



Valérie devon

Presents

Vincent Reynouard editorials

France, is a white race country
Message to Nadine Morano

Sans Concession tv
Editorials tv

Mrs Morano, when I heard what you said about "*France, being a white race country*", I didn't know if I should congratulate a brave woman or if I should feel sorry about a naïve politician. By invoking General de Gaulle, you believed, indeed, to defend a traditional and genuine France, stating: "*We are a country... France is a country with judeo-christian roots. That's it. France is a white race country.*"

Let me remind you, however, one important thing, so important, that I will dedicate the first part of this video to it. In recent History, the defender of this genuine France - therefore this France, country of white race, to which you are referring to - was Adolf Hitler. When, De Gaulle was among his enemies.

Part One - Hitler: defender of the genuine France

Here, you will exclaim: "*How can you turn Hitler into a defender of France, when he actually attacked her, invaded her and occupied her for 4 years, spreading terror and death on the territory!*"

Pardon me, Mrs Morano, but in your movie of the events, you have missed several scenes.

Why did Hitler invade Poland?

You fail to mention September 3, 1939, when France declared war against Germany, whereas, this was not required either in law or in fact. Georges Champeaux admirably demonstrated it in the first volume of his study entitled: "*The democracies' crusade*", so, I will not mention it again. You also fail to mention October 6, 1939, when Hitler offered peace to France and Britain. Peace that was denied by both their governments with contempt.

Hitler did not want the extension of the German-Polish conflict, on the contrary, he feared it, as evidenced by the way he received the British ultimatum. Far from rejoicing, Hitler stood petrified, he did not want a war with France and Britain. It was so obvious, that at the time, the press was saying it openly.

On February 29, 1940, thus, in Gringoire, the former Minister, Jean Fabry wrote: "*Hitler would be easily satisfied with a white peace, without having the fate sound of the weapons. Because they would be after l'Anschluss -after Munich- another intimidation victory. We are left with no other way to live, than to defeat the German Army.*" It was to recognize, that in February 1940, again, Hitler was seeking a diplomatic outcome, but in the opposite camp, some wanted war, war at all costs.

Then, certainly Mrs Morano, you have the right to say that Hitler' offers were not sincere and that one had to, in anyway, bring the National Socialism regime to an end. Besides, it's what Winston Churchill admitted confidentially in June 1940. But, then you'll have to admit that Poland was a pretext and that in reality war had been declared to annihilate the Third Reich.

Therefore, do not blame Hitler for choosing preventive attack, when conditions were favorable. By doing so, he only copied a well known French strategist, Napoleon First, wherein the best defense is attack.

When he launched his armies in France, the Fuhrer did nothing more, but defend himself against a war of extermination that was imposed on him. He did not want to annihilate the "eternal France" that you invoke.

Hitler and France

If he had wished it, he would have had the impunity to do so, as the quisling Xavier de Magallon, reminded it, in January 1942. Because in June 1940, the French Army was crushed and the German Air Force was the master of the skies. Hitler could have asked his squadrons to systematically strafe the columns of refugees, then he could have invaded the whole country and place in it a Gauleiter, and take captive the 5 to 6 million men in uniform. At the time, neither Britain, -who had evacuated its army in Dunkirk- nor the US -who had not even been able to provide France with 50 aircraft- would have been able to oppose this.

But, despite the most favorable situation, Hitler chose not to crush France; about 6 million refugees who wandered on the roads, less than 20,000 died, which proves that he had given no orders to strafe.

Moreover, Hitler agreed to the armistice, which, without it, as Guy Crouzet would later remind (**Les Nouveaux Temps, June 13-14, 1943, p.1**), there would have not been 2 but 5 to 6 million French prisoners in Germany. *"It's because the armistice was requested and obtained so that two third of those who were wearing the uniform at that time, have been peacefully demobilized in Limoges, in Pau or in Toulouse, instead of filling the Stalag quotas."*

In addition -with the exception of Alsace- Hitler limited the occupation territory to strictly the necessary parts for the continuation of the war. As for the refugees who wandered miserably on the roads, this woman who was part of it, later recalled:

"Suddenly, near Montargis, I heard shouting: Here comes the Germans! Oh my! You cannot believe how I feared these people. It was the devil personified that I saw coming. I made myself scarce. I pressed my little Colette against me, she was crying: Oh mom! What will they do to me?"

