is nothing new but what is forgotten, and that Roman supremacism was denounced in its own time.

In addition to the long speech of Critognat, which is surprising under the hand of Caesar, we also know that of the Breton chief Calgacus reported (or invented, we never know in these cases) by Tacitus.

Below is his text, the most ferocious criticism of Roman colonization (www.thelatinlibrary.com/imperialism).

"Robbers of the world, having by their universal plunder exhausted the land, they rifle the deep. If the enemy be rich, they are rapacious; if he be poor, they lust for dominion; neither the east nor the west has been able to satisfy them. Alone among men they covet with equal eagerness poverty and riches. To robbery, slaughter, plunder, they give the lying name of empire; they make a solitude and call it peace (ubi solitudinem faciunt, pacem appellant).

Nature has willed that every man's children and kindred should be his dearest objects. Yet these are torn from us by conscriptions to be slaves elsewhere. Our wives and our sisters, even though they may escape violation from the enemy, are dishonored under the names of friendship and hospitality. Our goods and fortunes they collect for their tribute, our harvests for their granaries. Our very hands and bodies, under the lash and in the midst of insult, are worn down by the toil of clearing forests and morasses...Do you suppose that the Romans will be as brave in war as they are licentious in peace? To our strifes and discords they owe their fame, and they turn the errors of an enemy to the renown of their own army, an army which, composed as it is of every variety of nations...Behind them there is nothing to dread. The forts are ungarrisoned; the colonies in the hands of aged men; what with disloyal subjects and oppressive rulers, the towns are ill-affected and rife with discord. On the one side you have a general and an army; on the other, tribute, the mines, and all the other penalties of an enslaved people. Whether you endure these for ever, or instantly avenge them, this field is to decide. Think, therefore, as you advance to battle, at once of your ancestors and of your posterity."

They received his speech with enthusiasm, and as is usual among barbarians....
..." (Tacitus Life of Agricola).

Barbarian warriors who were nevertheless crushed despite the power of their chariots and without even the purely Roman legions intervening.

All this is a bit strange! Except for the chariots perhaps: they were outclassed by the Roman auxiliary cavalry undoubtedly more numerous and especially used as means of transport of certain warriors, they were not equipped with scythes.

But if one understands well, it is thus non-Romans as well on foot as on horseback who gave the victory to Agricola.

NB. In the two cases, the paradox is that they are Romans themselves who echoed this criticism, reported it even invented it.

As for the cruelty of Critognat's speech (it is Caesar's word), as far as I am concerned, I can only find one equivalent nowadays, the song of the partisans written in 1943.

"Friend, do you hear the muffled clamor of enchained country?

Hey, partisans, workers and farmers this is the signal
tonight the enemy will know the price of blood and tears...

Come up from the mine, get off the hills, comrades!

Take the rifles, the machine gun, the grenades out of the straws.

Hey, killers, with a bullet or by knife, kill swiftly!

Hey, saboteur, take care of your charge: dynamite...

It's us smashing the prison bars for our brothers,

The hatred on our backs and the hunger that drives us, the misery.

There are countries where people are dreaming deep in their beds,

here, we, you see, we're marching on and we're getting killed, we're getting whacked...

Here everyone knows what he wants, what he does when it takes place,

Friend, if you fall, a mate out of the shadows takes your place.

Tomorrow black blood will be drying under the sun on the roads."

It sounds like Critognat's speech.....

THE TECHNIQUE OF THE SPECTRE.

Hyperbole in Diodorus of Sicily.

Technique which consists in presenting the position of one's opponent in an exaggerated way.

Example 1.

Parent: "You should tidy your room!"

The child: "I already did it last month, I'm not going to do it every day!"

The clause "tidy your room" has been changed to "tidy your room every day."

Example 2.

"You refuse to fund this program for making new generation weapons... I don't understand why you want to leave our country defenseless."

The clause "I don't want to fund the making of new generation weapons" has been twisted into "I am against the defense of my country," an argument that is much easier to criticize.

Arthur Schopenhauer calls this sophistry the "extension stratagem": "This consists in carrying your opponent's proposition beyond its natural limits; in giving it as general a signification and as wide a sense as possible, so as to exaggerate it; and, on the other hand, in giving your own proposition as restricted a sense and as narrow limits as you can."

Normand Baillargeon explains that "if one cannot defeat a given line of reasoning, it may be possible to emerge victorious from a debate with a weakened version of that same line of reasoning. This will be all the easier if we create the weakened version ourselves by shaping it in such a way as to ensure that it will be demolished. He classifies this process as a paralogism.

It is possible to create a spectre argument in different ways:

Take one part of your opponent's arguments, refute that part, and claim that you have refuted the whole argument.

Present the opponent's arguments in a weak form, refute them and claim that the original arguments have been refuted. This can be accomplished by taking the original arguments and separating them from the context in which they were presented.

Presenting a false statement by one's opponent, refuting it, and claiming that the original statement is the opponent's true position.

Present someone who awkwardly defends a position, refute his or her arguments, and claim that all arguments in favor of the position are refuted.

Inventing a fictional character with actions or beliefs that are easily criticized and claiming that this person is representative of the group the speaker is criticizing.

The spectre is a technique used very frequently in political debates or more generally in the media. It is practically the only one, and the phenomenon is aggravated by the fact that we do not give the same meaning to words, given the rapid evolution for different reasons of their meanings and connotations.

THE TREE THAT HIDES THE WOOD.

"To be unable to see the wood for the trees" is to see only a very small part of a situation or a problem. It is to see only a detail while ignoring the whole. It's being so close to something that you can't see anything else, to the point that you forget to see the big picture. You are bound to miss the point. For example, seeing only the talent of a sportsman without taking into account the endless training and the sacrifices he had to make to reach the top. Sometimes it's lying to yourself. Buying something cheaper is fine. But the fact that it was made by children in Bangladesh should also be part of the equation. In this case, it would be like "turning a blind eye" to something we don't like.

We can also deliberately put the "tree" in front of your eyes so that you cannot see the rest. Someone who is trying to convince you will often tend to magnify what goes in their favor, so that you forget the rest. Show you the joy of the lottery winners, but say nothing about the thousands of losers who have been playing for years, for example.

It is perfectly possible to publish very, very precise studies, as I have done myself, except in certain fields where it is important to point out the dangers of the whole, of which this particular point is a part, in order to warn against it. This warning can take different forms (foreword, final remark, etc.), but it must nevertheless be substantial. And it is only necessary, of course, if the very detailed study in question is either completely and mechanically neutral in this respect from a moral point of view or is

likely to give a positive image of the whole in question. If this very detailed study of a particular element emphasizes the dangers of the whole, then such an additional warning is not necessary.

Let us take two examples.

GERMANY'S NATIONAL SOCIALIST IDEOLOGY IN THE 1930S.

The character of Oskar Schindler is much more ambivalent than Steven Spielberg's film shows. "How can [Steven Spielberg] tell what the Holocaust was by telling the story of a German who saved 1,300 Jews when the overwhelming majority of Jews were not saved?" (Claude Lanzmann, *The Shoah*.)

RUSSIA'S STALINIST IDEOLOGY IN THE 1920S.

There is a Chinese proverb that means much the same thing: "The true face of Mount Lu remains unknown to the one who is there ,"

Now a counterexample.

It is hard to see what wood can hide a very sharp study of the common Islamic imagination in Tabari's commentary. Such studies are safe and can be discussed without any problem. Better still! They are indispensable to those who, like me, are fonder of vast syntheses compiling all these precise points to make the link with current events. In order to build a new man, WITH THE BEST OF THE OLD! May Academia.edu and all these humble researchers passionate about their subject be thanked for this! But this is not always the case, as we have said. Example VOLUNTARY FALSE TRACKS.

For we must not confuse primary and secondary victimology.

Primary victimology deals with victims from a medical or reconstructive point of view: it concerns doctors above all.

Secondary victimology is mainly aimed at creating a psychological profile of the criminal in order to make his arrest possible as quickly as possible. Secondary victimology should therefore be more like profiling than medicine.

But of course, when we do not want to talk about the criminal and his motives, for example, in order to profile or sketch him psychologically, we talk about his victims. The inevitable result is that part of the investigators' energy is then used for something other than identifying and locating the culprits.

Such a strategy may be deliberate from the criminal's sympathizers or accomplices in order to delay the investigation or divert it from the right trail, but it may also be involuntary.

LET'S REPEAT IT, GIVEN THE IMPORTANCE OF THE MATTER.

What is important, after the first care given to victims (primary victimology) is TO IDENTIFY, LOCATE AND ARREST, THE GUILTY, AS QUICKLY AS POSSIBLE.

P.S. I didn't see anything like that in Schopenhauer's 1830 pamphlet on this subject (*Die Kunst, Recht zu behalten*), which has since been published under different titles. Except perhaps this.

Our opponent has formulated a thesis (or we ourselves have formulated one, it amounts to the same thing). In order to refute it, there are two modes and two courses.

These means are the direct refutation; the indirect refutation.

The direct one attacks the thesis on its reasons, the indirect one on its consequences: the direct one shows that a thesis is not true, the indirect one that it cannot be true...

In the case of indirect refutation, we use either diversion or instance.

Diversion: we accept the opponent's thesis as true, and we state what follows from another proposition considered to be true, in order to arrive at a conclusion that is obviously false, either because it contradicts the nature of things, or because it contradicts other statements of the opponent *ad rem* or *ad hominem*...

Die Instanz, *enstatis*, *exemplum in contrarium*: *Widerlegung des allgemeinen Satzes durch direkte Nachweisung einzelner unter seiner Aussage begriffener Fälle, von denen er doch nicht gilt, also selbst falsch sein muß.*

The instance, *enstatis*, *exemplum in contrarium*: it is a matter of refuting the general thesis by referring directly to particular cases that theoretically fall within its scope because of the way it is stated, but to which nevertheless it is not supposed to apply, and which demonstrate that it is necessarily false? (My 4 years of German are away.)

It works even when the said general thesis has never been explicitly expressed and that one only attributes it to its opponent(s), that one only assumes they adhere to it.

PS. It goes without saying that the personality of the speaker also plays a very big role in all this. What the Greeks called *ethos*, but which it is better to call "prestige," as Gustave Lebon did in his famous work on crowd psychology: "Still, the various examples that have just been cited represent extreme cases. To fix in detail the psychology of prestige, it would be necessary to place them at the extremity of a series, which would range from the founders of religions and empires to the private individual who endeavors to dazzle his neighbors by a new coat or a decoration. Between the extreme limits of this series would find a place all the forms of prestige resulting from the different elements composing a civilization—sciences, arts, literature, &c.—and it would be seen that prestige constitutes the fundamental element of persuasion. Consciously or not, the being, the idea, or the thing possessing prestige is immediately imitated in consequence of contagion, and forces an entire generation to adopt certain modes of feeling and of giving expression to its thought."

My conclusion will therefore be the following one, the art of rhetoric is like Aesop's tongue, propaganda or advertising, it can be used for the worst as well as the best.

Put more elegantly, "Aristotle puts forward four arguments to demonstrate the usefulness of this art. First, it can be put to use in the service of truth and justice. Second, the fact that rhetoric is not a totally rigorous science makes it capable of persuading a wide audience. Third, the art of rhetoric allows arguing contrary positions, which doesn't allow defending indifferently one point of view or its opposite, but to better refute opponents driven by bad intentions. Finally, rhetoric is a worthier way to defend oneself than the use of force. However, Aristotle points out that an unfair use of the power of the word can cause serious damage" (Brigitte Boudon).

Hence this 7-page warning.

1) Whether it is totally invented or reported by Caesar's spies is of little importance to our purpose, which is to warn our fellow citizens against rhetorical traps. Andrew M. Riggsby, in his remarkable work devoted to Caesar's Commentaries, has already reminded of all that was to say about this speech and I can only refer my readers to it.

As far as I am concerned, my approach will be less positive towards Critognatus (*qui bene amat bene castigat*), and especially less backward-looking, because it will be more oriented towards the present in order to BUILD A NEW MAN WITH THE BEST OF THE OLD, and it will consist in making it a typical example of manipulation of minds (having turned into a disaster, moreover).

Let's not forget that, from a strictly military point of view, sorties are not always synonymous with useless massacre. The distant heirs of Critognatus proved this 2000 years later at Bir Hakeim in Libya by not hesitating to try everything to face the minefields that were now turning against them.

On the night of June 10-11, 1942, after 16 days of deadly assaults by an enemy 10 times more numerous, in small groups, motorized or not, they rushed through the minefields that they had not had time to neutralize.

This *furia francese* will be profitable, because, although many vehicles were blown up, the 3rd Foreign Battalion and the Pacific Battalion managed to get out after having neutralized one by one the three defense lines of the Axis forces.

The fact is that by 8:00 a.m., most of the men of the FFL brigade had succeeded in reaching the secured area set up by the British, either by vehicle or on foot, and that the British patrols will recover many isolated or lost men during the day. Rommel's forces found only dead bodies and a few wounded who had not managed to flee from Bir Hakeim.

2) The fact is that the relief army arrived (250,000 men, including some Heduvans), but left without really fighting. Caesar, who after Gergovia had begun to evacuate the country in view of the extent of the general uprising against his policy, must have been even more astonished than we are. And yet after the general assembly of Bibracte in -52 BC only the Remi (of Rheims) the Lingones and the Trevirii had not switched to the anti-Roman camp, the Remi and the Lingons because they had chosen Rome and the Trevirii because they were already very busy resisting the pressure of the Germanic peoples.

3) "In any case, from the beginning the notion of *ethos* does not have a univocal value. The term "ethos" in Greek has not very specific meaning and lends itself to multiple interpretations: in rhetoric, in morals, in politics, in music... Those who are familiar with these texts cannot ignore the multitude of debates that have arisen for more than two millennia over the interpretation of the slightest passage of the great Greek philosophers" (Dominique Maingueneau).

THE FIRST OF THE MEDIA: THE RUMOR.

The poison of the contemporary culture, it is the information show. It is therefore necessary for this purpose to break the compartmentalization of the fields of competence, to appeal at the same time to the economist and to the poet, the sociologist and the artist; each one enriches the comprehension of the others and closes the door to this new treason of intellectuals.

In this respect the lipdubs of certain French political parties are exemplary: the zero level in politics. And even below. What a shame to lower the struggle of ideas down to this level which is the zero level in politics.

There we have really hit the rock bottom and even worse still of the politics show so rightly denounced by Guy Debord and the Situationists in their time. The best of the solutions is nevertheless to have a good king or a good monarch.

The democratic systems can bring to power, by definition, only men or women able to gain votes.

In other words, liars or merchants of illusion, without greatness, nor profundity, of mind. And we are very lucky if they are not in addition individuals having a very high idea of the value of them, however, quite poor competences.

To fight against such a drift nothing equals PARADOXICALLY the fact of distinguishing well between information journalism and opinion journalism (having for goals not to inform but to train or to adapt , to format we would say today).

And the fact of improving largest of the freedoms of speech because the censorship, even driven by the best intentions of the world, is always politically counterproductive.

In the United States for example, freedom of speech is protected to a degree unknown in any other country in the world. In the 1960s, the Supreme Court has even very high expectations as regards the respect of the free speech, in accordance with a basic principle established as of the 18th century by the values of the Enlightenment. The position of the Court was that the speech was free, with for only limit the participation in a criminal act. If, for example, when I enter a store to rob it, one of my accomplices holds a weapon and that I tell him: "Fire! ", these words are not protected by the Constitution. For the rest, the reason must be particularly serious before freedom of speech is put in question. The Supreme Court even reaffirmed this principle in favor of members of the Ku Klux Klan.

"The true democrat after all is the one who admits that an adversary can be right, who therefore lets him be expressed and who agrees to think of his arguments" (Albert Camus, extracted from "Democracy and Modesty," in *Combat*, February 1947).

"It is necessary to never let criticism join insult, it is necessary to admit that our detractor can be right and that in every case his motive, even bad, can be disinterested. It is finally necessary to redo our political mentality " (Albert Camus, extracted from a short speech pronounced on March 15, 1945, at the time of a meeting arranged by the French Friendship).

In the series "beware" of rhetoric : CRITICAL...OR GENERAL...OR DRYADIC EPISTEMOLOGY.

(Dryad meaning "very learned.")

"Toe lethaign foen friss ocus fris adaind indlis." Anachronism is the archetypal mistake to avoid. Yet it is generally what characterizes all works of fiction, or not (documentaries), speaking about certain periods and political regimes.

The historian or non-fiction writer must explain the facts of the past, without judging the acts of the characters of the past. To do so (to judge the acts of the past through our present knowledge) is the best way to make them incomprehensible. And to prevent us from seeing similar, but not exactly identical, diastaters coming (the new totalitarianisms).

Strictly speaking, there can never be an objective history (paradox of the observer) and there were always dominant ideologies, including a fortiori in societies that believe themselves to be free of these distorting prisms; Noam Chomsky has, moreover, evidenced that in Western societies the dominant ideology is never stated as such, but implied, for example in the world of advertising, which is more effective than propaganda (in countries where there is official propaganda, ordinary citizens very quickly acquire the reflex of systematically distrusting these revealed or implied truths and seek other sources of information: at the time for example the samizdat).

Chomsky and Herman demonstrated in their book *The Manufacturing Consent* (1988), how (in the American context, it is true), the main media participated in the establishment of a dominant ideology. Their conclusion is that the media tend to keep the public debate and the presentation of issues within a given ideological framework, based on assumptions and interests that are never questioned or challenged, in order to guarantee the assent or at least the adherence of the governed to the dominant classes. This is what they called, using a formula coined in 1922 by Walter Lippmann, the "manufacturing consent."

Their study established, for example, that the media's treatment of countries that are enemies of the United States is systematically different from that given to allied countries, unfavorable in the first case and favorable in the second.

The model proposed by Chomsky and Herman is nevertheless highly criticizable, even if for Jeffery Klaehn, who in 2005 edited a book devoted to this "propaganda model," it is even more relevant today than it was at the time, given the "globalization of the economy and power and the growing influence of the large multinationals" in the face of the growing powerlessness of a majority of the world's population.

The studies of Noam Chomsky being very controversial to illustrate our point (the dangers of rhetoric) we will therefore expand on facts that are spatially and temporally less sensitive, because they are much more distant: the Hundred Years' War (BECAUSE IT IS THE SAME PRINCIPLE: history is always seen through the distorting prism of the dominant ideology).

The most caricatural case is the film dedicated to Joan of Arc by Bruno Dumont and released in France in 2019. While we're at it, it's even better to watch the Danish Carl Theodor Dreyer's *Joan of Arc* released in 1928.

Let's take another less scabrous example WHICH WOULD BE A PRIORI less thorny, but about the same period: the Battle of Agincourt in 1415.

Bang! It is even worse! Henry V is presented as a model Christian monarch, ideal, perfect, even a hero. One would believe to have entered another world! There was perhaps a space-time shift after 1415. But gone unnoticed. "Shakespeare's Henry V has long been one of the most ambiguous adaptations of the story of England's most celebrated historical figure: King Henry V. This adaptation raises the question of why Shakespeare presents Henry V in a way that not only differs significantly from the other accounts of Henry V's life, but is also entirely ambiguous as to whether this presentation of Henry V's character is optimistic or pessimistic in nature." Kate Morton. University of San Diego. *Manipulated Manipulation: The Political Origins and Implications of Shakespeare's Henry V*.

The dominant ideology since Shakespeare is that the battle of Agincourt took place between two enemy sides with a huge disproportion in favor of the French. Shakespeare himself had recourse to this image (in his Henry V, he sees it as an allegory of British national unity) and even today in a television series devoted to the Tudors (Henry VIII) such a cliché takes its toll.

But the reality was quite different.

First of all, in terms of the number of soldiers involved.

It ranges from a ratio of 1 to 2 to 1 to 12, that is to say approximately 72 000 French men-at-arms.

However, if there was a disproportion in favor of the French camp, it was not at all of this order of magnitude.

The most reasonable number is that of Anne Curry (A new history): 13,500 French. The kingdom of France could not mobilize more, especially since part of the royal ost was in Rouen to protect the king and the crown prince Lewis of Guyenne.

The same aberration in terms of losses.

On the English side, very fanciful figures have been put forward (thirty dead for Shakespeare), all of them minimizing a sadder reality, probably about a thousand dead (at the battle of Patay Joan of Arc only lost about a hundred men: one of the real mysteries surrounding her life is that the French never celebrated this victory, however decisive it was).

On the French side, our sources speak of 10,000 dead, when in fact there were more like 6,000.

It should be noted that if the toll was so heavy on the French side, it was because of the numerous summary executions of prisoners, ordered by the King of England, which outraged the whole of Europe. In his 1944 film adaptation, Laurence Olivier preferred to ignore this massacre. 1)

The course of the battle.

It should be pointed out that the disposition of the various army corps on the field at dawn on October 25, 1415, did not conform at all to the wishes of the generalissimo Jean II le Meingre, known as Boucicaut (his initial battle plan was found in the archives of the British Library by Anne Curry in the early 1980s).

And the French chivalry did not engage in a massive frontal charge for one reason: it could not deploy (given the configuration of the terrain: a real bottleneck).

On the other hand, some of the great lords fought in the front line on foot. Charles of Albret and Charles of Orleans.2)

The other factors that played a role are well known.

It had rained and the ground was muddy.

The English occupied the heights.

Etc.

CONCLUSION.

For a dryadic epistemologist an idea is considered true only if it is supported by facts from primary sources CONFORMING TO A MINIMUM OF LOGIC. A bit like in a police investigation in a way, or an investigation by the Police chief Pansy, by Pierre Magnan (humor!)

The most illustrious representative of this general, or druidic, or critical, epistemology... was in Ireland and in England John Toland and in France the encyclopedists of Diderot.

To be free is always to be free from some things. The main ones are the force of tradition and the violence of passions.

Nobody is completely free from one or the other, but the more one moves away from them, the more we deserve to be called a critical epistemologist. Or dryadic. Or general (in chief, humor !)

In the United States, Robert G. Ingersoll has been one of the flagships of this revolutionary state of mind, but according to Bertrand Russell, one does not have to go that far to deserve this name. (See the first paragraph of his essay *The Value of Free Thought, how to Become a Truth-Seeker and Break the Chains of Mental Slavery.*)

Note that Bertrand Russell had more polemical formulations on politics.

" What I am concerned with is the doctrine of the modern; Communist Party and of the Russian Government to which it owes allegiance. According to this doctrine, the world develops o. According to this doctrine, the world develops on the lines of a Plan called Dialectical Materialism, first discovered by Karl Marx, embodied in the practice of a great state by Lenin, and now expounded from day to day by a Church of which Stalin; is the Pope [...] Free, discussion; is to be prevented 3) wherever the power to do so exists. [...] If this doctrine and this organization prevail, free inquiry will become as impossible as it was in the Middle Ages, and the world will relapse into bigotry and obscurantism" (Bertrand Russell, *How to Become a Truth-Seeker and Break the Chains of Mental Slavery*).

This is a bit hasty on Bertrand Russell's part and forgets the hundreds of thousands of years of peaceful PRIMITIVE COMMUNISM! Whose last remains were at the Vaccaei in Diodorus of Sicily : " Book V,chapter XXXIV. Of the tribes neighboring upon the Celtiberians the most advanced is the people of the Vaccaei, as they are called; for this people each year divides among its members the land which it tills and making the fruits the property of all they measure out his portion to each man."

MORAL TO BE DRAWN FROM THESE STORIES.

It is true that Shakespeare never claimed to be a historian, BUT THE WORKS OF FICTION CONSCIOUSLY RUNNING WITHIN A HISTORICAL FRAMEWORK MUST BE CONFORMED TO HISTORY WITH RESPECT TO THE MAIN CHARACTERS AND EVENTS. BECAUSE OTHERWISE WE ARE NO LONGER IN THE FIELD OF HISTORICAL FICTION, BUT IN AN ALTERNATIVE HISTORY. What would be the world today if Hitler had won the war? 4)

As for the moral of this story, I can only refer my readers to the website [HISTORY AND FICTION. TRAVELING IN TIME THROUGH FICTION IN ALL ITS FORMS](#) from which I extract the following substantive content.

Historical fiction is a term used to designate all works that use the imagination but are inspired by real historical facts. It can be a historical novel, a historical film, or a historically themed television series, but it can also be a comic book, a short story, a play, or an oral history (e.g., a podcast), or even a hybrid work that combines several of these genres.

Historical fiction generally tells a story with characters with whom it is possible to identify. It thus places the destiny of one or more individuals in its historical context and makes the great events of history (revolutions, technical progress, social and cultural changes...) tangible through the experience that contemporaries had of them.

Historical fiction does not necessarily aim to achieve truth or objectivity in relation to real facts. On the other hand, a successful historical fiction seeks verisimilitude in relation to the context of the period, and in particular to its constraints. This is the implicit contract between the readers/viewers/listeners of

historical fiction and the creator of the work. For historical fiction to work, it must "feel real," that is, it must make us feel like we are traveling back in time to better understand what life was like at the time. This is why good historical fiction avoids anachronisms as much as possible. Not only from the point of view of practical constraints (no electricity before the 19th century!), but also in terms of psychology and morality (codification of male-female relations throughout history, the importance of religion in everyday life, etc.).

Whatever the author's date of birth, it must be recognized that it is especially the ability to bring to life a bygone era by using the imagination that makes a work a successful historical fiction!

In this respect, Shakespeare's play and the entire filmography that followed contain elements that do not match the criteria thus defined.

The mental illness of the king of France (Charles VI) is never mentioned and he is instead presented as a sane man who agrees in all awareness to sign the Treaty of Troyes just after the battle (act V).

However, this disastrous treaty for France was signed only 5 years later and it is doubtful that the unfortunate man could have negotiated it.

As for the crown prince, Lewis of Guyenne, he was not present at Agincourt. Shakespeare gives him a central role, even though he was a young man of 18, in poor health and relatively self-effacing (he died two months after the disaster of Agincourt, in December 1415). The episode of the barrel full of real tennis balls (of the ancestor of tennis) that he addresses to Henry V to show his contempt is a pure invention (if Shakespeare had practiced dryadic or critical epistemology, he would not have taken it over).

Closer to us there is another stunning case study, Peter Weir's 2003 *Master and Commander Far Side of the World*.

A very bad adaptation of the shanty about the fight of the Danae commanded by Jean Bart's nephew (superb interpretation by Meredith Hall although its translation is rather strange: "Come, all you old men all, let this delight you; Come, all you young men all, let affright you; Nor let your courage fail when comes the trial. Nor do not be afraid at the first denial."

Unless this is a remake of the 19th century shanty "on the 31st of August" (in reality Surcouf attacked the Kent on October 7).

Or the privateer called the great corsair of the Wellington Sea Shanty Society.

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR.

I am told that in the novel that really inspired Peter Weir's *Master and Commander* of 2003, the ship representing the "bad guys" was in fact an American vessel, the Norfolk. So, one day we will have to decide to definitively break all these stereotypes.

WHICH IN POLITICS AND EVEN IN WARFARE CONTRIBUTE TO MISLEAD DECISION MAKERS AND TO PROVOKE BLOODY DISASTERS.

Demonization, underestimation, denigration, even racism and paranoia never give good results (see the Vietnam War).

But let's not despair about human nature. Steven Spielberg's movie "Bridge of Spies" released in 2015 shows that we can also do a good job in this field (except for the last few minutes where we feel the siren songs of conformity again).

Critical monitoring.

Notes.

1) English-language filmography, on this particular point, the Battle of Agincourt, clearly idealizes King Henry of England. In the play, we see him close to his men, walking incognito in the camp, during the night before the combat, to probe their morale. In reality, if he had imposed total silence on his troops

during the night, under the penalty of death, it was in order to perceive the slightest of the adversaries' movements.

2) For Shakespeare, the victory of Agincourt celebrates the triumph of a humble, but united, popular army over a French nobility bloated with hubris and self-importance. Even if it means taking a few liberties with the true story. The procession of Henry V to Calais takes on an almost biblical dimension. "Come, go we in procession to the village, and be it death proclaimed through our host to boast of this or take that praise from God which is His only."

It is also worth noting, as is often the case in our modern filmography, that the French are portrayed in this battle, or its preparations, in a very negative way (boasting and ridiculous language) if necessary by inventing.

3) As far as we are concerned, we are not for the prohibition, the penalization or the censorship of erroneous ideas, BUT FOR THE moral and material SUPPORT of the truths (in adequacy with reality) which are directly opposed to them.

4) Alternative history is a fiction based on the principle of rewriting history by modifying the past. The author of an alternative history takes as a starting point an existing historical situation and changes its outcome in order to imagine the different possible consequences. This desire to change the course of history in order to imagine what it could have been reminds of the famous phrase of Blaise Pascal: "The nose of Cleopatra: if it had been shorter, the whole face of the earth would have changed" ~ Blaise Pascal, *Pensées* fragment 162).

Some examples of current alternative history.

The man in the High Castle, by Philip K. Dick (1962).

Swastika Night, by Katharine Burdekin (1937).

Fatherland, by Robert Harris (1992).

The question that every journalist intellectual or politician apprentice of today must ask himself in all humility is: what would I have thought and done, if I had lived in such societies?

DEONTOLOGICAL PRINCIPLES

ADOPTED BY THE PROFESSIONAL FEDERATION OF JOURNALISTS IN QUEBEC.

The essential role of journalists is to accurately report, analyze, and in some cases, comment on the facts that help their fellow citizens understand the world in which they live.

Complete, exact and diverse information is one of the most important guarantees of freedom and democracy.

When information is of public interest, it must always circulate freely. Facts and ideas must be communicated without constraint or obstacles. Knowing that a free press acts as an indispensable watchdog over authority and institutions, journalists must defend the freedom of the press and the public's right to information; they must fight any restrictions, pressures and threats that aim to limit the gathering and dissemination of information.

Journalists serve the public interest – not personal or specific interests. As such, they have a responsibility to publish everything that is of public interest. This obligation must override any desire to serve information sources or to favor the financial and competitive needs of news organizations.

Journalists must take their role very seriously. They must demand of themselves the same ethical qualities they demand of newsmakers; in other words, they cannot denounce other people's conflicts of interest, and at the same time, accept their own.

This Code establishes the ethical rules that should guide journalistic work. These rules lay the foundation for a journalist's most precious asset: credibility.

Since it takes into account the specific nature of the journalistic environment, this is not a Code in the strictest sense of the word.

[Clause disapproved by the author of this compilation. There is no professional body in Quebec to which journalists must belong. Neither the title of journalist nor the journalistic act are reserved for a particular group of people. The journalistic world is open, and that is the way journalists want it to be. Since there is no disciplinary board with the necessary legal authority to sanction breaches of ethics].

The term « journalist » in this Code refers to all people who exercise a journalistic function for a news organization. In the context of publicly disseminating information or opinions, this includes one or several of the following tasks: researching, reporting, interviewing; writing or preparing reports, analyses, commentaries, or specialized columns; translating or adapting texts; press photography, filmed or electronic reports; assignment, the desk (headlines, layout...), editing; caricatures; information drawing and graphics; animation, producing and supervising current affairs programs and films; managing news, public affairs or other comparable departments.

1. Fundamental journalistic values

The fundamental values of journalists include; a critical viewpoint, so they methodically doubt everything; impartiality, so they research and expose the diverse aspects of a given situation; fairness, so they view all citizens as equal before the press as they are before the law; independence, so they maintain their distance from authority and lobby groups; public respect and compassion, so they demonstrate moderation; honesty, so they display a scrupulous respect for facts and are open-minded. This in turn demonstrates a receptiveness to unfamiliar realities, and an ability to report on these realities without prejudice.

2. Truth and rigor

2a) Journalists must rigorously gather and verify information to ensure their facts are accurate. They must correct their mistakes diligently and appropriately with regard to the harm they have caused.

2b) Journalists must put their facts and opinions in their proper context so they are understandable, without exaggerating or diminishing their scope.

2c) Headlines and introductions of articles and news reports should not exaggerate or lead to misinterpretation.

2d) So as not to confuse the public, journalists must carefully distinguish between personal opinions, analysis and factual information. Above all, they must give a precise account of the facts. In the case

of editorials, columns and opinion pieces, or in advocacy journalism where opinions dominate, journalists must also respect the facts.

2e) A rumor cannot be published unless it originates from a credible source and contributes to the understanding of an event. It must always be identified as a rumor. In the judicial field, the publication of rumors is prohibited.

2f) Journalists must give an accurate account of what people say. Quotations, editing, sound effects, etc., and the sequence in which they are presented, must not distort the meaning of people's words.

2g) Photographs, graphics, sounds and images that are published or broadcast must represent reality as accurately as possible. Artistic concerns should not result in public deception. Edited images and photographs must be identified as such.

Extracts from the lesson by Professor Pierre Trudel of the Faculty of Law in Montreal.

A) Veracity of the remarks

[Variable Requirement: material facts] The veracity of the diffused remarks constitutes one of the guiding principles in the journalistic field. However, in certain cases, the truth can be difficult to discover because of the complexity of a situation. Thus it is generally advisable to distinguish three types of spread information: facts, remarks said by others and opinions or comments.

The materiality of the first one can be proved, the opinions do not lend themselves to a demonstration of their exactitude.

In this sense, if published facts are false, there is a fault. However, if falseness is only partial, it will be necessary, to conclude or not that there was a fault, to see the precautions that the journalist took.

Don't forget nevertheless that in English law, the falseness of the remarks is an element that constitutes the defamation.

[Facts revealed by others] the facts revealed by others (a informer), often included in journalistic texts, can involve the responsibility of the journalist if the revealed facts prove to be false and that the letter did not implement the sufficient means to make sure of their veracity or at least, to corroborate these facts.

[Opinions and comments] an opinion, as it cannot lend itself to a demonstration of its veracity, must be maintained in a reasonable way, i.e., to be based on a sufficient factual base. The honest comment constitutes besides a means of defense often used by the media when a fault in the information processing is reproached to them.

[Public debate] If the truth is one of the requirements in the journalistic field, when an ordinary citizen expresses himself orally within a public debate, when he ventures an opinion, the tolerance should be larger. The spreading on a broader scale of defamatory remarks (a circular), accusing an elected official of favoritism, was, however, punished.

[Public debate and criticism of public personalities] In the case *New York Times vs. Sullivan*, the American Supreme court established the need placing the right of criticizing under the first amendment, by demanding that a person exercising a public office has the burden to demonstrate that the author of the accusing text knew that the allegations were false, or at the very least, worried by no means about the veracity of the remarks. Thereafter, this requirement was extended to all the public persons whose activities are likely to interest the public. With regard to the individuals, it is enough for them to demonstrate the simple negligence of the author.

In *Bombardier vs. Bouchard*, a journalist had called pedophile a psychologist because of public statements had made on the question of the sexual intercourse between an adult and a child, maintaining that they were not necessarily harmful for children. This discussed assertion caused to him a punishment of his professional order and he admitted thereafter that this conclusion was not that taken on by the majority of the research about the question.

The journalist as for herself was blamed by the Quebec Press Council, but reiterated thereafter her denouncing remarks against the psychologist.

The Quebec Court of Appeal kept the responsibility of the journalist for the reason that by calling the respondent pedophile, she knew that she did not tell the truth or at the very least did not worry about it. By doing this, she had disregarded her duty and was to assume a reasonable level of responsibility for having attacked the honor, the dignity and the personal and professional reputation of the respondent. The latter was offended in his intimate feelings of dignity and pride. More than five years had passed since the spreading of the highly criticized by the appellant declarations. He was entitled to the oblivion and the protection of his reputation against every unjustified breach.

B) The honest expression of the author.

The freedom to express an opinion on a question of public interest profits from a protection but this one comes into play only when the defamatory opinion constitutes the honest expression of the point of view of the person who ventures it. It is to the author of the defamation to convince the court of the authenticity of his allegations.

[Good faith plea]. In the Quebec law, the good faith of the author does not constitute a factor making it possible to escape one's responsibility for defamatory remarks. However, if the revealed facts are true and that the disclosure of information pursues a public interest, it is justified to call upon the good faith, for the conclusions or deductions that he drew from these facts, even if those proved to be erroneous.

In French law, on the other hand, the good faith of the journalist is a significant component in the evaluation of the defamation, particularly as regards the investigation journalism. If the defamatory charges are reputed to be made with the intention to harm, they can be justified when the journalist establishes his good faith by proving that he pursued a legitimate, out of every personal animosity, end, and that he wrote his article while complying with a certain number of requirements, particularly of seriousness and of prudence in the expression.

General Principle of the article 1457 of the Civil Code of Quebec. Although the responsibility resulting from a defamatory deed does not require an intention to harm from his author, there will be, however, fault if the spread information is false or if it is presented so as to plant seeds of doubt as for the honor or the reputation of a person.

In addition, if the information is true, it will also be possible to conclude that there was an infringement of the right to one's reputation if an intention to harm or insult is noted. Moreover, so that there is defamation with regard to a person, it is necessary that the victim is identifiable, that the message is made public (at least a third party must have taken note of it) and that it conveys a negative perception of the victim with respect to the third parties, i.e., it exposes him to hatred or contempt and makes him lose the regard or the confidence of the public. This last criterion is generally evaluated according to the perception of an ordinary person. In simple terms, the offenses of defamation are distinguished according to whether the remarks attacking the reputation are conveyed in written or verbal form. Verbal defamation is generally regarded as less serious.

It should be noted that defamation can be the object of urgent proceedings: under the terms of the article 762b) of the Code of civil procedure. See also *Boily vs. Burniaux*, [1997] R.J.Q. 2191 (C.S.) where the Court recognizes that this procedure allows, in addition to get the suspension, to claim damages for defamation. See also *Peltier vs. Southam*, J.E. 96-929 (C.S.).

.C) The desire of revenge and the intention to harm

[Intention of the author] the intention of the author of a defamatory text is not determining to conclude that he is liable. The bad faith is, however, a factor taken into account to decide if it is necessary to grant to the victim damages or to make an example.

D) The victim of defamation.

Defamation can aim any person but distinctions were developed by the jurisprudence in order to take into account the need ensuring the conciliation of the right to one's reputation with the requirements inherent in the public debates.

1. Political personalities

On several occasions, the courts reminded of the fact that political personalities are prone, more than every other, to be criticized by the media. Their decisions and their actions are the object of more careful attention, and the criticisms, comments and opinions which will result from this will always be appreciated according to the quality of the concerned party, i.e., the fact that it is a political personality. On the other hand, the simple participation of a person in the public life does not give the right to deluge him with insults, to affect him in his private life, when the facts have no link with the achievement of the duties of his office. The engagement in policy does not confer a hunting license concerning the honor and the reputation of a public personality. Admittedly, there still, a personality public, and more particularly a political personality, must be more tolerant.

[Acceptable Limits to criticism] the European Court, in the Oberschlick case, reminds of the fact that political personalities are more prone than an ordinary citizen to be the subject of criticism from the media.

As for the acceptable limits to criticism, they are broader concerning a politician, acting as a public figure, than concerning an ordinary person. The politician exposes himself inevitably and knowingly to an attentive control of his actions, as well by the journalists as by the mass of the citizens, and must show a greater tolerance, especially when he engages in public statements being able to lend to criticism. He is certainly entitled to see his reputation protected, even out his private life, but the requirements of this protection must be put in balance with the interests of the free discussion of the political questions.

E) Context of the broadcasting.

1. The public assembly.

[Meetings of the town council] the meetings of town councils are privileged places of debates, of exchanges and of opposition of the points of view. Generally, some resolutions are discussed there then adopted and, according to the item on the agenda, the exchanges can become surging and hostile. The liberty of expression in this context should be sufficiently large to guarantee to the decision a solid and representative of a satisfactory popular support, character.

[Spontaneous words] Within the verbal exchanges between various people, the spontaneous words, which harm the honor or the reputation of a person, should not be punished, if it is possible to show that there was provocation or that they were simultaneous exchanges.

2. Internet.

2. [Practicable principles] The cyberspace media do not escape the law relating to defamation. The same principles are practicable. However, given the larger potential of broadcasting, the damage which results from this could prove to be heavier for the victim. In certain countries, a right to reply is admitted for the people about whom falsenesses were written.

2- Limits to the right to one's reputation

[General Principles] the attack against the honor and the reputation will be punished in the absence of justification from the author of the remarks in question. This justification will be based on the idea of a valid and appropriate use of the freedom of press and speech.

The (European) Court points out that subject to the paragraph 2 of the article 10 of the Convention, freedom of speech is worth not only for the remarks received favorably or considered as inoffensive or indifferent, but also for those which run up, shock or worry.

These principles have a particular importance for the press. If it should not cross the terminals fixed particularly to protect the reputation, it falls to it nevertheless to communicate information and ideas about the political questions as well as about the other topics of general interest.

N.B. In order to balance the rights to freedom of speech and of press and the right to the safeguard of one's reputation, rights which clash, the Quebec courts took on particularly the notions of public interest and of right of the public to information.

A) Public interest...

A) The honest commentary. The defense based on the concept of honest commentary, resulting from the Anglo-Saxon common law, is based on the existence of three conditions: 1 public interest; 2 honest intention; 3 the sincere conclusion.

Commentary, criticism and opinions

[The commentary] The commentary is one of the most used journalistic stylistic devices. The commentary is based on current events or documentary research and, by an analysis and an organization of these facts, the journalist tries to draw some conclusions for the action or the reflection. The commentary emerges from the strictly informative influence of the news to present a personal point of view to the readers and to the listeners. It is therefore an article of opinion which analyzes or interprets main facts. It is generally signed.

[Criticism] Criticism goes beyond the commentary in the sense that we find there a judgment, drawn from an analysis of the various aspects of the event or taken on subject. This journalistic genre is particularly valued in the field of arts and culture. The journalist, acting in a way as an expert, assesses the quality or the interest of an artistic or cultural event. Generally, the critic has a thorough knowledge of the background in which his articles fit. He acts in a way as a promoter of these events, encouraging the public to be present (or discouraging it, in certain circumstances).

[The lampoon]. It is a writing likely to cause a polemic, if not strong or violent reactions from the people aimed by this one. It is undoubtedly the literary genre most capable to constitute a defamation, since one of its goals is to attack the credibility of the subjects. Does the journalist who resorts to the lampoons genre enjoy a greater room for maneuver ? A Quebec journalist maintained this claim but without success. On this question, the judge took on what follows.

“It is the lot of polemist and lampoonist to seek to catch the attention of his readers by using striking, powerful and sometimes even exaggerated, phrases [...]

But if an act is defamatory, it cannot be excused under the pretext that the polemist style is used or that his author is a lampoonist....

It is allowed and sound in a democratic society that a journalist can analyze, criticize and comment on the police work and Delorme enjoyed the freedom to choose the lampoon like style and admitted means of expression; he had, however, the duty to respect the limits inherent in the use of the freedom of speech, of which the respect of the reputation of the persons; if he exceeds these limits wrongfully, he makes a fault.”

In the evaluation of the fault of the journalist, the judge writes:

“Nobody disputes the right of a journalist to give his opinion on the aspect of the operation techniques of the police officers and to criticize them if necessary, nobody can reproach him either for resorting to the aggressive and virulent style of the lampoons to achieve his goals. Still is it necessary that his speech makes sense and that his conclusions rise from the premises he posed.”

[Political or partisan writing] The political or ideological movements cause on behalf of the various groups attitudes which clash. Sometimes, these writings present a rewriting of history, dictated by the pursued political goals.

Is it to the courts to decide on the veracity of these stances? Can be such a veracity demonstrated ? These differences of opinions are in the very core of the idea of political debate. In a democratic system, they are in theory the elections which will release the way of the privileged political position. The courts play a role limited on these questions, falling particularly under the limits of the legitimate political speech, assessed in its particular context and regarding the competing rights.

In Romanov vs. Weymarn, the judge Tellier writes on this subject:

“The courts do not have the role of rewriting the history or of commenting on the political value of the declarations or stands from groups which clash.

The text in question contains some declarations whose exaggerations are obvious, even for a non-specialist reader, and are made by an author who does not hide his political opinions. We could even call this address a lampoon, but this does not make it defamatory for all that.

It is to the reader that it belongs to form his own judgment. As for the particularly targeted people, they have the indisputable right of either abstaining and letting the readers form an opinion, or to exercise their right to reply in order to also use their freedom of speech.

THE FRENCH LANGUE DE BOIS.

The height or the last straw of the rhetorical manipulation is, of course, the working out of a new language as in the case of the newspeak invented by George Orwell in her famous novel 1984 (published in 1949). The newspeak is used in the very basis of the story, but it is also the object of a short analytical development at the end of the novel, in a fictitious appendix entitled The Principles of Newspeak.

The Official language of Oceania, the newspeak was created to satisfy the ideological needs for the Ingsoc (soc = Socialism): it must support the official word and prevent the expression of heterodox or critical thoughts.

The fundamental idea of the Newspeak is to remove all the nuances of a language in order to preserve only dichotomies which strengthen the influence of the State, because the Manichean speech makes it possible to eliminate any reflection about the complexity of the problem: if you are not for, you are against, there is no medium. This kind of binary reasoning makes it possible to support the reasoning based on the emotion, and thus to eliminate any debate, any discussion, and therefore every potential criticism of the State.

The principle is simple: the more you decrease the number of words of a language and the more you amalgamate the words between them, the more you decrease the number of concepts with which people can think out by eliminating the subtleties of the language, the more you make people unable to reflect, and the more they reason with their emotion. The bad control of the language thus makes people stupid and easy to be manipulated by the massive instruments of propaganda.

It is therefore a lexical and syntactic simplification of the language intended to make impossible the expression of the potentially subversive ideas and to avoid any expression of criticism, the ultimate objective being of going as far as to prevent the very "idea" of this criticism. This concept also illustrates a remark of the logician Bertrand Russell pointing out that no problem could never be solved, even sensed, if you take care to eliminate at the beginning any possibility of posing it, or to discredit in advance any person raising it, we will add.

I think that our civilization is ready for slavery and ruin. What encourages me to think that it is the extraordinary inanity of our politicians (it would be children less than 7 years who would say of them that they are silly geese); which is rivaled only by the unfathomable inanity of our elites including journalistic ones. In every case they are the same ones. As dreams of greatness our civilization has to offer any more but the petty-bourgeois marriage for all.

ONE TRACK THINKING * AND LIE.

"Nineteen Eighty-Four," "BRAVE NEW WORLD": At the time of their publication these works by George Orwell and Aldous Huxley seemed science fiction, but today they join reality. With the globalization of economies the uniformity of cultures and societies seems today compulsory. Thus is born the one track thinking. Imposed by the "right-minded persons," it seeks to circumvent the debates in order to impose to everybody a single model. Any dispute becomes suspect, and any debate is dismissed. Thus we see appearing a single and dangerous for the democracies model of society. This is why to read Noam Chomsky remains essential. Behind the apparent neutrality of the media system are hidden indeed presuppositions which collapse when they are expounded.....

It is often said that the fourth estate follows on from the three traditional powers (legislative power, executive power and judicial power). In the United States, it is spoken about a fourth branch of the government by analogy with the executive, legislative, and legal branches of the American federal government.

The history of the uses of the expression can be traced back to Alexis de Tocqueville, in his work Democracy in America (1833). Tocqueville brings there a new classification of the powers, which would be...

- The central power (in the United States, the federal power), in which we find the traditional separation of powers (legislative power, executive power and judicial power).
- The local authority (federate powers).
- The associative power (lobbies).
- The [written initially, televised then] press.

Over time, the media took an increasingly important place in the society . They made it possible information to better and better to circulate. Indeed, today, it is primarily through them that we see the world. Therefore they got a strong influence on the population, would it be only negatively or through the choice of the subjects.

"There is no alternative" **.

Self-censorship. This kind of censure is subtle: it makes it possible to avoid for the power the constraining form of a concrete censorship, which would be sensed badly by the opinion.

That makes it possible at the same time to be freed from the observation costs, but also from the anti-advertisement generated by the perception of the censorship in the public opinion.

The development of the self-censorship makes the press prone to the politically correct, and gives the impression that the newspapers develop the same subjects and the same ideas. There is then a loss of the pluralism of the media, of their credibility and of their role.

The public opinion is then divided the all the more critical consumers of information, on the one hand, and the victims trustful in the information which is served to them, on the other hand.

The self-censorship is therefore practiced mainly in the editorial choice of the taken on subjects, the way of dealing with an interview or of giving an account of a subject dealt on the ground.

The self-censorship lastly confirms implicitly the absence of apparent censorship, and therefore the credibility to be given to subjects which circulate only on Internet, labeled officially "rumors" and for this reason purely and solely by mass media.

