

The 28 Pages, the Paris Attacks, And International Terrorism

On Jan. 9, Col. Alain Corvez (ret.), a former advisor to the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon (UNIFIL), was interviewed in Paris by EIR. The interview, in French, is posted on the website of [Solidarité & Progrès](#).

EIR: Colonel, a press conference was held on Jan. 7 in Washington on the need to declassify the 28 pages of the 9/11 report. Those 28 pages of the report of the bipartisan Congressional committee investigating the flaws of U.S. intelligence in the Sept. 11 attacks, co-chaired by former Democratic Senator of Florida Bob Graham, have so far only been accessible to Members of Congress, who may consult them under surveillance by watchers, and are prohibited from taking notes or revealing the contents.

Bob Graham, together with three members of the House, representatives of the families of victims, and with the support of some 20 Members of Congress, is demanding today, once again, that those 28 pages be released, so that the American people can judge the policy. They call into question the role of Saudi Arabia, of Saudi officials, and in particular, of Prince Bandar, who was Saudi ambassador to the United States at the time. This press conference was covered by the *Huffington Post*, CNN, Fox News, etc. What do you think of this?

Alain Corvez: Well, I think it will be very good if those 28 pages are released, and everyone can be informed of the contents. In all likelihood, as you seem to indicate, there must be highly interesting revelations in those 28 pages, since if they were not released along with the rest of the report, someone wanted the information to be covered up. U.S. intelligence services, and intelligence services all over the world, work in the same way, but if certain powers—and you mentioned in particular Saudi Arabia—did play a role in the Sept. 11 attacks, that must be made known, and it must be known to the American citizens to begin with, and to the rest of the world. As we all know, unfortu-

nately, the events of 9/11 have had repercussions throughout the world.

So I think it's a step forward, not only with the press conference, but with all the work that came before the press conference. I hope they will achieve their goal, and the pages will be released. Once the information in those 28 pages is generally known, we will certainly have a different vision of who commissioned what on Sept. 11, 2001 in the United States.

A Parallel Between 9/11 and Paris Attack?

EIR: Bob Graham brought up three times in his remarks, the relationship between the Sept. 11 attacks in the United States and the attack in Paris against *Charlie Hebdo*, and the assassination of the journalists. How do you see the relationship he mentioned?

Corvez: I also saw articles in the French press, and in the U.S. press—the stories in France may have been taken from the U.S.—which draw a parallel between the two, and point to two very surprising facts: First of all, that in one case, in 2001, the passport of one of the terrorists was found completely intact in the World Trade Center, although everything else had been destroyed. But, as if miraculously, that passport had not been destroyed. Then, there is the fact that the killers at *Charlie Hebdo* left behind a national identity card, which meant they could be identified immediately. That is already one parallel. Because they were apparently not amateurs.

How can professionals leave an identity card in their car, which would identify them?

I have no material proof at the moment that indicates that foreign powers are behind the attacks at *Charlie Hebdo*, just as foreign powers were behind the 9/11 attacks. But there are these two facts—the passport in 2001, and the identity card in 2015, which are incoherent elements. I don't know more than that, but it does seem astounding.

EIR: Do you mean that professionals who killed as

they killed would not act as amateurs by leaving behind the means to identify them?

Corvez: Exactly. That is totally incoherent for professionals. The images we saw and the way the attacks were carried out, show that these people were acting calmly and in cold blood. They were shooting, shot by shot, when they needed to, and only let off bursts of gunfire when it was indispensable. And the bursts were very well controlled, as could be seen in the impacts. So these were real professionals, who could shoot very well. You can also see in the video how they withdrew, how they got into their car: They were calm, and we had the impression that they had carefully prepared their coup. That such highly trained professionals would leave an identity card in the car they later abandoned, is inexplicable. It seems incoherent.

We cannot imagine that a terrorist would take his identity card out of his pocket and put it on the seat of the car, or on the floor, so that it could be easily found. I find that completely incoherent with the professionalism of those terrorists.

Cui Bono?

