

Children of Satan



Lyndon LaRouche PAC
Leesburg, Virginia
August 2004

Contents

Foreword

The Doom of the Would-Be Gods of Babylon <i>by Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.</i>	v
---	---

CHILDREN OF SATAN

The 'Ignoble Liars' Behind Bush's No-Exit War

LaRouche Says Charges Against Cheney Constitute Grounds for Impeachment	3
'Insanity as Geometry': Rumsfeld as 'Strangelove II'	6
The 'Ignoble Liars' Behind Bush's Deadly Iraq War	29
The Secret Kingdom of Leo Strauss	47
• Allan Bloom Interprets Plato's <i>Republic</i>	55
Strauss's Benefactor: Carl Schmitt, the Nazis' 'Crown Jurist'	58
• The Strauss-Schmitt Correspondence	64
Why the Democratic Party Failed To Function in This Crisis	66
Synarchism: The Fascist Roots of the Wolfowitz Cabal	82
Where the Chickenhawks Got Their Love of War	96

CHILDREN OF SATAN II

The Beast-Men

Letter of Transmittal	103
-----------------------	-----

The Return of the Beasts	106
• Donoso Cortes's 'Immense Sea of Blood'	133
• The Expulsion of the Jews	136
Mannikin: The Making of Tom DeLay	137
• DeLay Is, After All, a Freak!	150
• Some Public Figures Affiliated with the Fellowship Foundation	153
Dope Czar Soros Bids To Buy Up Democratic Party	155
Appendix: Soros, Dope, and Dirty Money	165

CHILDREN OF SATAN III

The Sexual Congress For Cultural Fascism

Preface: How 'The Sexual Congress of Cultural Fascism' Ruined the U.S.A. and Gave Us 'Beast-Man' Cheney	171
What Does Culture Do?	179
The Congress for Cultural Freedom	203
• Henry Luce's Empire of Fascism	224
The CCF and the 'God of Thunder' Cult	228
• CCF and the Boomers' Shakespeare	246
The American Family Foundation	250
• Henry and Clare Booth Luce Love Their LSD	261
Appendix	
The Bizarre Case of Baroness Symons	263
A Concise Timeline of the Symons-Duggan Affair	276

Illustrations follow pages 100 and 167.

Copyright © August 2004

Lyndon LaRouche PAC
P.O. Box 6157
Leesburg, VA 20178
www.larouhepac.com

LLPBK-2004-001

On the cover: Paul Wolfowitz: DOD Photo/Helene C. Stikkel; Dick Cheney: World Economic Forum/Davos; John Ashcroft: USCFC.uscourts.gov; Donald Rumsfeld: DOD Photo/R.D. Ward

Inside photographs: Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.: EIRNS/Stuart Lewis; H.G. Wells: www.arttoday.com; Dick Cheney, George W. Bush, and Donald Rumsfeld: Sgt. Tony DeLeon; Hannah Arendt: Library of Congress; Friedrich Nietzsche: www.arttoday.com; Paul Wolfowitz: DOD Photo/Helene C. Stikkel; Richard Perle: EIRNS/Stuart Lewis; George W. Bush, Donald Rumsfeld, Condoleezza Rice, and (back to camera) Dick Cheney and Paul Wolfowitz: DOD Photo/Helene C. Stikkel; Adolf Hitler and Hjalmar Schacht: Bundesarchiv; Adolf Hitler: Library of Congress; George Soros: EIRNS/Stuart Lewis; Mickey Steinhardt: Yeshiva University Today Online; George Shultz: EIRNS/Stuart Lewis; Tom DeLay: www.jamesmadisoncenter.org; headquarters of the Fellowship: EIRNS/Anton Chaitkin; John Ashcroft: EIRNS/Stuart Lewis; Spanish Inquisition scene: NORML; Henry Kissinger: EIRNS/Stuart Lewis; Ariel Sharon and George W. Bush: White House Photo/Paul Morse; Ku Klux Klan cross burning: Library of Congress; Lynne Cheney: www.gettysburg.edu; Tony Blair: World Economic Forum/Davos; Adolf Hitler and Francisco Franco: National Archives; Adolf Hitler and Benito Mussolini: clipart.com; Sidney Hook and Don Buck: EIRNS; Robert Penn Warren and John Crowe Ransom: Kenyon College Archives Special Collection website; Jerry Falwell: EIRNS/Stuart Lewis; Galen Kelly: EIRNS/Stuart Lewis; Dennis King and Chip Berlet: EIRNS/Stuart Lewis; Baroness Liz Symons: DOD Photo/R.D. Ward.

Paid for and Authorized by the
Lyndon LaRouche PAC and Not Authorized
by Any Candidate or Candidate's Committee

FOREWORD

The Doom of the Would-Be Gods of Babylon

by Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.

August 14, 2004

Already, with the ugly impasse which erupted around the abortive U.S. Presidential election of November 7, 2000, there was the smell of an ominous sickness in not only the U.S.A., but a sickness of the U.S.A. as the capstone of a self-doomed world monetary-financial system. Now, nearly four years since that mis-election, the words I spoke shortly prior to the actual January 2001 inauguration of President George W. Bush, Jr. must seem prophetic to all whose memories are sufficiently lucid to remind them of my words.

Unless we mend our ways, unless our republic ceases doing what it has been mostly doing during the recent four years, we are indeed at the very edge of a chasm of ruin and despair such as has been unknown to today's globally extended European civilization since the great New Dark Age which wiped out half the parishes of Europe, and one-third of the level of its population, during the middle of the Fourteenth Century.

You, the citizen, are not faced with a choice between candidates; you are faced with a choice of plunging into doom under the incumbent administration, and the possibility that we might not merely survive, but might actually do well under the incumbent's prompt replacement. The choice of the current administration, is unthinkable for thinking men and women.

Especially in times of crisis, such as these, the task of a scientist-statesman, which I am, is not to dazzle with mystification, as our all-too-numerous, self-important academic asses are wont to do, but to educate the constituency and leaders of the nation, to show them their folly, to induce them to mend

their sorry ways. It is to be the stern teacher, to make clear to those who must learn to survive, that which they now, urgently, need to know.

Therefore, my duty, formerly as a Presidential pre-candidate, and now as one working to bring a new Presidential administration into being, is to make clear to as many of our citizens as are prepared to listen to reason, to come to understand how we, the greatest nation yet to exist on this planet, could have brought about our own destruction, in the way we have done, during, especially, the recent forty years since the assassination of President John F. Kennedy and the lunacy of the launching of the official U.S. war in Indo-China.

Many citizens, both of my generation and the generation presently occupying most leading positions in private and public life, recognize the folly of having entered that former war. The problem has been, that even they have rarely understood, exactly what it was, which we as a nation did to ourselves, to bring us into the gruesome mess of our nation and its international relations today.

So, I created the series of widely circulated reports, on the subject of "The Beast Men," "The Children of Satan," crafted and issued during the course of the 2004 Presidential primary campaigns.

How did we change, from being greatest producer-nation of the world, to becoming something like the decadent Roman Empire, a nation of "bread and circuses" subsisting on the cheap labor of foreign nations, especially the poorest, while destroying the great productive power we used to represent forty years ago?

Who caused us to do this to our nation, and to ourselves? How did it happen? Why, under the present administration, do we lurch from bad to worse, even, now, to the brink of a self-inflicted doom? What must we understand, if we are now to pull back from the brink, before it becomes already too late for all of our presently living generations today?

The greatest danger today, is that sheer stubbornness of people, which causes them to blame a few leaders for the mistaken opinions for which the people in general either voted, or did not bother to vote against. We are a democracy, for whatever that means in fact. We have the power to vote, unless that

power is taken away from us, by computer-voting fraud, or other means, between now and the November election.

The way in which we use, or neglect that power decides our fate as a nation. The first step toward sanity and morality for our citizens today, is to blame themselves for the choices of policy which they have either made or tolerated. It was the votes, combined with the non-votes of the morally irresponsible professional underlings known as abstainers, which expressed, chiefly, those wrong ideas about policy which made possible the recent forty years' transformation of the world's greatest and wealthiest productive power into the tattered ruin we are today. Unless the people are willing to reconsider their habituated prejudices now, the chances for our nation's survival, even in the short term, are little or none. We have now come to the end of the road, to the edge of the chasm, where the road ends for all but our legendary lemmings.

So, I have chosen to "kick against the pricks," to tell the unpopular truths about the way in which the majority of public opinion, as more or less than lack of truly competent leaders, has led our nation into the present catastrophe. Unless the majority of our people are willing to change their political behavior on that account, there is little chance for a happy future for this nation. A nation in which so many people would tolerate the ideas of a Newt Gingrich for as long as ours did, could not be considered either moral, or entirely sane.

The following pages, which some should read again, and many for the first time, point the way to understanding what must be understood if we as a nation are to pull back from the brink toward which we are lurching, in time to save not only ourselves, but generations yet to come.

Children of Satan: The 'Ignoble Liars' Behind Bush's No-Exit War

The following was first issued as a LaRouche in 2004 campaign pamphlet in April 2003, with two subsequent editions released that year.

LaRouche Says Charges Against Cheney Constitute Grounds for Impeachment

WASHINGTON, D.C., June 7—In the midst of a growing mountain of evidence that Vice President Dick Cheney led a battery of senior Bush Administration officials, in repeatedly using what was known to be a forged document from a foreign government to corral Congressional and public support for the Iraq war, Democratic Presidential pre-candidate Lyndon LaRouche issued a sharply worded statement today, insisting on a full investigation, documenting exactly what Vice President Cheney knew, when he knew it, and precisely what he did, contrary to what he knew to be the truth.

The charges against Cheney are centered on the fact that the Vice President repeatedly used documents, allegedly from the government of Niger, purporting to show Iraqi government efforts to purchase large quantities of uranium precursor “yellow cake” from that African nation, long after he learned that the documents were forged.

On June 2, Rep. Henry Waxman (D-Calif.), the ranking Democrat on the House Government Reform Committee, sent a letter to President George W. Bush, demanding a full explanation from the Administration, as to why senior Bush Administration officials, including Vice President Dick Cheney, Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld, and the President himself “cited forged evidence about Iraq’s attempts to obtain nuclear materials.”

In a statement released through his national spokeswoman, Debra Hanania-Freeman, LaRouche was quoted as saying:

“Let there be no mistake about it. The nature of these charges constitute hard grounds for impeachment. The question has to be taken head on. It is time for Dick Cheney to come clean.

I want to know exactly what Dick Cheney knew and when he knew it. The charges are grave and specific and leave no wiggle room. Determining who knew what and when is, at this time, an urgent matter of national security.”

Freeman, citing LaRouche’s own track record in challenging the avalanche of disinformation and “spun” intelligence products thrown up by the Straussian neo-conservative network inside the Bush Administration, to launch the recent war against Iraq, said that LaRouche was uniquely positioned to hold not only the Administration itself, but also the other Democratic Presidential candidates accountable for their uncritical endorsement of what amounts to an ongoing fraud against the Congress and the American people.

She said that the chronology of events documented in the Waxman letter, indicates that Vice President Cheney was among the first Administration officials to be informed that the Niger documents were forgeries, and that he nevertheless continued to assert the Niger-Iraq uranium story as fact. “This kind of witting, repeated fraud against the Congress and the people of the United States represents a crime of the highest order. And, as such, I can tell you that Mr. LaRouche will see to it that a determination is made, and made quickly, and that he will not back off until appropriate and severe action against those perpetrating this fraud is taken.”

Appendix: Chronology

- Sometime in late 2001, the U.S. Central Intelligence Agency received a number of documents on the letterhead of the Niger government, detailing repeated attempts by Iraq to purchase vast quantities of uranium oxide “yellow cake,” a precursor for nuclear weapons production.
 - In early 2002, Vice President Cheney requested that the documents be investigated and, as a result, a former U.S. Ambassador to African countries was dispatched to Niger.
 - Sometime in February 2002, officials of the CIA, the State Department, and the Vice President were informed by the ex-Ambassador that the documents were forgeries. The fact that the documents were forgeries was reported around the Bush Administration.

- Nevertheless, on Sept. 24, 2002, Bush Administration officials and CIA officials briefed Congressional leaders that the Iraqis were attempting to purchase “yellow cake” from an African country. The same day, the Office of British Prime Minister Tony Blair published a dossier on Iraq’s weapons of mass destruction, asserting the same false information about the Niger uranium purchases.

- On Dec. 19, 2002, the U.S. State Department published a one-page fact sheet, disputing Iraq’s weapons declarations to the United Nations Security Council, again citing the Niger sales of “yellow cake” to Iraq.

- During January 2003, every top national security official of the Bush Administration, including National Security Advisor Condoleezza Rice, Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld, and President Bush himself, cited Iraq’s efforts to obtain nuclear materials from Africa, in briefings, interviews and, in the case of George Bush, in his State of the Union address.

- On March 7, 2003, Dr. Mohammed El Baradei, the director general of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), delivered testimony before the United Nations Security Council, in which he exposed the Niger documents as shoddy frauds.

- Even following the El Baradei revelations, Vice President Dick Cheney, appearing on March 16, on “Meet the Press,” repeated the Iraq nuclear-material lie.

The next day, Rep. Henry Waxman (D-Cal.) wrote his first letter to President Bush, demanding an accounting of the repetition of proven fabrications.

‘INSANITY AS GEOMETRY’

Rumsfeld as ‘Strangelove II’

by Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.

This statement was released March 26, 2003 by the LaRouche in 2004 Presidential campaign committee.

The first week of President George W. Bush, Jr.’s Middle East war sufficed to unmask the military doctrines of Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld, Vice-President Cheney, and their pack of Chicken-hawks, as the work of fools or, most probably, worse. Since then, the Bush Administration’s current Defense Department’s utopian military policies, are now ever more widely recognized among relevant professionals, and qualified other critics, as combining elementary military incompetence with several dimensions of unworldly delusion. The relevant delusions of Rumsfeld’s, Cheney’s, and Ashcroft’s flock, are to be recognized as an outgrowth of the fusion of two ingredients: the first, the Nietzschean fascism of Professor Leo Strauss; the second, that imperial, and frankly satanic, Wells-Crowley-Russell-Hutchins, English-speaking utopianism of the high-flying “military-industrial complex,” which has been the principal, alien adversary of the Classical U.S. military tradition in statecraft since the closing phase of World War II.

Predominant control over the present Bush Administration has been secured, until now, by a Cheney-led fusion of the combination of Chicago University’s imported fascist—that Professor Leo Strauss—with Wells’ and Russell’s goal of world government through Hitler-like, preventive nuclear war. Speaking in terms of epistemology, the “genetically” Nazi-like ideology of a Strauss, was that of a figure whose own writings, like those of his underling Allan Bloom, recall those of the Nazi philosopher, Martin Heidegger, who influenced Strauss. Strauss’s dogmas are those of a Nietzschean parody of the

wicked Thrasymachus from Plato's *Republic*. That same Strauss is the central ideological figure of that cult of his devotees known as the current Bush Administration's "Chicken-hawks." It is these Chicken-hawks who, in Donald Rumsfeld's Hitler-and-the-generals routines, have been the controlling, lackey-like figures of President Bush's post-2001 drive toward imperial, nuclear-weapons-wielding world war.¹

The shocking lessons of the first week of the new Iraq war's battlefields forced many to look back to the sum-total of relevant recent weeks' developments in and out of the UNO Security Council. Increasing numbers are being forced to recognize that President Bush's maddened lurch into a new Iraq war, was induced and intended by the President's current Chicken-hawk controllers, as a trigger for an enraged utopian's Hitler-like, chain-reaction-like plunge into what, unless stopped, will be spread, more or less rapidly, as a new world war. On that account, the French Foreign Minister Dominique de Villepin's UNO Security Council warning against Bush's proposed war, must be endorsed for fact, by all reasonable governments around the world, as many among them have either stated or clearly implied. Of that, I say, as I have said in various forms and locations before this: *That new world war, implicit in President Bush's current Middle East policies, unless stopped soon, will have an outcome comparable, on a global scale, to something worse than what Europe suffered during the 137 years preceding the Treaty of Westphalia.*

To begin to understand how President George W. Bush, Jr. came to this presently tragic state of his government, look back to January 2001, shortly before his dubiously contrived inauguration.

Just prior to the January 2001 inauguration of that current U.S. President, I delivered, from Washington, D.C., what must now seem to many as a prophetic public address to an international audience. In that address, I warned that the inauguration of that Presidency coincided with the U.S.A.'s previous entry into the terminal phase of the collapse of the world's current

¹ Cf. Field Marshal Erich von Manstein, *Verlorene Siege (Lost Victories: The War Memoirs of Hitler's Most Brilliant General)*, Presidio Press, 1994, for a devastating account of foolish fascist Adolf Hitler's comparable, Rumsfeld-like tyranny over his generals.

monetary-financial system. I warned that audience, then, that Bush's inauguration, under today's 1928-33-like conditions of terminal monetary-financial crisis, coincided with the likelihood that powerful insider forces behind the scenes would arrange a thus-threatened, early outbreak of an incident paralleling the Feb. 27, 1933 burning of the German Reichstag.

That Reichstag burning which I referenced in that address, was the incident which was used by the Nazi government to establish the Hitler dictatorship. The Reichstag event thus precluded the alternative: that the March inauguration of President Franklin Roosevelt would mean that the similar recovery programs of Roosevelt and Germany's Dr. Wilhelm Lautenbach might be adopted by Germany instead of Hjalmar Schacht's. Thus, by late Summer 1934, some form of World War II had become inevitable, under a world governed by the European leaderships of that time.

That new "Reichstag Fire" of which I warned in that January 2001 address, actually came, less than nine months later, on Sept. 11, 2001. Like Hitler's Reichstag fire of 1933, the Sept. 11, 2001 attack was exploited by Vice-President Dick Cheney and such followers of the Nazi-like Professor Leo Strauss as Attorney-General John Ashcroft, to unleash an attempted step-wise, fascist takeover of the U.S.A. from within.² That incident of Sept. 11, 2001 was then used to unleash a campaign of intended worldwide warfare, warfare modelled on Athens' tragic folly of the Peloponnesian war, and on such Classically fascist precedents as those of the Roman Caesars, the Emperor Napoleon Bonaparte, and Adolf Hitler. Thus, the ideology of that thieving, imperial outlook of Cheney and his fascist Chicken-hawks, now combines the nuclear "preventive war" dogmas of Bertrand Russell with the imported Nietzschean mode of fascist ideology of Germany's Carl Schmitt, Martin Heidegger, and Leo Strauss.

More recently, George W. Bush, a U.S. President of starkly limited intellectual capability, has reacted in a fit of rage to the

² Not only was Chicago University Professor Leo Strauss's career launched by the sponsorship of Germany's Carl Schmitt, the designer of that *Notverordnung* used to award Hitler post-Reichstag-fire dictatorial powers. The war policy of the Bush Administration, and the "Patriot Act" drafts and Guantanamo base and related doctrines of Ashcroft, are copies of the Nazi concentration-camp and related dogma in law developed by Carl Schmitt.

combined effect of both his desperation over a U.S. economic situation far beyond his capacity for rational decision-making, and his anticipation of a then immediately imminent political defeat of his war policy in the UN Security Council. That wildly irrational outburst of rage, orchestrated by "Svengali" Cheney, has triggered "Trilby" Bush's declaring a needless, lawless, and reckless war against Iraq, a war in violation of the relevant international code of law. Worse, this is a war for which the policies of arm-chair warlords Cheney and Rumsfeld had left existing U.S. forces both poorly deployed, and severely under-equipped for the mission assigned to them. Rumsfeld's playing "Hitler and the generals" in the Defense Department, produced the result, that within the lapse of a week of that war, signs of a new "Vietnam War" syndrome could no longer be hidden.

The President's lawless doctrine of "regime change" threatened Saddam Hussein, personally, with preventive war against Iraq, exactly as Hitler, in 1938, had personally threatened Eduard Benes with "regime change." Our poor President was moved to this action by puppet-strings of lies jerked by a special, Goebbels-like, Chicken-hawk intelligence unit in Rumsfeld's Department of Defense. So, the President invaded Iraq on the same type of pretext used by Hitler for his 1939 invasion of Poland. All this was done under the influence of a deceased German fascist emigré, Carl Schmitt-sponsored Leo Strauss, whose only disqualification for Nazi Party membership had been the Jewish ancestry which could not be expunged from his birth record.

So, the events of the first week of that war, have made undeniable the delusions under which the trio of the President, Vice President, and Rumsfeld had been operating, going into the war. As the war entered its second week, the watching world saw proof of that lunatic disregard for elementary Classical considerations of modern warfare and strategy, which is deeply embedded in the "Chicken-hawk" utopians' "Revolution in Military Affairs." Although U.S. power could crush Iraq, even despite Rumsfeld's Hitler-like muddling, sooner or later: yet, as for the 1960s Defense Secretary Robert McNamara's Indo-China war, there was no foreseeable, acceptable exit from the kind of war which the Rumsfeld-Cheney Chicken-hawk set had planned. The only solution for President Bush, had he been rational, was to get out of the war, and return to the UNO

process. President George “Flight Forward” Bush has so far lacked the proverbial “brains and guts” to make such a rational choice.

There would be an ultimately suicidal outcome for civilization already looming in failure to abort the Straussian Chickenhawks’ imperial strategic policies. These are the policies expressed by both the White House utopians and also kindred circles, such as the Conrad Black-backed McCain-Lieberman-Donna Brazile cabal, the cabal now dominating the Democratic Party bureaucracy. That cross-party, Nietzschean flight-forward impulse, is typified by the war-like flock of the followers of the now-deceased, professed Nietzschean fascist, Chicago University Professor Leo Strauss, whom I have identified, repeatedly, above. This role of second- and third-generation followers of fascist fanatics Strauss’s and Allan Bloom’s teachings, is typified by Vice-President Cheney’s present brood of Chickenhawks, the would-be “little Hitlers,” or “Goebbels” such as Chicago’s Wolfowitz, thieving magpie Perle, slippery Bill Kristol, and kindred Brechtian beggars’ opera types.

The Nazi-like, Leo-Straussian pathology of Dick and Lynne Cheney’s circles, could be, and must be described in political-historical, military, and related technical terms. Nonetheless, technical analysis of the political-strategic issue, however necessary as far as it goes, still fails to get to the more deeply determining, psychological core of the matter.

The crux of the matter is, that like a man of kindred Nietzschean disposition, Adolf Hitler, that pack of Straussian Svengalis which has been directing President George “Trilby” Bush’s ongoing imperial world war, is not merely misguided; it is, morally and otherwise, functionally insane. In global terms, that pack’s Nietzschean policies are as evil as Hitler’s in both intent and effect.

Worse, the many, so-called “ordinary” Americans among that sizeable minority which still foolishly supports the war policies, are also insane in the strictest clinical sense of that term. As Shakespeare’s Cassius warned Brutus: the popular insanity of these foolishly pro-war American populists lies not in their stars, but, in themselves, that they think as “underlings.” So many leading members of the Congress have also reacted today like the “underlings” described by Shakespeare’s Cassius.

The problem of that typical “underling’s” mentality must be

recognized and corrected, as a disorder which is spread much wider than the indicated clique of Leo-Straussian fanatics. What has impelled many wild and foolish Democratic Party figures, and others, to support or tolerate war-mongering fanatics such as Cheney, Rumsfeld, McCain, and Lieberman, is a culturally embedded tendency, in popular entertainment, and otherwise, to submit to the kind of neo-Nietzschean existentialist impulses which have taken over much of that "Baby Boomer" generation which came to adulthood during the period of the 1964-1972 U.S. War in Indo-China. That heretofore widespread toleration of such policies, is purely, simply, a case of personal and collective group-insanity shared among those sharing the relevant populist ("underling") mentality. The danger inhering in this global situation will not be overcome, unless that controlling factor of widespread, popular group-insanity is taken adequately into account, and addressed with a certain ruthlessness, as the aging Solon addressed his errant Athenians, as I do here.

I have now stated the problem. I have situated the paradoxes. Now, I shift to developing the solution.

1. What Is Sanity?

My first-approximation definition of sanity, is dedication to discovering and acting according to a principle of discoverable truth, as Plato's dialogues define truthfulness, contrary to the schizophrenic word-play of Strauss and Bloom. For example, when a typical U.S. politician says that he, or she is "going along to get along," he, or she usually means to say that one must "learn" to get along in such domains as politics or public office, in university life, in one among many public-school classrooms, using opinions expressed by major new media, or in the company board-room, or in cringing submission to some sitting U.S. Federal Fourth Circuit judges, and some Virginia judges I have known. The theme, in each case, is, one must "put the issue of truth behind us."

The categorical form of that widespread denial of the efficient existence of truth, is the central feature of the intentionally fraudulent life's work of that now-deceased Professor Strauss,

the Nietzschean den-mother of today's Chicken-hawk brood.³ It is the core of his fascist, Thrasymachian doctrine, as that of his underling Allan Bloom. It is also the dogma of like-minded truth-haters, such as Strauss's cronies among the German fascists of the Frankfurt School circles. The latter include such pro-Satanic existentialists as official Nazi philosopher and Strauss mentor Martin Heidegger, and the fascist truth-haters Theodor Adorno and Hannah Arendt.

The promotion, or acceptance of doctrines, such as the fascism of Hitler and Leo Strauss, or preference for popular, or learned opinion, over truth, are also symptoms of what is to be defined as a mental disease, a systemic delusion. Look at phenomena such as support for President Bush's unlawful, present war-drive, as expressing a form of mass-insanity. I point to mass-insanity such as that which, for a while, seized the majority of the German voters under Hitler. It is a form of mass-insanity which, more recently, seized the political forces which reduced the list of leading 2000 candidates for U.S. President to two Chicken-hawk-linked, known incompetents, each of whom was more or less equally likely to launch world-wide war within a few years of his inauguration.

The type of mass-insanity to which I am pointing, is best understood by defining it, first, in terms of some commonly occurring mental disorders expressed among students whose judgments have been shaped through drill-and-grill in empiricist and, especially, radical-positivist mathematical physics, still today. I now proceed accordingly.

³ We meet a related form of truth-hating insanity in the argument of U.S. Associate Supreme Court Justice Antonin Scalia's practiced doctrine of text. Contrary to the frankly kabbalistic textualism of Leo Strauss and his dupes, the Socratic dialogues of Plato, the principal target of Strauss's expressed hatred, are premised on experimentally demonstrable principles of construction, like the same Pythagorean tradition of Archytas and Plato which Gauss's 1799 paper puts into the form of the mathematical physics of the complex domain. With Plato, one need not debate the interpretation of the text; one must repeat the experience of the experimental construction which Plato provides. Any debates over a translation or copying of a Plato writing, are resolved solely through those epistemological methods of construction. Strauss's and Scalia's method of argument from text, are examples of specifically schizophrenic forms of radically nominalist word-play, a demonstration of diagnosable expressions, in the form of use of language, corresponding to, and often reflecting schizophrenic thought.

Math and Madness

For our purposes here, let us first define "insanity" as it appears in the guise of even the most elementary forms of dysfunctions in a formal mathematical physics.

Thus, in those terms, the empiricists Galileo, Thomas Hobbes, John Locke, the notorious Adam Smith, and the famous René Descartes, were, like Bertrand Russell and his devotees, systemically insane, in the strictest formal use of the term "insane." That is to say, that Descartes' way of thinking about the physical universe, was based on subordination of the physical evidence to included axiomatic presumptions which, in fact, can be found only in a non-existent, "ivory tower" universe. President George W. Bush, Jr.'s and former Vice-President Al Gore's opinions on economic and military matters, express, systemically, more or less extreme versions of the insanity of that same general ("ivory tower," utopian) type.

In mathematical physics, this same clinical type of systemic insanity encountered in the follies of Descartes, is echoed by Euler and Lagrange, as the latter cases were exposed by Carl Gauss's 1799, correct statement of the Fundamental Theorem of Algebra. The same pathological element typical of Galileo, Descartes, Euler, and Lagrange, is pervasive in classrooms and textbooks still today. Thus, I chose the case of that short, but crucial paper by Gauss, as the pivot on which to premise the program of higher education for the participants in the new youth movement I was sponsoring. My principle was, and is, that, for reasons I shall explain here, no youth movement among the 18-25 university-age population could succeed in leading society out of the kind of cultural disorientation which grips most of globally extended European civilization today, unless the participants in that movement were to proceed from discovery and mastery of an "ivory tower"-free, empiricism-free, elementary proof of the existence of knowable truthfulness.

I explain that connection by successive stages, in the course of the following pages.

At first glance, the mathematical definition of systemic insanity which our youth movement's pedagogical program derives from that Gauss example, apparently differs from the relatively more shallow-minded notion of clinical insanity usually prof-

ferred by psychiatrists. Nonetheless, a morally competent psychiatrist, following my argument here, would feel himself, or herself obliged to nod assent to the direction of my argument, and would probably qualify that assent with an observation which would be, more or less, to the following net effect.

To understand the relevant difficulty of the professional psychologist, ask yourself, what should we mean if we say that some persons are neurotic, or worse? Should we not mean, in the case of the neurotic, a person whose judgment is often efficient in dealing with many challenges in day-to-day life, but who suffers from the recurrent triggering of some emotionally driven, pathological quirk, a quirk which impels that person toward acting in a way contrary to physical reality? In one setting, that person appears rational; in another, his or her behavior is functionally absurd. Typical of such neurotics, is the alcoholic or drug-user, or the ordinary bi-polar personality, who may be competent at work, but who beats his wife, or also his children, or, threatens to do so under certain circumstances, or does so more or less periodically. The empiricist is categorically insane in a similar sense and degree.

Speaking in the very broadest terms, there are two general types of practical cases of systemic disorders of individual judgment. There is, first, the case of simple ignorance, in which the subject is exposed to a challenge of which he or she simply lacks relevant elementary knowledge, like an individual reared in a jungle tribe, trying to operate a bulldozer at first sighting. In a second general type of case, the individual, or society, is reacting under the influence of axiomatically false assumptions respecting man and society. For him, or her, these false assumptions function like the "ivory tower" axioms of a Euclidean geometry, thus exerting a more or less severe, even deadly, pathological influence over individual, or collective group behavior. These errors are the typical origin of insanity, or "non-sanity," as defined from a Classical Greek standpoint of reference.

In Euclidean, or Cartesian geometry, as in the empiricism of Paolo Sarpi's lackey, Galileo Galilei, the victim's mind is polluted by so-called a priori, so-called "self-evident," "ivory tower" definitions, axioms, and postulates, each of which, in fact, has no correspondence to the physical universe. In contrast to those popularized, Euclidean, empiricist, and Cartesian forms of insanity, in the pre-Euclid, ancient scientific practice of Thales, the

Pythagoreans, and Plato, the principle of physical construction defines the universe as a domain of physical geometry, as a universal physical space-time. With the Fifteenth-Century European Renaissance's rebirth, as associated with Filippo Brunelleschi, Nicholas of Cusa, and Leonardo da Vinci, the mainstream of scientific progress returned, from the decadence of Latin Romanticism, to the Platonic tradition of Classical Greece, that tradition also typified by the work of Eratosthenes, Aristarchus, and Archimedes. Out of these Renaissance origins, came the work of modern Classical giants most usefully typified by Johannes Kepler, Gottfried Leibniz, Carl Gauss, and Bernhard Riemann. Out of this modern, Classical scientific tradition, we have inherited the notions associated with a Riemannian form of Classical physical geometry, from which we have expelled the clutter of all those a priori definitions, axioms, and postulates associated with Euclid, of the empiricists in general, and of the Cartesians in particular. Only what are proven experimentally to be universal physical principles, are allowed.⁴

This Riemannian concept of physical geometry serves not only for what today's convention signifies as "physical science"; it also applies to provable principles of those aspects of social relations which determine mankind's effective social relationship to the universe in which we live. As I shall explain below, this same principle corresponds to the distinguishing principle of Classical (as opposed to Romantic or Modernist) composition and performance of art, as it does to physical science as such.

Therefore, as a matter of scientific precision, we ought to limit the use of the term "insanity," to those sets of practiced belief which are demonstrably in efficient systemic violation of that combined, Riemannian physical geometry which encompasses both the individual mind's knowledge of the physical universe around it, and also the efficient and valid universal principles of social relations governing society's coordination of its relationship to that same universe.

Ordinarily, the teaching and practice of psychology do not attempt to reach such a strictly scientific definition as that one. The relatively better practice among that profession, nonetheless seeks to define sanity in terms of definable principles, but

⁴ Bernhard Riemann, *Über die Hypothesen welche der Geometrie zu Grunde liegen*, H. Weber, ed. (New York: Dover Publications reprint edition, 1953).

usually falls far short of recognizing the functional significance of rigorously defined, truly universal principles, both truly universal physical principles and also their social correlatives.

Usually, among the least competent choices of standard for psychology, is the more or less frequent reliance upon an arbitrary standard of so-called "normal behavior." All true scientific geniuses of society today, are, by definition, "abnormal." Therefore, the only competent definition of a sick society, is, "axiomatically," one in which its prevalent standard of sanity is that set of belief which is usually considered "normal," or, as in the instance of the wrong ideas concerning economy, which are rampant in the U.S.A. today.⁵ The crisis hitting the U.S. today, has been caused by what have come to be widely accepted as "normal" forms of belief and mass behavior. To escape that trap, we must discard "normal" as a standard, and choose, instead, a standard which is provably universal, without use of the sometimes useful, but always slippery notion of "normal."

For example. In Classical tragedy since the best work of the ancient Greeks, as in the modern productions of Shakespeare and Schiller, the root of all that tragedy which corresponds to a nation, a people in crisis, lies in the currently prevalent mental habits of the general population represented. Shakespeare writes, that "there is something rotten in the kingdom of Denmark." It is Hamlet's fear of that conventional rottenness of his society, his terror of the prospect of immortality, which impels him, like his successor Fortinbras, to continue the same folly of Denmark which felled the foolish Hamlet. So, it is in Schiller's *Don Carlos*, the real-life tragedy of religious warfare which carries the real-life Philip II, his followers, and Spain itself, as in Schiller's play, into the culturally deserved ruin which Cervantes foresaw, and which Spain thus became in the course of the Seventeenth Century. The tragic doom of nations, lies, first, as Athens' Solon warned: in the foolish norms of its current, decadent culture; and, second, in the nation's failure to nurture and select leaders who will lead a tragic people to mend its foolish customs. So, Aeschylus' *Prometheus Bound* paints the doom of Greece under a culture polluted by the polymorphous perversity of its inhuman Olympian gods.

⁵ Among the worst cases of popular misuse of "normal" as a standard, are instances of threatened or actual violence promoted by racial and religious bigotry.

Therefore, especially in times of crisis, we must reject that which may happen to appear to be normal, and define what should have been adopted as normal, instead. As the aging Solon rebuked his foolish Athenians, it was always what had come to be accepted as "normal" behavior which brought about the subsequent threat of self-inflicted doom. Such is the more or less indispensable function of redefining mass insanity in society as I do here.

Therefore, for related reasons which I shall explain more fully here, I chose Gauss's 1799 paper on the Fundamental Theorem of Algebra, in opposition to the empiricists Euler and Lagrange, as the best choice of standard launching-point for a modern university or comparable education.

The young American, for example, must enter adulthood with a secure mooring of his or her sense of personal identity in a valid sense of the meaning of truth. Not what is prescribed as "truth," as by textbooks, or so-called popular opinion. It must be what he or she knows to be truth, by means of nothing but the internal authority of knowledge, as the experimental validity of an hypothesized universal physical principle, a principle free of the encumbrances of "ivory tower" definitions, axioms, and postulates signifies actual knowledge of truth. The young such American must command valid certainty of at least one such universal principle, as a benchmark from which to proceed with his or her personal, life-long mapping of the universe. Thus, to define a shareable mooring-point of that quality, I chose and proposed the Gauss paper.

The 'No Future' Crisis

There were also special, contemporary considerations compelling me to insist upon that standard at this point in the globally extended history of current European civilization. I point to the conflict between the typical representative of that "Now Generation," which entered adulthood during an interval of, approximately, 1964-1972, the interval of the rise of the "rock-drug-sex youth-counterculture," and the so-called "Now Generation's" children. Today, more than a quarter-century later, the former "Now Generation" has produced children who became university-age young adults, and adolescents, condemned to be part of a "No Future Generation." Despite the significant,

smaller rations among both of these generations which are more or less exceptions to this pattern, the conflict between the two sets of generations, is widespread and deep-going; it is a conflict which must be recognized, and overcome, if this civilization is to find a civilized future during the generations immediately ahead.

Prior to the rise of "the rock-drug-sex youth-counterculture," the typical outlook of that normally moral U.S. or European adult, who was conscious of his or her mortality, was a commitment to a brighter future for the children and grandchildren of one's own generation. Most among such Americans and Europeans were scarcely saints, but they had that degree of a sense of an efficient personal immortality. Most would have tended to accept the New Testament parable of the "talents." We are each given a mortal existence of uncertain duration. That is our finite talent, called mortal life. Therefore, wisdom says, "Spend it well."

Unfortunately, that moral tradition began to be swept away with the advent of the "rock-drug-sex youth-counterculture" of the middle to late 1960s. The resulting present moral and economic crisis of America and European society is a reflection of this change.