The Germans were on bicycles. They were singing. We, the military, the civilians, we all stopped, and we all lifted our arms up! They shouted: "Comrades, comrades, Armistice signed!"

The kids surrounded the German who gave them cookies and candies, everything they had. From that moment we fraternized. We went back to Paris. During the entire trip, we did not encounter the Red Cross. And instead of ambulances we saw those of the municipalities fleeing, stuffed with furniture and luggage.

I had a hard time walking. The German nurses treated the blisters that I had on my feet. Further along the way, they were distributing slippers to those who were limping like me."

This woman was not lying.



The refugees had been rescued by the NSV German teams, which was the National Socialist organization for the peoples welfare.



Primarily composed of nurses, this organization assured a large-scale supply, saving from death tens of thousands of women, children and weakened elderly. More than 80 reception camps were organized, where the refugees were entitled care, resting structures and for the new mothers, what they needed for their babies: milk, diapers, etc.

At the time, some have declared that the NSV had come to the aid of refugees for propaganda reasons. When questioned, one of the camp command officers, replied: *"Why?! But, by humanity..."*

Later, a French woman who had slipped among the teams, wrote: *"At the beginning it was the sisters of the NSV who were serving meals to the refugees, I came among them, then I started to serve as well and gradually I brought my young assistants. Ten days later, when the Germans realized that they were no longer needed, they left, very happy to be freed from this task in order to take care of something else, by humanity, simply..."*

Given this behavior, the French who had an hostile a priori towards the Germans, at first, changed their opinion, like the great scientist and genius inventor, Georges Claude.

The true meaning of the Second World War

Nevertheless, I do understand that in July 1940, while the real reason of this war was still hidden under various pretexts, that General de Gaulle wanted to continue the fight in order to free the country from foreign occupation and because the country national's pride had been injured.

I can understand it, although I don't approve it, because when it comes to something as serious as an armed conflict, obedience to legitimate authorities appears to be necessary to prevent calamities, in order to avoid further calamities caused by the guerillas. Having no guerillas, in France, to strick the Germans in the back and Collaborators despite the armistice, many misfortunes would have been avoided.

But hey, the Gaullist initiative of the end of June 1940 can, it seems, find excuses, if not justifications for this behavior.

However, on June 22, 1941, the alliances of circumstances cracked and the real meaning of this war unfolded. From that moment and as the months passed, the more it appeared that the Reich National Socialist had become - despite himself- the defender of white Europe against the two globalists and atheistic ideologies (whether claimed or fact): the Bolchevism in the East and the Capitalism in the West.

Early September 1941, in a call, a member of the French Volunteers Legion, Pierre Constantini called them the *"greatest Western ideal soldiers: a united Europe. You will not fight for cannon dealers. You will not fight only for France, but for Europe and the Civilization."* Hitler himself announced it when, on January 30, 1942 he said: *"The prayer of these devil minions who want to punish Europe through Bolchevism will not be heard but another prayer will be granted: Lord, give us the strength to keep our people freedom, to our children and children's children, and not only to our people but also to the other people of Europe. For it is not a war that at this time we support for our German people only; it is a struggle for all of Europe. And therefore for the entire civilized humanity."*

In July 1943, Etienne Rey stated: *"Like it or not, it is Germany that leads the fight against this Asian power which Russia has become again. That the conflict didn't have that sense at first, neither this magnitude, it's possible. But it is like that today. Anyway, Germany leads the fight for the Western civilization which France and England too, would and should have been leading. But one was forced to withdraw and the other has betrayed the cause of Europe allying itself with the enemy of Europe."*

What France would have been like in case of a German victory

70 years after the facts, a clever propaganda claims that after the war, in case of a victory, Hitler's Germany was preparing to annihilate France, spiritually, even physically. This is contradicted by numerous documents from that time.

During the Occupation, the first outlines of a unified Europe appeared. To the previous Europe with its crippling borders, Germany was offering a new Europe, where the States would continue to exist, including France and Paris its capital, but in the heart of a true union of brothers and cousins. Certainly, in this future Europe the Reich did not want to see a France with unrestrained claims anymore.