The media function like companies: they must make profits: The journalists are torn between the need of informing and that for charming. The communication is then less visible than in publicity because it appears in the middle of the subjects taken up by the journalists. For example, certain interviews with political actors of the foreground comprise no critical question. The foreign press is often stunned by the French practices in this field. Indeed, those make it possible to the president of the Republic to choose the journalists who will have to ask him some questions. It is current, in France, to submit in

advance the questions to a politician and to make him reread his answers, what is not done abroad. As the "European" journalist Jean Quatremer said it very well in his book entitled "Sex, lie and media" published at the time of the case Dominique Strauss-Kahn (president of the IMF) "the main problem of the [French in fact] media is well their reverence with regard to the power. "

Undoubtedly also because as the cable 07 Paris 306 a, of the American embassy in Paris (revealed by Wikileaks) said it very well, the French journalists believe they are intelligent, very intelligent (they believe that they are intellectuals) what they are not in reality, of course, and are less worried to inform objectively in a factual way than to train (by selecting and manipulating information discreetly in order to orientate the ideas of the public in their direction) sitting well warm in the armchairs of their offices.

Why 80% of the leading articles of the written or broadcast, daily or weekly press, say all exactly the same thing on the great possible topics: homosexual marriage, immigration, nation? And why does this speech, in a climate of absolute conformism, receive the perfect approval of the elites in their great majority, economic, legal, administrative and political? The existence of (alleged "anti-system" or "populist") extremist parties powerful in Europe is fully part of the background: they embody the foil, the devil, the absolute evil. They are a moral guarantee of the one track thinking. The one who does not think like everyone, i.e., like the leading elites, is inevitably compared to this cursed figure. They found nothing better than these foil parties to extinguish dissidence, to silence the free thinkers. But basically, what is the relation between the various totems of the one track thinking ? Why venerate in the same impetus the "gay marriage," the broad and unconditional welcome of immigration, the denial of the differences between nations and civilizations?

What is the relation between these various subjects? All occurs actually as if it were necessary to tend towards the suppression of differences, the emergence of a new man, single, interchangeable, transparent. The one track thinking for example tends to deny the distinction man/woman (gender studies), parents/children, foreign/citizen? master/disciple, to level the world by abolishing the social classes the borders and the countries.

"This passion of standardization is totalitarianism minded, a kind of by contrast by-product of the totalitarian regimes of the last century. It tends to create an aseptic, neutralized, transparent, cloned, deprived of identity and personality, and therefore easy to be manipulated ad infinitum, human being. Here is the sought-after goal. The totalitarian systems of the last century succumbed but their phantom continues to rule supreme over the consciences. But we uns high-knowers of the druidiaction we say, "Long live to the right to be different! "

Let us not forget how an ideology is always imposed. To dominate, violence is not enough, a justification of another nature is needed. Thus, when a person exerts his power over another one - whether it is a dictator, a bureaucrat, or an owner -, he needs a justifying ideology, always the same one: this domination is done "for the good" of the dominated person. In other words, the power is always presented as altruistic, disinterested, generous."

And let us not forget that the media are today an essential means for each one to keep informed of the topicality, they are indispensable to develop in the world of today, and to exercise our duties of citizens. But the media are not neutral, and can sometimes dictate our opinions to us. It is for this reason that the pluralism of the media and the way of using information are so important: the citizen must remain vigilant, put into perspective what he discovers, and compare, to cross-reference information: he must develop his critical mind in order not to be manipulated.

It is besides thanks to information that he can exercise his critical sense: It is a virtuous circle. From where the importance of always telling and getting the truth with regard to the great affairs of the world. In the 1930s, the methods of the Nazi propaganda consisted, for example, in choosing simple words, in repeating them unceasingly, and in combining them with emotions, feelings, fears. When Hitler invaded the Sudetes [in 1938], it was by calling upon the noblest and charitable objectives, the need a "humanitarian intervention" in order to prevent the "ethnic cleansing" undergone by the German-speaking people, and to make it possible that each one can live under the "protective wing" of Germany, with the support of the most advanced of the world in the field of arts and culture, power. Poor country poor people where it is no longer possible to tell the truth. The French or European intellectual it is the one who realizes something 40 years after the beginning of the phenomenon and 30 years after that the common people (sea fishermen bank employee mountain shepherd, etc.) began to feel it.

This spiral of silence comes from the fact that the media offer the carefully formatted same information to a large number of readers spectators or listeners; thus they have access to one opinion that they believe being that which is shared by the greatest number of people.

But individuals fear social isolation. So, to avoid it, they express the opinions that they regard as admitted by the majority. If they see that the media support an opinion which is not theirs, they will not dare to express themselves believing that they are alone to think that (what is not inevitably the case).

This behavior will therefore strengthen the opinion of the majority, and will lead to the disappearance of the minority. Thus the other opinions die, even if they are shared by a significant number of people, giving way, while keeping quiet, to the popularized through media information.

We live in a dictatorship of thought which is imposed by intellectual terrorism. The citizen has no longer something to say if it is not to follow the instructions of the elites which propose no longer a real political debate. The goal of this dictatorship tries to reduce each individual to the status of a consumer in an ultra-liberal world whose new power holders are the narrow-minded elites in the service of the generally anti-national mega-companies.

* As for us we call one track thinking any speech more or less amounting to express that there is no alternative **, that there are no other possible choices only that you preach.

This kind of speech is, of course, equivalent to conceal your personal choices, to conceal the choices that you made personally in favor of such or such branch (of the alternative), and consequently to exonerate yourself ultimately from any personal responsibility in every negative aspect being able to result from this. NB. Psychologically speaking that hardly prevents a lot of people, on the other hand, generally, to claim the possible positive aspects of these choices, and then to attribute them to their personal merits.

**There is no alternative is a rhetoric process generally ascribed to Margaret Thatcher when she was Prime Minister of the United Kingdom. It meant in her mouth that capitalism and globalization were two beneficial and necessary phenomena and that every society which followed another way would be heading for failure.

The Swiss sociologist Jean Ziegler in his book entitled "the new rulers of the world" regards this slogan as being after Bolshevism and Nazism that of a third totalitarian power.

THE SOPHISMS OF THE FASHIONABLE RHETORIC.

“Fírinne inár croidhedhaibh, 7 neart inár lámhaibh, 7 comall inár tengthaibh ” “Truth in our hearts, strength in our arms and the art of good speech.”

“Generally, Celtica seeks in the most industrious way two things: the art of the war and to speak subtly [Latin *argute loqui*] (Cato.Origins. Book II).

Being members of the priestly class, the bard is a druid (from “dru-wid-es” which means “very learned”) who, in the hierarchical order, comes second behind the “theologians.” His functions were therefore obligatorily religious but for fields which nowadays fall within the profane world. In the ancient Celtic world his main specializations were, history and genealogy (of sovereigns and noble families), oral and sung poetry (mythology or epics), the praise, the satire and the blame (as for the government of the society).His role was to make the praise, or the satire of the great. Praise satire or public blame were used to recall them to order.

The satirist bards (*cainte* in Gaelic language) played in the ancient Celtic world the same role as the prophets in the world of the Old Testament. The ancient Celtic societies even thought that a satire of bard could have a physical or material effect similar to a spell (see *glam dicinn*).

People were often very severe with the function of a satirist of the ancient Celtic bards, i.e., in relation to their capacity not to compose works in praise of their guards and sponsors but on the contrary in order to point or underline faults being able to harm their reputation even their honor. And there were incontestably cases of unfair satires (punished by a kind of poetic justice besides, at least in our legends).

But it is not necessary either to approve blissfully or shamelessly, in a financially interested way, all what the princes who govern us, do.

The criticism of the personality of all those who solicit our votes is, today as yesterday (let us not forget that the kings were elected by their peers, at the very least by a part of the population) a democratic requirement!

This satire of the men of power as a man is an all the more demanding need as the candidate has no precise basic idea, boasts about having no idea on the structural bases of our society, mocks or disparages systematically those who have some. When a pragmatic stands to solicit our confidence, we have then only his personality to determine our choice and nothing else.

And, of course, when we speak about ideas on the content, we want really to say ideas touching to the very principles or the very structures of our societies, not without import bills or details. This kind of decision or of management of the daily life is to be left to what our Irish texts call generally some stewards (*briugu*, *rechtaire*), some ministers would have said the kings.

The satire of the modern media circles was written by the great modern bard that is the Italian writer Umberto Eco in his novel entitled “Numero zero “.

The picture painted in his novel is rather apocalyptic: The background, it is the Italy of the Nineties, that of Berlusconi, at the same time political leader and owner of media. The journalists of Umberto Eco do not even manufacture a newspaper. They take part in “ zero issues,” these blank specimens , kinds of drafts carried out under real condition by an editorial board before the true commercial launch of a new newspaper.

Consequently below what we can say in connection with what should be the deontological code of our media.

ON THE RHETORIC OF JOURNALISTS.

Rhetoric was an art already very snuffed our ancestors. It was a question...

Firstly, of good speaking the language of his ancestors or of his people.

The motto of the Fenians, that all the warriors swore to respect, was stated indeed as follows.

The Strength in our hands.

The Truth in our hearts.

The Achievement in our word.

N.B. Certain translators it is true give a slightly different version: "Hand which does not tremble, embassies, and argute loqui, or art of good speech" according to Cato.

It was also a question, secondly to reason well (according to the laws of logic) possibly to convince and demonstrate but not necessarily.

Thirdly, to convince an audience, some peers or men even women, socially subordinated, by causing in them a certain number of emotions.

Let us say quite simply. The first two bases that we have just evoked (that to control well one's language, that of one's ancestors, that of one's people, even to perhaps illustrate it, and the science or method for reasoning well, for reasoning logically) are still part of the values that we preach.

On the other hand, regarding the third objective of the rhetoric, that which consists in convincing at all costs, by causing such or such emotion, we express the strongest possible reservations (except when it is poetry or work of art).

This third aspect of rhetoric is acceptable only in certain cases, for example that of a defense lawyer opposed death penalty by personal convictions and who therefore uses all the possible and imaginable processes to save the life of his client, including the lie.

But apart from these very rare cases lie and bad faith are also condemnable in the mouth or under the pen of a lawyer.

This third aspect of the art of rhetoric is called today "communication" or art to pull the wool over the eyes.

The education for adults of the political advisers consists indeed to use all possible and imaginable means to inspire the good people (the electorate in a democracy) some feelings which are contrary to their interest understood well or some ideas, concepts, notions, impressions, which by no means match objective realities, which differ from them appreciably, even which turn their back to them. For example, that $2+2 = 5$, 5 or $3,5$ or 4.5 but especially not 4 . However to convince a normal human being even moderately gifted that $2 + 2 = 5$ (or $3,5$ or 4.5) is not easy, various means are necessary for that, the first among these means being, of course, the pure negativity: the criticism including the insincere criticism (based on deliberated approximations or mere lies) of the positions of rivals or competitors.

The second of these means is the use of very advanced euphemisms, even the recourse to a language of newspeak type but not inevitably strictly identical to that of George Orwell. This newspeak instead of being based on a in a way Manichean simplification, multiplies on the contrary the synonyms or euphemisms which are not so, what has as an inevitable and precisely wanted result, the loss of any moral reference mark.

In France, for example, the notion of terrorism was created and developed in order to avoid talking about small jihadism of political Islamism, or even Nazislamism, as one of his prime ministers once did. The sometimes surrealistic result, but that was well the sought goal , is that journalists will sometimes talk for an hour about a killing committed with the cry of Allahu Akhbar ... without the word Islam-ism being ever spoken. The dominant ideology being indeed that jihadism has nothing but then absolutely nothing, to do, with a certain idea of Islam, since Muhammad was a new Christ, even a super Christ, died on his sick-bed, bed-ridden, because of the consequences of poisoning devised by Jews women who wanted to take revenge. And while Christ himself did not die on the cross as everyone knows. Or should know.

The third characteristic of the today fashionable rhetoric is that we can call single-minded approach. However no problem can be really solved in-depth (for a long time) if nobody is aware of it and if nobody can arouse it.

We find again here the deeply harmful role of the current media people and of the journalists, that we already underlined in addition.

The fourth characteristic of the today fashionable rhetoric is the lack of logic. Since the work of John Stuart Mill about logic (1843), we know that it is very often based on paralogisms i.e., on associations of unconscious or generally accepted ideas, presuppositions or implicit unsaid things falling under the guiding philosophy, and on shifts in meaning: mix-up between races (or communities with genic frequency characteristic as regards phenotype), nations, civilizations, cultures, religions, citizenship, etc. See for example the reception (the way in which was understood) in the 19th century of the book by Arthur de Gobineau about the inequality of the civilizations (or that of Samuel Huntington about their clash) and his mentality of horse breeders (in contrast to the interbreeding as single means of improvement of the human species).

We come thus as we have just seen it especially like in the case of the antiracism and its doubles (Taguieff) to reasonings which are only packs of paralogisms (even of sophisms in many cases) or to caricatures of syllogisms.

The taken separately premises of the reasoning are not easily questionable or seem apparently valid (although having nothing to do together) but arrive to a false or at the very least paradoxical in the etymological sense of the term, conclusion, in any case which is by no means brought quite logically by the juxtaposition of the two premises.

This inconsistency or lacks of logic of the reasoning is explained primarily by the approximation on which they are based, on the approximations or the non-relevance of their premises. They are what is called paralogisms.

Types of paralogisms.

All the men are mortal.
A cat is mortal.
Therefore a cat is a man.

The second premise is true, but we cannot draw from it the conclusion in question.

With the negation of the antecedent.

All the men are mortal.
A cat is not a man.
Therefore a cat is immortal.

Here still, the second premise is true, but we cannot draw from it the conclusion in question. Only the reasoning "If A involves B, then non-B involves non-A" is correct.

All the men are mortal (A involves B).
A stone is not mortal (C involves non B).
Therefore a stone is not a man (C involves non A).

Other types of paralogism: the argumentation contains a contradiction. That necessarily means that a mistake was made, it remains to find which... For example...

Speaking of a train.
I am not in the same car as John.
John is not in the same car as Peter.
Therefore I am not in the same car as Peter.

N.B. The distinction between paralogism and logical reasoning is sometimes difficult to do in certain cases, and it goes without saying that paralogism is absolutely not contrary with morality as regards poetry or in a work of Art. The paralogism is then perfectly legitimate. As regards poetry for example, where the oxymoron could in no case be equated with the newspeak of Orwell). Sophism and oxymoron should not be mixed up. The purpose of the oxymoron is not to mislead the interlocutor. It is only a poetic stylistic device.

On the other hand, it undoubtedly arises from the famous motto of the Fenians (the truth in our hearts) that sophisms or voluntary and deliberated paralogisms were not allowed.

THE TEN COMMANDMENTS OF THE INTELLECTUAL WORTHY OF THE NAME.

A reflection about the 10 principal mass manipulations is often ascribed to Noam Chomsky (this text would be in fact from Sylvain Timsit). The Machiavellianism necessary to the implementation of its strategies is undoubtedly variable from a political clique to another, without a priori distinction of membership to the left or right wing. The whole of these strategies being part of the "system" which is in power does not matter, each government modifying only the level of intensity of such or such approach. The control of an important part of the media is, of course, a requirement so that all that functions, whether it is by direct nomination of the directors or through the old-boy network.

N.B. Implicitly consequently, and by contrast, what could be a sound design of the role of the intellectuals in the society.

A paramount element of social control, the diversion strategy indeed consists in diverting the attention of the public away from the significant problems and from the changes decided by the political and economic elites, thanks to a continual flood of entertainment and insignificant information. The diversion strategy is also indispensable to prevent the public from being interested in essential knowledge, in the fields of science, economy, psychology, neurobiology, and cybernetics. To keep distracted the attention of the audience, far from the true social problems, captivated by subjects of no real importance. The sport also has another utility, it improves the competitive sense instead of developing the sense of co-operation collaboration complementarity.

N.B. A sound practice of the intellectuals worthy of this name : to start with most important, to draw attention to the most important.

You create initially a problem, a "situation" designed to cause a certain reaction of the public, so that this one is itself seeker of the measures that you wish to make it accept. For example, to create an economic or financial crisis to make accepted as a necessary evil the drop of the social rights and the dismantling of the public services.

N.B. A sound practice of the intellectuals worthy of this name: not to create problems, but to suggest solutions.

Another sound practice of the intellectuals worthy of this name: to treat the most of the bound problems in one go.

By contrast, mass unemployment, lack of security, flexibility, relocation, salaries not guaranteeing an acceptable income, as many changes which would have caused a revolution if they had been applied brutally.

Another sound practice of the intellectuals worthy of this name: not to procrastinate for the things that you can do immediately.

By contrast, one of the ways of making accepted an unpopular decision is to present it as "painful but necessary," and by getting the agreement of the citizens in the present for an application in the future. It is always easier to accept a future sacrifice than an immediate sacrifice. Firstly, because the effort is not to make immediately. Then because people always tend to hope that "all will be better tomorrow" and that the required sacrifice could be avoided. Lastly, that leaves time for people to be accustomed to the idea of the change and to accept it with resignation when the time will be appropriate .

Another sound practice: to speak to the audience as to adults.

Most advertisements intended for the general public use a speech, some arguments, some characters, and a tone particularly infantilizing, as if the spectator were a small child or a mentally handicapped person. The more you will seek to mislead the spectator, the more you will adopt a infantilizing tone.

Another sound practice : to call on reflection rather than on emotion.

To call on emotion is a traditional technique to short-circuit the rational analysis, and therefore the critical sense of the individuals. Moreover, the use of the emotional register makes it possible to open the access door into the unconscious in order to establish in it some ideas, desires, fears, impulses, or behaviors...

Another good practice: to develop knowledge education and critical mind.

By contrast to be sure that the public is unable to understand the technologies and the methods used for its control and its slavery. The quality of the education given to the lower classes is to be poorest, so that the gap which separates the lower classes from the higher classes is and remains incomprehensible by the lower classes.

Another good practice: to encourage individuals to surpass themselves. Not to encourage the public to find “cool” the fact of being stupid, vulgar, and uncultivated...

To replace guilt by revolt.

Because if you make believed by the individual that he is the single responsible for his misfortune, because of the insufficiency of his intelligence, his capacities, or of his efforts; instead of revolting against the economic system, then he self-devaluates himself and makes himself feel guilty, what generates a depressive state of which one of the effects is the inhibition of action. And without action, not revolution!...

Another good reflex lastly: to spread at the maximum the list of the various means of manipulating the minds, highlighted by the observations of Noam Chomsky on the media.

During the last 50 years, the lightning progress of science indeed dug a growing gap between the knowledge of the public and this held and used by the leading elites. Thanks to biology, neurobiology, and applied psychology, the “system” reached an advanced knowledge of the human being, at the same time bodily and psychologically. The system ended up in better knowing the average individual than this one knows oneself. That means that in the majority of the cases, the system holds a greater control and a greater power on the individuals than the individuals themselves.

THE NEW TREASON OF THE INTELLECTUALS ACCORDING TO NOAM CHOMSKY.

What Gustave Le Bon wrote in his psychology of the crowd (approximately: in a crowd the most intelligent ones if there are possibly some of them, behave like the least intelligent ones, the most simplistic, the clumsiest); applies very well to the organized crowd that are the media-political circles. But Noam Chomsky too is rather radical with regard to this fourth estate established by media. For him to be an intellectual has nothing to do with the fact of thinking, to be an intellectual and to cogitate are two different things.

"The people who we call intellectuals are no different from anyone else, except that they have particular privilege. They're mostly well off, they have training, they have resources. If somebody's working 50 hours a day to put food on the table and never got through high school and so on, their opportunities are, of course, less than the people who are called intellectuals. That doesn't mean that they're any less intellectual. In fact, some of the best-educated people I have known never got past fourth grade. But they have fewer opportunities " (Noam Chomsky. Who roughly speaking takes over here the ancient distinction between head on straight and head full of information, or between intelligence and education).

In short.

There is the intellectual job, that many people do ; and then there are what is called "intellectuals," who practice a particular job, not needing especially thinking - in fact, it is perhaps better not to think, too much - and it is that which people call to be an intellectual today. To be an intellectual has nothing to do with the fact of working with one's brain, they are different things. Average people are right to scorn that, because it is nothing very special. It is besides a trade not very interesting, and usually not very well done.

These people there call themselves "intellectuals," but it is actually rather a kind of secular priesthood, whose task is to support the doctrinal truths of the society.

The job of the intellectuals of the mainstream, it is to be used in a way as a "lay clergy," to make sure of the maintenance of the doctrinal faith in the socio-economic field. If you go back to the time when the Church dominated, it is what the clergy did: it was the clergymen who watched for and tracked heresy. And when the societies became more secular [...], the same controls remained necessary: the institutions were to continue to defend themselves, and if they could not do it by burning people on stakes, they had to find other ways. Gradually, this responsibility was transferred towards the intellectual class: to be the guards of the sacred political truth, some hired men in a way.

In France, if you are a member of intellectual elite and that you cough, an article is published on the first page of the journal Le Monde. It is one of the reasons for why the French intellectual culture is become so burlesque: it is like at Hollywood.

The intellectuals of today are therefore specialists in defamation, they are basically "political commissars," some ideological directors, and it is therefore them who feel the most threatened by the free thought.

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN OF THE JOURNALISM.

“Those tribes-states which are considered to conduct their commonwealth more judiciously, have it ordained by their laws, that, if any person has heard by rumor and report from his neighbors anything concerning the commonwealth, he shall convey it to the magistrate, and not impart it to any other; because it has been discovered that inconsiderate and inexperienced men were often alarmed by false reports, and driven to some rash act, or else took hasty measures in affairs of the highest importance. The magistrates conceal those things which require to be kept unknown and they disclose to the people whatever they determine to be expedient. It is not lawful to speak of the commonwealth, except in the council” (Caesar. B.G. Book VI, chapter XX).

Outdated idea you will exclaim! In the beginning of the 20th century the journalist Walter Lippmann (23 09 1899 - 14 12 1974) however expressed the same thing in his book dealing with the public opinion in a democracy but to do with it something of very questionable, rightly denounced by Noam Chomsky.

The text of Caesar was however clear, it was a question indeed on the behalf of these Celtic tribe-State of cleansing information before it comes into the masses, and what was initially targeted was
-the false information
-the decisions taken under the influence of emotion * and not after careful considerations.

It is therefore important today to rehabilitate this very creditable concern.

- To avoid NOT COUNTERBALANCED BY A TRUE FREEDOM OF PRESS NOR BY A TRUE PLURALISM OF OPINIONS ...false information.

- To avoid the decisions taken under the influence of emotion * and not after careful reflections.

But it goes without saying that the opinions expressed in this article do not coincide necessarily with the views or the policies of the government because, as the singer (Guy Beart) said it in 1968,

“The poet told the truth

He must be executed.

.....

A Chicago journalist died in the street

They will silently

On everything he thinks

Poor president all witnesses have disappeared

In chorus they are silent

The witness told the truth

He must be executed.”

Poor country poor people that the country where it is no longer possible to tell the truth. And finally it is generally rather in the letters to the editor or in the reactions of the readers that the truth nuggets lie.

The first presidential steps of Obama are fitted in the trace of Abraham Lincoln, those of Sarkozy led him to the Fouquet's, a Parisian luxury hotel with a restaurant where he was expected inter alia by his friends of the Stock Exchange. The first days of Obama's presidency were marked by work, those of Sarkozy by a holiday of a few days in Malta, on the yacht of one of his billionaire friends. The first emblematic measure of the chief of the White House was the closing of the Guantanamo Detention Camp, that of Sarkozy was the tax shield which reduces the tax of richest.

All the heel-piece shoes of the world will by no means be enough to bring President Sarkozy close to matching president Obama, nor to make any similarity accepted, as well as regards the bodily size as ethical and moral stature.

The words are missing in order to describe the vulgarity, the ridicule, the demagoguery... (list which cannot be exhaustive) of this parvenu supposed to govern... But I wonder: “Does he go as much as that against his true nature of a salesman of second-hand cars? ”

To poor president, poor language.

Pavi tries to put in perspective the mediocrity of the presidential word: "It is not necessary to lay it on thick about his mediocrity in the control of our language, this one is ridiculous compared with his deep gaps as regards economy, psychology, humanism... the French have elected a man in their image, undoubtedly... despairing with inanities."

Bloup prefers to criticize the author of the article: "You would be a good journalist, you would have done what I did, you would have gone to examine the archives to compare the Sarkozy of 1985 to the Sarkozy 2009. And what would you have noted? That he was as vulgar when he was thirty years old as today! Except that at the time, he had the excuse of the age, of the "young" speech, for not being to pronounce the negations. When fifty-four years old, with a tired intellect, and with dark rings under his eyes, down to the bottom of his cheeks, he makes no longer the necessary efforts to pretend."

CONCLUSION.

It goes without saying that the author of this essay does not claim to have shown here, in the few lines which are previous, a mathematical reasoning at 100% completely free from the quirks he denounces in it, SUCH WAS NOT HIS GOAL. His goal was to draw the attention of his readers to the big tricks of the media when they approach certain sensitive subjects. And for this reason himself also had recourse to some well-known rhetorical processes, particularly that of the simplification.

The Greek School of the Eleatics (Parmenides Zeno) indeed showed with its famous paradoxes that the human language was far from being mathematical, in other words, that it was far from being perfect. It can indeed lead to amphibologies.

One of the most famous amphibologies is the one that cost the life of King Edward II of England. His jailer received a message in Latin which could be understood in two different ways, and which only a well-placed comma could have clarified. But there was no comma!

The Latin text was as follows.

Edwardum occidere nolite timere bonum est.

If you place the comma after nolite it gives you the following meaning: do not kill Edward, it is better to fear doing it.

If you place the comma after timere it gives you the following meaning: do not be afraid to kill Edward, it will be a good thing [out of the way].

.....
.....

* N.B. This short reflection on the misdeeds of rhetoric in politics is primarily extracted from the book of Norman Baillargeon (Short course of intellectual self-defense, Lux Editeur , Quebec, 2005. Let us simply point out for our friend Norman, on this subject, that the best of the governments, the simplest, is still the enlightened despotism in the original sense of the term, i.e., the fact of having a good king, but that for lack of having a good monarch it is easier to govern a people with its approval, with the approval of a significant portion of the people, well aware of the challenges, and therefore approving in full knowledge of the facts, after careful consideration (a debate having lasted several months even a few years for example) such or such main direction (what is seldom the case today because we live rather in a society of the spectacle not inevitably in the meaning "Guy" Debord (1931-1994) of the word even if it there is much of that; where the communication prevails over sincerity even over truth. Simpler than the opposite: to govern against the people. It was besides undoubtedly what the famous Belgian leader Ambiorix thought when he pointed out in order to defend himself that in his case "The people had as much authority over him as he over the people."

Let us repeat it once again: the best of the solutions is nevertheless to have a good king. The democratic systems can bring to power, by definition, only men or women able to gain votes. In other words, liars or illusion mongers, without greatness and without nobility , nor profundity, of view. And you are very lucky if they are not in addition individuals having a very high idea of the value of them, however, very quite poor competences.

BADLY REPORTED WARS = FAILED PEACE = SURE DISASTER.

“Naming things badly adds to the misfortune of the world” (Albert Camus).

The great lesson to be learned from all the Irish legends like that of Mongan... IT IS THAT IT IS ALWAYS NECESSARY TO PAY GREAT ATTENTION TO ONE'S ACTS, AND THAT IT IS ALWAYS BETTER TO THINK THRICE BEFORE SPEAKING. Cf the ethics of responsibility of Weber. That is worth in all the fields including politics. Was it really quite intelligent for example, for the Western liberal democracies, to support IN THE FACTS (articles reflecting always one point of view, that of the Islamists, delivery of material to their camp, embargo on the other camp, etc.) the rise of Islamism in the Arab countries in the 2010s?

When the wise points at the moon, the French intellectual looks at his finger. i.e., sticks to appearances like a 7-year-old child used without him knowing and unable of a in-depth objective analysis, non-naive non-Manichean but taking into account all the factors concerned (fears, silent majorities or minorities, strategic considerations, possibility of staging, etc.)

The Clouseau prize or height of ridiculousness in this field was reached by the Parisian edition of Match which, the very day when the Syrian army began the recapture of Aleppo the second town in the country after having recaptured its capital (Saturday, July 28, 2012) released a number having as headline “Bashar and Asma Al-Assad. Syria escapes from them! ”

When for example the Sunni Syrian Prime Minister probably bought by Qatar, defected , how many journalists moderated the thing by reminding of the fact that a Prime Minister in a dictatorship is always only a puppet?

The same thing a few weeks later when the French Minister for the foreign affairs Laurent Fabius spectacularly announced the defection (which did not take place, at least immediately) of the Syrian vice-president. To count one's chickens before they are hatched seems to be become apparently a specialty of the media. But this media hype is by no means synonymous with intelligence neither with reflection nor even with information. In my dictionary in every case!

Journalism that should not be a gregarious behavior just worthy of the without brain neither without any intelligence, blind conformity, and let us not even speak about the intellectual honesty, of the famous sheep of Mr. Panurge, nor the psittacism even a pathos and spectacle racer, but a critical reflection, or analysis, so that the citizens that we are can form their own judgment instead of having at their disposal only that, personal, of the journalist on duty. Press and television always constitute really an irreplaceable instrument of propaganda and of manipulation of minds, of indoctrination, brainwashing, whether it is in a hard-line dictatorship or in a soft dictatorship like that in which the journalists, instead of informing us, dictate to us what it is necessary to think by joining the braying crowd.

The western journalists have dishonored themselves for a few years in the deal of the long conflicts having torn our planet, from the war in Iraq with its weapons of mass destruction to the war in Syria through Libya. In Libya and Syria particularly there were in a way two wars; the true one, the civil war with its procession of horrors on both sides, and the war seen by the journalists: pregnant women and old men making by blows with their canes or stones, the tanks of the few tens of Ukrainian mercenary fighters supporting the established dictator.... flow back.

The presence of aliens intervening in the human affairs was well evidenced by the media dealing with the civil wars in Libya and Syria during these last years.

What did we see in them indeed by following attentively the way in which all these journalists covered the events?

A Few tens of mercenary tank crew members or pilots in the service of the local dictator (since everyone was against him).

Doing nothing but shoot at old men armed with canes or children armed with stones, even at pregnant women .

Cowardly because these mercenaries fled at the first warning.

Stupidly because they did not even counterattack by trying to hit their mysterious attackers (who could be therefore only aliens) since apparently here and there reading through an article we could read between the lines that themselves too had suffered heavy casualties.

And finally young handsome dynamic democratic secular and hippie kind, revolutionists. I will always remember the extraordinary article of a journalist covering the Syrian civil war devoted to a young armed rebel student who had never yet used his kalashnikov rifle and who had to be undoubtedly , whence this article, very representative of these rebels.

It is to believe that there were two civil wars, the true one, with its procession of horrors and torn villages or families (I will remember always the very cold way, what a lesson of objectivity, with which certain cases of tortures of “traitors” have been reported in a professional way by media like L’Orient-Le Jour, in French) and that of our journalists, done only of barehanded pregnant women making tanks move back.

But did I understand well??? Because in fact, although following very attentively and every day the online press articles dealing with the proceedings of these civil wars, I acknowledge that I understood nothing as for their outcome which has much surprised me even seemed to me incredible.

Up to what point such a non-information could contribute to bringing back peace? We may wonder. How many dead in addition such a support for Muslim crusaders or “moonaders”? We can wonder. Such a Manichaeen propaganda also from the journalists hardly helped to understand the complexity of reality and the one who dealt assiduously with such “information” literally did not understand how these civil wars could end thus: the restoration of the sharia and/or the exodus of Christians.

Now I want well to say: “Ladies and gentlemen journalists, for pity’s sake, keep your personal value judgments for you and give me only facts, only facts, in order that I can in turn have my own opinion. As Vauvenargues could have said it, “the road to hell is always paved with good intentions.”

Without getting into it, it would be perhaps good to impose that the media say clearly if they make information journalism or opinion journalism .

The clear distinction between journalism of opinion and journalism of information is indeed necessary. Or now then a kind of writing license with penalty points for journalists. An odiously partial article instead of an objective article = down one point on the license to write articles.

Mr. journalists, keep your personal value judgments for you, stop wanting to manipulate our emotions, and do nothing but bringing to me objective information which can help me to form my own opinion.

The lie is, however, the second nature of the politicians who have no personal conviction apart from being on the side of the power.

And if it is necessary for that to explain for what reason the leader is right when he affirms that two plus two = five, now then , they explain seriously for what reason $2 + 2 = 5$! They are astonished that you have doubts, they pretend to see Satan or the Hitlero-Trotskyist on duty in your skepticism, before affirming two or three years later besides that they always said that (that $2 + 2 = 4$). The period 2007-2012 in France was remarkable for that.

In 2011 the English and the French (99% of their journalists) nevertheless supported Islamist movement close to al-Qaeda in Syria/ Al Nusra Front. The French minister for foreign affairs Laurent Fabius even called them “resistance fighters,” shame on him!) what did not contribute to ending the atrocious civil war which devastated this country.

Question now!

Do the French government and the journalists have, through their stubborn blindness, a share of responsibility in all these sufferings?

Can we answer, “No, they are in nothing responsible, even indirectly! A journalist or a politician is never responsible for anything! The only person in charge is the Devil, or God who wanted to punish this country.”

Tiebreaker: when will be able to bring to trial for more or less direct support to movements of the type Al Qaeda (for example Al Nusra Front) the French government and the journalists relaying its positions??

That there are civil collateral victims in a war is not astonishing, there does not exist indeed clean war; what is shocking when you are an intellectual journalist or politicians is to deny it, it is to make believe that there can be clean wars, that the just war that is supported does not take collateral victims, to

deny the existence of these casualties, to ignore them completely. How can they be inhuman at this point??? There would be therefore civilian victims worthy of interest, others not, some pieces of shit??? The inhuman and without empathy democracy, what a beautiful invention of our intellectual journalists established in the media. What is really amazing with the journalists of today, it is their total absence of the sense of responsibility. When everything is fine, and in the euphoria of victory, it is thanks to them; but when everything is less fine, it is never their fault, they are not involved, they did nothing but give objectively and impartially an account of the facts by letting the public form its own idea.

“You had the choice between war and dishonor, you chose dishonor but you will have and dishonor and war,” we said. Now it is true that you will be allowed to object me that Churchill was a fascist old schmuck and that it is not a reference as regards political intelligence or political clearness. If you want. But small question now: and today how many engagements in which there is a mistake about enemies, how many daily Munich facing the true new Fascisms???? Like Nazislamism !!

The lesson to be learned from all this is simple: material and technological superiority are useless if there is not clear ideas and particularly as regards the war aims. When you want to be a democracy for example what is to be important is not to occupy the most possible territories but to win the hearts. Afghanistan that made a long time that we should have withdrawn from it , at least since the death of bin Laden since we do not intend to impose even in the long r run the values to which we believe and that we think to be universal (equality in right of men and women, religious liberty, etc.).

I acknowledge particularly not very well grasp this new concept of democratic and secular attack by a car bomb, the concept of democratic and secular tortures, legitimate expressions of an angry people (that you would not fight nor denounce but laud or report in a very objective and very neutral way). It is a little like the good and bad cholesterol perhaps?

But let us return to the relatively recent wars very badly covered by the media not for material reasons but for human and mental reasons (absence of critical mind, partisan mind, laziness, etc.).

What Gustave Le Bon wrote in his psychology of crowds (approximately: in a crowd most intelligent people if there is some of them, behave like the least intelligent, most primary, coarsest, ones); applies very well to the organized crowd which is the media-political background.

Their sorting between good victims and bad victims (their indifference to the sufferings of the non-fighters, even of the non-members of the camp of rebels, fighters, their silence on this subject or their so cold objectivity lacking in compassion on this subject) send shivers down your spine, for it is true that the road to hell was always paved with good intentions.

And for this reason they resorted to all the possible means, half-truths, time truths, mistakes so coarse that they can be only lies, partiality, immediacy, examples badly selected, hardly representative, voluntary fuzziness, refusal to call a spade a spade, puerile childishness, unjustified comparison, etc.

In short what I blame here, it is even not their morality (they have the right to campaign on the quiet for the implementation of the sharia) but their intellectual maturity, even their intelligence, period.

This kind of journalism, instead of explaining the world, therefore made it incomprehensible.

What I will never understand, it is this fascination, for Islam, of people who believe themselves they are smart, as if to be Muslim were a proof of intelligence. However to be a convinced Muslim is anything but a proof of intelligence. It is only the proof of a faith, and of a non-enlightened by the reason, faith. Sunni (and non-Mu'tazilite) Islam is a decline of the critical mind of Man. Finally, let us remark that it goes without saying that by Islam we mean in this case and in this series of chapters, not the quiet inner spirituality or mysticism of the Sufis, but on the practical level the takfirism and on the theoretical level the sets QUR.HAD.SIR. and SHAR.FIQ.MAD. A word to the wise, let us return to the necessary framework of the 4th power in our country.

Such a mistake in reasoning (to take a short-lived, transitory and very specific, victory, for quite a revealing a strong trend, decisive turning point), made after so many others (the alleged capture of Aleppo by the rebels for example) shows well that the journalistic reports were by no means an even

possibly enlightened by a thorough reflection; objective description of reality, but a projection of their desperate expectation (the victory of the fanatics of Islam against the Secular State).

May the gods preserve us to be one day governed by such morons, because you saddle today and ride out tomorrow, it would be sure disaster or catastrophe.

I acknowledge for example that I have difficulty understanding why the armed Islamist fundamentalists should be fought by France in Mali in 2012 but supported in Syria the same year. I acknowledge that the distinction between good terrorists that the great democracies like Qatar the United States Saudi Arabia France Bulgaria (er there no, mistake, it was for Libya) should support.... and the bad terrorists that these same great democracies like Qatar France Bulgaria United States Saudi Arabia, etc. should fight.

Yes, I do not hesitate to say it, in its dealing with or in its cover of the war in Syria, the Western and particularly French journalistic class, unlike the very independent Robert Fisk, MADE ITSELF LOOK RIDICULOUS. It should be well admitted indeed that for the ordinary citizen who trusted only the media with regard to the war having devastated Syria starting from 2012, its outcome proves to be incomprehensible. What we want to say thereby it is that the journalistic class failed in its duty to inform. Worse even it dishonored itself!

- The Arab spring lasted fifteen days. It was followed by traditional revolutions with their chaos, and today by an icy winter.

- What involves a question: was it necessary to intervene in Libya?

- When you play the sorcerer's apprentices, you get out of it what the sorcerer's apprentices put in it.

We intervened to save the population of Benghazi, it is very well. But at the same time we let Sirte die: thousands of dead! We became allies of Saudi Arabia and of Arab regimes which fuel fundamentalist Islamism. We invented a duty to interfere which puts an end to the sovereignty of the States and which works only in the North-South direction. Would we accept that a country of the South comes on our premises "to defend" Negroes or Indians? No. It is for this reason that I speak, by weighing my words, of neocolonialism. The question bequeathed to the posterity will be therefore the following one: what is the share of dead of tortures and of destruction in all that, of which such journalists are responsible, who thus dishonored the trade? Of how many dead are they responsible? None of course! The journalist who delivers during months and months to his public a bad estimation of the situation is never responsible for something.

Yes really, just as there is a College of physicians doctors or architects, charged with disciplining and moralizing their professionals, it should be a council of the College of journalists, with a disciplinary committee having broad powers.

The principal weak point of democracies we have said it is the quality of its media people (the fourth estate).

The way in which these media transposed the account of the wars in Iraq Libya and Syria indeed showed that this fourth estate was to be supervised, and particularly by a perfectly clear distinction between journalism of opinion and journalism of information.

I admit for the journalists the moral right to campaign by all the means which are peculiar to them (untruths, never corrected "mistakes," lies, careful selection of information and witness statements, partial comments, time granted to the ones and the others during the montage in Paris or Washington, etc.) so that the sharia is applied. But I do not admit for them the right to the stupidity. However many of the articles dealing with the subject at the time, and particularly with the various military developments on the ground were hardly worthy of the intellectual and mental level of a not very good 7-year-old child speaking about Santa Klaus or the bad guys. What therefore involves a Manichaeian presentation of the facts fatally and consequently the impossibility of solving the conflicts in a just intelligent and sustainable way. Doesn't one usually say that the road to Hell is paved with good intentions??

Our ancestors had had besides a presentiment of the problem according to this quotation of Caesar: "Those tribes-states which are considered to conduct their commonwealth more judiciously, have it ordained by their laws, that, if any person has heard by rumor and report from his neighbors anything concerning the commonwealth, he shall convey it to the magistrate, and not impart it to any other; because it has been discovered that inconsiderate and inexperienced men were often alarmed by false reports, and driven to some rash act, or else took hasty measures in affairs of the highest importance. The magistrates conceal those things which require to be kept unknown and they disclose to the people whatever they determine to be expedient. It is not lawful to speak of the commonwealth, except in the council" (Caesar. B.G. Book VI, chapter XX).

OPEN LETTER TO MEDIA PEOPLE.

Preliminary foreword.

The reflection which follows doesn't concern the media people either the journalists or the intellectuals who sincerely think and therefore maintain sincerely that we exaggerate much their role or their weight as opinion makers, that in reality in the facts they never influence the public, that it is in a direction or in another one, and therefore in a word that their trade is not a important great trade which is very meaning , in the training or the education of peoples, or to enlighten the public opinion.

The reflection which follows concerns the media people or the journalists and the intellectuals who do not think that, and even think publicly (or secretly and deep down in their heart) all the opposite.

I think that our civilization is ready for slavery and decline. What encourages me to think that it is the extraordinary inanity of our politicians (it would be children younger than 7 years old , men would say about them that they are blockhead); which is rivaled only by the unfathomable inanity of our elites including journalistic. In any case they are the same ones.

One of the dramas of current Mankind is the lack of intelligence and of general knowledge of the journalists as well as of many intellectuals, their lack of intellectual honesty *, of courage, of memory, and lastly their irresponsibility. That made more than to delay the planetary realization of some of the very serious problems which threaten the future of our mankind, even worse, that aggravates it by causing decline or steps backward.

One of the measures which could rectify this situation would be the clear and visible distinction between journalism of opinion and journalism of information. The first being only bound to respect the laws in force, the second bound to respect an ethical charter of the most rigorous ones, together with severe punishments including being able to affect their personal estate (but excluding capital punishment), in the event of a breach. Punishments imposed by a College of the information journalists, or by a branch of the ministries for Justice or Culture, after filling and investigation of an individual or collective complaint from private individuals. As Caesar announced it very well in his commentaries on the Celtic wars: "Those tribes-states which are considered to conduct their commonwealth more judiciously, have it ordained by their laws, that, if any person has heard by rumor and report from his neighbors anything concerning the commonwealth, he shall convey it to the magistrate, and not impart it to any other; because it has been discovered that inconsiderate and inexperienced men were often alarmed by false reports, and driven to some rash act, or else took hasty measures in affairs of the highest importance. The magistrates conceal those things which require to be kept unknown and they disclose to the people whatever they determine to be expedient. It is not lawful to speak of the commonwealth, except in the council" (Caesar. B.G. Book VI, chapter XX).

* The modern intellectual quirk consisting in not distinguishing situations differing, however, in an important way, would it be only in their former or potential consequences, or on the contrary to draw not very relevant artificial parallels systematically, even to focus mainly on the trees but to speak very little about the forest that they form (when the things are seen from thirty-five thousand feet), been part of these characteristics of the journalism about which we do not know if they fall within the intellectual dishonesty or the lack of intelligence. In every case the English language to designate such a phenomenon had invented the image "not to be able to see the forest for the trees" (You can't see the forest for the trees, which prevents from having an overall view), the French language the image of the lark pâté and its definition (the journalists call lark pâté a pâté made half-half, one lark... for a horse), and the Arabic language, itself, uses the concept of taqiyya, the Jesuits that of "casuistry."

!----- !

"They likewise discuss and impart to the youth many elements respecting the stars and their motion, respecting the extent of the world and of our earth, respecting the nature of things, respecting the power and the majesty of the immortal gods" (Caesar, book VI, chapter 14).

OPEN LETTER TO POLITICIANS MEDIA AND INTELLECTUALS OR AT LEAST TO THOSE WHO WOULD FEEL HURT NOT TO BE REGARDED AS SUCH.

What Gustave Le Bon in his psychology of the crowd wrote (approximately: in a crowd most intelligent persons if there are some of them possibly, behave as the least intelligent, as the most simplistic, as the coarsest persons);applies very well to the organized crowd which is the political and media circle.

What is the intelligence was it asked one day to the Doctor Alfred Binet. What my IQ tests measure, he would have answered, but the joke is apocryphal. If we define intelligence as the capacity to take into account objective information then is asked the question: how is it possible ladies and gentlemen journalists, that you have so little information whereas all what is necessary to know is within reach, a click away, yesterday in the libraries today by surfing the Web? For example, about the mass destruction weapons in Iraq or about the war which broke out in Syria in 2011.

Why information is found in insufficient number and in quality leaving a lot to be desired in your brain? Would this be because you show much little intellectual curiosity? Would this be because you lack the critical mind necessary to analyze or cross-check data??? Would this be because of your innate propensity to submit yourself to authority? Would this be finally because of your incapacity to treat as it is necessary the objective information which comes to you??

Einstein or some other 7-year-old genius and his father are in a savanna. They are not sick and have eyes and ears....

T = 0. Smoke rises on the horizon just in front of them.

T = + 1 hour. Still more smoke on the horizon.

T = + 1 hour 30. A dull rumbling is made hear and the ground starts to quake .

T = + 2 hours. A crowd of animals thrown into a panic from the hippopotamus to the snake rush at them....

and go beyond them to flee by leaving them on the spot.

T = + 2 hours 30. A smell of burning reaches your nostrils.

T = + 3 hours. Something which resembles flames appears suddenly in your field of vision.

The 7-year-old child didn't understand something and looks at all that a little astonished.

But you, you, as from what moment will you understand that there is a fire in the meadow, in the savanna, in the bush, and that it is necessary without delay to run and to take shelter or at least to kindle without delay a backfire?? (domestication of fire - 500,000, and fortunately for mankind, the copyrights or the concept of intellectual property did not exist yet... if not we were still to pay I do not know what to the crafty people having succeeded in making admitted that they are direct descendants of the brilliant inventor.)

A very good example of the critical mind which must always drive us and which should therefore drive every self-respecting journalist is that which appears at the end of one of the innumerable Gaelic legends reported by an Irish monk remained anonymous and which is stated as it follows: "But I who have written this story, or rather this fable, give no credence to the various incidents related in it. For some things in it are the deceptions of demons*, other poetic figments; some are probable, others improbable; while still others are intended for the delectation of foolish men."

We have no doubt about the sincerity of the Christian faith of this copyist monk but what is extraordinary nevertheless it is that with this cry from the heart he finds again exactly the same critical state of mind which was that of the former druids according to Lucan and therefore which should motivate our modern information journalists (the journalists of opinion, themselves, fall more under the office of satirist bard).

QUESTIONS TO THE JOURNALISTS OR TO THE INTELLECTUALS WHO CONTROL US THROUGH MEDIA.

Assumptions, postulates or assertions to begin the debate. May we write that (for pity's sake play the game and do not answer straightaway these questions, return to them only after having answered the series of true personal questions which follows and after having well thought out, do not tell me for example that a New York Muslim an Irish Catholic or an English Anglican are part of the same nation because they speak roughly the same language).....

-The Navajos live in the United States, in some preserves in the North-East of Arizona and contiguous areas of New Mexico and Utah. The Navajos are distributed in more fifty groups, and their mode of filiation is passed down by the women (matrilineal clans). Navajos should neither marry nor to even go out with a member of their own clan: this obligation is a true taboo. The basic social unit is a (very) extended family whose members have a complete range of responsibilities.

- It is between the 7th and the 10th century that the Polish nation was particularized within the Slavic community, in the basins of the Oder and of the Vistula. The Polan, Vistulan , Pomeranian tribes form little by little the Polish nation.

- About the Breviary of Alaric. The personal law system is opposed to the system of the territoriality of laws which supposes on the contrary, that on a given territory, the law is the same for all. Under a mode of personality of the laws, the law which is applied to each individual is determined according to his nationality. When individuals of different nationalities live on the same territory, several laws are then applied to this territory, as many as involved nationalities. The resort to the personal law system in the 6th century in Europe was the direct result of the Barbarian invasions, in a time deprived of sufficiently strong central power to impose on everybody a similar legislation. Some say that in a way the Revolution and the end of the privileges granted to the nobility were needed for really putting definitively an end to this situation (of the personality of laws) in France.