The "Beatniks" and earlier "rock culture" of the Elvis Presley generation already echoed the Dionysian cult-legacy of the European existentialist degeneration of Heidegger, Jaspers, Leo Strauss, Theodor Adorno, Hannah Arendt, and such French followers of the Nazi Heidegger as Jean-Paul Sartre. This corruption, copied from the most decadent elements of Weimar Germany's post-Versailles 1920s, was subsequently carried to an extreme by the "rock-drug-sex youth-counterculture" of the mid-1960s. This led, more than a decade later, to the epidemics of "mid-life crisis," and kindred, pathetic bleats of "I must change my life-style," which were among the frequent lawful, middle-age consequence of joining a "Now Generation" imagined to dwell on the backside of a history which had come to nearly its Hegelian-Nietzschean end.

As the Baby Boomer generation's position within adult society became more and more dominant, the degeneration of the economy and other cultural attributes, into the characteristics of a so-called "post-industrial," or "consumption" society, accelerated. The economy degenerated under the increasing popular influence of post-industrial Baby Boomer fads. Degeneration

of the nation's culture and economy were not recognized as the catastrophe they were in fact, because, for the existentialist "Now Generation's" Baby Boomer culture, which was then moving toward the higher ranks of social, economic, and political life, their slide into decadence had become "the norm."

What, then, to do with the Baby Boomers' children? For the "Now Generation," their children, such as those maturing children entering university age, were an increasingly uncomfortable reality, just as the senior citizens, their own parents, were seen by Baby Boomers, such as former Colorado Governor Lamm, as becoming inconveniently costly to support. The maturing children of the Baby Boomers, whether adolescent or young adult, found themselves thrown on the dump of what was implicitly labelled a "No Future Generation." The latter's passion for acquiring a future, clashed increasingly with the contrary cultural norms of the "Now Generation's" impulses. The resulting friction is often ugly, as it is all too often as impassioned as a racial conflict might be.

Under these conditions, the apparent "norms" of the "Now Generation"—or, should we say "degeneration"—are, for the "No Future Generation," worse than useless norms of belief. In this circumstance, mere custom fails as a substitute for morality; the search for a standard of truth, must replace a presently failed, traditional reliance upon invoking custom as an authority for continuing adherence to the tragically failed traditions of the mid-1960s cultural-paradigm shifts. The continued existence of civilization now depends, absolutely, upon an immediate shift away from the traditions of the "Now Generation."

What might be recognized, in functional terms, as the morality of a people, occurs in two degrees. On the lower level, it is expressed as a commitment to the betterment of the conditions and persons of coming generations of one's own, and other nations and peoples. The famous 1648 Treaty of Westphalia, on whose precedent civilized life among modern nations depends, still today, is an example of this simpler expression of morality. On a higher level, we meet the exceptional individual, as typified most simply by France's martyred Jeanne d'Arc, or the Reverend Martin Luther King, Jr., who follows in the imitation of Christ, to spend one's mortal life wisely, for the sake of the betterment of future humanity.

The significance of the emergence of rampant, even rabid

existentialism, in the cultural currents of the post-World War II U.S.A., is that it tended, rather efficiently, to uproot the simple kind of popular morality from the population, and national custom in general. The intrinsically immoral influence of the cult of the “Now Generation,” the generation of President George W. Bush, Jr., has tended to uproot and eliminate that idea of progress, on which all the true achievements of our U.S. republic had depended. This form of moral corruption typified by the “Now Generation,” became something like an expression of cultural cannibalism toward both that generation’s own parents, and own children. The latter victims of the 1960s counterculture, are the present “No Future Generation.” Thus, today’s President Bush’s policy-making outlook expresses in the extreme, the same ugly essence of that moral decay, as the explicit, Leo-Straussian, Hegelian-Nietzschean “end of history” doctrine of the Baby-Boomer generation’s Cheney-Rumsfeld Chicken-hawks.

That implicitly awful present conflict among generations exists. How might we overcome it? My view, which is corroborated in a significant degree by the recent impact of our youth movement’s activity, is: A youth movement of this specific type is capable of reawakening a sense of a meaningful future among even a large part of the generation which had been sucked into a long sojourn within the ranks of the “Now Generation.” In that way, we can bridge the gap, and reconcile the two antagonistic generations around the common cause—the future—which this youth movement already represents. Therefore, we must look more deeply, and with cultural optimism, into the matters just identified.

2. Who Is Really Human?

This carries this discussion of mass-sanity into deeper issues of mass social behavior. Look again at the age-old question: Is there a fundamental difference between man and ape? What is that difference? For, example, do the parents of apes believe in future grandchildren? Therefore, is it really an exaggeration, to ask the question: Was that behavior of Professor Leo Strauss, to which I referred above, actually human, or a product of some

kind of "reversed cultural evolution," into becoming something less than human?

Who, then, is really human? Should we not recognize that Professor Strauss, Allan Bloom, and their Rumsfeld-Cheney-linked Chicken-hawk followers were, and are collectively insane: human beings who, like Adolf Hitler, or the Emperors Tiberius, Caligula, Nero, England's Richard III, Spain's Philip II, Napoleon Bonaparte, and the immediately relevant cases of G.W.F. Hegel, and Friedrich Nietzsche, after him, have reverted to forms of human behavior which are essentially unnatural, forming, in effect, a type of pseudo-human species? They have become equivalent to a species whose very existence is morally, and functionally worse than that of naturally determined lower forms of life.

These are not only formal questions of science. As I am emphasizing here: The ideological connections between Adolf Hitler and those Chicken-hawks presently inhabiting Rumsfeld's and Cheney's roosts, demonstrate, that these questions I pose here, are foremost among today's issues of national security, including "military affairs."

To define, and locate the answer to such questions of both science and of national security and its strategy, we must find the answer in the axiomatic differences between the Romanticism of extended European civilization's modern empiricists, on the one side, and the Classical European legacy shared among Plato and the connection of his modern followers, such as Nicholas of Cusa, Leonardo da Vinci, Johannes Kepler, Gottfried Leibniz, Gauss, and Riemann, with the crafting of the U.S. Declaration of Independence and of the world-shaking Preamble of the U.S. Federal Constitution.

The working definition of humanity which is crucial for understanding the cause and cure of that kind of imperial fascism typified by such followers of the late Professor Strauss as Rumsfeld, Cheney, and their Chicken-hawks today, runs more or less as follows.

1. The crucial issue is, first: What is the absolute difference between the human species and each and all species of possible members of a class of higher apes?

The empirical evidence is: If the human species were a member of the biological class of known, or other higher apes, that species could not have achieved a total living population of

more than several millions individuals under conditions associated with the ice-age cycles of the recent two or so millions years. The living human population today is estimated by some sources as greater than six billions individuals.

2. *The crucial issue is, secondly:* Any human society's ability to achieve sustainable population-levels depends, in the first approximation, on the willful employment of transmissible ideas from an accumulation of that which contemporary notions of physical science identify as technological derivatives of known, experimentally demonstrable universal physical principles.

The supplementary, crucial answer is, as I have shown in various earlier locations: No representative of the class of higher apes can generate the Platonic type of hypothesis which leads to the discovery of a universal physical principle.

3. *The crucial issue is, similarly:* Man's technological progress to that cumulative effect, depends on transmission of knowledge of the universal principles underlying that technology, which means the re-experiencing of the original act of discovery.

The supplementary, crucial answer is: No representative of the class of higher apes has shown the ability both to develop and use a language appropriate for transmission of such conceptions. This is an essential, qualitative distinction of principle, between the quasi-societies of higher apes, and an actual society of the type required for generating, transmitting, and employing discoveries of universal physical principle.

The knowledge of those three points is reflected in such results as geobiochemist V.I. Vernadsky's division of the universe of known geobiochemical effects, among three types of interacting, but experimentally distinct universal phase-spaces: a) the abiotic; b) the living as such, the Biosphere including its fossils; and, c) the Noösphere, physical effects, including the fossils of such actions, attributable solely to those cognitive functions of the individual human mind which do not occur in any other living species. In the language of Bernhard Riemann's celebrated 1854 habilitation dissertation, these three phase-spaces are multiply-connected, to the effect of defining the known universe, in a factual reading of the internal history of modern physical science, as essentially Keplerian and also

Riemannian. The human individual's function within that universe is unique.

4. *Therefore, the most crucial issue is:* What specific act do human beings perform, which no lower form of life can do, to generate those effects which set the human species, thus, apart from, and above all others?

The answer is implicit in Carl Gauss's referenced, 1799 attack on the willful falsifications of the Fundamental Theorem of Algebra by such empiricist ideologues as Euler and Lagrange (and, notably, also Immanuel Kant).

I explain, repeating as briefly as possible what I have said or written on this subject in numerous locations.

Perception or Knowledge?

This brings the continuing quarrel between Lagrange and Gauss into fresh focus. The essential issue was whether or not man is just another, if talking, species of higher ape. In the domain of physical science so-called, this deep-going issue of personal morality, is whether or not man's knowledge of the universe is limited to a combination of "facts" as defined by sense-perception, as interpreted according to a set of arbitrary, "ivory tower" definitions, axioms, and postulates, such as those of Euclidean geometry.

The empiricist ideologues Euler and Lagrange had gone to great lengths, even outright frauds such as that of Euler's associate Maupertuis, to insist that mathematical physics must be limited to a combination of sense-perceptions with a Cartesian sort of ivory-tower set of arbitrary definitions, axioms, and postulates.

The founders of modern physical science, as typified by Brunelleschi, Cusa, Leonardo da Vinci, Kepler, Fermat, Pascal, Huyghens, Leibniz, Bernouilli, Lavoisier, et al., had each and all emphasized experimental evidence which had proven man's ability to discover a class of discoverable universally efficient physical principles which are invisible to direct observation by the human senses. Typical of the latter is Kepler's uniquely original discovery of the universal physical principle of gravitation, as the details of this process of discovery are presented

in his 1609 *The New Astronomy*. The development of the discovered physical principle of universal least action, by the successive work of Fermat, Huyghens, Leibniz, and Bernoulli, is, when combined with Kepler's discoveries, the most conclusive basis in experimental scientific discovery for the proof that the arguments of Euler and Lagrange, which Gauss attacked, were hysterical falsehoods, as Gauss's 1799 paper showed them to be.

To continue to set the stage for the relevant point to be developed here, add the following background point as a matter of clarification.

In an attempt to rebut Gauss's referenced 1799 paper, Lagrange, and also his faction, insisted, that Gauss had "cheated" in the 1799 paper, by "bringing in geometry," not sticking to deductive arithmetic. In an argument "genetically" similar to that of Lagrange, and also that of Lagrange's follower, the plagiarist Augustin Cauchy, Germany's Felix Klein came to Euler's posthumous defense, by crediting what Cusa and others had already proven, the "transcendental" quality of pi, to the successive work of the empiricist mathematical ideologues Hermite and Lindemann.

The fraud, or hysterical self-deception of Euler and Lagrange, was their evasion of the fact that the physical universe does not correspond to a deductive mathematics of Cartesian geometry. What Gauss attacked, specifically, was Euler's and Lagrange's fraudulent evasion of the fact that their false argument depended axiomatically on "ivory tower" adherence to the prescriptions of a Cartesian geometry. What Gauss had demonstrated in his 1799 paper on the fundamental theorem, is that the real universe, the physical universe, does not conform to a mathematics premised on the assumed self-evidence of Cartesian geometric assumptions, but, rather, a different universe, that of the complex domain, in which Leibniz's universal physical principle of least action occupies a central position.

Gauss's argument was not entirely original. In his 1799 attack on the fallacies of Euler and Lagrange, Gauss was restating in modern terms exactly what had been shown by such followers of the Pythagoreans as Archytas and Plato, for the distinction in powers among lines, surfaces, solids, and physical space-time. Gauss addressed the matter of relations of powers among line, surface, and solid as the Classical Greeks had, but with the context of a modern physical science as defined by such modern predecessors as Cusa, Leonardo, Kepler, and Leibniz.

That much said on that matter of mathematics as such, we come to the crucial feature of the issue at hand, the difference between man and ape.

Knowing or Feeling?

The sense-organs of the human individual are an integral part of the physiological processes within the bounds of his skin. What his senses register is, at best, not the world outside his skin, but, instead, the reactions of his sense-organs to some external stimulus. A formally Euclidean or Cartesian geometry arises from the assumption that the individual's interpretation of the arrangement of his sensory apparatus defines, "self-evidently," the physical geometry of the physical space-time of the universe outside his skin.

The scientific thinker rejects the delusion that such imaginary geometries define the real physical space-time outside his skin. The scientific thinker says, in effect: "I must assume that the real world, outside what my senses might lure me into believing, is not as my habits of sense-perception suggest. Instead of blindly imagining what that real universe might be, let me attack the problem indirectly. Let me see if I can control that outside world in some significant degree, and thus force sensible and durably efficient kinds of changes in a world which, in reality, is invisible to my senses."

Turn, then, to the pages of Kepler's 1609 *The New Astronomy*, the same pages from whose later English translation, the fanatical empiricist Isaac Newton and Newton's helpers forged their attempted plagiarism of Kepler's original discovery. Even their plagiarism was not original; they resorted to an action-at-a-distance fraud by the notorious empiricist, and teacher of Thomas Hobbes, Galileo Galilei, to attempt to cover the tracks of their own forgery.

Kepler focussed upon an anomaly arising in more careful normalization of observation of the Mars orbit, to recognize a common unscientific error in the astronomy of ancient Claudius Ptolemy, and also the modern Copernicus and Tycho Brahe. From study of this anomaly, which actually controlled the planetary orbit, Kepler demonstrated the existence of an efficient, but unseen universal physical principle, called gravitation, existing outside the pro-Aristotelean, "ivory tower" pre-

sumptions common to the practice of those three misguided astronomers. A similar study of an anomaly contrary to ivory-tower faith in geometry of sense-perception, guided Fermat and his successors to Leibniz's universal physical principle of least action.

These and comparable successes in discovery of universal physical principles, have each and all been accomplished by that *method of hypothesis* which is the central feature of Plato's method of Socratic dialogue. Any qualified experimental proof of such an hypothesis, defines that proven hypothesis as an unseen, but efficient universal physical principle. It is through the willful application of such principles, that the human species—a society—increases its power to command the universe outside man's skin.

Classical Art as Physical Science

The same principle just illustrated for the case of what is usually called "physical science," also defines the principles distinguishing the methods of Classical artistic composition from such intrinsically irrationalist modes of composition or performance as the Romantic or the sundry shades of Modernist.

The neatest demonstration of that connection, is the case of the distinction of Classical Greek sculpture from the tombstone-like, so-called Archaic. As John Keats's *Ode on a Grecian Urn* should inform us, Classical Greek sculpture, like the revolutionary approach to painting by Leonardo da Vinci and Raphael Sanzio, and by such Rembrandt productions as "The Bust of Homer Contemplating the Blind Aristotle," replaces death-like "stilled life" with a living instant of continuing motion. This is no illusion, no magic; it is the same principle expressed by the use of the catenary by Brunelleschi for constructing the cupola of Florence's Santa Maria del Fiore cathedral, as echoed by Leibniz's discovered definition of the relationship of the complex domain's catenary to a universal principle of least action.

In poetry and music, the principle of the Pythagorean comma is a crucial key to artistic and physical scientific composition. The comma is defined, by the account of Pythagoras' argument, by a natural difference generated by contrasting the most natural (e.g., Florentine) *bel canto* singing voice to the divisions of

a lifeless linear monochord. The difference between human and linear music is not a mathematically determined, but a naturally determined reflection of the difference between a living instrument and a dead one.

In Classical poetry, the role of the potentially *bel canto*-trained human singing voice is crucial. Similarly, well-tempered counterpoint, as defined with scientific precision by J.S. Bach, defines a distance from the pathetic, "curry sausage"-like productions of the virtually brain-dead reductionist Rameau. As Franz Schubert illustrates the point concisely and simply with his setting of Goethe's *Erlkönig*, it is the apposition of voicings and voices which distinguishes the communication of the intent of irony and metaphor—the which are the essence of expressed human qualities of thought—from both the monotonous run-on babbling of teletype-like text, or meaningless Romantic or Modernist boom and babble.

The common characteristic of all Classical art and its performance lies essentially, not with the senses as such, but in the shared imagination of speaker and hearer. In the well-performed Classical drama, such as that of Shakespeare, the audience's attention is quickly transported from the vision of the stage to the stage of the audience's imagination, as Shakespeare points out in the opening role of Chorus for *Henry V*. It is the same for the performance of great works of Classical music, where composer, performance, and witting audience meet minds together in the common domain of the cognitive powers of imagination.

The connection between Classical art and Classical science, such as that of Plato, Cusa, Kepler, Leibniz, and Gauss, has the purpose of joining the cognitive powers of individual members of society together in exertions to a common end. Through the training of social relations within society, by aid of composition and performance of Classical modes of artistic composition, we are best enabled to muster individual discoveries of those universal physical principles dwelling in the unseen and unheard, into the mission-oriented common purposes of the social process through which mankind conquers external nature. It is by that means that man rises above the beasts, and distinguishes himself from the apes.

There is more to it all than just that.

Our mortal life is as but an instant of eternity. To see our

personal identity merely in terms of our fragile and momentary mortal existence, would tend to promote despair whenever we were confronted with awful circumstances. However, if we see ourselves as assimilating, enhancing, and transmitting the revolutionary ideas, such as valid discoveries of universal physical principles, from past, to present, and future, and perhaps adding something to that stock, we gain a sense of our personal existence as located essentially as befits creatures of ideas, in the eternity of past, present, and future human existence.

Thus, when we think of the benefits we may be transmitting in this way, to our predecessors whose dreams we fulfill and to the children and grandchildren after us, we are justly optimistic about ourselves, about our visiting the present, for whatever the span of our mortal life might prove to be. Any person, from any past time, whose original discovery is known to me, or other universally important person of that time, such as the peasant girl Jeanne d'Arc, once known to me as a universal idea, will never die for me as long as my mind lives. I will therefore fight for their cause. That is the way the good person lives.

Here lies the undeniable importance of an upward movement of the young, even under the most threatening and depraved circumstances of society in general. It is not a matter of feeling good; it is matter of actually being good, in the manner the principles of the U.S. Federal Constitution's Preamble prescribe, being good in the sense which the depraved John Locke's chief adversary, Leibniz, defined, as the rightful pursuit of happiness. It is the happiness of living efficiently, as an historical, thinking being, in past, present, and future, all at once.

For these same reasons, the exceptional political, as well as scientific and artistic leader remains, to the present time, a crucially indispensable leader of society, especially a society gripped by a time of self-inflicted tragedy, like the U.S.A. today. It is a role, which for lack of qualified substitutes, I am obliged to fill. I present to you, the future. See, here, your children, their children, and those yet to be born. Protect them from the evil that the likes of Old Wicked Witch Strauss's predatory Chicken-hawks and their wars and thieving schemes represent, for combined past, present, and future humanity today. Humanity is good. It is the best creature in the Creator's eternity. Defend it accordingly; be truly human.

The 'Ignoble Liars' Behind Bush's Deadly Iraq War

by Jeffrey Steinberg

On Sunday, March 16, 2003, Vice President Dick Cheney emerged from his cave to appear on the NBC News "Meet the Press" show, for a one-hour interview with Tim Russert. In the course of the hour, Cheney all but announced that there was nothing that Saddam Hussein could do to avert an unprovoked and unjustifiable American military invasion of Iraq. Cheney repeatedly referred to the attacks of Sept. 11, 2001, as the "historic watershed" that, for the first time, justified an American unilateral preventive war. Yet Cheney himself, a dozen years earlier, had embraced the idea of preventive war—not against a Saddam Hussein who had been armed by the Reagan and Bush Administrations with weapons of mass destruction, but against any nation or combination of nations that challenged American global military primacy in the post-Soviet world. On the pivotal issue of preventive war, Cheney was lying, willfully. But that was just the tip of the iceberg.

Cheney's extraordinary hour-long pronouncement was composed, almost exclusively, of disinformation, which had either already been publicly discredited, or would soon be exposed as lies.

Cheney asserted that Saddam Hussein was actively pursuing the acquisition of nuclear weapons, when, days earlier, International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) chief weapons inspector Mohammed El-Baradei had testified before the UN Security Council that the allegations were based on documents determined to be forgeries. Indeed, in the March 31 issue of *The New Yorker* magazine, investigative reporter Seymour Hersh detailed how IAEA investigators had determined, in just several hours of research, that purported Niger government communiqués confirming the sale of 500 tons of "yellow cake" uranium

precursor to Baghdad, were shoddy forgeries, drawn up on outdated Niger government letterheads. Hersh wrote that the forgeries were passed to the Bush Administration, through British MI6, and had probably originated with the British intelligence service, with the Mossad, or with Iraqi oppositionists affiliated with the Iraqi National Congress (INC) of Dr. Ahmed Chalabi.

Cheney also repeated the by-then-thoroughly-discredited charge that Saddam Hussein had “longstanding” ties to the al-Qaeda terrorist organization, and that it was “only a matter of time” before Saddam Hussein provided the bin Laden gang with weapons of mass destruction—biological, chemical, and, ultimately, nuclear. As Cheney well knew, an October 2002 assessment from Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) Director George Tenet, delivered to the Senate Intelligence Oversight Committee, had pointedly stated that Saddam Hussein would only resort to WMD, or engage with al-Qaeda, if he felt that he was backed into a corner and facing imminent American military attack. Repeated efforts by “war party” operatives, like former Director of Central Intelligence and Iraqi National Congress lobbyist R. James Woolsey, had failed to turn up any credible evidence of Saddam-al-Qaeda links, particularly prior to Sept. 11, 2001.

Perhaps Cheney’s biggest lie—which flew in the face of all assessments from the CIA, the Defense Intelligence Agency (DIA), the Joint Chiefs of Staff (JCS), and State Department Middle East experts—was that the military conquest of Iraq would be a “cakewalk.” Cheney told Russert, “Now, I think things have gotten so bad inside Iraq, from the standpoint of the Iraqi people, my belief is we will, in fact, be greeted as liberators.”

Russert challenged Cheney’s rosy forecast: “If your analysis is not correct, and we’re not treated as liberators, but conquerors, and the Iraqis begin to resist, particularly in Baghdad, do you think the American people are prepared for a long, costly, and bloody battle with significant American casualties?”

To which Cheney responded: “Well, I don’t think it’s likely to unfold that way, Tim, because I really do believe that we will be greeted as liberators. I’ve talked with a lot of Iraqis in the last several months myself, had them to the White House. . . . The read we get on the people of Iraq is there is no question

but that they want to get rid of Saddam Hussein and they will welcome as liberators the United States when we come to do that." Later in the interview, Cheney added, "If you look at the opposition, they've come together, I think, very effectively, with representatives from Shia, Sunni, and Kurdish elements in the population."

Towards the end of his performance, the Vice President extended his "cakewalk liberation" forecast, to further assert that American preventive military action to overthrow Saddam Hussein would stabilize the Middle East. He cited Dr. Bernard Lewis, the British Arab Bureau spook and author of the "Arc of Crisis," "Islamic card" fiasco, as his authority: "I firmly believe, along with, you know, men like Bernard Lewis, who's one of the great, I think, students of that part of the world, that strong, firm U.S. response to terror and to threats to the United States would go a long way, frankly, towards calming things in that part of the world."

Almost exactly 80 hours after Cheney's appearance on NBC-TV, the United States launched an unprovoked and unnecessary war on Iraq. According to Washington-based senior Arab diplomatic sources, governments of the Middle East were told by top Bush Administration officials, on the eve of the attack, that the Iraq war would be over in seven to ten days.

The Straussian Lie

Vice President Cheney's lying performance on "Meet the Press" was no mere act of personal hubris and folly. His declaration of preventive war against Iraq—which neo-conservative allies, like self-professed "universal fascist" Michael Ledeen, more frankly celebrated as the beginning of a perpetual Clash of Civilizations war, targeting virtually every Arab nation-state in the Middle East—marked the culmination of a campaign of more than a dozen years, to permanently redraw the map of the Near East and Persian Gulf, through unending war and colonialist raw material seizure.

Even more than that, it signaled a long-in-the-making policy putsch in Washington by a small group of neo-conservatives—a majority of whom were followers of the German-born fascist philosopher Leo Strauss (1899-1973). Their policy is to perma-

nently transform the United States, from a Constitutional republic, dedicated to the pursuit of the general welfare and a community of principle among perfectly sovereign nation-states, into a brutish, post-modern imitation of the Roman Empire, engaged in murderous imperial adventures abroad, and brutal police-state repression at home.

Although a Jew, who was active in the Vladimir Jabotinsky-led Revisionist Zionist circles in Germany in the 1920s, Strauss was also a protégé and enthusiastic promoter of the ideas of two leading intellectual figures of the Nazi Party: existentialist philosopher and Friedrich Nietzsche-revivalist Martin Heidegger; and Nazi jurist Carl Schmitt, who wrote the legal opinion justifying Adolf Hitler's February-March 1933 post-Reichstag Fire dictatorial putsch. Schmitt personally arranged for Strauss to leave Germany on a Rockefeller Foundation fellowship in 1932, to study in London and Paris, and then took up teaching posts in the United States, first at the New School for Social Research in New York, and later at the University of Chicago.

In Germany of the 1920s and 1930s, there were Jews who were Nazis, but who, like Strauss and the Frankfurt School gaggle of left-wing Nietzscheans (Theodor Adorno, Max Horkheimer, Leo Lowenthal, Herbert Marcuse, et al.), had no chance for party advancement because of Hitler's anti-Semitism; and so they chose to leave Germany, to pursue more "universal" fascist ideas and policies abroad, particularly in the United States and Great Britain.

For Leo Strauss and his disciples, the ignoble lie—disinformation—was the key to achieving and holding political power. And raw political power was the ultimate goal. For Strauss and the Straussians, there were no universal principles, no natural law, no virtue, no *agapē*, no notion of man in the living image of God.

William Kristol, a leading Washington "Straussian" and the chief public propagandist for the war party in the George W. Bush Administration, made the point bluntly in an interview with Nina J. Easton, who authored a book-length profile of the top leaders of the right-wing insurgency of the 1990s, *Gang of Five* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 2000). Kristol told her, "One of the main teachings [of Strauss] is that all politics are limited and none of them is really based on the truth. So there's a certain philosophic disposition where you have some distance

from these political fights. . . . You don’t take yourself or your causes as seriously as you would if you thought this was 100% ‘truth.’ Political movements are always full of partisans fighting for their opinion. But that’s very different from ‘the truth.’”

From his perch as editor-in-chief of the Rupert Murdoch-bankrolled *Weekly Standard* magazine, launched in 1995, Kristol has perfected the art of political deception and the Goebbels “Big Lie.” The son of two first-generation postwar neo-conservatives, Irving Kristol and Gertrude Himmelfarb, Kristol was trained at Harvard from the time of his 18th birthday by one of Leo Strauss’ leading disciples, Harvey Mansfield, Jr.

Kristol’s Harvard graduate school roommate and fellow Straussian was Alan Keyes, later a Reagan State Department official and unsuccessful candidate for the U.S. Senate in Maryland (Kristol ran Keyes’ 1988 campaign against Democrat Paul Sarbanes). His other classmates included Francis Fukuyama, later promoter of the Nietzschean idea of “the end of history,” who came to Harvard following undergraduate studies at Cornell, where he was trained by Allan Bloom, another of the inner circle University of Chicago students of Strauss. Bloom’s life was recounted by fellow Chicagoan Saul Bellow in the true-to-life novel *Ravelstein*.

Neo-Conservative 9/11 Putsch

Bellow’s tribute to Bloom also highlighted another Straussian now playing a larger-than-life role in the Bush Administration inside putsch: Paul Wolfowitz.

Wolfowitz was one of the first of the Strauss-Bloom disciples to come to Washington. Through Bloom, while completing his graduate studies at the University of Chicago, Wolfowitz had been introduced to RAND Corporation founder Albert Wohlstetter and to Paul Nitze, a leading arms control expert who had served in most of the post-World War II governments in senior posts. By the 1970s, Wolfowitz was working his way through the arms control bureaucracy—and establishing his ties to other Straussians and Wohlstetter protégés who had been planted on various Senate committee staffs. Among Wolfowitz’s collaborators during this period were Richard

Perle, Steven Bryen, and Elliott Abrams, who served on the Senate staffs of Henry “Scoop” Jackson (D-Wash.), Clifford Case (R-N.J.), and Daniel Patrick Moynihan (D-N.Y.), respectively. Perle reports that he first was introduced to Wolfowitz in 1969, when the two were both sent by Wohlstetter to do a research project for Senator Jackson.

Among the other Strauss disciples who are currently part of the ongoing neo-con insurgency are: John Podhoretz, editorial page editor of Murdoch’s yellow tabloid, the *New York Post*, former editor of *The Weekly Standard*, and offspring of first generation neo-cons Norman Podhoretz and Midge Decter; Supreme Court Justice Clarence Thomas; Attorney General John Ashcroft; I. Lewis “Scooter” Libby, chief of staff and chief national security advisor to Vice President Cheney, who was introduced to the world of Leo Strauss by his own Yale University professor and mentor, Paul Wolfowitz; Pentagon disinformation officer Abram Shulsky; Gary Schmitt, executive director of the Kristol-led Project for the New American Century (PNAC); David Brook, another editor of *The Weekly Standard*; Werner Dannhauser, a protégé of Strauss, who left academia to assume the editorship of the flagship neo-con magazine *Commentary* following the retirement of Norman Podhoretz; and Robert Kagan, also of *The Weekly Standard*, and the son of leading Yale University Straussian Donald Kagan.

As the Wolfowitz case makes clear, this cabal of Strauss disciples, along with an equally small circle of allied neo-conservative and Likudnik fellow-travellers, has operated as an underground network, in and around government, for the past 30 years—awaiting the moment of opportunity to launch their not-so-silent coup. Sept. 11, 2001 provided them with the once-in-a-lifetime moment of opportunity, a moment for which they were thoroughly prepared.

As Lyndon LaRouche has written in his LaRouche in 2004 campaign report, *Zbigniew Brzezinski and September 11th*, the events of 9/11 could not have occurred without significant inside complicity from elements of the U.S. national security establishment, given the total breakdown of rudimentary security procedures and the depth of inside knowledge about those vulnerabilities. The Sept. 11 attacks could not, LaRouche assessed, have been carried out by al-Qaeda operatives without

such complicity. Indeed, the attacks constituted a sophisticated act of military covert irregular warfare, far beyond the capacities of the bin Laden apparatus. The idea that Osama bin Laden, operating out of caves in Afghanistan, could have pulled off the most significant act of irregular warfare against the United States in memory is, perhaps, the most significant Goebbels “Big Lie” of all.

In his *Brzezinski and September 11th report*, LaRouche acknowledged that while the details of precisely how the attack was orchestrated involve covert military secrets that are often the most difficult to unravel, the larger question of cui bono—who benefitted—from the attacks is much more accessible. To deal with this question, however, requires a review of some critical events, dating back, at minimum, to the period of the “Bush 41” Presidency.

Imperial Preventive War

On May 21, 1991, at the request of then-Secretary of Defense Cheney, a team of civilian strategists in the Pentagon policy office delivered an oral presentation to Cheney on the subject of the post-Soviet strategic environment and long-range national security implications for the United States. The bulk of the presentation was delivered by Assistant Secretary of Defense for Policy Paul Wolfowitz. Other team members included: Lewis Libby, who was Wolfowitz’s deputy; Zalmay Khalilzad, a RAND Corporation/University of Chicago protégé of Albert Wohlstetter, who was at that time also in Wolfowitz’s Pentagon shop; and Eric Edelman, a career Foreign Service officer also working under Wolfowitz. Today, all four men hold top posts in the “Bush 43” government: Wolfowitz is Deputy Secretary of Defense; Libby is chief-of-staff and chief national security aide to Vice President Cheney; Edelman is Libby’s deputy there; and Khalilzad is White House liaison to the Iraqi opposition.

In that 1991 briefing to Cheney, Wolfowitz proposed that the United States adopt a policy of preventive action to forestall any nation or combination of nations from challenging American military and economic “primacy” for the foreseeable future, using all means necessary. When Cheney incorporated the

Wolfowitz concept in his 1992 Defense Planning Guidance (DPG), all Hell broke loose. Senior military officers leaked portions of the Guidance to the *New York Times*; President George H.W. Bush, his National Security Advisor Gen. Brent Scowcroft, and his Secretary of State James Baker III, all rejected the unilateralism of the Cheney-Wolfowitz strategy.

Ultimately the DPG was re-written, and featured only a substantially watered-down version of the scheme. But following President Bush's re-election defeat, in January 1993, Secretary Cheney and his team delivered a parting shot, with the publication of *Defense Strategy for the 1990s: The Regional Defense Strategy*, which not only revived the idea of preventive unilateral war, but also promoted the idea that the United States must develop a new generation of mini-nuclear weapons, appropriate for use against Third World targets.

It was no secret that both Cheney and Wolfowitz were furious at President Bush for not allowing the U.S.-led "coalition" forces to roll into Baghdad and overthrow Saddam Hussein, at the conclusion of Operation Desert Storm in 1991. Indeed, associates of Wolfowitz report that he has been obsessed with overthrowing Saddam Hussein and overturning the entire Middle East chessboard since the late 1970s. Saul Bellow's *Ravelstein* reported that Wolfowitz telephoned his Straussian mentor Allan Bloom, back in Chicago, to rant against President Bush for his lack of Nietzschean hubris.

The 'Clean Break'

Largely out of power in Washington during the eight-year Clinton Presidency, the Straussian cabal did not go dormant. Following the September 1993 signing of the Oslo Accords at the White House, the Straussians and neo-cons launched an all-out drive to kill the "land for peace" deal. Several leading disciples of Strauss and Bloom had already migrated to Israel, and they would form the core of an apparatus inside Israel dedicated to sinking the peace process.

In 1994, Hillel Fradkin and Yoram Hazony founded the Shalem Center, with financing from two American billionaires, both associated with the little-known but powerful "Mega

Group” of right-wing Zionists—Ronald Lauder and Roger Hertog. Hertog is today part owner, with Lord Conrad Black and Michael Steinhardt, of the *New York Sun*; and is also a one-third owner, with Martin Peretz and Steinhardt, of *The New Republic*, long a bastion of Straussian political propaganda. (*New Republic* editor Lawrence Kaplan, for example, has recently teamed with *The Weekly Standard's* William Kristol to produce a book-length promotion of the war on Iraq.)

Fradkin was a student of Allan Bloom, and taught at the University of Chicago Committee on Social Thought. He later went on to launch the Shalem Center's Washington office, while also serving as director of the Ethics and Public Policy Center (he replaced Elliott Abrams in that post, when Abrams was brought onto the National Security Council under “Bush 43”), and as a Middle East scholar at the American Enterprise Institute (AEI). Hazoney got his PhD at Rutgers University under another Strauss disciple, Wilson Cary McWilliams, then moved to Israel, where he worked as a speech-writer for Likud leader Benjamin Netanyahu. Hazoney is an unabashed backer of the racist Rabbi Meir Kahane, the late founder of the terrorist Jewish Defense League and Kach Movement.

In addition to the Shalem Center and the Foundation for a Constitutional Democracy, launched by leading Strauss student Paul Eidelberg—an advocate of the permanent annexation of all of “Judea,” “Samaria,” and Gaza by the Israeli state—a third Israeli think-tank played a pivotal role in advancing the Straussian/neo-con agenda during the Clinton Presidency. The Institute for Advanced Strategic and Political Studies (IASPS), with offices in Jerusalem and Washington, was launched in 1984 as an outpost of the “Chicago School” of British System free-trade economics, promoting the work of Adam Smith, Friedrich von Hayek, and Milton Friedman. Twelve years later, the Institute established a Division for Research in Strategy. By its own description, IASPS is a center of Straussian influence in Israel. An advertisement for the Institute's Strategic Fellowship program in Washington, posted on the IASPS website, warns applicants that if they are not followers of Leo Strauss, they need not apply.

In 1996, following the assassination of Prime Minister Yitzhak Rabin, the newly established IASPS Division of Re-

search in Strategy commissioned a series of studies on how to undo the Oslo Accords, to be presented to incoming Israeli Prime Minister Netanyahu.

The key study in the series, “A Clean Break: A New Strategy for Securing the Realm,” was prepared by a team of American neo-cons led by Richard Perle. Other members of the study group were: James Colbert of the Jewish Institute for National Security Affairs (JINSA); Charles Fairbanks of the Johns Hopkins University School of Advanced International Studies (SAIS), a Strauss disciple and an intimate of Paul Wolfowitz since the 1960s; Douglas Feith, now Undersecretary of Defense for Policy; Robert Loewenberg, President of IASPS; Jonathan Torop of the Washington Institute for Near East Studies (WI-NEP), the think-tank spawned by the American Israel Public Affairs Committee (AIPAC), the official Israeli lobby in America; David Wurmser, then the director of the Middle East project at AEI, and now the special assistant to State Department chief arms control negotiator John Bolton—himself, former Vice Chairman of AEI; and Meyrav Wurmser, formerly with the Middle East Research and Information Project (MERIP) of Sharonist Israeli military intelligence officer Col. Yigal Carmon, and now the director of Middle East programs at the Hudson Institute.

