

Joseph Fouché and The French Insurrection

by Katherine Kanter

In October 2002, mosques and Muslim prayer halls in Seine-Saint-Denis, a department near Paris, received a letter from the local Directorate of the Political Police, the Renseignements Généraux (RG): “At the request of the Interior Ministry, and of the Prefect of the Seine-Saint-Denis . . . , in order to update our information relating to those who lead prayer halls, all individuals in charge of a prayer room are instructed to attend.”

The letter was on Interior Ministry letterhead, ordering the religious leaders to appear at the RG headquarters at Bobigny, and to bring with them the following papers: “passport, residence permit, national insurance documents, wage slips, rent receipt for their lodgings, family-benefit card, income-tax returns, identity photographs, and school-leaving or university diplomas.”

The ostensible concern was “Muslim radicalism.” In response to a telephone call from the Paris daily *Le Monde*,¹ the Religions Section at the Interior Ministry acknowledged that the letter had been “awkward,” but that “the intentions behind it were good nonetheless.”

France is, I believe, the only country in the modern world, where there exists, openly, and quite officially, a Political Police. They attend, on a regular basis, openly, and quite officially, political and, as we have just seen, religious events. And the RG is wont to boldly interfere with “dissident” political formations, without, it seems, ever giving rise to public outcry.

The present study of the founder of the modern concept of political police, though very summary, will shed some light on what must change, in the French political psyche.

* * *

In 1789, there broke out an event that history refers to as the French Revolution, but were better known as the French Insurrection, being, as it was, more like the populist hysteria that preceded the fall of Salvador Allende in Chile in 1973, than to the events of 1777 in America.

Following the death of Foreign Minister Vergennes in 1788, France had scarcely a political figure of any stature. The scientific and engineering corps, not being, in the main, noblemen, were excluded from public life. As for the Church, both the Council of Trent faction, on the one hand, and the Gallicanists on the other, were equally reactionary. Unlike the American population in 1777—“Latin Farmers” as they were called—most Frenchmen were illiterate. Only a tiny

1. *Le Monde*, Oct. 17, 2002.



The story of Joseph Fouché is published here as a contribution to our series on the Synarchist International: the “beast-men” who seize control of nations in periods of crisis, perpetrating unspeakable horrors for the sake of terrifying their opponents into submission. This pamphlet by the LaRouche in 2004 campaign committee is circulating in hundreds of thousands of copies.



The bloodthirsty Fouché (left) has been described as a forerunner of Nazi SS chief Heinrich Himmler; but many in France today still leap to Fouché's defense, as they also defend the Terror of the French Revolution. Historian Jean Tulard's 1995 book on Fouché called the comparison with Himmler "unfair," adding that "Fouché was far cleverer than Himmler."



handful, outside the ruling elite, even knew what the word Republic meant, or had the remotest idea of what the program of the United States Revolution might have been, beyond the fact that it was anti-English.

Enter Joseph Fouché

In the year that Friedrich Schiller was born at Stuttgart, 1759, unhappy France acquired a petty bourgeois bounder of a peculiarly energetic complexion, Joseph Fouché. Together with his alter-ego, Charles-Maurice de Talleyrand-Périgord, this man was, over the course of his forty years in politics, to alter the character of the French people, much for the worse.

Born at Nantes into a family of sea merchants, whose affairs involved, *inter alia*, slave-plantations in the West Indies, young Joseph was put in with the Oratorians to study, and, on finishing the *cursum*, became an extremely popular teacher of mathematics and physics at the Oratorian College at Arras. There he met Maximilien Robespierre. Many of the Oratorians' pupils were to become perfervid Jacobins, but at the time, Fouché's mask was a Catholic one.²

In 1789, as the Insurrection erupted, Robespierre was elected to the Estates General, while Fouché was transferred back to Nantes to teach. He got himself elected, in 1790, chairman of the Friends of the Constitution and became principal of the College at Nantes. On learning that the monarchy

2. It has been suggested that a Jansenist cell had developed within the erstwhile Christian-humanist Oratorians, and as for Arras, that town had itself been notorious as a center of the French Inquisition.

had been overthrown, he began to agitate to become Deputy (Member of Parliament) for the Loire-Inférieure, astutely marrying in the process one Bonne-Jeanne Coiquaud, whose sole feminine attraction is reported to have been that her papa ran the province's Administration.

In the light of Fouché's later deeds, his electoral tracts are instructive. He describes himself as an "architect of policy," rather than a "revolutionist agitator." He praises the Oratorians for fomenting "those religious sentiments that are so needful, and so admirable, when purified by philosophy." He won the seat.

In 1792, we find him among the great Revolutionists, seated on the Committee of Public Instruction alongside Nicolas Caritat, Marquess of Condorcet.³ By 1793, the "moderate architect of policy" of 1790 was pressing for the death of Louis XVI, for which he

voted, and publishing a pamphlet entitled "*Reflexions sur la Mort de Louis Capet*" ("Reflections on the Death of Louis Capet") in which he shrieks: "We are strong enough to bend to our will all powers, and all events. Time is on our side, against all the Kings on this earth."