In 1916 in California died Ishi, the last Yahi Indian. The Yahi tribe had approximately 400 members, in 1840, who lived, like many of the other tribes, peacefully. Little time after the gold rush took place, and the Indians living in these regions had to face the massive immigration of White men.

When in 1908, a group of geologists by chance came across their camping, the Indians fled in the forest. Three years later, only one of these Indians was still alive. He was the last member of his tribe, nobody in the world spoke still his language, he was the last Yahi.

Alone and famished, the Indian decided to walk towards the world of the newcomers. Thus at the end of the summer 1911, he arrived in the periphery of Oroville.

A member of the University of Berkeley named Watterman met him, but he had the biggest difficulties in communicating with him.

In 1911 Ishi carried out more than 400 recordings on wax cylinders, telling the history of Yahis since the creation of the world until the voyage of the dead , but nobody understood what he said. Ishi also gave many demonstrations (archery, arrowheads, construction of a Yahi house).

He died on March 25, 1916.

Out with the language of the Yahi people therefore , but also with the Cupeño the Matipúhu the Sikiana, languages... Finished the Apiakà, the Koiarian, the Yimas, languages... Forgotten the Yugh language, the Palaung language, the Bahnar language... The old men go away, the languages too. Half of the 5,000 current languages will have disappeared in one century, crushed by the road roller of the globalization. And after? What does it matter to us finally if the Pataxó language or the Nakrehé language is no longer spoken?

However the languages are a little like the animal species: they live, die, yield to the attacks or the predators. They are not only words which fly away with each one of them. It is a history, a memory, a manner of thinking. A little of our humanity.

First sub question: what could well think in the last years of his life this old Indian (Ishi) who had no longer somebody with whom to speak in his own language, his mother tongue?

Second sub question: what to do so that the situations of bilingualism do not end up in situation of monolingualism as that often occurred for example in the world???

Questions now to the journalists or to intellectuals who govern us through the media:

Do you think that there can be within Mankind at least theoretically, national identities, in the former and traditional sense of the term evoked to begin in preamble, not in the sense of simple citizenship or of simple state allegiance towards such or such chief of the tribe such or such king such or such state power?

If you think that such an existence is theoretically possible, can you quote some examples in the recent or old history of Mankind, in which that occurred: in which there were one, or two, or several cases of existence... of a proven national identity???

If yes do you think that there are still undeniable national identities currently on this planet??

If yes with regard to our country, the State of which we are citizens, do you think that there was, one day, something that people could have legitimately designated roughly speaking with the term of national identity?

If not can you argue somewhat your opinion, what you think of being able to note??

If yes still with regard to our country, the State of which we are citizens, do you think that there exists still a national identity being able to characterize it, at least mainly, at least partially???

If no can you indicate to us as from what moment of its history and after what events or phenomena did this national identity in question disappear, for what reasons for example it is no longer relevant of speaking about national identity whereas that was so formerly??

Second series of questions:

If you admit the theoretical principle that it can exist national identities like defined higher and to begin, do you think

a) That it is a harmful thing for mankind, that it is therefore necessary to endeavor to make disappear from the surface of the planet.

b) That it is an excellent thing for mankind, therefore that we should especially not to harm them and even that we should support them.

c) That it is a little like Aesop's tongue, that it can be like often the worst or the best of the things, therefore that we must simply make sure to avoid the condemnable excesses or misbehavior of them.

May we with regard to our country and without making value judgment on the phenomenon that there was in its history a period when the assimilation (at least a advanced enough assimilation in the national melting pot) of the newcomers was done (for example by the means of the religion of the military service or of the trade unionism, etc.) but that what characterizes it today it is that the aforementioned assimilation of yesteryear in the national melting pot functions no longer, and for what reasons (technological, or others, increasing of individualism, of selfishness???)

Can a citizen who does not feel psychologically speaking, involved in a national identity whose he even thinks to be able to dispute the existence or to say that it disappeared, speak about it while being objective?

What can say each other, what can exchange, what dialog can have, citizens who do not feel with their heart or psychologically speaking to be involved in a national identity whose they even think to be

able to dispute the existence or to say that it disappeared, like Professor Watterman of the University of Berkeley in California, and a man like Ishi who feels exactly the contrary, who feels to be involved in an undeniable national identity as such but which is called in question or which disappeared. What felt Ishi in this world which was no longer his??? Was he unhappy, angry, did he feel being daily humiliated or ridiculed by all these strangers around him, at him, who was a son of this land??? How did he take that people ignore deny or make fun to that extent of his very being, of his identity, of his deep self, of what had the result that he was himself and not another man, by rejecting all that in a distant past, a distant past what was only his childhood, the California of the 1850s?

THE LONG TRADITION OF THE STATESMAN'S LIE.

One of most cynical ones relates to the destruction of the American battleship Maine in bay of Havana in 1898, which was used as a pretext for the entry into the war of the United States against Spain and for the annexation of Puerto Rico, of the Philippines and of the island of Guam.

On the evening of February 15, 1898, around 21:40, the battleship Maine was indeed blasted by a violent explosion. The ship sank in the harbor of Havana and 260 men perished. Immediately, the popular press accused the Spanish of having placed a mine under the hull of the ship and denounced their cruelty, their "death camps" and even their practice of cannibalism ...

All the other newspapers followed. The circulation of the New York Journal passed initially from 30,000 specimens to 400,000, then crosses regularly the million specimens! The public opinion became white-hot. The atmosphere became incredible. Urged from everywhere, the president William McKinley declared the war against Madrid on April 25, 1898. Thirteen years later, in 1911, a committee of inquiry on the destruction of the Maine was to conclude that it was an accidental explosion in the engine room...

Iraq it is a little the story of the thief who cries: "Stop thief!" How do you think that George W. Bush entitled the famous report of charge against Saddam Hussein that he presented on September 12, 2002, in the Security Council of UNO? "A decade of deception and defiance." And what did he affirmed there by listing his "evidence?" A chain of lies! Iraq, he said in substance, maintains close ties with the terrorist network al-Qaeda and threatens the safety of the United States because he has "weapons of mass destruction" (WMD) - an expression forged by his communications advisers.

However, at the time when Mr. Bush made such accusations, he had already received reports of his services showing that all that was false. According to Mrs. Jane Harman, democrat representative from California, we would be even there in the presence of "the greatest intelligence hoax of all time." In this gigantic manipulation, a secret back-room within the Pentagon, the Office of special plans (OSP) played a main role.

Colin Powell himself was manipulated. In an interview with the magazine Vanity Fair, on May 9, 2003, Mr. Wolfowitz recognized the statesman's lie. He acknowledged that the decision to point out the threat of the WMDs in order to justify a preventive war against Iraq was taken for reasons having "a lot to do with bureaucracy ." "We settled, he specified, on one issue, weapons of mass destruction, because it was the one reason everyone could agree on."

The president of the United States therefore lied. Seeking hopelessly a casus belli to circumvent UNO and to rally to his project of conquest of Iraq some accomplices (United Kingdom, Spain), Mr. Bush did not hesitate to make one of the biggest Statesman's lies.

He was not alone. In the House of Commons, on September 24, 2002, his ally Anthony Blair, British Prime Minister, affirmed: "Iraq did not stop (...). nor its continuing research relevant to chemical weapons and biological weapons (...) these WMD are ready for use in 45 minutes

On his side, in his intervention before the Security Council, Colin Powell declared: "Saddam Hussein has investigated dozens of biological agents causing diseases such as gas gangrene, plague, typhus, tetanus, cholera, camel-pox, and hemorrhagic fever."

In an address to the nation, on February 8, 2003, Bush went as far as bringing the false following details: "Iraq has sent bomb-making and document forgery experts to work with al-Qaeda. Iraq has sent bomb-making and document forgery experts to work with al-Qaeda. Iraq has also provided al-Qaeda with chemical and biological weapons training. And an al-Qaeda operative was sent to Iraq several times in the late 1990s for help in acquiring poisons and gases."

Taken over and amplified by the warmongers great media changed into organs of propaganda, all these denunciations were repeated ad nauseam by the television networks Fox News, CNN and MSNBC, the radio station Clear Channel (1 225 stations in the United States) and even some prestigious newspapers like the Washington Post or the Wall Street Journal. Throughout the world, these untrue charges formed the principal argument of all the saber rattlers. In France, for example,

they were taken over shamelessly by personalities like Pierre Lellouche, Bernard Kouchner, Yves Roucaute, Pascal Bruckner, Guy Millière, André Glucksmann, Pierre Rigoulot, etc.

These charges were also repeated by all the allies of Mr. Bush. Starting with the most zealous of them, Jose Maria Aznar, head of the Spanish government, who, in the Cortes of Madrid, on February 5, 2003, assured: "We all know, ladies and gentlemen, that Saddam Hussein has weapons of mass destruction (....) We also all know that Saddam Hussein has chemical weapons" (an MP screams : I do not!)

A few days before, on January 30th, carrying out an order expressed by Mr. Bush, Aznar had written a declaration of support for the United States, the "Letter of the Eight," signed inter alia by Messrs. Blair, Silvio Berlusconi and Vaclav Havel. They affirmed there that "the Iraqi regime and its weapons of mass destruction represent a clear threat to world security."

Thus, during more than six months, to justify a preventive war whose neither the United Nations nor the world opinion wanted, a true propaganda and hoax machine controlled by the dogmatic sect which surrounded Bush spread statesman's lies with an impudence specific to the most hated regimes of the 20th century.

They fall under the long tradition of the Statesman's lies which mark out the history of the United States.

LIE IN POLITICS BY JEAN-CLAUDE ST-LOUIS

(Canadian website Le Portail d'Albert).

"The first of the forces which leads the world is the lie" (Jean-François Revel, the useless knowledge, p. 9). The lie in politics forms a breach of trust and it must be condemned, whatever the form is.

But what is a lie? According to the dictionaries, it is to affirm what you know being false, deny or conceal what you should say. Under the terms of this definition, the partisan exaggerations, the little secrets, the half-truths, are all of lies. And those who engages in them are liars. In politics, starting from the Prime Minister to the simple deputy, all hide, circumvent, distort the truth systematically, without feeling the least embarrassment about that. Blinded by the power, the glory, the limousines, the flattery from their entourage, politicians lie shamelessly.

What is paradoxical, it is that the word "liar" is banished from the National Assembly and that all those who use it or allude there, are summoned to recant. If they refuse, they are expelled for the day. The politicians are ready to admit that they caricature the facts, that they hide some of them, that they always present their actions in a positive light, that they all are a little demagogue, but to admit that they lie? Never! And yet, in a democracy, the people is entitled to truth. The lie in politics forms a breach of trust and a breaking of contract, because a democracy is a kind of moral contract. The people gives up to his agents, the politicians, the care to manage the res publica but he reserves the right to assess their work at regular intervals. If the people is dissatisfied, it has the power to dismiss them and to replace them. There is here, not only a trust relationship, but also an explicit contract, based on the right of citizens to choose their rulers. However, so that a democracy is authentic, the citizens must be able to make their choice in full knowledge of the facts, by having all the necessary information. In his book "the useless knowledge" Jean-François Revel writes: "This regime (the democracy), based on the free determination of the major choices by the majority, sentences itself to death if the citizens who carry out these choices, decide almost all while being not aware of the realities."

The lie tactics, in politics, were handed down from generation to generation and many believe that to be indignant at such a quirk is, consequently, useless or is a waste of time. However, if there were always injustices, is it necessary to accept them and lower the arms? The danger is, precisely, to accept this lie politics and to regard it as normal. An all the more big risk as the lie became, nowadays, increasingly subtle.

When it is spoken about the intellectual dishonesty of the politicians, it is especially referred to their not kept election pledges. However, those who follow the elected officials closely, realize that the lie in politics is not reserved only for the election campaigns. It is daily and slips into press conferences, speeches, official statements. Lie wastes the politics as a cancer wastes the body of a patient.

The lie is part of the daily life of the politician. For him, the lie is essential to one's survival. A lazy politician can succeed, a tedious politician too, but a politician who did not know how to use the lie is doomed to the failure, according to most observers of the political scene. For them, this daily manipulation of the truth, can seem benign, but by their proliferation, by the place that they take in the political culture, the small daily lies open up the way to big lies and election trickery. Let us observe a new candidate and we will hear him delivering the same series of falseness of the kind: "I have no other ambition but that to serve my fellow citizens." In any party, we will hear him saying that he is not a traditional politician, that he wishes to do politics differently, to be frank and honest, then at once elected, he will hurry to disguise reality so that it is most favorable for him, to dissimulate the less glorious sides of his past and to conceal his opinion on a discussed policy of his party.

At the prize list of the lies in politics, those about the unity of the party come at the top. There is a non-written rule in politics according to which a party must appear united, whatever the circumstances. However this "appearance" requires an incalculable number of lies. Loyalty as such is not really necessary in a political party. What is important, it is the appearance of loyalty. The same applies to frankness. It is the appearance of frankness which is important.

In politics therefore, lie and cheating is, alas, appropriate. It is seen well that this system represses frankness and encourages lies. Robert Bourassa, who was Prime Minister in Quebec, admitted it while saying: "The partisan play is often quite ungrateful for the truth of facts." When you think of the obvious contempt of the politicians for truth, you remain struck in front of the prohibition to pronounce the word "liar" in the House of Commons or in the National Assembly. In our Parliaments, a politician can affirm anything against anybody, accuse somebody of the worst crimes without a piece of evidence, being

liable to any punishment. That is called parliamentary privilege. But to accuse another deputy of having lied, what a horror in a milieu where lie is part of the daily life?

Lies caused the political milieu to become gangrenous to its least nooks. It is therefore important to find the origins of the evil and to seek to understand why the politicians lie with every breath. The answer appears quite simple to us: If the politicians resort to lie, it is because they are convinced of its profitability. Wasn't this profitability shown many times? The politicians who are the most skillful liars are those who last longest and who obtain most success. The men and the women who go into politics and for whom frankness is an important value are isolated as of their first steps. By entering politics, the newcomers penetrate in a culture which is operated by lies and their success depends on their complete adherence to this culture.

And why is the lie profitable? Quite simply because the people rewards it, because in the final analysis, it is always the best liar who wins. Either that the people is not conscious of the cheating (what is very rare) or that it accepts it while grumbling, thinking that it does not have the choice, or still because it prefers to be unaware of the truth. Does the people know that they lie to it? It knows it very well but at the same time it does not determine the extent nor the refinement of it. For this reason the most skillful liars get such an amount of success. The people continue to vote and to be interested, at least seemingly, in the political thing. Comes a new figure, a new program and the people regains hope. This hope can be explained only by ignorance of the real extent of the lie in politics, because whoever follows the animal closely, loses one's illusions quickly.

Is there a slim hope that the situation changes? It is obvious that we cannot rely on the politicians so that they conform by themselves to the requirements of truth. The profitability of the lie was demonstrated so many times that this one forms from now on the alphabet of the political language. In the experimented politician, lie became a second nature, a reflex. It is this reflex which it is necessary to break. For that purpose, there is only one means: It is necessary that the truth becomes profitable and not the lie. Only the people have the power to carry out this change, by rewarding the truth and by punishing the lie severely.

-It is necessary to elect politicians who expound the problems in whole sincerity and who propose an ideal to be reached but while presenting the real prospects for solutions honestly.

-We should no longer accept the demagoguery which consists in "demonizing" the adversary at all costs.

-We should especially not elect those who suggest simplistic solutions and who promise the moon.

This change of attitude requires a vigilance of every moment, towards politicians and also with regard to ourselves who are liking the too much easy solutions. The condition of this vigilance is the conviction that truth is part of our rights; that we can and that we must require it. The politicians want our votes; it is to us to make them pay them dearly!

THE LIE IN POLITICS AND THEREFORE IN THE MEDIA.

"Father, I cannot tell a lie." This quotation of George Washington being too good to be true, we will therefore associate to it one of Albert Camus to start: "naming things badly adds to the misfortune of the world."

At the time of a televised interview broadcast on Monday, October 26, 2015, by the TV channel CNN, the former British Prime Minister Tony Blair has offered his "apologies" in connection with the war in Iraq in 2003 .

By doing this he still lied because he had knowingly "forgotten" to say some things.

It is a late mea culpa (it comes twelve years too late) - and especially very insufficient.

What tells us Tony Blair indeed?

"The information was false."

But Tony Blair "forgets" to mention that the information on the alleged mass destruction weapons in Iraq was voluntarily inflated at the time.

He forgets to say that certain informations were even completely invented, as the affair of the purchase of uranium in Niger.

He finally forgets to say that he knowingly lied to his people and his allies on his intentions.

A top secret memorandum of March 23, 2002, written by Colin Powell and sent at the time to President Bush was recently discovered indeed.

Blair is with us about Iraq the ex-general assures in it, whereas the White House prepares already the war which will be started one year later.

However at the time, Blair swears up and down that he seeks a diplomatic solution for the crisis , whereas secretly therefore he had already decided to intervene militarily together with the Americans.

Here on what he would have also, and especially, offer his apologies to the British citizens, and to the world. About his lies which discredited (definitively?) the international word of the Western leaders.

For that it will be necessary perhaps to wait twelve more years...

But does the journalistic profession be summarized in the fact of repeating and spreading the points of view of one of the parties in question, that of its choice, or of echoing both but while favoring in quantity and quality one of them, always that of its choice, of course?? If yes it is then no longer journalism of information but journalism of opinion.

.And in any event, as Albert Camus could have told it to this "famous" British prime minister : "A democratic system can be designed, created and supported only by men who know that they do not know everything. The democrat is modest, he acknowledges a certain share of ignorance, he admits the partly adventurous nature of his effort, that all is not given to him, and starting from this consent, he admits that he needs to consult others, to supplement what he knows..." Albert Camus, extract from "Reflections on a democracy without catechism," in *The Left*, July 1948).

To have a more precise idea of the intellectual level or of the scruples of the intelligentsia which controls us it is therefore enough to see the indulgence with which the media relayed the lie of the possession of mass destruction weapons by Saddam Hussein in Iraq in 2002 or the way with which they covered the situations of civil war like Libya or Syria experimented some of them in the second decade of the 21st century. So little clearness so little intelligence so little objectivity! It is frightening, it is like giving a bomb to 7-year-old children (what a disaster) and it is perhaps why none of the big challenges concerning mankind will be likely to be solved before a long time considering the weakness of this intellectual level of the media people and the equally dismaying lack of elementary intellectual honesty of these self-proclaimed elites (Gaston Bouthoul would say in his treatise of sociology).

The psychological motivations of such a bias are so obvious besides that they become childish Vauvenargues would have added. For want of being old enough to have oneself effectively in 1930 fought the increase of Nazism: the will to be on the side of heroes, what therefore involves a Manichean presentation of facts fatally and consequently the impossibility of solving the conflicts in a just intelligent and durable way. As the saying states, the road to Hell is paved with good intentions.

One of the responsibilities, and not of the least, of the media people and of the intellectuals, is well to form or inform their peoples, generation after generation, no ? However how this work of Sisyphus can bear fruits if the intellectual level of the journalists or of the intelligentsia is that of the 7-year-old kids fighting in a playground??

As for the letters to the editor or the reactions and comments accompanying the generally made presentation of the crimes which are the common lot of all the civil wars, they are enough to make the misanthropist definitively the wildest of the Robinson Crusoe. Stupidity and ignorance rival with spite or selfishness in their most natural state. Poor mankind yes! With when's a new man based on the best of the old one ?

* Ninety-five percent of these "heroes" besides, at least, in my opinion, would not have been members of the Resistance at the time, except at the last moment perhaps, because to be resistant it is already necessary to start by being politically incorrect. To be a resistance fighter in the occupied Europe of 1940 for example was to choose between two evils, to refuse to protect the civilians in the Sudetes or to agree to play into the hands of the communist parties, for example. In France in addition that was equivalent to combat, while fighting his own fellow countrymen, alongside the British hereditary enemy still ready to use his guns (Mers el Kebir) and to distrust one of the great architects of the victory in the previous World War, the marshal Petain, victor of Verdun. No, obviously, what politically correct one is, was not on the side of the resistance fighters in 1941.

ANGRY LETTER TO THE EDITOR.

“Those tribes-states which are considered to conduct their commonwealth more judiciously, have it ordained by their laws, that, if any person has heard by rumor and report from his neighbors anything concerning the commonwealth, he shall convey it to the magistrate, and not impart it to any other; because it has been discovered that inconsiderate and inexperienced men were often alarmed by false reports, and driven to some rash act, or else took hasty measures in affairs of the highest importance. The magistrates conceal those things which require to be kept unknown and they disclose to the people whatever they determine to be expedient. It is not lawful to speak of the commonwealth, except in the council” (Caesar. B.G. Book VI, chapter XX).

The ethical problem is known since an eternity: are all the means good (to reach a right cause)? Does the end justify the means? In any event there are only just wars now that there exist no longer mentality of second function, Hitler for example protected the Sudeten civilians in Czechoslovakia, the innocent German civilians against Jews, etc. the only thing is that the just wars of the defeated are always less just than the just wars of the winners. Woe to the vanquished indeed! Uae Uictebo!

LIBYA.

The tragic events of history are always repeated, but the second time, said Marx, “as a joke.” The Jacques Clouseau prize in this field incontestably goes to the French media. Alain Juppe, for the French government: “With Gaddafi the only negotiation it is the war.” A little surprising from the foreign minister of a great country (that would be better appropriate for a defense or army minister but it is true that the Minister of armies in this country as for him, “shoots down” tanks; he doesn’t destroy them, he doesn’t damage them, he shoots down them, like flying carpets).

Nevertheless in this unfortunate Libyan case NATO was of a rare hypocrisy, which undoubtedly discredited this military alliance and UNO for a long time and which in any event to begin made it possible the Syrian regime to avoid the worst (for it); many emerging countries being no longer willing to renew the experiment of the resolution of UNO about Libya considering what the English and French governments did with it, with the assistance of the media.

The journalistic class (some say the caste, other the profession) was really dishonored in its media coverage of the civil war which broke out in Libya in 2011, and played in it an odious role, for a very simple reason. Its deep desire; not to describe the reality of the world such as it is, in order to let the public judge it by itself; but to take part in the ancient fight of the good against the evil (according to it) while staying well warm, or cool, in the shade of its newspaper offices (because the reporters of war on the ground are not those who choose the images to be diffused, nor the comments to be made).

CERTAIN JOURNALISTS AND RESEARCHERS NEVERTHELESS FORMED SOME EXCEPTIONS TO THIS RULE. BELOW SOME OF THE TRUTHS THAT THEY REPORTED FOR US ON THIS SUBJECT.

David D. Kirkpatrick and Rod Nordland in The New York Times. August 23, 2011.

“.....Regarding the mantra, with racist overtones that Qaddafi's government is using African mercenaries, that rebels repeat as fact over and over. There have been no confirmed cases of that; supposedly there are many African prisoners being held in Benghazi, but conveniently journalists are not allowed to see them. There are, however, African guest workers, poorly paid migrant labor, many of whom have been labeled mercenaries.

The Amnesty International crisis researcher, Donatella Rovera spent the period from 27 February to 29th May in Misrata, Benghazi, Ajdabiya and Ras Lanouf. Yesterday she was interviewed by Austria's 'The Standard' and had this to say on the subject: “We examined this issue in depth and found no evidence. The rebels spread these rumors everywhere, which had terrible consequences for African

guest workers: there was a systematic hunt for migrants, some were lynched and many arrested. Since then, even the rebels have admitted there were no mercenaries...'

Indeed what says the report of this specialist on the subject?

Donatella Rovera. May 13, 2011,

It is fair to say that there is a state of denial when it comes to the less palatable aspects of the post-17 February situation in eastern Libya – notably the behavior of some of the opposition fighters, the “thumar” as they are called here.

Three men, who until 17 February worked for the once-all-powerful infamous Internal Security Agency (Jihaz al-Amn al-Dakhili), were killed in summary execution of the commando type. The body of the latest victim, a father of six, was found on 10 May in the south-western outskirts of Benghazi. He had been shot in the head, his hands and feet were bound and a scarf was tightly tied around his neck. He was missing a piece of flesh from his right calf and marks on his trousers indicated that he had been kneeling. A bloodstained note mentioning his name was found by the body; it said that “... a dog among Gaddafi’s dogs has been eliminated.”

Another former ISA member, a 48-year-old father of three, had been killed two weeks earlier in virtually the same manner. His body was found in the same area in the evening on 22 April. He had been shot twice in the head, had a scarf tied tightly around his neck, and his hands were tied behind his back with two plastic handcuffs. Here also marks on his trousers indicated that he had been kneeling.

In both cases there were no witnesses of the men’s abductions – or if there were, they have kept quiet about it.

In another case, a group of armed men – some of them masked – abducted a 55-year-old father of eight, also a former ISA member, from his home in the evening on 8 May. Needless to say, they did not identify themselves nor did they tell his terrified family why or where they were taking him. The following morning his body was found, also in Benghazi’s south-western outskirts. He too was handcuffed and had been shot in the head and injured on the head as well on the hand with a blunt object.

There are frequent night raids by groups of armed “thumar” on the hunt for al-Gaddafi loyalists rightly or wrongly suspected of being involved in some way in spying or planning or carrying out attacks, or of having been responsible for the brutal repression which was the hallmark of al-Gaddafi’s rule for the past four decades. Some of these vigilante groups are acting on the orders of so-called detention committees in military camps while others are seemingly acting on their own initiative. Sometimes foreign journalists are taken along in these night raids.

Former members of security agencies and al-Gaddafi loyalists are not the only targets. On 23 and 24 April the bodies of two unidentified men, seemingly from Sub-Saharan Africa, were found in Benghazi’s south-western outskirts. One had had his throat cut and his ankles were bound with a rope. The other had been shot in the head and had sustained multiple contusions. These are only the latest such cases. In the days immediately following the overthrow of the al-Gaddafi regime in eastern Libya, several nationals of sub-Saharan countries were killed. Some were shot, some were hanged publicly, others were lynched. No investigations are known to have taken place to identify those responsible for these heinous crimes.

Many African migrants have been the victims of attacks seemingly motivated by suspicions that they served as “mercenaries” with the pro-Gaddafi forces. Widespread but mostly unsubstantiated allegations, including by National Transitional Council members that African “mercenaries” had played a key role in the killings perpetrated against demonstrators undoubtedly helped to fuel such attacks. Scores of African migrants were detained after 17 February and were repeatedly paraded in front of the media as “mercenaries” before any investigation was even carried out. So far there is no public debate about these disturbing developments. Officials and political leaders have not come out publicly in condemnation of such killings of loyalists and migrants.

NATO’s Glorious Race War in Libya.
Glen Ford 09/07/2011

The western media pretended not to notice that their heroes were behaving like rampaging Ku Klux Klansmen.

But how could well-financed correspondents for The New York Times and the Washington Post have been for instance unaware of that which was known to NPR's West African reporter Ofeiba Quist Acton that a Benghazi mob had hacked to death 70 to 80 Chadian and Sudanese oil company workers in a single incident, a major massacre in a medium-sized town? African media were alive with many reports from the 1.5 million Black immigrant workers in Libya of mass killings, gruesome public lynching, savage burning, and organized rapes. But it was as if the western media were encamped in a different Benghazi, one filled with well-mannered lawyers and students forced by events to become militia, whose hatred of Moammar Gaddafi was proof of their virtue. Like little D.W. Griffith, the producers and reporters for the Times, the Post, CNN and the whole corporate alphabet soup each day directed their own mini-versions of "Birth of a Nation," in which the local racist mobs are the good guys and the villains are dark, sub-Saharan "mercenaries" or Viagra-inflamed government soldiers – both potential grave threats to Arab womanhood, but both mostly figments of western media imaginations.

14/09/2011. Congressman wants Libyan rebels Investigated on 'Crimes against Humanity.'

Representative Jesse Jackson, Jr., reacting to reports in The Wall Street Journal, has called for an investigation by the International Criminal Court into the reported killings of Black Libyans in the city of Tawergha.

Rep. Jackson also tells The Black Star News he will ask that U.S. assistance for reconstruction and transition to democracy in Libya be conditional. The Wall Street Journal indeed reported Tuesday that rebels from Misurata had torched the homes that belonged to the predominantly dark-skinned residents of the city of Tawergha, which is now abandoned.

A Journal reporter witnessed some of the torching and wrote that the words "slaves" and "negroes" were scribbled on the walls of the now emptied homes.

The town's entire population of 10,000 is gone.

In an earlier news report The Wall Street Journal reported besides that rebels from the city of Misurata had declared that Tawergha would be "no more" and that the units conducting the attacks were named "The Brigade for Purging Slaves, black Skin."

Misurata rebels blame residents of Tawergha, which was used by the Libyan army, as staging ground for the siege on their town. The Journal has also reported on long-historical feuds that predate the civil war, between the "white" residents of Misurata and the predominantly Black ones of Tawergha.

The Wall Street Journal Tuesday also reported that the Transitional National Council's (TNC) "prime minister" Mahmoud Jibril, referring to the reported atrocities in Tawergha by rebels, said: "Regarding Tawergha my own viewpoint is that nobody has the right to interfere in this matter except the people of Misurata."

Rep. Jackson took exception as follows to Jibril's remarks.

Racism in the form of ethnic cleansing, killing and genocide is wrong anytime, anyplace and against anybody in the world. It appears as though the Rebel leader, Mahmoud Jibril, is using the idea that the South used formerly to protect the institution of slavery – the 10th Amendment in our Constitution – to say, in essence: "it is an internal affair for each State and which comes under the local government."

Seumas Milne. Guardian.co.uk.

On Tuesday, Human Rights Watch reported the discovery of 53 bodies military and civilian, in Gaddafi's last stronghold of Sirte, apparently executed – with their hands tied – by former rebel militias.

Its investigator in Libya, Peter Bouckaert, told me yesterday that more bodies are continuing to be discovered in Sirte, where evidence suggests about 500 people, civilians and fighters, have been killed in the last 10 days alone by shooting, shelling and Nato bombing.

That has followed a two month-long siege and indiscriminate bombardment of a city of 100,000 which has been reduced to a Grozny-like state of destruction by triumphant rebel troops with Nato air and special-force support.

And these massacre sites are only the latest of many such discoveries. Amnesty International has now produced evidence of mass abduction and detention, beating and torture, killings and atrocities by the rebel militias Britain, France and the US have backed for the last eight months – supposedly to stop exactly those kinds of crimes being committed by the Gaddafi regime.

Throughout that time African migrants and black Libyans have been subject to a campaign of mass detention, lynchings and atrocities on the usually unfounded basis that they have been loyalist mercenaries. Such attacks continue, says Bouckaert, who witnessed militias from Misrata burning homes in Tawerga so that the town's predominantly black population – accused of backing Gaddafi – will be unable to return.

All the while, Nato leaders and cheerleading media have turned a blind eye to such horrors as they boast of a triumph of freedom and communicate about the need resorting to force. But it is now absolutely obvious that, if the purpose of western intervention in Libya's civil war was truly to "protect civilians" and "save lives," it has been a catastrophic failure.

It goes without saying that the speech of the journalists evolved little by little, with the result that on the end even a posteriori (it is easier then) there was hardly discrepancy between objective reality and reality, according to them, but it was not the case in the first part of the conflict when they did in their vast majority only take up again the set language of the allied of NATO (pressure, protection of civilians, loss of legitimacy, etc.) what is therefore by definition simply some propaganda completely similar to that to which we were entitled at the time of the war fought against Saddam Hussein due to weapons of mass destruction).

But in the French media or as regards the French journalists we have the feeling that it is another war which took place over there (a second Libya perhaps) which matches hardly the reality of the facts as to their proceedings. In every case what is certain it is that the human being of the 21st century who scrupulously followed the information or the news provided by the prism of the French media, at least at the beginning understands less than ever why the conflict ended thus in reality. Perhaps because, as the cable from the American embassy in Paris (revealed by Wikileaks), says it very well, the French journalists believe they are intelligent, very intelligent (they think they are intellectuals) what they are not in reality, of course, and are less worried about informing objectively in a factual way than about training (by selecting and manipulating information discreetly in order to orientate the ideas of the public in their sense) sitting well warm in the armchairs of their Parisian or other, offices.*

What we would be needed it is an obvious distinction between journalism of (objective) information and fighting or committed journalism , because after all, we have well also the right to take sides but on condition that not mixing both, or not making one taken for another (for example by using different terms to speak about it?) The first form of journalism being well trained but also well controlled from the ethical point of view, the other less (freedom of expression obliges long live to the first amendment of the Constitution!)

* We do not speak here about certain hands-on journalists kind war correspondents who do their work courageously and who do not deserve this opprobrium.

THE ABSOLUTE DISASTER: THE MEDIA TREATMENT OF THE SYRIAN CIVIL WAR.

Premises of the conflict.

In the years 1980, the leaders of the USA and their Saudi friends flooded with their financial generosity the Afghan and Arab combatants of the anti-Soviet jihad. Mortal enemies of the Muscovite empire, antidote for the secular pan-Arabism, convenient competitor of the Shiite subversion : the clever strategists of the CIA attributed from the start all the virtues to the Sunni jihadism. Product from the anticommunist guerilla in Afghanistan, the advent of al-Qaeda was thus the combined effect of the anti-Soviet obsession and of the Saudi fright in front of the Khomeini breakthrough. But this shameful coalition ended up being dissolved. Bin Laden wanted to settle a score with a foreign silent partner, the USA, whose regional success fold up his own world view. Poisonous fruit from the loves between CIA and jihadists, the devastating epic of the planetary jihad was born from this reversal of the monster against its moneylenders. Not very glorious scenario of the break: al-Qaeda was crossed from the list of the Western companies only as from the moment when bin Laden pronounced himself the end of the idyll. The divorce was not consummated by a West morally revolted by terrorism, but by the terrorists themselves, because of a discordance between their political diary and that of their associates.

The crisis.

New times, new mistakes: in 2011 break out in Syria some disorders which, with the assistance of the money and the various supports of great democracies as Qatar the United States Saudi Arabia France Bulgaria (uh no, that, it was for Libya) etc. quickly evolved into an atrocious civil then religious war (with participation all over the place of foreign fighters). The first demonstrations were peaceful (Daraa March 2011) but in the following (Baniyas april 2011) some members of the police were shot down. Since 2011, France USA and Saudi Arabia support a "Syrian opposition" on which the war came as a chemical developing bath. Once broken down the cardboard imitation of an allegedly democratic coalition, the reality spouted out publicly: that of the second generation transnational jihadism. At the end of 2012, to justify the support for the opponents to Bashar Al-Assad, the Secretary of State John Kerry had still the impertinence to deny in the American Congress the presence of al-Qaeda (Al Nusra Front) in Syria. Today, it is Barack Obama, elected in 2008 for his refusal of the military adventures of the previous era, who fights against his will a "third Iraq war."

Would the bloody ride of "Daesh" repeat, on the parodic note, the deadly al-Qaeda saga? Without the billion dollars unleashed by the Arab oil monarchies, the organization of Abu Bakr Al-Baghdadi, indeed, had not ensured the thundering succession of that of Usama bin Laden, liquidated by the American special forces in 2011. And similarly, without the multiform support of the United States and of their Western satellites (France, England...), the antigovernment guerilla in Syria, hoping in its nearest victory, had not fought a struggle to death against the regime, disastrous headlong rush which sowed the ground on which the overall violence of the jihadists was going to thrive.

A naive faith that their luck would hold led the Syrian rebellion to refuse the least compromise with the Baathist power, encouraged in its intransigence by the vast international coalition which still prophesied, in the autumn 2013, the imminent fall of the "butcher of Damascus." Imitating the "Mujahideen" triumphing over the regime in Kabul and the Soviet forces thirty years earlier, the Islamist insurrectionists saw in their ideological cohesion, combined with the support of the main western and regional powers the guarantee of a resounding success.

Before retracting in May 2013, the French minister for foreign affairs Laurent Fabius, being opposed to the Obama administration, had refused to register Al-Nusra Front on the list of terrorist organizations.

For what reason? "They do a good job in Syria," affirmed then without batting an eyelid, the spokesperson of France on the international scene. And the only law of the international penal court which was really applied at the express request of the French government was the law of Brennus (woe to the vanquished). As for the rest, the international penal court dishonors the very concept of

justice by applying always also just after, the famous law of the double standard . We have had of that an obvious counterexample during this civil war which devastated Syria starting from 2012. The Kurds on the Syrian side were regarded as friendly heroes nice and smart, democratic secular feminist progressive for the human rights and everything, the same Kurds on the Turkish side (PKK) were regarded as abominable terrorists plotting with Al Qaeda, etc.

Whereas a turning point in this war had just taken place (the total and final recapture of third town in the country, former rebel capital, Homs, and the capture of the last small town of importance in the south of the country) the western journalists on the web found the way of speaking much more abundantly and during three days of the pseudo-conquest by the rebels of the small town of Maarat between Damascus and Aleppo (in fact certainly attacked but never captured, at least at this moment, because it was the case indeed afterwards).

Radio Canada on October 10, 2012: The noose is tightening around the Syrian regime. ...signs show that the room for maneuver of Damascus is more and more narrowed.... whereas at the same time and besides the same article admitted it, the Syrian regular army completed the recapture of the third town of the country and continued its progression in the second (Aleppo).

My question is therefore simple: in what this "information" (the pseudo-capture of Maarat by the rebels, inaccurate information at the time) it could help the reader to form his own idea on the military evolution of the conflict?

We really feel that the search for the truth is not the main goal of all these journalists, we have really the impression that the main goal of all these journalists is rather to take part actively and even heroically in the rescue of the world in its eternal fight against the evil, simplistic Manichaeism just worthy of a 7-year-old child not very gifted, furthermore.

More generally besides we may wonder (beyond the mockeries or the RELEVANT AND WELL IN THEIR PLACE IN SUCH A DRAMA sniggers, from all these good souls), if it was really adapted for Western democracies to play with as much eagerness and during decades into the hands of armed Islamist fundamentalist movements.

May God be willing that our lot never lies in the hands of such useful idiots because the road to Hell is paved with good intentions!

This eagerness was such that you felt at times that it was a desperate personal combat on behalf of journalists ready for anything including to dishonor themselves or to ridicule themselves in order to help the advent of a dyed-in-the-wool fundamentalist and obscurantist Islam in these countries. Schizophrenia??)

Of how many mutilated or tortured dead and broken lives are morally responsible the journalists for this moral fiber in spite of their sniggers against the established regime at times??

Man is neither angel nor beast, and unhappily whoever wants to act the angel, acts the beast. The road to Hell is paved with good intentions. Were these sniggers really indicated?

To describe the facts not such as they are but such as we would like them to be, intentionally in order to mislead or by indulging in wishful thinking, is it to give form or to inform?

What I point out here it is not that certain persons in the Western countries (approximately all nice and smart people) have at all costs and almost until the end wanted to support the armed Islamist radicals...

What I intend to stigmatize here it is the stupidity of their analyses. Because a lie to be effective must also be intelligent (let us say probable). However their commentaries about this war were just worthy of a 7-year-old child, not very gifted, furthermore. With the result that the assiduous reader or listener of their "papers" did not certainly understand why finally they are not the gentle nice and smart secularist democrats who won.

For example, I who is well for evil disease and death, a dangerous psychopath torturing small children every morning with my breakfast, in short a Hitlero-Trotskyist satanist (delete as appropriate), ignoramus and deprived of any intelligence (generally besides it is in what my critics differ from me, they know, and I not); well, I have enough lucidity nevertheless to understand that the evil and Satan my Master have not yet completely won the game on earth, because there are still too many people like my despisers precisely.

One thing is that the western and particularly French journalists wanted at all costs to help the jihadists to establish most sanguinary and retrograde of the sharias in Syria (to want sharia for the Syrians was their right) but the stupidity is another thing.

How many contradictions sophisms otherworldliness stupidities worthy of a 7-year-old child, lapses of memory, untruths, appalling indifference as for the sufferings of the men and women not belonging to the camp they chose, in their articles? To translate and badly translate in addition the communication of one camp, in no case could be what we may expect from a true journalist. Sudden media hype, psittacism and herd mentality are not (by definition) in-depth and with historical perspective, reflections.

What is sad to note it is that the journalists, in this war in Syria, instead of helping the public to form its own opinion and to understand something in it; have in fact contributed to misinforming our fellow countrymen with as result that nobody could understand how that ended.

The spectacular rise of an organization treated as a thing unworthy of consideration three years before does not finish to ask questions. How the financings from the oil monarchies were sent to the vaults of the Islamic State? Up to what point the Western secret services did take part, in the name of the fight against the regime of Damascus, in the arming of its combatants? What was the exact role of Turkey, as eager to cut down Bashar Al-Assad as to reduce Kurdish resistance?

If we are and will remain a long time ignorant of the details, it is obvious today that the rise to power of "Daesh" owed as much to the exogenous factors of the Syrian conflict as to its internal data. Leading as far as possible the foreign interference, the enemies of the regime in Damascus on the international forum spared no pains to legitimate, finance, arm and unify the rebellion. Repeating the mistakes of those who financed the anti-Soviet small Jihad in Afghanistan in the 1980s, these new sorcerer's apprentice gave birth to the monster which they then subjected to public scorn as if they had no responsibility in its bursting in and could wash their hands with their vile acts.

Concentrate of extreme violence against the minorities, the women and the "apostates" of every nature, "Daesh" is the poisoned fruit of the loves between western powers and rotten oil monarchies which distill the venom of an interdenominational hatred. Its lightning rise doesn't happen by accident, but is the result of a cynical distribution of the tasks within an international coalition which is cemented by their common hostility with regard to Damascus and its allies: Teheran, Moscow, the Hezbollah.

The Western leaders provided weapons and the media orchestration of a one-way compassion where the only victims are those due to the Syrian army, while at the same time the last assessment of the SOHR (Syrian Observatory for Human Rights), near of the opposition, mentions 80,000 dead in the rows of the forces of the regime against 60,000 rebel combatants and 60,000 civilian victims of both camps. The oil monarchies too, provided and provide still (more discreetly) a lot of money, some fighters and an ideological orchestration whose content is summarized to the kindled hatred of the Shiites, of the Alawites and of the Baathists.

As opposed to what Peter Harling wrote in "Le Monde Diplomatique," the Islamic State is not the "providential monster" which would allow all the actors of this drama, without exception, to get themselves off the hook for their responsibilities. It is the combined effect of the collapse of the Iraqi State, rolled in 2003, and of the Syrian civil war, supplied with the USA and their satellites since 2011. It is not more the creature of Assad that a maneuver of Teheran: the thousands of soldiers of the Syrian Arab army and of the Hezbollah fallen while fighting against the jihadists of 80 different nationalities are enough to wash the Syrian president from this grotesque charge.

It is not necessary to be a supporter of the regime of President Assad, but simply an observer liking truth to be perplexed in front of the accounts of atrocities related so that it is necessary well to call Syria's civil war. The full number of victims (200 000.300. 000?) is very dubious, as it occurs besides in all the tragedies of this kind where happy is the observer or the historian who can already have an idea of the number of zeros.

The other question is to know who is responsible for these massacres.
AND THERE WE REALIZE WITH HORROR THAT KATYN (1940) AND TIMISOARA (1989) HAVE BEEN IN NOTHING USED AS A LESSON BY JOURNALISTS

Since there are two camps having lethal armaments, we may suppose, as in all the wars, that the assessment is shared, undoubtedly unequally but nevertheless shared, especially if certain adversaries of Assad claim to be in line with al-Qaeda (Al Nusra Front) or Daesh, which is not

considered as a humanitarian organization. But since some atrocities are signaled, the Western press, i.e., the wide-circulation newspapers ; and the large audiovisual media (the Internet is to be set apart) is almost unanimous to immediately attribute their responsibility to the regime.

We will raise in addition that the main source of the Western press agencies, the alleged Syrian Observatory for the human rights (SOHR), is reduced to one man, Rami Abdulrahman, for a long time an exiled opponent, living in Coventry.

When it is announced that there was a massacre in Houla on May 25, 2012 (108 dead including 49 children), he is behind the information. Such was also the case at the beginning on June 6, 2012, of the 87 dead in Hama or of the 55 dead in Al Qubeir.

But who spread these so precise figures and who can certify them? The Western press immediately accused the forces of the Assad regime even though at the same time this city was, it seems, controlled by the opposition. The Western and Arab countries at once send back the ambassadors of Syria in reprisal against the established power. However the information received since strengthens the assumption that the responsibility for this massacre could rather be attributed to the opponents (supposing that all the exhibited corpses were picked on the spot and not left from the mortuary as it was the case in Timisoara). The same doubts exist for the majority of the most popularized through the media, dramas, of these last weeks.

Not to mention the use of chemical weapons noted in the east of Damascus (in the Ghouta) on August 21, 2013, the very same day when investigators of UNO were still in the capital (since August 18th) in order to investigate onto a similar affair having taken place in Khan Al-Assal a few months before, very exactly on March 19, 2013.

By expressing these observations, we say neither that Assad's regime is innocent, nor even that it does not bear the heaviest share of responsibilities for the massacres. But that it bears the exclusive responsibility for them that each time an atrocity is known, it is necessary to blame it for that systematically, is at the very least little likely. The more so as the twenty-five last years saw multiplying, on the humane topic, large-scale operations of manipulation of the international opinion, each time carried out with most perfect professionalism: Timisoara, the Kosovo, the alleged weapons of mass destruction in Iraq, the Rwanda (where, of course, the international opinion was informed about the massacres but not of all, nor even of most serious). Let us admit that the threat that Gaddafi's regime made linger over a part of his fellow countrymen was quite real and could justify an intervention, it remains that the damage caused by this one -150 000 victims, according to certain sources- are not yet really known.

The role of the French government in this tragedy.

At the end of August 2013 President Francois Hollande went even as far as deciding to bomb Damascus and the troops of the Syrian regular army. Obama fortunately was sufficiently wise and cautious not to follow him.

The French diplomacy of the time indeed escaped all the standards of understanding by its inanity and its unlimited capacities of harm. The foreign policies designed in Paris, particularly as for the Eastern Mediterranean, in no case aimed peace but sought the war at all costs. Consequently such policies are only imaginable in polemical terms. Most suitable term - because nearest to reality - would undoubtedly be that of non-diplomacy because it is obviously a counter diplomacy.

Diplomacy generally seeks peace, sometimes war, but through means which are peculiar to it and for the second case, within limits fixed by laws and customs governing the ratios of power between nations. In every case it is towards what tended most peoples come at a certain stage of evolution. The "flower war" that the Aztecs practiced in order to get human cattle intended for the sacrifice was itself codified at the highest level. With regard to diplomacy, interfaces between potentially allied or antagonistic powers, lie was only tasked with being marginal, its use intervening a priori only exceptionally and with small doses.

Therefore let us not mix up the lie in diplomacy and the stratagem, in other words "the rape of masses through propaganda" as a weapon of mass destruction of the human understanding, of the moral sense of the societies ultimately, of the soul of the peoples. By contrast, in diplomacy, it is more a question of winning one's interlocutors over to the cause that you defend than to force their hand.

At a pinch it is a question of distorting their judgment, but let us not mix up fraudulent operation and characterized fraud. For this reason diplomacy is more an art of the conviction than a breach of trust. However today, precisely since 2003 and the diplomacy of the vial of "anthrax" held up before a Security Council astounded - but incredulous - by the Secretary of State Colin Powell, we witness a degenerative mutation of diplomacy mixing the subversive warfare, the accusatory inversion, the interpretive distortion of the international legality and the transgression of its founding legal principles. Consequently we see the treason of Treaties being insidiously systematized accompanied with a very immoderate use of the Special services. Without misuse of language, it is permissible to speak about Orwellian world where peace means war... For this reason it is necessary to understand that the peacekeeping or peace-keeping forces, are actors in wars disguised with humanitarian colors...often besides in the guise of color revolutions or of spring of the peoples. To understand that is the lexical basics necessary for an elementary reading of the present days.

It is true that no blow below the belt is a priori forbidden for whom wants to overcome. It remains to be seen! The end justifies exceptionally only all the means. Admittedly, the morality of the States could not be reduced to the morality of the individuals, but it exists nevertheless somewhere, so it would be convenient to remind of it. This is not besides precisely in the name of morality and of the humanitarianism that on Saturday, August 31, 2013, four days before the G20 summit in Saint Petersburg - by the skin of one's teeth - the world almost experimented a new setting ablaze... in France the orders had been communicated and if there was not the last-minute volte-face of President Obama after a planned blunder at the end of a press conference of his Secretary of State Kerry, here we would have gone again with a childish enthusiasm like in 1941.