The six-page “Clean Break” document was hand-delivered by Perle to Netanyahu on July 8, 1996—two days before Netanyahu addressed a joint session of the U.S. Congress. Most of Netanyahu’s speech consisted of pre-selected excerpts from “Clean Break.” The paper called for a total rejection of Oslo and “land for peace”; a brutal crackdown and reoccupation of the Palestinian Authority territories by the Israeli Defense Forces—to be justified on the basis of the “right to hot pursuit” of terrorists, leading to Israel’s eventual permanent annexation of the West Bank and the Gaza Strip; and a war against Iraq, to overthrow not only the Saddam Hussein regime in Baghdad, but the Ba’ath regime in Damascus.

“Israel can shape its strategic environment,” Perle and company wrote, “in cooperation with Turkey and Jordan, by weakening, containing, and even rolling back Syria. This effort can focus on removing Saddam Hussein from power in Iraq—an important Israeli strategic objective in its own right—as a means of foiling Syria’s regional ambitions.”

Perle and company penned "Clean Break" knowing full well that in 1990-91, the Bush Administration had launched Operation Desert Storm in response to Israeli threats to launch their own war of extermination against Saddam Hussein. Israel's move would have triggered a perpetual Middle East religious war, precisely along the lines of the Clash of Civilizations first spelled out by Dr. Bernard Lewis in a 1990 *Atlantic Monthly* article, three years before the appearance of Samuel Huntington's more well-known Clash of Civilizations diatribe in *Foreign Affairs*. The Bush Administration caved in to the Israeli threats and pre-empted Israeli strikes on Iraq, by conducting the "Coalition" war and imposing the post-war sanctions, no-fly zones, etc. Now, through Perle, Feith, Wurmser, et al. the Straussians were upping the ante.

'New American Century'

In early 1997, William Kristol and Robert Kagan, two of the leading neo-con "Straussian intellectuals" in Washington, joined forces with collaborators at the AEI to shove the "Clean Break" policy down the throat of the Clinton Administration. Using office space on the fifth floor of the AEI headquarters, Kristol and company launched a new tax-exempt front group, the Project for the New American Century (PNAC), specifically to promote the buildup of American military force to unilaterally police the globe—starting with the overthrow of Saddam Hussein.

On June 3, 1997, PNAC released a Statement of Principle, which was signed by Elliott Abrams, Gary Bauer, William Bennett, Florida Governor Jeb Bush, Dick Cheney, Midge Decter, Francis Fukuyama, Lewis Libby, Norman Podhoretz, Peter Rodman, Donald Rumsfeld, Paul Wolfowitz, and others.

The Statement of Principle was based on an article co-authored by William Kristol and Robert Kagan, published in the July/August 1996 issue of *Foreign Affairs*, the journal of the New York Council on Foreign Relations—simultaneous with the Perle-Feith-Wurmser release of "Clean Break." Kristol and Kagan called for a "Neo-Reaganite Foreign Policy." This was a willfully dishonest choice of terms, given that President Reagan's most noteworthy foreign and national security policy

achievement had been his collaboration with Lyndon LaRouche in launching the Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI), which Reagan envisioned as a joint, cooperative effort with the Soviet Union, to bring about the end of the era of “mutually assured destruction.” When Soviet General Secretary Yuri Andropov rejected Reagan’s generous offer of scientific and technological cooperation to build a global defense against nuclear weapons, the collapse of the Soviet empire was guaranteed, as LaRouche forecast in 1984, and again in a now-famous October 1988 speech in West Berlin, in which he anticipated the fall of the Berlin Wall a year later.

Kristol and Kagan defined their “neo-Reaganite foreign policy” as “benevolent global hegemony,” based on a massive buildup of American military might. The authors were reviving the 1991 Wolfowitz doctrine of unilateral preventive war, explicitly stating, “The appropriate goal of American foreign policy is to preserve that hegemony as far into the future as possible.”

Kristol and Kagan specifically called for the overthrow of more than 200 years of American anti-colonialist tradition, singling out John Quincy Adams as their particular nemesis: “Conservatives these days,” they wrote, “succumb easily to the charming old metaphor of the United States as a ‘city on a hill.’ They hark back . . . to the admonition of John Quincy Adams that America ought not go ‘abroad in search of monsters to destroy.’ But why not? The alternative is to leave monsters on the loose, ravaging and pillaging to their hearts’ content, as Americans stand by and watch. What may have been wise counsel in 1823, when America was a small, isolated power in a world of European giants, is no longer so, when America is the giant. Because America has the capacity to contain or destroy many of the world’s monsters, most of which can be found without much searching, and because the responsibility for the peace and security of the international order rests so heavily on America’s shoulders, a policy of sitting atop a hill and leading by example becomes in practice a policy of cowardice and dishonor.”

On Jan. 26, 1998, PNAC issued an Open Letter to President Clinton, calling for immediate “regime change” in Iraq, based on the bogus claim that Saddam was about to launch weapons of mass destruction against the United States and America’s allies. Among the signators on the Open Letter were the follow-

ing individuals, all of whom are now in the "Bush 43" Administration: Abrams, Richard Armitage, John Bolton, Fukuyama, Khalilzad, Perle, Peter Rodman, Rumsfeld, Wolfowitz, and Robert Zoellick. Other signators included Kristol, Kagan, and James Woolsey, who briefly served as President Clinton's Director of Central Intelligence, and who was, at the time the PNAC letter was issued, already the attorney representing the Iraqi National Congress.

In September 2000, on the eve of the Presidential elections, pitting George W. Bush against Al Gore, PNAC issued a lengthy study, "Rebuilding America's Defenses—Strategy, Force and Resources for a New Century," which revived at great length the Cheney-Wolfowitz 1991-93 preventive war strategy. Among the "usual suspects" who contributed to the "Rebuilding" study was Wolfowitz protégé Lewis Libby. He had just completed a stint as the general counsel to the Cox Commission, which was promoting a strategic showdown in North Asia with China and North Korea; he would soon be Vice President Cheney's chief of staff. While out of government, Libby had also been the personal attorney of Marc Rich, the Russian "Mafiya" godfather who had been convicted in absentia in Federal court for tax evasion and "trading with the enemy"—Iran's Ayatollah Khomeini—during the American hostage crisis of 1979-80. Libby was the behind-the-scenes Svengali responsible for the disastrous Clinton Presidential pardon of Rich, working directly with "former" Mossad operatives Zvi Rafiah and Avner Azulay.

Despite the proliferation of Straussians and neo-cons inside the George W. Bush national security team, the Iraq war lobby made very little headway until the event that Vice President Cheney termed "the historic watershed."

The Sept. 11, 2001 attacks on the Pentagon and the World Trade Center triggered an instant response from the neo-cons in and around the Bush Administration. Just four days after the attacks, Paul Wolfowitz attended a Sept. 15 National Security Council session with President Bush at Camp David, where he delivered a pitch for an immediate U.S. invasion of Iraq. For reasons that still remain in dispute, the President, the Vice President, and even Defense Secretary Rumsfeld rejected the Wolfowitz proposal as "premature." However, several days later, in a Presidential national security order authorizing the

attack on Afghanistan, President Bush did authorize the CIA and the military to begin developing contingency plans for dealing with Saddam.

‘Chickenhawk Intelligence Agency’ Is Born

A week after Wolfowitz’s “premature” war pitch, Richard Perle convened a session of the Defense Policy Board addressed by British Arab Bureau veteran spook Dr. Bernard Lewis, and INC founder Dr. Ahmed Chalabi, a bank swindler and protégé of Albert Wohlstetter at the University of Chicago, who was the Zionist Lobby and the Israeli right wing’s hand-picked successor to Saddam Hussein. At the CIA and the State Department, Chalabi was considered virtually *persona non grata*, and his INC umbrella was viewed as a collection of martini-slurping professional exiles, with virtually no assets on the ground inside Iraq. Perle and Bernard Lewis had been introduced to Chalabi in the early 1980s, and the former banker, who faces a 20-year prison sentence in Jordan for bank fraud and currency manipulation, has been a pet project of JINSA and AEI ever since.

In a candid moment shortly before Sept. 11, 2001, Defense Secretary Rumsfeld had confided to associates that he was thinking about resigning his Cabinet post and returning to Chicago. His explanation was revealing: “The Likud has taken over the building,” he told friends, referring to the Wolfowitz-Perle cabal that had run circles around him in the early months of the “Bush 43” Administration. Sources familiar with Rumsfeld describe the Secretary as a “control freak” and micro-manager, who had presumed that his participation in a Clinton-era commission on missile proliferation had sufficiently offset his quarter-century absence from Washington, and that he would be able to maintain a tight grip on the vast Pentagon bureaucracy, including the uniformed military command, centered at the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Through the personal efforts of former Secretary of State and “Chicago School” ideologue George Shultz, Deputy Defense Secretary Wolfowitz had been inserted in the inner circle of George W. Bush campaign policy tutors, the so-called “Vulcans,” which enabled him to bring Perle and the whole

neo-con crowd to Austin, Texas for personal mis-education sessions with the President-to-be. Wolfowitz parlayed that personal relationship with the new President, and staffed Rumsfeld's office with a veritable army of like-minded Strauss disciples and Likudniks.

In June 1988, *EIR* had revealed that then-Secretary of Defense Caspar Weinberger's general counsel office had compiled a list of suspected members of the "X Committee," the network of Israeli spies and agents-of-influence who had penetrated the Reagan-Bush Administration's national security establishment, and were believed to have directed the espionage efforts of Jonathan Jay Pollard. Among the dozen leading "X Committee" suspects being probed by the general counsel team were: Wolfowitz, Perle, Feith, Wohlstetter, Fred Iklé, Stephen Bryen, Michael Ledeen, Frank Gaffney, John Lehman, and Henry Rowen.

Under Wolfowitz, the "Bush 43" Pentagon once again became a hub of "X Committee" influence and penetration.

Nevertheless, the intelligence coming out of the CIA, the DIA, and the State Department firmly rejected any evidence of linkage between Saddam Hussein and the attacks of 9/11. The overwhelming evidence also suggested that Iraq posed no immediate or near-term threat to the United States or any of its neighbors. Early in the Bush Administration, Secretary of State Colin Powell had proposed a revision of sanctions, called "smart sanctions," recognizing that international support for the continuing isolation of Iraq was wearing thin.

To seize upon the dramatic shift that occurred on Sept. 11, 2001, Wolfowitz and Deputy Secretary of Defense for Policy Doug Feith, one of the most rabid of the Jabotinskyites in the Pentagon civilian bureaucracy, launched a secret intelligence unit. Its mission was to provide Secretary of Defense Rumsfeld—who had abandoned his pre-9/11 plans to retire, and was now fully in synch with the Wolfowitz cabal—with a constant flow of "intelligence" to counter the CIA/DIA resistance to the "Get Saddam" agenda of the "Clean Break" crowd. One of the principal sources of this unvetted "intelligence" was to be Chalabi's discredited INC.

Wolfowitz and Feith chose Abram Shulsky to head the secret cell, which was buried in the maze of civilian Pentagon bureaucracy under the Assistant Secretary for Policy. A Strauss disci-

ple, Shulsky had been a professional staffer for Sen. Daniel Patrick Moynihan (D-N.Y.), along with Elliott Abrams and Gary Schmitt—now the President of Bill Kristol’s and Robert Kagan’s tax-front, PNAC. Shulsky had served on the staff of the Senate Intelligence Oversight Committee. He had been an underling of neo-con wunderkind and Iran-Contra operative Roy Godson at the Consortium for the Study of Intelligence, a project of the New York City-based National Strategy Information Center. And Shulsky had co-authored, with Zalmay Khalilzad and others, a 1999 RAND Corporation study, “The United States and a Rising China,” which promoted the idea that China, more than any other nation, posed a direct challenge to American global and regional military primacy, and would have to be directly confronted.

Who Makes This ‘Intelligence’?

Others identified with the Shulsky “chickenhawks intelligence agency” included:

Harold Rhode, the Middle East specialist in Dr. Andrew Marshall’s Pentagon Office of Net Assessments (ONA). Marshall was a founder, with Albert Wohlstetter, of the RAND Corporation at the close of World War II. He was installed at the Pentagon in 1975 by then-Secretary of Defense James Rodney Schlesinger, who created the ONA specifically to house Marshall and his team of RAND systems analysis and game theory utopians. At the very outset of the “Bush 43” Administration, Marshall had grabbed the ear of Rumsfeld, provoking a near revolt of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, who considered Marshall to be the driver behind the dangerously incompetent “revolution in military affairs.”

Michael Ledeen, in his recent book-length rant, *The War Against the Terror Masters* (New York: St. Martins Press, 2002), described Rhode as his “guru on the Middle East for nearly 20 years.” In 1991, Rhode was in the Pentagon Office of International Security Policy, covering Turkey, at a time that Perle and Feith were running an international consulting operation, selling Israeli military hardware to the Turkish Army. Wolfowitz has described Rhode as his “Islamic affairs advisor” at ONA; and according to one account, Rhode, in a meeting during the

early months of the Bush Administration, had staged a noisy in-your-face confrontation with a top Saudi official, vowing that the historical U.S.-Saudi partnership was a thing of the past. The incident reportedly cost Rhode a more senior—and visible—post inside the Wolfowitz-Feith Pentagon bureaucracy.

Rhode, according to several sources, has travelled, on several occasions, to London, with Richard Perle, Chairman, until recently, of the Defense Policy Board, to gather “intelligence” from INC officials, which has been funneled through Shulsky’s shop to Rumsfeld—without first being evaluated and cross-checked by CIA or Defense Intelligence Agency professionals.

William Luti, formerly an advisor to Vice President Cheney, more recently named as the Deputy Under Secretary of Defense for Special Plans and Near East and South Asian Affairs, has been described by a recent visitor to his office as a man crazed with the mission to eliminate Saddam Hussein. “He reminded me of a serial killer, right out of a Hollywood horror flick,” according to the source, who described Luti’s Pentagon office as covered from floor to ceiling with desecrated photographs and news clippings of Saddam Hussein and his inner core. A retired Navy Captain and pilot who served during Operation Desert Storm, Luti was described, in a March 11, 2002 *New Yorker* story by Seymour Hersh, as “so obsessed with an immediate overthrow of Saddam Hussein that he hasn’t thought through the consequences.” Despite these psychological profiles, Luti has been one of the Pentagon civilian point-men, working with the Iraqi “opposition” on both intelligence and operations. According to accounts in the *New York Times*, Luti was dispatched to London in November and December 2002, to meet with Chalabi and other Iraqi exiles.

On Dec. 17, Luti and Maj. Gen. David Barno met secretly with 11 Iraqi opposition figures in London, and selected the initial group of Iraqis to be trained in Hungary to participate in any military operation, as the indigenist “window dressing” on what would, in reality, be an all-American or Anglo-American military invasion.

In a Washington speech on Oct. 16, 2002, Luti had promoted, aggressively, the need for the United States to adopt a new, imperial interventionist policy, which he dubbed “anticipatory self-defense.”

Reuel Marc Gerecht, a retired CIA officer, has been identified as one of the secret liaisons between the Shulsky “chicken-hawk intelligence agency” at DOD and the Iraqi oppositionists in London and elsewhere in Europe. Based most of the time in Brussels, along with Robert Kagan, Gerecht is a senior fellow at AEI, and is the Director of the Middle East Initiative at PNAC, working directly under Kristol, Kagan, and Shulsky’s close associate Gary Schmitt.

The Secret Kingdom Of Leo Strauss

by Tony Papert

April 5, 2003

Just a decade ago, a friend and I first read through Allan Bloom's *The Closing of the American Mind*, and were quite attracted to him. Why? For one thing, his opposition to the counterculture seemed to come from the heart: for example, he described how, as a college professor, he would take his own recordings with him up into his students' dorm rooms, to get them to turn off their rock music and listen to Mozart with him. Bloom also passionately denounced the fact that the universities were teaching nothing; so do I. On the other hand, I also saw that I had disagreements with Bloom, but I was going to give him the benefit of the doubt: maybe they would just turn out to be misunderstandings.

My friend and I intended to approach Bloom to join us in Lyndon LaRouche's campaign. But first, I wanted to find out more.

As anyone who read it will remember, *Closing of the American Mind* always left a peculiar mental aftertaste, no matter where you happened to close the book. In the midst of other matters, Bloom would slip in emphatic, unexpected statements, apparently off the subject, never followed up, but which would stay with you for days afterwards, just for that reason.

I still remember two of them. Bloom wrote that at Socrates' trial, there were men present who wanted him to be acquitted; they were the "gentlemen." What did he mean by that word "gentlemen?" I had never heard anyone use it in this context before, but Bloom just let it drop after that one sentence, and never picked up the thread again. In another nearby location, he wrote that Socrates was accused of not believing in the gods

of the city, and inventing other gods. Notice, wrote Bloom, that he never denied the charge. But I remembered, as I thought, that he *had* denied the charge, and, prompted by my puzzlement at Bloom's remark, I found the words in Plato's *Apology of Socrates*, where Socrates did deny it.

And yet this Bloom was supposed to be a Greek scholar and a translator of Plato. Just what was he trying to get at? What did he mean?

When I learned that Allan Bloom had been a follower of the late Professor Leo Strauss of the University of Chicago, I decided I had to find out what Strauss had said. My only knowledge of Strauss at that time, was through another friend, whose mother had taken his course at the New School in New York, where Strauss had taught from 1938 to 1948. She had marvelled at his command of ancient Greek. For the rest, all that she would remember was that he was gray, boring, and very distant.

Leo Strauss

Leo Strauss, born in 1899 to observant Jewish parents in Kirchhain, Germany, in the province of Hesse near Marburg, had lived in the U.S. from 1938 until his death in Annapolis, Maryland, in 1973. He had written at least sixteen books. Most of them were long, and had such uninteresting-sounding titles as *The City and Man*, or *Natural Right and History*. I decided I would read Strauss's book *Socrates and Aristophanes*, both because I was interested in the subject, and also because I now recalled that Bloom had given me an impression, in one of those dark asides of his, that Aristophanes' lampoon of Socrates in his play, *The Clouds*, had been at least partly truthful, while I knew it to be a lie.

Wading into the beginning of Strauss's prefatory material to his *Socrates and Aristophanes*, it all seemed simple, artless, and totally dull. Aristophanes wrote a play about Socrates. This play, *The Clouds* is important,—essential, in fact,—to understand the issues surrounding Socrates. And,—here it is! Strauss lands us smack into his own translation of the play. A very pedestrian translation, with the additional burden of lengthy stage directions inserted by Strauss, and even directions for

what happens offstage, which somehow overwhelm the dialogue.

Well and good. At length, having made it through *The Clouds*, I'm back to Leo Strauss again. As important as this play is, he writes, it cannot be understood apart from its context. Ten other plays of Aristophanes have survived. And,—here they are! In dry-as-dust translations by Strauss, complete with his lengthy stage directions. I put the book away, and with it my project to read long books of Leo Strauss.

There must be another approach.

Now, I had a friend with a Classics background, with whom I was frequently in touch, who was then leading a long-running seminar on Plato's *Republic* among some of the volunteers for Lyndon LaRouche, who was himself in prison at the time, having been framed up in a rerun of Socrates' trial at Athens. I learned somehow that my friend, the seminar leader, had studied under the Straussian Stanley Rosen.

I had always thought that this Plato seminar was a bit of a mixed bag. Some parts, which I think stemmed from my friend's own study of the history of Athens, were quite useful. Others were unexplained and eerie: such as, for example, his insistence that Socrates "seduced" his hearers. But more to the point was an indefinable, ominous sort of quirkiness which overhung every discussion.

Eventually it became clear to me, that Strauss, through Stanley Rosen, had made the same sort of imprint on my friend, that Strauss's teacher Martin Heidegger had made upon Strauss himself. In the insightful account of Shadia Drury, "Nothing made a greater impact on Strauss than Heidegger's manner of studying a text. He was totally struck by Heidegger's analysis of Aristotle's *Metaphysics*; he thought that Heidegger's approach laid bare the intellectual sinews of a text; and it was unlike anything else he had ever seen or heard. Strauss's reaction is not unusual. Heidegger's style of teaching was reputed to have a totally mesmerizing effect. He has been accused of a certain 'mystical bullying.' The goal was not so much understanding as initiation in a mystical cult. This is precisely why Karl Jaspers's letter to the Denazification Commission advised against Heidegger's return to teaching after the war. The gist of Jaspers's letter was that Heidegger's style was profoundly unfree, and that the students were not strong enough to with-

stand his sorcery. The youth are not safe with Heidegger until they can think for themselves, and Heidegger is no help where that is concerned. On a much smaller scale, the same can be said for Strauss." [Drury, 1997, p. 77]

Kabbalism in Annapolis

We also have imprints in the LaRouche movement of Saint John's College, in Annapolis, Maryland, and Santa Fe, New Mexico, with its "Great Books" program, another offshoot of the University of Chicago.

I had the chance recently to speak with a relative of one of our members, who is in effect an evangelist for Saint John's, and soon he was giving me thumbnail sketches of each of the courses there. When he got to a class on a Plato dialogue, he said that the teacher had stayed up all night, counting each word in the dialogue, so that she could show her class the central word: word number 25,000 out of 50,000 words, for example. The notion is that the central word in this sense, points to the central idea of the work.

"It sounds just like Strauss!", I burst out. Yes, he said, Strauss is influential in the Greek classics program at Saint John's.

The influence is probably broader. Already in the 1950s, Saint John's in Annapolis was headed for years by Strauss's lifelong friend Jacob Klein. Strauss retired from Chicago in 1967, and spent a year at Claremont Mens College in California. Then, from 1969 until his death in 1973, Strauss was scholar-in-residence at Saint John's at Annapolis.

Now was it an accident that Strauss's books, especially his later books, were unreadable? No; I came to see that it was deliberate. The purpose was to ensure that the huge majority of readers will "tune out," after finding nothing but some familiar-sounding exhortations, such as advice to be moral, patriotic, and god-fearing. This is largely how Bloom's *Closing of the American Mind* was read during its ten weeks on the best-seller list: as a pile of salutary exhortations. The mass of people will find nothing but pabulum. But, the few "intelligent young men,"—and it's always "men" or "boys," never "women" or "people," but "men" or "boys,"—the few intelligent young men will be intrigued by these obiter dicta, or these fragmentary

remarks, which are almost always off the subject,—and they'll say, "Now, what is that really all about? I've got to get into it; I've got to understand." And, then, they're taken aside, and taught in private, individually.

The case is the same as that of the police infiltrator, who, whenever anything important comes up in a meeting, says, "I have to talk to you about it after the meeting." He will never discuss anything of significance in a meeting, but only one-on-one, because he is habitually telling different things to different people.

By far the best book on Strauss is Shadia Drury's 1988 *The Political Ideas of Leo Strauss*. It may be that part of its excellence, is related to her awareness that there is a sense in which no woman could be a Straussian. In fact, Strauss said that no woman could be a philosopher. But, for many of the bright young boys, or men, their purpose for studying with Strauss, was to become "philosophers."

Illustrative of Strauss's method, is Shadia Drury's report of a debate between two long-time leading Straussians: Thomas Pangle and Harry Jaffa, which ran in the *Claremont Review* from fall 1984, through Summer, 1985, and continued in *National Review* on November 20 and 29, 1985. Pangle had implied that for Socrates (i.e., for Strauss), moral virtue had no application to the really intelligent man, the philosopher. Moral virtue only existed in popular opinion, where it served the purpose of controlling the unintelligent majority. Elsewhere in the debate, Pangle implied that for Strauss, philosophy had disproved religious faith. As the fight continued, Pangle said that Strauss had characterized America's distinctiveness as "modern," which for the Straussians is one of their worst term of abuse.

Harry Jaffa found "Pangle's interpretation completely foreign to his own understanding of his teacher and friend of 30 years," in Shadia Drury's summary. "Jaffa observes that such a vision of Strauss is Nietzschean, and he denounces Pangle for having perverted the legacy of Leo Strauss." [Drury 1988, page 182]

How is this contradiction possible? As Drury says, "... Strauss taught students such as Jaffa and Pangle different things." [Drury 1988, page 188] The esoteric, or supposedly secret teaching which was inculcated into Pangle, Bloom, Werner Dannhauser, and many others, including, reportedly, Bloom's protégé Paul Wolfowitz, was indeed pure Nietzsche.

In fact, the version which Pangle represented in that 1984-85 debate, as outrageous as it may have seemed to Jaffa, was greatly watered down. From Nietzsche to Leo Strauss, only the names have been changed, as they say. To begin with, what Nietzsche called the "superman," or the "next man," Strauss calls the "philosopher."

The philosopher/superman is that rare man who can face the truth. That there is no God, that the universe cares nothing for men or mankind, and that all of human history is nothing more than an insignificant speck in the cosmos, which no sooner began, than it will vanish forever without a trace. There is no morality, no good and evil, and of course any notion of an afterlife is an old wives' tale.

In a eulogy for a colleague, Strauss said, "I think he died as a philosopher. Without fear, but also without hope."

But the great majority of men and women, on the other hand, is so far from ever being able to face the truth, that it it virtually belongs to another species. Nietzsche called it the "herd," and also the "slaves." They require the bogeymen of a threatening God and of punishment in the afterlife, and the fiction of moral right and wrong. Without these illusions, they would go mad and run riot, and the social order, any social order, would collapse. And since human nature never changes, according to Strauss, this will always be so.

It is the supermen/philosophers who provide the herd with the religious, moral and other beliefs they require, but which the supermen themselves know to be lies. Nietzsche said that his supermen were "atheistic priests," and Strauss pretends that their lies are "noble lies." But they do not do this out of benevolence, of course; charity and benevolence are mocked by Nietzsche and Strauss as unworthy of gods and godlike men. Rather, the "philosophers" use these falsehoods to shape society in the interest of these "philosophers" themselves.

Now the philosophers require various sorts of people to serve them, including the "gentlemen," that word which had struck me earlier, when Bloom had used it in speaking of Socrates' trial. Rather than the "esoteric," or secret teachings, the future "gentlemen" are indoctrinated in the "exoteric," or public teachings. They are taught to believe in religion, morality, patriotism, and public service, and some go into government. Think of former Education Secretary William Bennett and his *Book of*

Virtues. Of course, along with these traditional virtues, they also believe in the “philosophers” who have taught them all these good things.

Those “gentlemen” who become statesmen, will continue to take the advice of the philosophers. This rule of the philosophers through their front-men in government, is what Strauss calls the “secret kingdom” of the philosophers, a “secret kingdom” which is the life’s objective of many of Strauss’s esoteric students.

Now the peculiarities I had found in Allan Bloom’s book, as well as in the Plato seminar I mentioned, resulted not only from the Nietzscheanism of Strauss and Bloom, but equally from Strauss’s insistence that the truth must be hidden, which Nietzsche did not share in that form.

It is because the truth would destroy society and the philosophers alike if it became known, that Strauss said that Plato and the ancient philosophers, like Strauss himself, wrote in a kind of code, whose true meaning only disclosed itself to the wise. If the vulgar happened on their books, they would find only the familiar salutary myths about the rewards of virtue, the punishment of vice and the like.

Strauss gives an example from Al Farabi, another of his esoteric writers, of how one may tell the truth in words, only to deceive. In Drury’s paraphrase, “The pious ascetic was well known in the city for his abstinence, abasement and mortification, and for his probity, propriety and devotion. But for some reason he aroused the hostility of the ruler of his city. The latter ordered his arrest, and to make sure he did not flee, he placed the guards of the city gates on alert. In spite of this, the ascetic managed to escape from the city. Dressed as a drunk and singing a tune to cymbals, he approached the city gates. When the guard asked him who he was, he replied that he was the pious ascetic that everyone was looking for. The guard did not believe him, and let him go.” [Drury, 1988, pages x-xi]

No surprise, then, that the Allan Bloom whom I and others had thought we had seen through the pages of his *Closing of the American Mind*, was not the real Allan Bloom at all. You can obtain a truer idea of his real beliefs, through the extracts from his “Interpretive Essay” on Plato’s Republic, which follow. Indeed, the real Allan Bloom was also, among other things, a promiscuous homosexual whose life was cut short by AIDS.

When he recognized that he was dying, he charged his close friend, the Chicago University novelist Saul Bellow, to write what has been called a "literary monument" to Allan Bloom, the *roman à clef* titled *Ravelstein*. It is a true-to-life biography. Bellow may justify his having suppressed some facts about himself, by the need to keep his friend Bloom in the foreground. Otherwise, only names and minor details have been changed. Bloom is "Ravelstein," Strauss is "Davarr" (Hebrew for "word"), and Bellow himself is "Chick" or "Chickie."

From a professor with a taste for luxury, but without the means to afford it, *The Closing of the American Mind* made Allan Bloom an overnight multi-millionaire. Japanese royalties alone were in the millions. Bellow's book begins with a fabulously expensive, all-night dinner party thrown by Bloom for perhaps two dozen people, including Bellow, in the Crillon, which Bloom had chosen as the best hotel in Paris. Bloom and Bellow wake up at two o'clock the next day, and go window-shopping through expensive Paris shops. Eventually, they pick up a \$5,000 yellow jacket, tailor-made for Bloom. Then, in a cafe, the jittery Allan Bloom accidentally pours an espresso down the front of his new jacket. Bellow squirms, and tries to assure his friend that the porter at the Crillon will know how to repair his jacket, but Bloom just laughs uncontrollably.

Instead of a telephone, Bloom's Chicago apartment featured what was in effect a custom-made, private telephone switchboard. He spent much of his time sitting at the center of the spiderweb getting telephone calls. With this device he could have a number of people on hold, while presumably conferencing others in ad-hoc or preplanned discussions. And Bloom, who died in 1992, was one of the first to carry the equivalent of a cell-phone, so that he could get his important calls anywhere.

One incident describes a call from Wolfowitz in Washington to Bloom's device during the Gulf War in 1991. Wolfowitz tells Bloom that the White House will announce the next day, that they're not going on to Baghdad. Bloom denounces them as cowards.

And what he did was discuss politics, manage the careers of his brood of acolytes, talk about their love lives, and about the other guy's love life, and match people up. Indeed, he helped break up Saul Bellow's current marriage, while finding him a

beautiful young literary assistant, a student of Bloom's, who then fell in love with Bellow and married him.

Remember that Strauss graduated 100 PhD's. Bloom graduated many. They in turn graduated others, and so forth. By now, the fourth generation has graduated. And there was a role for each one, whether they were esoteric or exoteric, "philosophers" or "gentlemen," or dissidents or whatnot. Remember, for instance, that a coveted academic job requires ten to twenty totally unreservedly positive recommendations, from others who already have such jobs. Now, this is one thing the Straussians will always do for each other, regardless of what might seem some very serious disagreements. And this academic "buddy system" stretches into the government, through the increasing proliferation of think-tanks which bridge between the two. This was the bridge crossed by Wolfowitz and many other Straussians.

Now, a year and a half after September 11, the "secret kingdom" seems at last at hand, or perhaps it is already here. Something similar probably appeared to Nietzsche through the syphilitic ravings of his final days.

Allan Bloom Interprets *Plato's Republic*

[From *The Republic of Plato*, ©1968 and 1991, "Interpretive Essay."]

—". . . thoughtful selfish men . . ." [p. 315]

—"If the distinction between friends and enemies, and the inclination to help the former and harm the latter, were eliminated from the heart and mind of man, political life would be impossible. This is the necessary political definition of justice, and Socrates does not simply reject it as he appears to do." [p. 318]

—"Socrates does not suggest that the just man would want

to benefit all men, only that he would want to benefit his friends and remain indifferent to the others." [p. 324]

—"Socrates' view is perfectly consistent with stealing from or killing an enemy just so long as he is not made more unjust." [p. 325]

—"And no reader can be satisfied that Thrasymachus' definition [justice is the will of the stronger] has been refuted or that this discussion has proved that there is sufficient reason to devote oneself to the common good." [p. 334]

—"...the character of men's desires would make it impossible for a rational teaching to be the public teaching." [p. 367]

—"The Socratic teaching that a good society requires a fundamental falsehood is the direct opposite of that of the Enlightenment which argued that civil society could dispense with lies and count on selfish calculation to make men loyal to it." [p. 368]

—"...from the point of view of the healthy city, perhaps men like Socrates should be repressed." [p. 377]

—"The soul in which reason is most developed will . . . abound with thoughts usually connected with selfishness, lust, and vice." [p. 377]

—"...if the parallel of city and man is to hold true, then a man, like the city, should be interested only in himself and merely use others for his own advantage, . . ." [p. 378]

—"Socrates can contemplate going naked where others go clothed; he is not afraid of ridicule. He can also contemplate sexual intercourse where others are stricken with terror; he is not afraid of moral indignation. . . . shame is the wall built by convention which stands between the mind and the light." [pp. 387-388]

—"The philosopher's public speech must be guided by prudence rather than love of the truth; . . . It is obvious that a man can love the truth without telling it. . ." [pp. 392-395]

—"The silent lesson would seem to be that it is indeed possible to possess intellectual virtue without what later came to be called moral virtue." [p. 396]

—"However, he [Socrates] is silent about the charge of atheism." [p. 400]

—"This was not just any city, but one constructed to meet all the demands of justice. Its impossibility demonstrates the impossibility of the actualization of a just regime . . . The think-

ers of the Enlightenment, culminating in Marx, preserved Socrates' ultimate goals but forgot his insistence that nature made them impossible for men at large." [pp. 409-411]

—"The Republic finally teaches that justice as total dedication to the city cannot be simply good for the philosopher, and that hence it is somewhat questionable for other men as well. . . . But there is one kind of doing good to one's friends which is also beneficial to the philosopher. There are some young men in whom his soul delights, for they have souls akin to his own and are potential philosophers; . . . He must always carry on a contest with the city for the affections of its sons." [pp. 411-412]

—"Socrates' political science, paradoxically, is meant to show the superiority of the private life." [p. 415]

—"The tyrant and the philosopher are united in their sense of their radical incompleteness and their longing for wholeness, in their passion and in their singlemindedness. They are the truly dedicated men." [p. 424]

—"Socrates, by curing Glaucon of his lust for tyrannic pleasures, can indulge his own lust for beautiful souls while at the same time acting the part of the good citizen who defends his city's regime." [p. 424]

—" . . . the moral problem consists in a simple alternative: either philosophy or tyranny is the best way of life. . . . If philosophy did not exist, tyranny would be the desideratum which only a lack of vigor would cause one to reject." [p. 425]

—"So Socrates undertakes to convince Glaucon that the soul is immortal. This discussion can hardly rank as a proof, and there is no attempt at all to show that the individual soul is immortal, which is the only thing a man anxious about his fate after life would care about." [p. 435]

Strauss's Benefactor: Carl Schmitt, The Nazis' 'Crown Jurist'

by Barbara Boyd

Leo Strauss was recognized as an asset to Nazi thinking very early on, by none other than the Nazis' "Crown Jurist," Carl Schmitt (1888-1985).

Schmitt drew on a variety of reactionary resources, including Roman law, Napoleon, Rousseau, Kant, Hegel, Hobbes, and the Spanish counter-revolutionary Donoso Cortes, to forge a synthetic theory of law which subverted the Weimar Republic's Constitution and rationalized Adolf Hitler's legal ascension to power. As the world Depression hit Germany in 1929, Schmitt was brought directly into government, successively advising the Brüning and von Papen governments on implementing austerity through rule by emergency decree. As will be shown here, Schmitt's legal analysis of commissarial and sovereign dictatorship, based on Article 48 of the Weimar Constitution, first formulated in 1922, provided the legal basis for Hitler's assumption of power, through the Führer's declaration of emergency and suspension of rights of Feb. 28, 1933.

Schmitt then authored the authoritative article justifying the Enabling Laws of March 24, 1933, which transformed Germany, legally, in Schmitt's analysis, from a commissarial to a sovereign dictatorship.

At the urging of the philosopher Martin Heidegger, Schmitt joined the Nazi Party. Heidegger and Schmitt stood in line on May 1, 1933 to join, having previously agreed to do so together. Schmitt proceeded to develop a Nazi theory of law, including the removal of "man" from the German civil code. Arrested for prosecution at the postwar Nuremberg trials, he was detained

for 18 months, but never prosecuted. Schmitt campaigned endlessly, until his death in 1985, to redeem his reputation, portraying himself as an academic victim of events, a man of ideas only, who supported the boorish Hitler because there were no other options.

Schmitt's Campaign Against The Weimar Constitution

Born in 1888 to a Roman Catholic working-class family, Schmitt studied jurisprudence at Berlin, Munich, and Strasbourg, where he took his law degree in 1910. A self-proclaimed "neo-Kantian" in his youth, Schmitt attacked positivism, utilitarianism, and philosophical liberalism. Like Romantic conservative moralists today, Schmitt thought he accurately depicted the world around him by declaring it bereft of "soul." His was an "inartistic, materialistic, relativistic, and capitalistic age," which elevated "function" as some grand means to a "useless and senseless goal." Right had been transformed into power, faith into calculation, truth into a general recognition of accuracy, beauty into good taste. In place of good and evil, there was a sublime distinction between usefulness and destructiveness. Schmitt attacked the dominant positivist theory of law as a sterile and proceduralist closed system of norms, which was morally neutral and incapable of inspiring fidelity or sacrifice in the population. No one would die for positivism.