In May 1942, the German author Karl Epting addressed the French in these terms: *"One of the great sacrifices that France will have to grant to the new Europe will be to abandon its claim to its civilization universality: France will no longer be able to spiritually consider herself as the universal church, but as an individual national community, determined by race and history. It is as a historical and national unit that France will take part in the spiritual discussion of the European people, by integrating into the dialectic of Europe. We do not believe that France will lose anything. We believe on the contrary, that she will gain greatly. By restricting herself, France will enrich the rest of Europe, because the true French values will no longer be covered by a claim that excluded any dialogue. The invisible limb that separates the two countries will always be a frontier. But we will no longer say that there are values on one side and a void on the other; Civilization on one side, and barbarity on the other. But there is the French values on one side and the German values on the other. And the two universes will measure each other by getting in touch. The Franco-German dialogue goes from advocacy to debate. But it is History which will decide the conclusion of this debate, as part of the greater Europe."*

Germany wanted no longer, therefore, a presumptuous France, but she reached out to a friendly France and conscious of her value. Already on April 4, 1941, in a conference in Paris, a German said: *"It is not a matter of defeating France, but to win Europe."* *"Listen to the call of reason [...] Your place is here, on a plan of dignity and work. Neither above nor below. At our sides."*

In late August 1942, the French press broadcasted this sensational news: *"In gratitude for the noble behavior observed by the French people at the first attempt of British invasion in*

Dieppe, Hitler had ordered the release of the prisoners located in Dieppe, Neuville, Hautot-sur-Mer, Pourville, Petit-Apperville and Arques-la-Bataille."

The absence of anti-French hatred among the majority of Germans was also demonstrated by many French who worked in Germany. Certainly, after the war, many were silent or tried to exonerate themselves by claiming that they had suffered. But, here again the documents of that period help us to get a more realistic view.



I will quote for example Georges Mangeolles, who volunteer with a relief organization, in October 1942 and who testified thusly: *"I would like now to say a few words about the behavior and the conduct of the German workers towards their French comrades. There is here, I said, workers of all nationalities. However, and my French comrades will not contradict me, the Germans are, among all, the most correct with us. Never a word, nor a vexation towards our responsibility for the war, our defeat; always ready to help us when we are in trouble, always calling us "Sir" or "Comrade" and above all, willing to recognize our taste and our work quality. For if, undoubtedly, the Germans are superior to us in construction and technique matter, they are the first to accept the qualities of the good French worker, often accustom to work with older equipment and make repairs that we are not used to doing here."*

Early 1943 (**Les Nouveaux Temps, January 15, 1943 p.1**), the labor representative, Fritz Sauckel, paid tribute to the French workers in Germany.

In March 1944(**Le lien, March, 1944, p.3**), the head of the Propaganda-Staffel of Dijon, Captain Sauerlaender, spoke about the subject: *"Give a new direction to the future of Europe"* and *"Develop new forms of co-existence"* He explained: *"Of course, this assumption does not require removing the personality of each nation, as it has developed in the course of history... It is rather to moderate individual claims in what they have as excessive and outrageous in their dogmatic nature. The greatest obstacle to the European Union would be that of a French intelligence tightly enclosed in a self-centeredness that would not recognize value other than its own, which would virtually be tantamount to refusing any contact with German values. Is France ready to abandon this attitude that has decided her entrance, in part, to this war? The answer to this question will decide the future Franco-German relations. In adjusting to the dialectic of this new Europe without abandoning her own cultural values, France will find its purpose as an entity among other national entities, as they were designed by blood and by history."*

Having reviewed the French supporters of the Franco-German agreement, the Captain said: *"[...] If the new ideas and if the new men were to succumb in France, the absence of this country in the European Community would heavily weigh on the edification and the peaceful organization of the continent. If the new elements outweigh on the contrary, leading with them the consent of the French people, France could be able to provide the most powerful impulses to the European Revolution. The demon of the Youth and the ghost of the old quarrel over the soul of France. May the Sheperdess of Domremy, who was the young soul whom France rallied around in the past, come again to rescue the Youth."*

On March 17, 1944, the labor representative, Fritz Sauckel, explained:

"The new order in Europe could only be that of social justice.