Devastating but never legally "declared" wars.

In the Syrian case, we see well that the diplomacy leans back against the Special Services, and that they play there a main even determining role since it is them which direct the occurrence on the ground and fuel the diplomats with arguments of more or less bad faith, providing the usual logorrhea of the warmongering quibbles, of those which are spread out in the media sewage farms. Services which we would name wrongly "intelligence service," since their function is from now on less to inform the competent jurisdictions about the exact situation in such or such country, by bringing to the politician objective, even neutral, data, on the ratios of power, theaters of operation, than to intervene actively together with one of the belligerents. In fact, in the Syrian case - as in Libya - a rebellion which was carefully armed and supervised (telecommunication, logistics) within a not declared but quite effective war... for the defense of obscure interests that we don't know.

Because it is well here the main point of friction. Except for the never-ending lament concerning the human rights, what interests do we defend as by fighting together - or in the service - of the Islamist Turkey and of the Wahhabi, fundamentalist and structurally violent, oil monarchies? Under these conditions the intelligence fulfilled no longer its marginal role - i.e., underlying under the political, diplomatic and ultimately military, action - but holds by one's own will a fighting operational capability. As far as getting an autonomy forming a threat for the State itself... what the superabundant Hollywood catalog of films exploiting this topic illustrates profusely.

As for their underground role of operators - but with direct involvement - in the genesis and the development of the current conflicts, and without going back to the dirty wars in Laos and Cambodia, nothing new under the sun. However, between 1979 and 1989, years of the Soviet-Afghan confrontation, the joint participation of the American and Saudi services in support of the Arab Legion of Usama bin Laden and the Wahhabi fundamentalists of Gulbuddin Hekmatyar [for an outlay bordering the 7 billion dollars over ten years], was done by the means of the Pakistani ISI [Inter-Services Intelligence]... but it was an open warfare not aiming in an unavowed way as in Syria the overthrow of a legal regime, member of the Community of the Nations. Regime whose legitimacy was not basically called in question since, after two years and half of war, the Baathist power in Damascus, was obviously still supported by a majority of Syrians of all denominational obedience.

In short, the way in which media generally covered the recent civil war having torn Syria starting from 2011 proves that we cannot trust them as regards the next challenges which wait for Mankind, considering the mediocrity of their intellectual level (they make idiots) and of their moral integrity.

The lack of objectivity of the French media having had to deal this war can make nauseous. It was more some misinformation than some information. It is to believe that they campaigned all for the coming to power over there of a hard-line Islam based on the sharia. The "information" was always

given from the point of view of the rebels, never from the point of view of the loyalist forces, the massacres made by the rebels were very rarely evoked, even often attributed to the governmental forces. It is difficult to make more Manichean, the word was practically never given to the victims of the rebels but such a Manicheism cannot report well the complexity of reality: as the proverb says it: the road to Hell is paved with good intentions. French journalists as in Iraq a few years earlier pulled again the trick of the mass destruction weapons during several days.

The problem of the little world of the French media, Vauvenargues could have said, it is that the hubris of its journalists, persuaded of their intellectual and moral superiority, eager to live as heroes, or at least on the side of authentic heroes, has as a result that they are psychologically unable to learn or to take into account past, realities. The Libyan precedent should have been used by them as a lesson but not, they do it again with regard to the war in Syria. There exist weapons carrying licenses. It was to exist informing licenses. Or now then it is necessary to distinguish the opinion journalism, which is perfectly legitimate, including in its most severe value judgments, well, from the information journalism which should nevertheless be bound to a little more objectivity.

OTHER EXAMPLES OF THE HARMFUL ROLE OF MEDIA IN THE EVOLUTION OF A WAR (misinformation).

The war in Ukraine in 1941.

A German historian Harriet Scharnberg showed that, in the 1930s, the Associated Press (AP) had agreed to publish information approved by the Nazi regime in return for an authorization to be able to work in Germany.

The participation of the AP in propaganda Nazi is particularly obvious in the case of the invasion of the town of Lviv, in Ukraine, in June 1941. After the discovery of slaughters perpetrated by the Soviet troops, the Nazi forces organized pogroms against the Jewish population of the city.

However, at this time, the AP diffused only photographs of the slaughters carried out by Soviets inside Lviv prisons, Franz Roth's photographs selected upon Hitler's personal orders.

"Instead of printing pictures of the days-long Lviv pogroms with its thousands of Jewish victims, the American press was only supplied with photographs showing the victims of the Soviet police and 'brute' Red Army war criminals," Harriet Scharnberg told the Guardian. "To that extent it is fair to say that these pictures played their part in disguising the true character of the war led by the Germans".

THESE PICTURES THEREFORE PLAYED THEIR PART IN DISGUIISING THE TRUE CHARACTER OF THE WAR LED BY THE GERMANS.

A spokesperson of the AP rejected any notion that it deliberately collaborated with the Nazi regime. An accurate characterization would be that the AP was then "subjected to intense pressure from the Nazi regime".....

SO IMPORTANTANCE OF THE CHOICE OF THE PHOTOGRAPHS, WORDS, MOMENT.

The conflict in the south Ukraine starting from 2014.

Jean.- François. Kahn. Journalist and press baron.

Consider the way in which the press deals, for example, with Ukrainian crisis. What occurs in Ukraine is infinitely complex. However, when you read the French newspapers, it is binary, simplistic, childish, Manichaeian, with on a side absolute bad guys and on the other formidable good ones. If people in the Crimea are mainly for the detachment from Ukraine, is this a shame? Perhaps that it is, in the name of the intangibility of the borders, but how to be offended about that when you have, for that matter, supported that it was necessary to tear off Kosovo from Serbia!

All right, Vladimir Putin is a rascal. He has, without encountering any opposition, occupied last year the Crimea (like formerly Catherine II) and dares today to meddle spectacularly with the business of the complicated East: he dispatches his air Cossacks in the Syrian sky. Each day, the most enlightened spirits, the most immaculate souls, the best armchair specialists thunder anathemas against this new drunk with power tsar. They analyze his necessarily evil intentions, scan his obligatorily evil ulterior motives.

Scandal! That the Americans, the French, the Iranians, the Turks, the Saudis, Qataris and some more discrete others interfere, with the success which we know, in the bloody Syrian bedlam, what could be more normal. But Russians! What legitimacy they therefore have to intervene, these bumpkins of muzhiks? And this Putin with his bad manner! Sometimes you would believe to go back in time: in 1717, when, in the Regency, Peter the Great visited France, the courtiers, already, held their nose vis-a-vis the roughneck soldier's behavior of the tsar of all Russia...

Of course, at a closer look, Moscow thinks to have some reasons not worse than others to dispatch its Sukhoi into Syria.

To get back to Ukraine, I acknowledge that the incredible civil war which tore this country in 2014 personally left me speechless because it illustrated in a grotesque way to what extent the media of certain countries could systematically practice the "double standard."

The in good faith observer always hesitates to put such an OCD down to the simple stupidity or lack of culture of the professionals of these by definition non-manual trades.

At the very least perhaps would it be necessary to add to it the factor hubris or "disproportionate ego" of the interested parties.

This collective madness which seized then certain politicians or certain journalists is a problem.

Especially for the media of which the role is theoretically to inform objectively the citizens in theory so that they form themselves their own opinion and not to play the warmongers.

Facing such a herd mentality in the most nauseating or most coward (almost silence about the acts of violence or the crimes of the ones, systematic signaling of the misdemeanor or isolated crimes of the others) stupidity, then I reminded of the study of Gustave Le Bon about crowd psychology including the organized and structured crowds (the sociological law of the alas systematic conformity with the most primary behaviors of the individuals composing the same organized crowd.

If we try to see clearly in the media mechanisms running in these cases, we could reduce them to two simple sociological motivations concerning the professional journalists , especially youngest.

The first is the Manichaeism which urges them to seek in each necessarily complex situation some good guys and some bad ones. This approach has several advantages for them it makes it possible to quickly understand (or to have the feeling to understand) a complicated situation; it makes each journalist a missionary or a dispenser of justice, not only a reporter of facts but an agent of the good and, thus, it coincides enough with the psychology of an idealistic older teenager which is often that of the war correspondent. Lastly, it is well known that to present the things, whether it is in an article or in a book, in black and white , in the way of an adventure movie, kindles the attention of the public, where a subtly refined presentation could annoy it.

The second motivation is that the particular treatment from which the trade profits (existence of press services, appointed correspondents, hotels reserved not too far from the frontline, press conferences) has as a result that the journalists, from what country they come and of what side they are, live together and that the one who lands without knowing where the good and bad guys are will ask the others about it and will quickly join the common opinion. Manicheism and herd instinct (like in the famous story of the sheep of Mr. Panurge and not like in the story of Mr. Seguin's goat) seem to be the lifeblood of the war information.

And if the mechanisms of distortion of the facts that we have just described are set up, the field investigation is hardly necessary. If you are informed that at such place a massacre was made, it is no longer necessary to investigate in order to know who is responsible for it: it can be only the camp of the bad guy. The press correspondent who is based on a Manichean ideology and the unanimity of his corporation, needs no longer facts, he can be satisfied with what Kant called synthetic a priori judgments.

Apart from the fact that it distorts the truth, we say in passing to what extent such an attitude is potentially criminal (accomplice) or criminogenic.

The fighters who have not come down in the last shower and know thoroughly these mechanisms are well advised today to perpetrate the maximum of atrocities: since those will be without examination put down to their adversary, each one of them will be a psychological victory in addition.

We could stop there the analysis and be satisfied to blame the sociology of a particular trade. It would be a little short. Because it is well necessary to say it, this mechanism does not run in any direction: it plays today always against the State, the regime or the faction opposed to(except perhaps for what concerns Palestine). Saudi Arabia, the Gulf emirates, are anything but democratic States: women are stoned there regularly, the elections are not faked there since there are not of them, the attempts at revolt are suppressed there with bloodshed. But they are alliesand if facts of this kind are reported occasionally they make little noise in all , being considered more for mishaps than for the expression of criminal regimes.

This unilateral nature is therefore not reduced to a simple sociological data, being inherent part of the information background. The truth reality it is that information became a weapon of war. And as such, it calls on the most sophisticated techniques. It is handled by people who know very well all the motivations of it and perhaps have it all tied up by exploiting the naivety and the idealism of the young journalists. The paradox is that the majority of these press correspondents are positioned on the left wing, i.e., that, taken one by one, they are perhaps opposed to the American supremacy, critical of the international finance which underlies it, of the prison in Guantanamo or the unfair use of drones, etc.

CONCLUSION.

“Those tribes-states which are considered to conduct their commonwealth more judiciously, have it ordained by their laws, that, if any person has heard by rumor and report from his neighbors anything concerning the commonwealth, he shall convey it to the magistrate, and not impart it to any other; because it has been discovered that inconsiderate and inexperienced men were often alarmed by false reports, and driven to some rash act, or else took hasty measures in affairs of the highest importance. The magistrates conceal those things which require to be kept unknown and they disclose to the people whatever they determine to be expedient. It is not lawful to speak of the commonwealth, except in the council” (Caesar. B.G. Book VI, chapter XX).

The text of Caesar was however clear, it was indeed a question on behalf of these Celtic tribe-State of cleansing information before it comes to the masses, and what was initially aimed were..

- False information.

- Decisions taken under the influence of emotion * and not after careful considerations.

It is therefore important to denounce loud and clear the nowadays operated corruption of this very praiseworthy worry.

- To avoid false information.

- To avoid the decisions taken under the influence of emotion * and not after careful considerations.

*The congenital anomaly of the media is the infantilism. Let us remind about this subject of what the French media political class repeated ad nauseam in the beginning of September 2015 in connection with the drowning in Turkey of the little Aylan Kurdi, empathy is not the first of the emotions, the first and strongest of the emotions is FEAR.

ON FACTS CHECKING.

The systematic checking of the facts is a method consisting in checking and validating the accuracy of the figures, information and assertions stated in a text or a speech.

But subject the political speeches to the factual testing is not enough because such an approach can also fail through fear of looking partisan.

The decisive turning point for these “inspectors” -who go over the assertions or promises of the politicians with a fine comb and more generally try hard to check the facts- was the prestigious prize Pulitzer awarded in 2009 to PolitiFact.com which had dealt very closely with the American presidential campaign of 2008 opposing Barack Obama and John McCain.

But if it is hailed by many, this new side of the journalism does not avoid for all that the polemics and criticisms which target the media world.

Nobel Prize of economy, Paul Krugman, of whom some of the assertions had been put in question by PolitiFact, had summarized it in a biting way as soon as 2011: "The people at PolitiFact are terrified of being considered partisan if they acknowledge the clear fact that there's a lot more lying on one side of the political spectrum than on the other. So they've bent over backwards to appear 'balanced' — and in the process made themselves useless and irrelevant."

"It's hard to establish something in a way that no one can disagree with," Lucas Graves Professor of Journalism at the University of Wisconsin points out "and it is especially true when it comes to the kinds of facts that politicians traffic. All the fact checkers I've talked to are open about this, they say it is as much art as science."

Between the reality of the world in all its complexity (because there is a complexity of reality), and the ordinary citizen; our current media-political , this new planetary conformism, a little like the Pharisees in the 4 Gospels, instead of informing, as it would be, gives form, to the citizens, with its simplistic and Manichean absences of reasoning or with its conditioned reflexes, a configuration besides level playground for 6-year-old children; by euphemizing FOR INSTANCE the man's exploitation of man * under the names of liberalism, market economy, supply-side economics; as well as the law of the jungle or the planetary struggle of all against all renamed by these “Pharisaic” journalists... globalization. **

Or remote spiritual ancestors were right therefore to want to resolve such a situation since, as Caesar says, “Those tribes-states which are considered to conduct their commonwealth more judiciously, have it ordained by their laws, that, if any person has heard by rumor and report from his neighbors anything concerning the commonwealth, he shall convey it to the magistrate, and not impart it to any other; because it has been discovered that inconsiderate and inexperienced men were often alarmed by false reports, and driven to some rash act, or else took hasty measures in affairs of the highest importance. The magistrates conceal those things which require to be kept unknown and they disclose to the people whatever they determine to be expedient. It is not lawful to speak of the commonwealth, except in the council” (Caesar. B.G. Book VI, chapter XX).

It is therefore more than ever important to build a New Man by return to the best of the former one. By return to the best of the former one to build a New Man because, as explained it formerly my old master the late polemist Gaston Bouthoul, “the birth of a value judgment is seldom a true invention in the meaning of creation of a new concept. It consists generally in moving the border between the sacredness and the non-religious or in reclassifying values in a new hierarchical order” (Treatise of sociology volume II).

As Eugene Volokh points out it very well, freedom of speech should suffer only negligible exceptions and the hate speech is even not part of it. At least in the United States.

One is as free to condemn Islam — or Muslims, or Jews, or blacks, or whites, or illegal aliens, or native-born citizens — as one is to condemn capitalism or Socialism or Democrats or Republicans. To be sure, there are some kinds of speech that are unprotected by the First Amendment. But those narrow exceptions have nothing to do with “hate speech” in any conventionally used sense of the term.

-For instance, there is an exception for “fighting words,” face-to-face personal insults addressed to a specific person, that are likely to start an immediate brawl. But this exception isn't limited to racial or religious insults, nor even does it cover all racially or religiously negative statements.

The fighting words are not generally considered a “hate speech” , and match no legal definition of “hate speech.”

The same is true of the other narrow exceptions, such as for true threats of illegal conduct or incitement intended to produce and likely to produce imminent illegal conduct. Indeed, threatening to kill someone because he's black (or white), or intentionally inciting someone to an immediate attack on someone because he's Muslim (or Christian or Jewish), can be equated with a crime. But this isn't because it's "hate speech"; it's because it's illegal to make true threats and incite imminent crimes against anyone and for any reason, for instance because they are police officers or capitalists or just someone who is sleeping with the speaker's ex-girlfriend.

-The "hostile environment harassment laws" do not criminalize speech society at large, but only apply to particular contexts, such as workplaces. None of them represent specifically a "hate speech" exception.

"Hate speech" doesn't have any fixed legal meaning. Law never defined "hate speech" any more than it defined violence, evil, unpatriotic speech, or any other speech that people might condemn but which is not a legally relevant category.

Those who want to make such arguments about this subject should acknowledge that in reality they are calling for a change in First Amendment, and should explain just what that change would be, so people can thoughtfully evaluate it. Calls for a new First Amendment exception for "hate speech" shouldn't just rely on the undefined term "hate speech" — they should explain just what viewpoints the government would be allowed to suppress, what viewpoints would remain legal, and how judges, juries, and prosecutors are supposed to distinguish the two. Saying "This isn't free speech, it's hate speech" doesn't suffice.

Personal commentary of the author of this compilation. It would be perhaps necessary nevertheless to somewhat widen the scope of application of the two exceptions mentioned above. Just a little bit.

It is thus necessary to decide to have one's hands dirty, i.e., to fight the enemy on its own ground vigorously rather than to demonize it without respite. And with this intention we will reconsider the subject by the means of two or three notebooks devoted to the sets QUR.HAD.SIR. and SHAR.FIQ.MAD.

THE JOURNALISTS FACING THE CHALLENGES OF OUR TIME.

In his prayer on the Acropolis to him, a splendid conference delivered in Athens in 1955, Albert Camus distinguishes the tragedy, where the forces which clash are all legitimate, from the melodrama, where there is one of them only which is justifiable: "Antigone is right, but Creon is not wrong. Prometheus is similarly at the same time righteous and unrighteous, and Zeus who oppresses him without pity is also within his rights. The formula of the melodrama would be all in all: "That only is right and righteous" and the tragic formula: "All are righteous persons, nobody is wrong." This is why the chorus of the ancient tragedies always gives prudence pieces of advice. "

But Alain Finkielkraut adds that today, considering what happened in Europe from 1933 to 1945 (holocausts by bullets, death camps,... .Raul Hilberg 5,100,000 victims) the tragic chorus has become silent: moral Manichaeism spreads again, the anti-Nazi vigilance secures the absolute domination of the melodrama and, oh what a wonderful world apart from.....because the evil everyone is against but the first of the evils of our Mankind since the world began unfortunately is that they are only designs of good, different, ... which clash in it. Its second misfortune is that those who know do not speak and that those who speak know nothing! Latin qui sciunt tacent, qui loquuntur nihil sciunt etc... We will never say enough the deeply harmful part played in this country by the intellectuals or the media men (journalists, stars of the show business, sociologists). Too much information kills information. The current overmuch information is a veil which prevents us to find our way around. We know more and more things about unimportant things. And besides we can only wonder about the real level of intelligence of all these beaux esprit who could believe one moment or during their whole life that the sum of individual selfishness (Mandeville the fable of the bees) could lead to another thing that to the survival of the fittest thanks to the intervention of an "invisible hand" (Smith). Unless it was simply the shameless cynicism of dirty bastards! It is tasteful among certain people (a small minority for the moment) to mock the antiquated nonsense of the English Adam Smith in connection with the market economy or liberalism; but we must not forget the extraordinary stupidity, as for the content, of the theories of the Dutchman Mandeville stated in 1714, with his fable of the bees (the private vices are the elements necessary of the wellbeing and of the greatness of a society; in other words: we should in nothing block the egoistic research of the personal interest, because it is it which produces the public benefits. But what is scandalous, what an aberration is it is not so much the extravagant expenditure as the money which sleeps, or which goes up in smoke (destruction, war, planned obsolescence), in short what produces neither tangible material wealth nor spiritual wealth or really useful services.

The utility of the extravagant expenditure or the social utility of selfishness is a sophism which can have an appearance of truth only in a world where an infinite growth of the production of wealth is possible; and not in a world characterized by the finitude of the vital resources in all the great fields: in fossil fuels water, and so on...) That begins even to be accepted by our Finance Minister . Alan

Greenspan himself admitted that he had perhaps made a mistake by believing that the sense of their private interests among bankers could be the best protection which is, for everybody.

The self--harmonization of the most egoistic interests is a myth with toxic and noxious consequences. When the wise man points at the moon, the French intellectual looks at his finger. Will the French intellectuals, the French journalists, the French political officials, be the last ones to discover it and to make shared by their readers, their listeners, their viewers, this necessary return to the reality or to the common sense? We need a world where it will be necessary, like not long ago still, of living more simply and of being refocused on the production of the essential goods; which is no longer characterized by the laissez-faire, because the laissez-faire, it is to let the most dangerous selfishness for the future of our species, run, this mankind, of which we are all members.

Facing Nazislamism, facing this new green Fascism, traumatized by the vile beast, become morons with the "never again , " the great Western souls, far away from the spirit of our current first amendment, havee chosen indeed the setting under supervision of the speech through a solid legal arsenal allowing the immediate outlawing of every thought considered to be "nauseous," without passing via the square "deconstruction." Since to develop counter-arguments would implicitly amount to legitimate, witch hunts and McCarthyism were preferred to the civilized argument, summoning massively "the darkest hours in our history" in order to discredit right from the beginning the "stinking" adversary.

The dominant conformist generally accepted idea, in French intelligentsia (the program of is for example a very good illustration of it, no radical atheist is ever invited there in this case) is that there would be two Islams, the true one which would be only love brotherhood peace tolerance freedom of thought of worship and....and the false one which would be only... (all the contrary, of the Quran of the hadiths of the biography of Muhammad or of the deductions of the first prescriptive thinkers of Islam).

In our country the intellectuals (the media-political class) are so poor... that it treats the symptoms instead of treating the causes, and that it is deceived by the sophisms of the first preacher or smooth talker who come.

This mediocrity or confusing naivety of the intellectuals in our country undoubtedly explains its decline even its disappearance from the center in the concert of the nations.

Our elites, in addition to the fact that they attack the whistleblowers who sound the alarm bell instead of arresting the flammers disguised in lambs; attack also the symptoms instead of attacking the causes. This is why the purpose of this publication will be to stigmatize certain designs of the mass religions of today, and particularly, oh certainly not your Islam, dear reader, but the false Islam whose 6 pillars are.

- 1) The Quran and particularly its abrogating verses.
- 2) The hadiths and particularly those which legitimate the most serious infringements of the human rights.
- 3) The integral imitation of the life of Muhammad including in what Muhammad did more contestable.
- 4) The deductions in what relates to the concrete and daily life (the relationship with the other communities the war the status of women, etc.) drawn from these three previous sources that are gathered under the generic name of Sharia, by various authors.
- 5) The jurisprudence.
- 6) The different Law Schools (madhab). 4 Sunnites (Hanafism malekism shafism hanbalism) and 4 Shiites (ismailism, jafarism, zaidism, Twelver) plus some others very minority.

Everybody knows or at least should know the famous anecdote of the English landing in Paris and who, seeing the first Frenchwoman of one's life, notes at once in his intimate diary: "French women are russet-red."

Put "French journalist" instead of "English" and there you have an excellent description of 95% of the media-political class in our country (what explains why certain challenges of the greatest importance could never be really answered, our intellectuals fighting more against the symptoms than against the causes of some of the evils which afflict us).

"God is laughing at men who complain about the consequences while they cherish the causes." The reasoning stupidity, current among our intellectuals, often also comes from the fact that they compare or put on the same level elements (premises) which are not comparable or which are not to be put on the same level, by canceling differences having serious consequences. The fact of refusing systematically to get involved in an argument between each other without dealing nor seeking to understand (therefore while showing in fact many ignorances) explains many of the idiotic "reasoning" of our elites.

They put for example on the same level the behavior of the Crusaders in the Middle East WHICH WAS IN CONTRADICTION WITH THEIR FOUNDING TEXTS (the 4 Gospels) and the behavior of the jihadists (WHICH IS IN CONFORMITY WITH THEIR FOUNDING TEXTS: THE QURAN THE HADITHS THE LIFE OF MUHAMMAD).

We will never say enough the deeply harmful role played in this country by the intellectuals or the media men (journalists, stars of the show business, sociologists). Cf. as an example, the demonstration which took place in the center of the heartlands, in Limoges, on Friday, September 17, 2010, with the call of the Islamic organization Sirat Alizza, for burning the Penal Code. The least that we can say it is this, however, very symptomatic information, would it be only as regards symbol, was hardly repeated by the big media of the day or of the following day; nor by the national politicians, usually so prompt to be moved when a little inflamed clergyman threatens to burn the Quran.

This nation (the French nation) therefore deserved well to disappear at the end of the 20th century (starting from 1962?) as the impossible debate or parody of debate opened by President Nicolas Sarkozy in 2009, showed it well.

Legal exclusion a priori of certain opinions considered as hate speech (the first Amendment in the French way!), decision of the organizing authorities in support, everywhere present evocation of "nauseous misdemeanors" without people know still in what precisely the aforementioned misdemeanors consisted. For an extreme right-wing racist indeed, the misdemeanor can be simply the fact of claiming to be in line with a certain humanism. And vice versa. And besides, it is simple, the racist, it is always the other (how many interventions did not start with preliminaries of the kind: "I am not racist, but..."). In short, the normal position and of good sense of the ones forms always a misdemeanor in the eyes of the others. We would therefore like to have a little more precise details on what was regarded as a nauseous misdemeanor by the intellectual having expressed on this subject. For example, by giving the floor to the authors of the aforementioned misdemeanors so that each one forms one's opinion.

The truth which emerges from all this it is that the elites of this country (poor people, poor France) do not have or have no longer if they ever had them, the conceptual tools to discuss such a subject intelligently. Distinction between citizenship (official membership) and nationality (birth community), between race, religion, culture and language (as if all those who spoke the language of Shakespeare were English. Well, not, Sirs, know it, even when you speak English you are not necessarily "British" as the Irishmen say. Between refugee and immigrant. Between interbreeding and diversity (the interbreeding by definition makes the differences disappear). Discrimination or equality. Because if there is affirmative action for the ones that means necessarily that there is a negative affirmation for the others. Secularism (to recognize no worship) and paganism (to recognize all the possible worships).

A French intellectual like Lilian Thuram for example, can, in the same sentence, and in front of millions viewers, affirm that the races do not exist, that the Aryan race therefore does not exist (what is true), but that the Blacks are superior to the Aryan or white race because they are lower in nothing to it; but that, on the other hand, they are superior to it in a certain number of fields where they are stronger, more gifted sport, music, dance... without these inconsistencies in conformity with the dominant ideology being in any way corrected by the other intellectual who questioned him, the French journalist Thierry Guerrier. In this country racism passed, and passed well... in the luggage of anti-racists 1). But it is true that the same applies to certain enormous untruths uttered by some participants in the televised pseudo-debates of his fellow-member Yves C... Example "The general De Gaulle comes from an immigrant family"... A enormity brought up by the French pharmacist Patrick Lozes in order to evoke the Flemish origins of his name (De Walle); as well as many the other language cunning that this host presenter is, of course, unable to note. Kind...

- Are we allowed to criticize Islam or Muhammad?

- But, of course, dear Mr. you are allowed to criticize the Muslims. The Muslims are only men like the others, they can be mistaken or act badly, etc.

- Ah, I am reassured!

The process, however, proves to be old as the hills since it was implemented for a long time by the Catholic church, when it carefully distinguished between the institution itself (the Church) which is a saint, infallible, and the men who compose it (who themselves are fallible and sinners).

Once again Let us repeat it, as long as there is not also in this kind of debate about the Muslim or other, religion, presence of convinced and well versed in this kind of controversy, atheists; there will be only misinformation or parody of debate.

N.B. When you tolerate down to that point to be denied in your very essence like the French Minister of the time, called Eric Besson, did; it that you deserve to disappear, made looking ridiculous and covered with spit, humiliated.

Fortunately, that in what relates to me I am no longer French in the strictest sense of the word, not being alone a Republic, neither a host country, neither a secularism, nor a tolerance, and so on (what claim it would be!) I am only a common and simple human being, male, born in 1952, whose family at the 17th century in Attancourt, Champagne, was of Gallo-Romance origin, Oillitan more precisely, etc., etc.

Generally (but this general rule, of course, goes hand in hand with a certain number of exceptions as always), the politician journalist intellectuals acting hidden behind an apparent virtue, who control the media and the exaggerated mass consumption characteristic of our time, therefore make the public opinion; are mentally and intrinsically unfit * to grasp all the moving complexity of reality; they are only able to have a simplistic (static and Manichean) view of the things, simplistic ideas and not simple ideas. It is true that to be equipped with an as acute as a scalpel clearness to dissect the depths of the

human soul/mind, and to excavate or dig in the darkness of its congenital hypocrisy as the luminous pencil of a headlight in the night, is not the most widely shared thing in the world. It is already necessary not to be conformist for that. However it is far from being the case of the journalists, because they are generally on the contrary conformist enough, not as regards manners but as regards the reflection; insofar as there is reflection besides because it is generally in their case a non-reflection, an absence of reflection, at least thoroughly or rising somewhat above the conditioned by dominant ideology reflexes, a little like Pavlov and of his famous doggie. In short, everyone cannot be Vauvenargues.**

Since 1963 (and not 1763, although it is the year of the pathetic treaty of Paris), since 1963 therefore, the year when France lost her last chance to be still a great power (it is more currently only an average power whose culture is only one of the provinces of the world, and who even lost his soul) a whole series of incredible laws were voted (by a majority of senators or representatives of the people, left wing or democrats in the broadest sense of the term, and republican right wing combined) which completely muzzled the freedom of speech guaranteed theoretically by every Constitution worthy of the name. Cf. the first of the amendments (ratified in 1791, that is to say two years hardly therefore after the beginning of the "great" French Revolution, which was then only in the stage of the first steps). These laws are the Gayssot Act, the Taubira Act, the law on the acknowledgement of the Armenian genocide, and finally the law relating to the positive aspects of the colonization [of the Roman type?]. What an idea!

France of today is characterized by the reign of the infernal quartet of the intellectual orthodoxy, of the intellectual terrorism, of the right thinking, and of the quite convenient notion of "public nuisances" A) And as a representative of the people (UMP) from the North, Christian Vanneste, said it well, one day: "the intellectual terrorism has species of gun dogs unleashed against the unhappy game which came on their ground. These gun dogs are rather paradoxically associations supported by public money. Eric Zemmour B) and I we have the means of defending us, but let think of the others! A local journalist or a local elected official versus an association, he can't have a defense lawyer, he cannot appeal, what gives a two-tier justice... but as Eric Zemmour B) pointed out it well yesterday, to us, freedom of speech consists in saying what you want, even silly things... is it necessary to agree to limit the democracy in order to avoid the verbal misdemeanors or to accept them in order to safeguard democracy? I am for the second solution. Freedom of speech is the priority of the priorities."

Notices.

* By mentally unfit we want to say thereby that the rather vulgar form of intelligence in the final analysis which drives them is not endowed with the mental characteristics necessary to the extreme clearness which consists in fact in having simple but non-simplistic ideas because what is clearly thought out is clearly expressed. And the words to say it come easily (art of poetry 1674). That, joined with their lack of courage even with their intellectual, cowardice, as with their lack of integrity, their careerism and their mentality of courtiers without shame, through the lure of gain (see the confessions of Nicholas Domenach and Maurice Szafran in their book entitled "off" in English (in the text) therefore their role in the presidential election of 2007, well in conformity with that described by certain cables from the American embassy in Paris)...

** A moralist of the 18th century (1715-1747) whose here one of the maxims listed in his introduction to the knowledge of human mind: "The common excuse of those who bring misfortune on others is that they desire their sake."

1) The stupidity or the lack of culture and the inconsistency of the anti-racists are such that in what relates to me I prefer to regard myself as a NON-RACIST (not antiracist, non-racist!)

A) The notion which makes it possible to the representatives of the government to infringe laws and constitution without you can say something, even when that is not justified by the situation. Hey yes! It is so in France !

B) Eric Zemmour is a French journalist at the origin of a vast debate about racism and anti-racism or the contrary having been widely talked about in 2010 /2011.

THE JOURNALISTS IN FRONT OF THE SET QUR.HAD.SIR. and SHAR.FIQ.MAD.

Did this set become the dominant religion in France?? Did the France that we love, that of La Fayette, become the oldest daughter of Islam, a country from now turning her back on the Enlightenment and Voltaire? Hurrying at any speed towards obscurantism? What is certain it is that we currently see in media and elites an intellectual decline (if the term shocks let us say a movement of ideas going in a direction opposed diametrically to that which characterized the Enlightenment) whose only known precedent was the period which followed the collapse of the Roman Empire because of the Barbarian invasions: the Dark Ages or Middle Ages of our history. Rescript of Honorius 410 and victory of Clovis at Soissons in 486.

The whole by return at a rate of knots to the crassest obscurantism as John Toland and the baron d'Holbach could have said in their time: idolatrous worship of a man (isma), Muhammad, as well as of a cluster of printed words, the Quran. However to be converted to Islam is not a proof of intelligence but only an act of faith, having nothing to do with the reason (since it is generally admitted that faith and reason are two different things).

Would France have become the junior daughter of the mosque? In France in any case (in the old papal city of Avignon), there are those who were outraged by this blasphemy (well yes, Ma'am, in a way) consisting in exhibiting a photograph representing a Christ or a crucifix in urine (a work by Andres Serrano entitled Piss-Christ), at the point to put an end to it, radically, who are pursued by police and justice (after a complaint of the director of this "artistic" exhibition). It is not for nothing that France is the country which invented the expression "contrasting principles" in other words the double standard. And during this time we all dance there on the bridge, however, about to be broken, and we all dance there in a ring. In the time of Roland, in Roncevaux, of Charles Trenet, one could speak about Swete France, but today the most relevant name is unquestionably "Poor France!" France, oldest daughter of the Church, and then younger daughter of the atheism of the Enlightenment (after so many centuries of obscurantism), therefore look in a mirror what you became under the leadership of your elites (media journalists, professional sportsmen – what a wasted energy! -, intellectuals, artists, political officials, professional philosophers – what vacuity, how many contradictions, how many inconsistencies! – clergymen of the allegedly reformed religion or other priests of the same family, rabbis and Imams, always of the same family?? Etc. in short of all these beaux-esprits, nicest and smartest or most anti-racist, which would mean the same result, who walked ever on the face of the earth) an escheated, exploded, disintegrated, with no more cohesion, society (Alain Finkielkraut), where the differences between the standards of living increase vertiginously, whose culture became provincial (in the bad meaning of the term) in short which sold its soul for a handful of lenses. Dear country of my ancestors (since at least 1635 and perhaps 1560 in Laneuville-Saint-Joire devant Treveray), your "ourselves" (Irish Sinn Fein) is become a "and me, and me" (agus me agus me in Gaelic language), and the example of such indifference or such a lack of empathy towards the destiny of the large family or collective being or collective soul (Renan) that is a nation*; comes from the top, drips from higher classes of the social pyramid. And nevertheless, as the well-known nazi-bolchevist or hitlero-trotskyist Jean Jaures said it: "the homeland it is all that remains for those who have no longer something" and "a little internationalism moves away from the homeland, much brings back to it."

What a return to obscurantism at a rate of knots guaranteed with all these nice and smart, and everything, beaux-esprits! The offense of blasphemy (against the Quran), brought for example in the lower court 3 months of prison and 1000 euro of fine to the French Ernesto Rojas Abbate (Bischheim April 11, 2011). France boasts about being the freedom of speech country, but it is very far from the United States as regards religious freedom of speech (as in many other fields besides) and, in addition to the fact that it is itself contradictory to define a concrete entity by an abstraction (worse than an oxymoron, it is nonsense), it insults them truly by claiming that what distinguishes it from all the other countries (its identity its identity) it is precisely freedom as well as secularity. The United States is actually more a country of freedom or true secularity than France itself where every criticism of the Quran and of the Islam is prohibited by the law, just as the fact of eating pork and of drinking wine in the street or in public space in the presence of pious Muslims (there it is prohibited by the authorities, not by the law). Poor country and poor people! They have really sunk very low! What happens to our France, the true one, that we love, that of Lafayette?? Would it have become mad???

* A nation is a soul, a spiritual principle.

At the end of 2011 for example (December 10th and 11th, 2010) A) B) the reassertion by a political woman running for the presidential elections, of the principles and of the law of the country, with regard to religions, saw the vast majority of the politicians (all wings confused) of the professional sportsmen, of the French intellectuals, Johnny Hallyday for instance, of the journalists, of the media, to stand up made indignant by the idea to apply this principle of neutrality or of non-intervention of the States, in favor of such or such particular religion.

See in footnotes the exact remarks made by this politician (N.B. I had the biggest difficulty to find them in their entirety on the Internet, the vast majority of the intellectuals and of the journalists repeating only short extracts put end to end. Because, like the cable that the American embassy has one day sent Washington, the French journalists are not there to inform the public but to train it in their ideas.C)

The almost -unanimity of this reaction of the elites of the nation or of the French intellectuals D) like Johnny Hallyday, Claude Goasguen, Sophia Aram D), as its speed, leads to arouse some very simple questions.

1) Is it legal not to be Muslim in this country? Said differently: "Do we have the right not to be Muslim in this country?? "

2) Is it moral not to be Muslim in this country?? Said differently: "Can we be not Muslim without being automatically suspected of being a condemnable character from the point of view of ethics or morals?"

3) Do we have the right not to be charmed by this religion? (by the immensely majority practice and for a long time if it is not since always of this religion, such as it is defined by the trinomial Quran + hadiths + Sharia.)

4) Do we have the legal or moral right to have precise reasons (concerning its freedom of thought or of speech) or much less precise reasons (falling rather within the tastes which we prefer) not to be charmed by this religion?

5) Do we have the legal right to express or announce these precise reasons (falling within one's freedom of thought or of speech) or the much less precise reasons (falling rather within the tastes which we prefer) explaining that we are not charmed by this religion?

6) Said differently: is it necessary to prohibit the book entitled "Why I am not a Muslim? " and to punish his author Ibn Warraq for having written and spread it?

Editor's note: look out, these two questions are bound, you cannot answer yes for the latter if you answer in a negative way for the previous one and vice versa.

7) Do we have the legal right to wish a) neither for oneself b) neither for his children c) neither for his neighbors d) neither for his friends, e) nor even for any other inhabitant of this planet (to check the appropriate box), a life of the type fervent Muslim or (practicing believing) Islamist?

8) Do we have the moral right (i.e., without being automatically suspected of being a condemnable character from the point of view of ethics or morals) to wish a) neither for oneself b) neither for his children c) neither for his neighbors d) neither for his friends, e) nor even for any other inhabitant of this planet (to check the appropriate box), a life of the type (fervent or let us say very believing, very practicing) Muslim or Islamist?

9) Do have the citizens and the people having announced and therefore expressed (freedom of speech?) these opinions or these thoughts which are theirs (freedom of speech?) or having expressed that they shared them, the legal right to join in order to spread in an even more important way these thoughts or these opinions and therefore to unite to their thesis indecisive persons (even some citizen persuaded of the opposite initially)?

10) Do have the citizens and the people having announced and therefore expressed (freedom of speech?) these opinions or these thoughts which are theirs (freedom of speech?) or having expressed

that they shared them, the moral right to join in order to spread in a even more important way these thoughts or these opinions and therefore to unite to their thesis indecisive persons (even some citizens persuaded of the opposite initially)?

11) is it possible objectively speaking and in all intellectual honesty, to be based on the only criterion of the relation to Islam in order to locate intelligently on the political scene a natural or a legal person? Kind: favorable to Islam and fervent Muslim = democratic extreme left wing, not favorable to Islam and not fervent Muslim = beyond any republicanism: extreme right wing quite simply.

Not to be Muslim, to be far from becoming such one day, and even to wish on anyone of living in a society ruled by the Sharia i.e., by fervent and practicing Muslims, to say it and to announce it in order to make this opinion shared, is this sufficient to classify non-republican extreme right-wing a man a woman or a party?

12) Can we imagine that it is possible at least theoretically, in certain cases, not to be Muslim, to be far from becoming such one day, and even to wish on anyone of living in a society ruled by fervent and practicing Muslims.... for reasons other than some manifestations of selfishness (for reasons other than economic reasons of the type: unemployment crisis decline of incomes, etc.).

In fact, all that asks the question of the intelligence of the elites in this country. What is the form of this intelligence as well on the individual as on the collective (analytical, synthetic, both?) level. What is its degree or its acuteness (is it deep? Surface? Incomplete? With eclipses? Prone to taboos? Endowed with a strong superego? Or on the contrary with a rather weak superego?) It is a question of intelligence!

Unless it is not a question of integrity (either they are uncompromising , or they are disposed to compromise with the expression of what they think nevertheless deep down in their heart ... being the truth. When that can be good for their career...).

Or then quite simply, beyond the lack of moral or intellectual, integrity, of the journalists, of the elites and of the politicians or of the professional sportsmen in this country, a lack of courage (and this, whether they are true or false republicans, true or false democrats and so on). i.e., to do journalism of opinion (what is perfectly legitimate) in order to make the public go in the direction of one's own personal ideas... but without saying it, admitting it, making it clear (a fault confessed is half redressed it is said); while claiming on the contrary to be objective or to report facts, as the American embassy in Paris says it so well C), including in the secrecy of the rooms of information or in the backstage of programs.

In what concerns us, let us point out our principled stand: to be converted to Islam is not a proof of intelligence. Except in the event of a constraint, of course! But a manifestation of faith and of the blindest ones.

And if not to be Muslim, be far from becoming so one day, and even to wish on anyone of living in a society ruled by fervent and practicing Muslims, to say it and to announce it in order to make this opinion shared, it is to be a monster as in the film by Fritz Lang M. Satanist or henchman of the Devil, Nazi and Hitlerian, or Stalinist, let us say Nazi-Bolshevist or Hitlero-Trotskyist, of extreme right or extreme left-wing, and in a word yucky, icky, or boo-boo wee, now then we are (optional and by deleting as appropriate according to your personal convictions)...

- Bolshevist, Trotskyist, of extreme left wing, Satanists and henchmen of the Devil, in short wee yucky, icky.

- Nazi, Hitlerian, of extreme right-wing, and still Satanists and henchmen of the Devil, of course, not forgetting yucky, icky, or boo-boo wee.

- And proud to be thus!

As regards religion the freedom of the ones must stop where that of the others including that (to be come) of the future adults, begins. The invading religions, which tend a little too much to restrict individual freedoms or to impose a lifestyle, to children or adults (whether they are or not members of their community); not really agreeing for real, deep down in their heart, and all things well considered , after having been freely enlightened by Reason; must find limits imposed firmly by the society. That

freely consenting adults whip themselves in their garden or sleep there on a bed of nails (they are, of course, some examples taken randomly from a much longer list), we agree but that it should be imposed to nobody. If somebody wants to worship Jesus, Muhammad, Buddha, the great spirit, the little Hesus, Lug, the Mother-Earth, a Book (the Quran the Bible...) and even the onion as it appears that it is the case in France E), he is to be able to do it, in thought in words and in actions, provided that there is no breach against the liberty of others; the criterion in fact being that of the reciprocity: do not do to others what you would not want done to you. Such is our position, each one is free to call it open secularity or paganism, even heathenism (Latin gentilitas).

We entirely agree therefore with Christian Vanneste when he distinguishes carefully between oral or written defamation aiming at a natural person in flesh and bone (which must be punished) because of his membership or his non-membership to such or such community (ethnic, religious, etc.) and criticism or remarks being more general. "An association should not be entitled to replace a natural person when the accused remarks are general."

Nobody should have the right to lie i.e., to repeat publicly or to insinuate in order to base one's opinion and one's ideas, untruths in the strongest sense of the term, i.e., factually inaccurate things (for example that president Obama was not born on the American territory, but in Africa, or what I still know). The problem is: how to reach this result? Creation of a College of journalists or media having the task to make observed the basic rules of the ethical code of the trade? Increase of the cultural level of journalists??

Zemmour nevertheless was wrong to regard as an absolute right for an employer the fact of taking on the people that he wants and conversely to refuse whom looks unfitting for him. Quite logically this right cannot be recognized in a multi (multi racial multi ethnic multi religious multi sex etc...). State. And as regards the private individuals, it must be moderate.

Now abolition of the Gayssot Act or not? Best will be perhaps quite simply to modify it, particularly for example by inserting in it the reminder of the right, for each one, to criticize a religious ideology, a religion, or certain aspects of such or such religion, to criticize a culture, or certain aspects of such or such culture, the right for each one not to love (one's neighbor, such or such community). People must be able to enjoy the right no to love, to say it, to express it for example by refusing to open their door (within certain limits, of course, as the needs a police investigation or the failure to assist a person in danger of death, because in the event of danger of death, you must help any other member of mankind, that goes without saying). On this subject: I always seek in the Old Testament or in the non-abrogated verses of the Quran the hadiths or the Sharia, the equivalent of the druidic precept reported by Nicholas of Damascus in order to astonish his readers (title of his work: collection of remarkable customs) in connection with the Celts: "Among them, man is punished more rigorously for the murder of a stranger than for that of a fellow citizen: in the first case, death, in the second exile only." As well as the equivalent of the parable of the Good Samaritan as regards Christianity. They are there just like in the case of the fate to be reserved to the adulteress (see the case of the wife of Partholon in Ireland, it is the dog supposed to look after her, which is stoned; or the famous one "let he who was without sin throw the first stone") undeniable moral superiorities of druidism and Christianity over Islam.

The goal to reach in this field is not that each one loves everyone; what is the wide-open door to all excesses as Vauvenargues noticed it, 2000 years of Christianity (what a horror) and 1500 years of Islamism (what a failure) showed it to us; but to get that each one lives in peace.

A) Friday, December 10, 2010. "Fifteen years ago, we have had the headscarf, there were more and more headscarves. Then there was the burka, there were more and more burkas. And then there were prayers in the street [...] Now there are ten to fifteen places where in a regular way a certain number of people come to monopolize the territories. I am afflicted, but for those who like much to speak about the Second World War, if it is a question of speaking about occupation, we could speak about it, this time, because that, it is an occupation of the territory. It is an occupation of sides of the territory, some districts in which the religious law is applied, it is an occupation. Admittedly, there are no tanks, there are no soldiers, but it is an occupation nevertheless and it weighs on the inhabitants."

B) Saturday, December 11, 2010. "A certain number of territories, increasingly many, are subjected to religious laws which replace the laws of the Republic. Yes, there is an occupation and there is an illegal occupation. I hear more and more witness statements about the fact that in certain districts, it is not easy to be a woman, neither a homosexual, nor a Jewish [some references to the purely French situation therefore without interest, follow]...I put the finger where it hurts. And this truth brings back the political community to its renouncements, its blindness, its cowardice."

C) French journalists... see themselves more as intellectuals, preferring... to influence readers more than to report events. Cable 07 Paris 306 a, published by WikiLeaks.

D) Reactions that we can approximately reduce to five categories (for those who know what I mean !)
First category. They are satanic remarks, inspired by the great or little Satans who found there a good way of ruling on Earth.

Second category: it is prohibited by Constitution, sorry!

Third category. They are Hitlero-trostkyist or Nazo-bolchevist remarks (in short, not the absolute evil but almost).

Fourth category. Not to wish, for oneself or for his children, a life of the type fervent Muslim, is well the proof of an incredible ignorance. It is a refusal which is explained by the ignorance (of this or of that), because when you know, like us (like me) that (this, that); you find indeed no valid reason not to be Muslim.

Fifth category. Not to wish, for one's neighbors or the other human beings peopling this planet, a life of the type fervent Muslim, and to say it... is nevertheless well, of course, the proof of an incredible selfishness.

E) Sophia Aram. The French chronicler Philippe Bilger believes to detect in her remarks an incredible potential of racist hatred (blog of April 6, 2011, on Marianne).

"The contempt oozed from each one of her words, with the look pleased with oneself which goes generally with this kind of attitude. We were supposed to admire her while she degraded. To congratulate her at the time when she humiliated. All that was disappointing. We led to this paradox that she expressed a hatred of the other by reproaching the National Front a hostility with regard to foreigners and that, steeped in her monologue, she showed what the exact opposite of the democratic behavior in the radio or elsewhere was the arrogance of the judgment instead of preparing the confrontation and the contradiction of the ideas. For lack of knowing to make laugh, she was reduced consequently to exclude from the people a significant portion of it which was not appropriate to her." Philippe Bilger is undoubtedly right, but we could say the same thing of many the racist hate declarations of the French communist Jean-Luc Melenchon against the blue-eyed fair-haired persons (in a polemic against Marine Le Pen: roughly, he finds that there are too many blue-eyed fair-haired persons, he is fed up with the blue-eyed fair-haired persons).