As those words were written, the Kings of Europe (Prussia, Austria, Great Britain) were, in point of fact, preparing an onslaught on revolutionary France, then in the grip of civil war. The British, riding the wave of imperial victory in Canada and India, had stipendiary agents in every Paris faction and throughout the countryside, the scenario being to provoke inchoate uprisings, whereby France would be knocked out of the Great Game by civil strife, dissolution, and dictatorship.

At what point Fouché entered the service of the British, or the Austrians, or both, this author cannot say, not having access to primary sources in the relevant State Archives. But enter the service of a foreign power, he did. There is otherwise no explanation for how a complete mediocrity could have succeeded in his designs to cover the entire territory of France with the most finely-tuned network of political police and informants since the Assyrian Empire, a design, moreover, that served no positive national purpose whatsoever. Unless it were some other nation's purpose: At the end of the day, virtually every event in France during

3. The Marquess of Condorcet (murdered 1794), was a central figure in the Committee, whose work was to lead, in 1795, to the Revolution's few real achievements, notably the Conservatoire des Arts et Métiers, the Ecole Normale, and secondary schooling.



The storming of the Bastille, July 14, 1789. The French Revolution—better called an Insurrection—quickly degenerated into a brigand’s den of warring intelligence factions. Fouché was later dispatched by the Committee of Public Safety with the explicit mission of unleashing Terror.

Fouché’s political existence tended to the advancement of the British Empire.

Fouché’s Career as a ‘Mission Agent’

Lacking, as it did, any programmatic content, the French Insurrection promptly became a brigand’s den of warring intelligence factions. Within a fortnight of the fall of the Bastille, the Constitutional Assembly had set up the Committee of Information, renamed, in turn, the Committee of Research, the Committee of Surveillance, and finally, in 1792, the Committee of General Security (*Comité de Sûreté Générale*). By the time the Convention placed Terror “On the Agenda of the Day” (1793), the Committee of General Security had become a virtual ministry, with at least 160 official employees, and dozens (hundreds?) of six-man teams combing hill and dale, called agents of execution. The Committee of General Security could issue arrest warrants, and had access to secret funds.

In 1794, the Committee of Public Safety (*Comité de Salut Public*), the only known positive elements of which were Lazare Carnot⁴ and Prieur de la Côte d’Or, set up a rival body, known as the Bureau of Administrative Surveillance and General Police.

One of the salient traits of this so-called Revolutionist period, is the entwining of the prosecution services with both the investigative agencies, and the administration of justice. In plain English, the same people were judge, jury, and executioner. For example, in 1793, the Convention placed the local authorities (district administrations) under its direct control. These administrations had full power to enforce “revolutionary law,” and could, in particular, arrest people. Each district had a National Agent, whose explicit mission was political surveillance of private citizens. This agent could issue the equivalent of *habeas corpus* writs, impound private property, and enter the jails unhindered.

Then there were the “spontaneous” grass-roots grouplets, known as Surveillance Committees, Central Committees, and Revolutionary Committees, planted in every town and hamlet. They were “legalized” in 1793. Among the pastimes of these bucolic bodies: checking the identity of “outsiders” (persons foreign to the town, more often than not people fleeing Paris and the Terror), issuing arrest warrants and Certificates of Civic Virtue and passports, receiving informants’ reports, and bringing people up *manu militari* before the Revolutionary Tribunals. The latter were empowered to hand down summary judgment,

including in capital offences—of which there were many—without right of appeal.

Now, this seething mass of tittle-tattlers had to report to someone. By decision of the Committee of Public Safety, they were to tattle to what were known as “mission agents,” who had unlimited power to “maintain order.” As soon as the mission agents would arrive in a district, they would make contact with the local Surveillance Committees and Jacobin clubs, and could bring any citizen up before the Revolutionary Tribunals. They also ran the press-gangs. Some mission agents must have done their job in raising an army, because Lazare Carnot’s defense of France succeeded; others, like Fouché, were otherwise engaged.

Somehow, we know not precisely how, Fouché got him-

4. Lazare Carnot (1753-1823), mathematician, one of the greatest military reformers in modern history.

self appointed mission agent for the Loire-Inférieure and the Mayenne, with orders to raise a force of 300,000 men. On March 26, 1793, our subject wrote to the Convention that he had jailed all nobles and priests in the Nantes area, and had set up a Tribunal to judge them. He did not, however, succeed in raising soldiers, owing to the local population's anti-Jacobin sentiment. Empty-handed, he turned back to Paris, and veered toward the Hébertistes, a still-more extreme revolutionist faction. In June 1793, we find the ex-seminarist publishing a pamphlet entitled "*Reflexions sur l'éducation publique*" ("Reflections on public education") in line with the ideas of his new allies in the Commune. The pamphlet is an onslaught upon the clergy, and upon religion in general; "religion," he wrote, "sullies man, and degrades him." The revolutionists must create a "monopoly" over education—in other words, all schools run by the Church must be forbidden—in order to "combat the odious influence of religion."