We, National Socialists, along with Adolf Hitler, want fanatically to bring about this true socialism. We want the honor, freedom and bread for the millions of those working in Germany, whether they be manual workers or intellectual workers, and, for this purpose one so noble and so important, the German soldiers are fighting today.

For us, German National Socialists, it is quite natural that we recognized the right of all the other European nations to organize their lives according to their national and social ideas.

If France, the French people and, above all, the French worker, both in France and in the Reich, by his work, fights alongside of Germany, and therefore Europe, the German worker will never forget it.

The new Europe will not be built on the lie of an international solidarity which denies the uniqueness of nations, but on the respect towards the people themselves and their neighbors."

I recall that Germany had created the workbook of the European workers. After the war, those who had come to work in the Reich, could go back in their country and assert their acquired experience. We had there, a socialism embryo at a European scale, this true socialism that the German authorities aspired.

Besides, at the general conference of the foreign workers in Germany, 14 nations were represented, united under the banner: *"Victory of Europe"*

De Gaulle: enemy of this united Europe, therefore, of this true France

I say it and repeat it: until 1942, one could still be indecisive about the real meaning of this war. But from this year, all became clear to anyone who was willing to take the trouble to think. The Third Reich had become the defender of the true socialism and the European nations taken in their true meaning.

But, in this titanic struggle which would decide the fate of Europe, General de Gaulle remained until the end alongside Hitler's enemies. Even today, he remains the symbol, in France at least, of the anti-Nazi struggle. You will understand, therefore, Mrs Morano, my surprise when you invoke this character in support of the defense of the genuine France.

But, I can already hear your indignant reaction: you will answer me that a moral abyss separates the noble Gaullist doctrine from the criminal "Nazism". On Facebook, moreover, you pointed out that you had "*never spoken of race superiority*".

According to you, there would be two ways to defend one's country. A good one and a radically bad one. The good one would be a De Gaulle nationalism, therefore, a bourgeois patriotism tinted of universalism with a republican touch.

Nadine Morano - *France is a white race country, which, in its universal openness, it is true, it is her greatness, General de Gaulle was saying it. It demonstrates her universality to welcome people who come from other countries...*

The other would be a Hitler-Nationalism, openly racist and aggressive. You could add that the Hitlerism -and only it- have been condemned after the war in the court of Humanity. That is your mistake, Mrs Morano. A mistake that causes the lynching that you are undergoing now.

Part Two - The current impact of the Nuremberg judgment

The prescience of Maurice Bardeche

Some have advised you to open a dictionary to the word "*race*". Personally, I will advise you to read the book of Maurice Bardeche published in 1948. The author announced in advance the consequences of the Nuremberg judgment on October 1, 1946. He explained:

"The National Socialism condemnation goes much further than it looks. It reaches in fact all solid forms, all the geological forms of political life. Every nations, every party who remember the soil, the tradition, the occupation, the race is suspect. Anyone who claims the right of the first occupant and certifies such obvious things as that of the city property, offends a universal morality that denies the right of the people to write their laws. It's not only the Germans, but all of us who are dispossessed. No one has the right anymore to sit in his field and say: "This land is mine." No one has anymore the right to stand up in the city and say: "We are the elders, but we have built the houses of this city, that he, who doesn't obey the laws, must leave my house." It is written now, that a council of impalpable beings has the

power to know what is happening in our houses and in our cities." Crimes against Humanity: this law is good, this one is not. Civilization has a veto right.

We were living until now in a solid universe, whose generations had placed the stratifications one after another. Everything was clear: the father was the father, the law was the law, the stranger was the stranger. We had the right to say that the law was harsh, but it was the law. Today these certain bases of political life are struck of anathema. Because these truths constitute the program of a racist party condemned by the court of Humanity. And in exchange, the stranger recommends a universe according to his dreams. There are no more borders, there are no more cities. Across the continent, the laws are the same and also the passports and also the judges and also the currencies."

Yes, Mrs Morano, by condemning National Socialism, the victors of 1945, have condemned all forms of nationalism -at least in Europe- including the bourgeois patriotism, which you claim to belong to.