EIR: What do you think of so-called Islamic terrorists who killed a policeman who was already on the ground, with a shot to the head, although the policeman was a Muslim?

Corvez: Did they know he was a Muslim? We don't know. The impression I have, without being privy to any secret information—I only have what has appeared in the press—is that these were professionals who had carefully prepared their coup. To act in that way, they must have had a plan and probably orders to carry out.

Afterwards, we had other terrorist attacks in Paris, and even outside of Paris. Is all of that coordinated? I would not go so far as to say that. I think it is possible that the barbarous act of killing the journalists at *Charlie Hebdo* had been commissioned. There are at least clues that point in that direction.

However, we also have to ask “who benefits from the crime” and what the result of all this is? We can see that anxiety is spreading everywhere in France. Many fear confrontations among various layers of the population. That might be the result sought after: to divide France and create chaos by getting different layers of society to fight one another.

EIR: What do you think of the links between the Kouachi brothers—presumed to be responsible for the



Schiller Institute

Col. Alain Corvez: “Once the information in those 28 pages is generally known, we will certainly have a different vision of who commissioned what on Sept. 11, 2001 in the United States.”

attack on the *Charlie Hebdo* journalists and the police—and Abu Hamza, the London-based Finsbury Park Wahhabi preacher? His lawyer has apparently stated that his client was cooperating with British intelligence services, in particular with MI5. Should we draw any conclusions from what would seem to be a blatant process of indoctrination?

Corvez: Yes, I think so. First, I think we can say with certainty that—as is known—many Islamic terrorists meet in prison, and are indoctrinated there. Of course, indoctrination can also occur outside of prison.

Concerning their connections with Abu Hamza, it does not strike me as particularly surprising. In a milieu where people deliberately go underground and cut themselves off from society, though keeping up the appearance of belonging to the society they come from, and in which they live normally, while joining something organized as a network, you will find someone who will ask: “Have you heard of such and such an Imam?” or “Do you know Abu Hamza?” or “Do you know the Imam of the Drancy mosque?” or from some other mosque? “You have to meet him,” etc. That’s the way it happens.

As for the fact that Abu Hamza was collaborating with MI5, that is indeed rather disturbing. It may indicate that those people were manipulated by the British services via multiple channels.

EIR: The fact remains that for quite some time in London, these people have been out in the public, freely without being bothered. And the extraditions that French services requested were only reluctantly granted.

Corvez: Absolutely true. That was surprising for people who were following such issues. It was surprising to see that the British allowed the most extremist imams to freely express themselves, in particular in London. We could not help but wonder what their purpose was. If the British government indicated it was worried about that, the secret services might have told the prime minister or the government: “We control the situation—we manipulate them, they are our agents.” Well, if they are manipulating them, if they are agents, how far does that go? To the point of indoctrination, of creating international networks, including in France? If the Kouachi brothers were in contact with Abu Hamza, there is a possibility that this was manipulation by MI5.

EIR: Curiously, the Kouachi brothers were shot and killed by the police, and so was the Montrouge terrorist [Coulibaly], who had proposed that they [the Kouachis] be allowed to go free, in exchange for him freeing the hostages he was holding at the Jewish kosher store. Every one of them has been killed by the police. Just as occurred in the case of Merah [Mohammed, a terrorist who perpetrated attacks at Toulouse and Montauban in 2012]. Again, should we draw certain conclusions from that?

Corvez: This is a great pity. As I saw on TV yesterday evening—I repeat that I only have access to public information—there were two former directors of intelligence, one a former leader of a domestic service, [Bernard] Squarcini [head of the General Directorate for Internal Security (DCRI) 2008-12], and another whose name and exact position I cannot recall. On two different channels, and at different times, both of them said, when asked by journalists what would happen next, that the policemen would try to catch the terrorists alive, that it was very important to catch them alive so they would talk.

Squarcini said this was critical, because it was the most essential way to get information on other possible attacks on France in the future. Well, this evening, I heard that they all had been killed. I don’t know the circumstances of how it happened, but it is certainly a

great pity. They were completely trapped in a confined area, perhaps they could have waited for them to surrender. It is a great pity that these people will never be able to talk, and tell us how their operation was set up.