In World War I, Schmitt served under the General Staff, administering martial law. From this time forward, Schmitt was fascinated by concepts of crisis management, the "state of exception" or "state of emergency." According to Schmitt, how the state acted in the face of "concrete danger" or the "concrete situation," rather than any moral purpose, determined its legitimacy. Schmitt viewed the spread of the Russian Revolution as the greatest peril facing Germany. Plunging into simultaneous studies of Italian Fascism and Leninism, he emerged as a Mussolini devotee, claiming that Il Duce had effectively united the Church, an authoritarian state, and a free economy, and created a powerful mythos to motivate the population. Schmitt was

also convinced that a closed system of positive laws and existing democratic norms, was powerless in the face of charismatic political movements and the irrational myths employed by the Bolsheviks to achieve popular success. Democratic “norms” failed in conditions of social upheaval precisely because such moments represented non-linear discontinuities and “original” moments.

Beginning with his book *Political Romanticism* in 1919, and continuing with major books and speeches every year until the demise of the Weimar Republic in 1933, Schmitt launched an unrelenting polemical assault on the Republic and its Constitution. In his books *Political Romanticism*, *The Crisis of Parliamentary Democracy*, and *Political Theology*, Schmitt attacked the liberalism, protection of individual rights, and pluralism of the German Republic as “Romantic.” His attacks echo those of the conservative revolution and populists in the United States today. Parliamentary legitimacy rested on the idea that “endless discussion” could generate truth, Schmitt argued, yet the Weimar Parliament had long ago ceased to represent the people. Instead, it represented powerful interest groups and partisan political formations which were incapable of decisive action, particularly when the very existence of the state was the issue. Schmitt famously commented that a Social Democrat, when asked, “Christ or Barabbas?” would immediately seek consultation and then convene a commission to study the matter. The liberal and Romantic regime had replaced the objectivity of God with the subjectivity of the individual, and partisanship and interest groups made decisive governmental action impossible.

In *The Concept of the Political* and *The Dictator*, Schmitt presented his response to liberal democracy and legal positivism. According to Schmitt, the existence of the state presupposes the existence of the political, and the political consists primarily of the relationship between the friend and the foe. Look around you—Schmitt instructs a Germany devoured by war, economic breakdown, and social crisis—and see whether any other relationship empirically and objectively defines the state’s legitimacy, its ability to exist. The most basic definition of the sovereign, Schmitt adds, is the individual who is able to define the exceptional situation, and to define the foe in the exceptional situation.

Weimar's Article 48

In proposing solutions to the Weimar Republic's political paralysis, Schmitt focussed on Article 48 of the Weimar Constitution, which allowed for temporary rule by decree, and suspension of rights in emergency situations. Schmitt, taking a page from Roman law and Napoleon III, argued that Article 48 established a commissarial, or temporary dictatorship, without abrogating the Constitution, and, under crisis conditions, was the only way to govern. The job of the temporary dictatorship was to save the existing Constitution, and therefore, rule by the President, under Article 48, did not establish a sovereign or long-term dictatorship. In his campaign to legitimize his theory of Presidential powers under Article 48, Schmitt won the endorsements of Social Democratic Party (SPD) member Hugo Preuss, the author of the Weimar Constitution, and Max Weber, a celebrated racist sociologist who originated the idea of incorporating Article 48 into the Weimar Constitution.

When the Depression hit full force in 1929, Schmitt, then a law professor in Berlin, was asked by Chancellor Heinrich Brüning to advise the government concerning maintenance of the Constitution under the brutal austerity regime he proposed to implement, in response to the economic crisis, over the opposition of a fractured Parliament. In a July 28, 1930 opinion for the government, Schmitt argued that because an economic emergency existed, Article 48 allowed the President to issue decrees with the force of law—in effect, to legislate, without regard to Parliament. As a result of Brüning's brutal measures against the German people on behalf of the banks, Nazi representation in the Parliament rose from 12 seats to 107, in the elections of Sept. 14, 1930. Brüning was dismissed, and replaced in the Chancellorship by the intellectually vacant and radically conservative Franz von Papen.

When von Papen declared martial law and took over the government of Prussia from the SPD, Schmitt defended the Reich before the German Supreme Court, and strongly supported von Papen's imposition of harsher economic austerity measures. These measures emphasized wage cuts and reductions in unemployment benefits. Job creation was to be promoted, not through government intervention, but by tax relief for business. In a speech to a group of industrialists in support

of von Papen's program, Schmitt developed the twin themes "strong state" and "free economy," arguing that only an authoritarian state could assure the success of a pure free-market economy. While acknowledging that crisis management had not improved the economic situation, Schmitt nevertheless argued for the continued vitality and employment of Article 48, stating that it was the only means to oppose those advocating a "legal functionalism" which stays neutral with respect to truth and values.

The Nazis' 'Crown Jurist'

Schmitt's next crucial role came in legitimizing Hitler's police state.

As *EIR* has documented, Hitler was appointed Chancellor of Germany on Jan. 30, 1933, as a result of the direct support of George W. Bush's grandfather, the Morgan interests, and certain British financiers.¹ The last chance for avoiding this result collapsed with the failure of sufficient forces to support Gen. Kurt von Schleicher's efforts to implement an economic recovery. On Feb. 27, 1933, the Nazis, under Hermann Göring's sponsorship, staged the Reichstag Fire, and on Feb. 28, Hitler suspended basic constitutional rights, and accusing the Communists of sabotage, imprisoned at least 4,000 alleged Communists and banned the party from Parliament.

On March 23, the Reichstag passed, by a vote of 444 to 94, enabling legislation, which stated that henceforth, the Executive, as well as the Reichstag, could pass laws. The "Act to Relieve the Distress of the People and the Reich," effectively legislated Schmitt's 1930 legal opinion authorizing Presidential rule, and installed Hitler's sovereign dictatorship. In an article in the *Deutsche Juristen Zeitung* of March 25, 1933, Schmitt defended the enabling legislation, claiming that the Executive prerogative now included the power to pass new constitutional laws and declare the Weimar Constitution a dead letter. Schmitt found the new law to be the expression of a "triumphant national revolution," equating it with the German Revo-

¹ Anton Chaitkin, "Dubya's Grandpa and Great-Grandpa Helped Put Adolf Hitler into Power," *EIR*, Aug. 25, 2000.

lution of 1918. According to Schmitt, "The present government wants to be the expression of a unified national political will, which seeks to put an end to the methods of the plural-party state, methods which were destructive of the state and the Constitution." According to Schmitt, the Weimar Republic lacked "charismatic leadership," without which the state becomes a directionless "bureaucratic regime."

During his service to the Nazis, Schmitt reported directly to Göring and Hans Frank. From his position as a Professor of Law at the University of Berlin, Schmitt supervised a project to conform all German law to Nazi theory. The overall Reich now consisted of three elements, according to Schmitt: state, Nazi movement, and people. The state represented the administrative apparatus; the movement represented the political leadership which acted on behalf of the people; and the people, or civil society, lived free of governmental interference, under the shadow and protection of the higher political order. To the extent that orders of the Führer needed democratic legitimacy, they could be voted upon in referenda or plebiscites by the people.

Schmitt's description was altered by the Nazis in only one respect. They found his frank admission that the people were to play a completely passive role politically unacceptable, and substituted the populist myth that the people represented the "vitality" of the Reich. Hitler did, in fact, submit various measures to the population for votes.

'Carl Schmitt Abolishes Man'

In revising the criminal code, Schmitt declared that previous law had served only to empower criminals against the population, and he levelled a scathing critique at the German Supreme Court for failing to impose the death sentence on those prosecuted for the Reichstag Fire, because the law making arson punishable by death had only been passed after the fire. Henceforth, retroactive laws must be available to judges, Schmitt argued, who should be allowed to reach the right result, without the hindrance of abstract and irrelevant precedents. Judges could employ "concrete order thinking" in this process.

Schmitt's revision of the civil code declared that the "legal

concept of man conceals and falsifies the differences between the citizen of the Reich, a foreigner, a Jew, and so on. . . . Seeing equal as equal, and, above all, unequal as unequal, and emphasizing the differences among men of different races, nations, and occupational estates in the sense of God-given realities, those are the goals of National Socialist academic jurists.”

The emigré press, which included many of Schmitt’s former students, led its coverage of these statements with the headline, “Carl Schmitt Abolishes Man.”

Finally, Schmitt justified Hitler’s aggression against other nations of Europe by claiming that Germany was creating a *Grossraum*, a sphere of influence, just as the United States had done with the Monroe Doctrine. This formulation, Hitler employed directly in defending his actions.

Such rulings by Schmitt underscore his admission that the English philosopher Thomas Hobbes was the central influence in his theory of the state and theory of justice, theories in which truth and morality play absolutely no role. Schmitt transformed Hobbes’ individual “war of each against all,” into wars of identified groups, including states against other states, claiming that the “Westphalian” order of Europe had been completely broken by World War I.

Like Hobbes, Schmitt considered man evil and “dangerous.” As he put it, “If man were not evil, then my ideas would be evil.”

The Strauss-Schmitt Correspondence

There are three extant letters from Leo Strauss to “Professor” Carl Schmitt, without any record of Schmitt’s reply. What is evident from these short letters, however, is that Strauss relied on Nazi jurist Schmitt’s recommendation—even after Schmitt had publicly come forward to defend Hitler’s emergency rule—to gain and extend his Rockefeller Fellowship to study Thomas Hobbes.

Letter One, dated March 13, 1932, is simply an expression of thanks for Schmitt's recommendation, which helped him get his Rockefeller Foundation fellowship.

The only substantive letter of the three, number two, dated Sept. 4, 1932, is instructive, in that it contains Strauss's comments on Schmitt's *Concept of the Political*. In that letter, Strauss summarizes his understanding of Schmitt's view, based on what he calls "oral exchange," and gives the clear implication of his agreement with this view. The relevant section goes as follows:

"The ultimate foundation of the Right is the principle of the natural evil of man; because man is by nature evil, he therefore needs dominion. But dominion can be established, that is, men can be unified, only in a unity against—against other men. Every association of men is necessarily a separation from other men. The tendency to separate (and therewith the grouping of humanity into friends and enemies) is given with human nature; it is in this sense destiny, period."

The third letter, dated July 10, 1933, thanks Schmitt again for his help, in that Strauss had just received his Rockefeller Fellowship for a second year, due to Schmitt's approval of his study on Hobbes.

THE INSIDE STORY

Why the Democratic Party Failed To Function In This Crisis

by Anton Chaitkin

In the weeks leading up to the invasion of Iraq, the world's governments and millions in the streets spoke out against the impending disaster. Demonstrators protested within the United States as well. But except for the LaRouche wing and scattered individual politicians, the Democratic Party—the putative opposition—was frozen, intimidated. Its new controllers had locked the former party of Franklin Roosevelt and John Kennedy into complicity.

Shamefully, key Democratic leaders had stood publicly at the White House on Oct. 2, 2002, announcing they would give a “bipartisan” blank check, authorizing an insane war on Iraq. Flanking President Bush were Senators Joseph Lieberman (Conn) and Evan Bayh (Ind), and Rep. Dick Gephardt (Mo) (Bayh was then chairman of the “Democratic Leadership Council” and Lieberman and Gephardt were past chairmen), Republican Senator John McCain (Ariz), and the two Republican official leaders of the Senate and House. (The Democratic leader in the Senate, Tom Daschle, did not initially support the agreement.)

As the nightmare approached, U.S. Senator Robert Byrd (D-WVa) addressed a nearly deserted Senate chamber on Feb. 12, warning that “every American on some level must be contemplating the horrors of war. Yet, this Chamber is, for the most part, silent—ominously, dreadfully silent. There is no debate, no discussion, no attempt to lay out for the nation the pros and cons of this particular war. There is nothing. We stand passively mute in the United States Senate, paralyzed. . . .”

Once the war began, the Democrats, like whipped dogs, joined in approving a resolution lauding Bush's leadership, unanimously in the Senate, with tiny resistance in the House.

How has this happened—since typical Democratic voters overwhelmingly oppose the imperial madness of the Bush Administration, preferring the humaneness Americans associate with Franklin Delano Roosevelt and John F. Kennedy? The answer is similar to that of the religious question: How have Christians and Jews come to be represented, as far as the public sees, by right-wingers and armageddonists?

The Democratic Party has been hijacked by the same fascist faction driving the Bush Administration mad. The identical Straussian neo-conservative clique embodied in the Pentagon and Cheney's office, now dominates the Democratic Party top-down. They operate largely through the tiny Democratic Leadership Council (DLC) of Joe Lieberman and Al Gore, and they control the party apparatus through gangsters and gangsterism.

Although some call it the rightist or corporate "wing," the DLC has never been an actual faction of the Democrats. It deliberately has no rank-and-file members. Since 1985 it has increasingly intruded into and disrupted the party, passing along money from outright gangsters, Wall Street criminals, and Republicans to party officials, officeholders and candidates, aiming to silence and break the Democrats.

High-ranking Democratic Party officials have told associates of Lyndon LaRouche that the DLC was launched in order to stop the takeover of the party by LaRouche, as well as others who were working to bring the party back to its Franklin Roosevelt orientation.

Bury FDR, Bring in the Bull Moose

Roosevelt himself, speaking to labor, the poor, Depression-wrecked farmers, the forgotten man, in his 1933 Inaugural Address, blasted "the rulers of the exchange of mankind's goods. . . . Practices of the unscrupulous money changers stand indicted in the court of public opinion. . . . Stripped of the lure of profit by which to induce our people to follow their false leadership. . . . [T]he money changers have fled from their high seats in the temple of our civilization. . . . Our greatest task is

to put people to work. . . . [T]here must be a strict supervision of all banking and credits and investments; there must be an end to speculation with other people's money. . . . ”

The DLC, sponsored by the criminal element Roosevelt denounced, has boldly announced their intention to bury Roosevelt's Democratic Party. In the September 1998 issue of their magazine, *Blueprint*, DLC strategists William Galston and Elaine Kamarck propounded certain supposed “Realities that Will Shape 21st Century Politics,” whose main premise is that “The New Deal era has ended.”

They declare that America has a “declining working class”—and that is good for politics. They celebrate the collapse of labor unions in the hyper-speculative New Economy, and applaud “the decline of organized labor as a force within the Democratic Party.” The “Hollowing Out of the Middle Class” is “mostly for the better”; the “widening gap between the wealthy and the poor” is a good development!

Shamelessly, they claim: “The . . . middle class is shrinking . . . not because poverty is on the march, but because millions of Americans are surging into the ranks of the upper middle class and wealthy.”

They cheer that the New Deal-generation voters are dying off, leaving instead a supposedly “better-educated,” “wired” generation of Baby Boomers and their children, who have never known successful government.

The DLC says the widening gap between the rich and poor must not be seen “as grounds for returning to a New Deal-style politics,” nor be allowed to induce the party “to mobilize lower-income groups for a new round of interventionist, centralized government that protects Americans against all forms of economic insecurity.” The Democrats must not be allowed to think they “can construct majorities based on a swelling pool of poor and near-poor Americans waiting to be mobilized by an old-fashioned politics. . . .”—since the average American is doing so much better in recent years!

Note here the background of the two authors of this piece. William Galston, senior adviser to the DLC, is a leading American follower of fascist Leo Strauss, and a specialist in Strauss's attack on Plato's doctrine of truth. Elaine Kamarck is a long-time enforcer of Wall Street rule in the Democratic Party and

the wife of an investment banker; she will be encountered again in this report.

But what is to replace Franklin Roosevelt's party, so as to represent the "newly wealthy"? The DLC projects a third-party scheme to wreck the Democrats, while blackmailing George W. Bush to move to the right, if not to elect the unsellable Chickenhawk Joe Lieberman.

This scenario is a repetition of the 1912 election. Then, Theodore Roosevelt ("TR"), who had earlier been President, ran again on a "Bull Moose Party" ticket, to sink the Republican candidate, President Taft, and elect TR's fellow Anglo-Saxon imperial racist, Democrat Woodrow Wilson. The DLC proposes Lieberman's closest ally, Republican Senator John McCain, as the new Teddy Roosevelt to go up against President Bush in 2004 on a third-party ticket. The object: maximum mayhem against the Democrats.

It is noteworthy, here, that on his way to the Presidency, Franklin D. Roosevelt explicitly repudiated the thuggish imperialism of his cousin Theodore.

The DLC announced the Bull Moose scheme in the May 2002 Blueprint, where Marshall Wittmann wrote that "John McCain [seeks] to recapture the legacy of President Theodore Roosevelt, by advocating government as an agent of 'national greatness' . . ." Wittmann demanded Bush give up any remaining tendency to protect American jobs, as with steel tariffs, which Bush had imposed earlier that year.

In the same issue, Tod Lindberg praised McCain's "rogue state rollback" policy, commending John Ashcroft's "Freedom Corps" (which includes the blockwatch and mass FBI informants programs) as originally having been a McCain and DLC proposal.

Note again the background of the authors, in this supposedly "Democratic" magazine.

Marshall Wittmann is an adviser to John McCain, and works for the right-wing Hudson Institute, as does the recently disgraced Richard Perle. Beyond this, the McCain Bull Moose scheme was explained candidly by author Franklin Foer in the *New Republic* (March 20, 2000):

"Jewish neo-conservatives have fallen hard for John McCain. It's not just unabashed swooner William Kristol, editor of The

Weekly Standard . . . [but] . . . such leading neo-con lights as David Brooks, the entire Podhoretz family [etc.]. . . [In this the neo-cons are following] their forefather Leo Strauss, the political theorist. . . Kristol and Brooks [are] both Strauss disciples. . .

“It’s easy to think that Kristol and Brooks are projecting their Straussianism onto McCain. . . Kristol has worked with McCain adviser Marshall Wittmann, another Jewish neo-con, to cultivate the Arizona maverick. A year ago, Wittmann gave McCain *Standard* articles on ‘National Greatness Conservatism’—the Kristol-Brooks theory that Republicans should return to the domestic activism and foreign interventionism of Theodore Roosevelt. And Wittmann has regularly worked the *Standard’s* rhetoric into McCain’s speeches. . . .”

The other Blueprint author, Tod Lindberg, is editor of *Policy Review*, issued by the Hoover Institution. The current issue (April-May 2003) of Lindberg’s own magazine carries an article entitled “Leo Strauss and the Conservatives,” showing the reader why he must “appreciate Strauss’s greatness.” Lindberg put in his February-March, 2002 issue, an article entitled “Charmed by Tyranny,” on why the great Strauss should not be blamed for being sponsored by the Nazi Carl Schmitt, since Schmitt’s “pathological anti-Semitism was . . . the identity handed him by fate.”

The Great Betrayal—Moynihan and Nixon

Where did such a “Democratic Party” originate?

Facing the true history of this abomination will require cutting through such hypocrisy and deliberate memory-suppression as was seen recently in the eulogies for the racist Daniel Patrick Moynihan, who died March 26, 2003.

Recall that FDR won the Presidency by creating a new majority coalition of labor, farmers, intellectuals, white and black, taking the Democratic Party out of the hands of the London-New York financiers and Southern racists who had dominated it since the days of Andrew Jackson and slavery.

Recall that John F. Kennedy strove to revive FDR’s nationalism and anti-colonialism, resisting the Vietnam war scenario. The Kennedy assassination allowed financiers such as Morgan,

Rockefeller, Harriman, Rothschild, Paul Volcker (Federal Reserve), Felix Rohatyn (Lazard Freres), and McGeorge Bundy (Ford Foundation) to overturn America's whole mission for industrial progress, and move toward erasing the American Revolution itself.

Recall, finally, that Richard Nixon's election campaign (1967-68) and Presidential term (1969-74) brought in explicit political racism, free trade to destroy workers' jobs, and austerity to crush the poor. The Straussian gangsters, now on center-stage in the current war crisis, originally entered the picture in connection with this Nixon "Southern Strategy." Their main agent, the Benedict Arnold who began burning down the Democratic Party, was Daniel Patrick Moynihan.

Back in late 1960s, Moynihan was a bitter man. He had been a minor Labor Department official in the Kennedy and Johnson Administrations, but neither the Kennedys nor Johnson liked him or valued his services. Moynihan had issued a notorious 1965 report on the Black Family, claiming that the ingrained culture of slavery—not the destruction of the industrial economy—caused blacks' unemployment and poverty. He left the government in a storm of criticism from the civil rights movement.

Democrats shunned him. They mocked his British airs, his affectation since attending the London School of Economics.

The only "Democrat" to whom Moynihan was ever close, was banker Averell Harriman, his former boss. This was the same Harriman who had financed the eugenical racial propaganda of the early fascists; the same Harriman who, with his banking partner Prescott Bush (grandfather of the current President), had financed the German Nazis' rise to power. When Harriman ran for New York Governor in 1954, he hired Moynihan as speechwriter, and then brought him into the Governor's office as a publicist. Harriman entrusted Moynihan with writing the authorized history of the Harriman gubernatorial term. Harriman would persist as shadow sponsor of the anti-FDR side of Democratic Party politics.

After Moynihan's debacle in the Labor Department, he began writing right-wing articles for Reporter magazine, and became a devoted follower of its editor, the Straussian Irving Kristol. Moynihan later (in *Pacem in Terris IV*, Dec. 2, 1975) called Leo Strauss "the foremost political philosopher of his time in

America." It is Irving's son William of the *Weekly Standard* who, as we have seen, has concocted the McCain-Lieberman Bull Moose scheme.

Thus it was that in 1966, Moynihan was hired as director of the Ford Foundation's Joint Center for Urban Studies, at Harvard and MIT. The Foundation's boss, McGeorge Bundy, had just reversed Kennedy's decision to get out of Vietnam, immediately after Kennedy was murdered. At the Ford Foundation, Bundy was running racially divisive schemes to pave the way for severe austerity and banker looting against New York and other cities. At Harvard, under Bundy, Moynihan could now be audaciously racist.

Thus employed, Moynihan made history on Sept. 23, 1967 with an explosive, Hitlerian speech to the National Board of Americans for Democratic Action.

He ranted, "American liberals . . . have . . . presided over the onset both of the war in Vietnam and the violence in American cities. . . . The Vietnam war was thought up and is being managed by the men John F. Kennedy brought to Washington to conduct American foreign and defense policy. . . ." (Ironically, this must mean McGeorge Bundy.)

He warned, "Liberals must see more clearly that their essential interest is in the stability of the social order; and given the present threat to that stability, they must seek out and make much more effective alliances with political conservatives. . . ."

He cursed FDR: "Liberals must divest themselves of the notion that the nation—and especially the cities of the nation—can be run from agencies in Washington. Potomac fever became a liberal disease under the New Deal. . . ."

He ushered in a new, Imperial America: "But the biggest problem of running the nation from Washington is that the real business of Washington in our age is pretty much to run the world. That thought may not give any of us great pleasure, but my impression is that it is a fact and we had better learn to live with it. . . ."

With his sissy diction, he spoke for a new White Politics: "Liberals must somehow overcome the curious condescension that takes the form of defending and explaining away anything, however outrageous, which negroes, individually or collectively, might do. . . ."

At that time, Richard Nixon had a law partner named Leo-

nard Garment, a New York lawyer plugged in to right-wing Jewish leaders and gangsters such as Max Fisher. Garment was helping steer Nixon, the former Vice President who had lost the 1960 Presidential race to Kennedy, back to the top by introducing him to New York politicians and moneymen.

Leonard Garment seized on Moynihan's startlingly evil speech, and told Nixon how to use it in his "Southern Strategy" campaign. Nixon quoted the speech and praised Moynihan in his address to the National Association of Manufacturers (Dec. 8, 1967). Moynihan offered his services. He was brought in as Urban Affairs counselor in the Nixon Administration.

Moynihan's notoriety stems largely from his memo to Nixon, urging "benign neglect" as the best racial policy. But he did his real damage as the architect of so-called Welfare Reform, or slave labor—which was later a central issue of the Gore-Lieberman DLC. This was the tactic of forcing welfare recipients, under threat of starvation, to go to work for their sub-minimum welfare checks, while the number of standard-pay industrial jobs was decreasing, thus sabotaging the general wage level.

Congressional Democrats defeated the welfare slave-labor bill Moynihan crafted. But another law, authorizing creation of Health Maintenance Organizations, was pushed through under Nixon by Moynihan and his allies. The HMO Act imposed Nazi medical standards, closed hospitals, and greatly increased suffering and death among the lower social orders. Again, this "privatization" is a hallmark of the DLC neoconservatives who have since then strangled the Democratic Party.

Timeline: The Battle for the Democratic Party

In 1974-75, Moynihan was Ambassador to the United Nations, with his Republican host Leonard Garment at the UN as an aide. Garment's gangster friend Max Fisher got Garment this UN post, and Garment told Moynihan to accept the ambassadorship. Garment and Norman Podhoretz taught Moynihan the doctrine of rightwing Zionism, using as a guide the British Arab Bureau's Bernard Lewis, who claimed that the Arab view of the matter was merely a product of Soviet propaganda.

Garment and his neo-con friends now convinced Moynihan to run for the U.S. Senate. The clique that formed around Moynihan's 1976 campaign and subsequent Senate career, later emerged in the core of the fascist war faction that sabotaged the Democratic Party.

- Leonard Garment and his law partner Lewis "Scooter" Libby became chief attorneys for Russian gangster godfather Marc Rich. They and Michael Steinhardt, the DLC's main financier and Rich's investment partner, conned outgoing President Bill Clinton into pardoning Marc Rich, by then a fugitive from U.S. justice. Recently Clinton said he regretted the pardon, citing Libby's role as chief of staff for Dick Cheney.

- The first employee of the 1976 Moynihan election campaign was Lynn Forester, who was to be the central courtesan-operative in the DLC's Bull Moose scheme (see below).

- As Senator, Moynihan brought onto his staff:

Elliott Abrams—Norman Podhoretz's son-in-law, later an Iran-Contra criminal, currently chief of Middle East affairs for the Cheney/Rumsfeld-dominated National Security Council. In 1980, Abrams proposed that Ronald Reagan take Moynihan as his Vice Presidential running mate.

Abram Shulsky—Straussian, later head of Rumsfeld/Feith/Wolfowitz intelligence unit that "cooked" the Iraq intelligence.

Gary Schmitt—later executive director of the Project for the New American Century (PNAC), which issued the September 2000 document outlining the world-conquest and regional Mid-east strategy of the current war cabal.

By 1980, the Jimmy Carter-appointed Federal Reserve chairman Paul Volcker was demolishing the industrial economy. At the August 1980 Democratic national convention, the Democratic Party forces associated with Lyndon LaRouche and with Sen. Ted Kennedy (Mass) pressed for an open convention, for deliberation on an economic recovery program, and on the choice of a new candidate instead of a second term for Carter. But thug operations run by Harriman political fixer Robert S. Strauss, and led on the floor by banker operative Elaine Kamarck, prohibited discussion and gooned the opposition.

As all had expected, the renominated Carter was defeated by Reagan. After the election, Sen. Moynihan told a press conference that he would lead a fight to prevent the takeover of the Democratic Party by the "extremist" backers of Ted Kennedy!

Moynihan declared that Kennedy is a “cadre” who believes government should be strong while America should be weak.

The LaRouche wing of the party now rapidly advanced in popular support. LaRouche and Democratic House Majority leader Jim Wright of Texas, both demanded the firing of Fed chairman Volcker. LaRouche associate Steve Douglas got 20% of the statewide vote, and 35% of the Philadelphia vote, in the Democratic primary for Governor of Pennsylvania on May 18, 1982.

At a mid-term Democratic convention soon thereafter, “Democrats for the ’80s,” the personal committee of Averell Harriman and his wife Pamela, was given complete control of the meeting by Bob Strauss, banker Felix Rohatyn, and labor faker Lane Kirkland. Harriman’s group, nicknamed PAMPAC, got the franchise to directly issue a “fact book” for all Democratic candidates; they stressed slashing the Federal budget, squeezing Social Security payments to seniors, saving health-care costs by forcing HMOs on the population, and demolishing U.S. industry to make way for an “information economy.”

Meanwhile, in July 1982, Sen. Moynihan began his assault on LaRouche. Moynihan lied that Mel Klenetsky, a Jewish associate of LaRouche who was challenging Moynihan in the primary election for Senate in New York, was “anti-Semitic.” Klenetsky’s campaign focussed on Moynihan’s support for eugenical “race science” theories.

In May and June 1983, anti-LaRouche strategy meetings were held in the home of New York investment banker John Train. Among those attending were members of the neo-conservative clique within Reagan’s National Security Council and Justice Department, rightist billionaire Richard Mellon Scaife (later funder of the “Get Clinton” campaign), Peter Spiro of the *New Republic*, the Anti-Defamation League (which was then crafting the right-wing religious alliance behind Ariel Sharon), assorted neo-conservative media men, and a representative of rightist spook Leo Cherne.

This Cherne was Moynihan’s close associate and former employer, and a government intelligence adviser. Cherne and Henry Kissinger had jointly activated an FBI harassment onslaught versus LaRouche—on false “national security” grounds, following LaRouche’s meeting and collaboration with the President of Mexico for an anti-imperial banking program.

In July 1983, Louisiana Congressman Gillis Long and Harri-man operative Bob Strauss began a U.S. tour to promote the "National Democratic Caucus," demanding a rightist turn for the Democrats. Their main advisers were Averell Harriman and Felix Rohatyn. Al From, who was soon to found the Democratic Leadership Council, was an aide to Gillis Long, a personal protégé of Robert Strauss, and an operative of Harriman's PAMPAC.

A *New Republic* article by Peter Spiro (Feb. 6, 1984), urged a political attack on LaRouche, and an Internal Revenue Service prosecution. Spiro warned that LaRouche Democrats were regularly getting 20-30% of the vote, had thousands of candidates, and 100,000 dues-paying members in LaRouche's National Democratic Policy Committee.

An avalanche of anti-LaRouche slurs now poured through the media, originating in the Train salon meetings. In this environment, Al From formed the Democratic Leadership Council on March 1, 1985. The initial group of officeholders receiving DLC funds were predominantly Southern Democrats; they warned Democratic Party officials they must stop being cozy with blacks if they were to hold the South. The creation and initial funding of the DLC was aided by Heritage Foundation chief Ed Feulner, who worked with DLC founder Al From while personally shaping the Reagan Administration's policies on the model of Margaret Thatcher.

LaRouche associates won the March 1986 Illinois Democratic primaries for Secretary of State and Lt. Governor, with over 50% of the vote.

A Moynihan op-ed in the April 1, 1986 *New York Times* stated that the "rise of primary elections has weakened the Democratic Party," and demanded party rule changes to enforce discipline. Moynihan ordered Democratic chairman Paul Kirk's participation in an "Operation LaRouche," which Moynihan had set up in New York State, aimed at keeping neo-conservative control of the party.

Pollster J. Michael McKeon, consultant to Moynihan, told *EIR* on June 24, 1986, "Sen. Moynihan is the only person in the Democratic Party who is thinking seriously of how to respond to LaRouche. That's why he brought me to Washington." McKeon, who had predicted the LaRouche Illinois victory, said "LaRouche has about a 25% core vote through the country."

The Mob Says: Cement Shoes for the Democratic Party

Lyndon LaRouche was falsely imprisoned in 1989, following a several-year attack by neo-conservatives corrupting the media and the justice system.

The Democratic Leadership Council was now in full swing, under the leadership of Michael Steinhardt, a second-generation New York mobster. Steinhardt chaired the DLC board, and chaired the DLC's Progressive Policy Institute think tank, personally contributing millions in mob-generated funds. Steinhardt's father, in Sing Sing prison as a fence for Meyer Lansky's syndicate, had sent his son cash which Michael turned into a billion through speculation. Steinhardt got other funds for investment from fugitive gangster Marc Rich, who was then looting Russia and Africa.

The DLC, jointly with Averell Harriman's widow Pamela, arranged and financed the Bill Clinton-Al Gore ticket in 1992, knowing that Clinton could get votes that their friend Gore could not. This ticket won election; but Clinton promptly told a gathering at *Washington Post* owner Katharine Graham's house, that they would not like what he would do as President. The DLC was "stiffed"—Clinton had ambitions to side with the poor, as had FDR. Among other things, under Clinton, Lyndon LaRouche was paroled from his false imprisonment as soon as this was possible.

The mobsters raged. The DLC's own, sanitized, authorized history of itself (*Reinventing Democrats*, by Kenneth S. Baer, 2000) relates the public action of one of Steinhardt's operatives: "Joel Kotkin, a PPI [Progressive Policy Institute] senior fellow, made the first public call for a break with Clinton. In a *Wall Street Journal* column [Dec. 7, 1994], Kotkin argued that the New Democrats should sever ties with Clinton, back a primary challenge in 1996, and even consider leaving the Democratic Party altogether. . . .

"The largest . . . sign [of the DLC's break with Clinton and the Democrats] was its 'Third Way Project' . . . [T]here is some evidence that this project was to be the beginning of a third-party movement. According to Michael Steinhardt, chairman of PPI's Board of Trustees until he resigned at the end of 1995,

the Third Way Project was to be 'a new approach to separate ourselves from the Democratic Party.' He explained that the DLC began to take on a more bipartisan focus, which appealed to a number of contributors, including Steinhardt himself, who advocated the formation of a third party and went so far as to meet with Bill Bradley to try to persuade him to run for President in 1996."

The DLC gang pressed Clinton to fall in line with the Conservative Revolution. With Dick Morris and other moles, DLC adviser Elaine Kamarck, Gore's aide, was lead enforcer pushing the President to accept the "Welfare Reform" bill, Moynihan's original project, which became a political disaster for Clinton. The DLCers tried to use the situation to force Clinton to resign in the Lewinsky scandal. The LaRouche Democrats successfully counterattacked.

Steinhardt turned over the formal leadership of the DLC in 1995 to his co-factioneer, Connecticut Senator Joseph Lieberman. But Steinhardt continued to drive forward the DLC's "Third Way" scheming. This Steinhardt project was co-financed by banker Felix Rohatyn, currently a DLC board member, and a longtime controller of the *Washington Post*.

There is also a trans-Atlantic link, with a fascinating historical echo.

British Prime Minister Tony Blair, a Margaret Thatcher in "New Labour" pants, had a well-known collaboration with Bill Clinton. Now Blair, without missing a beat, collaborates with the war-crazed Bush Administration. Steinhardt's DLC and some powerful friends are behind this smooth political gender switch.

During the last period of the Clinton Administration, a think tank called the Policy Network was created in England as an official coordinating agency between the Democratic Leadership Council and Tony Blair's advisers. Policy Network's chairman is Blair crony Peter Mandelson, the former Blair Cabinet member (who became known as "Lord Mandy of Rio" following an at-government-expense romp through the homosexual haunts of Rio de Janeiro).

This official channel from the DLC to Blair's "Third Way" inner council was funded entirely by Sir Evelyn de Rothschild, head of Britain's famous N.M. Rothschild bank.

How did Sir Evelyn get into American gangster Mike Stein-

hardt's DLC scheming, aimed at wrecking the Democratic Party from the inside?

In the 1990s Steinhardt picked up the assistance of Lynn Forester, who had climbed into the big time since her appearance as a Democrat on Moynihan's notorious 1976 campaign staff. She first married New York politician Andy Stein, of the Roy Cohn/Dick Morris sleaze set. She dumped Stein when he lost a mayoral bid. Meanwhile she was building a fortune on mergers and acquisitions, tutored by Virginia billionaire corruptionist John Kluge. She dated the richest and most powerful men, coached by Henry Kissinger. Along the way she befriended Bill and Hillary Clinton.

In 1998 Forester flew on a private plane with Henry Kissinger to a Bilderberger meeting in Scotland. There Kissinger introduced her to Sir Evelyn with a lewd joke. Forester brought Rothschild to the U.S. and connected him to Steinhardt's and Rohatyn's New Economy speculator friends.

With Clinton on his way out, and an economic disaster shaping up, the DLC crowd hurried to scuttle the Democratic Party before an FDR reflex set in. Rothschild, 70, married Forester, 46, in November 2000. The couple were fêted at a party thrown by Sen. Moynihan. On their wedding night they slept in the White House. By this time Rothschild had contributed an acknowledged £250,000 to the Policy Network, the -Forester Third Way link to Blair.

Lady Lynn de Rothschild, meanwhile, is a top director of the corporate empire of billionaire Ron Lauder, who has created the Shalem Center, Israel's headquarters for Leo Strauss's philosophy and the funding of Ariel Sharon's politics.

How Did This Elephant Get into the Parlor?

The Democratic Party has now been dragged all the way back to the slavery days, when it was known as the Party of Treason. The Rothschild family's official American representative, banker August Belmont, whom the Rothschilds had trained as a British spy, was chairman of the U.S. Democratic Party during and after the American Civil War. For several decades, in conjunction with the British Empire, Belmont promoted every aggression and secession scheme of the slaveowner radicals.

Against the background presented by this report, the observer should now be able to discern clearly how the Democrats' enemies took over the party. And what such a disgraced character as Terry McAuliffe represents, as chairman of the Democratic National Committee (DNC), when he works to block criticism of the Chickenhawks' war.

McAuliffe was DNC Finance Chairman in Clinton's first term. He brought in huge contributions from billionaire Carl Lindner, a leading figure in latter-day American gangster circles. Lindner chaired United Fruit/Chiquita Banana, running that empire along with mobster Max Fisher, and was considered the godfather and organizer of the entire Michael Milken junk bond swindle.