Oh sure, it didn't appear right away. But, the seed has been sown. Today, it has germinated and the lynching of which you are the victim of -pending the sanctions of your own party- brings clear evidence of it.

To refer to the "race", even by invoking General De Gaulle, causes a media outcry and means a political death. The race became taboo, much like sex in the Victorian society. Yann Moix even told you:

Yann Moix - *If you want to be President of the Republic one day, a little advise: never use the word "race", never again.*

Nadine Morano - *But, why?*

Yann Moix - *Because it is indecent.*

Nuremberg is therefore, the lock that prevents any real defense of the European homelands as true entities. I will go further: Nuremberg is the programmed death of all these nations, including France, which you defend.

Nuremberg and the programmed death of the true nations

Because, as Maurice Bardeche has foreseen it, Nuremberg, is a France with no race, no religion and no roots. It's a multicultural France, that is to say without any real culture, which can only communicate in sport or other superficial activities.

Besides, when I see today, these young people from this "black, white, arabs" society, glued to their Smartphone, to watch all possible stupidities or send hollow messages, I wonder what will remain of our cultural heritage in only one generation.

Finally, Nuremberg, is a mixed France, whose only "ideal" consists to have lots of money and to satisfy their primal needs...

It's true that with this only "ideal" -if one may say so- the "coexistence" can be assured. But the country is then ripe for a short-term death. This is why Nuremberg is the programmed death of our nations.

**Facing the globalist ideology, invoking a
"white France" cherished by De Gaulle is useless.**

This programmed end, you refuse it, Mrs Morano. But this is where the problem comes in: constantly interrupted, the only argument you mentioned was to say that a France devoid of her roots (racial and cultural) would no longer be France. But Yann Moix then answered that the nation is a changing reality at the whim of History.

Nadine Morano - *(France)...is a Judeo-Chrestian country -General de Gaulle was saying it- of white race, who welcomes foreign people...*

Yann Moix - *Momentarily Mrs Morano"*

Nadine Morano - *I don't want it momentarily...*

Yann Moix - *"There is no eternal France... One day France could be a Muslim country and it will be like that, history in movement..."*

Nadine Morano - *And I don't want France to become a Muslim country... You see... No.*

Yann Moix - *Well, it's a pity*

We were here in the heart of the problem. Indeed, on what grounds, Mrs Morano, do you prefer a true France versus this France of Yann Moix, that is to say, a country that would change at the whim of historical events?

For a simple reason, the obvious reason, that you didn't dare speak about, because it is politically very incorrect. This reason, Mrs, it's hold in one formula:

"Not everything worth".

In other words and in our case: you consider, Mrs, that the legacy of those who, from century to century, created France, is better far better, than this sub-culture "*Black Blanc Beur*".

But, this legacy of the centuries, this legacy that you know is superior, we owe it mostly to the Whites. And only a racial homogeneity will perpetuate this rich culture.

You know it, Mrs Morano. That's why you recalled that France was predominantly white. *"...in majority, nonetheless, sorry to say it: of a white race..."*

Here, allow me to digress: it is true that homogeneity doesn't mean absolute purity. Our countries have seen many people race mix, racial purity is a chimera... Besides, you've said it: France has been able to welcome people of foreign origin, even if they were racially different. On this point the National Socialist that I am agrees with you: interbreeding on the march of the empires is nothing catastrophic. Each generation can absorb foreign blood, it is even in the nature of things.

During the last war, I would have been a great friend the Algerian Mohamed El Maadi, a devoted National Socialist Muslim, founder of the Er Rachid newspaper (The Messenger), in 1943, in which he wrote: *"And if I admit and advocate racism when it means selecting and protecting against a determined race in order to maintain its virtues, I disapprove disguised racism of the democracies which under the guise of civilization, murder and rob the weaker."*

I would also gladly frequented the Arab cabaret *"El Ald Jazir"*, which was located 27, rue de la Huchette, in Paris. Its owner, Mr Louaib, came from Algeria. His father, a volunteer in the French army in 1914, had died for the country. In September 1939, the son had also enlisted in the army. Wounded and demobilized, he became an ardent apostole of the Franco-German collaboration, by joining the French League of Pierre Constantini.