By the end of June 1793, Fouché was sent out as mission agent yet again, this time to the center and west of the country. After a campaign of rabble-rousing against "the rich," he issued a Decree on Requisitions in October 1793, which recalls Stalin's *Ukazy* against the unhappy *kulaks*. Under Article 4, any "rich landowners or farmers" who were "declared suspect" of withholding wheat were to have, not only the grain, but all their private property, and *all their private papers and documents seized*. The same measures were to apply to factory owners whose machines were idle, and to landowners whose land lay fallow.

The impounding, continues the decree, was to be done by "patriots" of the Revolutionary Guard, endowed with a Certificate of Civic Virtue issued by the local Surveillance Committee. Under Article 16, those committees were to "effect the same" vis-à-vis all "rich men" in their districts, "in proportion to their fortune, and to their lack of civic virtue." Peering into one's neighbor's coffers, and accusing him of "lacking civic virtue," is what that boils down to. Meanwhile, Fouché amused himself with scribbling signed notes, that he put into the hands of the local riff-raff, authorizing them to turn up at the homes of the rich, and demand to be "clothed from head to toe."

Encouraged by the popularity that such acts of petty tyranny gained him with the Hells Angels of the day, Fouché, by September 1793, threw himself headlong into the Hébertistes' de-Christianization campaign. On Sept. 23 he issued an Order ordering "all priests on state pension either to marry, or adopt a child, within a month." At Moulins, he obliged the Bishop and 30 priests to renounce the faith, and tore down all signs of the Christian religion. At Nevers, on Oct. 9, he issued a decree stating that "all signs of religion on the roads, squares, and in all public places, shall be destroyed." At the gate of the cemeteries in his provinces, he had put up the sign: "Death is eternal sleep."

At the end of May 1793, the City of Lyons, which at that time held about 100,000 inhabitants, rose up against the Revolution, led by a coalition of Royalists, republicans opposed to the terrorists, Girondins, and the bourgeoisie. Lyons was accordingly besieged by the Convention from August to October 1793. When it fell, Fouché was dispatched by the Committee of Public Safety with the explicit mission of unleashing Terror. By the time he left, something like 2,000 people lay dead. He first set up a temporary Surveillance Commission, in November, and then a Revolutionary Commission to sentence the suspects. So many were shot, that gunpowder became scarce. Fouché thereupon brought in cannon. The insurrectionists of the lower classes—their betters were guillotined—were tied together in the Plaine des Brotteaux, and mowed down with cannon. Did the cannon miss, they were chopped to bits, or buried alive. Lyons was renamed Commune-Affranchie, the Liberated Commune. And Fouché wrote to the Committee of Public Safety—which gives one a good idea of the psychosis that reigned there—that his anti-British (sic) strategy was to "let their bleeding corpses, thrown into the Rhône, present to both its banks . . . the impact of horror, and the image of the French people's irresistible power."

"Irresistible" indeed, the power to slaughter most of Lyons skilled textile workers. A few decades back, the British had cut off the right arm of Calcutta's textile workers; but they had not, at the time, found so eager an Indian to command the maneuver for them.

A ceremony Fouché organized at Lyons at that time, gives one a flavor of his rule:

November 10th, 1793

A Sans-Culottist wearing a Bishop's Mitre and bearing his Staff, walks solemnly before a donkey, over which Papal garments have been draped, and a Mitre placed on his head. Round the donkey's neck, hangs a chalice, and attached to his tail, a Bible, and a Missal book. Bringing up the rear of the procession, another Sans-Culottist, dragging in the dust the Fleur-de-Lys.

The instant Fouché learnt that Hébert had been guillotined at Paris, he ordered a halt to the executions, and purged the Lyons Revolutionary Committees of all Hébertist supporters. This moment will likely emerge as the one at which Fouché came to the attention of the Austrians and the British, as a possible major asset. Just as one must commit a murder, in cold blood, to gain entrance into the Mafia, so Fouché had proven, through the de-Christianization campaign, and by his conduct at Lyons, that for his own advancement, no act was too vile. It is known that at a later stage in his career, Fouché became *Grand Conservateur* of the *Grande Loge Symbolique*, of which Napoleon's brother Joseph Bonaparte was the Grand Master, the latter's deputies being Murat and Cambac-



“Contrary to official French historiography, the Terror was not a sacrificial flame, purging and purifying everything it touched, with a few collateral losses. It had no redeeming features.” Left to right: Robespierre, whose Reign of Terror drowned the Revolution in blood; Jacques Necker, who as Finance Minister in the pre-Revolutionary government, steered the plan to destroy France on orders from Britain’s Lord Shelburne; and Jean-Paul Marat, imported from London, who was the leader of the Jacobins.