Money Is the Sinew of War

EIR: One of the victims, Bernard Maris, was an economist strongly opposed to the financial oligarchy. Could that mean something in particular?

Corvez: Yes. We know that the world’s being run by capitalism, that is, by the people who have money. Money is the sinew of war, and of everything else. Without money, nothing moves. Those who have money today are the major international financiers, who essentially take their orders from Wall Street and the City of London.

In that context, we could mention the ongoing affair of the takeover of Alstom by General Electric. This is off-topic, but it is linked to the issue of international finance. A very good report was drafted on the subject by the Centre français de recherche sur le renseignement [French Center for Intelligence Research]; it has been widely debated, and to the degree that several parliamentarians have called for a commission of inquiry into Alstom’s takeover by GE. The report is all the more remarkable, in that it describes the financial powers, like the hedge funds, hidden behind General Electric.

One can readily imagine that the international finance networks did not precisely appreciate Bernard Maris. Although I did not know him personally, I do know that he was a harsh critic of the financial world.

Now, did the people who planned the attacks intend to kill two birds with one stone? I can’t say, but many questions remain unanswered. Further reflection is in order. I told people to wait for the results of the inquiry in the circles I belong to, because some people wanted to take a position right away. I tried to calm them down, and say we should wait for the outcome of the inquiry to see who commissioned what, and how the attacks were set up, etc. Unfortunately, nothing more will emerge, because those who could have told us were killed.

EIR: Would not the best homage we could pay to the victims be, to react by returning to a policy of real national independence?

Corvez: Of course, but that’s true in all areas. Our

millstone is the lack of a policy of national independence. It began at the end of the Chirac Presidency and continued under Sarkozy, and now under Hollande. It became even more explicit with the “rapprochement” between France and the U.S., i.e., the increasingly shared views between French and U.S. diplomacy. Hence, we are now in a situation, as in the case of this terrorist attack, where it is legitimate to ask: Is this a signal that foreign powers are trying to give us, telling us: “Be careful, don’t move too far away from us, otherwise, we could harm you...”

Everything is possible, we can make all the assumptions we want to. What is certain, is that international terrorism has been steered, as we know, by the United States, and I think you stress the role of the British, which is probable. It is established that the Daesh [Arabic acronym for ISIS], which is the latest expression of terrorism, is entirely controlled by the U.S. secret services with the help of Qatari, Saudi, and Turkish intelligence. Nobody should be fooled by this: Daesh is a U.S. secret intelligence operation. Therefore, if they are able to control Daesh, they can probably run those who might be friends of Daesh, and who are in France.

A New World Emerging Around the BRICS

EIR: Does a Europe from the Atlantic to the Urals [an expression of Charles de Gaulle] and a New Silk Road worldwide to overcome the danger of being manipulated and controlled by directed financial flows, appear to you to be an attainable perspective?

Corvez: Yes. I find that is not only a possible, but a desirable, perspective. In fact, the jolts that we are experiencing today may just be the consequences of the emergence of a new world with new poles, with new power relations. The United States, whose power is declining, but still the largest in the world, views the emergence of these poles with great worry.

There is a major problem in the fact that the U.S. government does not rule the U.S., but it is lobbies, in



French security officials said it was critical to capture the terrorists alive, so that they could provide information. Yet, they were all killed. Shown: the kosher grocery, Hyper Cacher, during the attack by police Jan. 9, where four hostages and a terrorist were killed.

particular financial lobbies, which are intervening in Washington and preventing President Obama and his government from applying a strategy of openness. A strategy of opening up to the world and taking into account the new power poles is not at all to the liking of this faction of international finance, which wants to maintain the total supremacy of the dollar and of the United States in all areas, including against the realities it faces. When that doesn’t work, when China, India, and the BRICS countries in general, decide to organize trade relations in other currencies than the dollar in order to avoid having to carry out the orders given by Washington, the financial magnates are obviously not happy. And they are capable of preferring chaos—as in Ukraine, for example, or the terrorism of Daesh—rather than losing American influence over the course of world events.