McAuliffe arranged for the use of the White House Lincoln bedroom for donors, and personally brought Lindner into the White House. Then the Clinton Administration, and trade representative Mickey Kantor, went into the "banana wars" (tariffs, etc.) against Europe on behalf of Lindner's company.

In about 1995, Lindner made McAuliffe the chairman of a huge Lindner subsidiary in Florida, American Heritage Homes. For the rest of Clinton's tenure, McAuliffe was taking a chairman's salary and profits from the Lindner organization—by informed accounts, doing nothing for the money but providing access to the White House—until McAuliffe resigned in October 2000, shortly before becoming Democratic chairman.

But this was not nearly enough.

In 1997, McAuliffe was hired as a consultant by billionaire Gary Winnick, creator of Global Crossing company and a partner with DLC kingpin Michael Steinhardt in Israeli operations.

Working out of Winnick's office in Los Angeles, McAuliffe made political connections that helped spin up the value of Winnick's holdings. As Global Crossing's phony stock inflated towards its inevitable collapse, McAuliffe sold out at just the right moment. He turned an original \$100,000 stake into an \$18 million profit. Investors not on the inside lost tens of billions in Global Crossing's bankruptcy.

Later Global Crossing hired Richard Perle to convince the Defense Department to allow the sale of the company to Chinese investors. Since Perle was being paid \$700,000-plus to lobby the Pentagon, of whose Defense Policy Board he was

chairman, this became part of the case leading to his forced resignation as chairman of the DPB.

Perle has promised to contribute these particular ill-gotten gains to the widows his war makes.

Perhaps Terry McAuliffe will now likewise resign and cough up his loot.

Look, now, at the gangster cartel that sent Democratic chairman McAuliffe to Israel in February 2002: When the decent elements in Israeli politics were demanding an end to Ariel Sharon's murderous war provocations, when the Labor Party was agonizing over whether they should stop collaborating with Sharon, McAuliffe showed up—"representing the U.S. Democrats"—to support Sharon in his difficulties.

Look, now, at the gangster cartel that went in person, Michael Steinhardt and Marc Rich, to Israel in January 2003; they intrigued inside the Labor Party, to fatally undermine the candidacy of Amram Mitzna that challenged Sharon's war drive.

Gaze, now, at African-American Democrat Donna Brazile, as she strategizes with Bush adviser Karl Rove on how to crush Democratic opposition to the war. As Al Gore's 2000 campaign manager, Brazile arranged to cancel the South Carolina Democratic primary so Democrats would vote for McCain (against Bush in the state GOP primary), and has since been a McCain-Lieberman mole. Basking in the Ashcroft witchhunt atmosphere, Brazile attacks Sen. Daschle for insufficient hawkishness; she sneers that the Congressional Black Caucus members seem to "have their reasons," for not applauding the war. She says that for President, she could "support Lieberman. Gephardt or Lieberman."

In sum, this is why the Democratic Party has failed to function in the present crisis.

Barbara Boyd and Mary Jane Freeman contributed to the research for this report.

Synarchism: The Fascist Roots of the Wolfowitz Cabal

by Jeffrey Steinberg

In 1922, Count Richard Coudenhove-Kalergi launched the Pan European Union, at a founding convention in Vienna, attended by more than 6,000 delegates. Railing against the “Bolshevist menace” in Russia, the Venetian Count called for the dissolution of all the nation-states of Western Europe and the erection of a single, European feudal state, modeled on the Roman and Napoleonic empires. “There are Europeans,” Coudenhove-Kalergi warned, who are “naïve enough to believe that the opposition between the Soviet Union and Europe can be bridged by the inclusion of the Soviet Union in the United States of Europe. These Europeans need only to glance at the map to persuade themselves that the Soviet Union in its immensity can, with the help of the [Communist] Third International, very quickly prevail over little Europe. To receive this Trojan horse into the European union would lead to perpetual civil war and the extermination of European culture. So long, therefore, as there is any will to survive subsisting in Europe, the idea of linking the Soviet Union with Pan Europe must be rejected. It would be nothing less than the suicide of Europe.”

Elsewhere, Coudenhove-Kalergi echoed the contemporaneous writings of British Fabian Roundtable devotees H.G. Wells and Lord Bertrand Russell, declaring: “This eternal war can end only with the constitution of a world republic. . . . The only way left to save the peace seems to be a politic of peaceful strength, on the model of the Roman Empire, that succeeded in having the longest period of peace in the west thanks to the supremacy of his legions.”

The launching of the Pan European Union was bankrolled by the Venetian-rooted European banking family, the Warburgs. Max Warburg, scion of the German branch of the family, gave

Coudenhove-Kalergi 60,000 gold marks to hold the founding convention. Even more revealing, the first mass rally of the Pan European Union in Berlin, at the Reichstag, was addressed by Hjalmar Schacht, later the Reichsbank head, Economics Minister and chief architect of the Hitler coup. A decade later, in October 1932, Schacht delivered a major address before another PanEuropa event, in which he assured Coudenhove-Kalergi and the others, “In three months, Hitler will be in power. . . . Hitler will create PanEuropa. Only Hitler can create PanEuropa.”

According to historical documents, Italy’s Fascist dictator Benito Mussolini was initially skeptical about the PanEuropa idea, but was “won over” to the scheme, following a meeting with Coudenhove-Kalergi, during which, in the Count’s words, “I gave him a complete harvest of Nietzsche’s quotes for the United States of Europe. . . . My visit represented a shift in the behavior of Mussolini towards PanEuropa. His opposition disappeared.”

At the founding congress of the Pan European Union in Vienna, the backdrop behind the podium was adorned with portraits of the movement’s leading intellectual icons: Immanuel Kant, Napoleon Bonaparte, Giuseppe Mazzini, and Friedrich Nietzsche.

Bankers’ Fascism

The pivotal role of Schacht in the Hitler coup and in the Pan European Union, highlights a critical dimension of the universal fascist scheme: the top-down role of the financial “overworld” and its banking technocrats. By all historical accounts, Schacht was the architect, in 1930, of the Bank for International Settlements (BIS), along with the Bank of England’s Montagu Norman. Historian Carroll Quigley, in his epic book, *Tragedy and Hope—A History of the World in Our Time* (New York: MacMillan Company, 1966), described the BIS scheme to establish a dictatorship over world finance:

“The powers of financial capital had another far-reaching aim, nothing less than to create a world system of financial control in private hands able to dominate the political system of each country and the economy of the world as a whole. This

system was to be controlled in a feudalist fashion by the central banks of the world acting in concert, by secret agreements arrived at in frequent private meetings and conferences. The apex of the system was to be the Bank for International Settlements in Basle, Switzerland, a private bank owned and controlled by the world's central banks which were themselves private corporations. Each central bank, in the hands of men like Montagu Norman of the Bank of England, Benjamin Strong of the New York Federal Reserve Bank, Charles Rist of the Bank of France, and Hjalmar Schacht of the Reichsbank, sought to dominate its government by its ability to control Treasury loans, to manipulate foreign exchanges, to influence the level of economic activity in the country, and to influence cooperative politicians by subsequent economic rewards in the business world."

Quigley highlighted the role of Schacht's closest ally in the BIS scheme, Bank of England Governor Norman, who headed the privately owned British institution for an unprecedented 24 years (1920-44). "Norman was a strange man," Quigley reported, "whose mental outlook was one of successfully suppressed hysteria or even paranoia. He had no use for governments and feared democracy. Both of these seemed to him to be threats to private banking, and thus to all that was proper and precious in human life. Strong-willed, tireless, and ruthless, he viewed his life as a kind of cloak-and-dagger struggle with the forces of unsound money which were in league with anarchy and Communism."

Montagu Norman and Hjalmar Schacht personified the banking overworld, that bankrolled and installed Hitler and the Nazis in power, in pursuit of their larger, universal fascist scheme.

Even more damning were the profiles of Schacht and Norman and their role in the Hitler project, in *The Hitler Book*, by a Schiller Institute research team, headed by Helga Zepp-LaRouche (New York: New Benjamin Franklin House, 1984):

"The BIS, nominally set up after the breakdown of 'normal' international financial relations in order to prevent a downward spiraling of international payments, in fact finished off the hapless Weimar Republic by its stern refusal to come to the help of a virtually bankrupt Germany in the crucial summer of 1931, after the Danat Bank collapse had brought the whole

nation to its knees. Schacht, who had been a member of the original BIS team and was to return to its board from 1933 through 1938, had been campaigning since his 1930 resignation as head of the Reichsbank, for Anglo-American support for a takeover by the NSDAP [Nazi Party] and its leader, Herr Hitler. He had resigned on March 7, 1930 and the BIS was formally established in June. In September, he was off to London and the United States, to 'sell' the Nazi option to the Anglo-American leadership, notably Bank of England governor and BIS director Montagu Norman, and the already influential Dulles brothers of Sullivan & Cromwell law firm, one of America's most influential—and the attorneys for IG Farben, and many other large German companies and provincial governments. Schacht's Hamburg friend and colleague, patrician Nazi Gerhardt Westrick, ran the correspondent law firm to Dulles's in Germany."

On March 16, 1933, a grateful Hitler brought Schacht back as head of the Reichsbank, explained *The Hitler Book*. A year later, Schacht was made Economics Minister. "Now, the BIS was going to help the Third Reich—by 1939 it had no less than several hundred million Swiss gold francs invested in Germany. On the BIS board were Baron Kurt von Schröder, by now a general in the SS Death's Head Brigade; Dr. Hermann Schmitz of IG Farben—whom Schacht had trained at the imperial economics ministry from 1915 on—and, later, Hitler's two personal appointees, Walter Funk and Emil Puhl of the Reichsbank."

File: 'Synarchist/Nazi-Communist'

The larger universal fascist schema, into which the Norman Schacht "Hitler project" fit, was well known to leading American intelligence, military, and diplomatic figures of the Franklin Roosevelt era, who maintained exhaustive files under such headings as "Synarchist/Nazi-Communist."

U.S. government archives from the FDR era, which were made available to *EIR* researchers, feature extensive intelligence reports on the international fascist plots, from the files of the U.S. State Department; U.S. Army Intelligence and Navy Intelligence; and the Coordinator of Information (COI), and its successor, the Office of Strategic Services (OSS). These files are of immedi-

ate relevance today, given the ongoing coup d'état in Washington by the disciples of Leo Strauss, Alexandre Kojève, and Carl Schmitt inside the George W. Bush Administration. Kojève and Schmitt were leading figures in the wartime "Synarchist" conspiracy, and they personified the perpetuation of that universal fascist plan and apparatus into the postwar period.

Already, following *EIR*'s lead, major American and European newspapers have identified such putschists as Paul Wolfowitz, Abram Shulsky, William Kristol, John Ashcroft, Steve Cambone, and Gary Schmitt as the offspring of the late University of Chicago Prof. Leo Strauss; Strauss, in turn, was the life-long collaborator and promoter of Nazi jurist Carl Schmitt, official Nazi philosopher and Nietzsche revivalist Martin Heidegger, and French Synarchist Alexandre Kojève—all unabashed advocates of tyranny as the only appropriate form of government. Although the May 4 Sunday *New York Times* feature off-handedly mentions Kojève as Strauss's colleague, without further identification, all of the major media coverage has been sanitized of any discussion of the overtly fascist/Synarchist roots of the Straussian creed.

Nevertheless, there are growing indications that some elements within the U.S. political institutions—particularly the military and intelligence communities, which comprise an important element of what Lyndon LaRouche refers to as "the institution of the U.S. Presidency"—are waking up to the cruel reality that a small group of universal fascists has seized the reins of power and is steering an ill-equipped President George W. Bush, the United States, and the rest of the world into a maelstrom of perpetual war and chaos.

A timely review of the history of the 20th-Century Synarchists is, therefore, in order, to enable those political circles already shocked into action, to understand the nature of the enemy, and exploit the greatest weakness of these Straussian would-be putschists—their open embrace of universal fascism, otherwise known as "Synarchism."

The Langer Study

As *EIR* reported on May 9 ("Dick Cheney Has a French Connection—To Fascism"), in 1947, OSS veteran and Harvard Prof.

William L. Langer assembled the official history of the Roosevelt Administration's dealings with Vichy France. *Our Vichy Gamble* was based on an exhaustive review of wartime archives, buttressed by interviews with top American officials, including OSS head Gen. William Donovan and President Franklin Roosevelt himself.

Langer minced no words in discussing the Synarchist circles in Vichy France. Referring to Adm. Jean François Darlan, who, along with Pierre Laval, was among the most notorious of the Vichy collaborationists with the Nazis, Langer wrote: "Darlan's henchmen were not confined to the fleet. His policy of collaboration with Germany could count on more than enough eager supporters among French industrial and banking interests—in short, among those who even before the war, had turned to Nazi Germany and had looked to Hitler as the savior of Europe from Communism. . . . These people were as good fascists as any in Europe. . . . Many of them had long had extensive and intimate business relations with German interests and were still dreaming of a new system of 'synarchy,' which meant government of Europe on fascist principles by an international brotherhood of financiers and industrialists."

EIR is in possession of many of the documents that Langer reviewed, in preparing *Our Vichy Gamble*. They offer an in-depth study of a fascist apparatus, whose European-wide tentacles extended into France, Germany, Britain, Spain, Italy, the Netherlands—and, across the Atlantic, inside the United States. One particularly revealing document, prepared by the Coordinator of Information in November 1940, focussed on the Synarchist strategy towards England and America. The document was called, "Synarchie and the Policy of the Banque Worms Group."

The unnamed author began, "In recent reports there have been several references to the growing political power of the Banque Worms group in France, which includes amongst its members such ardent collaborationists as Pucheu, Benoist-Mechin, Leroy-Ladurie, Bouthillier, and representatives of big French industrial organizations." Under the subtitle, "Similarity of aims of 'Synarchie' and Banque Worms," the report continued, "The reactionary movement known as 'Synarchie' has been in existence in France for nearly a century. Its aim has always been to carry out a bloodless revolution, inspired by

the upper classes, aimed at producing a form of government by 'technicians,' under which home and foreign policy would be subordinated to international economy. The aims of the Banque Worms group are the same as those of 'Synarchie,' and the leaders of the two groups are, in most cases, identical."

The "Banque Worms group" was closely allied with the Lazard banking interests in Paris, London, and New York, and with Royal Dutch Shell's Henri Deterding. Hippolyte Worms, the bank's founder, was one of 12 initial Synarchist Movement of Empire (SME) members, according to other French police and intelligence reports.

The report itemized the aims of the Synarchists, as of August 1940: "to check any new social schemes which might tend to weaken the power of the international financiers and industrialists; to work for the ultimate complete control of all industry by international finance and industry; to protect Jewish and Anglo-Saxon interests; . . . to take advantage of Franco-German collaboration to conclude a series of agreements with German industries, thereby establishing a solid community of interests between French and German industrialists, which will tend to strengthen the hands of international finance and industry; . . . to effect a fusion with Anglo-Saxon industry after the war."

The author of the COI study reported, "There is reason to believe that both [Hermann] Göring and Dr. [Walther] Funk are in sympathy with these aspirations," and that "Some headway is claimed to have been made in securing the adhesion of big U.S. industry to the movement."

Beaverbrook and Hoare

The COI study's segment regarding "Policy in regard to Great Britain," elaborated the following Synarchist plan: "To bring about the fall of the Churchill Government by creating the belief in the country that a more energetic government is needed to prosecute the war; it is recognized that an effective means of creating suspicion of the Government's efficiency would be to induce the resignation of Lord Beaverbrook; to bring about the formation of a new Government including Sir Samuel Hoare, Lord Beaverbrook and Mr. Hore-Belisha. (Note. The source has added that in the Worms group it is believed that those

circles in Great Britain who are favorably disposed to their plan, are most critical of Mr. Churchill, Lord Halifax and Captain Margesson.); through the medium of Sir Samuel Hoare to bring about an agreement between British industry and the Franco-German 'bloc'; to protect Anglo-Saxon interests on the continent; to reach an agreement for the cessation of the reciprocal bombing of industrial centers. (Note. The source has added that Göring is reputed to have signified his entire approval of this project.)"

The naming of Lord Beaverbrook and Sir Samuel Hoare, two leading figures in the British Roundtable group, as Synarchist collaborators is of great significance, indicating that American intelligence, from no later than 1940, was tracking the high-level British involvement in the scheme for a postwar universal fascist "Europe of the oligarchs," along precisely the lines spelled out in Count Coudenhove-Kalergi's "Synarchist" manifesto, founding the Pan European Union. Indeed, other U.S. intelligence wartime documents identified the PEU as a project of the European Synarchist secret brotherhood. The Synarchist Movement of Empire (SME), according to various accounts in the wartime U.S. files, was founded in 1917 or 1922, and the first two major "projects" of the Synarchists were Mussolini's March on Rome and the launching of the Pan Europa movement.

Back on the British front: Sir Samuel Hoare was a leading figure in British intelligence, having been posted to Russia during the period of the Bolshevik Revolution, where he had a personal hand in the assassination of Grigori Rasputin, after Rasputin had warned that Russian participation in World War I would surely lead to the fall of the Romanovs. Hoare was the leading British military intelligence case-officer for instigating the overthrow of the Tsar and the Russian Revolution. He personified the upper echelons of what U.S. intelligence files characterized as the "Synarchist/Nazi-Communist" group. In his capacity as Foreign Secretary in 1935, he had negotiated the Hoare-Laval agreement, by which Great Britain and France mutually accepted Mussolini's conquest by invasion of Abyssinia, a major act of appeasement. He later served as British ambassador to Francisco Franco's Spain, and, according to several biographical accounts, remained secretly on Lord Beaverbrook's payroll as a policy advisor. Hoare, later "Lord Tem-

plewood," was also a leading British promoter of Frank Buchman and the Moral Rearmament Movement, the antecedent to Rev. Sun Myung Moon's Unification Church (see *EIR*, Dec. 20, 2002).

The case of Lord Beaverbrook (Max Aitken) has even more profound and enduring implications, given that two of the leading financial-political propagandists for today's neo-conservative revolution in Washington—press magnates Lord Conrad Black and Rupert Murdoch—are Beaverbrook protégés. The Australian Murdoch, on graduating Oxford, did an apprenticeship at Beaverbrook's London *Daily Express*, which Murdoch referred affectionately to as "Beaverbrook's brothel."

For Black, the connection ran deeper—through the wartime British secret intelligence high command. Conrad Black's father, George Montagu Black, worked directly under the Beaverbrook chain of command during World War II, when Beaverbrook was Minister of Aircraft Production, and when Black and Edward Plunkett Taylor ran the Canadian front company War Supplies, Ltd. out of the Willard Hotel in Washington, coordinating all British-American-Canadian military procurement arrangements. The \$1.3 billion garnered by Taylor and Black from their wartime "private" arms deals provided the seed money for G.M. Black's postwar launching of the Argus Corp., which, today, is the Hollinger Corp. media cartel of Conrad Black.

Beaverbrook's transformation, from a leading promoter of an Anglo-German alliance following Hitler's takeover, to a leading war cabinet official, following Hitler's attack on Britain, was nothing short of miraculous. In 1935, when Hoare had conducted the secret negotiations with Laval, Beaverbrook had accompanied the Foreign Secretary on the trip and conducted his own back-channel work to assure positive media coverage of the deal in both England and France. That year, Beaverbrook traveled to Rome and Berlin for personal meetings with Mussolini and Hitler. A year later, Beaverbrook was the guest of Hitler's Foreign Minister Joachim von Ribbentrop, at the Berlin Olympic Games.

But the most famous part that Beaverbrook played in the Hitler saga, had to do with the 1933 Reichstag fire—the arson attack on the Weimar Republic's parliament—which consolidated Hitler's death grip on absolute power. Beaverbrook had

posted a trusted aide, Sefton Delmer, in charge of his *Daily Express* press bureau in Berlin, and Delmer had become a confidant of Hitler, traveling with him on the campaign trail during the 1933 elections. Delmer was one of the first “journalists” to arrive as the Reichstag burned, and his dispatch from the scene—complete with exclusive interviews with Hitler, Göring, and others—established the cover for the actual Nazi authors of the terror attack, which sealed Hitler’s dictatorship. Delmer, in a 1939 article recounting the incident, stuck to his story, which countered the majority of the world media coverage, and blamed the fire on a communist—not on the Nazis.

Beaverbrook—even after his “Damascus road conversion” to war cabinet minister—retained his ties to the Nazi machine. When Nazi leader Rudolf Hess parachuted into Scotland, in a final vain effort to maintain the Anglo-Nazi alliance against the Soviet Union, Beaverbrook arranged a private prison interview with Hess. Details of the session are still sketchy, but one quote to emerge from the meeting, was Hess telling Beaverbrook: “Hitler likes you a great deal.”

‘Synarchism’ Defined

Among the thousands of documents that *EIR* obtained from the U.S. wartime archives was an 18-page French military intelligence report, summarizing a 100-page dossier on the French Synarchist groups, dated July 1941. The report dealt with the Synarchist Movement of Empire (SME), the Synarchist Revolutionary Convention (SRC) and the Secret Committee of Revolutionary Action (SCRA), the military leadership arm of the SME, also known as the “*Cagoullards*” (the “hooded ones”).

The report provided a brief history: “The Synarchist movement is an international movement born after the Versailles Treaty, which was financed and directed by certain financial groups belonging to the top international banking community. Its aim is essentially to overthrow in every country, where they exist, the parliamentary regimes which are considered insufficiently devoted to the interests of these groups and therefore, too difficult to control because of the number of persons required to control them.

“SME proposes therefore to substitute them by authoritarian

regimes more docile and more easily maneuverable. Power would be concentrated in the hands of the CEOs of industry and in designated representatives of chosen banking groups for each country. In a word, the idea is to give to each country a political constitution and an appropriate national economic structure organized for the following purposes:

“1. Place the political power directly into the hands of chosen people and eliminate all intermediaries. 2. Establish a maximum concentration of industries and suppress all unwarranted competition. 3. Establish an absolute control of prices of all goods (raw materials, semi-finished or finished goods). 4. Create judicial and social institutions that would prevent all extremes of action.”

The dossier reported that, following failed *Cagoulard* insurrections in 1934 and 1937, the SME infiltrated all the economic and related ministries of the French government, conducted sabotage from within the regime, and set the basis for the Vichy government of 1940, which was dominated, from top to bottom, by Synarchist secret society members. The report named 40 top officials of the government of Marshal Henri Philippe Pétain, who were all SME members.

The dossier repeatedly emphasized that the French SME was but one component of an international Synarchist apparatus, “organized and financed in all countries by certain elements of industrial CEOs and high banking circles. Its objective on the international level is to subvert all of the democratic regimes in the world, and substitute them with stronger governments, more docile and whose leaders of command in each nation are centralized in the hands of a number of affiliates belonging to big business and international banking interests which coordinate their activities around the world.” In France, under the Vichy regime, noted the dossier, “the main administrations of the country, have become the arms of Bank Worms whose administrative council controls all of the top administrators of the state.”

The Synarchists did not concentrate all their efforts on infiltrating and controlling the Vichy regime. A U.S. military intelligence report, dated July 27, 1944, from the military attaché in Algiers, warned of Synarchist penetration of the upper echelons of the Free French government of Gen. Charles de Gaulle, headquartered in Algeria. “Some of the oldest and formerly most

faithful supporters of General de Gaulle are worried by what they call a tendency to let ‘Synarchism’ penetrate even the highest brackets of the Algiers Administration,” the report began. “It is believed that General de Gaulle up to recently, opposed Synarchism, which is a strongly reactionary movement, financed by the Haute Banque. He has even ordered a confidential study to be made on the subject, a copy of which has been seen by American officers.” The report concluded, “If it is a fact that many individuals who are holding positions of importance in the cabinet and the immediate entourage of General de Gaulle, are also closely associated with political ideas alien to the program which de Gaulle and his government publicly endorse, then far-reaching political inferences may be drawn.” Of course, a decade later, leading wartime “Gaullist” Jacques Soustelle would launch the Secret Army Organization (OAS), which would be responsible for repeated assassination attempts against de Gaulle, and would be implicated in the Perminex assassination of President John F. Kennedy.

While it is not certain that Soustelle was a wartime member of the Synarchist plot, it is certain, from French and American government records, that one leading Synarchist operative infiltrated into the de Gaulle Free French camp was Robert Marjolin, one of Alexandre Kojève’s prize student/protégés of his 1933-39 courses on Hegel, Nietzsche, and the “end of history.” Marjolin became Minister of Economy in the first de Gaulle postwar government, and he immediately brought Kojève into the ministry.

The Cult of Napoleon

At its core, the Synarchist international—like its front group Pan European Union—sought to create a one-world tyranny, modeled on the reign of Napoleon Bonaparte. The first “Synarchist” text was written in the 1860s by Joseph Alexandre Saint-Yves d’Alveydre (1842-1909), an occultist and follower of Napoleon Bonaparte’s own mystical advisor, Antoine Fabre d’Olivet (1767-1825). Fabre d’Olivet had started out as a leading member of the Jacobins, participating personally in the foiled assassination plot against King Louis XVI in 1789. He later served as a top official of the Interior and War Ministries under

Napoleon Bonaparte. His occult writings about “purgative violence” and the “will to power”—antecedents of the works of Nietzsche—were adopted by Saint-Yves d’Alveydre, who launched the idea of Synarchism as a counter to the anarchy that had destabilized all of Europe, from 1848.

Saint-Yves’ successor, Gerard Vincent Encausse (“Papus”), founded the Saint-Yves School of Occult Sciences, and began a recruiting drive for a secret society, which he called the Synarchy Government. In his 1894 book *Anarchie, Indolence & Synarchie*, Papus spelled out an ambitious scheme to recruit all of the leaders of industry, commerce, finance, the military, and academia, to a single power scheme, aimed at destroying the “internal microbe” of society, anarchy.

Both Saint-Yves and Papus envisioned a global Synarchist empire, divided into five geographic areas: 1. the British Empire; 2. Euro-Africa; 3. Eurasia; 4. Pan-America; 5. Asia. Indeed, Alexandre Kojève is identified in Russian sources as a leader of the so-called “Eurasians,” a group of Russian emigrés in the 1920s Berlin and Paris, led by Sir Samuel Hoare’s Guchkov and tied into the Soviet secret service project called “the Trust.” The “Eurasians” welcomed the Russian Revolution as a purgative force to wipe out corrupt Western civilization. Kojève’s own cosmology of great tyrants counted Josef Stalin and Adolf Hitler as second only to Napoleon, in achieving the “end of history” goal of a true global tyranny.

Strauss, Kojève, Schmitt, and Schacht

While none of the American archive documents reviewed to date by *EIR* identify Nazi jurist Carl Schmitt as a Synarchist, circumstantial evidence points to that conclusion. Schmitt was an emissary to Spain, Portugal, France, and Italy, during the height of fascism, turning out a series of juridical documents, justifying the jackboot tyrannies. Schmitt was a protected asset of Göring, the leading Synarchist figure in Nazi Germany. Like the banker Hjalmar Schacht, Schmitt was cleared of war crimes by the Nuremberg Tribunals.

In effect, as documented in *The Hitler Book*, Schacht blackmailed the Tribunal, by aggressively asserting that he was only acting on behalf of the international financial establishment,

represented by the Bank for International Settlements, in his incarnation as a top Nazi official. If backed against a wall, he threatened, he would provide evidence of the international financial cabal behind the “Hitler project.” Schacht was acquitted, over the strenuous objections of both the American and Soviet judges.

In effect, the perpetrators of the Nazi Holocaust were brought to justice at Nuremberg, while the architects of the larger Synarchist scheme, like Schacht and Leo Strauss’ mentor Carl Schmitt, were given a safe conduct, and, through the efforts of postwar occupation figures like John J. McCloy and Gen. William Draper, were vetted for future service.

A final note: In 1955, Schmitt was corresponding with Kojève, arranging for the Paris-based Russian emigré to address the Düsseldorf industrialists’ association—which had been a focal point of Franco-German “Synarchist” collaboration between the Nazi and Vichy governments—and meet, during that visit, with Schmitt’s close friend Schacht.

It was this Kojève who maintained the closest collaboration with Leo Strauss, and who promoted his theories of purgative violence and universal tyranny with such leading Strauss disciples as Allan Bloom (the mentor of Deputy Defense Secretary Paul Wolfowitz) and Francis Fukuyama. This Synarchist stew remains Vice President Dick Cheney’s gang’s “French Connection.”

—*Al and Rachel Douglas, Katherine Kantor, Pierre and Irene Beaudry, Anton Chaitkin, Stephanie Ezrol, Helga Zepp-LaRouche, and Barbara Boyd contributed vital research to this article.*

Where the Chickenhawks Got Their Love of War

by Tony Papert

A version of this article appeared in the May 9 issue of Executive Intelligence Review magazine.

Thanks largely to exposés by the LaRouche Presidential campaign, which have been picked up and echoed in electronic and print media worldwide, many of the inner workings of Vice President Dick Cheney’s ongoing “cold coup” in Washington since Sept. 11, 2001, are now very well known internationally. The world now knows that the footsoldiers for Cheney’s power-grab are the neo-conservatives, also known as the “Chickenhawks,” because, although military hawks today, they earlier “chickened out” of military service in Vietnam. The identities of the leading Chickenhawks, many of their institutions and conduits, have become household words.

More recently, further exposés from LaRouche and others have put a spotlight on the “Straussian” core of the Chickenhawk phenomenon: that is, the organization of the students of the late Leo Strauss (1899-1973) of the University of Chicago, with the students of his students (like Deputy Secretary of Defense Paul Wolfowitz), their own students (like Wolfowitz’s student Lewis Libby, who is Cheney’s Chief of Staff), and so forth.

The duality Strauss himself built into this sect, is also being widely publicized: that on the one hand, he created the hard core of the “esoterics,” like the late Allan Bloom, Paul Wolfowitz, Werner Dannhauser, Thomas Pangle, and many others, who share Leo Strauss’s secret Nietzschean doctrines, and secretly view themselves as Nietzschean “supermen,” a caste which Strauss, in his peculiar terminology, renamed “philoso-

phers.” But on the other hand, around this inner group, is the softer outer layer of the “exoterics,” like William Bennett, Harry Jaffa, and quite likely Donald Rumsfeld, who are loyal to Strauss and his sect, but at the same time innocent of Strauss’s actual views. Instead, they are committed to versions of traditional morality, patriotism and religion—commitments ridiculed by Strauss.

Just as Strauss called the first group “philosophers,” he called the second, “gentlemen,” using a more dignified term than Lenin’s “useful fools.”

Alexandre Kojève’s Cult of Violence

What is not yet as widely known, but now soon will be, is what could be called Dick Cheney’s “French Connection.”

It first came to light for us some weeks ago, because a friend had become puzzled at the lack of a doctrine of *purgative violence*, in the known work of Strauss and his followers, at just the moment when as those followers are plunging the United States and the world into what chicken-hawks Eliot Cohen and James Woolsey of Rumsfeld’s Defense Policy Board, openly call “World War IV.” What greater orgy of purgative violence could there be? In pursuit of the call for “purgative violence” which he thought must be found somewhere in the Strauss concoction, our friend looked into the connections between Leo Strauss and a man called Alexandre Kojève, as adduced by Shadia Drury, in her 1994 book, *Alexandre Kojève: The Roots of Post-Modern Politics* (New York: St. Martin’s Press).

There it was.

Kojève, a Bolshevik in Russia until 1920, met Leo Strauss in Berlin in the late 1920s, and the two became lifelong friends. Although Strauss and Kojève claimed to have important philosophical differences, each one wrote to the other, words to the effect: You are one of only two or three individuals worldwide, who are capable of fully understanding my thought. All of Strauss’s students knew this. Given the intimate connection, the Strauss sect should instead be called the Strauss-Kojève sect, headquartered simultaneously out of Chicago and Paris.

Kojève situated his ideas as a far-reaching commentary on G.W.F. Hegel's *Phenomenology*, beginning with the enslavement of the "slave" by the "master," as the first truly human act, since humanity equals the negation of nature. By risking his own life to conquer the slave, the master negates his own natural fear of death, for the sake of "recognition," or "pure prestige," something which is purely human rather than natural, according to Kojève. In this way, the master first becomes truly human. The slave, by surrendering to slavery through the fear of death, in turn becomes less than human. But in the course of time, the ancient society of noble slavemasters is ultimately superseded by the society of slaves, which is—Christian society. The "End of History," finally, is an "homogeneous universal tyranny" in which everyone "recognizes" everyone else as simultaneously slave and master.

Within this context, Drury describes Kojève's demand for purgative violence. "It is important to realize that Kojève does not lament the terrors of revolution. On the contrary, he places special emphasis on terror as a necessary component of revolution. For Kojève, man cannot be liberated simply by having Hegel renounce God and introduce an age of atheism. The liberation of the slave is 'not possible without a fight.' Kojève explains that the reason for this is metaphysical—since the idea to be realized is a synthesis of mastery and slavery, the slave must be a worker as well as a warrior. This means that he must 'introduce into himself the element of death' by risking his life while being fully conscious of his mortality. But how is this possible in a world without masters, in a world where everyone is a slave? Kojève stumbles on an idea. Robespierre's Terror is the perfect vehicle for transcending slavery. . . . Kojève applauds the Jacobin Terror that followed on the heels of the French Revolution. It is 'only thanks to the Terror,' he writes, 'that the idea of the final Synthesis, which definitively satisfies Man, is realized.'

"Stalin understood the need for terror and did not shrink from crimes and atrocities—whatever their magnitude. This was integral to his greatness in Kojève's eyes. Kojève thought that the crimes of a Napoleon or a Stalin were absolved by their success and their achievements."

(For more on Kojève and Strauss, see the preceding article.)

Role of Michel Foucault

Kojève's student and longtime friend, Georges Bataille (1897-1962) was a sociologist and anthropologist. Drury writes, "In Bataille's view, the deathlike state of modern life has its source in the undisputed triumph of God and his prohibitions, reason and its calculations, science and its utilitarianism. In an effort to reinvigorate the world and restore the exhilaration of life at the dawn of history, Bataille resolves to rediscover what has been banished, liberate what has been subjugated, uncover what has been hidden, reveal what has been repressed, applaud what has been marginalized, and affirm what has been negated. Only by reawakening the original dualism can the vitality of life be restored.

"The first task at hand is to kill God and replace him with the vanquished Satan, since God represents the prohibitions of civilization. To reject God is to reject transcendence in favor of the 'immanence' achieved through intoxication, eroticism, human sacrifice, and poetic effusions. Replacing God with Satan also means replacing prohibition with transgression, order with disorder, and reason with madness."

Bataille wrote at least half a dozen pornographic novels, which do not titillate, but attempt to involve the reader in the most perverse combinations of sex with intense cruelty, violence, and blasphemy. He also authored a volume on Gilles de Rais, a sadistic nobleman of the Middle Ages who, in the words of Drury, "lured innumerable little children of both sexes to his castles, and offered them up as sacrifices to the Devil. He tortured them, sexually violated them, and slit their throats in orgiastic exaltation. Drenched in blood, he would sleep while his servants and accomplices cleaned the castle and burned the cadavers." Bataille glorifies Gilles de Rais "as a noble warrior who belonged to an age where war was a sovereign activity and an end in itself. He portrays him as the casualty of the ruthless march of reason in history. He celebrates his lust for carnage and brutality as the supreme characteristics of nobility."

Best-selling postmodernist writer Michel Foucault acknowledges a great debt to Bataille and especially Kojève. Foucault's study of Pierre Rivière, a young man of the Nineteenth Century

who killed his mother, sister, and brother with an axe, echoes Bataille's work on Gilles de Rais. Rivière wrote a long account, in which he gave the details of his life and the reason for the crime. Rivière's defense declared him to have been insane at the time of the crime, but "Foucault protests that in declaring Rivière to be mad, the court has silenced an act of protest against the regime of reason. By dismissing him as a madman, the court divested all his actions of their significance."

In his book *Discipline and Punish*, Foucault bemoaned the extinction of "sovereign power," which he thought displayed itself most dramatically in the public medieval torture-execution. "Sovereign power inspired awe and terror precisely because it allied itself with *death*. The 'spectacle of the scaffold' and its terror were its distinguishing marks. Knowing that the sovereign did not shrink from atrocities struck fear into the hearts of the subjects. Foucault's harrowing description of the public execution of the would-be regicide, Damiens, is meant to show that sovereign power did not shrink from gratuitous and altogether unnecessary cruelty," writes Drury.

Children of Satan II: The Beast-Men

The following was first issued as a LaRouche in 2004 campaign pamphlet in January 2004.

Letter of Transmittal

In April 2003, the LaRouche in 2004 Presidential campaign committee issued a special report, *Children of Satan: The 'Ignoble Liars' Behind Bush's No-Exit War*. By the end of the year, around 1 million copies of the report had been distributed inside the United States, with an equal number of copies distributed via the campaign's Internet website. Copies of the text circulated in German, Spanish, French, Italian, Arabic, and Russian. Scores of major newspapers around the world republished portions of the report, and many leading American investigative reporters and members of Congress used the material first published in *Children of Satan* as the basis for their own investigations, creating a climate of widespread public exposure of the neo-conservative cabal inside the Bush Administration, which duped the American people, the Congress, and some international leaders into backing a thoroughly unjust war against Iraq, for which hundreds of American soldiers have already given their lives and many thousands more were injured. The devastation brought on Iraq will take generations to reverse.