ères. The freemasonic Lodge would seem to have been the equivalent, perhaps even the direct ancestor, of Licio Gelli’s Propaganda-2 right-wing terrorist cell structure in Italy during the 1980s. Be that as it may, whether Fouché was already, in 1794, a highly-placed freemason, this author does not, at present, know.

In April 1794, a year known to the Revolutionists as Year II—the world was supposed to have begun afresh in 1793, Year I of the Republic—Fouché was recalled to Paris. Failing a worthwhile political or economic program, the Jacobins had let loose gang warfare in that city, dignified, in the history books, by the title of “Terror.”⁵ The Committee of General Security was, in theory, in charge of “repressing plots by enemies of the Revolution.” To that end, it was empowered to issue arrest warrants. Arrests were also ordered by the Committee of Public Safety, the Police Administration of the Commune of Paris, and the Revolutionary Committees of the City’s 48 districts.

Each Revolutionary Committee was under orders to draw up a Schedule of Information on each citizen they arrested, which schedule was then put before yet another body, known as the Office of Prisoners. That Bureau was answerable both to the Committee of Public Safety, and the Committee of General Security. There was also established a Bureau of Administrative Surveillance and General Police, within the Committee of Public Safety, on which sat Robespierre, Couthon, and Saint-Just. *Nacht und Nebel*. The upshot was police

and secret intelligence warfare; arrest and release warrants contradicted each other while thousands of innocents were murdered without the shadow of a cause. In the meantime, myriad files on individuals were collected, an underground city of facts, like the East German Stasi’s labyrinth beneath Berlin, that were to turn up as blackmail against entire families, for two or more generations thereafter.

No Redeeming Features

Thrashing through the impenetrable thicket of names, events and counter-events—we are dealing here with one of the most tumultuous epochs in modern history—one thing is crystal-clear: Contrary to official French historiography, the Terror was not a sacrificial flame, purging and purifying everything it touched, with a few collateral losses. *It had no redeeming features*. As with Pol Pot in Cambodia, anyone of quality, “anyone wearing eye-glasses,” was either murdered, or had to flee the country for his life. The dregs of society were given *carte blanche* to murder, loot, and ransack; 80- and 90-year-old aristocratic women were gang-raped and torn limb from limb. Informants ratted on informants in an infinite loop.

The Terror left the French population, down to our own day, with almost a genetic fear of any strong emotion, save for hatred, which is but another sign of deep-seated fear. Any appeal to Christian sentiment in its strongest forms, to higher moral ideals of any kind, is met by a cynical cackle, or a salacious remark. Then, as now, the population took refuge in pornography, one form of gnosticism in favor of which there was, and is, a broad national consensus.

5. See *Les Hommes de Londres*, by Olivier Blanc (Albin Michel: 1989), one of the few modern studies on the role of British intelligence in the Terror.

In the midst of the uproar, Fouché clambered over cadavers into the Presidency of the Jacobin Club, from which unsteady vantage point he was to effect the downfall of Robespierre (1794). Somehow weathering all attempts to unseat him from the Convention, when survivors of the atrocities at Lyons attempted to get him indicted, he wrote:

You have been coolly asked to contemplate the fate of four thousand men mowed down by cannon. . . . I refer to the fact only to draw serious reflections on the false and hypocritical mood of sensitivity that has become noticeable, in order to show how necessary it is to instill terror in the souls of the wicked. . . . and that any thought of indulgence, of moderation, is a counter-revolutionary thought.

Although the Convention did in fact vote for Fouché's arrest, in 1795, on hearing reports from the provinces of atrocities perpetrated at his orders, he was never taken. He simply dropped out of view until an Amnesty was proclaimed on Oct. 26 of that same year, busying himself in the interval with making money, appropriately enough, from a fraud involving the fattening of swine for market, and thereafter, from military procurement. The Directorate, which held sway over France from 1795 to 1799, saw Fouché offering to serve Barras as police agent and informer. Barras thereupon introduced Fouché to a banker and outright British agent, one Gabriel Julien Ouvrard, with whom he was later to plot against the American Republic, and then catapulted him into his first major position, as Ambassador to Milan, in 1798. Talleyrand, also a British agent, but of a rather higher ilk, had become Minister of Foreign Affairs in July 1798, which conveniently made him Fouché's superior.⁶

As an aside, allow us to report here, that rumor has it that, on being recalled to Paris from Milan, in 1799, Fouché took care to remove with him the Embassy's stable of horses, and all its linens and furnishings.

Fouché's next assignment was as Ambassador to Holland, where he remained for some months, until the Directorate recalled him to Paris, this time, as Minister of the General Police, a position created in 1796.