F) Sect founded by Thomas Le Vot in 1929.

FROM “NO ANIMAL SHALL KILL ANY OTHER ANIMAL” to “NO ANIMAL SHALL KILL ANY OTHER ANIMAL...WITHOUT CAUSE”.

(In the Nazislamist taqiyya for useful idiots it would be “ from no animal shall kill any other animal without cause” to “no animal shall kill other animals”.....period).

George Orwell and the brave new world: Animal Farm. As this author says in his (non-published at that time) preface: “Liberty means anything at all it means the right to tell people what they do not want to hear. The common people still vaguely subscribe to that doctrine and act on it. In our country - it is not the same in all countries: it was not so in republican France, and it is not so in the USA today [i.e., 1945] - it is the liberals who fear liberty and the intellectuals who want to do dirt on the intellect: it is to draw attention to that fact that I have written this preface.”

Orwell wonders indeed why and how in the “free” England of his time, certain ideas can be eradicated without recourse to force. According to him, the first reason is that media belong to rich men who have all the reasons not to want that certain opinions are expressed.

But the second reason is the indoctrination. You received a good education, you come from Oxford or of Cambridge, you have assimilated the idea that there are things it is better not to tell even not to think. For example, you may not think that England is guilty of an unspecified aggression. When we make war, it can be only a liberation and those who resist are then the attackers by definition. This assumption is therefore inconceivable. On the other hand, you express it when it is Russia.

Open systems are therefore much more interesting to study. In a repressive system like the ex USSR, the journalists could justify themselves through fear. In Great Britain a journalist or a professor cannot take refuge behind the fear excuse. It is just some cowardice. And as the fact that the idea was inculcated to you as there are things that you cannot tell, not think.

Orwell in this not published preface of the “Animal Farm ” when he compares the authoritarian regime he satirizes, with free England, does not claim that the media of these various regimes are similar. But he claims that the result got is the same one.

The mechanisms of it are nevertheless completely different.

In England, it is voluntary. There is no constraint, no use of force or very little. This control passes by the application of the laws on the defamation or the incentive to hatred which are a way for rich and powerful people of silencing those they do not like.

The Washington Post published there are a few years an article on a study from the government and from a research institute on the way in which the Russians got informed in the time of the ex USSR. The results were rather interesting. Approximately 95% of the population was going to seek its information to sources like the BBC. They listened to the foreign radios, because they did not trust their own press. Among the general population, it was approximately 70%. About 50% of the educated people and 15% of the less educated population read the samizdat i.e., the artisanal publications circulating clandestinely. However over there, the dissenting publications were illegal. But in America not! However in the United States: hardly a tenth of the population is not satisfied with only the headlines of television and press. Does it exist here a small dissenting publication which can reach 50% of the population? No, it is inconceivable. Therefore, comparatively speaking, in the Russia of this time people resort to a larger variety of information than the Americans. Because it is a totalitarian State, the propaganda is so manifest there that nobody pays attention to it. Conclusion: at the time the Americans have therefore a critical mind much less developed than the Russians.

In France, in the United Kingdom and in the rest of Europe, freedom of speech is defined in a way much more restrictive than in the United States. Does the State have the right to determine what is a historical truth, and that of punishing whoever deviates from it? To think so amounts to accommodate oneself to a really Stalinist practice.

Poor country poor people that the country where the people is thus ridiculed, where you are no longer allowed to tell [what you believe to be] the truth.

Besides in France, the intellectual community has no idea of what is really the freedom of speech according to Noam Chomsky questioned in connection with the Faurisson case. And most French intellectuals have difficulty to admit that it is well there their second nature , similar to that of the clerics of the Middle Ages: to denounce the heretics.

A professor at the NorthWestern University of Boston, Arthur Butz, one day has published books denying the existence of Holocaust. Was he pursued or falsification of history? Absolutely not, people ignored him, what the best answer is. In Paris, on the other hand, they have forgotten Voltaire and they are unaware of what the true freedom of speech is and it is stimulating for the French intellectuals to stand in front of the television cameras and to declaim their belief in the Holocaust courageously their agreement with the public opinion. It is a very Parisian phenomenon which was then taken over by the rest of the country... However, it is a remarkably clear case of a breach of the freedom of speech. Does the State have the right to prosecute somebody for falsification of history? Does the best manner of defending the victims of the Holocaust consist in taking over the methods of their murderers? Such is the true problem.

There is something distressing and even scandalous in the fact of having to discuss these questions two centuries after Voltaire, who, it appears, would have written, " I detest what you say, but I would give my life to make it possible for you to continue to say it."

The principle of the freedom of speech has something very elementary: either you defend it even in the case of opinions that you hate, or you do not defend it at all. And it is to do quite a sad favor to the memory of the victims of the Holocaust that to adopt one of the fundamental doctrines of their torturers. The State should have no means of punishing whoever maintains that the Sun revolves around the Earth.

As regards propaganda, if in a certain way nothing changed since Athens; nevertheless there were also many improvements. The instruments were much refined, particularly and paradoxically in the freest countries of the world: the United Kingdom and the United States. It is there, and not elsewhere, that the modern industry of the public relations, in other words, the manufacturing of the opinion, or the propaganda, was born in the 1920s with Walter Lippman.

These two countries had indeed progressed as regards democratic rights (vote of women, freedom of speech, etc.) so much that the aspiration to freedom could not be no longer contained only by the state-sponsored violence. Specialists therefore turned to technologies of the "manufacturing consent." Let us not forget how always an ideology is imposed. To dominate, violence is not enough, a justification of another nature is needed. The authorities must give the impression of acting as a good king of the Celtic type, i.-e. not as a strong man holder of an arbitrary power (können) but as an altruistic and generous adviser or guide (regs rex rix).

Let us return to the case of Germany in the beginning of the 1930s. We tended to forget it, but it was then the most advanced country in Europe, at the cutting edge of art, of sciences, technology, literature, philosophy. Then, in very little time, a complete reversal intervened, and Germany became the most murderous, most barbarian, State, of the human history.

All that was achieved by disseminating fear: that of Communists, Jews, Gypsies, in short, of all those who, according to the Nazis, threatened the soul of the European civilization, i.e. "the direct heirs to the Greek civilization."

In any case, it is what the philosopher Martin Heidegger wrote in 1935. However most German media which bombarded the population with messages of this kind took over the techniques developed... by American publicists. Even Hitler and Stalin admitted the freedom of speech of those who shared their point of view. Let us point out here that in the 1930s, the methods of the Nazi propaganda consisted, for example, in choosing simple words, in repeating them unceasingly, and in combining them with emotions, feelings, fears.

As we have had already the opportunity to say it, above, when Hitler invaded the Sudetes [in 1938], it was by calling upon the noblest and charitable objectives, the need a "humanitarian intervention" in order to prevent the "ethnic cleansing" undergone by the German-speaking people , and to make it possible that each one can live under the "protective wing" of Germany, with the support of the most advanced of the world in the field of arts and culture, power.

The monitoring system of the democratic societies is not less effective; it disseminates the guiding line like the air that we breathe. We don't realize it, and sometimes we think to be in the presence of a particularly vigorous debate.

The industry of the public relations produced, in the proper sense of the term, some consent, some acceptance, some submission. It controls ideas, thoughts, minds. Compared to totalitarianism, it is a great progress: it is much more pleasant to undergo an advertisement than to find oneself in a torture room.

The thorough research undertaken by Noam Chomsky about the media manipulation or the manufacturing consent shows that actually, the influence of the media is more important ON THE PORTION OF THE POPULATION WHICH READS THEM OR LISTENING TO THEM, THEREFORE ON THE PORTION OF THE POPULATION WHICH IS PART OF THE PSEUDO DECISION-MAKING ELITES, OF THE LITTLE WORLD OF THE DECISION MAKERS. The mass of public opinion seems, itself, less dependent on the speech of the media. For a simple and good reason besides, it pays only little attention to it. What therefore brings back us to the problem of the quality real and in profundity of the true or alleged (supposed) elites of our societies.

The repurchase of great newspapers - the "Wall Street Journal" in the United States for example, by fortunate men accustomed to bend the truth at the whim of their interests, the cannibalization of information by the sports, the weather and the minor news items, the whole in an orgy of advertisements, constitutes the permanent instrument of government of the democratic regimes. It is, for them, what propaganda is for the dictatorships.

Concerning, for example, the federal budget of the United States, most Americans wish a reduction of the military expenditure and an increase, on the other hand, of welfare expenditures, of the sums of money paid to the United Nations, of the international economic and humanitarian aid, and finally the cancellation of the tax reductions decided for the richest taxpayers.

On all these subjects, the policy of the White House is completely contrary to the claims of the public opinion. But the investigations which note this persistent public opposition are seldom published in the media. So that the citizens are not only removed from the political decision-making centers, but also held in the ignorance of the real state of this same public opinion.

Chomsky showed in his research that in a democratic society, the defended political line is never stated as such but is implied. It is besides one of the big differences between the system of propaganda in a totalitarian State and the way of proceeding in democratic societies. By exaggerating a little, in the totalitarian countries, the State decides the line to be followed and each one must then conform to it. The democratic societies proceed differently. They proceed, to some extent, to the "brain washing, in all freedom." And even the "impassioned" debates in the large media are within the framework of the implicitly agreed parameters, which hold in edge many contrary points of view. It is infinitely more effective than the totalitarian systems. For instance, in France the famous program "C'est dans l'air."

The one track thinking it is every speech that is more or less equivalent to supporting (as the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom Margaret Thatcher did it in the 1980s) that there is no alternative, that there are not other possible choices than the one which is preached.

In 1989, at the time of the collapse of the communist system, the two main systems of propaganda agreed to say that the tyrannical regime instituted by Lenin and Trotsky, then changed into a political monstrosity by Stalin, it was that the "true socialism." The Western leaders could only be delighted by this absurd and scandalous use of the term, which enabled them during decades to defame authentic socialism.

"There is no alternative to the emerging system of state corporate mercantilism disguised with various mantra like globalization and free trade."

And on this subject Chomsky analyzed very early in a critical way the globalization by stressing that the motivation of its elites is always the same one: they try to remove the population from the important processes of decision-making, the difference being that the centers of powers are from now some transnational companies and some supranational banks. Chomsky ventures even that the powerful international companies develop their own governing institutions.

THE PROBLEM OF THE MODERN DEMOCRACIES IS THE FOURTH ESTATE.

A very good example of the critical mind which must always lead us and which should therefore drive every self-respecting journalist is that which appears at the end of one of the innumerable Gaelic legends reported by an Irish monk remained anonymous and which is stated as it follows: "But I who have written this story, or rather this fable, give no credence to the various incidents related in it. For some things in it are the deceptions of demons*, other poetic figments; some are probable, others improbable; while still others are intended for the delectation of foolish men."

The problem is, however, not complicated.

I) There exist various types of political regimes since the man is man, since the naked ape became a man. Best known of all before was that known as "of the dominant male."

II) A little bit of historical perspective (the assassination of Julius Caesar in Rome) makes it possible to understand that two of the principal formulas experimented by the human beings are...

1) The strong power of one of the group members (monarchy) possibly hereditary (many variants).

2) The power shared between a more or less large number of group members.

Various variants: aristocracy, matriarchy, plutocracy, democracy, etc. We may even include in them the theocracy from an atheistic point of view (God does not exist but those who claim to speak on his behalf, yes!)

III) Two notions annex themselves on that

1) The notion of heredity or not.

2) The fact of treating or regarding this power as a tangible property having to follow the same handover ways as a personal property or not: in other words the opposition classical traditional monarchy (Rome of the time of Etruscans) or the more or less democratic Republic (Senatus populusque romanus).

IV) With regard to the opposite political force, the notion of Republic should be opposite in theory only with the concept of strong personal power equated with a personal therefore alienable good, in a hereditary way for example (although a personal good can also be sold).

V) The great philosophic-political thinkers considered for a long time that the human being could in no case be deprived from certain rights in a human society sufficiently civilized, according to them: for instance the basic freedom of the group member, inside the group. From where the notion of imprescriptible rights which in no case could be alienated. We could add to it the right to be living in general if it was needed, etc.etc.

VI) We may therefore consider that a certain number of quite precise ideas are by definition out of the field of a republic. The idea most obviously located out of the republican field is the claim of a monarchical power handed over like an ordinary good or almost i.e., most often in a hereditary way.

VI) But what are the other political designs we can in a as naturally obvious way locate out of the limits of a republic??? The fact of considering that some of our fellow creatures aren't human beings by definition or are through their body and their build some subhuman beings closer than us of animals?

VII) Is the death punishment compatible or not by definition with the notion of a republic?? Is polygamy or polyandry compatible or not with the notion of a republic?? Is the distinction between citizen and non-citizen of a State, yes or not compatible with the notion of a republic? Is discrimination between citizens according to their bodily appearance, institutionalized at the official level, compatible with the notion of a republic? Are the human sacrifices yes or not compatible with a republic, is the circumcision yes or not compatible with a republic? And the female circumcision ??? The divorce??? etc., etc.

VIII) Intelligence and intellectual honesty in politics begin only as from the moment when you agree to ask yourself clearly this kind of question and when you list the ideas renamed values clearly, which (in your opinion) exclude their partisans from the republican field.

XI) In the contrary case they are only unfounded accusations a little similar to witch hunts . Unworthy and appalling.

XII) Let us repeat it once again to insist: the intellectual honesty on behalf of a politician is to stop speaking about values without precisely defining what he understands in that way, and to say precisely what the ideas are which, according to him, are not part of the republican framework. And the intelligence for a journalist is to make specified by the aforementioned politicians, for the public, what are precisely the ideas that they reckon they must exclude from the republican field (for example hereditary monarchy death punishment borders atheism, etc.). Then it is up to the citizens to judge in full knowledge of the facts.

XIII. In what concerns us, we are as such neither for neither against monarchy, neither for nor against vergobretship (a republic directed by a vergobretus) etc. because we do not determine according to political criteria of this kind. Republic or Democracy??? Such is not our problem and our members can very well be republican democrat even others, that concerns only themselves. In what concerns us we determine according to criteria other than some so closely political in a strict sense of the term, criteria: in what concerns us it is a spirituality, not a policy.

The principal weak point of the democracies we said it is the quality of its media people .The big problem of democracies is the intrinsic quality of their media people, i.e., men and women who form a filter or a screen between the power and the citizens or between the citizens and the power. Their intellectual and moral mediocrity would not play a very negative role in a society directed by a good king or a great monarch but in democracies the situation is quite different, their intellectual and moral mediocrity plays an eminently negative role in the process of decision-making. It is particularly clear in the field of foreign politics since there, that concerns citizens who by definition do not vote since they are foreigners.

The main obstacle to the good performance of a democracy is the unfathomable intellectual and moral mediocrity of its media people we said, but also of its other elites. Let us give some examples.

The senior officers of the French big companies are really dirty bastards without shame to please to their line manager, and finally not so intelligent than that, as certain (secret) recordings of suspensions published in 2011 within a pseudo-case of espionage in the premises of Renault, show it. The named Christian Husson shows himself in it, on that day (on January 3rd) quite simply odious! Divide et impera (divide and rule) was always one of the great laws of Mankind with the famous "Woe to the vanquished" (Brennus).

Nevertheless I am not completely convinced that it is there a quite conscious application of this iron law on behalf of the journalists of the intellectuals and of politicians of all kinds haunting our handsome and sweet French Broadcasting. Because the human stupidity that exists including and especially when it is strengthened by hubris.

Another great human rule is that it was always easier for the hypocrites or for the very surface people in order to ease their conscience to give a fish (to make unceasingly coming new migrants in order to hold the most thankless posts in our societies) rather than to teach them how to fish (rather than to help them politically and economically on their premises). Our modern journalists, intellectuals or politicians, therefore speak every day of giving fish, what is, of course, easier than to be a revolutionist i.e., to some extent in a kind of new night of August 4 to throw overboard the tea, in order to put an end really and concretely to the reign of the man's exploitation of man and to establish instead of it a radically more just and egalitarian society.

A FISH ALWAYS STINKS FROM THE HEAD DOWN.

FIRST EXAMPLE : ON THE NATIONAL LEVEL (REFLECTIONS IN CONNECTION WITH THE BOOK OF THE FRENCH SOCIOLOGIST TARIK YILDIZ).

Of what is it question? The author of this book having bodily the appearance of an indigenous man or of a native of this country, although or because of his Turkish origin, he therefore underwent more or less the same fate as his comrades "of old stock or assimilated" as it is said. From where this book (anti-white racism, not to speak about it: a refusal of reality, 58 pages).

There is no antiracism in this country, in any case for 60 years, there are only anti something racisms. Anti Negro racism when you are white, anti white racism when you are black, anti-Arab racism when you are pro-Israeli, anti-Jewish racism when you are Arab-Muslim, and so on. What is incredible it is the regular and almost institutionalized increasing (cf. the socialist "think" "tank" terra Nova) of all these communitarianisms in France since the end of the 20th century. It is a rising tide which will end up carrying everything if our elites don't put themselves together at the very last moment.

The racism which was practically unknown on the national territory of the time of Boadicea (ladies take precedence) or of Ambiorix and Commios, Charlemagne, and even still of Napoleon (since at the time it was above all intolerance or wars of religion, a fresh start having been made with regard to the Jews by the revolutionary principle proposed by the latter in 1806 and 1807: nothing for the Jews as Jews, everything for the Jews as citizens...); for a few decades is augmented at an incredible speed in the country, at the same time as the laws and associations subsidized to fight it.

At the end of 2010 (on October 6th more precisely) in Aix en Provence, medium-sized and quiet town in the south of France, an ophthalmologist was accused by a patient to have refused to look after his little daughter by making him the following remarks: "Piss off from here, damned Arab, you make my surgery dirty. I, I do not look after the Arabs."

The media hype was immediate. During several days there was a surge of articles and made indignant reactions inviting to go into action against Nazism or for God and to smash the face to the National Front, against racism against Fascism, for cultural enrichment to smash the face of Marine Le Pen etc. The correctives (because of course all that was invented, it was enough to think a little on the inconsistency or on the variation of the accusations as on their well not very probable characteristic) were slow to come and in any case thousand times fewer or less detailed than the initial articles relaying this false accusation.

Apparently, there would have been thereafter a legal proceeding started against the author of this as awful as unjustified accusations, and we are pleased about that ! Racism is a too gross and too serious thing so that we let anybody sully or devalue the legitimate fight which should be fought... against! Racism is too serious a thing to be left to the licensed anti-racists alone! We hope only that the punishment will be on a par with the evil done by this false charge. Every unjustified accusation of racism should be besides systematically followed by a legal action on behalf of the State, for false accusations. Every accusation of racism should be followed by vigorous judicial proceedings for false accusations if the conclusion of the court is that the case is to be dismissed or the acquittal of the person accused (of racism). As for the media having repeated on a loop ad infinitum the accusation, they should have the obligation under penalty of serious punishment to "make adjustment." A Little in the same conditions as the right to reply in the newspapers, and this even if the victim of this unjust accusation does not ask for it.

We will never say enough the evil done to the inhabitants of this country (how many lost generations) by the odious and blind behavior * of the intellectuals of the sportsmen of the professional politicians, even of the men of God... in this field. They created ex nihilo or almost a very serious and very painful problem, which appeared by no means inside the national borders (see the situation in 1700, in 1800, in 1900) as if the others were not enough (anti negro racism antisemitism, etc.) and now we will need four or five centuries to overcome it. In France several centuries will have been necessary so that descendants of "Barbarian" invaders and "Romans" are melted and united in the same nation (after being gone through the Frankish stage of the personality or non-territoriality of law from the 5th to 10th century).

The Count of Boulainvilliers in his essay on the nobility of France published in 1732 in Amsterdam still made nobles some descendants of Frankish conquerors and the people some descendants of the Gauls who will only come together under Hugues Capet, the first king of the Franks to no longer speak Frankish language but to speak in Old French (for the Old French see the sermon on Jonah, fragment of Valenciennes, written in Latin but also in Old French).

And in the United States also one or two centuries were well necessary so that people manage to go beyond the stage of black/white division (in every case psychologically with the election of Obama). As for the Indians, themselves, they will have had to wait until 1924 to have the same rights as the other citizens in this country. In Ireland and Spain, on the other hand, the melting could not be made (there was Reconquest or Independence).

Now you will tell me, yes, but journalists and media people nevertheless ended up understanding (i.e., that where a mountain shepherdess or a sea fisherman of the Maritime provinces, needs 15 days to realize, a French intellectual, himself, needs 15 years, when it is not 50), a little late therefore, of course, but finally they understood!

Absolutely nay, my lord! Allow me to doubt the intelligence of media people promoting this book by Tarik Yildiz today for two reasons.

First reason: they underline as the author that they especially do not want extremes to seize this subject...

However it is there a republication of the old history of the vicious circle, because this kind of individuals (if it is not him it is his brother, in spirit) labels "extreme" the autochthons or the natives worried by this challenge - and therefore rejects in fact in the aforementioned extremes, a part of them, like in the case of the self-fulfilling prophecies; then is astonished to discover, oh catastrophe, that indeed they are always the extremes, thus defined, who are concerned with these challenges for our society. From where this syllogism of a new kind (in fact it is a sophism, more precisely a begging the question).

- All the extremists are sensitive to this kind of racism.

- To be concerned with this racism is therefore to be a part of the extremes.

- It is necessary to be for the cultural, or not cultural ** enrichment.

The same report can be made in connection with the sound and legitimates necessary criticism of religions, religions in general or of such or such religious ideology in particular, criticism to which they deny from the start any legitimacy by comparing it to an unspecified religious racism.

The French intellectuals do again besides in this moment by classing automatically republican of extreme right wing all those who...

a) Are not close to be converted to Islam.

b) Do not love Islam (the true one, the one which is defined by the triptych Quran + Hadiths or majority Tradition + Sharia).

c) Think that it is better that the most human beings can live... freed from the constraints of this religion, starting with the Muslims themselves.

Second reason. They point out as excuse, for less being concerned with this worrying phenomenon, that it is still easier in this country to find work or accommodation when your name is John or Peter than when your name is Muhammad or Ali. Admittedly, admittedly, but for how long still? You saddle today and ride out tomorrow! To show a minimum of intelligence, it is also to foresee. The true question is therefore what will be the situation in hundred years? In two hundred years? In three hundred years?

For the record, the Native Americans were several million in 1500 and only 237,000 in 1900. The French 2500 in 1663 and 90,000 in 1766. The English or comparable (German Amish and French Huguenots, Presbyterian Scots, German Lutherans) 60,000 in 1650, 270,000 in 1700, 434,600 in 1715 and finally 2.3 million in 1765. That is called History. What the fervent sworn enemies of Communism (i.e., everyone now that it is a part of the great vanquished of the History of the social ideas and it is nevertheless easier to denounce racism without calling into question one's personal way of life, as the celebrated wife of the current president of the French republic does, that is less expensive, than to work concretely for the end of the man's exploitation of man) still did not understand already... it is that, apart from Communism precisely, there is what is called... History! Nothing is ever frozen, everything moves constantly!

Let us point out lastly that an indigenous or a native of this country, let us say originating in the heartland of the country, could very well have written the same kind of work... 50 years ago (see besides my essay on the humanistic nationalism published in 1982, Editions Keltia in Merdrignac by my old friend Jacques Quatreboeufs and who starts with this quotation of Jean Jaures: a little internationalism moves away from the homeland, much brings back to it).

But here, it was necessary to wait for a 25-year-old young immigrant so that is done, in 2010. Because it is true that such a work written by an unspecified John or Peter would never have been accepted by a publisher at the time.

I reassure nevertheless my increasingly anxious despisers or critics, I will make easier for them their task in order to be quickly able to move on to another thing: I acknowledge! I acknowledge that they are completely right and their universal cosmic crusade against me or what I wrote down is more than legitimate: essential, for four reasons.

1) I am deprived of any even elementary education (no primary nor even secondary schools, of course, and in any event I was always the last of my class).

2) I have no intelligence (no intellectual curiosity, no reflection, no perspective, no critical mind, I am completely unable to make connections or to establish links between proven facts - for the simple reason besides that I remember nothing learns nothing and have no memory, with regard to the extent of knowledge and scholarship I am close to the absolute zero - not forgetting a total incapacity to see the things in the long-term or in their duration).

3) I am a real villain, to be more precise I am a psychopath and a monster liking to torture the innocent little children every morning.

4) And lastly, of course, I am rich, I have always lived in wealth, because my parents themselves always lived in opulence!

Whereas themselves, of course, are all poor, and have only their shirt on their back, by definition, since they give all and to their last penny to the unhappy children obliged to ruin their bodily and mental health as their future by working like slaves or by scavenging in the dustbins.

They are some infinitely good saints, new Christs, new Buddhas, perfect beings, come by chance where they are.

Their lightning genius made that they never were mistaken in their life and that they are always right, of course, but always with modesty that goes without saying, hubris being by definition unfamiliar to them.

As for their level of education there, I hesitate. To see the orthography or grammatical mistakes made by many among them, we could, of course, infer from it that they were far from being always the first of their class, but on another side the fact that they were not like me lucky enough (because it is luck), of being able to study basically in solid primary or secondary, schools because of the poverty of their parents, because of that emphasizes better the intrinsic profundity of their congenital, innate, even ancestral perhaps (genetic?) genius.

In any event, it is quite simple, take a list of qualities (if necessary do it yourself): they have all of them and at the optimum level, of course. As for me, make a complete listing of all the faults in the world, from the most demonic or diabolic or satanic to the most venial or to the most minors (when I was 4 years old for example I stole a piece of cake left in order to become cool on the edge of a window belonging to the family Lefray of Lerouville, if it is not me it is therefore my brother!!) and keep well in mind that I have them all in the most ultimate degree. I have no quality, except by mistake, I have only flaws to the absolute power, I am the absolute hatred and even straightforwardly the absolute evil! The Devil or the Great Satan and Lucifer joined together, personally. And now that this was said, let us move on to something else ! Let us return to our sheep (of Panurge) !

* The name of the "victim" is masked that of the wrongfully accused doctor, on the other hand, itself, is spread, no conditional in the article, any checking of facts, etc.

** If immigration is used only to enrich us MATERIALLY now then it is disgusting. If it is used to enrich us culturally, then how many generations lost for results which could have been reached differently! It is enough to look at what occurred in the Middle Ages and in the Renaissance!

EXAMPLE ON THE ECONOMIC LEVEL (REFLECTIONS CONCERNING THE LAST ESSAY BY EMMANUEL TODD).

The sociologist and historian Emmanuel Todd has often right words but of a great moderation to characterize the French elites, because it is a little like Obama. It is a too well-mannered man to use a more striking vocabulary or to extend his judgment to other fields.

For Emmanuel Todd indeed the increasing disaffection with regard to the traditional political parties is explained only by a double historical mistake of the elites in this country “which gave the feeling to the French population and to other populations in the world that their ruling class was inefficient. Or completely indifferent to their fate.”

The great innovation of the political and ideological situation is a radical delegitimization of elites, a phenomenon which makes possible all the conceivable swerves or all the political misdemeanors... Even if it occurs accidents in the history (and for me, the Russian intervention in Georgia in 2008 is one of them), a president such as Nicolas Sarkozy embodies wonderfully this situation of a vacuum. But this void is not confined in the Elysee. The ruling classes in the broadest sense were the keen defenders of two options for which everyone knows today that they are obsolete: the free trade with China and the euro. I would use readily, to describe the state of these concepts, an expression of the German sociologist Ulrich Beck, that of “zombie concept”: a dead concept but which is believed living.

Our fellow countrymen indeed understood that this free trade destroys their life. They understood very well since the European budgetary crises that the current monetary system is the victim of a use of intensive medication. The media men of my generation also have a responsibility in this rout of the French elites.

When I see Jean-Michel Apathie facing Marine Le Pen on the set of Channel +, or when I read Laurent Joffrin calling Lepenist “This evening or Never,” the best program of debate of the broadcasting scene, threatened in addition by the Elysee, they are less journalists than mere ideologists who try to perpetuate a completely antiquated vision of the world. But they are members of the ruling classes and particularly Laurent Joffrin whose two-way trip between the *Nouvel Observateur* and *Liberation*, as a director, have significantly contributed to the ideological paralysis of two very important great newspapers of left wing and contributed to the non-taken into account by the left wing of the economic interests of the working-class backgrounds.... I was absolutely fascinated, at the time of the after election comments, by the fact that Jean-François Cope and Christian Jacob pointed out that the need keeping the euro was the primary division which separated them from the National Front. Fundamentally, the Sarkozyst leanings of the UPM follow the National Front fully on the identity and safety sets of themes, what makes the situation unmanageable. The relaunch of the identity sets of themes was decided besides in the Elysee. But this strategy leads to put the UPM in a kind of syringe: whereas the National Front can also to spread out on the economic and social topics by preaching the exit of the euro, the Sarkozyst orientation of the UPM which represents at the highest level the economic oligarchy, can only defend the euro which is the money of the rich persons.

The true explanation of the transfers of votes lies there undoubtedly ... Symmetrically, the Socialists who fight against the national preference, but subscribe to economic policies which destroy in priority the children of immigrants are not sincere republicans.

In truth, the attachment of the parties known as republican to economic concepts which destroy the life of the French could make soon the word Republic soon a zombie concept zombie. We can, however, bring back to life this Republic by changing the economic policy... beyond the confusion, they are the generational swings which are important. The initial weakness of the Sarkozysm was that the President was the elected official of the old men, very frightened by the riots of 2005 of which he was largely responsible, and currently, the escape from the UPM electorate is carried out in what remained of young people within the electorate of the right-wing... I am not for a disappearance or a rejection of

elites. I plead simply for the return of the elites to responsibility and reason... I ask simply that the French meritocracy does its job, deals with the French democracy, and thus justifies what its education cost for the nation... The good democracy functions when an important part of the elites deals with the economic and moral interests of the whole of the population.

As we are not at all as well mannered as Emmanuel Todd we will take the liberty of rewording his ideas by resorting to the vocabulary which is essential, by calling a spade a spade and Rollet a rascal, not forgetting to extend them to much more fields than he dares to do it, because on certain points Emmanuel Todd does not manage yet to take the plunge, and stops along the way, as kept by a kind of decency facing the inconceivable one. Facing the worldwide brainwashing therefore, we will make some Emmanuel Todd power 10.

However, if we understand Emmanuel Todd well, when a wise man (the facts: our Master to all) points at the moon, the French intellectual (or the journalist or the politician, etc.) looks at his finger. Here what happens when the hubris (the matching euphemism which is in reality a litotes, to designate this flaw, is nowadays the expression "oversized ego") when the hubris therefore and the contempt, of others, of the people (of the simple shepherdess or of the old sea fisherman of the Maritime Provinces as it is said among my cousins) replaces the good sense. This lack of intelligence of the French elites of today is beside shown we could do better by the affair of the two Marine Le Pen opinion polls *. That shows well...

1) The incapacity of these elites (politicians, men of media, of religion, professional intellectuals and sportsmen, politically committed artists...) to understand and feel empathy towards a whole part of the electorate who suffers socially or psychologically. Literally: they cannot understand! They cannot explain!

2) The incapacity of these same elites to counter this basic movement: their arguments are completely lacking of relevance at the very point that it becomes frightening, because that shows once again and the gap of intellectual comprehension (lack of general knowledge, of thorough reflection, of historical perspective, etc.) and the lack of empathy of these elites (professional intellectuals and sportsmen, artists, etc.) towards a part of their fellow citizens.

* Summary of the case: at the beginning of 2011 in France (February 28th - March 3rd) a first survey on the voting intentions had placed almost first the candidate of the party called "National Front." Before the agitation caused by this result another survey was at once carried out (March 5th and 6th) with somewhat different questions... but gave and even amplified the same result. The moral of the story? Do a little less tactics "to win" at all costs Sirs. To exercise responsibilities in the community should not be a trade or a means of growing richer (moreover I am for the prohibition from holding more than one elective office and for their nonrenewal). And defend simply with perseverance your most sincere personal convictions, even if that "does not pay" ! Let the people choose with complete freedom! If that it is Nazism, then I am Nazi and long life to Nazism! If that it is to be Stalinist, then I am Stalinist and long life to Stalin! The principal weak point of the democracies we said, it is the quality of its media people. What Gustave Le Bon in his psychology of crowds wrote (approximately: in a crowd most intelligent persons if there are possibly some of them, behave like the least intelligent, the most simplistic, the coarsest ones); applies very well to the organized crowd which is the media-political background.

ON THE SOCIETAL LEVEL

(ANOTHER EXAMPLE AFTER THAT OF THE RACISM OR OF THE ECONOMICS:
THE MARRIAGE).

The homosexual marriage is a fashionable idea . The ultimate in the human rights. Of the man, or of the woman.

I fear, alas, that all that are sophisms of a sorcerer's apprentice very typical of the climate of heterophobia or of the refusal of the other, reigning in our society even of the little thoroughgoing intelligence of the intellectuals who control us and which can also be noted in other fields. It is necessary for example to have the inhibited mind of a Sulpician small middle-class man to believe that the marriage was instituted in the societies of Homo sapiens in order to make it possible that human beings who love each other may live together....

The engraved tile No. 16 found in 1997 in Chateaubleau in France is the absolute proof of it. The first quality of the fiancee is there indeed to be INCORBOUIDA. What means approximately "rich with cattle".

The absence of marriage never prevented human beings who love each other to live together if they really want it (once become adults). Moreover why limit oneself to two persons? Polygamy, polygyny, polyandry, it is to each one to see BETWEEN CONSENTING ADULTS (the only true problem they are the children who can be born from these unions, and it is one of the main reasons besides having presided over the marriage institution).

It is enough to look a little into the life of Muhammad to realize that the marriage is a contract of sexual services, of assistance in the need, with as a bonus the possibility of ensuring a posterity resulting from the two parents, from where indirectly an alliance between families. From there its second name besides in French: alliance.

The Greeks had not been mistaken in this field who practiced and the official marriages (of convenience) and the semi-official marriages.

Now, of course, nothing prevents from combining business with pleasure, and to have both (native love or marital love). It is besides rather imprudent to marry with somebody for whom you have no minimal attraction and against your will. It is rather advised to be at least attracted by him or her in a way or another. Let us say to conclude that the ideal it is not the love marriage, that the ideal it is not either the marriage of convenience, that the ideal it is the MARRIAGE OF LOVE AND OF CONVENIENCE OR CONVERSELY. A little as regards religion besides, the alliance of the Faith AND OF THE REASON.

REFLECTIONS THEREFORE IN CONNECTION WITH SOME OTHER POINTS OF THE TOPICALITY.

Note. Set of 25 sheets of rough paper found by the heirs to Peter DeLaCrau and inserted by them into this place considering the allusion to the second battle of Mag Tured scribbled in the beginning in order to start.

I shall be perhaps forgiven for dealing in what follows with our elites like Vauvenargues did with the human beings in general, in the common senses of the term (there I feel that I will make enemies because their hubris will be damaged and that they will never forgive me).

On the other hand, I shall be forgiven; at least I hope for it, for being more lenient for the sea fisherman or the cowherd, in other words, for the ordinary men who, of course, are not better but have the excuse, themselves, at least, not to have as much studied, to even have an ego a little less oversized.

Such an amount of human energy (so many billions representing so much human energy) spent at the planetary level in vain futility, in transitory spectacles or in quite as transitory mechanics to be changed every ten years - Teilhard of Chardin was well right to speak about planned or carefully organized in advance obsolescence in what relates to them instead of already getting ready, by discussing it, for the inevitable degrowth which waits to trip us up. As for the open secularity or the peaceful coexistence of religions in a modern State, which was called paganism formerly, no need to discuss it - we are definitely in a show or bluff society, it is enough to apply the 1905 law and it is very good, it was long and hard thought (after three centuries of wars of religion) in this field.

From 1918 to 1938 the whole world (now at least let us say all the nice people) lived petrified by the memories of the previous world war. All the political life focused on this fear. The result everyone knows it: Munich 1938! And then, of course, in an inexorable or inescapable way, a new war, worse than the first (55 million dead).

But are we not reiterating such a capitulation in open country on the level of the fight of ideas, of the clash of values??? Uae Uictebo declared one day Brennus. And since the ancient (Romans) therefore added consequently, " Si vis pacem para bellum."

What we could translate today by "need for a moral rearmament." Moral because the wars of the future will be won by freeing minds and not by mutilating bodies. What I do not understand it is how so many people, obviously kind and intelligent, can claim to fight, sometimes even virulently - to see their relentless fights against Nazism Socialism Stalinism Racism Communism and so on, bare-handed against tanks and machine guns -, with their right hand, to preserve biodiversity, diversity, minorities, cultures, languages, in short all that makes the wealth of our world; whereas they are indifferent, or on the contrary applaud, even contribute, with their left hand, to the most fantastic phenomenon of uniformization of standardization and universal or planetary brain washing, ever tried to date. It is enough to look at the TV advertisements in the evening.

Every fifteen days or almost indeed tribes languages cultures mythologies spiritualities, die out. By the end of the 21st century, half of the seven thousand living languages of our planet will be no longer.

The phenomenon accelerated during the 20th century. Around 1900 the State of California for example had still 50 native languages, today, its inhabitants express themselves only in Spanish or English. This phenomenon is faster in certain countries than others. But as the American linguist Michael Krauss explains it: " the world of languages is a microcosm of highly specialized information. A language is not simply a different set of words for the same things. Every language has its own way of seeing the world."

But now from an end to another of the planet there are only the same ways of living or of dying, of eating, of getting dressed, of founding accommodation, of behaving; the same empty ideas, same generally accepted ideas, the same commonplaces (obligatory consumption obligatory interbreeding obligatory economic liberalism and immediate corollaries, the exaltation of the multimillionaire professional sporting champions and so on) hammered ad infinitum in the works of fiction or the pseudo-information, at best between two true information or reflections useful for Mankind, in order to sell and still to sell or to be imposed over others; without any greatness nor profundity but always in

the most coarsely and childishly materialistic fields as in the most unworthy spectacles of reality* TV : in short a brainwashing and a subliminal or insidious propaganda, on a worldwide scale. More than ever the cry formally launched by our old Master Pierre Lance under the name of Personalism is topical: "Become each day more yourself and not another" Sinn Féin! It is better to be poor and to keep one's soul, one's nobility of soul we could say than the opposite, to sell one's soul for a handful of transitory tangible properties. Once again Sinn Féin!

* Reality reality... never a kind of televised program will have so badly borne its name. And, however, they are typical of our in full decline civilization. Having a without precedent material power but equipped with sphincters instead of the soul. Ready to be subjugated by the new barbarians of our time, the Nazislamists, as the Roman Empire was so in its time, and the Celtic empire (Letavia or Celticum) before it.

REFLECTIONS ABOUT THE ACCUSATION OF POPULISM. WHICH SAYS MORE ON THOSE WHO MAKE IT THAN ON THOSE WHO ARE THUS TARGETED.

THE EQUATION FAR RIGHT WING = NATIONALISM = POPULISM having become the dominant mode of “ thought” in our media, what contributes hardly to the clearness of the basic political debates since they are on the face of it, three different things.

N.B. It is not a question in this chapter of returning in the Boston of the 18th century to chatter around a cup of tea (moreover we prefer coffee) but our motto could be well also “Don’t tread on me” *. Or as could have said it the Algerian Marcel Camus “Between Washington and my mother I choose my mother.”

All for one and one for all. Ambiorix king of the Eburones: “His power was of such a nature that the people had as much authority over him as he over the people” (Caesar, B.G. Book III, chapter XXVII).

The great Athenian democracy when account is taken of the fact that are excluded from it the minors the women the metics (immigrant) and the slaves, it is 40 000 citizens at the best in the beginning (- 500) . Hardly more and perhaps even less than the great Iroquois confederation. It is therefore important to look a little into this idol of the modern times.

And we will therefore consider here as only true democracy the direct democracy of an old Iroquois chief who tries to implicate the maximum of the male or female big mouths of his tribe in the decisions to make which are most difficult :to spend the winter on the spot or to migrate towards the south, to go to war or to accept the unfair proposals of the White (I use the terms employed at the time but each one must know well that the races do not exist in the America of this time: there are neither Indians neither white nor blacks, there are only Americans **).

A sign of the times, we can witness for a few decades an incredible rise to power of the rejection of the true democracy on the behalf of the journalists of the elites and of the politicians.

It is even become a commonplace: as soon as a movement or a politician departs from the rules of the consensus, they speak of populism.

For his detractors, the populist appears under the figure of a skillful demagogue who would endanger in fact the true democracy, theirs.

The accusation of populism actually betrays by contrast the two major political challenges to which our societies are confronted.

In the first place, the historical emergence of populist movements marks a crisis of the traditional political representation which can no longer answer the expectations of the people.

In the second place, the accusation of populism masks the idea that the call for a more direct or more involved form of the people remains basically illegitimate, because the people would be by nature unable to rule itself.

Here the challenge of this debate is seen: it is a question no more no less of the legitimacy and validity of the popular claims themselves! To accuse of populism, it is to disguise the very principle of the democracy. It is no longer the “government of the people by the people and for the people,” but the government of the people by these only who know what is good for it.

The representative democracy is here battling against a major contradiction: it used the name of people, but it cannot tolerate that the popular social classes interfere in politics. Since the years 1950, the intellectuals encourage the political apathy, the absence of commitment, the people having to be satisfied to choose between rival elites. For them, an involved in politics people is dangerous. Working classes, dangerous classes. Formerly the tax-based voting system or the hereditary aristocracy was justified. Today, an oligarchy recruited in the same universities, trained in economic by a one-track thinking , declares itself only worthy of the votes.

The word populism involves the notion of people. However, can this concept have an individualistic meaning? The dictionary defines the people as a “whole of human beings living on the same territory or having jointly a culture, some manners, a system of government.”

Considering this very broad and general definition of the “political people” it is practically impossible to find a shared interest about which all its members would agree. Sorry for the Swiss Rousseau and his social contract.

Let it be therefore a politician who promises to the people some tax reductions. It is some populism, judge his opponents. But this definition is inappropriate: the politician doesn't promise it to himself, neither to his rivals, nor in fact to the whole of the population. He may in reality promise it only to those who pay taxes. The word populist to have a sense must therefore implicitly involve, at least partly, to define the people as the whole of those who pay taxes.

The use of the pejorative notion of populism by certain politicians (in order to call others demagogues), makes it possible to make forget that they all are so necessarily. Rather than to use the term populism in this meaning, it would be therefore preferable to use that, much more precise and less ambiguous, of vote-catching maneuvers and to point out that the only necessary competence to do politics in a democracy is that consisting in knowing to collect votes, in other words, to lie, to flatter, to make promises which will not be kept.

The word populism in reality summarizes more the mentality of the one who uses it more than it describes a reality, this would be to stigmatize it.

To deal with the people indeed is not self-evident. The Greco-Roman thought saw already the people under several figures. If we speak about democracy, it is also because for the Greeks, the people it is as much the demos than the plethos: the crowd, the rabble. As of its origin, the democracy suffers from a rejection, even from a true hatred. Plato refuses the democracy in his Republic. According to him man of the democratic type would follow his bodily inclinations instead of reflection. Worse, the democracy does not recognize the traditional order of the aristocracy, because it is based on the equality. Equality against aristocracy.

The literal meaning of the word populism, given initially by the dictionary, is: “political attitude consisting in aligning oneself with the people, its major aspirations, its defense against various wrongs which are done to it.”

However the main use which is made of this notion consists in accusing of populism those who defend popular wishes which are not the same ones as those of the accuser. There still, the word is used for a simple reason: to do everything to hide the only relevant distinction, which is that between the wishes of the “people” which are perfectly legitimate and those which are not so. Thus is systematically called populist or demagogue every politician daring to point out that safety is less and less guaranteed, and that it would perhaps be necessary consequently...

- Either to let the individuals defend themselves against the aggressions
- Or that the statesmen secure the safety of the goods and of the persons, what, after all, is the main pretext of their monopoly of violence.

The fact is that actually today, objectively speaking, the word “populism” refers to no similar reality since it includes under this label very diverse political discourses going for example in the media debates of the old Europe, as far as to lump together Blocher, Haider, Marine Le Pen, Pim Fortuyn.... And even supposing that they have in common a certain mistrust towards immigration, to various degrees, in very diverse forms and for very diverse reasons besides, that does not explain still the “populist one” nor why it would be necessary to designate with the same word a more or less socialist nationalist (and increasingly socialist since the beginning as of years 1990...), a conservative liberal a nationalist conservative or an opponent to Islam.

The word populism can designate those who think that the will of the people must be respected, the role of the politician being to ask themselves, “What the people wants?” and to do it. There are for example Swiss sociologists who criticize the excesses in the right to asylum, not because they would arouse a problem in themselves, but because “the people” regards them as a problem.

The word populism also designates sometimes those who defend the “popular will” against the representative democracy (for example, at the time of the debate dealing with the referendum about the Treaty of Rome II in 2004, the French journalist Noel Mamere used it in this meaning by saying that it is the French Parliament which should have ratified the TCE, and that those who thought the opposite are against the representative democracy and therefore some populists.

It is also meaningful that the parties in power plan sometimes to seriously prohibit certain parties “of far right-wing” and certain forms of the freedom of speech, while at the same time they accept otherwise that the will of the majority takes precedence over the Law: their idea of the democracy is to let the majority choose - as long as it chooses them, themselves.

But these, it is useless to call them populist, they are quite simply (pseudo ?) democrats! While a Mamere, in this case, appears as an anti-democratic authoritative: not only he denies the right of the individuals to self-determination (like all the pseudo-democrats), but in addition he considers that it is the political class, rather than the majority of the people, which can violate the individual rights.

Populism is then used in the same meaning as demagoguery, i.e., to claim to defend the interests of the “people” for in reality better to defend his, what is in reality the very characteristic of every politician! In this sense there, the politician who calls his counterparts populist makes it only towards a single goal: to turn “the people” away from the fact that he is himself such.

Conclusion. By exploiting the vague meaning of the word “people,” the use of the term populism makes it possible to maintain the confusion about the (pseudo) democracy, and therefore to avoid the basic debate on its definition and its legitimacy. However the people must recover its sovereignty, which is removed from it by a system which little by little intends to summon at very spaced intervals only to require from it to decide among a choice of self-proclaimed elites. And our reference in this respect apart from that to the nature of the power of the famous Belgian king Ambiorix, that must be the Things in Northern Europe, not the Greek pseudo-democracy. The legitimate wishes of the “people” are all those which do not imply aggressive violence, but on the contrary aim at being protected from it. The whole re-examined and corrected in the perspective of a real political equality between men and women.

N.B. We find some Things in all the Viking civilization. From Norway to Iceland, the Faroe Islands, the Shetland and the Orkneys, even in the Isle of Man. When the Vikings and the first Scandinavian settlers landed on a new site, they brought their habits and their legal system there. The place of the Thing was the place where the political decisions were made; the laws were proclaimed there, the arguments settled. They played the role of a meeting place and were often the seat of a religious and trade activity.

Like in the case of Ambiorix the institution of the Thing could coexist very well with that of a certain type of kingship (without going as far as to speak about enlightened despotism like Voltaire and Diderot, let us notice indeed that the best of the political solutions is always, of course, to have a good king). Besides a Lögsögumad of the 11th century one day reminded the king of Sweden Olof Skötkonung of the fact that it was the people which had the power, and not him. The king realized that he can do nothing against the assembled Thing in Uppsala and had to yield.

And let nobody come and say to us that the complexity of the modern world make the existence of professionals of the politics paid for that necessary.

We are convinced that current technological progress (Internet) would make it possible to frequently consult the citizens about all the problems being posed to the society, periodically, by returning to them even often (each week?) It is a question in this case indeed of defining the field of the people’s sovereignty. Certain choices being by nature above the will of the majorities, and being imprescriptible, inalienable.

Most difficult, of course, being to agree once and for all about the points OR THE RIGHTS which would be regarded as imprescriptible inalienable untouchable. AT LEAST FOR A LONG TIME (two years of debate for a clarification intended to last at least thirty years).

N.B. A federal form of government can facilitate the thing.

There is nevertheless in this case, that of the practice of the referendum, an absolutely necessary correlate: the education of the new generations and an honest loyal and sufficient information of the adults. Saint-Just and Condorcet made a priority of it. There cannot be a popular implication without a SINCERE LOYAL AND HONEST information of adults. The result of the vote always depends on the riches of the electoral campaign and of the public debates. The only problem in this case and we always return to it is that of the quality of the media, which too often act as a screen between the people and his government or his decision makers.