The release of that *Children of Satan* report also shone a long-overdue spotlight on the role of the fascist philosopher Leo Strauss, and his role in launching the neo-conservative march through the U.S. political institutions. Some leading Straussians reacted, sharply, to the fact that their fascist roots were now showing. The late Robert Bartley, longtime editorial page editor of the *Wall Street Journal*, penned an hysterical diatribe against the LaRouche campaign document, after *The New Yorker* magazine and the *New York Times* published extensive articles, drawing upon the Leo Strauss exposés first surfaced in the LaRouche in 2004 report. More recently, Kenneth Timmerman, a neo-con propagandist, issued a second hysterical shriek against LaRouche's exposé of the Straussians, and the fact that the exposés of the neo-cons, first published by LaRouche, now form the basis for serious Congressional inves-

tigations into the intelligence fakery leading to the Iraq invasion.

Although the first Children of Satan report was published in three editions, each containing added, updated material, much new evidence against the neo-cons, particularly against the Bush Administration's self-anointed Grand Inquisitor, Vice President Dick Cheney, has been assembled in recent months. As the result, Presidential candidate LaRouche has commissioned a completely new report, which he has titled *Children of Satan II: The Beast-Men*.

While much has evolved in the eight months since the release of the first Children of Satan report, certain essential facts remain unchanged. As a result of the continuing power of Vice President Cheney, the entire neocon apparatus remains in place inside the Bush Administration. Every effort to clean house has been stymied by the personal intervention of Cheney, or by his Russian Mafiya-linked chief of staff and chief national security aide, Lewis "Scooter" Libby. Whether he is fully conscious of it or not, Cheney is the Grand Inquisitor of the Bush Administration, far more than the Vice President or even the "Prime Minister," as he was recently described by Nightline host Ted Koppel. You will read, in the pages that follow, about the Straussians' commitment to transform the United States from a democratic republic into a tyranny, using the events of Sept. 11, 2001 as their "Reichstag fire," to justify the overthrow of our Constitutional system.

Strauss and his ally, Alexander Kojève, adopted the work of the 18th- and early-19th-century Martinist occultist Joseph de Maistre, to promote the 15th-century Spanish Grand Inquisitor as the model for the "beast-man" tyrant of the future world government, built on a foundation of terror and brutality. They cited Maistre protégé Napoleon Bonaparte as a prototypical ruthless dictator to inaugurate the "end of history," an epoch in which all events center around a succession of tyrannical dictatorships and Jacobin blood-revolts. The Bernard Lewis-authored and Samuel Huntington-promoted "Clash of Civilizations" perpetual war against the entire Islamic world and China is the policy being now promoted by Cheney and company. This is a Synarchist insurgency against the American Founders, and against the very survival of civilization.

These are the stakes in the 2004 Presidential election. If Dick

Cheney is not removed from office prior to the November 2004 elections, the United States will not survive, in any form recognizable to the Founding Fathers. The document you are holding in your hands is intended as a military field manual. Know the Synarchist enemy within, as the first step towards effective action.

—Jeffrey Steinberg
Dec. 29, 2003

The Return of the Beasts

by Jeffrey Steinberg

Prologue: A Trail of Two Beasts

It is no secret among Washington insiders, that there are two people who constantly intimidate, and, occasionally, infuriate President George W. Bush: These are Israeli Prime Minister Ariel Sharon and Vice President Dick Cheney. Sharon and Cheney, while differing in personality, share the same “Beast-man” temperament and tyrannical thirst for power.

However, Sharon and Cheney share an additional flaw, a propensity not only to kill, but also to steal. Their present chief political vulnerability is that both men greedily pursue personal fortune, and have no qualms about using their public clout to pursue wealth, far beyond anything which might be called their needs.

Now, events seem to be catching up with both men. Sharon’s two sons face indictment in Israel for financial fraud relating to their father’s January 2003 reelection campaign.

Vice President Cheney’s corrupt ongoing ties to the corporation he formerly chaired, Halliburton, have grabbed headlines around the United States and around the world. The Cheney corruption scandals have triggered at least one Pentagon audit and a French criminal probe. The subjects of these Cheney corruption scandals may soon be the subject of Congressional hearings, Justice Department fraud inquests, and growing attention from voters.

If Bush reelection campaign guru Karl Rove has one recurring nightmare, it’s the looming prospect of a “war profiteer” label dangling around the neck of the Vice President and presumed G.W. running-mate, as we enter the “hot phase” of the 2004 reelection campaign.

But, that is only one of two leading nightmares haunting

Rove's dreams of the coming Presidential election. Halliburton-linked corruption is but one criminal count in a larger indictment that could, hypothetically, be drawn up against the Vice President at this very moment. If that were not enough, other counts could include the leaking of the identity of an American undercover intelligence officer, and the conducting of illegal covert operations.

But the exposure of Sharon's and Cheney's compulsive greed, which is grabbing the headlines today, is actually the lesser of the pair's crimes.

Rove's second-most-disturbing nightmare involves Dick Cheney, Robert Hanssen, and Aldrich Ames. Hanssen and Ames were, respectively, the FBI and CIA career counterintelligence officers who were convicted of spying for the Soviet Union and Russia. The biggest crime that the duo committed was the coughing-up to the KGB of American double-agents, inside the Soviet bureaucracy and military, a crime which resulted in the execution of some of the U.S.A.'s leading moles within the East bloc.

There is that common feature of the behavior of those convicted turncoats and Dick Cheney. For example, Vice President, or, shall we say, "President of Vice" Cheney and his chief of staff I. Lewis "Scooter" Libby, head the list of suspects in the ongoing Justice Department national security probe of the leaking of the identity of a Central Intelligence Agency undercover intelligence officer, who also happened to be the wife of former Ambassador Joseph Wilson.

The public exposure of the identity of a CIA officer is, under a 1982 law, a serious felony carrying a possible 10-year prison term. Beyond those legal issues of the case which appear to be beyond the comprehension of Attorney General John Ashcroft, the idea that the Vice President and/or his chief of staff may have leaked the identity of an American secret agent, to gain political benefit and cover up their own misconduct, is a scandal of the highest order.

Ex-Ambassador Wilson had been dispatched by the CIA to the African country of Niger in February 2002, as the result of an intelligence query by Vice President Cheney, to probe reports that Iraq was seeking uranium with which to make nuclear bombs. Even though Wilson's trip debunked the Iraq-Niger story, Cheney persisted in peddling the lie that Iraq was on the

verge of building a bomb, and he reportedly went berserk at the prospect that Wilson's revelations, instead of confirming Cheney's "yellow-cake" concoction, would expose Cheney's "Big Lie."

In a July 2003 widely syndicated column by Robert Novak, Wilson's wife, Valerie Plame, was "outed" as a CIA spy. In fact, she worked for years as a "non-official cover" officer, developing overseas sources on weapons of mass destruction. Vice President Dick Cheney—who, more than any other Bush Administration figure, had aggressively argued for the need for a war against Iraq, since his days as Secretary of Defense under President George H.W. Bush, Sr., pushing this through on wildly exaggerated threats of Saddam using "Weapons of Mass Destruction" (WMD) against the United States and our regional allies—may have blown the cover of one of the U.S.A.'s top WMD-hunters.

The Robert Novak column that exposed Valerie Plame cited two unnamed "senior Administration officials" as his sources. The purpose of the Novak leak was to discredit the Wilson fact-finding mission ("He got the assignment because his wife was a CIA officer, working on weapons of mass destruction, and he wasn't really qualified"), and to send a chilling warning to any other prospective whistle-blowers, that there would be a stiff price to pay for coming forward with information displeasing to the Vice President.

According to well-placed U.S. intelligence sources, the "Get Wilson" operation, which led to the Novak leak, was launched in Cheney's office in March 2003—right after International Atomic Energy Agency head Mohamed El-Baradei testified at the UN Security Council that the Niger allegations were based on shoddy forged documents. The sources suggest that the leaking of Plame's identity to Novak and a handful of other Washington reporters may have been conduited through members of the Pentagon's Defense Policy Board (DPD), an advisory body chaired, until several months ago, by Richard Perle, and dominated by neo-conservative ideologues, including such dubious characters as former Speaker of the House Newt Gingrich, former CIA Director James Woolsey, and former arms-control negotiator Kenneth Adelman.

Under "normal" circumstances, the President and Karl Rove might already have dumped Cheney from the 2004 ticket, or

even demanded his earlier resignation for “medical” or “personal” reasons. But the Cheney Vice Presidency has been anything but normal.

But, even those types of charges hanging over Cheney’s head are relatively minor, when the deeper issues of the case are taken into account. Had Adolf Hitler been tried at Nuremberg, the charge would not have been stealing.

The Long Knives of the Cheneyacs

A recent Nightline broadcast labelled Dick Cheney the most powerful Vice President in American history, someone almost worthy of the title “Prime Minister.” He lords it over a Vice-Presidential staff of over 60 full-time intelligence and national security aides, a team larger than the National Security Council of President John F. Kennedy, and overwhelmingly dominated by neo-con ideologues and far-right-wing Israeli lobbyists.

Cheney’s own agents are in top posts on the “official” NSC under Condi Rice, and his moles occupy key posts at the Pentagon. Dr. Robert Joseph, for example, the NSC desk officer for arms control, takes his marching orders from Cheney chief of staff “Scooter” Libby, according to several Administration-linked sources. Joseph was the author of the infamous “16 words” inserted in President Bush’s January 2003 State of the Union address, which charged that Iraq was seeking uranium in Africa—well after the CIA had determined that the reports were bogus.

Cheney, in effect, is the behind-the-scenes power inside the Bush Administration, the “godfather” of the neo-conservative cabal that grabbed power in the immediate aftermath of the Sept. 11, 2001 attacks. If, as Lyndon LaRouche revealed at the moment those attacks were going on, 9/11 fits the pattern of Nazi boss Hermann Goering’s “Reichstag Fire”-style coup d’état, staged from inside the nation’s security establishment, Dick Cheney is the putschist-in-chief, operating from the shadows, through a weak-minded and easily manipulated sitting President George W. Bush, Jr.

As a result of these circumstances, the survival of the United States as a Constitutional republic, dedicated to the general welfare and the common defense, now hangs on the issue of

Dick Cheney. Nothing short of the more or less immediate removal of Dick Cheney from power could repair the damage.

However, were the President to dump Dick Cheney, and purge the neo-con apparatus inside the Bush Administration, a dramatic change in policy could be immediately effected, turning the United States and the world back from the brink of disaster. Within the ranks of the traditional Republican Party—including some leading GOP Senators who have made their distaste for the neo-con pack-rats a matter of public record—there are numerous individuals qualified to fill the vacant posts for the remainder of the Bush Presidency.

The recent appointment of former Secretary of State James Baker III as the younger President Bush's special envoy to renegotiate the Iraqi debt, is an indication of what the post-Cheney remains of a Bush, Jr. Presidency might become. That appointment of Baker, which took place over the strenuous objections of Cheney and Sharon, might prove to be an early sign of a power shift within the White House. During the "Bush 41" Administration, when Baker was Secretary of State and Cheney was Secretary of Defense, relations between the two men reached such a point of friction, bordering on hatred, that all communications between the two Secretaries were handled by National Security Adviser Gen. Brent Scowcroft, according to one close observer. Sources that cannot be ignored report that it was Karl Rove and White House Chief of Staff Andrew Card who engineered this new appointment of former Secretary Baker, with the full backing of former President George H.W. Bush, Sr.

Even among long-standing Washington insiders, there has been a persistent failure to comprehend how Dick Cheney appears to have emerged as the coach and quarterback for the neo-con hijacking of U.S. national-security policy in the immediate aftermath of 9/11. Some longtime Cheney associates have attributed his emergence as a true "Beast-man" to his several near-death experiences surrounding his heart condition. When one knows the history of Cheney and his wife over decades, that rumor must be discarded. Others attribute it, naively, to the shock of the Sept. 11 attacks, when Cheney was in the White House as the planes were crashing into the World Trade Center towers and the Pentagon.

The truth is that, for at least the past 30 years, Cheney has

been an intimate collaborator of the same followers of Leo Strauss's circle of neo-fascist intellectuals, who have trained and indoctrinated other key players in the present imperial camp, including Paul Wolfowitz, William Kristol, and Richard Perle. Those bonds were established by the mid-1970s and have never been severed. While Vice President and political hit-man Cheney exhibits all the "Beast-man" characteristics of a Straussian fascist himself, it is his wife, Lynne, who has been the intellectual in the Cheney household. She has been a fellow-traveller of this neo-fascist apparatus for at least the past several decades.

For years, beginning prior to her husband's inauguration as Vice President, Lynne Cheney has been a senior fellow at the American Enterprise Institute (Cheney, too, briefly served on the AEI board), the leading neo-con thinktank in Washington, where she hobnobs with Perle, Kristol, and crew.

1. Cheney, Hitler & The Grand Inquisitor

As documented in the first (April 2003) edition of our Children of Satan report, the late fascist philosopher Leo Strauss, of the University of Chicago, and St. John's College in Annapolis, Md., was the most prominent U.S.A.-based disciple of the two leading Nazi Party ideologues: Nietzschean revivalist Martin Heidegger, and the Crown Jurist of the Nazi legal establishment, Carl Schmitt. Strauss trained two generations of American academics and political operatives around the idea that tyranny is the purest form of statecraft; that the manipulation of fear of an enemy, and debased forms of revealed religion, are the key to political power; and that strategic deception—the "Big Lie" technique associated with Nazi Propaganda Minister Goebbels—is the number one weapon in every successful politician's arsenal.

Dick Cheney is not a copy of Adolf Hitler, but he comes directly out of the same background as Mussolini, Hitler, Franco, and their like, from the 1922-45 pages of modern history. He belongs to the same psychopathological stereotype which history traces back to the ancient Phrygian Dionysus from whom the models of the Spanish Grand Inquisitor and the French Jacobin Terror are traced by the leading intellectual

founder of all modern fascist movements—the chief intellect of the modern fascist tradition, Joseph de Maistre. The Cheney-Strauss-Nazi connections to Maistre are clear, and crucial for understanding the Nazi-like global menace which Cheney, as a sitting U.S. Vice President, typifies for the world today,

In his extensive correspondence with his longtime intellectual ally, Alexandre Kojève, the Paris-based Russian emigré, Strauss jostled with Kojève over the issue of whether a national tyranny or a universal tyranny were superior. Kojève, a lifelong operative of the international Synarchist movement of European-centered fascists, cited the case of Napoleon Bonaparte, and the later cases of Mussolini, Hitler, and Stalin, as proof that a universal—i.e., world government—form of tyranny was possible and desirable.

Kojève aggressively promoted the Nietzschean idea of “Beast-man” as universal tyrant, an idea first spelled out by the 18th- and 19th-century French Martinist cult philosopher Joseph de Maistre, whose writings inspired Napoleon Bonaparte, and later formed the basis for Joseph Alexandre Saint Yves d’Alveydre’s vast writings on Synarchism, the modern form of bankers’ universal fascism.

Maistre was himself a member of the Lyons Martinist lodge of occult Freemasons, along with Fabre D’Olivet, Saint Yves’ other sources of inspiration (and Maistre’s Martinist followers were leading Jacobins). Maistre was a graphic promoter of the need for “a new inquisition,” modelled on the Grand Inquisitor of Spain.

Maistre was obsessed with the personality of the executioner, writing, “All grandeur, all power, all subordination to authority rests on the executioner; he is the horror and the bond of human association. Remove this incomprehensible agent from the world, and at that very moment, order gives way to chaos; thrones topple and society disappears.”

Cheney, Fascism, and the Inquisition

As Presidential candidate Lyndon LaRouche has emphasized that often-overlooked, crucial fact of modern history, the French Revolution of 1789-1815 had been pre-organized by Lord Shelburne’s financier interests, the imperial British East

India Company, as part of Shelburne's avowed determination, from 1763 on, to crush the independence of the English-speaking colonies of North America, and to destroy the British Empire's leading rival in Europe, namely, France. The victory of the American cause at Yorktown had therefore driven Shelburne and his circles into a frenzy of lust for destruction in all directions.

For this purpose, Shelburne had built up a network of British East India Company assets in France and Switzerland, of which the most important was the synthetic freemasonic cult known as the Martinists, centered around Lyons, France. It was these Martinists who developed the Beast-man model around which both the Jacobin Terror and Napoleon's subsequent tyranny were crafted. This was the model used by Jeremy Bentham's chief protégé and successor, Lord Palmerston, for creating the Giuseppe Mazzini-led Young Europe and Young America networks around the British intelligence assets he and the British Library's David Urquhart shared.

This was the model which produced the Synarchist International's wave of fascist tyrannies of the 1922-45 interval. The Hitler regime typifies nothing other than the "Beast-man" concept of Martinist ideologue Joseph de Maistre, and of such Maistre followers as Friedrich Nietzsche and Hannah Arendt's beloved Nazi philosopher, Martin Heidegger. However, as Maistre himself insisted, he did not invent that concept of the Jacobin, Napoleonic, and Hitler models of the Beast-man as dictator. As he insisted, his proximate model for what we have come to know as the Nazi and Nazi-like model echoed by Vice President Cheney today, was the Spanish Grand Inquisitor.

This role of the Spanish Inquisition, and its continuing ideological tradition via Franco's Spain, is of crucial significance for the endangered security of the American continents today. The most deadly threat to the internal security of South and Central America, still today, as during the late 1930s and early 1940s of the Nazi-backed Synarchist penetration there, via Franco's Spain, is the recently reactivated network of Spain-linked, self-styled right-wing, pro-aristocratic religious fanatics in Central and South America.

Therefore, the role of Maistre's model of the Grand Inquisitor as the model for what became Hitler, is no mere literary-historical curiosity. It is of crucial practical importance for security

concerns today. The abuse of the nations and peoples of South and Central America, chiefly by the U.S. and Britain, since, especially, 1982, has built up an accumulation of both left- and right-wing revivals of, ironically, often U.S.-backed Synarchist hatred against the U.S., which has turned those looted parts of the hemisphere into a hotbed of potential we dare not ignore. The right-wing admirers of the tradition of the Spanish Inquisition are, ultimately, the great source of internal danger to the Americas as a whole, from this quarter. The left-wing varieties are, like British agents Danton and Marat, and also the Jacobin Terrorists, the political cannon-fodder fertilizing the ground for the coming of a reactionary Synarchist tyrant like Napoleon or Hitler.

The relevance of that Spanish Inquisition which conducted the Hitler-like expulsion of the Jews of Spain in 1492, is, briefly, as follows.

From about the 10th century A.D., until the aftermath of the mid-14th-century New Dark Age, Europe and adjoining regions of the world had been dominated increasingly by a symbiosis of the Norman chivalry with the growing imperial maritime power of Venice's financier oligarchy. The 15th-century Renaissance, which revived Classical European civilization, restored a shattered Christianity, and launched the first modern nation-states, in France and England, was a great threat to the Venice-Norman feudal tradition. The Spanish Inquisition was a leading element of the forces mustered by Venice's financier oligarchy to unleash the successive waves of religious warfare which dominated Europe from about A.D. 1511, until the 1648 Treaty of Westphalia.

With the decline of Venice's secular power, during the late 17th century, the formerly Venice-centered financier oligarchy shifted its bases of international operations to the Netherlands and England, where the Anglo-Dutch imperial maritime power was built up around the Dutch and British East India companies, to emerge as the dominant force in Europe. To preserve that emerging imperial power, the forces typified by Lord Shelburne mobilized to crush the threat represented by the emerging tendency for establishment of a true republic from among the English-speaking colonies of North America.

Then, just as the Venetian oligarchical interest had unleashed the religious warfare of 1511-1648, in the effort to turn back the clock of history to 14th-century feudalism, so the financier-

oligarchical architects of the British East India Company's imperial maritime power, looked back to the Spanish Inquisition-led religious warfare of the 1511-1648 interval, for a design to be used to crush the emerging Classical humanist republicanism of the late 18th century. Maistre's prolific references to the model of the Spanish Inquisition are not to be discounted as merely literary, but, rather, represent a resurgence of a tradition of the Inquisition which had not actually died out, then, or even today. Tom DeLay is an ironical example of this unbroken connection to the present time.

So, to the present day, the hallmark of the Synarchist is often his or her hatred of the actual history of the United States, especially among those influenced by the Spanish-speaking branch of the de Maistre tradition. The argument that the existence of the U.S. was nothing but a mistake, or even an evil from the beginning, is typical of the "aristocratic" Spanish-speaking pro-fascist fanatic of this type.

That admiration of the tradition of the Spanish Inquisition, combined with explicitly anti-Semitic defense of Isabella's expulsion of the Jews, is the leading edge of the fascist (Synarchist) threat from within the Americas today. Cheney is no Christian in fact, but the character of his role over the recent several decades is fully in accord with the doctrine according to de Maistre.

In that context, we must recognize the deeper implications of Dick Cheney's incantations. We must understand, thus, how the very fabric of the social order came apart on 9/11, and the significance of Cheney's repeated lies about Saddam Hussein's weapons of mass destruction and links to Osama bin Laden, which have, on occasion, forced even President Bush to issue correctives, are right out of the pages of de Maistre and Saint Yves. Vice President Cheney didn't just come upon this approach to politics by happenstance. He was placed under the wings of two of the leading Strauss cultists back in the early 1970s, when he first came to Washington and was adopted by Donald Rumsfeld.

The Goldwin Case, for Example

According to a little-known, but quite revealing 2002 book, *Intellectuals and the American Presidency*, by Tevi Troy, during

the early 1970s, both Rumsfeld and Cheney came under the sway of leading Strauss protégé Robert Goldwin. Goldwin got his Ph.D. in political science under Strauss at the University of Chicago in 1963, and remained at Chicago as director of the Public Affairs Conference Center, a program through which the Straussians spread their net into the business and political communities. At one Center seminar, Goldwin met two Midwest Republican Congressmen, Gerald Ford (Michigan) and Donald Rumsfeld (Illinois). Goldwin and Rumsfeld struck up a friendship, which continued even when Goldwin left Chicago to become Dean at his undergraduate alma mater, St. John's College in Annapolis, Md. Goldwin brought Strauss to St. John's as a resident scholar from 1969-1973, allowing Strauss to spend his final years near the Washington, D.C. center of political power.

In 1973, Goldwin became Rumsfeld's deputy when the Congressman accepted Richard Nixon's appointment as U.S. Ambassador to NATO. When Gerald Ford became President, after Nixon's resignation, Rumsfeld, and his protégé Dick Cheney, came to the White House as chief of staff and deputy. Goldwin also came to the White House as a special consultant to the President.

According to extensive records at the Gerald Ford Presidential Library, reviewed by Troy, Goldwin's first assignment was to organize a small White House seminar for Ford and senior staff. The guest scholar for the kickoff seminar was Irving Kristol, the former Trotskyist, who had become one of the neo-conservative movement's founding fathers, and a close collaborator of Leo Strauss. Kristol and Goldwin both became White House fixtures under Ford; and Cheney, according to a string of memoranda and letters, became particularly enamored of Kristol, bringing him in on speech-writing and other policy tasks. When Rumsfeld was named to replace James Schlesinger as Secretary of Defense, Cheney stepped up to the post of White House Chief of Staff, and the love affair with Kristol and Goldwin blossomed even further.

Goldwin left the White House in October 1976, but did not return to academia. Instead, following Kristol's lead, he became director of seminars and senior fellow at the American Enterprise Institute. Goldwin's move was part of a Kristol-devised scheme to use a group of right-wing foundations, led by the Mellon-Scaife, Smith-Richardson (the sponsor of Dennis King's

ravings), and Eli Lilly endowments, to establish a neo-conservative beach-head inside the Washington Beltway. Upon Goldwin's arrival, AEI was rather rapidly transformed, from a traditional conservative outfit, to a hotbed of neo-con insurgency, paving the way for the later arrival of such Kristol and Strauss protégés as Perle, Michael Ledeen, William Kristol—and Lynne and Dick Cheney.

2. An Empire of Blood and Steal

Cheney has cast himself in de Maistre models as the Spanish Grand Inquisitor and Hitler, but he often stops on the way to the assassinations, to pick up more than a bit of cash.

Cheney's early pedigree as a Straussian "gentleman," the politician who places himself, willingly, in the hands of a behind-the-scenes cabal of imperial "philosophers," was still evident when he left the U.S. Congress in 1989, to become the Secretary of Defense in the "Bush 41" Cabinet. Cheney staffed his policy office with a team of Straussian intellectuals, headed by Allan Bloom protégé Paul Wolfowitz, Wolfowitz's understudy "Scooter" Libby, and University of Chicago-trained utopian Zalmay Khalilzad. These men, along with foreign-service careerist Eric Edelman, formed an in-house thinktank, charged with deliberating on "big picture" issues, like American defense and national security policy in the post-Cold War era.

In May 1990, Cheney staged a competitive policy debate between the Wolfowitz team and a rival group, led by Joint Chiefs of Staff chairman Gen. Colin Powell. President Bush's choice of Powell as JCS chairman had badly rattled Cheney, who was not even consulted by the President before the choice was made; and Cheney's personal animus against Powell, which persists to the present day, dates at least back to that experience.

The subject of the "Team A/Team B" debate was the future U.S. national security doctrine for the post-Soviet era. Wolfowitz, according to published accounts, dominated the discussion (Powell never even got to deliver his alternative vision until several months later, long after Cheney had wholesale bought into the Wolfowitz strategy), setting out a neo-imperial mission for the United States, premised on the idea that no nation or combination of nations would be allowed to match American economic, military, or political power, for decades to come.

To assure American primacy, Wolfowitz, sometime Marc Rich lawyer Libby, Khalilzad, and Edelman argued that the United States should adopt a doctrine of preventive war. The corollary to the preventive-war theme was that the U.S.A. should develop a new generation of mini-nuclear weapons, which could be integrated into the conventional military arsenal—to terrorize any potential future rivals into submission.

The Wolfowitz presentation to Cheney occurred in May 1990—three months before Iraqi tanks rolled into Kuwait. At the time, Saddam Hussein was still an “American asset,” who had received vast quantities of U.S. chemical weapons and other “weapons of mass destruction,” during the eight-year Iran-Iraq war. Nevertheless, policy papers were already crossing Secretary of Defense Cheney’s desk, promoting the development and use of mini-nukes, to counter “Third World dictators” seeking WMD. Saddam Hussein’s name was already on top of the list of despots, to be possible targets for U.S. preventive war, and American first use of mini-nukes.

Cheney had emerged as the Bush 41 Administration’s very own “Colonel Blimp,” promoting preventive wars, nuclear first strikes, and an American 1,000-year imperium.

Cooler heads, including President George H.W. Bush. Sr., National Security Adviser Scowcroft, Secretary of State Baker, and JCS chairman Powell, prevailed at that time. When Cheney, Wolfowitz, et al. tried to codify their American imperial wet-dream in the 1992 Defense Planning Guidance, the draft was leaked to the *New York Times*, and sent back to Cheney’s office for rewrite. Despite the setback, Cheney got in the final word—after Bush, Sr. lost his reelection bid. In January 1993, on the way out the door, “Beast-man” Cheney published *Defense Strategy for the 1990s: The Regional Defense Strategy*, in which both the preventive-war and mini-nuke policies were put on the record.

The Spoils of Cheney’s Future Wars

Once again, on the way to all that killing, Secretary of Defense Dick Cheney had set in motion another piece of the imperial agenda—one that he would parlay into a personal fortune, while opening up U.S. taxpayer dollars to looting by a cartel of military-industrial complex giants.

In 1991-92, Cheney hired the Texas oil industry service company Halliburton to conduct a secret study of how the Pentagon could outsource essential logistical functions to private corporations. At that time, Cheney was cutting the size of the U.S. military by a half-million men and women. The two actions, taken together, represented a dramatic transformation of the U.S. armed forces, from an organization based on military logistics-in-depth, to a "professional" quasi-mercenary force, restructured to pursue the imperial agenda of Third World raw-materials looting and neo-colonial occupation. The outsourcing scheme was the third rail of the new Cheney-Wolfowitz-Libby "preventive nuclear war" doctrine.

Halliburton received at least \$8.9 million for the privatization scheme (some accounts place the Pentagon secret payout at closer to \$25 million), and also received a vital infusion of Pentagon cash, through contracts to rebuild some of the oil facilities in Kuwait and Iraq that had been destroyed in the just-concluded "Operation Desert Storm."

In 1995, an indiscreet interval of two years after Cheney left his post as Secretary of Defense, he became Halliburton's chief executive officer. Armed with the secret privatization study he himself had commissioned from the Texas company, Cheney oversaw Halliburton's transformation into a Pentagon subcontracting shop. This was the arrangement he enthusiastically continued to promote, once he was sworn in as Vice President. During his 1995-2000 tenure as Halliburton CEO, the company had doubled its government contracting work, and Cheney had greatly increased his personal future thereby.

Today, Halliburton is, not so remarkably, the largest private-sector subcontractor for the U.S. occupation of Iraq. One contract, with the Pentagon's Logistics Civil Augmentation Program (LOGCAP), the agency that grew out of the original Cheney-Halliburton outsourcing study, is for \$8.6 billion: to provide food services and other logistical support to the American troops in Iraq.

That contract is now under scrutiny by the Defense Contract Audit Agency (DCAA), which has found that the food services, provided by Halliburton's Kellogg Brown and Root (KBR) subsidiary, are a scandal. According to a report on NBC Nightly News on Dec. 12, 2003, inspections of the KBR-operated kitchens at U.S. military bases in Baghdad and Tikrit, conducted in August, September, and October, found "blood all over the floor

... dirty pans ... dirty salad bars ... rotting meats ... and vegetables.” Halliburton charges \$28 per meal, per soldier, for a total of over \$9 million per day. On top of those charges, Halliburton has billed U.S. taxpayers \$220 million in cafeteria service charges—at a cool \$67 million net profit.

The second Halliburton contact in Iraq, for \$7 billion, involved “continuity of operations” and rebuilding of Iraq’s oil infrastructure. The initial contract was given to Halliburton in December 2001—some 15 months before the U.S. invasion—and was expanded on Nov. 11, 2002, and again on March 8, 2003, on the eve of the war. This open-ended contract was given to Halliburton without any competitive bidding.

Pentagon sources report that, under this string of contracts, Halliburton personnel were integrated into the U.S. invasion plans. In fact, Halliburton “fire fighters” were brought into Iraq, with U.S. Special Forces teams, days before the bombing and invasion began, on March 20, 2003—to prevent sabotage of the oil fields. Halliburton is also under public and Congressional scrutiny for overcharging an estimated \$61 million for delivery of gasoline to Iraq since the U.S. occupation phase began. At one point, Halliburton was billing Uncle Sam \$3.06 per gallon, for gasoline trucked in from Kuwait. At that time, according to records obtained by Rep. Henry Waxman (D-Calif), the wholesale price for gasoline in the Persian Gulf region was 71 cents per gallon!

And the French daily *Le Figaro* reported, on Dec. 22, 2003, that a French judge is considering indictments against Halliburton for a massive bribery and kickback scheme in Nigeria, which aimed at a monopoly on liquid natural gas production in that African country. The events under investigation occurred when Dick Cheney was CEO, and French sources report that Cheney’s signature is found on some of the key documents driving the French investigation.

Is It Cheney’s Money, or Yours?

As a result of U.S. government largesse, Halliburton’s stock values have soared since the outbreak of the Iraq war. In March, as a result of credible rumors that Halliburton might be forced into bankruptcy reorganization, due to more than \$3 billion in outstanding asbestos-suit liabilities involving subsidiary

Dresser Industries, share prices had fallen to \$7 a share. As of December 2003, Halliburton's stock price had jumped to nearly \$25 a share.

And Dick Cheney promises to be one of the biggest beneficiaries, personally, of this remarkable turnaround.

While the Vice President claimed, as recently as Sept. 14, 2003, in an interview on NBC's Meet the Press, that he had severed all ties to Halliburton upon being sworn into office in January 2001, a Sept. 25, 2003 Congressional Research Service study, released by Sen. Frank Lautenberg (D-NJ), found that Cheney was still actively linked to the Texas firm.

Cheney receives well over \$100,000 a year in deferred salary from Halliburton, and holds 433,333 unexercised company stock options. The CRS study was blunt, finding that a deferred salary "is not a retirement benefit or a payment from a third-party escrow account, but rather an ongoing corporate obligation paid from company funds. If a company were to go under, the beneficiary could lose the deferred salary." As far as the stock options go, Cheney has pledged to turn over all profits to an unnamed charity. But, the CRS report cautioned, "Should Halliburton's stock price increase over the next few years, the Vice President could exercise his stock options for a substantial profit, benefitting not only his designated charities, but also providing Halliburton with a substantial tax deduction."

There is some speculation that one of the "charities" designated by Cheney to benefit from his corporate profits is the 501(c)3 tax-exempt American Enterprise Institute, where wife Lynne Cheney is a senior fellow. According to a source who has reviewed AEI's IRS 1990 financial filings, Lynne Cheney's chair at AEI is financed by an undisclosed private donor.

The Cheney-Shultz Axis

Not only have Dick Cheney and his Halliburton corporate cronies profiteered from the needless suffering of American GIs in Iraq, who have been deprived of basic services previously provided far more efficiently by military logistics commands. Hundreds of Americans have died, and thousands have suffered life-altering injuries in Iraq, in a war and postwar occupation that was engineered by Cheney and his neo-con allies, through lies and scare-mongering.

Sources with intimate access to the Bush campaign operations from prior to the November 2000 election, confirm that the actual decision to go to war against Iraq had been set, in the minds of several key future Bush Administration officials, during the formative days of the 2000 campaign—nearly two years before election day! So much for the story that it all began with 9/11.

The two architects of the Bush for President effort had been former Reagan Secretary of State and top Bechtel Corporation executive George Shultz and Dick Cheney. Shultz was chairman of the policy advisory group to the George W. Bush exploratory committee, and, in that capacity, was the person who brought Paul Wolfowitz, Richard Perle, and Robert Blackwill together to Austin, Texas in early 1999, to begin the indoctrination of the then-Texas Governor.

According to several eyewitnesses, Bush was told, in no uncertain terms, that the most pressing foreign-policy issue he would face, the day he was sworn in, was the removal of Saddam Hussein from power in Baghdad. The Israel-Palestine issue, he was schooled, could not be permitted to interfere with regime change in Iraq.

“Israel-Palestine was placed on the back burner, really, in the deep freeze,” said one source privy to the early Austin prep-sessions.

Wolfowitz, the head of former Defense Secretary Cheney’s Pentagon brain-trust, and now one of the leading figures in the “Vulcan” team of Bush campaign policy advisers, was the most ardent “Get Saddam” crusader, seconded by Richard Perle, who had already devised a radical overhaul of Mideast policy—in a July 1996 paper prepared for then-incoming Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu.

The Perle document, “A Clean Break,” was co-authored by Douglas Feith, David Wurmser, Meyrav Wurmser, Charles Fairbanks (Paul Wolfowitz’s former college roommate and close confidant), and several others. It called for the military overthrow of Saddam Hussein, as the opening shot in a thorough overhaul of the Middle East, rapidly leading to regime change in Syria, Lebanon, Iran, Saudi Arabia, and Egypt. Ultimately, the entire Persian Gulf and Mideast region was to be controlled by a new balance-of-power arrangement, in which the United States aligned, unambiguously, with Israel, and drew upon Turkey and Jordan as window-dressing allies, to

conceal the dramatic tilt towards a Washington-Israel military axis, maintaining a lock on the region's oil flows.

At the same time that former Secretary of State George Shultz of Azores Conference notoriety and Bechtel associations, was chosen to assemble the "Vulcans," Dick Cheney was selected to head up the search committee for a viable Vice Presidential running mate for Bush, Jr. He miraculously chose himself.

In Washington, following the tumultuous November 2000 election, Vice President Cheney established a "shadow national security council" in his Old Executive Office Building headquarters, with tentacles into the Pentagon, the State Department, and the NSC. His former Pentagon "think team" member Lewis Libby took charge of the shadow NSC unit; Eric Edelman, another Wolfowitz team veteran, now the Ambassador-nominee to Turkey, joined, along with Washington Institute for Near East Policy (WINEP) right-wing Zionist John Hannah.

In a Nov. 13, 2003 Nightline interview with Ted Koppel, former Clinton Administration NSC official Ivo Daalder described the Cheney shadow NSC: "They write their own analysis. They do their own briefing papers. They are putting together their own views of what the policy should be for the Vice President. So that what you have is that inside the White House, you have two sets of staffs and two sets of option papers, and two sets of briefing papers, ultimately, for a decision that is going to be made by one person, the President of the United States."

Koppel added, "As one former top official in the Bush Administration told me, Cheney gets two whacks at every issue. He's in the interagency meetings where policy is considered. And then, he is usually the last person to talk to the President privately before a decision is made."

Newsweek reported, in a Nov. 17, 2003 cover story, that Cheney has a one-on-one lunch meeting with President Bush every Thursday. The contents of the meetings are a tightly guarded secret, shared only by the two men.

Captain Luti and His Horse Marines

According to legend, he would have "fed his horse on corn and beans," but members of Cheney's crew prefer something a little more expensive.