This ministry was in charge of the National Guard, Legion of Police, and the gendarmerie, as well as the jails. When Fouché came to it, it was under the Directorate's fairly direct control, and had few men and less power. He was astute enough to see that, in his own words, "all personal advantage that could be got from the Revolution, had been got," and that *the next stage, was dictatorship*, in which the police, through his own person, were to become the core institution.

6. That being an acknowledged fact, it is quite extraordinary how, in our own day, there flourish a number of French societies, several of which have websites, bearing names like "Friends of Talleyrand."

Joseph, Joséphine, and the Slaves

Fouché's political faction of king-makers, appears to have toyed with General Joubert, who was killed in action, and with General Bernadotte, before lighting upon Gen. Napoleon Bonaparte. Fouché's assignment was to use police measures to paralyze any Royalists or Jacobins likely to obstruct Bonaparte's coup; Fouché was, in point of fact, personally responsible for the measures taken against Lazare Carnot. To sweeten Joséphine de Beauharnais,⁷ the General's mistress, she was given a cut on the capital city's gaming tables.⁸

In the Bonapartist coup d'état (1799), the two emeritus agents of foreign powers, Charles-Maurice de Talleyrand-Périgord and Fouché, each played their assigned role. Talleyrand forced Barras to resign from the Directorate, leaving a power vacuum. Fouché organized the technicalities: transferring the Parliament by force to Saint-Cloud, for "security reasons," under the "protection" of Bonaparte's troops, and closing the Barriers of Paris, thus preventing anyone from entering or leaving the capital without his personal authorization. On learning, at seven in the evening, that Bonaparte's coup had succeeded, Fouché announced that "an assassination attempt against General Bonaparte" had been successfully foiled, and issued a truly Orwellian proclamation to the citizenry:

Events are at last upon us, for our own felicity, and that of future generations. . . . let the Weak rest assured; they are with the Strong. Let everyone return to their own business and homely practices. Let there be feared, and checked, only those who foment disquiet, sow confusion, and store up disorder.

Coming from a man whose only credentials were his own unchecked propensity to shed others' blood, one can only imagine how the proclamation may have been received by fellow citizens, on hearing from a Terrorist that their physical survival henceforth depended on refraining from all public or political activity.

Haute Couture, Haute Cuisine, Haute Police

We are now come to the point in Fouché's history, where he was given *carte blanche*, officially, to alter the character of the French nation. Here, emerges the concept of the so-

7. Joseph Fouché and the courtesan Joséphine de Beauharnais, a French creole who later married Napoleon, had more in common than their Christian name. As we have seen, Fouché's family's fortunes lay, at least in part, with the progress of the slave trade in the West Indies, from whence came the lily-white Joséphine. In 1802, slavery was *restored* in Guadeloupe, Martinique, and French Guyana. Ten percent of the population of Guadeloupe, over ten thousand people, were shot or deported, by Napoleon's troops. An attempt to restore slavery *manu militari* on the island of San Domingo (Haiti today), by Napoleon's brother-in-law, General Leclerc, failed.

8. Fouché may have been the first to have seen the advantages to official, institutional control over gaming.

called Haute Police. You, dear reader, have heard of Haute Cuisine; you have heard of Haute Couture. But this may be the first time you come across this sympathetic little expression, the Haute Police. The concept is Fouché's own. "The police is an agency that tracks down crime, and ensures that old ladies do not get themselves struck by vehicles hurtling at red lights?" Wrong! In the French tradition, the true, and central, function of the police, is a political police. Any other public-safety duties are anecdotal.

And what, pray, could the political police be up to? Might they be there to thwart foreign subversives? Might they be innocently reporting on all political meetings to their minister? Wrong again! The concept behind a political police, is terror *by other means*. The political police not only intervenes directly into others' political events, it creates events, and it even creates, dare one say it, candidates to highest office. The political police leaks privy personal information at its disposal to the press, to foreign governments, to interested third parties.

All this, and more, we owe, in its modern form, to Joseph Fouché, minister to a military dictator.

So here we have Fouché himself, installed as the Minister of the General Police. His first move, on the 22nd Brumaire (November 1799) was to purge the Paris Administration, and the Central Police Bureau. He had 37 "Jacobins" immediately deported, including a journalist, and placed 22 under house arrest. He had the leader of a so-called "Royalist" conspiracy shot. He bought newspapers, literally, with ministry funds. Sixty newspapers out of 73 were outlawed, and Fouché personally saw to it that they were closed down (January 1800). In the midst of all this, Napoleon Bonaparte had his own private, and highly unofficial, police force.

How Fouché saw his assignment is instructive:

The Paris police is, for a Republican Government, of far greater importance than it was before the Revolution . . . those who oppose the new political order, have now come to increase the number of those who oppose the social order.

And

the police, as I see it, shall be established to forestall, and prevent, offences, to contain, and check, whatever the laws have not foreseen. Its authority is *discretionary*.



Charles-Maurice de Talleyrand-Périgord (left), Foreign Minister from 1798-1807 was Fouché's alter-ego and fellow British agent. From 1801 on, Fouché encrusted himself like a barnacle with Napoleon, surviving each successive convulsion in the French political wars.