THE IMPRESCRIPTIBLE CHOICES IN QUESTION NOT HAVING TO BE NECESSARILY THOSE OF THE SOCIAL CLASSES WHICH ARE GENERALLY HOPPING MAD NOT TO BE CONSIDERED AS BEING PART OF THE ELITES, OF THE GOOD, NICE, AND SMART PEOPLE, WHO HAVE A SINGLE FAULT: THAT TO BE POOR (well, then, since they give all that they earn to homeless persons).

* The Gadsden Flag and its libertarian motto ("Don't Tread On Me ") appears in the revolutionary imagery of the independence war.

** Ask the descendants of these Native Americans what they think of this not differentiation, of this non-existence, of the White.

OTHER REFLECTIONS ABOUT SOME VERY HUMAN PASSIONS...

Biodiversity is a pagan invention. The abundance of differences, languages, cultures, civilizations; it is not what the demiurge of the monolatrous people, whatever his name (God Yahweh or Allah) had initially provided for the Man in his garden of Eden. What he had initially concocted for the Man so that he pays him worship, one Earth one God one People. Any resemblance with the "ein volk ein reich ein fuhrer" being obviously excluded. In the Bible and in the Islamic religion, it is necessary to wait for the episode of the Tower of Babel so that the God of the monolatrous people converts to the biodiversity, designed as a punishment. But his priests come back today to his former speech. A strange reversal of the situation, it is what our elites call today "democracy" while going into raptures before it. However in what concerns us we are against the antiracism of "horse breeders" type (it is necessary to improve mankind by systematic interbreeding). Our feeling to us is that in this field it is necessary to stick to the only game of love and chance and not to the laws of the natural selection or anti selection applied in the national stud farms. Sorry antiracist gentlemen, man is not a horse and our country is not a stud farm.

And as for democracy the best solution nevertheless was always to have a good king.

The democratic systems by definition can bring to power, only the men or the women able to gain votes.

In other words, some liars or illusion mongers, without greatness and loftiness, nor profundity, of vision. And we are very lucky if they are not in addition individuals having a very high idea of the value of them, however, very little competences.

It should be admitted therefore, more than the treason of these intellectuals, the very perceptive drop of their level of intelligence and of their IN-DEPTH reflection. There is cause for being indeed disgusted about democracy (the true democracy it was the old chief of an Indian tribe trying to involve the maximum of warriors and of loudmouth , not forgetting the women, in the important decisions to be made: the winter is coming, we go towards more full of fish rivers? We accept the cruel and humiliating conditions of peace proposed by the white men or not???)

THE DEAD END OF THE CURRENT ANTIRACISM.

As incredible as that can appear, in France today and for reason of racism of Nazism or apartheid, ethnic statistics are prohibited, it is forbidden to speak about negroes white men or Indians.

The multiracialism or all-out racism renamed by these new Pharisees antiracism, even multiculturalism, but also globalization, of course; since this catch-all word , antithesis of any human biodiversity, either it is cultural or linguistic, is today the very best of the fashionable dominant ideology; objectively an accomplice of the road roller of the world standardization. Eighty years of official antiracism for such a failure!

The French writer and journalist historian Benoît Rayski, in a long article published on November 5, 2015, by the Atlantico website, and in connection with a big anti-racist demonstration having taken place on October 31, 2015, in Paris wrote:

"Antiracist" this demonstration? But the hatred of the other oozed, the hatred of those who do not resemble the demonstrators. All the "damned races" of course. And you name that how? As for the scene where these words were delivered, we hesitate about the way of calling it: a frantic meeting of voodoo exorcism or a Nazi meeting with his cries of death.

This video should be looked at. It tells the truth better than all the careful and assuaging analyses from experts and political commentator. It is necessary to miss none of the speeches from the various spokespersons of the suburban collectives. There was in this demonstration neither dignity, neither solidarity, nor brotherhood. Only hatred in its natural and unmasked state. Unless, of course, to regard the stinking breath of hatred as a benevolent breeze.

The absolute anti-racist ideology is actually an aporia of the thought harmful to the life in common or to the art of policy because there is not true non-racism in our country, there are only racisms anti this anti that. Then when in addition these racisms anti something or somebody are subsidized by the State our taxes and improved by journalists...

Conclusion: the most intelligent attitude is not the antiracism such as it is in vogue today but the non-racism: not to be obsessed by the racial question, not to take into account the color of the skin when you represent the State, not to take into account the color of the skin when it is a question of rewarding the personal merit of the individuals, and when you are a company not to deprive oneself stupidly from such or such competence because of the color of the skin, except, of course, if you openly practice a policy of affirmative action as in Israel, what some people call improperly a policy of national preference.

And with regard to the formation of the couples to stick to the only game of love and chance (neither disapproval nor praise).

The evidence that the absolute antiracism is impossible it is that if this infernal logic were followed through, THERE WOULD BE NO MORE POSSIBLE AFFIRMATIVE ACTION .

In South Africa for example, to open a bank account, to send a transfer, to have an X-ray, to buy an admission ticket for a national park or to fill out a report after an accident... the South Africans must always notch a box to say if they are "white," "Indian," "colored" or "black," like during apartheid.

More than twenty years after the abolition of the last laws governing their life according to the color of their skin, they are daily classified according to the four "races" arbitrarily fixed since 1950 by the architects of the segregationist regime.

Since 1994, nothing changed, Gerhard Maré, the director of the Centre for Research on races and identity, testifies it.

But the goals are different today. We must make discrimination to correct the legacy from the apartheid.

In fact, a good part of the laws passed these last years, particularly those which institute an "affirmative action" intended to promote the populations most injured by the former regime, clearly refer to these four racial categories. Particularly the policy of "Black economic empowerment" (BEE) which supports them in the professional life.

The irony is that the categories are defined in any of these laws, because, of course, it is impossible" except by coming back to the racist theories of the apartheid and to its infamous "pencil test" (if a pencil placed in the hair of a person having an olive complexion did not fall this person was regarded as "non-white"), notes Lucy Holborn, Research Manager at the South African Institute of Race Relations (SAIRR).

In fact, everyone may declare anything, she smiles. If you are white, you can say that you are black!" But people would undoubtedly realize rather quickly that it is not the case...

Because beyond the work world where it is a question of curing the inequalities inherited from the apartheid, the reference to the four "races" is very present in the daily life.

For the banks, it is a legal requirement related to the affirmative action. But elsewhere, like in the national parks, for the police or at the hospital? When you wonder in front of a form comprising the four boxes corresponding -on choice—to the race or the ethnic group, the answers vary, ranging from "it is an old form" to "it is not obligatory," through sometimes incredulous, sometimes irritated "where is the problem?"

Today, racial classification is especially used to supply the statistics. For the greatest delight of the researchers.

And even if the answer is often optional, the South Africans do not object to nail their color to the mast, according to Isaac Phaahla, spokesperson of the office of the national parks (SanParks).

More generally, to keep the reference to the races makes it possible to measure the progress of the post-apartheid South Africa.

ABOUT THE FOUR CONDITIONS FOR HAVING ONE NATION ACCORDING TO ERNEST RENAN.

Today's influencers often, if not always, quote Renan to give a definition of the nation. This is rather strange, given that he is a thinker who would be classified more on the extreme right today (for him, races exist and he uses the word on countless occasions).

WHAT IS THEREFORE A NATION ACCORDING TO RENAN.

Here is what he wrote on this subject in reaction to the annexation of Alsace and Lorraine (a part of it) after 1870.

"A nation is a soul, a spiritual principle. Two things, which in truth are but one, constitute this soul or spiritual principle. One lies in the past, one in the present. One is **THE POSSESSION IN COMMON OF A RICH LEGACY OF MEMORIES**; the other is present-day consent, the **DESIRE to live together, THE WILL TO PERPETUATE THE VALUE OF THE HERITAGE THAT ONE RECEIVED IN AN UNDIVIDED FORM**. Man, Gentlemen, does not improvise. The nation, like the individual, is the culmination of a long past of endeavors, sacrifice, and devotion. **OF ALL CULTS, THAT OF THE ANCESTORS IS THE MOST LEGITIMATE**, for the ancestors have made us what we are. A heroic past, great men, glory (by which I understand genuine glory), this is the social capital upon which one bases a national idea. To have common glories in the past and to have a common will in the present; to have performed great deeds together, to wish to perform still more - these are the essential conditions for being a people. One loves in proportion to the sacrifices to which one has consented, and in proportion to the ills that one has suffered. One loves the house that one has built and that one has handed down. The Spartan song - **"WE ARE WHAT YOU WERE, WE WILL BE WHAT YOU ARE"** - is, in its simplicity, the abridged hymn of every homeland.

More valuable by far than common customs posts and frontiers conforming to strategic ideas is the fact of sharing, in the past, a glorious heritage and regrets, and of having, in the future, a shared program to put into effect, or the fact of having suffered, enjoyed, and hoped together. These are the kinds of things that can be understood in spite of differences of race and language. I spoke just now of 'having suffered together' and, indeed, suffering in common unifies more than joy does. Where national memories are concerned, griefs are of more value than triumphs, for they impose duties, and require a common effort.

A nation is therefore a large-scale solidarity, constituted by the feeling of the sacrifices that one has made in the past and of those that one is prepared to make in the future. It presupposes a past; it is summarized, however, in the present by a tangible fact, namely, consent, **THE CLEARLY EXPRESSED DESIRE TO CONTINUE A COMMON LIFE**. A nation's existence is, if you will pardon the metaphor, **A DAILY PLEBISCITE**."

In summary, for there to be a nation according to Renan, four conditions are necessary.

First condition: the possession in common of a rich legacy of memories

Second condition: the will to perpetuate the value of the heritage that one received in an undivided form.

Third condition: the cult of the ancestors.

Fourth condition: the clearly expressed desire to continue a common life.

But before the Renan of **WHAT IS A NATION AND HIS ALLUSION TO SPARTA** (eh yes!) let us not forget that there was the Renan of the prayer on the Acropolis, a text introduced by a preface entirely devoted to the city of Ys. In both cases (City of Ys and/or Acropolis), the emotion and the nostalgia of a world irretrievably disappeared can only seize our hearts. The prayer on the Acropolis is also a jewel as far as writing is concerned, so we can only recommend reading it to every well-born soul.

Let us be well understood! It is not a matter of approving (or disapproving) this prayer on the Acropolis as well as the 4 conditions to really have a nation!

BUT OF UNDERLINING OUR AMAZEMENT IN FRONT OF THE INTERPRETATION THAT OUR MODERN INFLUENCERS MAKE OF THIS TEXT OF RENAN.

An attempt at definition based on the following authors.

Anthony Lodge (for his refutation of the oil language/oc language dichotomy).

Patrice Coirault (musicologist)

Guillaume Veillet (ethnomusicologist).

Serge Kerval (for the richness of his repertoire).

The (Breton?) group Tri Yann (for its philosophy).
Various etymological dictionaries.

Point No. 1 of the reasoning.

Are the Irish British? Are the Huron (Wendat) Abenaki or Malecite Indians some French?
It goes without saying that in this field (the French traditional song) we cannot confuse Frenchmen and French-speaking people. The traditional French song is not simply the French-speaking song. This preliminary point being established, it is necessary to start by answering the following question.

Point No. 2 of the reasoning.

THE ANSWER TO THE BASIC QUESTION BELOW.

SHOULD SONGS IN THE OC LANGUAGE (in Occitan) BE EXCLUDED FROM THE NOTION OF TRADITIONAL FRENCH SONGS ? A)

On this subject, well aware of what Maurice Barres said in 1897 : " Intelligence, what a small thing on the surface of ourselves..... deep down we are affective beings " for the needs of my argument I will borrow from Antony Lodge : the division oc/oil in the Middle Ages : a methodological fiction. In : Miscellanea of the French School in Rome. Middle Age, volume 117, No. 2. 2005. pp. 595-613.

For as they say in China, "The true face of Mount Lu is always unknown to the one who is there"!

.....

"The Galloroman unity persisted longer than we are used to thinking; intercomprehension within and between the different dia-systems was not by means of stable oral koines, but by means of thousands of individual ad hoc acts of accommodation.

The clear delimitations between the Romance languages are the product of a standardization which, although it is true that it began in the 13th century in the vernacular writing systems, took centuries to affect the language of the common speakers, true custodians of the language.

A tripartite linguistic division of medieval Gaul undoubtedly has a certain demonstrative value, but we should nevertheless be careful not to grant it more reality than other methodological fictions....

One of the great paradoxes of general linguistics is that the notion of "language," like that of "dialect," is not in fact a linguistic concept. It is, in both cases, a question of sociocultural, ideological, even political "representations." In order to distinguish between different languages, the reciprocal intelligibility criterion is often used, but it is not always appreciated to what extent this is a relative notion.

There are of course different levels of reciprocal understanding, ranging from 0% to 100%. Some would say that even within the same language, mutual understanding rarely amounts to 100%. Then there are cases where reciprocal understanding works better in one direction than in the other. The Danes, for example, say they understand Norwegian better than the Norwegians understand Danish. Danes, Norwegians and Swedes all understand each other, but they insist that they are three different languages" (Lodge.)

For the record, I, who am a speaking French with a northern accent Frenchman (an Oillitan, if I may use this neologism), I understand without any problem some (I say some) of the passages in the moving *cançon dei païsans*, especially after reading the text ("Lei paisans son matiniers.....paure païsans que son totjorn morts de fam etc. etc.").

Some political opponents will raise the question of the language spoken by Joan of Arc during her trial. Did she speak English? Since it was the English who accused her of being a witch.

And more generally, what language did she speak?

In her native village, it must have been a mixture of Champagne or Lorraine dialects. Whatever the exact location of her birthplace in Domremy (county of Champagne or enfeoffed Barrois: the fact that Charles VII exempted the inhabitants of the village of taxes after his coronation is a clue, an exemption which lasted until 1766 for the territory of Greux).

During his trip to Chinon too, since his escort came from Vaucouleurs (another enclave, neighboring, remained faithful to the kingdom of France).

But once she arrived in Chinon?

And even more so in Rouen during her trial?

Some clues.

During the trial in Rouen, on February 21, 1431, she gave "d'Arc" as her father's name, but the court in the original recorded it as "Tarc".

In Sully-sur-Loire, on March 16, 1430, Jeanne dictated a letter to the inhabitants of Reims. In the sentence: "Je vous mandesse anquores auques nouvelles de quoy vous series bien joyeux..." the word "joyeux" originally appeared as "choyeux" and was later corrected: it was crossed out and the word "joyeux" was added, just above the signature.

During the siege of Orleans, on the occasion of the final assault, on May 7, 1429, she would have shouted to William Glasdale "Clasdas, Clasdas, ren-ti, ren-ti au Roi des Cieux."

Deposition of Friar John Pasquerel of the Order of the Hermits of St. Augustine, when he was questioned by the judges at the end of February 1431.

"Once this dressing was done, Jeanne confessed to me, weeping and lamenting. Then she went back to the attack, shouting: "Clasdas, Clasdas, ren-ti, ren-ti to the King of heaven! You called me a whore; I have great pity for your soul and that of yours."

At that moment, Clasdas, armed from head to toe, fell into the Loire River and was drowned. Jeanne, moved by pity, began to weep loudly for the soul of Clasdas and the others, drowned there in large numbers. The expression "ren-ti" is translated in good French as "rends-toi."

Finally, the last clue. During the trial for the nullity of the condemnation of 1455-1456, Friar Seguin, of the order of the Friars Preachers, dean of the Faculty of Theology in Poitiers, aged about seventy years, is said to have declared: "I asked him what language her voice spoke. A better language than yours, she answered. I speak Limousin. I asked her again if she believed in God. "Yes, of course," she said, "and better than you. I then told her that God did not want her word to be believed, if she gave no other proof that she deserved credence, and that we would not advise the king on her simple word to entrust men-at-arms to her and to put them in danger. She answered, "In God's name, I have not come to Poitiers to make signs; but lead me to Orleans and I will show you the signs for which I am sent."

What can we conclude from all this?

Let us say that the Frenchmen of the Middle Ages were essentially Gallo-Romans. The French of the Middle Ages are essentially Gallo-Romans in the traditional meaning of the term 2), oil languages AND oc language, with two special cases, that of Breton and that of Catalan 3).

A poem by Raimbaut de Vaqueiras (the multilingual descort), composed around 1200, cheerfully mixes the languages in question.

Occitan.

Belhs Cavaliers, tant es car
Lo vostr'onratz senhoratges
Lombard.

That every day I am glued.

Oï me lasso! que farò

French.

Si sele que j'ai plus chier me tue,

Ne sai por quoi?

Gascon.

Ma dauna, he que dey bos

Ni peu cap Santa Quitera,

Galician Portuguese 4)

Mon corasso m'avetz treito

E mot gen favlan furtado.

"Literary documents of this kind are always to be interpreted with the greatest caution: this is above all a "salon" game and not a "normal" act of language; the text offers us a comic stereotyped imitation of five "languages" and not authentic specimens; the courtly culture shared in all the regions concerned means that the meaning of each of the stanzas was to a large extent predictable. That said, the text is not entirely irrelevant: it is legitimate to deduce that for Raimbaut de Vaquairas and his listeners, each "language" may have had its own spelling and pronunciation, but the boundaries between these "languages" were much more blurred than they are today. In courtly circles, at least, it was easy to slip from one Romance language to another. And Raimbaut's poem is far from being an isolated case".

CLERMONT-FERRAND'S CASE.

"It is probably an anti-episcopal feeling which explains the attachment of the councilors of Montferrand to the common language [and no longer to Latin]. The town's archives that they left us are immense, containing hundreds of accounting registers, tax rolls, originals of the sessions of the town council, etc. Many other cities with such councils have preserved archives in the vernacular language. But none, as far as I know, goes back as far as those of Montferrand. They begin in 1258 and do not stop until the middle of the 18th century. ...As far as the language of these Montferrand councilors is concerned, what strikes first is the local characteristic of their writing. One sees the kinship between this language and that of the Toulouse charters, but the presence in the minds of our "town hall secretaries" of a supra-regional Occitan norm is completely missing.

It is undoubtedly Occitan, but an Occitan that a Francimand gone down from Bourges would not have had too much trouble understanding. And this was quite necessary, because the city received many visitors coming not only from Alvernha, but from Fransa and elsewhere. And, in turn, it constantly sent various members of the Councilship on missions to defend the commercial and judicial interests of the Montferrand inhabitants.

The Montferrand councilors often went to Paris (a distance of 400 km, or 10 days' travel), and Parisians often arrived in Montferrand. There is never any mention in the archives of translators or problems of understanding. The passage from Occitan to French at the end of the 14th century [at the instigation of the Duke of Berry] does not give rise to any metalinguistic comment. We feel, moreover, from reading the documents, that these people were quite used to the variability of Gallo-Romance, and that they accommodated themselves to it, without any apparent problem.

"When it comes to the evolution of languages, we almost always have to deal, not with "saltations," with great jumps, but with continua; diachronic (time-related) continua, diatopic (geographical) continua, diaphasic (stylistic) continua, diastratic(social) continua.

The situation of the linguist is thus paradoxical: the needs of description oblige him to introduce divisions in the dialectal continuum, but the divisions he introduces can only be, most of the time, abstractions, methodological fictions. What is true for socio-stylistic variation within a language is also true for temporal mutations: most of the time, we are not dealing with stratifications, with abrupt cuts, but with continua.

It is quite legitimate, for descriptive purposes, to postulate distinct dia-systems north and south of the border. But it is forbidden, in my opinion, to attribute to our ancestors in the thirteenth century [it is Anthony Lodge who speaks] an analogous linguistic awareness. Conditioned by centuries of standardization, we have great difficulty in conceiving the extreme relativity of linguistic norms in the Middle Ages. However, the research of Dees (1985) has drawn attention to the inherent variability of Old French, and has shown that this variability is to be analyzed not in terms of deviations from a central norm, but in terms of quantitative differences in the distribution of key linguistic variables" (Lodge).

Point No. 3 of the reasoning.

THE DELIMITATION OF THE REPERTOIRE.

According to Guillaume Veillet and Serge Kerval.

So there is a French traditional song and we know it well thanks to the work of several successive generations of researchers for nearly two centuries.

"The approached themes are inspired by daily life and describe concrete situations, constantly repeated, but whose outcome can vary: a young soldier leaves to "serve his country" and informs his fiancée (depending on the version, he will promise her eternal fidelity or leave her "in the lurch, with a child on his hands"); a soldier returns home and his wife, having thought he was dead, has remarried (he will challenge his replacement into a duel or, like the "brave sailor returning from war," will leave to rejoin his regiment, leaving his wife to her new life)...

- The songs are made of stereotyped expressions, of interchangeable "poetic clichés": a fountain is "clear" ("At the clear fountain, going for a walk" ...); a "suitor" takes his "mistress" by her "white" hand ("And I took her by her white hand, on my horse I put her"); the sea is "smooth" ("Sweetheart embark on my pretty ship, along the sea, the smooth sea"); a nightingale is "free" or "from the beautiful woods" ("Small nightingale in the wood, free small nightingale in the wood, teach me your language, teach me to tell, teach me the way how we must love")...

- Often the action of the song begins only after one or more formulas calling the audience to attention (according to procedures that invariably remind of the street singers or the Pont-Neuf singers): " Approach and hear, the song of a girl "; " Who wants to hear a song, a beautiful little song "; " Approach all to listen, o nice company "...

-However these introductory formulas can also identify in the simplest possible way the protagonists and the place of the action (" They are Rochelle's girls who have equipped a vessel "; " We were two we were three, we were three sailors from Groix "; " It is in Paris there is a little dressmaker " (Guillaume Veillet).

The question in the form of an objection is now the following one: "Are these songs only French because they were collected in the French political framework, by definition?"

Answer.

I will take the liberty here of quoting once again the specialist in this field (ethnomusicology), Guillaume Veillet.

"There are always versions in common French, even if we have been able to collect on the ground versions in Gallo-Roman languages close to French (Franco-Provençal Occitan, Oïl languages, Piedmontese, etc.).

Each song has a multiplicity of versions, whose words and often its melody vary slightly... without any of these versions being the "true" or "authentic" one: all are the result of a process of collective writing/rewriting, starting from a distant original "literate" version of which we often lost the trace.

- These songs are sung throughout the French domain (France in its current political borders, but also the French-speaking border regions such as Wallonia or French-speaking Switzerland, or the French-speaking populations in North America). Thus, a song meeting these characteristics and collected in Berry, for example, is not a "regional Berry" song, but the version simply sung in Berry of a song that will be found in other regions."

The famous song " Don't cry Jeannette " is for example the archetype of the song of which there are many variants, some apparently older (the Pernette or the Pernelle gets up).

Patrice Coirault, in his Repertoire of the oral tradition French songs made a census of these songs in ancient sources where he has identified several archaic forms that are somewhat distant from the song as we know it today. They are all presented in the collections or manuscripts below under the title or incipit " The lady-love is sitting at the base of the tower " or " The daughter of the king is near the tower." We have not been able to find an early version in Occitan language in the sources identified by Coirault, but many folklorists and collectors during the 19th century have noted in their collections versions of The Pernette in Occitan language.

Here are some of them.

-Alphonse Lamarque de Plaisance, Usages et chansons populaires de l'ancien Bazadais, Bordeaux: [s.n.], 1845.
 -Bladé, Poésies populaires de la Gascogne, Tome III : chansons de danse, Paris : Maisonneuve, 1881.
 -Abbé Léopold Dardy, Anthologie populaire de l'Albret : sud-ouest de l'Agenais ou Gascogne landaise, Agen : J. Michel et Médan, 1891.
 -Henry Vaschalde, Chansons populaires du Vivarais, : Paris : E. Lechevalier, 1897.
 -Daymard Joseph, Vieux chants populaires recueillis en Quercy, Cahors : Girma, 1889.
 -Eugène Cheminade, Les vieilles chansons patoises du Périgord, Périgueux : Cassard jeune, 1902.
 -Chants populaires du Rouergue recueillis et publiés par la Solidarité aveyronnaise, Rodez : imprimerie Carrère, 1910.
 ...

I saw the wolf the fox and the hare (or the weasel) is also a typical song in the traditional French and Occitan repertoire. Because of its oral transmission, it is impossible to define an original version. The text of the Burgundian, Occitan and Acadian versions seems to have a marked sexual nature. Some adaptations in other languages therefore prefer to transform the meaning of this scene.

At the beginning of the 21st century, this song can be found under several names, most often corresponding to the incipit of the sung version, for example I saw the wolf the fox and the hare, A vist lo lop, lo rainard, la lèvre (Occitan version) or I saw the wolf the fox and the weasel, even if these variants are not necessarily specific to a given geographical area. The Michao'mare has become the most popular in France today, but consists of a combination of two traditional songs that had nothing to do with each other at first.

As for the clear fountain, which almost became the Canadian national anthem (revolt of 1837), it is not clear at all (as far as its meaning is concerned) and Jules Gillieron (1854-1926) has well emphasized that in ROMANIA : "the story that is the basis of all these versions, a very quick, very concise story, was understood by none of the singers we know, and all the important alterations that the song underwent in the course of its wanderings through the countries of France are due to this circumstance. It is about a young girl that her lover has left. She has been to the wedding, she has seen her companion happy, everything is cheerful round her, the fountain was clear, the nightingale was singing in the trees: then sadness came to her heart. She regrets having refused this rosebud (which, for me, is taken here in the figurative sense), and having so kept her friend Peter away ."

Point No. 4 of the reasoning.

Natio (with long a and o) -ionis, fem., is a derivative of nascor, nasceris, nasci, natus sum "to be born": the word designates, first of all, birth, in fact, the result of childbirth, the litter of an animal, hence "the set of individuals born at the same time or in the same place" (see Festus 165, 3 : natio, genus hominum qui non aliunde venerunt, sed ibi[dem] nati sunt). The word, formed on *gnatio, is close, in origin and function in the language, to the more recent feminine gens, gentis, made on geno,-is, duplicate of the more usual gigno-is,-ere, genui, genitum, "to beget"; originally, gens designates the group of all those who recognize a common - and free - male ancestor and who form a clan (with a gentilic name) ; then the meaning, when the precise "clan" disappeared, became "family" (restricted), "race" (broad), and tended to designate the nation, the people, the group (in the imperial era, gentes designates foreign peoples as opposed to the populus Romanus, while among Christians, the plural designates the pagans as opposed to the Jews and Christians) The neuter genus, generis, taken from the same root *gen-, and which has correspondents in many Indo-European languages, designates all beings (male or female) of the same origin and with common characteristics, hence genus, species, class (concrete and abstract vocabulary).

The original concrete meaning is therefore only abandoned in two cases, which also have a negative connotation.

To designate a type of individual, a race, whatever their language or their skin color.

And with the Christians it becomes an equivalent of goy, goyim, but without including Israelites, of course.

Here is what Gerard Jeanneau's *Prima Elementa* has to say about it.

Nātiō, ōnis, f. [nascor, natus]: - 1 - birth. - 2 - race, offspring, species, kind. - 3 - nation, people. - 4 - plural. nations, pagans, gentiles.

-nationu (= nationis) cratia (= gratia) donom dedi, CIL 2, 60: I have made this gift [to Fortune] because of a birth.

-natione Medus, Nep. Medus by birth.

-Natio (Nascio), ōnis, f.: Nation (goddess who presided over birth).

-Natio quoque dea putanda est, Cic. Nat. 3, 47: Nation also to be considered a goddess.

-omnes nationes servitutem ferre possunt, nostra civitas non potest, Cic. Phil. 10, 10, 20: all other nations can suffer slavery, our city cannot. cf. id. Font. 11, 25; Nat. 3, 39, 93.

-omnes exteræ gentes ac nationes, Cic. Imp. Pomp. 11, 31: all the countries in the world, all the peoples. --- cf. Quint. 11, 3, 87; Cic. de Or. 2, 4, 18; id. Prov. Cons. 5, 10; id. Q. Fr. 1, 1, 9, § 27; Cæs. BG. 3, 7; Tac. G. 38; id. An. 11, 18.

-nationem reddere deteriolem, Varr. R. 2, 6, 4: to harm the litter (of an ass).

-bona natio, P. Fest. : abundant litter, great fecundity.

-nationes, Plin. 22, 109 : varieties (of bees).

-nationes ceræ, Plin. : different species of wax.

-natio officiosissima candidatorum, Cic. Pis. 23, 55 : the candidates, very obsequious people.

-famelica hominum natio, Plaut. : half-starved brood.

-omnes ejus gentis nationes, Tac. all the peoples in this country.

-nationes, Tert. Id. 22: the pagans, the gentiles.

-ante aditum porticūs Ad Nationes, Plin. 36, 39: before the entrance to the portico of Nations. cf. Serv. Virg. En. 8, 721 (portico decorated with statues representing all the nations).

It should be noted that the broadening of the meaning only really began with the Church Latin (Tertullian) which made it an equivalent of goy, goïm, but non-including the Jews.

Other etymological dictionary online.

Nation (n).

C. 1300, *nacioun*, "a race of people, large group of people with common ancestry and language," from Old French *nacion* "birth, rank; descendants, relatives; country, homeland" (12c.) and directly from Latin *nationem* (nominative *natio*) "birth, origin; breed, stock, kind, species; race of people, tribe," literally "that which has been born," from *natus*, past participle of *nasci* "be born" (Old Latin *gnasci*), from PIE root **gene-* "give birth, beget," with derivatives referring to procreation and familial and tribal groups.

The word is used in English in a broad sense, "a race of people an aggregation of persons of the same ethnic family and speaking the same language."

But now, the influencers in this country prefer to think through oxymorons (sic)

and also in the narrower sense, "a political society composed of a government and subjects or citizens and constituting a political unit; an organized community inhabiting a defined territory within which its sovereignty is exercised."

Point No. 5 of the reasoning.

METHODOLOGY.

When did it stop being reasonable to call the inhabitants of Manhattan Leni Lenape or Munsee? From the passage of the French in 1524? In 1613 with the Dutch?

You'd have to ask the people of the Ramapough Mountains. Or Fenimore Cooper. 5)

After a certain number of changes, an "existing one" ceases to be reasonably designated by the name that suited its ancestors.

The authors who publish maps of France with legends that are meant to be ironic, such as "Eternal France" with a question mark, make me laugh a lot! Because in spite of their conformism and their submission to the obvious dominant ideology in fashion, they give themselves the answer to their question, just by publishing this map...

Is France eternal ? Of course not! Except for the poets who want to emphasize her durability perhaps.

Is France immortal ? Of course not ! France is mortal and one day it will no longer be logical, reasonable or even intellectually honest to continue to speak of "French" to designate the inhabitants of the northern Pyrenees.

Just as with the Leni Lenape of Manhattan, the equation boils down to the question of knowing at what point in time it is no longer logical to use a term characterizing an entity that has been known until then. And even in this case to start with the equation that can be summarized as follows. The French being no longer Gauls, everyone agrees, except the Greeks, and some inhabitants of the Parisian suburbs, from when can we speak of France and Frenchmen to begin with?

Point No. 6 of the reasoning.
CLAUSE A.

Let's the political events (the victory of Clovis at Soisson in 486, over the last representative of the Western Roman Empire : Syagrius) drop.

France and the French, from the origins and until the (industrial) revolution at least, are the regions of oil AND OF OC language, the whole seasoned with some external elements (Jewish Franks Vikings and others) ASSIMILATED, FOR A LONG TIME.

Let's say that the paternal DNA is the kingdom of West Francia, but that the matrix and the mitochondrial DNA of France are the regional cultures and languages.

The regional cultures are the soul of the French identity, the French language its reason.

The regional cultures including that of Corsica or Alsace. This was well understood by the great musicologist Serge Kerval (1939-1998).

CLAUSE B.

As for the father, let us say that it is the critical mind regarding religions of d'Holbach, the irony of Voltaire, the intellectual freedom or independence of mind, the mockery and even the caricature... But also the faith of Joan of Arc or the spirituality of Manon of the Springs, the reason of Descartes, the geometrical spirit of its gardens, the elegance of its music, without forgetting the pleasures of good food that are the wines, the delicatessen and all the rest (of the gastronomy). Even the gallantry, the smooth talking and the libertinism (in terms of morals). Didn't Casanova write his memoirs in French? In short, to conclude, there is no French race, nor an eternal France, because, even if traces of settlement dating back a million years have been found there, and even if we have inherited a part (variable percentage according to the authors) of the genes of the Neanderthal Man 6), France has not always existed, is mortal, and will die one day. No eternal France, but a Gallo-Roman whole 7) of the Oil language + plus Oc language type. Regionalism and kingdom of France are therefore the two breasts of French identity.

Point No. 7 of my reasoning.

I will finish with a quotation from the Tri Yann in 1976, the year I landed in Paris, because their song "Michao's mare" raises the same problem of methodology.

"At this hour, children are born in Brittany

Will they be Bretons? No one knows.

It is up to each one, when he is become old enough, discovery or ignorance."

NOTES.

1) "The Greek race is the least religious of races. It is a superficial race, treating life as a thing devoid of the supernatural, and having no future. Such simplicity of conception is owing in great measure to the climate, to the purity of the atmosphere, to the astonishing joy that one breathes, but even more so

to the instincts of the Hellenic race, finely idealistic...these are the delights of the Greeks, the pleasures of a race, poor, economical, eternally young, inhabiting a charming country, finding its welfare within itself, and in the gifts that the gods have given it [...] . with us Celts and Germans, the source of our genius is our heart. Our deepest recesses (au fond de nous) resemble a fairy fountain, a fountain clear, fresh, and deep, in which is reflected the infinite. With the Greek, love of self and vanity is mixed with everything; vague sentiment is unknown to him [...] Greece was never seriously Christian, nor is she to this day. No race in our Middle Ages was less romantic, more destitute of chivalrous sentiment" (Ernest Renan. The history of the origins of Christianity Book III chapter VII Saint Paul in Athenes).

2) It is only for political reasons that the southern part of this Gallo-Roman group has been separated from it under the name of Occitan-Romance by some specialists. This PARADOXICALLY amounts to putting the sign = between "Gauls" and "language of oil." This manipulation is all the more stupid because everything depends, as always, on the definition given to words. Let us remind for the record of the fact that the original West Francia (843) INCLUDED TERRITORIES WHICH WERE NOT OF GERMANIC TEUDISCA LANGUAGE NOR OF OIL LANGUAGE, SO WERE OF OC LANGUAGE (Bordeaux Barcelona Nîmes Limoges Poitiers Montluçon).

3) The Catalan is almost Occitan (independence de facto only with Borrell II) and the Vannes Breton almost Gallic, in any case brittonic like him. As for the case of Alsace, it is a heartbreaker, the analysis of Renan that it entailed, being purely circumstantial (being explained only by the annexation to Germany). This explains why it has been overused since this time whereas Renan was fundamentally an extreme right man, anti-republican and against democracy (see "The intellectual and moral reform" he called for, in 1871).

4) It is a bit of junk Portuguese language, but as far as I am concerned it does not keep me awake at night.

5) In evolutionary biology, a model of "gradual" mutations is usually contrasted with a model of "jump" mutations.

The gradualist model assumes small changes perpetually in progress, the "jump" model alternates rapid transformations and long periods of stability.

But should we still call a dinosaur...a chicken? To say that chickens are dinosaurs is only a hyperbole, a shock expression, intended to remind us of their distant origins.

6) Sankararaman, S., Mallick, S., Dannemann, M. et al. The genomic landscape of Neanderthal ancestry in present-day humans. Nature 507, 354-357 (2014). "While the average frequency of these sequences is 1-3%, there are areas where they form more than 60% of our DNA."

Vernot Benjamin, Akey Joshua M. University of Washington Seattle. Resurrecting Surviving Neanderthal. Lineages from Modern Human Genomes.

Anatomically modern humans overlapped and mated with Neandertals such that non-African humans inherit ~1 to 3% of their genomes from Neanderthal ancestors. We identified Neanderthal lineages that persist in the DNA of modern humans, in whole-genome sequences from 379 European and 286 East Asian individuals, recovering more than 15 gigabases of introgressed sequence that spans ~20% of the Neanderthal genome (false discovery rate = 5%).

7) Let us pass over the vain polemics as to the notion of Gauls (Julius Caesar: those whom we call Gauls, and who in their language are called Celts) as regards the substratum. France is still called Gallia in Greek, but everyone will agree that there has been too much change (too much gradual mutation, too much mutation by jumps) affecting the said Gauls for it to be still logical, rational and intellectually honest.... to use this term to call the inhabitants of the territory located north of the Pyrenees in the 7th century. The last mention of this language appears in the life of Saint Euthymius the Great (a Galatian monk named Procopius).

THE OLD FOREIGNERS.

Arrived at this point of our presentation it is important to remind to our readers and somehow preventively of the fact that there is an absolute counterexample to all the pessimistic scenario which will follow, these are all these great Irish families of Norman origin, the Seanghaill, who gradually became so assimilated to the Irish of Gaelic stock, from the 12th century, that they ended up finding themselves on the side of the Irish nationalists and even sometimes supported the independence movement of the modern era.

For example, our famous muse Lady Augusta Gregory, who literally rediscovered the fascinating personality of our great civilizing hero, Cuchulainn of Moritamna.
IT IS TRUE THAT RELIGION WAS NOT ABLE TO OPPOSE THEM; QUITE ON THE CONTRARY.
This fascinating enthralling and seductive example of a "happy" assimilation is so rare that it deserves a few lines of development, just to cheer us up a bit.

Seanghaill or "old stranger" in Gaelic is the name given after the fact to the descendants of the colonists who arrived in Ireland, after the conquest of the country in the 12th century, coming from Wales, Normandy and England.

Hiberno-Normand would have been a more accurate term, but lo and behold, in Ireland the term Seanghaill prevailed.

This name was created at the end of the 16th century to designate the part of this community which lived in The Pale, in the heart of the region dominated by the English (Dublin, Drogheda).

Over the centuries, many Old Foreigners or Seanghaill integrated into Irish society, and their aristocracy became the real ruling class of the country until the sixteenth century. They were, however, dispossessed of their lands during political and religious conflicts, which took place in Ireland in the 16th and 17th centuries, mainly because of their unwavering adherence to the Catholic religion. From 1700, they were almost all expelled from the ruling and wealthy classes, and replaced by Protestant settlers, called "New English."

The "Seanghaill" community was never monolithic. In some areas, particularly in The Pale around Dublin, in the south of County Wexford, in the counties of Kilkenny, Limerick and Cork, the term referred to relatively urbanized communities, who spoke English, but in the most of the rest of Ireland, the term referred to a small segment of the population, made up of landowners and nobles, who ruled over free farmers and Gaelic sharecroppers.

In the provinces, it was sometimes difficult to distinguish the Seanghaill from the surrounding Gaelic lords and chiefs. Dynasties such as the Fitzgeralds, the Butlers and the Burkes adopted the native Irish language, the Irish legal system and other customs, such as child boarding, mixed marriages with Gaelic people, and patronage of the Irish poetry or music. Thus some of these families were considered, "more Irish than the Irish themselves."

In order to put an end to this Gaelicisation of the Norman families the Parliament of Ireland voted in 1367 the Statutes of Kilkenny, which, among other things, prohibited the use of the Irish language, the wearing of Irish clothes, and the stay of Irish Gaelic inside fortified cities. These outrageous laws were hardly enforced or made little difference for the situation.

The crises of the 16th and 17th centuries

The colonists who arrived from the Elizabethan era on the occasion of the reconquest of Ireland by the Tudor, preserved their English, religious, social and cultural, identity, and, unlike the Normans who became Seanghaill, they did not merge with the rest of the country. The new settlers felt fully English and Protestant, and viewed Ireland as a conquered country, which needed to be civilized and converted to Protestantism. Edmund Spenser was one of the main advocates of this idea. He argued in an "A view on the present state of Ireland" (1595) that the failure of the total conquest of Ireland had led to the corruption of the previous generations of English settlers by Irish culture. For these "New

English," many of the "Old English" or Seanghaill had therefore "degenerated," by adopting the Irish customs and the Catholic religion.

Their exclusion from the government of Ireland due to their religious divergence during the 16th century threw them into the arms of the native Irish.

The first confrontation with the English government in Ireland took place on the occasion of the problems connected with the raising of taxes from the years 1556 to 1583. Originally, this was an internal dispute, with residents of the Pale (Dublin area and Drogheda) refusing to pay new taxes which they had not previously approved in the Irish Parliament. The Seanghaills of the Pale therefore refused to pay the English soldiers charged with suppressing this series of revolts which ended with the rebellions of Desmond (1569-73 and 1579-83).

The conflict also took on a religious dimension from 1571, when Elisabeth I was excommunicated by the pope. Rebels belonging to the Hiberno-Norman dynasty of Desmond, presented their revolt as a "holy war." Several hundred Seanghaill of the Pale were hanged, either for rebellion or because of their religion. This episode caused a major break between the Pale and the English government, between the Seanghaill and the New English. "Seanghaill" writers, such as Geoffrey Keating, then asserted that the true identity of the Seanghaill was Irish and Catholic rather than English.

In 1641, many Seanghaills decisively broke with their past as loyal subjects of His Britannic Majesty by joining the Irish Rebellion of 1641. Several factors influenced their decision, including fear of the rebels and fear of government reprisals against all Catholics without exception. The main reason, however, was their desire to reverse the anti-Catholic policy which had been practiced by the English authorities during the previous forty years.

Historians do not agree on how to name the community "Seanghall" at different periods of its existence, nor on how to define its sense of identity. The oldest known reference to the term "Seanghaill" dates back to the 1580s. Before that, the descendants of the Normans used several epithets to define themselves, and it was the political crises of the 1580s that made this one emerge rather than another. In his study of late 16th century poetry, Brendan Bradshaw points out that in Gaelic language the Normans were not called Seanghaill (Old Foreigners), but rather Fionnghaill (White foreigners, or blond = Norwegian Vikings) or Dubhghaill (Black foreigners = Danish Vikings).

In his book Surnames of Ireland, the historian Edward MacLysaght distinguishes between Hiberno-Norman names and Anglo-Norman names.

AND NOW A NEW AESOP'S FABLE!

On December 31st, 2000 was a historic day for the Earth. This evening indeed, from New York, our president proclaimed on all the televisions in the world and live that all the borders of our country were abolished; and that from now on every man or every woman of this planet could come there freely; that he would profit there at once exactly from the same rights as the citizens depending on his authority.

The following day January 1st, it occurred strictly nothing.

Two days later millions men and women marched courageously in the street, with their bared chests proudly offered to the machine guns, to protest, particularly to denounce the incredible racist hatred that our beloved president showed by refusing to aliens the right to live and to have a family. Three dead persons in the subway after a derailment, and a hundred casualties after a crush in the crowd, police officers having not rush as they should do in order to bring first aid to them.

Two days later, on January 3rd, in the ports and the airports, on the other hand...

Editor's note: this was a fiction story, but what follows and which occurred in France is not so!

On November 14, 2008, took place on the German or French TV channel Arte, within the program Paris-Berlin, or Berlin-Paris? a debate about interbreeding. Presented in alternation by Thea Dorn and Isabelle Giordano. Here some of the reactions which followed.

Patrick Lozes. a pharmacist president of the CRAN (Representative Council of Black Associations in France). Black, quite simply?

Last week, at the time of a debate about interbreeding in the ARTE program "Paris-Berlin" presented by Isabelle Giordano; the journalist and leader writer of the Figaro Eric Zemmour, expressed sentiments about which we have difficulties to know if they come from ignominy or unconcern.

Facing the philosopher Vincent Cespedes, the German actress and writer Renan Demirkan, and Rokhaya Diallo, president of the association "the indivisible ones," Eric Zemmour explained that "races" identifiable "by the skin color" would exist.

With a bloodcurdling argumentation , he explained: "I feel that the denial of the races succeeded the sanctification of the races of the previous Nazi period ." Two designs which would be, according to Eric Zemmour "as ridiculous one as the other."

Further questioned , he answered one of the guests: "I belong to the white race, you belong to the black race! "

I am shocked by the fact that on a great channel of French television (sic), such confusing remarks can be expressed.

I am surprised that nobody thought of asking Mr. Zemmour where began the alleged "black race" and where finished the alleged "white race."

Let us remind that all the scientists agree for decades to admit that there is only one mankind, and that if through misuse of language people may speak about a human race, there could not be several human races.

Mankind comprises negroes, white, colored, fair-haired men , dark-haired men, tall men, little men , etc. Among the human beings, there exists a continuum of skin color as there is a continuum of hair color or a continuum of human size: there is not more a "race of tall men" than a "race of dark-haired men."

Albert Jacquard in a famous and cosigned by six hundred scientists declaration, said: "The concept of race can be defined only within species whose various groups were isolated from each other sufficiently a long time so that their gene pool become different. However , in mankind, this differentiation is so little marked that the concept of human races is not working."

Marthe wrote| 11.19; 2008.

The word "race" has several meanings. When it is spoken about races in mankind, it is different than when it is spoken about races among the dogs. To understand that there exist human races, it is enough to open the dictionary: "Race: Natural Grouping of current or fossil human beings, which present a set of hereditary common bodily characteristics, independently of their languages and nationalities." There are some examples: white, yellow, black race; pure race, crossed race. If you seek the definition of "interbreeding," you find: "Crossing between individuals members of different races."

You see that the dictionaries admit the races. And no, they are not racist, fascistic, Nazis or others, dictionaries. They do not date either back to the pre-war period. It would be necessary that you also open your dictionary: the races exist, because this word does not have only a definition of "genetic" nature. It is not either question of a superiority of a race (what would be then some racism). Moreover, so that you can speak about "interbreeding" and "diversity," it is necessary to start by admitting the concept of different races. If not, it is absurd!

Tesla the mailman wrote | 11.19 . 2008.

If I agree with you about the uselessness of getting overexcited on the remarks from Zemmour, on the other hand, I don't agree with your concept of races. The race is a taxonomic row lower than the species, based only on subjective criteria such morphological and physiological characteristics. This taxonomic row has no international nor scientific value and it is generally used with a commercial aim (they speak about races of dogs or varieties for the plants). It would be difficult to apply it to the human being.

Mr. Zemmour could have said the same thing by using the word "type" (Caucasian, etc.), which does not contain all the serious connotation of the word race, and would not have thus caused the general outcries from the French right-thinking people. Unless, of course, that such was the intention of Mr. Zemmour...

Now I do not believe that the freedom of speech is restricted to that extent in our country, that it is forbidden to speak about races. Only value judgments of the kind: "The human race X is higher than the human race Y" are prohibited in a penal way.

UcCaBaRuCcA wrote | 11.19. 2008.

Once more, I do not see what is reproached Mr. Zemmour.

Even though we shouldn't use the word race for the human beings (it remains to be proved besides), in what these remarks are ignominious?

You don't need to have done eight years of further studies in genetics to speak about race! Either he speaks about type, race, of phenotypes, of features... Most important is that we understand his speech. Zemmour is well white! And Diallo is well black! Where is the problem?

It is incredible! "It is urgent that the persons in charge of the public TV channels on which this gentleman appears ... nauseous stinks." Freedom of speech, that rings you a bell in your association, gentlemen of the criticism ? Facing the philosopher Vincent Cespedes, the German actress and writer Renan Demirkan and Rokhaya Diallo president of the association "the indivisible ones," Eric Zemmour explained that "races" identifiable "with the skin color" would exist.

Yes, all that it is very, very well!

But I note nevertheless that the subtitle of the blog by Patrick Lozès is "Black, quite simply"...

Mr. Lozès, don't you have the feeling to fall a little, but then really a little, in the bad faith?

Tesla the mailman wrote |11.19. 2008.

By the way: let us imagine just a minute that a (white-skinned, hum) guy, has the nerve to subtitle his blog "White, quite simply"...

We may suppose - without much risk to be mistaken - that this guy would be quickly described as a vile racist, of those it is necessary to imprison as fast as possible.

Moussa wrote |11.19. 2008.

Universal declaration of human rights, article 2.1: "Everyone is entitled to all the rights and freedoms set forth in this Declaration, without distinction of any kind, such as race, color, sex" etc.

What an array of wretched racists!

More amusing, could you find the authors of these declarations?

"In the political field, there are two attitudes with respect to this question: One falls under the traditional racism based on the idea of superiority of certain races; the other, anti-racist, denies the races, but, as a result, masks the existence of the black question and leads finally to relatively similar results. It is impossible to reduce the problem of the Negroes to a socio-economic question and deny its racial dimension."