EIR: The U.S.A. you mention here is not acting for the good of the American people. Do you see the possibility that a different kind of government could emerge in the U.S.A., opposed to Wall Street and to the Anglo-American world, which would act in the interest of the people and respect the spirit of Franklin D. Roosevelt, the Founding Fathers, and especially, of the U.S. Constitution?

Corvez: That is my wish, and in my opinion, a wish readily shared by all men of good will. I was in Tehran

last Dec. 9-10 for a conference [World Conference against Violence and Extremism], on the theme of the new world to be created with moderate relations. That countries have interests to defend is perfectly normal, but they should defend them in a moderate fashion and engage in dialogue, rather than saying “the military option is on the table.” The general theme of the conference was a world against violence and extremism. So a lot of people from around the world intervened. There were Russians, Chinese, many people from European countries, and also a former U.S. Senator who made a remarkable intervention. I say this to underline that there are many people in the world, including in the United States, who say: “We don’t want a world where might makes right.”

Now, I’m going to caricature somewhat, but I think the image fits. The U.S. behaves like cowboys from the *Belle Époque*.¹ If an Indian refuses to hand over his land or bothers them, they draw their Colts and kill him. U.S. policy today, with a bit of exaggeration, is like the cowboy drawing his pistol when anybody disagrees. But I do feel that more and more people in the United States are raising their voices against that. Senator Graham and the committee he set up in the U.S. on the subject we discussed before, also proves that there are people who want to get out of a world in which the U.S. lays down the law for the entire planet.

You are right, that is not in the interest of America. It might last for a while, but it can’t last eternally. And so it isn’t in the interest of the United States of America, and it isn’t in the interest of the American people. Because today—as very important voices have said—Americans are hated throughout the entire world. So when they travel, they are unpopular just because they’re Americans: “Arrghh, it’s you!”

So it isn’t in the interest of the Americans. I am sure that the American people, and I have American friends, do not share that idea. I’m sure the American people would be glad to have a government that would take into account the fact that we are living in a world where there are no more threats; there is no more threat of mutual destruction, but there are powers with different cultures and ambitions, but which carry out a dialogue

with one another and want to discuss with moderation, when different viewpoints arise, instead of pounding their fists on the table or drawing a gun and saying, “If we disagree, I’ll kill you!”

EIR: This is what [Chinese President] Xi Jinping calls a “win-win” system.

Corvez: Exactly, it is a “win-win” system, that’s exactly it.

Investigate the Sources of Terrorism

EIR: Do you think it would be necessary to create in France a Parliamentary Inquiry Commission to investigate the sources of terrorism?

Corvez: It certainly would be useful. I think our secret services certainly have a lot of ideas on that. But, as you know, the political power only authorizes secret services to write and circulate their analyses if they do not go against the diplomatic line that has been chosen, and chosen without taking into account these analyses....

On revealing the sources of terrorism, if we define it as being backed by U.S., Saudi, Turkish, and Qatari intelligence services, as well as those of countries with which we have close relations, and which we ask to invest in our real estate or other sectors of the economy, the political power will likely oppose it. But if we find enough parliamentarians and senators who would agree to set up such a commission, which goes in the direction demanded by Mr. [Bob] Graham in the United States, it would be very good. We could put on the table, without of course revealing state secrets, what terrorism is all about. Everybody talks about terrorism, but ask the man in the street what he knows about it. [He will say:] “These are people who want to kill, but I don’t know why.”

Very few people know that behind these players, who are often barbarians unaware of who they are really working for; there are intelligence agencies which control them, which steer them. It would be very interesting if a commission would bring that into the open and say: “Be careful, you can’t fool everybody. Terrorism did not come out of spontaneous generation. This is where it came from, how it is financed and how it operates.”

EIR: Thank you, Colonel, for giving us reasons for thought and hope.

Corvez: We have thought it out together.

1. Literally, “Beautiful Age,” it refers to the period in France from the end of the Franco-Prussian War (1871) to the start of World War I (1914).