Documents released under a Freedom of Information Act lawsuit which was filed by Judicial Watch against Vice President Cheney's energy task force, confirm that, prior to 9/11, Team Cheney was hard at work preparing for the occupation of Iraq and the seizure of the country's oil reserves.

Within days of the Sept. 11, 2001 attacks on New York and Washington, Deputy Defense Secretary Wolfowitz was already pitching for a war on Iraq, at a gathering of national security aides with President Bush at Camp David.

The Wolfowitz proposal was rejected by George W. Bush, but several days later, the President quietly signed an intelligence finding, authorizing the escalation of covert operations, aimed at regime change in Baghdad.

In early 2002, shortly after combat operations were launched in Afghanistan, Vice President Cheney dispatched one of his Middle East aides, retired Navy Captain William Luti, to the Pentagon. The seemingly insignificant personnel shift was, in fact, the beginning of Cheney's launching of an effort that would go far beyond the excesses of Oliver North's now-infamous Iran-Contra "secret parallel government" scheme.

Luti was described by one foreign military attaché who has had close dealings with him, as "someone who reminded me of a serial killer from a Grade-B Hollywood horror flick."

Luti had been Speaker of the House Newt Gingrich's military aide. He had received a degree from the neo-con haven, the Fletcher School of Diplomacy, at Tufts University in Boston, where he had struck up a close friendship with Chris Lehman, brother of Reagan Navy Secretary John Lehman. According to a recent Washington Post profile, Luti had been introduced to RAND Corporation and University of Chicago utopian war-planner Albert Wohlstetter, who had, in turn, opened up the doors to the entire Washington neo-con scene.

Learning the lessons of the Iran-Contra fiasco, Vice President Cheney was determined to create a quiet corner from which to run the Iraq war propaganda drive—far away from the White House/Old Executive Office Building center of attention.

Luti became Deputy Under Secretary of Defense for Near East and South Asia (NESA), heading a policy shop that normally handled liaison missions with foreign military services. Luti reported up the Pentagon chain of command to Under Secretary of Defense for Policy Doug Feith, the rabidly Jabotin-

skyite Zionist, who had been one of Perle's co-authors on the "Clean Break" project.

Ultimately, however, Luti reported directly to Dick Cheney, via the Veep's chief of staff (and, ominously, chief national security aide) "Scooter" Libby.

Libby had come to Washington in the Reagan Administration as State Department aide to Paul Wolfowitz, his Yale Law School professor and mentor. Libby's other career track was as a Washington, D.C. power-alley lawyer, protégé of another GOP powerhouse, former Nixon personal attorney Leonard Garment. As Garment's junior partner at the D.C. firm of Dickstein Shapiro, Libby had handled the account of fugitive fraudster and Israeli/Russian Mafiya bigwig Marc Rich.

Israeli law enforcement officials with years of experience battling the Israeli/Russian Mafiya have confirmed that it is impossible to separate Marc Rich's Swiss-based metal-trading and speculative empire from Russian organized crime, and from corrupt elements of the Mossad. The head of Rich's Israel foundation is a former top Mossad official. One senior U.S. military intelligence veteran with hands-on experience in Israel, is convinced that Rich's so-called "private" financial apparatus is actually a covert arm of Israeli intelligence, and that Rich's fortune was built upon Israeli government seed money, and nurtured through Israeli government connections.

Lt. Col. Karen Kwiatkowski (USAF-ret.), who served for eight months under Luti at the NESA shop, confirmed that Luti made no secret of the fact that he was being tasked by "Scooter." On at least one occasion at a staff meeting, Luti made extremely deprecating remarks about his ostensible boss, Under Secretary Feith, further underscoring that his actual boss was Vice President Cheney.

Immediately after 9/11, even before Luti's arrival at the Pentagon, Wolfowitz and Feith had created a "Team B" unit, to "cherry pick" bits of intelligence from the massive CIA, NSA, DIA, and State Department data base, to make the case for war against Iraq. That initial two-man unit involved "Clean Break" co-author David Wurmser and Michael Maloof, a longtime Richard Perle underling who had been in the Reagan Pentagon. Wurmser later was transferred to the State Department, as deputy to resident neo-con John Bolton, the Department's top arms-control negotiator, who had been planted on Secretary of

State Colin Powell's staff at Cheney's instigation. In September 2003, Wurmser was brought into Cheney's office as a top Middle East policy aide—just in time for the launching of the drive for a war against Syria.

After the CIA had thoroughly discredited the Niger-Iraq uranium fib (and had even prevented any mention of Saddam's quest for nuclear bomb material in Africa, in an October 2002 speech by President Bush in Cincinnati, Ohio), a Dec. 19, 2002 State Department "fact sheet" on Saddam Hussein's purported continuing concealment of his WMD program repeated the same Iraq-Niger uranium charges. State Department sources confirm that the disinformation sheet was the work of Bolton and Wurmser.

During summer 2002, Vice President Cheney launched the countdown for war with Iraq, in an August speech before the Veterans of Foreign Wars convention in Nashville, Tenn. Simultaneously, Luti vastly expanded the Iraq desk at his NESAs policy shop into the Office of Special Plans, headed by Abram Shulsky, a Leo Strauss student and protégé of Iran-Contra figure Roy Godson.

Under Luti and Shulsky, this OSP brought on a large number of "personal service contract" consultants, almost all drawn from AEI and allied neo-con citadels. According to sources familiar with the unit, at the height of the preparations for the Iraq war, OSP had as many as 100 contract employees engaging in a range of activities—some of which crossed the line from rogue intelligence-gathering and amateur postwar planning, to illegal covert operations.

Already, in December 2001, NESAs Iran desk officers Larry Franklin and Harold Rhode had held at least one secret meeting, in Rome, Italy, with Iranian arms dealer Manucher Ghorbanifar, another pivotal player in the Iran-Contra fiasco. In a recent interview with *Newsweek*, Ghorbanifar confirmed that the purpose of the meeting was not to swap intelligence, but to discuss "regime change" in Tehran, through a U.S.-backed covert operation. While Pentagon officials denied that the U.S. government was pursuing ties to Ghorbanifar to overthrow the ayatollahs in Iran, the fact was that contact with the widely discredited Iranian continued up through the summer of 2003, at times involving five to six phone discussions and fax exchanges per week.

Director of Central Intelligence George Tenet has told members of the House and Senate intelligence committees that he believes that the OSP engaged in illegal covert operations, without first receiving Presidential authorization.

The Ghorbanifar caper was but one example of such covert operations that went far beyond the already criminal effort to start a string of Mideast wars on the basis of disinformation.

The MEK Caper

Another element of the schemes of the Cheney/OSP apparatus, targeting Iran, involved attempts by the neo-con propagandists to promote the Mujahideen-e Khalq (MEK), an Iraqi-based Iranian organization on the U.S. State Department's list of Foreign Terrorist Organizations. On May 20, 2003, Daniel Pipes, head of the Middle East Forum, a right-wing Zionist thinktank in Philadelphia, and Patrick Clawson, of the Washington Institute for Near East Policy (WINEP), co-authored an op ed, calling on the Pentagon to back the MEK in covert operations inside Iranian territory, to remove the group from the State Department list, and openly meet with the group's leaders, to deliver a direct threat to the mullahs in Tehran.

The MEK had been responsible, in its formative years, for the assassination of a half-dozen U.S. military advisers to the Shah of Iran, had been part of the initial Khomeini revolution in 1979, and had only later fled to Iraq. After the break with the Islamic Republic, the MEK became a surrogate military arm of Saddam Hussein, carrying out brutal attacks against Kurds inside northern Iraq, and engaging in heavy combat with Iranian forces during the 1980-88 Iran-Iraq war.

Despite this checkered past, and continuing terrorist activities, the MEK enjoyed backing from such leading U.S. neo-conservatives as Sen. Sam Brownback (R-Kans), and former Sen. John Ashcroft (R-Mo), the Bush Administration Attorney General. Clawson, a regular fixture at AEI, was a WINEP intimate of John Hannah, the chief Middle East aide to Vice President Cheney. Despite broad-based Congressional opposition and howls of protest from the Arab-American community, Daniel Pipes was appointed by President Bush to the board of the Institute for Peace, a Washington-based government-funded

“quango” (quasi-autonomous non-governmental organization). When it was clear that Pipes’ nomination would be shot down by the Senate, the President waited until a Congressional recess to give him a recess appointment, which carries through to the end of the current Congressional session—that is, January 2005.

Ultimately, to cut off the neo-con/MEK collusion, Secretary of State Colin Powell ordered the shutdown of the MEK support offices in the United States, and the French authorities carried out a massive raid on the group’s Paris international headquarters, arresting most of the top leadership.

In response, Defense Policy Board member and leading Cheney ally Newt Gingrich launched a high-profile personal attack on Powell, which forced White House chief political strategist Karl Rove to personally intervene to silence Gingrich.

The Case of Bernard Lewis’s Mole

The role of the already-mentioned Harold Rhode deserves further note, in this context. Rhode has been identified as Paul Wolfowitz’s personal confidant on the Islamic world. Self-professed “universal fascist” and Iran-Contra culprit Michael Ledeen described Rhode in a recent book as his 20-year mentor on Middle East policy. Dr. Bernard Lewis, the British intelligence “Arab Bureau” spook who is the actual author of the “clash of civilizations” war on Islam, dedicated one recent book to Rhode.

At the start of the Bush 43 Administration, Rhode was posted at the Office of Net Assessments, under Dr. Andrew Marshall. But he was transferred, following 9/11, to Luti’s office, and served as one of the key liaisons to Ahmed Chalabi and the Iraqi National Congress, the neo-con-promoted network of London-based exiles, who fed a constant stream of disinformation into the OSP, in the run-up to the Iraq invasion. It was Chalabi’s INC that assured Vice President Cheney that the American forces would be greeted by Iraqis as “liberators,” and that the invasion and postwar occupation would be a “cakewalk.”

Curiously, on Sept. 23, 2002—the day before British Prime Minister Tony Blair issued his now-infamous, thoroughly discredited “White Paper” on Iraq’s WMD program, Rhode was

at the English countryside estate of Lord Jacob Rothschild, delivering a closed-door briefing to a collection of 50 top Anglo-American financiers on the looming U.S. invasion of Iraq, and the planned follow-on wars against Syria and Iran. Among the participants, along with Lord Jacob: American multibillionaire speculator Warren Buffett, and Arnold Schwarzenegger, the millionaire Hollywood actor-turned-Governor of California.

More Regime-Change Schemes

Another prime regime-change target of Team Cheney was, and remains, Syria/Lebanon. But a monkey-wrench was thrown into the Cheney/OSP schemes on Jan. 28, 2003, when a Lebanese-American arms dealer and wannabe “liberator of Beirut” with close ties to the OSP, was arrested at Dulles International Airport in Virginia. Emad El-Hage was detained when his suitcase was searched, and a .45 caliber gun and four stun-guns were found among his belongings. He had not declared the weapons with U.S. Customs officials. El-Hage has been linked to recently deposed Liberian dictator Charles Taylor, who was a pivotal figure in the African arms-for-diamonds trade, which included deals with al-Qaeda. In the whacky world of African “blood diamonds,” nothing is too hard to believe. In addition to El-Hage, al-Qaeda, and top Israeli diamond smugglers, Taylor had been a longtime business partner of U.S. “Christian Zionist” televangelist Pat Robertson.

El-Hage was allowed to travel to Beirut after several hours’ detention at Dulles Airport, but a criminal investigation was opened, leading to a sealed indictment in March 2003 on illegal weapons possession. According to law enforcement and intelligence sources, the investigation revealed that the gun had been provided to El-Hage by OSP staffer Michael Maloof. Maloof had his security clearances stripped around the time of the El-Hage sealed indictment; however, intelligence sources report that Maloof is being probed on suspicion that he leaked details of the U.S. Iraq invasion plans to Israel; not just the Dulles gun incident. According to one Knight Ridder account by Warren Strobel, Doug Feith and Richard Perle both intervened, unsuccessfully, to have Maloof’s clearances restored.

Maloof, El-Hage, former Lebanese President Gen. Michele

Aoun, Ledeen, and other members of the Cheney/OSP network, are believed to be involved in covert operations aimed at provoking a confrontation with Syria over the occupation of Lebanon. General Aoun has been brought to Washington on several occasions by the Hudson Institute's Middle East program, headed by "Clean Break" co-author Meyrav Wurmser, the wife of David Wurmser, now of Vice President Cheney's staff. In September 2003, shortly after David Wurmser's transfer to Cheney's staff, the Bush Administration, in a policy about-face pushed through by the Veep, embraced the Syria Accountability and Lebanese Restoration of Sovereignty Act, a bill promoted by the "right-wing Zionist" lobby in Congress, but previously blocked by the White House from being voted on, on the floors of Congress.

The Case of The D.C.-Tel Aviv Axis

In December 2003, the prestigious Jaffee Center for Strategic Studies at Tel Aviv University, published a paper by retired Israeli General Shlomo Brom, in which the former deputy director of operations for the Israeli Defense Force accused the Sharon government of abetting the Bush Administration and the Blair government in fabricating intelligence about Iraq's weapons of mass destruction, to justify the invasion.

The Brom exposé placed a fresh spotlight on the fact that, following 9/11, a parallel unit to Cheney's OSP had been created by Israeli Prime Minister Ariel Sharon, to funnel unvetted and wildly exaggerated "intelligence" to the U.S. to abet the Washington neo-con war party.

While both Israeli and American officials deny the existence of the U.S.-Israel intelligence backchannel, a few key pieces of evidence have surfaced, lending credibility to the charges. On June 29, 2002, the *Washington Times* reported that two top Israeli officials, Interior Minister Uzi Landau and Brig. Gen. David Tzur, had come to Washington, to confer with Under Secretary of Defense Feith, about establishing a permanent joint counter-terror unit. The scheme, the *Washington Times* boasted, had the enthusiastic backing of Rep. Tom DeLay (R-Texas).

Lt. Col. Kwiatkowski, who was cited above, reported that in

November or December 2002, she escorted another delegation of top Israeli military officials to private meetings in Feith's office. She noted that the Israelis knew precisely how to get from the Pentagon entrance to Feith's office suite, and one member of the group actually barged into Feith's private office. The delegation was specifically waved off from signing the guest register in Feith's office, even through new regulations, post-9/11, had made such sign-in mandatory.

She also reported that, when she arrived at the NESA office in the late spring of 2002, there were reports circulating among staffers that the unit was under investigation for passing classified material on to Israel. Three other high-ranking former U.S. intelligence officials confirmed this report.

The Jaffee Center report by retired General Brom triggered a flurry of revelations inside Israel about the secret U.S.-Israeli intelligence channel. On Dec. 7, Ha'aretz newspaper published a column by Uzi Benziman, which identified reserve Maj. Gen. Amos Gilad as one of the men most responsible for "shaping intelligence estimates about developments in Iraq."

In fact, there is good reason to suspect that Gen. Gilad is the Israeli equivalent of Bill Luti and Abram Shulsky, the chief of Sharon's own OSP. A longtime Ariel Sharon protégé, he was Defense Minister Sharon's man on the scene at the massacres of Palestinian refugees at the Sabra and Shatila camps in Beirut during Israel's 1982 invasion of Lebanon. Those massacres are still the subject of war-crimes proceedings against Sharon in Belgium.

Upon his retirement from active duty in the IDF at the start of 2003, Gen. Gilad was made the chief of a new Directorate of Political and Security Affairs at the Israeli Ministry of Defense. The post was created for him by Dov Weisglass, Sharon's personal attorney and chief of staff. Gilad is currently the chief political adviser to Defense Minister Shaul Mofaz.

Just prior to retirement from active IDF service, Gen. Gilad's final official posting had been as Coordinator of Israeli Government Activities in the Territories—the pro-consul military boss of the West Bank and Gaza. Gilad oversaw the spring 2002 IDF invasion of the West Bank and the siege of Yasser Arafat's Palestinian Authority Presidential compound in Ramallah, as well as Israel's infamous "preventive assassinations" policy.

While in the Occupied Territories post, Gilad had travelled

to Washington with Gen. Mofaz, delivering wild disinformation reports on Syria, Iraq, Iran, and the Palestinians to Pentagon and White House officials.

Gilad continues to run a shadow intelligence unit out of his current Defense Ministry shop, according to Israeli sources, who also point to his role as liaison between the Sharon government and the Jewish Institute for National Security Affairs (JINSA), the Washington-based Israeli recruitment front, targeting current and retired Pentagon brass and U.S. intelligence officials.

This brings us to the case of Gen. Wayne Downing, who was among the JINSA recruits who played a pivotal role in the Iraqi National Congress disinformation pipeline to the Cheney team inside the Pentagon and the Old Executive Office Building. General Downing, the former head of the Special Operations Command, was Ahmed Chalabi's chief Pentagon booster from the early 1990s inception of the INC. He was and remains an intimate collaborator of Wolfowitz and Perle. Following 9/11, Downing was brought to the White House as Counterterror Czar; however, he quit the post in mid-2002, when his schemes for a Special Forces-led invasion of Iraq were rejected by the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Within months of his resignation, Downing, along with his longtime close collaborator, Iran-Contra CIA figure, Dewey Claridge, were travelling to India, as part of a JINSA-sponsored, joint U.S.-Israeli military delegation.

As the recent Iraq war was unfolding, Downing was in Basra and Baghdad, ostensibly as a "war correspondent" for NBC-TV. But sources familiar with his activities report that he was there in his old capacity as "military advisor" to Chalabi and the INC and its "Free Iraq Force." Today, perennial "bad penny" Downing is running a Counterterrorism Center at West Point. In the low-lying fog of a cold winter night, one might see the ghost of Gen. Douglas MacArthur nailing up a slogan: "so go sadly the glories of our past."

Donoso Cortes's 'Immense Sea of Blood'

Lust for the spilling of human blood is a touchstone of the Synarchist mindset. Take the case of the 19th-century Spanish Catholic counter-revolutionary ideologue, Juan Donoso Cortes (1809-53), who argued that human sacrifice is the most universal of all human institutions.

Whatever his importance in the leadership of the post-1848 reaction in Europe in his lifetime, Donoso Cortes posthumously played a central role in the creation of fascism in Europe in the first half of the 20th century through the work of his admirer Carl Schmitt, the Crown Jurist of the Nazi regime. As early as 1922, at least, Schmitt set out to revive the work of Donoso Cortes as one of three thinkers necessary "For A Political Philosophy of the Counter-Revolution," as Schmitt titled an essay published that year. Schmitt credited Donoso with reaching conclusions more profound than his philosophical predecessor, Synarchist ideologue Joseph de Maistre, the other "thinker," along with the purported father of traditionalism, Louis de Bonald, whom Schmitt identified as key for the counter-revolution.

Schmitt held up Donoso Cortes as the principal "theoretician of dictatorship and decisionism." Spanish fascist legal authorities, who collaborated with Schmitt, used Schmitt's reworking of Donoso Cortes to give legitimacy to Francisco Franco's regime. Indeed, speaking in Franco's Madrid in May 1944, Hitler's Schmitt hailed Donoso Cortes as the Cassandra who had forecast that the whole planet would be submerged in just such a "universal civil war" as was then occurring, if "the discussing class" were left in power. Victory in this civil war requires that Donoso's importance be understood, Schmitt argued.

Man, the Most Despicable of Creatures

Donoso Cortes is most famous for his Jan. 4, 1849 speech before the Spanish parliament in which he cried: "Let us have dictatorship!"

"I say, Gentlemen, that dictatorship, in certain circumstances, in given circumstances, such as those in which we find ourselves, for example, is a legitimate form of government, as good and as profitable as any other, a rational system of government which can be defended in theory as well as in practice," proclaimed Donoso. "So wise are the English" that in England, "dictatorship is not an exception in law, but is part of common law." Dictatorship, indeed, is part of the divine order—God reserves the right to arbitrarily break his own laws, he asserted. Thus, folly awaits "the party which imagines that it can govern with less means of doing so than God, and refuses to use the means of dictatorship, which is sometimes necessary."

Donoso hated humanity. "The meanest reptile which I trample under my feet would seem less despicable to me than Man," Donoso wrote in his philosophical piece, *Essay on Catholicism, Liberalism and Socialism*. "The point of faith which most oppresses and weighs upon my reason is that of the nobility and dignity of the human species; a dignity and nobility which I wish to grasp and understand, and cannot. . . . Before I can believe in the nobleness of this stupid multitude, I must receive the fact as a revelation from God."

A typical fundamentalist, Donoso argued that revealed religion (in his case, the Roman Catholic Church), must impose dictatorship, as human beings are incapable of independent reason. "The doctrinal intolerance of the Church has saved the world from chaos," he wrote, because the moment discussion of the sacred political, domestic, social and religious truths is permitted, "that moment the mind becomes unsettled, being lost between truth and error, and the clear mirror of human reason is obscured."

"Reason has not been given to man to enable him to discover the truth, but only that he might comprehend it when it is explained, and perceive it when it is pointed out to him," he wrote. "The misery of man is so great, and his intellectual indigence so lamentable, that he could not understand the first thing with certainty which he ought to comprehend, if the divine plan permitted that he should discover anything by himself. I would ask, if there exist any man who can exactly define what reason is; or who can tell why he is endowed with it; or in what way it is useful to him, and what are its limits."

'God Told Me To Kill!'

Donoso's view is, in fact, strictly Satanic, for he argues that God granted Man the faculty of free will only to do evil. His liberty is only "to draw evil out of good, disorder out of order, and to disturb, even though it be accidentally, the perfect adjustment with which God has arranged all things. . . . Evil exists, because without it we cannot imagine human liberty. . . . Evil comes from man, and is in man, and, coming from and dwelling in him, there is in it a great agreement, and no contradiction whatever," Donoso argued.

The culmination of Donoso's philosophical treatise, is that "the institution of bloody sacrifices" is "the most universal" of all human dogmas and institutions. The most civilized nations and the most savage tribes believe in "a pure victim offered as a perfect holocaust," he wrote. Without the death penalty, without "the purifying efficacy of blood," all societal bonds would collapse. He even asserted that "the dogma of solidarity" between men is embodied in "the institution of bloody sacrifices"!

Donoso Cortes virtually bathes in blood:

"Since the day of the first effusion of blood, it has never ceased to flow, and it has never been shed in vain. . . . Mankind . . . has always believed these three things with an unconquerable faith: that the effusion of blood is necessary, that there is a manner of shedding blood which is purifying, and another mode which is condemnatory. History clearly attests these truths. It presents to us the narrative of cruel acts, of bloody conquests, of the overthrow and destruction of famous cities, of atrocious murders committed, of pure victims offered on blood-stained altars, of brothers warring against brothers, of the rich oppressing the poor, and of fathers tyrannizing over their children, until the Earth appears to us like an immense sea of blood, which neither the piercing breath of the winds can dry up, nor the scorching rays of the sun can absorb."

—*Gretchen Small*

The Expulsion of the Jews

Illustrative of the character and effects of the expulsion of the Spanish Jews by Ferdinand and Isabella in 1492, at the insistence of the Grand Inquisitor, Tomás de Torquemada, is this citation by American historian William H. Prescott, from a Genoese historian who saw the following with his own eyes:

“No one could behold the sufferings of the Jewish exiles unmoved. A great many perished of hunger, especially those of tender years. Mothers, with scarcely strength to support themselves, carried their famished infants in their arms, and died with them. Many fell victims to the cold, others to intense thirst, while the unaccustomed distresses incident to a sea voyage aggravated their maladies. I will not enlarge on the cruelty and the avarice which they frequently experienced from the masters of the ships, which transported them from Spain. Some were murdered to gratify their cupidity, others forced to sell their children for the expenses of the passage. They arrived in Genoa in crowds, but were not suffered to tarry there long, by reason of the ancient law which interdicted the Jewish traveller from a longer residence than three days. They were allowed, however, to refit their vessels, and to recruit themselves for some days from the fatigues of their voyage. One might have taken them for spectres, so emaciated were they, so cadaverous in their aspect, and with eyes so sunken; they differed in nothing from the dead, except in the power of motion, which indeed they scarcely retained. Many fainted and expired on the mole, which being completely surrounded by the sea, was the only quarter vouchsafed to the wretched emigrants. The infection bred by such a swarm of dead and dying persons was not at once perceived; but, when the winter broke up, ulcers began to make their appearance, and the malady, which lurked for a long time in the city, broke out into the plague in the following year.”

[William J. Prescott, *The Reign of Ferdinand and Isabella*, Part I, Chapter XVII, quoting Senaraga, apud Muratori, *Rerum Ital. Script.*, tom. xxiv, pp. 531, 532.]

Mannikin: The Making of Tom DeLay

by Tony Papert

December 29, 2003

The snakelike cast of Tom DeLay's eyes can be disconcerting, can't it?—Somewhat as though you had pulled open a long-hidden door, only to start at finding a pair of lidless eyes staring directly back into your own. Intently,—but with just what intent?

“Close that door,” you say? “Enough for now.”

Very well,—don't “go there.” But if you don't, remember never to make a judgement of Tom DeLay, since you refuse to look at what he really is. From that point on, anything you may say will only be tossed onto the scrapheap of impotent, self-righteous moralizing, and instantly forgotten.

Our creative genius, the American intelligence agent Edgar Allan Poe, the Poe of “Maelzel's Chess-Player,” and “The Case of Marie Roget,” had quite another approach. Where you find horror here, Poe would walk directly up to, into, and through the horror. For what is horror, after all?—a question which must occur to the reader of Poe's tales. Horror may simply be a representation of the mental barrier which seeks to block your path to a required creative (and loving) insight, somewhat like the wall of fire through which Dante had to pass to enter Paradise.

Viewed in that way, the mummy's mask, glaring at you incomprehensibly, is not in itself the horror, but only a distraction. The real horror is in the question: Just what sort of a creature would choose just that ghoulish mask for its disguise? And just what does it see right now, as it looks out at me from behind it?

Peeking out furtively through the reptilian mask, Poe would

immediately have sensed eyes moist with shame, pain, and confusion. Inside the scarecrow effigy, there huddles the diminutive figure of an abused child, or, more exactly, of a young boy sadistically maltreated by an alcoholic, and almost certainly a bipolar, father, Charles DeLay. Tom and both of his brothers followed Charles DeLay into alcoholism. Tom was already grown up before he learned to control his stuttering by taking a course in auctioneering, but the stuttering would come back whenever he was under emotional pressure.

It is often noted that we make some of life's worst mistakes while still too young to know what we are doing. So it was with the DeLay boys' (and their sister's) choice of father.

Tom DeLay has long made the care and protection of abused children a special cause. His outburst to Washington, D.C., city officials on their alleged mishandling of a child-abuse case in 2000, showed that he regarded himself, now in his 50s, as an abused child still. As paraphrased by an admiring participant, DeLay said that "children are beaten, battered, burned, sodomized and bruised! I would like for us to treat each of you like that, and not respond to you for a while, and see how you feel."

But, this is no "simple" case of bipolar disorder imposed by father on son, so ugly and so commonplace, (even while each particular case is also special and different). The flaws which young Tom DeLay carried within himself from boyhood, later became tools in the hands of psychological technicians, to remold Tom DeLay the "grown-up" Congressman, into the compound creature we see today. Psychological engineering has been at work, analogous to the days-long vivisections, performed without anesthesia, by which H.G. Wells' fictional Dr. Moreau transformed beasts into man-beasts.

The "before," a crippled, but reachable neurotic. The "after," a hopeless manufactured psychotic. The transition, the brainwashing, can be dated approximately to the period 1985-91.

Earlier, when DeLay had served in the Texas state legislature from 1978 to 1984, as one former Texas colleague, Democratic legislator Debra Danburg, says, "When he used to go to the microphone—and he didn't very often—people would start chanting 'De-lay, De-lay,' because we knew it was usually just a waste of time." For, as Peter Perl wrote in the *Washington Post* magazine of May 13, 2001, "DeLay had a reputation in Austin less as a lawmaker than as a partygoer and playboy

known as 'Hot Tub Tom.'" Although married, "he roomed with other fun-loving male legislators at a condo they dubbed 'Macho Manor.'"

Similarly, as a freshman Congressman in Washington in 1985-86, DeLay was considered a lightweight, a joke, and the "roach-exterminator Congressman,"—having earlier run pest-control companies in Texas. He tells that in those years, he used to stay out drinking every night until the bars closed. What a different man, in so many respects, from the Tom DeLay who today glories in the nicknames "the Hammer," "the Exterminator," and "the Meanest Man in Congress."

Credit the change to one of the most secretive and most powerful organizations in Washington, one which flaunts, behind closed doors, its access to the powerful of many countries, while at the same time it lacks officers, organizations, and indeed even a name. Absent a name, it is called by some, the "Fellowship," by others, the "Foundation," but by members, usually the "Family." Only two functions are ever seen above-ground by the public: the National Prayer Breakfasts, and former Watergate figure Chuck Colson and his Prison Fellowship Ministries.

The account of his induction that DeLay himself has allowed to be publicly circulated, describes how he was taken in hand by Rep. Frank Wolf (R-Va), an important "Family" member, in 1985; that Wolf showed DeLay a religious videotape and convinced him of the futility of his life. DeLay says he was soon broken down and weeping.

But because this particular zombie-factory, the "Family," is only the subsidiary of a subsidiary, we must first get a look at the parent company.

Synarchy in America

The "Family" is a tentacle of the Synarchist movement. which was founded by Britain's Lord Shelburne at the time of the American Revolution, both to destroy the United States, and to prevent the propagation of the American idea to Europe and the rest of the globe. The chosen instrument of this movement was, and is, terrorism against the American Intellectual Tradition.

The Spanish Inquisition played and still plays a central role for the Synarchy, because one of Synarchism's intellectual authors, the Savoyard noble and diplomat Joseph de Maistre (1754-1821), based his conception of the Synarchist "Beast-Man," on the role of such Spanish Grand Inquisitors as the Dominican Tomás de Torquemada. The Beast-Man was the leader capable and ready for whatever unimaginably enormous crime. Thus, the precedent for Hitler's genocide against the Jews, was the Expulsion of the Jews from Spain, which Torquemada forced on King Ferdinand and Queen Isabella in 1492. Never before then had presumed Christians conducted such a genocide. Nor was this done in the course of war, but against those who were then, and had been for centuries their peaceable neighbors

In this sense, the late Sir Isaiah Berlin was quite right to choose Joseph de Maistre as "the first fascist." And it is no coincidence that Poe's famous tale, "The Pit and the Pendulum," takes place in the Inquisition's central prison/fortress at Toledo, and at a then-recent, datable historic moment. This was no mere choice of a "horrible" theme; quite the contrary. For the reasons given here, the actual Spanish Inquisition was central to Poe's collaborators in American Intelligence, among them the diplomat and great writer Washington Irving, and Irving's collaborator, the leading historian William H. Prescott.

In the 1930s, the American branch of Synarchy centered on the pro-Hitler, Mussolini, and Franco alliance between the Ku Klux Klan-descended Nashville Agrarian movement, and the anti-Renaissance, pro-Roman Empire, pro-Spanish Inquisition "Catholic" movement known as the Distributists. Both these movements were sponsored and promoted by the British Fabian "Round Tables" associated with H.G. Wells, Bertrand Russell, Sidney Webb and company.

After the second World War, the movement was funded and promoted here, notoriously, by the family of William F. Buckley, in conjunction with the circle of Nazi ideologue Leo Strauss. The "Catholic" Janus-face, which recruited DeLay associates Senators Sam Brownback and Rick Santorum, now centers in a network of institutions led by the Buckley and Hapsburg-family dominated Christendom College of Front Royal, Va., and the University of Dallas. Christendom's ideological dominance of the Church's Arlington Diocese, and its in-

fluence over so-called “conservative” thinking in our capital, is typified by Nazi-like Associate Justice Antonin Scalia, and Nazi-Communist spy Robert Hanssen.

This “Catholic” wing is intertwined with the Ku Klux Klan revivalists associated with the League of the South, Southern Partisan and Southern Patriot magazines, and Buckleyite conservative thinktanks such as the Rockford Institute and the Heritage Foundation, as well as with the Straussian cult,—notably the “West Coast” wing centered at California’s Claremont Institute.

The outlook of the Agrarian-Distributist movement, is as follows: The United States, and the idea of a community of principle among sovereign nation-states as prescribed by John Quincy Adams’ Monroe Doctrine, is the greatest evil on Earth, being the most advanced manifestation of the Platonic Christian idea, that man shares in the cognitive capability of the Creator, and has a mission, therefore, to provide for the General Welfare of himself and his posterity, by creating nations which foster scientific and cultural progress to that end. This idea is villified by Southern Agrarian John Crowe Ransom and the others as the “half-man, half-god” Jesus Christ, as the “American Heresy,” the “heresy of nationalism,” the chaos of sovereignty, and in myriad other ways.

To this idea of man, they counterpose those qualities, such as appetite, which man shares with the beasts. Poet and literary critic Ransom insisted that the purpose of literature and art is to focus man’s cognition on those animal, rather than human, qualities. His lifelong friend, William Yandell Elliott, the Harvard professor and mentor of such Utopian foreign policy figures as Henry Kissinger, Zbgniew Brzezinski, Samuel Huntington, and McGeorge Bundy, preaches that myths and legends should be, “employed to condition people as you train animals, as you train a dog.”

The Synarchists insist that thus bestialized man must be dominated by the terror “god” of the “Family,” and of Joseph de Maistre, what Ransom calls the “God of Thunder,” which British Catholic rightist ideologue Hilaire Belloc (1870-1953) specifically identifies as the “god” of the Roman Pantheon. This is the “god” which man’s reason can never comprehend, and which it is a great sin to attempt to comprehend, who terrorizes and destroys man at his will. It is the god of the Spanish Inquisi-

tion, which insists, as Ignatius Loyola put it, that, if he says black is white and white is black, they are.

Belloc and the Distributists insist, with Maistre earlier, that the Catholic Church is not the Church of Christ, but, rather the Cult of the Roman Empire. In his *Great Heresies*, Belloc went so far as to insist that it is a heresy to question the alleged "Donation of Constantine," whereby that Roman Emperor supposedly made the Pope, the Bishop of Rome, heir to the world-empire of the Caesars,—even though it might be a forgery. Maistre likewise insisted on the authority of that "Donation," even if forged, in his *Letters on the Pope*. Thus, there could be no sovereign governments, because all were subject to the Pope as emperor.

In Orthodoxy, Belloc's co-thinker G.K. Chesterton (1874-1936) described Christ as an object compatible with the "Family's" "faith," but, one which Christians would properly recognize as a different figure. Chesterton called Christ "an extraordinary being with lips of thunder and acts of lurid decision, flinging down tables, casting out devils, passing with the wild secrecy of the wind from mountain isolation to a sort of dreadful demagoguery: a being who often acted like an angry god. . . Morally [He] is equally terrific; he called himself a sword of slaughter . . . We cannot even explain it by calling such a being insane."

Napoleon's career as Jacobin terrorist, and then the Beast-Man of France and of all Europe, was shaped by Joseph de Maistre, for instance in his *Considerations on France*. In his own 1932 biography of Napoleon, Chesterton's other half, Belloc, likewise promoted Napoleon as a "Thunder God" model for the 1930s re-establishment of a united "Christian" Europe under the Fascists. There, he characterized Napoleon with phrases like "Lightning in the Hills," "rolls of thunder on thunder," and "sharp elbows of lightning." Belloc's description of Napoleon's mission, which he was then entrusting to the Fascists, was, "He would have caught up again the undying Augustan tradition, the inheritance of the Caesars, the legacy of Rome to our race," and cured, "that disruption among the members of a common stock in culture, no part of which can live without the rest, that chaos of separate conflicting sovereignties which had for three centuries [i.e.: since the Renaissance founding of

the nation-state by Louis XI] grown more and more perilous, threatening the destruction of our whole society.”

Despite the Distributists’ appeal to “Christian Orthodoxy,” their movement, like the “Family,” is non-denominational. Ransom concludes his *God Without Thunder* with an appeal to members of all sects, “With whatever religious institution a modern man may be connected, let him try to turn it back towards orthodoxy. Let him insist on a virile and concrete God, and accept no Principle as a substitute. Let him restore to God the thunder. Let him resist the usurpation of the Godhead by the soft modern version of the Christ.”

As a matter of fact, “Distributism” was launched by a magazine, *New Age*, which was financed by the Fabian socialist Sidney Webb, and edited by the Theosophist A.R. Orage. In its pages, the works of Chesterton and Belloc appeared side by side with those of the Fabians including the Webbs, George Bernard Shaw, and H.G. Wells, and mystics, notoriously including the 20th century’s leading Satanist, Aleister Crowley. Unlike the professed “Christian” Distributists and Agrarians, and the “Family’s” theocratic cronies today, Crowley correctly identified his “god” as Satan, and himself as “The Great Beast.”

The ‘Family’

Now the “Family” exists to recruit notables into the Synarchy, especially officials of the U.S. and other governments, as far as we can tell. These are recruited into various levels, of which the brainwashed zombie Tom DeLay represents only one.

The depth of the secrecy with which the “Family” surrounds itself is such that we would know rather little about it, but for the fact that free-lance writer Jeffrey Sharlet responded to an invitation to attend a sort of training camp in its posh Arlington, Va. compound at the end of 24th Street North, in spring 2002. Afterwards, he described it in *Harper’s* of March 2003, and also in an interview with Guerrilla News Network (on www.alternet.org), on June 13, 2003. Although Sharlet did not join the “Family’s” training program under any false auspices, he was, nevertheless, predictably threatened after his article appeared. It is well worth reading in full.