The authors are... Patrick Lozès and Louis-Georges Tin, cofounders of the CRAN. You have said "hypocrisy?"

Tesla the mailman wrote | 11.19. 2008.

I agree with you, Guess! I understand that the word race has dangerous connotations, but then why do they speak about racism and racist, if we are all members of the same race, and that there are not races different among the human beings??

Ryvius wrote | 11.19. 2008.

You break us the testicles with your inanities. No races, no racism, no S.O.S Racism, no CRAN! Total Dissolution!

OMW wrote | 11.19. 2008.

This overreaction of all that France has as "right-thinking people" is completely ridiculous. The only wrong of Mr. Zemmour is to have spoken about "race" whereas he is white. The same remarks made by a negro and used to heap thousand reproaches upon the "white" would be, in the best case, gone unnoticed, in the worst case acclaimed by these same right-thinking people.

OMW wrote | 11.19. 2008.

If races do not exist, so interbreeding doesn't exist either?

Asterix wrote | 11.19. 2008.

Biodiversity is in vogue, but on TV when Eric Zemmour defends it everyone takes fright... or pretends to do it! More seriously, unlike what the claue of the politically correct assures us in unison, the debate on the races goes everywhere in favor of the races, except in France, of course. Chernobyl effect?

Asterix wrote | 11.19. 2008.

We are indeed surprised by the speed with which everyone draws for a simple problem of semantics: a question which has its importance, but which should not mask the content. Zemmour is neither an anthropologist nor a scientist. Replace in its speech the word race by the word root, and where is the problem? To note differences is not to scorn what is different.

Asterix | 11.19. 2008.

Does Mr. Zemmour know that among the people supporting his brilliant quip of the moment, there are some to think that there exists a "Jewish race," different from the "Caucasian white race?" Which would not be distinguished, in the eyes of these narrow morons with a narrow forehead, by a question of skin color, but by physical characteristics such as hooked nose, separated ears, innate tendency to cupidity (and that is not all there is worst...) ? A man is defined only by his acts. The rest ? A perishable packing ...

Cedric wrote | 19.11.19. 2008.

When you call yourself "Representative Council of BLACK associations" (CRAN), and that you pretend to be offended to hear the word race, I do not know if it is necessary to laugh or to cry about it. Hypocrisy, or then you do not even realize the total nonsense of your reasoning compared to the community ideal on a "racial" basis (the skin color: black) of your association? You publish a book "WE BLACK WOMEN," and you are offended by the words from Zemmour... Most "shocking," to take over your own words, it is that people like you are received by the President in order to promote the institutionalized racism, or rather the "affirmative action," wonder of the newspeak.

Hypocrisy wrote | 11.20. 2008.

How will it be done to favor the members of the oppressed races if the races do not exist? How will it be done to favor the members of the oppressed races if it is for cultural reasons and not for skin color that they must be recognized? Will be excluded from this affirmative or positive action those who

profited from the State Education or those who have the TV, because they are cultivated? Poke your nose elsewhere! Other than that, I agree: Zemmour is a moron, he was unpleasant and ill-mannered - but, well, the French are like that now - with the little Rockaya - that I find adorable. It would not be necessary that the author of this blog tries to surpass him in idiocy.

Sicambre wrote | 11.20.2008.

Lozes must relax, he meets the ultra-sensitive ones of the epidermis as soon as the word race or black is used, he goes to the front line for anything... Zemmour could have said colored ethnic groups or what do I still know, but perhaps that there too in this case, he would have incurred the wrath of some persons. In short, to say nothing then? Pathetic!

Khalide wrote | 11.20. 2008.

Zemmour indeed went a little too far with his last word. "I am of white race and you are of black race." That does not prevent that the rest of his assertions is on the contrary felt well.

You fall besides into the trap that Eric Zemmour describes by justifying the inexistence of the races by the scientific authority. And if there had been a scientific consensus which had on the contrary declared that the races exist? What would we do all? Wisest of the positions is to take science for what it is, but not to sanctify it.

They are arguments of great scientists which justified the existence of the races and the inferiority of some ones. It is on the basis of scientific argument that the Nazi biopolitical program was based. And it is important that Mr. Zemmour points out that today, the same process is working in the constant incentive to interbreeding. If there is no race, why want to cross them?

Moreover, on the racial question, the current scientists are as a whole very far from sharing the extreme positions of Mr. Jacquard. They can show today that starting from an analysis of DNA, it is possible to define various ancestral geographical origins. Here therefore a new concept of ancestral geographical groups which, in a way, could be very well called races if the word did not have the weight that we know to it. And certain people would keep a dominant geographical feature, whereas others would have several of them. The blacks, the white, the mixed races like you say. Yourself therefore you see it well. There are blacks, there are white, there are white-black mulattoes (mixed races), there are even people whom we would not be able to characterize so easily. I will go even further, there is an Ethiopian type. We can make many groups, but it is a little stupid to want to put in the same group a Lapp and an Australian Aboriginal. You can do it if you want, Jacquard can do it very well. He will find an argument about the blood group, etc., but what I see it is that people can attack your remarks in the same way in which you attack Mr. Zemmour. It would be possible to return you the compliment.

So what do we do with the scientific arguments? The answer is: we take them for what they are, science and nothing more. A new element of comprehension of the world but not an authority for political options.

Blinded by St. Albert Jacquard, you do not hear what is important in the remarks of Mr. Zemmour. He points out what the racism is, the true one: to decree a hierarchy, defined in an allegedly natural way, between human groups. He explains to us rather precisely then why the dominant politics today is: in order to make no longer possible to people to think that, it is necessary to make any group disappear thanks to the virtues of the interbreeding. The Nazis refused the diversity of the reality by wanting to eradicate all that was not Aryan. The dominant position today is to refuse the diversity of the reality by mixing all the human groups massively in order to prevent that men are led to think again like Nazis. These two programs are of biopolitic nature. One uses strong-arm tactics and the second without violence tactics, but their root is the same one, the denial of the reality, the Utopia of which we generally know where it leads us.

So yes Mr. Zemmour was wrong to pronounce a sentence as easy as "I am white and you are black"; because I, I could for example then string together with "No, it is me that I am of the white race, you, you are of the Jewish race" and we would never be gone out the debate. But under pressure from a television studio set, even the most trained man cannot always say the most precise remarks. There is a portion of joust, war, attacks and counter-attacks. You can go down quite low on a studio set, especially when your adversary decided to be thus. As for me, I do not focus on his last sentence, because what he said before is of the highest importance. And it is about this part that you do not want to discuss.

Bcbg wrote | 11.20.2008.

Hello everybody!

The one-track thinking struck again!!! And we must submit ourselves to the totalitarian speeches of the right-thinking people...Zemmour has 1000 times reasons!!! We are fed up to the back teeth all day long with interbreeding, with diversity... men are different, that is all! And it is necessary on the contrary to be pleased with this difference. Each one must be proud of one's race, and that is not pejorative.

OBAMANIA wrote | 11.20. 2008.

The big problem of this subject, they are the words and their definition.

If it is said that there is no race ---- > scientific interpretation; then S.O.S racism, the fight against racism, the interbreeding, all that must not exist,... because in the definition of interbreeding, it is well spoken about mixing of two races, no? ? ?

The pejorative connotation of the word "Race" is due only to the fact that it is combined with a notion of hierarchical order. If there is no hierarchical order, there is no longer a problem.

Question wrote | 11.20. 2008.

It is necessary that the intellectual level of the public debate in this country dropped singularly so that the commentators are unable to admit that a word can be polysemous. To admit the existence of races as sensed realities (black, white, yellow, redskin, etc.) involves in no way the adherence to any racial theory. In addition (but this point is incidental), it is better to avoid the standpoint which starts with "all the scientists think that" (especially if the first name which comes to mind is that of Albert Jacquard, French popularizer without any scientific fame).

Broke wrote | 11.20. 2008.

The words exist to be used. It is the way in which we use them which can "kill." Many constitutions of great countries and States subject to the rules of law do not have a problem to write the word race, which also appears in all the dictionaries of the whole world in all the great Western languages. Moreover these days all the French press and everyone speak only about the "black" president Obama. Conclusion: no hypocrisy, more especially as the CRAN itself, claims the word "black." If you are black, it is that there is a black race.

Moreover, for me the most shocking about the human beings, it is to use the word species, which in my imagination is much more adapted for animals than for men. Once again it is the way with which you say it, the context, etc. which is important. It is necessary to focus on the important one which is to denounce racism. @Question.

I think that to fight against the discrimination of which Blacks are victims, it is vile to attack the Jews or every other component of the Nation. It is all together that we must be mobilized against discrimination. There is no hierarchical order between discriminations. They all are of offenses to individuals.

Civis romanus wrote | 21.11.21. 2008.

I always admired the talents of illusionists of those who were never elected. People's Republic of China. Democratic Republic of Congo. REPRESENTATIVE Committee of Black Associations... Mr. Patrick Lozes and his association which claims to speak in the name of the Blacks are not more representative of the Blacks in this country than Mobutu or Kabila are representative of the Blacks in Congo. Sorry, Mr. Lozes, but it is only the truth!

Civis romanus wrote | 11.21. 2008.

But Mr. Lozes, all that is delirious!

The word "race" is only an intellectual convenience to define a population which shares a certain number of common bodily features. It is not because this non-specialized classification is scientifically contradicted that it has no ethnological reality! The fact that some people in the past could make (or make still) an infamous use of this terminology, does not invalidate it for all that. It is neither good nor bad in itself, and to get on your high horse when somebody uses it on the pretext that the latter could insinuate a distinction of quality, is anything else but to impugn motive.

All this fuss around a short sentence lost in the middle of a debate without interest, shows to what extent the political correctness is about to become a moral dictatorship of the media. Certain individuals having journalistic platforms go as far as to require that the individual who dared to say "I am of white race and you of black race" is punished according to his crime and as an example. Is this really that democracy? Is this really that a State subject to the Rule of law?

AN INSTITUTIONALIZED NEO-RACISM ? THE THINK TANK TERRA NOVA?

Terra Nova is a French association, founded in February 2008 by Olivier Ferrand which claims to be a laboratory of ideas, close to the socialist party.

Terra Nova federates a network of several hundred specialists in various fields, from the senior civil service, the academic world, the business world or the associative sector.

The dissemination of Terra Nova's ideas requires direct contact with politicians and an active presence in the media.

Electoral strategy. Olivier Ferrand and Bruno Jeanbart wrote in 2011 a report entitled "Left, what an electoral majority for 2012" which saw fit to spread the following observation entitled THE NEW ELECTORATE OF THE LEFT: THE FRANCE OF TOMORROW. 3. Minorities and working-class neighborhoods

"The France of diversity is almost entirely on the left. The self-positioning of individuals reveals an alignment of French immigrants, and even more of the second generation, on the left - of the order of 80-20. We find scores of this magnitude in polling stations in lower-income neighborhoods, and again 62-38 in sensitive urban areas ."

Since this circle of reflection continues to make headlines in France, below some of its waves.

The French anthropologist Jean-Loup Amselle raised the alarm bell besides on this subject in an excellent book published in 2011 under the title " France's ethnicization."

There exists, according to him, a double phenomenon of identity claim i.e., that symmetrical claims appear.

On the one hand, minority claims increase, from groups which estimate themselves to be discriminated, oppressed, marginalized: "blacks," "born of North African parents," "Jews" but also all the movement LGBT.

We attend a phenomenon of inveiglement of these claims by what I call of the "entrepreneurs of ethnicity and memory." They speak in the name of these groups which they form themselves, and of which they set themselves up as a spokesperson, in order to monopolize for their benefit the at the beginning little formalized and disseminated claims.

Indeed, whether they are ethnic categories or phenomena of homosexuality, the "members" of these supposed groups do not claim permanently as being members of them. A "black" or a "born of North African parents " is not defined constantly as such. The identity of an individual is always multiple, it depends on the context of interlocution, on the person with whom we talk. An excellent example which is not new is provided to us by the case for example of the little Alsatian boy Joseph Egen born in Guebwiller in 1884 who was called Joseph in the French way by his father, Joseph in the German way by his teacher and Seppala or Seppi (Alsatian diminutive of Joseph) by his mother and his buddies. Conversely, the claims monopolized by these entrepreneurs of ethnicity and memory lock up the social actors in mono-identities.

On the other side of the spectrum, exists the claim of those who are called for lack of anything better "French of stock" [or equated persons].

Claim which is taken over symmetrically by the multicultural and post-colonial left wing [terminology of Jean-Loup Amselle] or post-national. It is enough to see the paradigmatic example of the use of the pejorative * word "souchien" which locks up the French of stock or equated persons to a mono-identity that they did not think of claiming there are some generations (not under Louis XIV not under Louis XVI not under Napoleon not in 1914...

Finally, between these two tendencies, we witness a kind of reciprocal strengthening, as these minority identities harden, on the other side is also established by reaction a hardening of the white and more or less Christian identity [the more or less is required because this group also extends to the atheists or agnostics whose families were traditionally Christian].

I would not call that racism on behalf of the left wing. It is rather a differentialism, a singularism, an anti-universalist attitude. Because I do not believe, as for me, in the existence of "anti-white" racism [opinion of Jean-Loup Amselle that the book of the French sociologist Tarik Yildiz contests categorically].

On the other hand, the public speech is literally infested by the multiculturalism, with a tendency to identity confinement seems to me very detrimental [but wouldn't this be what is called racism when that comes from White, either they are Protestant or Catholic besides?]

* Pejorative because it is implied in it the well-French racist play on words "= under-dog." But the French courts have no one of it apparently.

Why these minority claims did multiply lately?

It is related to the decline of the social one. This decline - with that of universalism - is continuous since May 1968. It is a slow phenomenon, which also proceeds of the disqualification of the Marxist analysis grid, the Marxism being regarded as related to totalitarianism.

This discredit of Marxism made it possible, in the post-students' revolt of May 68, post-modern, post-colonial, post-national, situation, to substitute, to an analysis in horizontal and classes terms, a way of cutting out the society in fragmentary groups, what I call "vertical notches." This set of themes of the "fragments," of the multitude, was particularly formalized by Toni Negri, but also by all the current called "French Theory."

These vertical identities (blacks, born of North African parents, Jews, homosexuals) are felt as more "flourishing" than the horizontal identities of class. It is enough to read a newspaper like Liberation, which is completely emblematic. This daily newspaper has completely deserted the social one, to devote itself to the societal one. Not a day goes by without it promotes some "minority" (except for that of the free natives of this country).

On the political level, these sets of themes are primarily taken over by Terra nova, which preaches an abandonment of the working classes, which would have disappeared. This "ethno-eco-bobo" left wing therefore prefers to them the urban strata, the young people, the minorities, etc. to them.

Despite all that, do not have these "entrepreneurs of ethnicity and memory" that you describe, a utility? Discrimination exists indeed...

Yes, it is the argument which is generally opposed to me. I absolutely do not deny it. Of course discrimination exists! But what do we have to put at the foreground? These discriminations or the social question?

As for me, I think that the "positive discrimination," this French and dubious transcription of the American "affirmative action," is a swindle. What is fundamental on a worldwide scale and especially in the developed countries, it is the increase in inequalities? The rich persons are increasingly rich, the poor increasingly poor, and the "middle class" shrinks away fast. It is what Alain Lipietz formerly called the "hourglass shaped," with a phenomenon of downgrading of the lower middle class, particularly in the peri-urban areas.

Discriminations are far from being a negligible phenomenon, but as for me I see there a secondary phenomenon, that some people are pleased to point out in order to mask the increasing inequalities of incomes within the developed countries. The affirmative action, which aims at counterbalancing discrimination, is besides perfectly compatible with liberal economy.

Besides that goes hand in hand with the rise of the phenomena of ethnic markets. It is known, the market does not apply to atomized individuals but to categories of customers. The companies know

very well that the market should be segmented. Thus they created a market of cosmetics for the blacks, a market of the halal intended for the Muslims, a market which concerns the homosexuals, etc.

Will be this left wing that you call "multiculturalist and post-colonial" obliged to realize, little by little, its societalist misguided ways?

They will end up being obliged to do that! It will be well necessary that the left-wing deals again with the "poor white settlers," as it is said.

Does the rise of parties like the National Front express, for you, a rise of racism, or can we see other causes there?

I think that it is necessary to ponder on the European level. Huntington was much criticized but he anticipated largely "the clash of civilizations" which really occurs.

What do you answer those which consider that racism would come from the top that it would be inspired to the people by the "elites?"

I agree in no way with that. Of what elites do we speak? If you speak of the political elite, we may indeed note a radicalization. But this more radically shift to the right-wing was made possible by several factors. Firstly, by the distance of the memory of the Second World War and the fact that Gaullism exists no longer [In France, but did it really exist outside the general De Gaulle, wasn't it Gaullism only an alibi or a G-string of the most traditional right-wing? What did you do in 1940? I was Gaullist m Sir, answered Maurice Papon]. Then because the discredit brought on Communism and Marxism deprived the left-wing of its role of true alternative model. As for the multicultural and postcolonial left wing, it should well be said that it harbors the phenomenon.

What proves well, once more, the urgency to separate from the societal bandages and to return to the social one. It is suited to adapt but also to regenerate the Marxism realism, on the one hand, and to keep alive, on the other hand, universalism.

Two drawbacks show nevertheless that it is difficult to be intelligent until the end.

Firstly, it is false to make the equation NF = French of stock, it would be more right of speaking about French of stock AND EQUATED PERSONS.

Secondly, Jean-Loup Amselle speaks about the Catholic pregnancy in France BUT FOR HOW LONG (like many intellectuals he is unable to anticipate the future, he is stronger in the analysis of the past).

First note: as he cannot psychologically speaking or by conformism admit that the NF is right on certain points, it is necessary that he finds negative ways to say the things about it.

Another notice: he is not intelligent or courageous enough to ask the right question: is (true) Islam a way of living enviable, in conformity with the human rights, the progress, the intelligence, etc.???

BECAUSE IF THE ANSWER TO THIS QUESTION IS NO THEN THOSE WHO ARE ANXIOUS ABOUT ITS PROGRESSION ARE RIGHT COMPLETELY AND THOSE WHO DO NOT WORRY ABOUT IT... THE DANGEROUS IDIOTS.

DEVELOPMENT.

There is good reason to be literally dismayed by the intellectual and moral mediocrity of the elites in this country, i.e., particularly by that of the media people and of the politicians, or reciprocally. We have passed for several decades of the combat of ideas * (of course contestable but which at least exists) to the combat of the selfishness or of the oversized egos. When I was young that was called hubris (without confusing for as much the letter with the legitimate pride which sometimes can be felt, rightly). Our time is not characterized by its modesty.

This blind and without reflection collective fierceness (the journalists are, of course, sheeplike but they cannot prevent from following the crowd) from the French journalists....that is frightening and that undoubtedly explains the decline of this country since the end of the 20th century.

And a few weeks later, the cherry on the cake, the philosopher writer and former secretary Luke Ferry, having had the misfortune of evoking prudently and in veiled terms in order not to be against the French laws about the protection of privacy or the defamation, a pedophilia case having involved a French secretary of State passing through Morocco, of which he had been more or less informed, like several hundreds of other members of the Parisian elite, but without having been the direct witness of it (from where his prudence)...The whole of the French media (at least to 90%) instead of investigating in order to know more about this case, then set on the unhappy one who had released a bit of truth. He was thus entitled from the French media, during several days, to all kinds of names like the village idiot (South-east French : lou ravi).

Some going as far as to compare him with the authors of anonymous letters having delivered Jews to the Nazis during the Second World War. A last straw whereas he had so much taken care not to give a name or too precise information considering the laws in force in France.

An article was even published in a satirical weekly magazine usually inspired better, to insinuate that he had a fictional work (paid for lessons that he gave no longer).

Most incredible is that nobody at that time could really say who was involved, worse even, some people believed (wrongly) to be aimed and complained of being defamed (a French former secretary of State named Jack Lang for example).

And that some threats forced the first (ex) journalist having evoked these rumors on a blog (a called Thierry Desjardins) to suppress it immediately or almost (at the end of a few hours).

This display of silly things (a former minister of justice explaining, wrongly, that it was there on behalf of the unfortunate philosopher a violation of the French laws.... Such an ignorance of the elementary legal rules on behalf of a former minister of French justice... sends retrospectively shivers down your spine) lasted several days before all is brought back to righter proportions.

Luke Ferry had done nothing but adapt to the intellectual level of the debate to which he had been invited as to that of the journalists who presented it, by saying things like anybody can do it while chattering with colleagues around the coffee machine.

In short, what the former French secretary Luke Ferry did was a peccadillo, he cannot help but to descend to the level of the journalists, presenters of the program in which he took part; but what is terrifying, on the other hand, it is the almost unanimous reaction of the French media political milieus. Long live to the first amendment of the (American) Constitution.

To equate pedophilia with private life, to claim for pedophilia the legitimate respect due to the private life between consenting adults? As if the fact of engaging in sexual relations with minors were legitimate since it is done privately?

We can only lose ourselves in conjecture about the reasons for such an almost unanimous reaction from the French journalists and political French.

- Many didn't have a clear conscience in this respect and felt targeted?
- Preferred to follow the crowd.
- To act important.
- To appear important.

The deep intellectual (and moral besides) mediocrity of the French elites can be judged at a glance when certain problems are tackled. There are taboos indeed on which their intelligence freezes as paralyzed. I want to say by there that what nature gave us between the ears under the scalp of the

hair, and which is called a brain, works no longer. Same thing as in the case of the blind spot in the eye discovered by Mariotte.

Media people intellectuals and political apprentices didn't assimilate still the principle of the tongue of Aesop which can be at the same time the worst and the best things, or the opposite and show on certain subjects a very low level of intelligence: the degree zero of the philosophical reflection is reached, it is the level class of 7-year-old pupils. When a sage points out the moon, the French intellectuals (journalists or political officials) look at the finger. Unlike the fingers wars violence and rifles are hateful things in oneself of which it would be well of being able to do without them. But rifles violence and wars can also be the only means quickly effective to put an end to the man's exploitation of man the constraint the slavery and the injustice even if 8 years of fight are necessary for that. A weapon can certainly be used to commit a crime but can also protect.

You can kill with a knife. Should the knives be prohibited??? To handle with precautions and not to be put in all the hands, of course, but to prohibit them?

However it is usual of reading under the pen of the French intellectuals philosophers media people or political apprentices, remarks which show well that in many fields they did not reach yet the level of wisdom of our Constitution.

It is indeed common of reading under the pen of the French intellectuals philosophers media people or political apprentices, remarks of the kind...

Nation, national identity, citizenship, language, community of language, cultural identity, family, border and frontier check (we could just as easily add shovels spades pickaxes and handles of pickaxes) are dangerous ideas, dangerous concepts, they can kill; therefore it is necessary...

- To do everything so that shovels spades pickaxes (and handles of pickaxes especially) exist no longer (for example to make big public burning with them).

- To prohibit, morally first, by discrediting them systematically (critical denigration, etc.) shovels pickaxes and rakes (to point out for example systematically that God is against because he had not envisaged them at the beginning for his gardener (He just agree to double the staff by manufacturing Eva starting from - yes because it is a god who always needs an initial raw material like the Tohu wa-bohu- a rib from Adam).

- To legally prohibit in the second time the maintenance or the repair of hammers shovels screwdrivers (you can kill with a screwdriver).

- To start to discuss the question if it would not be necessary to cut the hands of everyone systematically (because man can also kill with his own hands too. The feet it is more difficult therefore that it should work, but the hands it is sure).

- To refuse on the face of things every idea of new man through the restoration of the best of the former one, even when you are Christian, by firmly condemning the words of the epistle to the Ephesians (4.24).

By reasoning like that (if we can call reasoning such a mental process because it is in fact less reasoning than conditioned reflexes or repetition by psittacism of ideas in fact worked out in other brains); we could just as easily say that democracies and freedoms are certainly responsible for many more wars and dead than the British monarchy of 1775 to 1785.

That parliamentary democracies make wars (start military operations) in order to establish or to consolidate Islamic Republics, Islamic kingdoms or caliphates, is, of course, a policy, but wouldn't this be that of Gribouille?? The French journalists dream themselves as revolutionists, but is not revolutionary who wants to be so! In the time of my (misspent) youth we confused by no means, vanguardism (a vanguard is indeed by definition followed by the people) and petty bourgeois adventurism.

* Like the ecology or the (sustainable , understood well) degrowth, the defense of the languages and cultures in the world (in acts, not in words only) even of the civilizations, the criticism of the religions or the development of a new spirituality, the fight against the man's exploitation of man, the fair trade.... Policy (in the noble sense of the term) must take precedence over economy. When the fish or the game are missing, it is up to the tribe as a whole (the very evident majority of its adults) to decide after having lengthily discussed about it, if it is still necessary to remain a year on the spot, or to go upstream the course of the river, even to go beyond the mountain in order to explore new tracks. If it is not to do the opposite (to go down the river to the ocean).

Either the decision is made by an almost consensual vote or by a chief after consultation of the members (most influential?) of the tribe, it does not matter. A good chief can always associate with his decision the maximum of members of his tribe (like this, in the event of failure, he will be easily able to highlight the fact that he was far from being alone, quite to the contrary, of this opinion). But it is true that it is not always easy, see the case of the Cheyenne Autumn filmed in 1964: the tribe and even the families are torn in two strictly equal halves (splendid scenes by John Ford in this respect, one of the most beautiful films of the kind with the big sky of Howard Hawks in 1952, the year of my birth).

BONDY BLOG.

The president of the Republic donned his new uniform yesterday at the Polytechnic School in Palaiseau, that of the architect of the brotherly compromises. Nicholas Sarkozy learned the lessons from the Obama. It was well necessary to do something between the historical November 4, 2008, the day of the American elections, and the not less planetary establishment of the entering of the future US president in the White House, on next January 21st.

This period of time is completely comfortable to get involved in the interbreeding: "to take up the challenge of the interbreeding that the 21st century lays down for us. The Republic, during centuries, always crossed cultures, ideas, histories." President Barack Obama is warned, France too, also changes.

The problem with Nicholas Sarkozy, it is that a terrible force emerges from his speech, a moral strength, an intellectual strength. He is a hurricane, but as soon as you leave the eye of the cyclone, it is nothingness everywhere. In other words, the catalog presented yesterday is a true letter to Santa Claus. Each one is free to believe in it or not, and if necessary to put down one's shoe under the tree. After the state education and its procession of measures to support excellence, the assistance to prepare the competitive exams, the experimentation of the anonymous CV to prevent that the application of Babacar will join that of Luis in the dustbins of the Human resources managers, the President dwells one moment on the political life. He gets his breath back and announces: "All the political parties have a considerable delay to catch up. Few candidates resulting from the minorities stand for the vote, even less elected. This situation is unjust." I believed to hear a militant of the Movement Suburb Immigration or then the spokesperson of the "Natives of the Republic." In order to insist, he adds: "What can be the legitimacy of a political community in which a good portion of the population does not recognize itself?" My pen falls on the ground, I have no longer the strength to write, I shiver. And he overdoes it: "To introduce more diversity, it is necessary to renew thoroughly the political class. I wish therefore that the parties commit to implement a diversity charter. Their public financing could be dependent on the respect of their commitments." Martine Aubry and Xavier Bertrand must know it, before coming to seek the tip, it will be necessary to prove their credentials. The end of the speech approaches, the president shows signs of fatigue, he stumbles over certain words, calls out to his ministers and some personalities in the forefront. He announces the name of the new diversity foreman, Yazid Sabeg, diversity and equal opportunity commissioner. An architect always needs a foreman. It is him who will have to take the responsibility for the delays. The latter has three months to put everyone facing the front with as a roadmap a speech concluded by this sentence: "We must change and we will change." Obama inspires others. Sabeg will have to meet the deadlines... Nordine Nabili. Thursday 12/18/2008.

The Secretary of State for the town, Fadela Amara today on France 2... with the speech of the President, including in the nomination of Yazid Sabeg (as diversity commissioner, Editor's Note), it is the interbreeding which is the challenge of the 21st century." AFP 12/17/2008 | Update: 20:55.

COMMENTARY BY PETER DELACRAU.

The president throws himself in the affirmative action or discrimination...

It is obviously easier to encourage or support a basic movement working since already quite a lot of decades in our societies, than to make the SOCIAL Revolution, to organize the obligatory degrowth which will be imposed on us by necessity, so that this one occurs in the best possible conditions, i.e., by concerning firstly the rich person, or to fight finally effectively against religious alienation, all the religious alienations!!

The intrinsically confusion monger characteristic, contained in the word diversity, in this kind of conventional speech, however, delivered in front of the elite of the nation, without nobody reacting, says a lot about the level of collective intelligence of the today Frenchmen.

Three notions as different as important and serious, each one, are indeed confused in this kind of speech.

- a) The social one, the social policy. Never the word “worker” will have been as used. Are missing only the farmers and the employees to have some Marxism.
- b) The bodily (or cultural) interbreeding. Also confused with the simple juxtaposition of differences, a little as in a mosaic. Idea in vogue which, IN THE FACTS, goes hand in hand with an accelerated disappearance of the minority languages and ethnic groups. What is wrong?
- c) Racial discrimination (renamed affirmative action).

As we already had the opportunity to say it, the best means of starting an unfathomable display of silly things (in France at least) is to tackle the question of races and racism! Or of religion besides! It is unanswerable! We can wonder if human intelligence doesn't need, to function normally or brilliantly (otherwise) of a blind spot, like the eye, which is, however, an admirable organ, a true wonder of nature. Specialists call Mariotte's blind spot this Bermuda Triangle in which any capacity of Man to well see the things is swallowed.

Let us point out our position. We are not anti-racists, because this intellectual attitude involves too much idiocy, ignorance, or pseudo-science. We are quite simply non-racialists, i.e., in no way obsessed by these questions but especially worried by the defense of our freedoms or of our differences (minority languages like the Gaelic, the Navajo, our various ways of cooking, of wooing the other sex, etc.).

Therefore no incitement or obligation to interbreeding, in order to avoid consanguinity or to improve the human race or what I still know! It is there to speak like a horse breeder, or cattle breeder, who crosses his animals! In this field let us only laws of love and chance.... decide and let's not do as the world of advertising (thus the dominant ideology) which visibly advocates crossbreeding!

As for the existence of a Jewish race, see work of the Austrian historian Shlomo Sand about the Khazars, the Berbers, etc. and not those of Marek Halter.

N.B. As regards the possible characterization of subgroups * inside the animal species that a zoologist has one day very justly called “the naked ape”; it is currently spoken about gene frequency, or genetics of populations.

* And the ape became....Idiot! Enthusiasts take note: the expression wants by no means to say “lower group” but subdivision of a group.

When Solzhenitsyn took the floor on June 8, 1978, in Harvard, it was to denounce the weakening of courage in the western world. He did not hesitate to say to the students of the university whose motto is Veritas, in substance and in short, what follows.

Firstly. This lowering of courage is particularly perceptible in the leading class and in the dominant intellectual class of the society, from where the feeling that courage deserted the whole society.

Secondly. The History, the true one, which is not that of personalities or heroes, but that of the low-ranking persons, obscure persons or of the nobodies, in short of the people (or of the society); is made, of course, independently of the characters who occupy the small screens of our television sets, all day long.

Independently for example of the clergymen, rabbis, or priests, or all those who wrote books or make films even work in the media. Although we should not underestimate the importance of the media men or women, they are opinion makers. i.e., in other words, that by manipulating information, they end up little by little making their personal ideas pass in reality. An all the more easy thing as, generally, they act masked, under the pretext of objectivity when they are journalists, or under the pretext of fiction stories when they are authors of TV series. The election of Barack Hussein Obama in 2008, with 52% of the votes, is the perfect illustration of the role of the fourth estate played by the authors of TV series or the media; and we write that while having, however, leant towards him without hesitation, but in all clearness.

There were also catastrophic books for Mankind, considering their deeply criminogenic nature: Torah, Koran, Mein Kampf, Necronomicon.

I hesitate to include the New Testament in this short list because of its very composite nature, and it is true that certain of its passages are also clearly criminogenic. But the parables of the type of that of

the woman taken in adultery, and its conclusion (let anyone who is without sin be the first to throw a stone) are always good and useful, to be meditated.

In short, independently of all those who are officially nice and smart; and who explains to us all day long that if we are not of their opinion, or that if we do not have their tastes about such or such subject; (God or the Demiurge, the religion, America, immigration, freedom to undertake, La Fayette, France, the battle of Fort Ticonderoga 1) it is because we do not know that, that we did not understand, that we are unaware of that... (By the way what? What are these truths that we don't know?)

Independently especially of the mass media which format the minds (journalists or anchorwomen of the TV screen...) or of the TV film-makers, who impose their ideas as well as their personal views; by selecting among the thousands of possibilities given to our understanding, and the information and the commentary, or by always staging in their TV film or their report a society; which is not that to which they had to deal with, whether it is in the past or in the present, but that they would like to see becoming the standard (without saying it explicitly). Or conversely.

It is completely normal and natural to have one's ideas about the ideal society, were they rather surface (in any case by no means radical, because not attacking most important). To ease one's conscience in a cheap way, helps to live. But it would be necessary that there are not too many contradictions in this ideal society.

It is not very honest to move masked or not to post this bias clearly, however legitimate, we said it; especially in a (TV) film supposed to be realistic, supposed to speak about the society such as it is, or such as it was, not about the "ideal" society (the quotation marks are necessary with regard to this adjective). What to think of the man or of the woman who, at the beginning of the 16th century in Europe, would have spread a report showing that you could say or do anything as regards religion, that it had no importance. As for me I do not think much good about it. For your information the wars of religion in our History caused more deaths than all the other wars. About such serious subjects, the right to say anything and especially things contrary to the truth, should not be allowed; and Justice would have it that they are those who are responsible who hold the bag, it is to those who encouraged these dramatic errors to undergo the consequences of them (deaths, rapes, sufferings, destruction and tortures) not to the others! And the ape became idiot! The devil of Man t is his own stupidity, it is the stupidity that he spreads unceasingly in his despaired efforts to do good (according to him). Better is a smart malicious man (Didn't say Emperor Tiberius that a good shepherd shears his flock without flaying it) than a nice man only persuaded to be so (sin of hubris). The road to Hell is paved with good intentions! As Pascal said it one day: "Man is neither angel nor beast, and unhappily whoever wants to act the angel, acts the beast".

Nietzsche has had one day very harsh words for Christians. I wonder if we should not apply them to the journalists of mass media or the makers of films and programs, unable to see the forest for the trees right underneath their nose.

What is missing to all these opinion makers, to all these officially nice and smart people, to these sorcerers' apprentices, it is the reflection on an overall vision.

Example.

Every human being is entitled to the life. This is my absolute conviction.

But to this dogma, I bring at once the five following specifications.

Firstly, by life, I naturally understand a worthy and in no way miserable life.

Secondly, I find perfectly normal that a society tries to get rid of its most dangerous elements (and there I think of all kinds of means, of which banishment, exile, relegation, and not necessarily the death penalty).

Thirdly, without being in favor myself personally (sic) of the death penalty, I am not shocked by the latter if it is applied to the really most serious crimes; and if there is no, but then no doubt as for the culpability (crime not only acknowledged, but with some elements making impossible the miscarriage of justice, for example the indication of the place where the body can be found, red-handed man, etc.); the defenders of the death penalty applied under these conditions and who are of my friends... will remain friends, and I will never hesitate to have a drink with them.

Fourthly, it is impossible to regard as a completed human being a human ovum fertilized for only eight minutes. I am therefore in favor of the right to abortion of the women. It is not less obvious that to have an abortion whereas the embryo is eight months old remains nevertheless a crime if it is not an accident.

Between eight minutes and eight months, there is a happy medium to find. It is up to each one to find it. As for me, I will refrain from expressing any opinion on this subject. What say scientists, for example?? A piece of advice nevertheless, draw aside from the beginning the opinion of those who

claim themselves to be religious persons. God or the Demiurge have only to solve our problems upstream.

Fifthly, let us not be stupidly Christian. Every man being entitled to the life, therefore has the right to defend oneself in the event of an attack endangering him. He has even the duty to intervene when it is not him, but others who are endangered by such aggression. The intrinsic right to self-defense is part of the natural right of each individual (of the *recht aicnid*). But the response must naturally be proportioned with the attack (I do not find normal to kill a chicken thief) and should aim only the persons guilty of this attack, not their neighbors or their brothers.

Same thing for private property, immigration, free enterprise, etc.

What is also missing to our time, it is to call a spade a spade (and Mr. Rollet a rascal).

Often besides simply for lack of intelligence and instruction, as the thousands of French journalists inventors of the Belarus (capital: Minsk) after the fall of the Soviet empire [whereas Bielorrussia (White Russia) existed already and was fully enough].

It is true that to require of a journalist to be educated and cultivated, it is to require much. It is already a conscience, so... Knowledge and reflection would do nothing but muddle him.

It is true also that France has quite a strange characteristic. That which consists in artificially creating problems which did not exist (up to that point at least, and in such a place) in order to be pleased then to spend one or two centuries by solving them.

That of marching per million in the streets with passion and eagerness (media bashing, lawsuits, and so on) against an idea, with politicians of all stripes leading them. Example Mr. Hubert Falco campaigning against the arrival of the train at Very High Speed in the French department of the Var, whereas all was ready for that, at the time; then, his combat having succeeded, fighting thirty years after with as much as eagerness for the arrival of this TGV so much disparaged by him in his good town of Toulon, but, of course, with much more cost and damage to the environment, into the bargain. You saddle today and ride out tomorrow. When 100% of people are mistaken, there is some excuse to be misled like them.

When 99% of people are mistaken, there is still some excuse to be misled with them.

But when there are only 80% of them?? There is in this case no excuse, at least for who wants himself to be better or more intelligent in short, being a member of the elite. You saddle today and ride out tomorrow!

We will never underline enough the role incredibly harmful for Mankind; played by the fourth estate which is the media class as a whole (journalists, presenters, stars); starting from second half of the 20th century.

For three primary reasons.

The first is the mediocrity of their intellectual level. The mediocrity of the intellectual level of the main actors of this "tribe." Let us not speak here about intelligence since, as Binet said it to get out this trick question, the intelligence, it is what my tests measure. The fact which remains, on the other hand, it is the weakness of their general knowledge, which makes them unable to rectify the cock-up made by one of their fellow members or collaborators, automatically; and their incredible lack of profundity, philosophical or other.

It is enough to hear the incredible naivety or superficiality of some of their questions or of their comments, even of their guilty silences. And don't tell me that it is a false naivety in order to get in tune with the public. It is far from being always the case!

The second characteristic of these workers who would be very hurt to be regarded as practical persons or employees is their cowardice.

Oh! Admittedly, there are exceptions, generally moved by careerism or a wild will "to get on" (the quotation marks are necessary) at all costs.

But the vast majority of the men or women of media prefer to go in the way of the world or at least of what they believe being the way of the world.

For example, how many were the intellectuals openly anti-Nazi in the occupied Europe of 1940???

How many were the intellectuals openly anti-Bolshevik or anti-Soviet in Eastern Europe around 1950, even in certain countries having the characteristic to have a very strong Communist party (example France)???

Answer: very little! Worse even, the majority of the media men or women were more or less hostile, or at the very least hardly favorable, to the rare intellectuals then savagely against the USSR;

systematically equated with the fascistic extreme rightwing; except, of course, for the McCarthyism which was a movement exactly of the same nature, but with a reversed polarity.

To this, rather ideological, first cowardice, of the journalist, or of the media man ; is added that which consist , indeed, in having always the last word (to circumvent a right to reply being a child's play); in choosing among the multitude of daily information, or not of today besides, that they want to blow out of proportion in order to highlight it; and finally, for the information journalist , in wearing a mask : i.e., in presenting as a granted natural obviousness what only the result of his personal commitment is.

Third reason explaining this incredibly harmful part played by the men or the women of this fourth estate; in addition to the two previous ones (their lack of general knowledge and philosophical profundity, as well as their cowardice in all its forms); is their exaggerated careerism. They are ready to sell their soul to the devil to rise in the (social or not) hierarchy, to have more increased incomes, or a higher standard of living.

For that the journalist is always ready to fly to jump on the bandwagon and to flatter or to spare all the powers, whatever they are.

The result of all that is that very serious problems for the survival of peoples, of cultures, of civilization, and even of Mankind; could not be taken on frankly in time, could not be discussed thoroughly in the society before, and therefore solved, in a satisfactory way.

Yes, definitely, we will never underline enough the role incredibly harmful for Mankind; played by the fourth estate which is the media class as a whole (journalists, presenters, stars); starting from the second half of the 20th century.

1) 106 dead and 266 casualties this day. The marquis de Montcalm submitted to his chiefs a report doubling the figures. The fort, whose garrison was withdrawn to defend Quebec, will be occupied by Jeffrey Amherst.

THE TRUE NEOCONS OF TODAY.

In the current democracies, more and more free citizens feel limed, pitched by a kind of viscous doctrine which, imperceptibly, wraps any free reasoning, inhibits it, disturbs it, paralyzes it and ends up choking it. These doctrines, it is the one track thinking, the only authorized by an invisible and omnipresent police of opinion.

Since the fall of the Berlin Wall, the collapse of the Communist regimes and the loss of credibility of socialism, the arrogance, the haughtiness and the insolence of this new Gospel reached such a level that we may, without exaggerating, call this ideological fury a modern dogmatism.

The word right thinking is the term which is suited to speak about the political correctness of certain categories of intellectuals. It also designates an alienating social environment in which a form of intellectual terrorism prevails.

The works of the professors Noam Chomsky and Edward Hermann (the manufacturing consent) showed that the media finally influenced only little the mass of the public opinion; but that the media and the written press influenced only those who read them or listen to them (tautology). The problem is that those who read them or listen to them are part of the decision-making pseudo-elite, of the small world of the decision makers OF WHOM WE SHOULD ESPECIALLY NOT OVER-ESTIMATE THE INTELLIGENCE NOR THE CRITICAL MIND.

The main weak point of the democracies we said, it is the quality of its media people. A fish always rots from the head down.

In addition to the fact that certain discussions with political actors of the foreground do not comprise a critical question, as we have signaled it higher, this "business" editorial orientation called journalism of market also implies a form of imitation or herd instinct.

The imitation is the reproduction of the behaviors, of the attitudes of others. However we observe a strong imitation between the editorial boards which are inspired the one from the other. The journalists often come from the same social background and studied in similar schools. That leads to a "bowl" effect due to the Parisian centralization and to the passing in the universities. i.e., that the journalists, because of their permanent contacts, like goldfish in their aquarium, end up influencing themselves mutually.

That can also lead to what we may call a "magnifying effect." i.e., that certain information is largely expounded, followed and discussed whereas others are almost not popularized through media. Thus, some information is developed and hides others. That can give to the citizens an unbalanced vision of the various facts of the moment.

I am often accused to reproach to the media people for being intellectually dishonest persons, and therefore by thus misinforming the general public to play a great part in the delay of the necessary awakenings, with respect to the very serious challenges to be answered for the future.

But how is it possible to head an article "The religion will be absent from Tunisian Constitution" whereas in the body of the aforementioned text it is specified in black and white that all the political parties in the country agreed to preserve the first article of the current fundamental law, which declares that Islam is the religion and Arabic the official language of the country.

To be noticed. The website Algeria Focus the duty to know, itself, had had the intellectual honesty, or the intelligence, there too elementary, to add after, in the same title and with the same size of characters, the important very important nuance which changes everything: "Ennahda says."

How is it possible to put on the same level a few hundreds of fundamentalist Christians demonstrating in the streets against a breach against their religion, and hundreds of thousands even tens of millions fundamentalist Muslims attacking some churches including by shedding blood? (N.B this figure is gotten by adding the estimation of the crowds in question, over a short period of time, but in the whole world, from Indonesia to Nigeria through Pakistan.)

In the Pakistan "when a person is accused of blasphemy, everyone comes, sets fire to his house and, sometimes, kills him." This process based on the popular vindication is, of course, not envisaged by the law. Nevertheless, this one supports it largely in fact, considering the extensive nature of the criminalized behaviors and the disproportion of the punishments. Very severe, and being able to go to the death penalty for the person accused of blasphemy, much more lenient for the authors of the

lynching. N.B. The law prohibiting blasphemy in Pakistan was passed under the dictatorship of the general Zia ul-Haq, in 1986.

But which is the State today, except for the Vatican and Monaco perhaps, where Christianity is the only official religion or at least officially dominating??

How is it possible for example, to speak of interdenominational confrontations in Nigeria, without only once mentioning the religious membership of the victims or of the attackers?

Case of the AFP dispatch of the 05/11 at 09:48 which speaks only about attacked churches or of dead, without other precise details. And let the Frenchmen responsible for this dispatch not come to speak to us about their good faith, the need for being careful, etc. (in this case they even did not have to speak about church but only about religious buildings). Anyway their fellow members themselves, had at least the honesty to mention that the suspicions strongly weighed on the Muslim sect of Boko Haram. These journalists of the AFP therefore have either knowingly tried to mislead the reader in a hurry, in this case, or then they are not intelligent enough to have the perspective or the high-mindedness which makes able to see the forest for the trees. In both cases (intellectual dishonesty or lack of minimal profundity in the analysis), it is serious.

MISCELLANEA.

The Crown Clinic in Manchester specialized in the plastic surgery asked to 1000 women in 2014 the question, "What would be the ideal face of the perfect man according to you?" Two faces were carried out then by Doctor Asim Shahmalak, one for the men under 30, the other for the men over 30. The result is a little from George Clooney, Ryan Gosling or Bradley Cooper, Brad Pitt's nose, David Beckham's beard...

Let here the big HitleroTrotskyist idiot that I am, reaffirm to the nice and smart people that there is no accounting for taste and that beauty is always subjective. Therefore that we can doubt the level of philosophical profundity (10 out of 10? 9 out of 10? 8 out of 10, less??) of the media which generalize implicitly the results from such a survey which do nothing but betray the current world domination of the Anglo-Saxon models (what was called imperialism when I was young) not the rigor and the accuracy of their reasoning). Our civilization today has only to offer such futilities, our civilization became the civilization of the plastic surgery for celebrities.

Nios fearr a bheith bocht, ach a bheith tú féin, a bheith saibhir ach a bheith eile. Sinn-Fein!
Better is worth to be poor, but to remain oneself, that to be rich, but by becoming another one.

The next wars will be cultural, some true spiritual battles to make the hearts and the souls lean in such or such direction, such or such camp. To what is useful indeed the heaviest of the materials if in control of the latter, there is somebody who balks to use it, worse even, who turns it against you???

The most stable political regimes are those based on the rock of the crass selfishness inherent in the man and rooted in the thick hotbed which is the human stupidity. Servility makes stupid, servility kills intelligence.

The one-track thinking is an absence of thought.

The slogans serve as thought for them. The slogans of the kind Bush murderer or Canada Land of welcome serve as reflection for them. However even if Bush is not your cup of tea (since 1173?) it should be admitted well that the things are nevertheless more complicated than that.

The generalization of English to the whole planet had as an inevitable consequence...

a) A loss in local color even in precision of the language, loss due to generalizations of the English selected and practiced by the non-native English speakers. The Globish or global English IS A UNDER-ENGLISH

b) A world fall of the intellectual level of Mankind, particularly in international politics: oversimplification and hypocrisy.

c) Not counting in the cultural even civilizational field the loss in human biodiversity.

However the problems caused by a certain way of thinking cannot by definition be solved by those very ones who caused them, by the same type of brain. It is necessary for that to have a radically different way of seeing the things, to be non-conformist, to have resisted the road roller of the dominant ideology resulting from the globalization.

A problem cannot be solved by the very brain which caused it. It is necessary or to change brain or to rely on someone else.

* In fact, I voluntarily omitted to give the complete listing in order to give more intensity to my expression . But the complete listing is here:

The States below recognize the mentioned Christian denomination as being their official religion:

Catholicism: The Vatican, Monaco, Liechtenstein, Andorra, Malta. Some Swiss cantons.

Are actually densely populated only Argentina, Haiti, Costa Rica, El Salvador.

Orthodoxy: Greece.

Reformed Christianity. Denmark, Iceland, Norway. And always some Swiss cantons.

Not forgetting the a little special case of Anglicanism in England.

But how much million people concerned in all that??? Compared to Iran Saudi Arabia, Pakistan, Bangladesh etc.etc? ?