These few examples demonstrate that, through close ties with foreign countries, a controlled immigration can provide examples of real integration.

But, you and I, Mrs Morano, are making a difference between this controlled immigration and this will of a forced interbreeding that causes the generalized acculturation, therefore the death of the host country.

This is why, Mrs Morano, you want to defend this eternal France, country of *"white race"*, even if she knows how to welcome the other to some extent and under certain conditions. You want it, I say it again, because you sense that a certain racial homogeneity is necessary to perpetuate this French culture that you know is superior to the subculture of the widespread miscegenation.

But you can't say this, because there is the weight of History. Consequently, you declare at minimum, that an acculturated France *"would no longer be France"*. But Yann Moix can then easily contradict you, alleging that France will always be France, regardless of her racial and cultural evolution.

And indeed, if the races do not exist, if all things are equal, then why prefer this white secular heritage to the miscegenation subculture born a few decades ago?



Why prefer the France of the painter Watteau than any modern dauber?



Why prefer the France "*Judeo-Christian*" to a Muslim, Shinto or atheist France?

Therefore, you are trapped, Mrs Morano, because you've backed up at the time to say not everything equals and that there are superior cultures.

Then, trying to get out of it and give legitimacy to the argument according to which France is a white race country, you invoke a great figure in the national history: General de Gaulle.

The trouble is that this individual is among the victors of 1945 and he, at the time, led a country who had participated to the Nuremberg trials! Far, therefore, from coming out of it, you entangle yourself a little more, Mrs. Because, whether you want it or not, the man who most emphasized the need of a racial homogeneity, is Adolf Hitler, whose ideology was opposed by De Gaulle, before being defeated by brute force and condemned at Nuremberg.

(Mein Kampf, N.E.L,1934,p.151):*"The State is the organization of a community of human beings, similar to each other physically and morally, established to better ensure their offspring and achieve the assigned objective for their race by Providence. It's there, and only there, the purpose and meaning of a State."*

And further **(p.391):** *"The State is a means to achieve a goal. Its purpose is to maintain and promote the development of a community of beings which, physically and morally, are of the same species: it must maintain, first, the essential characters of the race, condition for the free development of all the latent faculties of the latter. Of these faculties, some will always serve to the maintenance of the physical life and another part to encourage the intellectual progress. But, in fact, the first is always the necessary condition of the second."*

The only way: dispute Nuremberg

Therefore, Mrs Morano, you don't have a choice. If you want to be able to defend this true France, then, you must first fight for the restoration of the truth about National Socialism. Remark, I didn't say: *"fight FOR National Socialism"*; I said: *"fight for the restoration of the truth about National Socialism"*. This restoration implies to objectively answer these two questions:

Did Hitler's racism led to all the horrors which he is being accused of?

And if it led to some of them, was it a fatality due to the very nature of this ideology or an accident due to external circumstances?

As long as you do not even dare ask these two questions, that is to say as long as you do not dare to revise the Nuremberg trial, then any defense of this true France will remain impossible. For the implacable logic denounced in 1948, by Maurice Bardeche will develop.

You might answer me that, as a whole, the judgment of Nuremberg was fair and in line with historical reality. I will not make here a presentation of this trial. But, frankly, Mrs Morano, would you accept to be judged by people who have been your worst enemies and who just defeated you with weapons at the end of a fight without mercy? Especially if, in its Statute, the Tribunal that is going to judge you announced:

1- That it will not be bound by technical rules on the taking of evidence;

2- That it will adopt and apply as much as possible an expeditious procedure by admitting all means that it will estimate to have a probative value;

3- That it will not require that proof of facts of common knowledge be reported, but that it will hold them for granted.

The Nuremberg Tribunal was an ideological war machine to morally condemn those who had just been defeated by the weapons. It was so obvious that when delivering his final indictment the US Attorney that led the prosecution clearly stated it. He emphasized that the Allies were still technically at war with Germany and that this military court continued the war effort of the Allied nations. It was therefore, no question of objectively judging the vanquished, but to present them at all costs as monsters to morally justify the crusade initiated in September 1939 by the democracies. Remember, Mrs, the confession confidentially delivered by Churchill in June 1940.

To show you the injustice nature of the "*Nuremberg trial*" I will take the well-known example of Katyn.

