

---

Who ordered the attack against Charlie Hebdo?

14/01/2015



While many French react to the attack against Charlie Hebdo denouncing Islam and demonstrating in the streets, Thierry Meyssan points out that the jihadist interpretation is impossible. While it would be tempting for him to see it as an Al Qaeda or Daesh operation, he envisages another, much more dangerous hypothesis.

On January 7, 2015, commandos erupted in Paris, in the premises of Charlie Hebdo and murdered 12 people. 4 more victims are still in serious condition.

## **The mission of this commando had no connection with jihadist ideology**

Indeed, members or sympathizers of the Muslim Brotherhood, al-Qaeda or Daesh would not be content to just kill atheist cartoonists; they would have first destroyed the archives of the newspaper on site, following the model of all their actions in North Africa and the Levant. For jihadists, the first duty is to destroy the objects that they believe offend God, and to punish the "enemies of God."

Similarly, they would not have immediately retreated, fleeing the police, without completing their mission. They would rather have completed their mission, were they to die on the spot.

In addition, videos and some evidence shows that the attackers are professionals. They wielded their weapons expertly and fired advisedly. They were not dressed in the fashion of the jihadists, but as military commandos.

How they dispatched a wounded policeman who posed no danger to them, certifies that their mission was not to "avenge Muhammad" because of the crass humor of Charlie Hebdo.

## **This aims to create the beginning of a civil war**

The fact that the assailants speak French well and are probably French does not necessarily indicate that this

attack is a Franco-French episode. Rather, the fact that they are professional forces one to distinguish them from possible sponsors. And there is no evidence that these are French.

It is a normal reflex, but intellectually wrong to consider, when one is a victim of an attack, that one knows his attackers. This is most logical when it comes to normal crimes, but it's wrong when it comes to international politics.

Sponsors for the attack knew it would cause a divide between French Muslims and French non-Muslims. Charlie Hebdo had specialized in anti-Muslim provocation and most Muslims in France have been directly or indirectly their victims. Though the Muslims of France will surely condemn this attack, it will be difficult for them to experience as much pain for the victims as felt by the readers of the newspaper. This will be seen by some as complicity with the murderers.

Therefore, rather than seeing this as an extremely deadly Islamist attack of revenge against the newspaper that published the Mohammed cartoons and multiplied front page anti-Muslim headlines, it would be more logical to consider that it is the first episode of a process to trigger a civil war.

### **The strategy of "the clash of civilizations" was designed in Tel Aviv and Washington**

The ideology and strategy of the Muslim Brotherhood, Al Qaeda and Daesh does not advocate the creation of civil war in the 'West', but on the contrary to create it in the "East" and hermetically separate the two worlds. Never has Sayyid Qutb, nor any of his successors, called to provoke confrontation between Muslims and non-Muslims in the territories of the latter.

On the contrary, the strategy of the "clash of civilizations" was formulated by Bernard Lewis for the US National Security Council then popularized by Samuel Huntington not as a strategy of conquest, but as a predictable situation. [1] It aimed to persuade NATO member group populations of the inevitability of confrontation that preventively assumed the form of the "war on terrorism".

It is not in Cairo, Riyadh or Kabul that one advocates the "clash of civilizations", but in Washington and Tel Aviv.

The sponsors of the attack against Charlie Hebdo did not seek to satisfy jihadists or the Taliban, but neo-conservatives or liberal hawks.

### **Let's not forget the historical precedents**

We must remember that in recent years we have seen the US or NATO special services:

- Testing the devastating effects of certain drugs on the civilian population in France;
- Supporting the OAS to try to assassinate President Charles de Gaulle;
- Carrying out false flag attacks against civilians in several NATO member states.

We must remember that since the break-up of Yugoslavia, the US joint chiefs of staff practiced and honed its "dog fight" strategy in many countries. This consists of killing members of the majority community, and also members of minorities, then placing the blame on each of them back-to-back until everyone is sure they are in mortal danger. This is the way Washington caused the civil war in Yugoslavia as well as recently in Ukraine.

The French would do well to remember also that it is not they who took the initiative in the fight against the jihadists returning from Syria and Iraq. To date, moreover, none of them has committed any attack in France, where the case of Mehdi Nemmouche is not that of a lone terrorist, but of an agent tasked with executing two Mossad agents in Brussels. It was Washington who, on February 6, 2014, convened the interior ministers of Germany, the US, France (Mr. Valls was represented), Italy, Poland and the United Kingdom in order to make the return of European jihadists a matter of national security. It was only after this meeting that the French press addressed this issue, and that the authorities began to react.

We do not know who sponsored this professional operation against Charlie Hebdo, but we should not allow ourselves to be swept up. We should consider all assumptions and admit that at this stage, its most likely purpose is to divide us; and its sponsors are most likely in Washington.