APPENDIX No. 1: AN EXAMPLE OF MASSIVE MISINFORMATION : THE MEDIA TREATMENT OF INDIA AND OF SIMILAR CASES ACCORDING TO FRANCOIS GAUTIER

(journalist born in Paris in 1959, established in Auroville close to Pondicherry in India since 1969).

OUR MOTHER INDIA.

India is the perfect example of how a tremendous, rich, contrasted, nation, whose five times thousand-year-old civilization survived all the pangs of its history, can be been ignored, distorted, minimized, degraded by Western journalism.

And yet, a correspondent in office cannot find a richer in subjects country: not only something always occurs there - elections, changes of governments, great sways in the crowd - but India is also a country of a formidable diversity, where all the great religions in the world coexist, where the most astonishing ethnoses live side by side, where to pass from north to south is equivalent to the change of habits, language and climate, that you can feel when you fly from New York to Athens. You also discover here material for unpublished and captivating subjects of magazine, whether it is the Ayurveda medicine, the oldest medical system still in practice in the world, containing only plants and minerals, or the Kalaripayattu, the ancestor of all the great martial arts in Asia, which left towards China and Japan with Buddhism, or the Pranayama, the breathing science that the Indians have developed for three thousand years and which give astonishing results to those who practice it.

But what do you see about India on television? Firstly, it is spoken about her only when some major event occurs there: if Rajiv Gandhi is assassinated, or if there are elections - and more, the greatest democracy of the world has only the right to a short mention at the end of the newspaper - or if an earthquake happens there, as that was the case recently. The Kumbh-Mela at Allahabad in January 2001 shows once again, to what extent the television, when it is interested in India, focuses only on the anecdotes, the superfluous one, distorts all and changes what is beautiful and noble in a trade show with dubious images. The media were interested only in the international stars (Madonna, Demi More, Richard Gere, etc.), who came to the Kumbha Mela, whereas they were only a handful of anonymous persons among millions; they were lingered over uninteresting angles: the luxury tents for foreigners in lack of spirituality, Hindu sages with a cellphone next to their ear, the "Hindu nationalists" who recover the Mela...

Couldn't one find more extraordinary than four twenty million souls converged by plane, by car, on horseback, on foot, towards a place that they consider as sacred, only to speak to what is beyond us, to this immanent Force towards which the men turned for thousands years? But not, all what Western televisions found useful to do was to film naked, or lying on beds of spines, sadhus. Always these disparaging images of India, this colonialist superior mind which remains in the vision than the western journalists have of India.

Today, our mother India, unknown, ignored, belittled by journalists and Indianists, fights alone in South Asia against a certain form of Asura embodied by Muslim fundamentalism.

India, in addition to the Kashmiri problem, indeed must face a true Islamist threat in South Asia, because, on the one hand: she is surrounded by Moslem countries which are radically hostile to her : the Pakistan, of course, the rival brother, born from the refusal of the Muslims, who formerly conquered and ruled over Indies, to be minority in a free India; the Pakistan, theocratic country, where the religious minorities are regarded as second-class citizens, when they are not victims of pogroms; the Pakistan, which made the jihad a national business, encouraging the separatism in the states of which it shares the border with India. Afghanistan too, whose reputation of militant fundamentalism is no longer to be made; but the United States and the Europe, physically far away from Afghanistan, have to undergo only indirectly this fundamentalist threat, whereas India must cope with it daily.

THE NAZISLAMISM IN INDIA.

In addition, the Indian government never knows if the loyalty of its important Muslim minority (120 million) goes firstly to Islam and then to India, or vice versa; many Indian Muslims go and work in the Gulf States and return pervaded with a much harder and intransigent Islam; Saudi Arabia sponsors thousands of mosques and madrasas (religious schools) into the most remote villages of India, which is a true insurgency, giving rise to terrorist groupuscules, such as Al Ulema, in Kerala, responsible for many bomb attacks. And if at least the non-Muslim neighboring states were some allies; but they often show an active hostility towards India: for example the Sri Lanka, of which the Sinhalese majority supports a true phobia of the Indian giant.

Among foreign correspondents, people like to say "that these small countries are afraid by the shade from the Indian giant." This is a true historical misinterpretation. Because not only Hindu India never invaded another country to impose her religion and her habits, like Islam and Christianity (also Buddhism, even if it was in a non-violent way) did, but many persecuted in the East minorities found refuge in India: the Christians from Syria or of St. Thomas, the driven out from Iran Parsees * the Jews fleeing the Romans (India is probably the only country in the world where the Jews were never persecuted) the Arab merchants, the Armenians, today the Tibetans; all these communities thrived and could practice in peace their religion. Unfortunately, the contrary is not valid: the Hindus are members of the most persecuted faith in the world: that began with the first Arab invasions in 711 and continued with the waves of successive invasions of Turks, Afghans, Iranians, whose incursions often constituted true holocausts.

The American historian Will Durant thinks that "The Muslim Conquest of India is probably the bloodiest story in history. It is a discouraging tale, for its evident moral is that civilization is a precarious thing, whose delicate complex of order and liberty, culture and peace may at any time be overthrown by barbarians invading from without or multiplying within" (Our Eastern heritage. 1954, p. 459).

He is not the only historian to be frightened with consequences of these invasions.

Professor K.S. Lal in his book "the growth of the Muslim population in Medieval India" estimates that between the only years 1000 to 1525.80 million Hindus were killed directly (without speaking of the famines and other natural disasters generated by the war), perhaps the largest holocaust in the history of Mankind, he affirms. The Bahmani Sultans, who governed central India, have set themselves a quota of 100,000 Hindus each year and seem to have respected it. In 1399, the famous Tamerlane did better, he killed 100,000 Hindus in only one day, a record.

And if at least this hatred from Islam for India was extinct with the death in exile in Burma of the last Mogul king. But it was reincarnated in the Pakistan for which the 850 million Hindus, who form the enormous majority in India, by definition remain the infidels. And what the Quran says? "Slay the idolaters wherever you find them, and take them (captive), and besiege them, and prepare for them each ambush" (Surah 9, verse 5).

Today still, the cemeteries of martyrs, the shahid, whether it is in Chechnya, or in Palestine, are holy places used for political ends. Who saw the burial of a "martyr" at Srinagar, capital of the Kashmir, when the men hold up the coffin at arm's length, such a trophy, and the women start to lament and to tear off their hair - especially if foreign journalists are present - can be sure that the same scene is repeated in Bosnia, in Palestine, in Chechnya, or in Afghanistan.

The West must understand that India is not only a shield of pro-Western democracy, in an Asia in the grip of dictatorships and intolerance, but that she fights, alone, courageously, against the Muslim fundamentalism, which is ready to set ablaze all Asia, from the Tajikistan to the Kashmir, from Afghanistan to Indonesia.

But if some correspondent in office at Delhi has the courage to report what he sees with his own eyes, he is immediately taxed with being Islamophobic and pro-Hindu, or even fascist and racist – the last straw!

Another historical and even contemporary misinterpretation. India was never characterized by an excess of nationalism; the Indian National Congress, to which the historical books attribute the independence of India, was for a long time a docile subject of Her Majesty, who required only privileges within the British Empire. Ten centuries of bloody invasions blunted besides considerably the intrepidity of the Hindus that Gandhi himself accused of "cowardice." As soon as there is the

shadow of a risk of riots, or even of strikes, the Hindu shuts himself up, in his premises, and goes out no longer from them. The Hindus continue to be tolerant almost to stupidity, adore to turn the left cheek when they were slapped on the right one. The Bharatiya Janata Party is not an exception to the rule: its reactions to the hijacking of 1999 by Muslim separatists supported by Afghanistan and Pakistan, or to the recent mutilation of Indian soldiers by Bangladeshis, remain in the purest tradition of the Hindu "tolerance" (i.e., that you do not react and that you shut up).

They are also the French Indianists who are responsible for the label "Hindu nationalists," (sometimes even "fascistic") with which as of the beginning the Bharatiya Janata Party was taxed. If at least our Indianists, subsidized by the State (and the taxpayer) tolerated the diversity of points of view. But no, there is intellectual terrorism: on the least deviation of the "political correctness" about India, they retorts with numerous requests for rights to reply, outrage letters to the editor, or even by not very ethical maneuvers which aim at muzzling the impertinent one. As a result: the French always hear the same story on India, because each time a newspaper, or a journal wants a commentary about India, remote and rebarbative country par excellence, it turns towards the National Center for Scientific Research or its affiliate members. And the influence of the NCSR is not only felt on the left wing, but also in major daily newspapers of the right-wing, of which the Foreign departments, when it is a question of judging India, fall into the same trap, as we saw recently, during the visit of the Indian President in France, when a newspaper of right-wing lingered heavily over the "untouchability" of Mr. Narayanan with a lot of titles, subtitles and introductory paragraphs, and implied that India "was governed by Hindu fanatics."

This enormously shocked at the same time the Indian government and the public opinion in India, so much that the editor-in-chief of the daily newspaper in question had to write a letter of apology to the Indian President (what is known in India, but not in France). It would have been a thousand times more intelligent and true to write that in India, an untouchable can also reach the highest political, social and economic, level. But instead of that the Indianists shelled out for the usual commonplaces on the fate of "persecuted persons" of the untouchables in India, as well as of the religious minorities. It is a truth - but it is only a part of the truth - because today the differences of castes are leveled by the modern life: in the best hotels of Delhi or Bombay, the Brahman and the untouchable cannot be distinguished one from the other. Do the French know that the Brahmans, so much despised by our Indianists, are often poor and disadvantaged? Even Krishna, the blue god beloved of all the Indians, was of low caste. This affair, which looked as a diplomatic incident, could even harm the French interests, because India does not need only Mirage fighter jets, but also Airbus, nuclear power plants, as well as enormous investments in infrastructure, needs for which India could now turn to the United States, especially after the success of the visit of Clinton in the country.

Of course, there was Ayodhya. On December 6, 1992, a handful of Hindu militants demolished this mosque whose gray domes had dominated during more than four centuries the town of Ayodhya, one of the oldest and most sacred cities of Hinduism. The legend has that the god Rama, (whose Peter Brook, told us the deeds there is a few years in his Ramayana), A God cherished by all the Hindus for 3000 years, was born there. Like thousands of other Hindu temples, the sanctuary of Ayodhya was razed by the Mogul emperor Babar in the 16th century in order to build there a mosque instead. For many Hindus this mosque symbolized the humiliation of ten centuries of Muslim invasions and the abuses of Muslim war leaders, like Firuz Shah Tughlaq (1351-1388), who wrote in his notebooks: "On the day of the great Hindu Festival assembly I went there personally and I ordered that the leaders of these people and the promoters of this abomination should be put to death. I destroyed their temples and instead thereof raised mosques."

It should be underlined, on the one hand, that the destruction of this mosque is an isolated incident and that during all their history the Hindus respected not only the holy places of the other religions, but also that they often prayed in them; on the other hand, that Hindus killed nobody in Ayodhya, whereas to be avenged, the Indian Muslims, supported by the Pakistan and with the tacit agreement of Saudi Arabia (which one moment gave asylum to the "brain" of all the affair) planted bombs in the center of Bombay, attacks which made several hundreds of dead most Hindus.

* The tradition of the Christians in Kerala has that the apostle Thomas would have arrived by sea (around 52) and would have landed in Muziris on the Malabar Coast (today Cranganore). The

existence of Christians in India, evangelized by Thomas and the apostle Bartholomew, is attested as of the middle of the 2nd century by the travel to them of Pantaenus of Alexandria, sent by Demetrius, bishop of Alexandria, "at the request of legates of that nation." Pantaenus would have returned from there with a specimen of the Gospel that Matthew had written in Hebraic language and which seems to have contained only words of Jesus (some logia ?)

JOURNALISM WHEN IT DEALS WITH INDIA IS NOT A MICROSCOPE BUT A DISTORTING MIRROR.

Journalism when it is applied to India also creates icons and legends which do not always correspond to the truth. The Mahatma Gandhi, Mother Teresa and the "persecution" of Christians, for example. For the whole world, the mahatma (great soul) Gandhi embodies the fight for the Indian independence, got thanks to a remarkable technique of non-violence. But this myth, imposed on the world by journalists and writers, is completely false. The movement for the independence of India was launched well before Gandhi - in 1904, to be precise - by the first nationalists, Tilak, Deshpande and Sri Aurobindo, who recommended the departure of the English then, by force if necessary, but were accused of being insane and radical persons by the Congress (Gandhi's party). Besides the Congress was satisfied for a long time with begging some rights for the Indians timidly, but within the British Empire. The idea that it was Gandhi who won her independence for India is erroneous: during the Second World War, the mahatma was thrown into prison because he refused that his country collaborates with the allies against the threat Nazi; he called besides Hitler "my beloved brother" and advised Ethiopians, "to lie down under the shoes of the Italian horses." In 1945, England was exhausted by the war, India had been emptied from her natural resources by three centuries of colonization and Gandhi had become a thorn in the side of the British Empire. It was therefore decided to give up India, while leaving her nevertheless as poisoned chalice the partition of the subcontinent and its procession of slaughters.

Gandhi if he did not preach, an extreme and extremely rigid violence, was rather intolerant with respect to the others and his moralism was rather ambivalent. He imposed to his wife draconian conditions during his entire life, required from Indian women that they practice the sexual abstinence to overcome overpopulation; but it remains in India only million statues of Gandhi, because independent India never put into practice his ideas so much most of them were unsuited to the needs of the country.

Mother Teresa brought not only the happiness of the correspondents in office, but also that of the journalists who came to India in order to do a report. Lastly, they said to themselves, here is a subject worthy of India - THE subject - which guaranteed the TV rating and the attention of the European and French readers. Because Mother Teresa tallied perfectly in all the stereotypes, a priori, and prejudices that Kipling and the white missionaries of Tintin left to us: she picked up dying persons on the sidewalks of Calcutta and recovered the orphans whom nobody wanted - what proved that Indians still died of hunger; that they did not deal with their fellow being. She converted the poor Indians to "true" God, what proved that Indians were still these pagans of our stereotypes; that they still needed good words. In short, she was White, she was Christian and she brought civilization to the nice savages of Kipling, even if, of course, all that was not written in black and white and could not be said out loudly. What is the other side of the medal that the journalists overlooked? Mother Teresa, even if unquestionably she radiated with a great kindness, was, a little like the Mahatma Gandhi, very intolerant, had appalling fits of anger, was dictatorial and especially used all the means to convert the Indians, making last rites given to the dying persons, even if they were Hindu, baptizing the orphans she takes in and asking, including the Hindus who assisted her, to adopt "the true" religion. The Indians are very tolerant, besides the greatest fans of the Mother were Hindu; but all the same, many Indian intellectuals wondered whether Mother Teresa, who had the Indian nationality and who was the most popularized through the media symbol of India, could not have benefitted from her popularity to counterbalance the negative effect that she conveyed, by a more positive image of India. To speak about the extraordinary hospitality of this country, which adored her, or about the kindness of Indians, about the brilliant brains who were found there and who proved that all was not only poverty and destitution in India. But in her lifetime she never did it. One died - and even she was made a saint - she still will convey in the 21st century the old missionary stereotype of the Good Word brought to the pagans. Which journalist ever wrote that in his panegyrics to Mother Teresa?

That raises the issue of the “persecution” of Christians in India. It would initially be necessary to point out, as we mentioned higher, that the Syriac Christians found refuge in Kerala and could practice their faith with a complete peace of mind - it is besides the first Christian community in the world (1st century). When Vasco da Gama arrived in Kerala in 1498, he was cordially welcomed by Zamorin, the Hindu king of Calicut, then capital of Kerala, who allowed him to establish factories, on condition that they stick to these trading posts. But the Portuguese each day asked for new concessions and instead of being satisfied with the financial advantages that they derive from them, tried to establish their hegemony on the Eastern seas and to attack the ships of the other nations, what displeased Zamorin. The Portuguese got into then in dark political plots and built an alliance with the sovereign of Cochin, main rival of Zamorin. It is in 1510 that Alfonso de Albuquerque seized Goa, where he established a reign of terror, burning the heretics, crucifying the Brahmans and encouraging his soldiers to take Indian mistresses (from where the Portuguese names of many inhabitants of Goa today).

Since 1998, the journalists have accused the BJP and the groupuscules which derive from it, the RSS, the VHP, or the Bhajrang Dal, to encourage the persecution of Christians. If it is true that there were terrible incidents, such as the murder of the Australian missionary Graham Staines in 1999 by a handful of men members of a tribe in Orissa (west-central area), most incidents are the result of the imagination of journalists, particularly of the foreign correspondents, who made this subject their number one priority. Take for example the rape of the sisters in Jhabua in November 1998. This rape was supposed to be a “religious crime,” committed by Hindus, who wanted to humiliate Christians. Very few journalists made the effort to go to Jhabua, which is located in the jungles of the Madhya Pradesh (Central area). If they had done it, they would have discovered that the sisters themselves, as well as the bishop of Indore, admitted that this rape had nothing religious, but that it had been the work of Bhils gypsies, notorious for raping the women of their own tribe. Unfortunately, the rape of Jhabua is still quoted today among the cases of persecution of Christians by Hindus. In the beginning of 2001, a series of bomb attacks were committed in the churches of the Andhra Pradesh (Southern area) - and of course, the Hindus were accused. It happened unfortunately that these attacks had been perpetrated by a Muslim groupuscule having roots in Pakistan, which wanted still worsen the tensions Hindu-Christians. Most cases of persecution against the Christian minority in India (3%) are often quarrels of jealousy between converted tribes and not converted tribes. It should be known indeed that the American missionaries, particularly the Pentecostals or the Adventists, convert with million dollars the tribes and the untouchables in India, which are particularly vulnerable to the economic lure. They go even as far as placing “miracle boxes” in the churches: you make a wish - a boat of a fisherman, a loan, a grant for your son - put down the small paper in the box - and then lo and behold - a few days later your wish is fulfilled. The growth of Christendom in India is thus phenomenal since independence, particularly in certain states of the North-East, populated in majority by tribes: there were practically no Christians in Tripura in 1991 - there are 120,000 of them today! In the Arunachal Pradesh, there were 1710 Christians in 1961 - and 115000 today; in 1947 there were three churches, always in the Arunachal Pradesh - today 700 ! If at least these American and Australian missionaries practiced an open and ecumenical Christianity, but they cut completely from their roots these poor innocent people, they teach them to scorn their civilization, they teach them that entering a temple or even to wear a bindi (third eye that the married women paint on their forehead) is a “sin. Inevitably, this kind of conversion causes a few sparks to fly. The pope, when he came to India in the year 2000, proclaimed that the third millennium would be that of the evangelization of Asia - India and China being especially aimed. Are we still in conversions, by accusing the other of worshipping a false god, in stirring up the hatred and the contempt of the other cultures? This outdated, intolerant and false attitude caused so many wars, so many massacres, so many genocide. Isn't it time for the Church to put it behind it?

APPENDIX No. 2 : BOOSTER SHOT THEREFORE.

First let us remind of the fact that when a journalist is sent somewhere to do a report, he undergoes from the start several constraints. He is not free of the choice of the place. Then he must often comply with what his editor-in-chief expects from him.

For a long time, for example, a report in the Balkans could only underline the “fascistic” role of Serbs, as well as the genocide they perpetrated on the person of the “innocent” Albanians and Kosovans. And that is very symptomatic of the blindness of the contemporary journalism towards Islam. Why are media so tolerant towards Muslims, to the point of excusing almost all when it comes from them - and so intolerant towards those in the grip of the Muslim fundamentalism, whether they are the Serbs who fight against the Kosovans, the Russians trying to suppress the Muslim fundamentalism in Chechnya, or the Indians who must face a serious problem in the Kashmir.

[Note of the children of Peter DeLaCrau. With regard to the author of this compilation, he was rather for the independence of the various people of the ex-Yugoslavia].

The journalists can also play on the good intentions of the public opinion by showing us the unfortunate fate of the Albanian, Palestinian, or Chechen, refugees. It is true that the spectacle of a displaced people is disturbing and that the suffering of women and children who are not responsible for the wars of the men, seems unjustifiable.

But the French, who are interested more and more in the Tibetan Buddhism should know that for Buddhists and Hindus, every collective or individual action bears in itself its consequences. That for the Dalai Lama, for example, the Tibetan people pays today the “black karma” that it amassed during centuries: feudalism, lack of opening to the world, spirituality become too ritualistic. Therefore, still for Buddhists and Hindus, the karma of massacres made by a people, a nation, or a community, are paid sooner or later, in this life or another one. Would it be possible that the Croatians or Muslims of today pay the atrocities made by their parents and grandparents against the Serbs? From an only Cartesian point of view (which is ours) what is certain it is that the spirit of revenge can remain during at least two or three generations.

Once again, let us repeat it, the journalists are selective in the choice of their refugees; we remember for example how there are some years forty Palestinians who occupied the no-man’s-land between Israel and Palestine have monopolized the attention of the media, whereas at the same time they ignored everything of the tens of thousands of Sikh and Hindus who were to leave Afghanistan at the time of the takeover of the Taliban, after having lived several generations there. Today, we are moved by the fate of the Afghan refugees, who pay decades of stupid and bloody internal struggles, whereas the media do not say a word to us about the hundreds of thousands of Hindus driven out of the Kashmir by Muslims and who became refugees in their own country. The history shows us that people are always responsible for the atrocities or genocides made by his leaders: Hitler and the Germans offer to us a close example of that.

“The clash of civilizations,” by Samuel Huntington is a prophetic book, where it is predicted that the 21st century will experiment a conflict between Islam and the West allied with India, with China opting sometimes for Islam [there we must nevertheless stress that on this point Francois Gautier analyzes badly China's role].

We also see that with George Bush, and after the incident of the American spy plane, the United States has started a period of contentious relation with China, whereas they approach India, which is democratic, pro-Western and fights too against the Muslim fundamentalism. Bin Laden, the Taliban, the destruction of the statues in Bamiyan and the Muslim attacks against the United States made in the whole world, by terrorists often having links with Afghanistan and Pakistan, perhaps opened the eyes of the Pentagon. Lastly, second reason, it could be well that the West is afraid of Islam and that unconsciously the journalists reflect this apprehension, thus hiding the truth from the readers.

It should be said that the Islam of the 21st century, which still believes that Allah is the only true God and that it is necessary to fight a jihad to impose it over the others, forms a real threat for the free world. But it is not politically correct to say it.

One also sensed during the Gulf War to what extent there exists a true phenomenon “herd instinct in the way of Panurge’s sheep” among the journalists. As a result, if you read a report, it is as if you had read each of them!

Another constraint undergone by the journalists: they generally arrive on the place of their reporting endowed with the prejudices, preconceptions, false ideas that they collected here and there, through their atavism, their culture and their education. i.e., that they often know - unconsciously, of course - what they will write, before even beginning their report!

This is particularly obvious for the Third World. The last three centuries saw the supremacy of the West being established on the world; Europe not only imposed its habits, its principles and its ideas, on the countries it conquered, but it often continues today to judge its old colonies according to Western parameters, whereas many of these countries have a much older civilization and have developed over time some customs and ideas which are peculiar to them. The Spanish and Portuguese conquistadors showed that the sword worked perfectly together with the cross and that the missionary was never very far from the soldier. If the proselytism brought to the conquered countries unquestionable benefits, it also cut whole populations from their roots, taught them how to scorn their civilization and to despise those who practice still a “pagan” religion.

This scorning attitude towards the natives and their “gods,” which is no longer relevant in the 21st century- was reincarnated in a much more subtle way in the content and the way of the reports about the Third World.

Lastly - and it is there the vicious circle - the journalist must satisfy the requirements from his readers and to comply with their expectations. It is constantly repeated over and over that this readership is today leveled down : the large mass is interested only in the shock photos, the gossips, the murders, the sex life of the princesses and the image of disaster .

It is the reign of Paris Match and Gala, it is the eternal ball attached to the feet of the editor-in-chiefs: how to satisfy this hunger of the reader for the small one, the macabre one and the uninteresting one? But who is to blame? They would like to make us also believe that people have become stupider for thirty years and have no longer the time to read serious things, because of the precipitation of the modern life and of the mind-numbing effect of television. But actually, it is often the fault of the media, which cause in the readership or the audience a need for morbid sensationalism, which becomes as a drug without which the reader/listener can no longer live.

The case of Princess Diana is eloquent besides on this subject. This maiden, with her qualities and her faults, who lived anonymously and without needing for somebody, became at once the center of focus in England when Prince Charles announced his interest for her. From this moment, the journalists and the photographers of the whole world (and the French photographers distinguished themselves by their eagerness) dogged her footstep, left her no longer a breathing space, granted her any more intimacy. She will be pursued everywhere: in her gymnasium, in her bathroom, with her children, on holiday and they will even succeed in listening to her intimate talks on his cell phone. She will negotiate with journalists, she will try to temporize by granting them pieces of her life, she will try to protect children against this voracious monster that is the tabloid press. But vainly! She will die pursued, once more, by the vultures. The photographers and journalists fed themselves through Diana and made billion dollars at her expenses; and not only they made her a saint after her death - what she was not - succeeding thereby in making money, even after her death; but moreover, last trick, they succeeded in being exonerated from their terrible fault by putting all the blame on the unfortunate driver, who would never have driven so fast if Diana had not been pursued.

Regarding the journalism which informs the readers, educates them, elevates them up, you can always dream. If at least the sacrifice of Diana had not been useless. But did the media learn a lesson from it? ...

The merits of Anglo-Saxon journalism are always praised to us: an impartial journalism, an information journalism , which supports nobody. And they quote the BBC as an example. Two comments are to be made nevertheless.

Firstly, the English are the greatest hypocrites in the world, because everywhere they went, they divided and ruled , leaving friction and discord behind them. One thinks of Palestine, one thinks of Ireland, of course, and India also, where they promised to Muslims, at the beginning of the 20th

century, an independent state after their departure, thus sowing Pakistan's seed. History also knows that Englishmen converted to Protestantism as many Irishmen as possible, in order to guarantee their loyalty towards the British Crown [Editor's note: reflection of Francois Gautier which much astonishes us nevertheless]. Not forgetting the bloody suppression carried out against the Irish nationalists during the First World War; today the result is known. Then, when a presenter of the BBC, trying to look most serious and pained in the world, says us that "interfaith slaughters continue even more in Ireland," he is taken seriously only by those who have a (very) short memory ; or then when the Independent or the Times gives us a lecture about the Kashmir whereas the English - these marvelous traders, who sell even what does not belong to them - in the 19th century gave up this Himalayan state for £ 1 million , we cannot help laughing gently. Secondly, the British newspapers practically invented the tabloid press and are never short of ideas to combine it with a plus, whether it is the photograph of a naked girl, the confidences of the lover of Princess Diana, or the memories of Ronald Briggs - all that, of course, spending millions of pounds. So, British gentlemen: do not give us a lecture in this field!

It should be added that TV is the biggest of the culprits in this contemporary propagation of lies or untruths. Everything was already said about the misdeeds of TV: stupefaction, mushiness, intellectual poverty of the programs. But we could add this: the TV is self-centered. Those among us who live in great countries, in the process of development, such Brazil or India, are always shocked while arriving in France to see to what extent the televised information which is disseminated to million viewers three times a day, produces insignificant things, unimportant things, the anecdotal one, and especially the self-centeredness.

It is told us that the French are concerned only about France. But it would be only necessary to educate them, to inform them that France is a very small country, which not only plays no longer in the world the important role about which she boasted formerly, but whose main actors and media encourage today narcissism when the planet is more and more globalized and at the moment when the sun starts to rise again in the East.

The research of the Truth should be the first command of journalism. Journalism should be a fight for the truth, a battle against the Asura, the Lie, the truth perversion. The true vocation a reporter is to show to his reader the truth beyond appearances, which are often false, misleading, untrue. A true journalist, when he arrives on the spot of his report or in front of the person he must question, should always turn his nose up at his prejudices, his atavism, to make a clean sweep of his preconceived ideas and of what he had imagined; and to aspire to sense the essence of what he confronts. Much more than that, a sincere reporter should always call on his intuition, on what is on this side of the visible one, in order to have a presentiment of the atmosphere, to release the subtle forces which often pervade a place, or issue from a person. We will go even further: in certain cases, journalism can be compared with a war: as a soldier, a journalist fights against the preconceived ideas, the unwillingness, the ignorance and the maliciousness which stick to a person and a country; a journalist must campaign on the good side in the battle between the forces of the Lie and that of the Truth, as Hemingway showed it to us. The talent is usefulness if it is put in the service of Lie; a Celine, so brilliant he was, does not weigh very heavily compared with a Vercors, who stood on the good side - even if Celine occupies a place more important than that of Vercors in the French literary Pantheon.

APPENDIX No. 3: CONCLUSION BY FRANCOIS GAUTIER.

The duty of a correspondent in India is to become aware, during the three or five years when he will be working, of this reality which is behind the appearances and to inform the world about it, even if it is not politically correct to be said, even if that is not in agreement with what his editor-in-chief (who generally knows nothing on India) expects from him, even if that does not correspond to the macabre, sensational, or folk requirement of the TV rating. It is that the true journalism, the fight against Asura, so that the truth triumphs.

It is always necessary to be wary about general information.

Americans Indians or Chinese instead of SOME AMERICANS SOME INDIANS OR SOME CHINESE.

Importance also of the exactitude of the premises in the political or religious reasoning.

The research of historical truth arouses various questions relating to the historical methodology of journalists.

-The matching between the reality and its representation.

-The "human" judgment: how to understand men having lived in a remote past, starting from the only vestiges of their tread on the earth that they left to us? What involves the constant refusal to mix up the trade of a historian and that of a "prosecutor" as it is done generally today.

What involves on the other hand...

- Research of materials and sources.

- Criticism of materials and sources (reliability, matching).

- Method of interpretation of these materials for the writing of history.

It appears therefore obvious that we should form another class of journalists, because the present generation does not seem to meet these requirements nor to profit from these intuitive qualities. We are worn out by these reporters growing old, paunchy, drunkard and cynical whom we meet all over the world – still the same ones. How? It would be necessary that our schools of journalism in the West, non-content with teaching the best techniques of reporting, what they do very well, can also give to the candidate journalists a certain ethical code and especially the thirst for the truth. For that, it is time that the contemporary journalism gets rid of its blinders which prevent it from seeing beyond the prejudices of its small narrow and west-centered mentality. India this greatest Cartesian has much to teach us. The Vipassana meditation, for example, a Buddhist technique of introspection should be taught in all the journalism schools. Based on the simple observation of breathing, this technique helps to promote the intuitive mindset, by calming little by little the spasms of our intellect which always turns around itself. The hatha-yoga, copied by all aerobics in the world, would give to journalists the minimum of bodily endurance necessary to his sometimes tiring peregrinations. The pranayama, this extraordinary breathing science, gives tonic energy, slows down the heartbeats and stimulates blood circulation.

We are tempted to say, in conclusion: if, like Malraux thought, the task of this century is "to reinstate gods," India this vast country, which always admitted that Unity is expressed in the Diversity, what represents the true polytheism concept, so badly understood by Islam and Christendom, could play a role much more important than we think in the future decades. It is therefore necessary, with the assistance of a new generation of journalists and Indianists, that we realize the extraordinary wonder that is India, who not only is becoming a superpower in Asia, but who is the only country in the world which succeeded in preserving a real spirituality, which accepts God in all his forms and teaches us that all the ways are good to reach the Divinity. This spirituality, which not long ago spread all over the world, from the Celts to the Egyptians, from the Chinese to the Greeks, disappeared today and was replaced by the dogmas and the militant convictions of our Churches. Because if India suddenly had to die - through globalization - the future of our jolly old earth would be seriously affected.

AFTERWORD IN THE WAY OF JOHN TOLAND.

Pseudo-druids with fabulous initiatory derivation (the famous and indescribable or hilarious perennial tradition) having multiplied since some time; it appeared us necessary to put at the disposal of each and everyone, these few notes, hastily written, one evening of November, in order to give our readers the desire to know more about true druidism.

This work claims to be honest but in no way neutral. It was given itself for an aim to defend or clear the cluto (fame) of this admirable ancient religion.

Nothing replaces personal meditation, including about obscure or incomprehensible lays strewn these books, and which have been inserted intentionally, in order to force you to reflect, to find your own way. These books are not dogmas to be followed blindly and literally. As you know, we must beware as it was the plague, of the letter. The letter kills, only spirit vivifies.

Nothing replaces either personal experience, and it's by following the way that we find the way. Therefore rely only on your own strength in this Search for the Grail. What matters is the attitude to be adopted in life and not the details of the dogma. Druidism is less important than druidiaction (John-P. MARTIN).

These few leaves scribbled in a hurry are nevertheless in no way THE BOOKS TO READ ON THIS MATTER, they are only a faint gleam of them.

The only druidic library worthy of the name is not in fact composed of only 12 (or 27) books, but of several hundred books.

The few booklets forming this mini-library are not themselves an increase of knowledge on the subject, and are only some handbooks intended for the schoolchildren of druidism.

These simplified summaries intended for the elementary courses of druidism will be replaced by courses of a somewhat higher level, for those who really want to study it in a more relevant way.

This small library is consequently a first attempt to adapt (intended for young adults) the various reflections about the druidic knowledge and truth, to which the last results of the new secularism, positive and open-minded, worldwide, being established, have led.

Unlike Judaism, Christianity, and Islam, which swarm, concerning the higher Being, with childish anthropomorphism taken literally (fundamentalism known as integrism in the Catholic world); our druidism too, on the other hand, will use only very little of them, and will stick in this field, to the absolute minimum.

But in order to talk about God or the Devil we shall be quite also obliged to use a basic language, and therefore a more or less important amount of this anthropomorphism. Or then it would be necessary to completely give up discussing it.

This first shelf of our future library consecrated to the subject, aims to show precisely the harmonious authenticity of the neo-druidic will and knowledge. To show at which point its current major theses have deep roots because the reflection about Mythologies, it's our Bible to us. The adaptations of this brief talk required by the differences of culture, age, spiritual maturity, social status, etc. will be to do with the concerned druids (veledae and others?)

Note, however. Important! What these few notes, hastily thrown on paper during a too short life, are not (higgledy-piggledy).

A divine revelation. A (still also divine) law. A (non-religious or secular) law. A (scientific) law. A dogma. An order.

What I search most to share is a state of mind, nothing more. As our old master had very well said one day : "OUR CIVILIZATION HAS NO CHOICE: IT WILL BE CELTISM OR IT WILL BE DEATH" (Peter Lance).

What these few notes, hastily thrown on paper during a too short life, are.

Some dream. An adventure. A journey. An escape. A revolt cry against the moral and physical ugliness of this society. An attempt to reach the universal by starting from the individual. A challenge. An obstacle fecund to overcome . An incentive to think. A guide for action. A map. A plan. A compass. A pole star or morning star up there in the mountain. A fire overnight in a glade?

What the man who had collected the core of this library, Peter DeLaCrau, is not.

- A god.
- A half god.
- A quarter of God.
- A saint.
- A philosopher (recognized, official, and authorized or licensed, as those who talk a lot in television. Except, of course, by taking the word in its original meaning, which is that of amateur searching wisdom and knowledge.

What he is: a man, and nothing of what is human therefore is unknown to him. Peter DeLaCrau has no superhuman or exceptional power. Nothing of what he said wrote or did could have timeless value. At the best he hopes that his extreme clearness about our society and its dominant ideology (see its official philosophers, its journalists, its mass media and the politically correct of its right-thinking people, at least about what is considered to be the main thing); as well his non-conformism, and his outspokenness, combined with a solid contrariness (which also earned to him for that matter a lot of troubles or affronts); can be useful.

The present small library for beginners “contains the dose of humanity required by the current state of civilization” (Henry Lizeray). However it’s only a gathering of materials waiting for the ad hoc architect or mason.

A whole series of booklets increasing our knowledge of these basic elements will be published soon. This different presentation of the druidic knowledge will preserve nevertheless the unity as well as the harmony which can exist between these various statements of the same philosophical and well-considered paganism : spirituality worthy of our day, spirituality for our days.

Case of translations into foreign languages (Spanish, German, Italian, Polish, etc.)

The misspellings, the grammatical mistakes, the inadequacies of style, as well as in the writing of the proper nouns perhaps and, of course, the Gallicisms due to forty years of life in France, may be corrected. Any other improvement of the text may also be brought if necessary (by adding, deleting, or changing, details); Peter DeLaCrau having always regretted not being able to reach perfection in this field.

But on condition that neither alteration nor betrayal, in a way or another, is brought to the thought of the author of this reasoned compilation. Every illustration without a caption can be changed. New illustrations can be brought.

But illustrations having a caption must be only improved (by the substitution of a good photograph to a bad sketch, for example?)

It goes without saying that the coordinator of this rapid and summary reasoned compilation , Peter DeLaCrau, does not maintain to have invented (or discovered) himself, all what is previous; that he does not claim in any way that it is the result of his personal researches (on the ground or in libraries). What s previous is indeed essentially resulting from the excellent works or websites referenced in bibliography and whose direct consultation is strongly recommended.

We will never insist enough on our will not be the men of one book (the Book), but from at least twelve, like Ireland’s Fenians, for obvious reasons of open-mindedness, truth being our only religion.

Once again, let us repeat; the coordinator of the writing down of these few notes hastily thrown on paper, by no means claims to have spent his life in the dust of libraries; or in the field, in the mud of the rescue archaeology excavations; in order to unearth unpublished pieces of evidence about the past of Ireland (or of Wales or of East Indies or of China).

THEREFORE PETER DELACRAU DOES NOT WANT TO BE CONSIDERED, IN ANY WAY, AS THE AUTHOR OF THE FOREGOING TEXTS.

HE TRIES BY NO MEANS TO ASCRIBE HIMSELF THE CREDIT OF THEM. He is only the editor or the compiler of them. They are, for the most part, documents broadcast on the web, with a few exceptions.

ON THE OTHER HAND, HE DEMANDS ALL THEIR FAULTS AND ALL THEIR INSUFFICIENCIES. Peter DeLaCrau claims only one thing, the mistakes, errors, or various imperfections, of this book. He alone is to be blamed in this case. But he trusts his contemporaries (human nature being what it is) for vigorously pointing out to him.

Note found by the heirs to Peter DeLaCrau and inserted by them into this place.

I immediately confess in order to make the work of my judges easier that men like me were Christian in Rome under Nero, pagan in Jerusalem, sorcerers in Salem, English heretics, Irish Catholics, and today racist, sexist, homophobic, Islamophobic, person, while waiting to be tomorrow kufar or again Christian the beastliest antichrist of all the apocalypses, etc. In short as you will have understood it, I am for nothingness death disease suffering

By respect for Mankind , in order to save time, and not to make it waste time, I will make easier the work of those who make absolutely a point of being on the right side of the fence while fighting (heroically of course) in order to save the world of my claws (my ideas or my inclinations, my tendencies).

To these courageous and implacable detractors, of whom the profundity of reflection worthy of that of a marquis of Vauvenargues equals only the extent of the general knowledge, worthy of Pico della Mirandola I say...

Now take a sheet of paper, a word processing if you prefer, put by order of importance 20 characteristics which seem to you most serious, most odious, most hateful, in the history of Mankind, since the prehistoric men and Nebuchadnezzar, according to you...AND CONSIDER THAT I AM THE COMPLETE OPPOSITE OF YOU BECAUSE I HAVE THEM ALL!

Scapegoats are always needed! A heretic in the Middle Ages, a witch in Salem in the 17th century, a racist in the 20th century, an alien lizard in the 21st century, I am the man you will like to hate in order to feel a better person (a smart and nice person).

I am, as you will and in the order of importance you want: an atheist, a satanist, a stupid person, with Down's syndrome, brutish, homosexual, deviant, homophobic, communist, Nazi, sexist, a philatelist, a pathological liar, robber, smug, psychopath, a falsely modest monster of hubris, and what do I still know, it is up to you to see according to the current fashion.

Here, I cannot better do (in helping you to save the world).

[Unlike my despisers who are all good persons, the salt of the earth, i.e., young or modern and dynamic, courageous, positive, kind, intelligent, educated, or at least who know; showing much hindsight in their thoroughgoing meditation on the trends of History; and on the moral or ethical level: generous, altruistic, but poor of course (it is their only vice) because giving all to others; moreover deeply respectful of the will of God and of the Constitution ...

As for me I am a stiff old reactionary, sheepish, disconnected from his time, paranoid, schizophrenic, incoherent, capricious, never satisfied, a villain, stupid, having never studied or at least being unaware of everything about the subject in question; accustomed to rash judgments based on prejudices without any reflection; selfish and wealthy; a fiend of the Devil, inherently Nazi-Bolshevist or Stalinist-Hitlerian. Hitlerian Trotskyist they said when I was young. In short a psychopathic murderer as soon as the breakfast... what enables me therefore to think what I want, my critics also besides, and to try to make everybody know it even no-one in particular].

Signed: the coordinator of the works, Peter DeLaCrau known as Hesunertus, a researcher in druidism. A man to whom nothing human was foreign. An unemployed worker, post office worker, divorcee, homeless person, vagrant, taxpayer, citizen, and a cuckolded elector... In short one of the 9 billion human beings having been in transit aboard this spaceship therefore. Born on planet Earth, January 13, 1952.

BIBLIOGRAPHY OF THE BROAD OUTLINES.

As regards the bibliography of details see appendix of the last lesson because, as Henry Lizeray says it so well, traditions that must be interpreted. It is there the whole difference which exists between former druidism and neo-druidism.

Lebar Gabala or The Book of Invasions. Paris 1884 (William O'Dwyer)
Base of the druidic Church. The restored druidism. Henry Lizeray, Paris, 1885.
National traditions rediscovered. Paris 1892.
Aesus or the secret doctrines of the druids. Paris 1902.
Ogmios or Orpheus. Paris 1903.

CONTENTS.

Introduction	Page 004
The rhetoric	Page 006
Art or science ? The limits of rhetoric	Page 014
Examples of rhetoric	Page 020
The first of the media: the rumor	Page 025
Dryadic or general epistemology	Page 026
The deontological principles of the Quebec journalists	Page 031
The French langue de bois	Page 036
One track thinking and lie	Page 037
The sophisms of the fashionable rhetoric	Page 040
On the rhetoric of the journalists	Page 041
The ten commandments of the intellectual worthy of the name	Page 043
The new treason of the intellectuals according to Noam Chomsky	Page 045
Ladies and Gentlemen of the Journalism	Page 046
Badly reported Wars = failed peace = sure disaster	Page 048
Open letter to media people	Page 052
Questions to the journalists who control us	Page 054
The long tradition of the Statesman's lie	Page 057
Lie in politics	Page 059
Lie in politics and therefore in the media	Page 061
Angry letter to the editor	Page 063
The absolute disaster.	Page 067
Another example about the harmful role of the media in the evolution of a war	Page 073
On Facts Checking	Page 076
The journalists facing the challenges of our time	Page 078
The journalists in front of Islam	Page 082
From "no animal shall kill.... to no animal shall kill without reason"	Page 087
The problem of democracies	Page 090
A fish always stinks from the head down	Page 092
Example on the economic level	Page 095
Example on the societal level	Page 097
Reflections in connection with some other points of the topicality	Page 098
Reflection on the accusation of populism	Page 100
Other reflections about some very French passions	Page 104
About the four conditions for having one nation according too Ernest Renan	Page 106
The old foreigners	Page 116
Aesop	Page 118
Institutionalized neo-racism	Page 124
Development	Page 127
Bondy Blog	Page 130
The true neo-cons of today	Page 135

APPENDICES

APPENDIX No. 1: An example of massive misinformation: the media treatment of India.	Page 138
APPENDIX No. 2: Booster shot therefore	Page 143
APPENDIX No. 3: Conclusion by Francois Gautier	Page 146

Afterword in the manner of John Toland	Page 147
Bibliography of the broad outlines.	Page 150

BOOKS BY THE SAME AUTHOR.

1. Quotations from the ancient authors speaking about Celts or druids.
2. Various preliminary general information about Celts.
3. History of the pact with gods volume 1.
4. Druidism Bible: history of the pact with gods volume 2.
5. History of the peace with gods volume 3.
6. History of the peace with gods volume 4.
7. History of the peace with gods volume 5.
8. From Fenians to Culdees or "The Great Science which enlightens" volume 1.
9. Irish apocryphal texts.
10. From Fenians to Culdees or "The Great Science which enlightens" volume 2.
11. From Fenians to Culdees or "The Great Science which enlightens" volume 3.
12. The hundred paths of paganism. Science and philosophy volume 1 (druidic mythology).
13. The hundred paths of paganism. Science and philosophy volume 2 (druidic mythology).
14. The hundred ways of paganism. Science and philosophy volume 3 (druidic mythology).
15. The Greater Camminus: elements of druidic theology: volume 1.
16. The Greater Camminus: elements of druidic theology: volume 2.
17. The druidic pleroma: angels jinns or demons volume 1.
18. The druidic pleroma angels jinns or demons volume 2
19. Mystagogy or sacred theater of ancients Celts.
20. Celtic poems.
21. The genius of the Celtic paganism volume 1.
22. The Roland's complex .
23. At the base of the lantern of the dead.
24. The secrets of the old druid of the Menapian forest.
25. The genius of Celtic paganism volume 2 (liberty reciprocity simplicity).
26. Rhetoric : the treason of intellectuals.
27. Small dictionary of druidic theology volume 1.
28. From the ancient philosophers to the Irish druid.
29. Judaism Christianity and Islam: first part.
30. Judaism Christianity and Islam : second part volume 1.
31. Judaism Christianity and Islam : second part volume 2.
32. Judaism Christianity and Islam : second part volume 3.
33. Third part volume 1: what is Islam? Short historical review of the set QUR.HAD.SIR. and SHAR.FIQ.MAD.
34. Third part volume 2: What is Islam? First approaches to the set QUR.HAD.SIR. and SHAR.FIQ.MAD.
35. Third part volume 3: What is Islam? The true 5 pillars of the set QUR.HAD.SIR. and SHAR.FIQ.MAD.
36. Third part volume 4: What is Islam? Sounding the set QUR.HAD.SIR. and SHAR.FIQ.MAD.
37. Couiro anmenion or small dictionary of druidic theology volume 2.

Peter DeLaCrau. Born on January 13rd, 1952, in St. Louis (Missouri) from a family of woodsmen or Canadian trappers who had left Prairie du Rocher (or Fort de Chartres in Illinois) in 1765. Peter DeLaCrau is thus born the same year as the Howard Hawks film entitled "the Big Sky". Consequently father of French origin, mother of Irish origin: half Irish half French. Married to Mary-Helen ROBERTS on March 12th, 1988, in Paris-Aubervilliers (French department of Seine-Saint-Denis). Hence 3 children. John Wolf born May 11th, 1989. Alex born April 10th, 1990. Millicent born August 31st, 1993. Deceased on September 28th, 2012, in La Rochelle (France).

Peter DELACRAU is not a philosopher by profession, except taking this term in its original meaning of amateur searching wisdom and knowledge. And he is neither a god neither a demigod nor the messenger of any god or demigod (and of course not a messiah).

But he has become in a few years one of the most lucid and of the most critical observers of the French neo-druidic or neo-pagan world.

He was also some time assistant-treasurer of a rather traditionalist French druidic group of which he could get archives and texts or publications.

But his constant criticism both domestic and foreign French policy, and his political positions (on the end of his life he had become an admirer of Howard Zinn Paul Krugman Bernie Sanders and Michael Moore); had earned him moreover some vexations on behalf of the French authorities which did everything, including in his professional or private life, in the last years of his life, to silence him. Peter DeLaCrau has apparently completely missed the return to the home country of his distant ancestors.

It is true unfortunately that France today is no longer the France of Louis XIV or of Lafayette or even of Napoleon (which has really been a great nation in those days).

Peter DeLaCrau having spent most of his life (the last one) in France, of which he became one of the best specialists,

even one of the rare thoroughgoing observers of the contemporary French society quite simply; his three children, John-Wolf, Alex and Millicent (of Cuers: French Riviera) pray his readers to excuse the countless misspellings or grammatical errors that pepper his writings. At the end of his life, Peter DeLaCrau mixed a little both languages (English but also French).

Those were therefore the notes found on the hard disk of the computer of our father, or in his papers. Our father has of course left us a considerable work, nobody will say otherwise, but some of the words frequently coming from his pen, now and then are not always very clear. After many consultations between us, at any rate, above what we have been able to understand of them.

Signed: the three children of Peter DeLaCrau: John-Wolf, Alex and Millicent. Of Cuers.