When in February 1943, the Germans discovered the bodies of thousands of Polish officers summarily executed, they gathered an international commission of inquiry which resulted in the Soviet guilt.



At the time, besides, the collaborationist press never ceased to repeat that the guilt of the Soviet Secret Police was demonstrated, including in the Polish press. Despite the evidence, at the "*Nuremberg trial*", the Soviet Prosecution had the nerve to deposit a report which -the Prosecution claimed- demonstrate the German guilt in the massacre.

On February 14, 1946 (TMI,VII,p.430), this prosecution presented the document, calling Katyn as one of the most important crime of which the major war criminals had to pay for. The case being very serious, the German lawyers demanded the hearing of all necessary witnesses in

order to make it clear. Embarrassed, but unable to elude, the Tribunal allowed the hearing of only three witnesses for the Defense and three others for the Prosecution. The lawyers could only accept. Although, it was clearly insufficient. The case came to the hearing on July 1, 1946, with a President determined to do everything so that the truth wouldn't burst.

The most surreal moment was when the German High Command lawyer wanted to interrogate a witness. (TMI,XVII,p.292) The President opposed it, evoking a Tribunal decision according to which, no more than two lawyers could interrogate a witness. The Defender requested a derogation, on the grounds that the Katyn case was of an exceptional one. This request was perfectly legitimate, because three witnesses on each side, was already very unsubstantial. Therefore, it was necessary to allow more interrogatories. But the President continued to refuse. The Defender insisted, arguing that it was one of the most serious charge against the group he was defending. In vain, the President ordered him to seat back. The lawyer then protested against this serious interference put to the defense.

According to the investigation report (TMI,VII,p.431), submitted by the Soviet Prosecution, and whose conclusions were read out at the hearing, the massacre would have been committed by a German unit camouflaged under the official name of State Major 537, Engineer Battalion.

But, interrogated (TMI,XVII,p.283), the first German witness affirmed that such unit never existed, which was also confirmed shortly after by another witness (TMI,XVII,p.305). It was the evidence of the total lack of seriousness of the Soviet investigation report, therefore, the Soviet impudent lie.

Knowing that neither the accused, nor the lawyers could not shout that all this was a lie, a lawyer then had a judicious idea. Addressing the President, he declared (TMI,XVII,p.293): "*I would like to ask to the Public Prosecutor whom [therefore to which German army group] must be charged with the Katyn case?*" The President answered: "*I do not intend to answer such questions.*"

This way of evading sounded like a confession. Obviously, the Court knew that the Soviet Prosecution was shamelessly lying in this case and that the Germans were innocent. However, to recognize it would not only tarnish the honor of the victors, the Crusaders of Civilization, but it would also discredited all the documents provided by the Soviets.

Because, if they had been shamelessly lying in drafting this thick investigative report, which contained dozens of testimonies, then what worth were the dozens of similar reports on which many other accusations were based on?

This is why, the Court had no choice: it had to do everything to hide the truth about the Katyn case. What did it do? Very simple: relying on the Article 21, of the Statute, he admitted the Soviet "*report*" as an "*authentic evidence*". On the other hand (TMI,XVII,p.357), the report of the international commission convened by the Germans was accepted under Article 19 (not 21), which did not grant him the status of "*authentic evidence*".

Beyond the judgment on October 1, 1946, this difference was crucial, because the Soviet report, and only that, was published in the proceedings of the trial reports. It is found in Volume 39 (TMI,XXXIX,p.290), in its German translation.

The German report, for its part, was not reproduced, even partially.

Here is how, for years, only the Soviet "*truth*" has been publicly available. Katyn was the work of these horrible "*Nazis*". It was not only until several decades later that the Russian authorities finally admitted their guilt officially.

You see, Mrs Morano, that was Nuremberg: a gigantic parody of Justice intended to stifle disturbing truths. Poisoned tree, you must not be surprised that its fruits are now poisoned.

You showed some courage, Mrs Morano. But this is clearly insufficient: If you want to save France and beyond, the bearer of an irreplaceable old European civilization, then, you need to go further, by revising Nuremberg.

It will certainly be very painful, but the game isn't worth the candle.

Good evening.