Eschewing, henceforth, the weapon of indiscriminate brute force, Fouché was utterly lucid about the impact that his very British, very modern, psy-war was designed to have on the politically-aware: One must, he wrote, keep the citizenry in an ever-shifting state of uncertainty. Few were exiled, still fewer killed, but one never knew who would be next, or quite why.

Bonaparte, who was wont to personally meet with Fouché to review his daily bulletins, greatly feared his own Minister of Fear, and set up a Prefect at Paris as counterweight, since he dared not do without him. According to a contemporary, Pelet de la Lozère, "Discussion with Fouché held its attractions for Napoleon, because he would report to him only matters pertaining to the political police, that which related to parties, diplomatic or intrigue, and never to the police on the streets or highways, in which neither took the slightest interest. Fouché would sign without reading everything relating to such lowly business."

From 1801 on, Fouché, who maintained throughout a tight, though in the main discreet, link with Talleyrand, encrusted himself like a barnacle with Napoleon, by orchestrating various assassination attempts on the dictator, all of which naturally failed, greatly redounding to the credit of the Minister of Police. Briefly disgraced in 1802, his Ministry dissolved into that of the Justice Ministry (a relative disgrace, since Fouché was made Senator of Aix-en-Provence, a highly lucrative position), Fouché was back in the saddle the following year, and this time, engaged, alongside Talleyrand, in one of the most blatant breaches of international law since the Peace of Westphalia.

The Duke of Enghien, a Bourbon Prince, was kidnapped

on the territory of a foreign state, Baden Wurtemberg, dragged to Paris, and executed in dead of night on March 20, 1804, the year in which Napoleon had himself crowned Emperor. The presence of both Talleyrand and Fouché at a secret parley where the murder was planned, was a signal to the world that France would no longer pay even lip-service to international law⁹: The Empire was to be, and it meant World War. A short week later, Fouché stood boldly before the Senate pleading for the Empire, in order that Bonaparte's "great work be brought to completion, by making it immortal." In return, Fouché's Ministry of the General Police was restored.

France had been prey to revolution, civil war, terror, repression, foreign wars, for over 15 years. There was no mood about in the nation for wars of conquest. Fouché set about creating that mood, by the application of force, using his return to the Ministry to crack down on playwrights, and on all forms of literary activity. All printed books were reviewed at the Justice Ministry, before they could be put out on sale.

Fouché thoroughly reorganized his ministerial fief. He had three state counsellors appointed to the Ministry, each responsible for one district (*arrondissement*). The first *arrondissement* was Northern and Western France, the second, the South, the third, Paris. In 1809 a fourth was added, *viz.*, those parts of Italy under French dominion. Increasingly, as the frontiers of France spread eastward, the activities of the police became entwined with those of military intelligence, and diplomacy.

A singular trait of the Age of Fouché, is the rise of what the French call, "the Administration." It had readily become clear to educated Frenchmen, that political activity would not be tolerated by the Life Consul, soon to be Emperor. Ambitious men accordingly flocked to become civil servants, where they expected to serve, not the public, but private particularist interests, and thereby enrich themselves at the expense of the nations that Napoleon crushed. Other scions of the bourgeoisie sought a "politically-correct" outlet for their stunted energies in *outré* focus on bodily pleasures, notably greedy feeding, of which Brillat-Savarin's *The Physiology of Taste* is a remarkable, and reliable, testimony.¹⁰

In 1808, Napoleon, advised by his Mephistopheles, Talleyrand, invaded Spain. Whilst the Emperor waged what one might today call "preventive" war on the Spaniards,¹¹ Fouché and Talleyrand "brought together," as Prince Metternich curiously put it, "by circumstances independent of their own voli-

9. In 1806, Fouché's men kidnapped at Hamburg the British Ambassador, and seized his papers.

10. While the wealthy flitted about in garments so transparent, for women, and so close-fitting, for men, that they would be frowned on even by theatrical artists today. Balzac has reported on this amusingly, in his "Physiology of Marriage."

11. The reader is referred to Francisco Goya's "Disasters of War" to appreciate the exquisitely tactful behavior of Napoleon's troops in Spain

tion," met to discuss how, and by whom, the Emperor should be replaced. The Austrians were to attack once the French Army collapsed in Spain. When Napoleon returned, he threw out Talleyrand, who promptly went over to the Austrians. Fouché, however, had the files. He intended to remain in place, and thus did not shrink from a little blackmail. In his bulletin dated March 13, 1809, Fouché wrote to Napoleon:

It is bruited about by intrigants that the Minister of the Police [Fouché himself] did burn many documents, since the Emperor's return [from Spain]. The Minister does indeed order the burning of many documents a week . . . there would otherwise be clutter and confusion. . . . Everything that relates the history of things, and individuals, is carefully kept. In that respect, no Ministry is kept in better order. But the . . . lies of every kind raised against the most honest of our citizens, and often, against members of the Imperial family, all such documents, once they have been reviewed, are put before the Minister, who has them destroyed.

A Plan To Reconquer the United States

As the Emperor left for the Austrian front in June 1809, Fouché became interim Minister of the Interior as well, holding sway over the Prefects, and thus, over the economy. His first move was to grant licences to trade with England, despite



DVD

LaRouche: 'The Immortality Of Martin Luther King'

Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr. speaks to the Martin Luther King Day Prayer Breakfast in Talladega County, Alabama on Jan. 19, 2004.

\$25 postpaid order # EIR DV-2004-1

Call 1-888-EIR-3258 (toll-free)
EIR News Service, Box 17390,
 Washington, D.C. 20041-0390

We accept Visa and MasterCard.

the blockade that Napoleon had instituted. He then began to raise a National Guard in four provinces, and 30,000 men in Paris, commanded by acolytes of the exiled Talleyrand, including a known British middleman, one Montrond. Rumor had it, that Fouché had begun his maneuvers, aided by the British, to bring Prince Bernadotte to power.

Although Napoleon must have got wind of the Bernadotte maneuver, he authorized Fouché to negotiate with the British through a relative of the Barings, a Dutch financier named Labouchère. Baring (whom Fouché knew through a long-standing contact, the banker and intelligence operative Gabriel Julien Ouvrard [1770-1846]), was to deal with the British Cabinet. Fouché however, went well beyond the instructions given him by Napoleon: He put to Lord Wellesley, in 1810, a plan the details of which had been worked out by Ouvrard: *The French would help England reconquer the United States, and for one year, all the French Empire's ports would be open to English trade.*

No sooner had Bonaparte learnt of Fouché's *ultra vires* diplomacy, that he had Ouvrard arrested, and ejected Fouché from his ministries, but, fearing retaliation from the latter's allies, yet appointed him Governor of the Papal States. Before Fouché left for Italy, he *removed from the Ministry every scrap of paper of the remotest interest, and burned the rest.* His successor, Savary, found the cupboard bare.

Very briefly, Fouché fled Bonaparte's anger abroad, though his precise movements remain unclear to this day. It is said that he had intended to go to Naples, to meet there with Murat, the "King" placed by his brother-in-law Napoleon on that throne. Why? It would seem that through Murat's wife, Caroline Bonaparte, who had been at one time Prince Metternich's mistress, communications with that Prince were unfettered.

The year 1810 was, in any event, an upbeat one for any Frenchmen not enmeshed in one of Napoleon's foreign wars of aggression. As France annexed Rome and Holland, a new domestic Criminal Code came into force, instituting 30 capital offences, and other measures of a notoriously repressive character. The words "Liberty, Equality, Fraternity" were rubbed off public buildings, while police censorship of the press was greatly intensified.

Fouché appears to have put the years of his "disgrace" (1810-13) to good effect, as Prince Metternich and the Duke of Wellington gathered forces and moved to extinguish Napoleon.

Instrument of his own downfall, Napoleon Bonaparte, in 1813, appointed Fouché Governor of Illyria, an imperial province that covered roughly the territory of present-day Croatia. No better position could have been wished, from Fouché's standpoint, for dealings with the Austrians, to whom, a few short weeks later, that province fell. Fouché thereupon removed to Italy, where Bonaparte again issued to him unwise orders: to go to Naples, and there to act virtually as viceroy of the Italian peninsula, while Murat, King of Naples,



After the abdication of Napoleon, Louis XVIII became King of France, and named Fouché as Secretary of State to the Ministry of Police, from which post the latter carried out the White Terror—a new orgy of bloodletting.

Fouché's ally, was deep in turn-coat negotiations both with Lord Bentinck, and with the Austrians.

Chaptal, a former Minister, reports in his Memoirs that Fouché acknowledged to him at the time that he was in contact with Prince Metternich, and had decided to throw his weight behind General Bernadotte, a replacement for Bonaparte whom he believed might prove agreeable to the British and the Austrians.

Between 1813 and 1815, as Bonaparte's Thousand-Year Reich collapsed, and France lost something like half a million men in foreign wars, Fouché was the still, steady center of foreign intelligence in Paris. There was some sort of division of labor—Talleyrand more closely connected to the British; Fouché, to the Austrians. By 1815, Fouché had become so bold as to meet in Paris with Metternich's emissaries "by light of day."¹²

Wellington, Talleyrand, Fouché

When Napoleon abdicated, it was to Fouché that he handed over the Act of Abdication. That Act stated that Napoleon's son, the so-called "King of Rome," was to reign in his

12. Cf. the "Eskeles Bank" affair, where Baron Ottenfels, Metternich's private secretary, had sent the clerk of the Bank to Paris with missives for Fouché.

stead. Fouché sped, Act in hand, to Parliament, where he read out a speech quite disregarding the existence of the little King. He rather proposed that a five-man commission be appointed to “negotiate” with the Allies, although those negotiations should, in point of fact, have been conducted by Parliament. Lazare Carnot, who lacked Fouché’s “international support,” was elected to the Commission, and promptly outmaneuvered.

The Duke of Wellington, Prince Talleyrand, and Fouché had long since agreed to bring a British puppet, Louis XVIII, to power. They met at Neuilly in July 1815, to decide what should become of France. Talleyrand proposed that an amnesty be proclaimed of all charges (treason, and so forth) raised against Fouché, and that he be reinstated as Minister of Police. In the chaos of Napoleon’s fall, Fouché thus got leave from Metternich and Wellington directly, to sweep away anyone associated with Lazare Carnot, and to thwart all attempts to institute a Republic. The Commission led by Carnot was dissolved that same July, a date that marks the last breath of Carnot’s political life in France.

Louis XVIII signed the order appointing Fouché Secretary of State to the Ministry of Police; and the ubiquitous Prince Talleyrand was made the new King’s Minister of Foreign Affairs, as well as President of the Council of Ministers, which met in Talleyrand’s private residence. Fouché’s first move was to issue to the Prefects a Circular calling upon them to intensify political repression: “The time has come to sacrifice Opinion, on the altar of the Public Weal.”

How ready Fouché was to set the example, and sacrifice Frenchmen himself, is shown by his interesting behavior during what is known as the White Terror. This refers to yet another episode of extreme violence, this time intended by Louis XVIII, during which anyone who had helped Bonaparte return to power during the One Hundred Days was hounded down, exiled, or executed. Fouché, who was, with Talleyrand, Bonaparte’s longest-serving Minister, drew up the list of suspects, and signed them himself. Although apologists of Empire, like the contemporary historian Jean Tulard, would contend that Fouché attempted to water down Louis XVIII’s vengeful zeal, the exile of Fouché’s bitterest enemy, Lazare Carnot, *inter alia*, can scarcely have been a slip of the pen.

The White Terror was Fouché’s final gift to the nation. Pricked by the people’s keen hostility, Louis XVIII could not keep on both Talleyrand and Fouché, lest his own head come off. He eschewed Wellington’s advice, and probably that of Castlereagh and Metternich as well, and decided, by Sept. 15, 1815, to pack Fouché off as Ambassador to Dresden. In January 1816, Louis went further, and had a sentence of exile pronounced against Fouché, *in absentia*.

Fouché died at Trieste in 1820, having declined to be harbored by his allies in England, Holland, and Austria. His last act was to order his private papers burnt.

That Fouché acted throughout his career, as a conscious

agent of foreign powers, is undoubted. What cannot but astonish, under the circumstances, is how certain Frenchmen will spring to his defense to this day. Witness the following extraordinary passage from Jean Tulard’s 1995 *Joseph Fouché*:

the imperial police’s reputation is not of the best. Some would have it to be a forerunner of that of the 20th Century’s totalitarian governments, and they would have us believe that Fouché was an early Himmler, an early Beria, an early founder of a Gestapo, an NKVD. How unfair a judgment! There is no such line of descent: [Under Fouché] there were no concentration camps, no deportation, no genocide planned under Napoleon. The scale of repression was simply not the same. What is more, Fouché was far cleverer than Himmler, far less cynical, less of a roué than Beria. . . . Himmler too, after Hitler’s death, thought to negotiate with the Allies. But comparisons stop there.¹³

13. Cf. Friedrich Schiller, fragment of a play, *The Paris Police*, he was working on at the time of his death in 1805, as well as *The Ghost-Seer*.

For Further Reading

Helga Zepp-LaRouche’s speech to the conference of the Schiller Institute and International Caucus of Labor Committees on Feb. 15, 2004, which deals with Joseph de Maistre and other Synarchist “beast-men,” will be published in a forthcoming issue of EIR. Other important articles from our archives include:

Pierre Beaudry, “Jean Sylvain Bailly: The French Revolution’s Benjamin Franklin,” *EIR*, Jan. 26, 2001.

—, “Why France Did Not Have an American Revolution,” *EIR*, Jan. 18, 2002.

Anton Chaitkin, “Synarchy Against America,” *EIR*, Sept. 5, 2003.

Jacques Cheminade, “Time to Destroy the Mythology of Bonapartism,” Oct. 17, 1996.

Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr., “How France’s Greatest Military Hero Became a Prussian Lieutenant-General,” Oct. 2, 1998. (On Carnot.)

Dino de Paoli, “Lazare Carnot’s Grand Strategy for Political Victory,” *EIR*, Sept. 20, 1996.

Jeffrey Steinberg, “Synarchism: The Fascist Roots of the Wolfowitz Cabal,” *EIR*, May 30, 2003.

Helga Zepp-LaRouche, “Empires Always Destroy Themselves,” *EIR*, Sept. 22, 2000. (On Napoleon.)