Important points of Sharlet's account can be corroborated and fleshed-out with the aid of the voluminous writings of former Watergate figure Charles B. "Chuck" Colson, now head of the "Family" subsidiary, Prison Fellowship Ministries (PFM). (Note that DeLay has also taught a course on "The Theology of Chuck Colson," in his church in his hometown of Sugarland, Texas.) PFM is the closest that the secretive "Family" comes to a publicly acknowledged organization, just as Colson is the closest it comes to a publicly acknowledged leader who is himself a public figure. PFM depends upon webs of contractual agreements with U.S. and some foreign prisons, which provide it with government funds and even money from prisoners themselves, as well as ensuring massive prison recruitment. For that reason, it cannot exist in secret in the same way that the rest of the "Family" does.

As a "Family" trainee, Sharlet had to participate in a special form of basketball, "bump," invented by the "Family." It seems the true objective of the game was for players to hit and jostle each other with basketballs and their bodies, so as to "face your anger" and then abandon it. The trainees prayed to be "nothing." They were there to learn to "soften to authority," to crush their "inner rebel." Anything had to be crushed, which stood in the way of blind, instant, wholehearted obedience.

And indeed, a look at almost any of Chuck Colson's writings, will disclose that he also, always and everywhere reduces faith, hope, Christian love (or *agapē*), and any and all other virtue, to the one sole coin of blind "obedience."

The "covenant" of which the "Family" leaders speak continually, is therefore a "covenant" of absolute obedience,—“to Jesus,” they will add,—but let's examine that further.

Sharlet is reporting on a visit by the "Family's" supreme leader, Doug Coe.

“Two or three agree, and they pray? They can do anything. Agree. Agreement. What's that mean?”
Doug looked at me. “You're a writer. What does that mean?”

I remembered Paul's letter to the Philippians, which we had begun to memorize. Fulfill ye my joy, that ye be likeminded.
“Unity,” I said. “Agreement means unity.”

Doug didn't smile. "Yes," he said. "Total unity. Two, or three, become one. Do you know," he asked, "that there's another word for that?"

No one spoke.

"It's called a covenant. Two, or three, agree? They can do anything. A covenant is . . . powerful. Can you think of anyone who made a covenant with his friends?"

We all knew the answer to this, having heard his name invoked numerous times in this context. Andrew from Australia, sitting beside Doug, cleared his throat: "Hitler."

"Yes," Doug said. "Yes, Hitler made a covenant. The Mafia makes a covenant. It is such a very powerful thing. Two, or three, agree."

On another occasion, Doug Coe's son and heir apparent, David Coe, taught the trainees what might be called the Gospel according to Genghis Khan.

He walked to the *National Geographic* map of the world mounted on the wall.

"You guys know about Genghis Khan?" he asked. "Genghis was a man with a vision. He conquered"—David stood on the couch under the map, tracing, with his hand, half the northern hemisphere—"nearly everything. He devastated nearly everything. His enemies? He beheaded them." David swiped a finger across his throat. "Dop, dop, dop, dop."

David explained that when Genghis entered a defeated city he would call in the local headman and have him stuffed into a crate. Over the crate would be spread a tablecloth, and on the tablecloth would be spread a wonderful meal. "And then, while the man suffocated, Genghis ate, and he didn't even hear the man's screams." David still stood on the couch, a finger in the air. "Do you know what that means?" He was thinking of Christ's parable of the wineskins. "You can't pour new into old," David said, returning to his chair.

“We elect our leaders. Jesus elects his.”

He reached over and squeezed the arm of a brother. “Isn’t that great?” David said. “That’s the way everything in life happens. If you’re a person known to be around Jesus, you can go and do anything. And that’s who you guys are. When you leave here, you’re not only going to know the value of Jesus, you’re going to know the people who rule the world. It’s about vision. ‘Get your vision straight, then relate.’ Talk to the people who rule the world, and help them obey. Obey Him. If I obey Him myself, I help others do the same.

You know why? Because I become a warning. We become a warning. We warn everybody that the future king is coming. Not just of this country or that, but of the world.” Then he pointed at the map, toward the Khan’s vast, reclaimable empire.

One thinks of the e-mailed memo of DeLay press secretary Michael Scanlon, relative to DeLay’s effort to impeach President Clinton: “This whole thing about not kicking someone when they are down is bullshit. Not only do you kick him—you kick him until he passes out—then beat him over the head with a baseball bat—then roll him up in an old rug—and throw him off a cliff into the pounding surf below.”

In a later interview with Guerrilla News Network, Sharlet reported that many of the cultists loved German Synarchist thinker Friedrich Nietzsche, and thought him fascinating.

The “Family’s” “Jesus” is not only, or even primarily, interested in religious matters, but even in details of Social Security and highway legislation. That is to say that he has very definite opinions, and therefore orders, concerning much of the legislation DeLay’s office deals with.

Sharlet reports that the “Family” rejects the designation of “Christian” for themselves and their acolytes. He passes on various tortured rationales for this, but the reality is simpler: In fact, they are anything but Christians. No Synarchist is a Christian.

Official founder Abraham Vereide began the process of dissolving the whole structure of the “Family” in 1966. What remains is similar to the small-cell structure of the Martinist and

Synarchist secret organizations of the 18th and 19th centuries. As a “Family” member, all that you should know, is the leader of your own cell, and its six to eight other members. A document called “Our Common Agreement as a Core Group,” defined the “core group,” or “cell,” as a “publicly invisible but privately identifiable group of companions.” When Sharlet asked to what organization a donation check might be made, he was told there was none; money was raised on a “man-to-man” basis.

Yet the “Family” still runs the very public National Prayer Breakfasts, featuring the President and other top U.S. and foreign notables. Behind the scenes also, it is continually hosting top politicians. Former Attorney General Edwin Meese led a weekly prayer breakfast at the Cedars mansion, in the Arlington compound, while Sharlet was there. Former President George H.W. Bush had been there on several occasions, as had every President, or so Sharlet was told. President Yoweri Museveni of Uganda was a frequent participant. At 133 C Street S.E., in Washington, the “Family” operates a town house for U.S. Congressmen. Eight Congressmen—Nevada Republican Senator John Ensign, and seven U.S. Representatives—were living there during Sharlet’s internship. The *Los Angeles Times* wrote that Congressmen who have lived there include John Elias Baldacci (D-Me), Ed Bryant (R-Tenn), Mike Doyle (R-Pa), and Bart Stupak (D-Mich). A fuller list of associated names accompanies this article.

Are all of the men mentioned here, and in the accompanying list, “Family” zombies like Tom DeLay? Of course not. Some probably know little about it, while others support it to varying extents with varying degrees of knowledge. Others are members; still others are leaders. But all the lists of members and leaders are secret.

Yet think what the “Family’s” ability to produce a President of the U.S. or other top politicians, as if on demand, does for their brainwashing prowess. One thinks of Mephistopheles’ ability to produce Alexander of Macedon and Helen of Troy, for his dupe, Dr. Faustus, in Marlowe’s great play. It allows them to intimate to their dupes, that they secretly control the whole world! In the suggestible frame of mind induced by their brainwashing, the dupes will believe it.

Other elements of the brainwashing program can be learned from DeLay’s and Colson’s accounts, and also correlated with

the “Twelve Steps” of Alcoholics Anonymous, which AA inherited from Frank Buchman’s “Oxford Groups Movement,” later called “Moral Rearmament”—which latter, in turn, was later reorganized into the “Rev.” Sun Myung Moon’s cult. Alcoholics Anonymous has special relevance for DeLay’s case, because of the way that movement focussed its efforts on “Bowery bum” types, especially in its early years in the 1930s.

The “Family” specializes in recruiting men at a low point of despair: Colson, for instance, faced jail for Watergate offenses. He writes pitifully about how, for him, a highly successful, upwardly mobile lawyer, a man at the very pinnacle of power as a top adviser to the President, for him, being sent to prison was his “greatest humiliation,” his “most abject failure.” He wrote that he had “lost everything I thought made Chuck Colson a great guy.”

First, then, in the program comes “conviction of sin,” what AA co-founder William Griffiths Wilson called “deflation at depth.” The brainwashing victim must be convinced he is worthless. As Colson writes, “victory comes through defeat; healing through brokenness.” Next, he is persuaded to give up all attempt to use his reason, or to control his life and his destiny; he has only made a hopeless mess of it all; he must resign it all to “God.” A humiliating private confession to the cell leader or AA “sponsor,” is followed by some sort of humiliating confession before a group. And, so on; the rest may be found in these and other sources.

What Now?

The result of the brainwashing of Tom DeLay, taken together with the criminal apparatus and other capabilities which were then made available to him by the zombie’s masters, combined with the effects of Vice President Cheney’s virtual coup since Sept. 11, 2001, has been to subject the whole U.S. House of Representatives to the unconstrained power of a secret and unaccountable Synarchist (e.g., fascist) cult.

Before concluding this article by considering some of those aspects of that much more important matter, let me note that DeLay’s own psychopathology has been badly aggravated by the “Family’s” abuse of him since 1985. His father Charles

DeLay died in 1988, and since that time, Tom DeLay has totally severed relations with his mother, both his brothers, and his sister. In the mid-1990s, DeLay conducted an all-out vendetta against Jacqueline Blankenship, the wife of a former business partner, attempting to deny her the ability to get any employment in Fort Bend County, which he represents in Congress, and where they both live. His actions towards Mrs. Blankenship were so bizarre, that none of his friends could defend them, and instead refuse to discuss the matter at all. His crazy outburst at Washington, D.C., city officials in 2000 or 2001 was summarized above. It is possible that Tom DeLay is now able to better control his drinking binges, but, if so, the “dry alcoholic” of today, is far sicker than the old drunk was, in most or in all other respects.

The “Family” enabled Tom DeLay to form the network of Political Action Committees known as “DeLay, Inc.,” the money machine which gives DeLay a stranglehold over Republican Congressional campaign financing. It did this by linking him up with Jack Abramoff, who was then, and still is, the leading private lobbyist for so-called American Indian gambling casinos. In 1985, Abramoff chaired Oliver North’s Citizens for America, tasked to attract wealthy private funders for the Central American “Contra” adventures. Abramoff then founded the International Freedom Foundation (IFF), a secret U.S.-British-Israeli propaganda bureau for South Africa’s military forces. IFF and Abramoff worked with the World Anti-Communist League (WACL), itself closely linked, first to Buchman’s Moral Rearmament, and then to the “Rev.” Moon and Col. Bo Hi Pak. South African rightist Rabbi Daniel Lapin, whom Abramoff funds to run a Jewish alliance with Pat Robertson and Christian Zionists, introduced Jack to Tom DeLay.

Ever since, Abramoff has been DeLay’s chief financier, fundraising tactician, and chief manager of DeLay’s lucrative and important links to lobbyists such as Enron.

In 1989, when DeLay ran the campaign of Edward Madigan for Republican (Minority) Whip against the rising Newt Gingrich, DeLay’s man lost a close race. But DeLay then got himself elected chairman of the Republican Study Committee, a House Conservative vehicle which he ran in conjunction with Pat Robertson’s Christian Coalition. (The Fellowship created televangelist Robertson, who was originally a playboy, and first

began speaking in tongues and exchanging prophecies under the guidance of Fellowship master-trainer Harald Bredesen.)

With the Republican 1994 takeover, DeLay was elected Majority Whip.

Later, DeLay created a new Republican Party instrument called the Values Action Team, to bring Christian Zionist functionaries into directly running the House of Representatives. DeLay placed then-freshman Pennsylvania Congressman Joe Pitts as chair of this inside-outside leadership coordination. Joe is a Fellowship core member, who has conducted orientation at the Arlington, Va. headquarters, “The Cedars” mansion, for potential cult recruits.

The power exercised within the Congress by Vice President Cheney, who presides over the Senate, is closely coordinated with DeLay and his “Family.” Aided by senior Synarchist figure George Shultz, Cheney ran all aspects of the transition to power of the Bush-Cheney Administration in 2000-01. Cheney’s liaison man in charge of arranging the new Administration’s relations with Congress was David Gribbin—a noted bigshot at the Fellowship cult’s Cedars mansion. Previously Gribbin was chief lobbyist for Halliburton Corporation under CEO Cheney, and Chief of Staff for Defense Secretary Cheney.

[Sources: On Tom DeLay’s life: Peter Perl, in the *Washington Post* magazine, May 13, 2001. On the “Family,” Jeffrey Sharlet, as noted above. On Tom DeLay’s life, his career, and many other matters covered: published and unpublished research by Anton Chaitkin. On Synarchy in America: published and unpublished work by Stanley Ezrol.]

DeLay Is, After All, a Freak!

[A timely reminder to some among my friends.]

There is sometimes a tendency to forget, or overlook what should have been recalled as the plain fact of a case.

Obviously, Tom DeLay is not a Christian; he is a freak salvaged from Washington, D.C.’s political equivalent of “Skid

Row"; he is a case of a "zombie-like" synthetic personality taken over by something like the psychopathological equivalent of "the body-snatchers from outer space"! An important comparison which clarifies the significance of that distinction for our national-security, is to set the deluded DeLay, and kindred sorts of reprocessed cultural garbage disposed by the Fellowship's "Frankenstein Factory," beside the 1970s trio from the "Revolution in Military Affairs" project of Newt Gingrich, Al Gore, Jr., and Alvin Toffler. Gingrich was fully witting; pathetic Gore is nasty, but his wits are somewhere else much of the time; but, DeLay, as U.S. intelligence agent Edgar Allan Poe might have said, is a clear-cut clinical case of the missing marbles.

Read Newt "Contract on America" Gingrich's 1995 "inaugural address" as "Squeaker of the House." This was the speech which Newt delivered then to his faithful "storm troopers" preparing for their triumphal march into the House of Representatives. For any competent student of modern history, Gingrich's equivalent of "Mein Kampf," delivered orally on that day, was a confession of Newt's fully witting conversion to the original form of the Synarchist International, the banker-owned Jacobin with radical-right-wing intentions. On that occasion, Newt pro claimed himself as re-launching the France-Revolution's model of a putatively left-wing (e.g., "populist") 1789-94-style revolution against the principles of the American Constitution represented by Bailly and Lafayette. He was an incarnate, Phrygian-capped dionysiac en route to establishing a fascist (e.g., Napoleonic reactionary tyranny) in the U.S.A. Newt was playing "Beast-Man" Robespierre to Dick Cheney's "Beast-Man" Hitler-role.

As Al Gore demonstrated, as Vice President, in the summer of 1996, and later, Gore had remained then, and since, the "Fowler side of the Democratic Party," the "Southern-fried" fascist he had been when he had been openly politically bedded with Gingrich and Toffler back during the late 1970s. Gingrich is the fully witting fascist of that type; one could never fairly describe Al Gore, or that piece of Fellowship Center salvage, Tom DeLay, as "fully witting" on any account. Mean? Yes: as howling mean as a hyena at full tilt. A specimen of an able human intellect gone awry? You must be kidding!

In such matters as those, there are apprentice game-masters, and there are also what is merely human wreckage repro-

grammed as virtual “devil dolls.” When the ventriloquist turns out to be a serial killer, don’t blame a poor half-witted dummy like Tom DeLay.

When in doubt, look for the man with the mark of the beast—the Nietzschean beast, that is. That beast is the Phrygian Dionysus, or Joseph de Maistre’s Grand Inquisitor of the Spanish Inquisition, or such true followers of Robespierre as Adolf Hitler, or, the circles behind Vice President Cheney today. Newt Gingrich is such a beast, and plainly proud of it.

On the Matter of Christianity:

Contrary to the current self-adulatory delusions of, not reformed, but reprocessed Tom DeLay, God does not have bad taste. People are not naturally “born wretches.” The human being is naturally good, which is why Jesus Christ wished to redeem him from childish errors such as the depravity to which DeLay was subjected in both his rearing and the Sodom-and-Gomorrah-like erring ways of his adulterated young manhood.

The Christian is therefore a person of love, as the Apostle Paul emphasizes in such locations as 1 Corinthians 13. A Christian is a person like France’s Jeanne d’Arc, who, sensible of the immortality specific to all human beings, refused to betray her mission for God and humanity, even at the price of knowing her refusal to betray her mission meant being burned alive by that satanic monster known as the Inquisition. Unlike poor Isabella I, who submitted wickedly to the inquisitors’ demand that she launch a Hitler-like expulsion of the Jews from Spain, Jeanne ultimately refused all such corruption demanded of her. So, the birth of the first modern nation-state, that of France’s Louis XI, was made possible, and Henry VII’s England after that.

It was such deeds as Jeanne’s which contributed to rescuing Christianity from the grip of that depravity which had plunged Europe into that 14th-century New Dark Age during which no less than one-third of the population of Europe, and half the existing parishes, were wiped out. In the faithful imitation of Jesus Christ, Jeanne gave her life, a sacrifice made for love of Christ and mankind, for the sake of the redemption of humanity.

Poor, “burned-out” rake Tom DeLay could not tell the difference between a church and a pigsty. The noises he makes these days tell us from what seamier side of Skid Row the sounds of his religious fervor are coming.

Gingrich, on the other hand, knows himself to be damned evil, and is damned proud of it, too. Joseph de Maistre understood Gingrich and Cheney, very well. At the sight and sound of poor freaks like DeLay, the Devil himself laughs like Hell.

—*Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.*
Dec. 23, 2003

Some Public Figures Affiliated with the Fellowship Foundation

(Source of knowledge of affiliation is given in parentheses)

- **Michael Timmins**, Detroit investor, chairman of Colson’s “Prison Fellowship Ministries”; board member of Promise Keepers, in whose “Men’s Accountability Group” Tom DeLay participates at his Sugar Land Baptist Church. Timmins is a central financial sponsor of Fellowship Foundation (Lisa Getter, *Los Angeles Times*, Sept. 27, 2002).
- **Paul N. Temple**, investor, board chairman and co-founder of Willis Harman’s New Age trancers’ “Institute for Noetic Sciences,” Temple is a central Fellowship financier (Getter, *L.A. Times*).
- **Charles “Chuck” Colson**, Watergate figure, founder of the Fellowship’s “Prison Fellowship Ministries (Colson’s autobiography, *Born Again*).
- **Pat Robertson**, televangelist; founder, “Christian Coalition.” Robertson was employed, trained, and set into his career by Fellowship agents (Harald Bredesen autobiography, *Yes Lord*, Robertson’s biography, *Shout It From the Housetops*).
- **David Gribbin**, former chief of staff to Dick Cheney when the latter was Secretary of Defense, and coordinator of Bush-

Cheney relations to Congress, 2000 transition team (Fellowship affiliation: Bush Administration interviews).

- **Rep. Jim DeMint** (R-SC) (Jeffrey Sharlet, *Harpers*, March 2003).
- **Rep. Joseph Pitts** (R-Pa), chairman of DeLay's Values Action Team; member, House International Relations Committee (Getter, *L.A. Times*; Messiah College Alumni Newsletter, May 1998).
- **Rep. Bart Stupak** (D-Mich) (*Harpers*).
- **Rep. Zach Wamp** (R-Tenn) (*Harpers*).
- **Rep. Frank Wolf** (R-Va) (Getter, *L.A. Times*).
- **Sen. Sam Brownback** (R-Kans) (*Harpers*; Lara Jakes Jordan, Associated Press, "Fellowship finances townhouse where 6 congressmen live," April 20, 2003).
- **Sen. Pete Domenici** (R-NM) (*Harpers*).
- **Sen. John Ensign** (R-Nev) (*Harpers*).
- **Sen. Charles Grassley** (R-Iowa) (*Harpers*).
- **Sen. James Inhofe** (R-Okla) (*Harpers*).
- **Sen. Bill Nelson** (D-Fla) (*Harpers*).
- **Sen. Don Nickles** (R-Okla) (*Harpers*).
- **Former Rep. John Baldacci** (D-Me) (*L.A. Times*).
- **Former Rep. Ed Bryant** (R-Tenn) (*L.A. Times*).
- **Former Rep. Mike Doyle** (D-Pa) (*L.A. Times*).
- **Former Rep. Todd Tiahrt** (R-Kans) (*Harpers*).

Dope Czar Soros Bids To Buy Up Democratic Party

by Michele Steinberg and Scott Thompson

George Soros is using his ill-gotten billions to cast himself as the “saviour of the Western World,” claiming to be in a fight against the “preemptive war doctrine” crafted by Beastman Dick Cheney. The vehicle he has selected for the campaign is the Democratic Party in the United States, buying it up with tens of millions of dope dollars, to turn it into a toothless tool of the “Billionaires’ Club,” which will posture as the “anti-Empire” party, but will in reality be a “protection racket” for Cheney.

Soros’s operations—which include the Center for American Progress (a thinktank for Democrats modelled on the Heritage Foundation); Americans Coming Together (a voter mobilization funding mechanism); and Moveon.com (an Internet gathering place for “radicals”)—are, like the Democratic Leadership Council which spawned them, a clever means to keep the Cheney apparatus intact.

As usual, Soros plays both sides of the street; he will attack “Empire” without ever naming Dick Cheney, and will use the “Dope Democrats” and the “progressive” movement to implement Soros’s own brand of “Empire,” which he calls “preventive action of a constructive character.” His aim, as stated in *Atlantic Monthly* magazine of December 2003, is that “the United States must find a way to assert its supremacy in the world. . . .”

Soros is a mole of the Synarchist financiers, whose dirty dope dollars will destroy the Democratic Party. Howls of protests have already come from “progressives” and “Democrats” about this charge, but after more than a decade of investigation, the LaRouche movement is the authority on Soros’s sordid history.

The reality is that Soros can co-exist just fine with Dick Cheney, with whom he shares an intimacy through mutual acquaintance George P. Shultz.

But Soros cannot politically co-exist with Lyndon LaRouche, who delivered the first defeat of Soros's drug-pushing in many years, when a November 2002 referendum to legalize recreational drugs in Nevada went down in defeat after an intervention by LaRouche's Presidential campaign.

In a Sept. 8, 2002 campaign release, LaRouche charged that the people of Nevada had been snookered by "mega-speculator George Soros" and the dope legalization lobby which he has funded, nationally and internationally. LaRouche went through the details of an *EIR* investigation (reported in *EIR* Sept. 20, 2002) showing how Soros profits from destroying national currencies and then uses the money to promote drugs.

LaRouche said: "Preliminary investigations by associates of LaRouche have confirmed that the Nevada referendum is being run by a Washington, D.C.-based group, the Marijuana Policy Project (MPP), which receives direct funding from Soros, through the Drug Policy Foundation, which has received more than \$15 million from Soros in recent years." The release said, "Soros has poured at least \$25 million into various dope legalization schemes over the past five years, and has vowed to substantially increase his bankrolling of the dope lobby efforts."

Working with Nevada Democrats such as State Sen. Joe Neal, a national leader of black elected officials, and organizing in the tradition of Franklin D. Roosevelt, LaRouche was able to defeat the tens of millions of dollars Soros put behind the Nevada referendum.

While it cannot yet be proven that Soros is Cheney's "Trojan Horse," sent in to stop LaRouche's campaign to oust the Beastman Vice President, some leading Democrats have begun to suspect Soros's motives, noting that in his upcoming book against "Empire" and the Iraq war, Soros never mentions Dick Cheney!

Who Is George Soros, Really?

It is time for patriots to know who—and what—Soros really is. Consider the following:

- In 1993, when Soros was asked by interview show host Adam Smith what has given him the motivation for his speculative financial success, he cited his work on behalf of the Nazis

in looting wealthy Jewish estates in his own native Hungary. Here is Soros's own carefully crafted admission (on the Adam Smith Show, produced by WNET-TV on April 15, 1993) that he had been a small cog in Adolf Eichmann's killing machine, which ran the Holocaust against 500,000 Hungarian Jews.

"It really started in 1944, when Hungary was occupied by the Germans, and me being Jewish, I was in danger of my life. . . . When the Germans came in, he [Soros' father, a prominent Budapest attorney] said, 'This is a lawless occupation. The normal rules don't apply. You have to forget how you behave in normal society. This is an abnormal situation.' And he arranged for all of us to have false papers, everybody had a different arrangement. I was adopted by an official of the Minister of Agriculture, whose job was to take over Jewish properties, so I actually went with him and we took possession of these large estates. That was my identity. So it's a strange, very strange life. I was 14 years old at the time."

- Soros, the self-proclaimed "anti-Bush," is one of George W. Bush's "two Godfathers," the other being George P. Shultz, former Secretary of State (1982-89). Soros bailed out failed Texas oil man "Dubya" Bush, when his company Spectrum 7 was about to go bankrupt in 1985.

But more significant is Soros's decades long alliance with Shultz around the legalization of dope. Soros's Open Society Institute has frequently ponied up funds to help the "conservative" Hoover Institution on War, Revolution, and Peace sponsor conferences on the legalization of mind-altering recreational drugs.

Shultz, of course, is not only a "Godfather" to Bush; he also sponsored the entire Straussian cabal responsible for the Iraq war, putting Bush under the tutelage, in 1999, of warmongers Paul Wolfowitz and Richard Perle, who dubbed themselves the "Vulcans" who would hammer Candidate Dubya into shape. Shultz put together the Wolfowitz team when he was tapped by then-Governor Bush to launch his Presidential Exploratory Committee. At the time, Shultz was (and still is) a Distinguished Fellow at the Hoover Institution, where Condoleezza Rice served as a Senior Fellow. Rice would eventually be appointed by Shultz to nominally head the "Vulcans," but Wolfowitz and Perle ran the show. At the same time, assisting Shultz on the Exploratory Committee was Dick Cheney, now

Vice President and the chief “Beast-man” behind present neo-imperial policy.

Shultz and Soros also share a hatred of currency exchange controls. According to leading figures in Texas, it was Shultz, as Assistant Secretary of the Treasury in 1971—not his nominal boss, then-Treasury Secretary John Connally—who pushed President Richard Nixon into ending the Bretton Woods system, removing the dollar from the gold-pegged fixed-rate system on Aug. 15, 1971. Thus, Shultz was the key operative who opened the doors to the Synarchist international’s ability to control the international scene with dope dollars and attacks on the floating currencies of weaker states.

But it was only after he left office that Shultz’s explicit support for legalizing drug addiction—a new Opium War tactic—came out into the open.

In an Oct. 7, 1989 address to the Stanford Business School, Shultz told alumni that the time had come “to make it possible for addicts to buy drugs at some regulated place at a price that approximates their cost.” Shultz argued that the “criminal justice approach” to fighting drugs had failed, because what drives the drug trade is simply the economic marketplace. “These [criminal justice] efforts wind up creating a market where the price vastly exceeds the cost. With these incentives, demand creates its own supply and a criminal network along with it. . . . We’re not going to get anywhere until we can take criminality out of the drug business. . . . We need at least to consider and examine forms of controlled legalization of drugs.”

From 1990 to 2000, Shultz at the Hoover Institution organized at least five conferences to back up Soros’s campaign to legalize drugs in the United States, through a series of state referenda. When Shultz and the evil Synarchist Milton Friedman appeared as the keynote speakers at a Hoover Institution conference on “Ethical Issues in Drug Enforcement,” advocating the end of the war on drugs, the event was financed by Soros’s Open Society Institute.

Soros’s lead henchman on legalization, Ethan Nadelman, head of the Lindesmith Center, has appeared frequently at Hoover conferences. Moreover, some of the state referenda (e.g., Arizona) in which Shultz gave his support to Soros’s minions, would have legalized nearly all Schedule I drugs, making

it possible for doctors to prescribe anything from “crack cocaine” to LSD, if they believed (or claimed to believe) that such drugs had a “medicinal” purpose. “Medical decrim” became a bonanza for the “Dr. Feelgoods” who serviced the Baby Boomers and, eventually, their greatest victims—their children.

- Soros made George W. Bush a rich man. Throughout his career, Dubya was known as a train wreck in business, until the intervention of Harken Energy—of which Soros was a major stockholder. As mentioned above, Harken bailed out Bush’s failing Spectrum 7 oil firm in 1985. Before that, Bush had run a string of “wildcat” (independent) oil firms, ranging from Arbusto (Spanish for “bush”), to Bush Exploration, to Spectrum 7. These relied largely on tax shelter handouts from cronies of his relatives, while returning to investors only 20 cents on the dollar. When Spectrum 7 was about to go under, Bush was saved from bankruptcy by the intervention of Soros, who made him a non-voting member of the board of Harken, at a salary of \$120,000 a year. And, as Harken founder Phil Kendrick put it, “His name was George Bush. That was worth the money they paid him.” The success of Harken in beating out Amoco, one of the famous “Seven Sisters” oil companies, for drilling rights in Bahrain in January 1990, was attributed to having the “son of the President” on the board.

But there were also charges of insider trading levelled against Bush’s Soros connection. On June 22, 1990, George W. Bush suddenly unloaded 212,140 shares, or about two-thirds of his holdings in Harken Energy, for a total of \$848,560. Author Joe Conason writing in the February 2000 issue of *Harper’s* magazine raised the question whether Bush had been tipped off that a war was about to break out that would affect Gulf oil stock prices. Only weeks after Bush dumped the majority of his Harken stocks, Iraq invaded Kuwait. Within two months of this stock sale, Harken Energy would report a \$20-million loss for its second quarter. Harken stock dropped like a stone. While investigative reporters and business rivals raised the accusation of insider trading, there never was an investigation of the trade, nor of Bush’s failure to inform the Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) of this timely insider trade until eight months after the legal deadline. Bush was a member of Harken’s audit committee, which knew that vast sums of money had been spent digging dry holes off the coast of Bahrain.

Once Harken was in, Bush was elevated to the high-rolling circles of co-investors, the Harvard Management Corp., the corrupt Bank of Credit and Commerce International (BCCI), and Bass Enterprises Production Co., a Texas-based family fortune that formed one of the core elements of Bush's mythical "fundraising" capability in the 2000 campaign.

Now, the same Soros who is an ally in pushing dope with George Shultz, the father of the neo-con imperial war faction; who uses his experience as a Nazi beast-man seizing Jewish properties as a guide to success in speculating; and who personally made Bush a rich man, is duping Democrats with promises that he'll outfinance the Bush machine in the 2004 elections.

Synarchist War Against Civilization

If Synarchist financier Soros and his Republican twin Shultz have their way, mind-destroying drugs will be legal in the United States within four to five years. In turn, this legalization will be forced upon other nations under the rubric of "free trade" and globalization. It is part of the Synarchist International's war against civilization. Since the middle 1990s, Soros and his two major allies in financing legalization—Peter Lewis, head of Progressive Insurance, and John Sperling, a Republican moneybags from Arizona—have spent a minimum of \$100 million in funds, to pass versions of "medical decriminalization" not only of marijuana, but other deadly Schedule I narcotics, in state referenda. Now, with Soros penetrating the Democratic Party, and Shultz having joined the California administration of Hitler admirer Gov. Arnie Schwarzenegger, they are perfectly placed to execute the final drive.

This countdown to legalization was explicitly stated at the Nov. 6-8, 2003 conference of the Drug Policy Alliance (DPA), the latest version of the legalization lobby founded by Soros more than a decade ago.

The conference provided a privileged inside glimpse into Soros's long partnership with George Shultz, when the Drug Policy Alliance's key award was given to the current and former Mayors of Vancouver, for establishing on Sept. 21, 2003 the first legal heroin injection center in North America, with a legal cocaine center to follow. And it turned out that the Vancouver

model was Shultz's brainchild. The story was told at the session called "Those Wild and Crazy Canadians," where former Vancouver Mayor Philip Owen, who took office in 1993, said that in 1995 he had travelled to the Hoover Institution at Stanford University, for a seminar. There, George Shultz and Soros's protégé, then-Baltimore Mayor Kurt Schmoke, convinced him that the War on Drugs was a "disaster."

Back in Canada, Mayor Owen opened a similar seminar modelled on the Hoover Institution event, and set out to implement the Soros/Shultz model for legalization, which Owen called the "Four Pillars Declaration." When Owen retired in 2002, having served the longest consecutive period of any mayor of Vancouver, he was succeeded by Mayor Larry Campbell, a co-thinker and former officer in the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, who completed the implementation of the legalization plan. While Campbell claimed support from 80-90% of Vancouver citizens, opposition was such that he could not open the first legal heroin injection center in North America until September 2003—eight years after Owen had begun the Shultz drug legalization campaign. He now promises to open a legal cocaine center.

Then, Mayor Campbell let the cat out of the bag. He pledged not to bust pot-growers in Canada, "because if we did not have those \$3 billion [from the pot trade], we'd be in a recession." According to another conference speaker, Canadian federal Senator Pierre Nolin, head of the Senate Special Committee on Illegal Drugs, there now exists a comprehensive report calling for the legalization and regulation of marijuana in all of Canada, based on the financial success of the marijuana industry in British Columbia (capital: Vancouver).

It cannot be assumed to be accidental, that a leading U.S. financial magazine, *Forbes*—owned and run by Steve Forbes, another Hoover Institution sympathizer and former GOP Presidential candidate—hailed British Columbia's pot "boom" in its December 2003 cover story.

'Grass Roots'

The Democratic Party's alliance with Soros is the biggest political buyout in decades; not since the "Southern Strategy" of post-1972, when Democrats adopted Dick Nixon's embrace of

the Ku Klux Klan in his 1968 Presidential campaign, have the Democrats embarked on such suicide. It is completely out in the open, that LaRouche's rivals for the Democratic Presidential nomination—especially those most active in keeping LaRouche out of the Presidential debates—are on Soros's dole, led by Howard Dean, for whom Soros threw a major fundraiser. Soros also purports to support John Kerry, Wesley Clark, and Richard Gephardt, according to the *Washington Post*.

Through a series of organizations known as "527s," after the Federal code that allows such non-party political groups to raise unlimited amounts of money from single individuals, the Democratic Party is, in effect, putting the future of the United States into dope pusher Soros's hands. The "527s" came into being after the McCain-Feingold "reform" bill that barred "soft money." But now campaign financing is privatized in a latter-day version of Nixon's "CREEP" (Committee to Reelect the President), and the fate of the 17 "swing" states where the Democrats have the best chance of defeating the Cheney coalition depends on Soros and his cronies. Soros gloated to the *Washington Post* that the Democrats who set up America Coming Together (ACT), Steve Rosenthal and Ellen Malcolm, "were ready to kiss me" when he told them he would be giving them \$10 million, bragging that "Money buys talent."

But the new front groups created by Soros's friends are nothing more than a retreat of the discredited Democratic Leadership Council (DLC), whose favored candidate, Sen. Joe Lieberman of Connecticut, was a neo-con insider at the White House in pushing the Iraq war. According to a report in the *Jewish Times* newspaper, Soros is now working closely with Lieberman's sponsor, Michael Steinhardt (the organizer of the Mega group of billionaires, who made his fortune using the organized-crime lucre of his father, the fence for Murder, Inc. boss Meyer Lansky). "Mickey" Steinhardt used his money to found the DLC as the "second Republican Party." For the DLC and Steinhardt, as for Soros and the dope legalizers, LaRouche is "Public Enemy No. 1," because he represents the FDR tradition.

Co-financing the Soros penetration of the Democrats is fellow drug-legalization financier Peter Lewis, chairman of the Progressive Corp., an Ohio-based insurance company which is the fifth largest in the United States. For more than a decade, Soros and Lewis have poured tens, if not hundreds, of millions into

a single “grass roots” cause—drug legalization. Together with Arizona Republican moneybags John Sperling, Soros and Lewis put \$30 million into California alone in 1996, to push through the paradigm-shift legislation—“medical marijuana.” These three financed decriminalization measures nationwide, and are adoringly referred as “The Funders” by the dopers backing legalization. In 2000, multimillionaire Lewis was arrested with hashish and pot in New Zealand, while attending a jet-set yacht race. He was let off with a “contribution” of \$5,000 to a drug rehab center.

Now the “dope Democrats” are going for the money from Soros and Lewis, while abandoning FDR’s “Forgotten Man”—the lower 80% of the U.S. population suffering under economic depression. A perfect example is Soros fan Harold Meyerson, editor of the *American Prospect*, who believes that using easy big money from Soros and Co. is better than organizing real people. Writing in the *Washington Post* on Nov. 12, 2003, Meyerson falsely claimed that Soros was responsible for the landslide victory of Philadelphia Mayor John Street, a black Democrat, who had been targetted for frameup by Attorney General John Ashcroft, and whose re-election was secured when his campaign called in a deployment of the LaRouche Youth Movement—the envy of Democratic Party hacks across the United States. Meyerson actually attacked the idea of a youth movement, asserting that Mayor Street was saved by Soros’s dope money. Now, said Meyerson, organizations funded by Soros have “the resources to hire . . . as state directors experienced operatives . . . not the 25-year-olds who have often run such operations in the underfunded past.”

Soros has other plans for youth: They’re the market for his legalized dope.

Why You Don’t Want Soros’s Money

Where does Soros get his money? Years of investigation by LaRouche’s associates have answered that question in grisly detail: Soros’s money comes from impoverishment of the poor countries against whose currencies he speculates, and from deadly mind-destroying, terrorism-funding drugs.

Since the late 1980s, the model for Soros’s operations has

been the destruction of Bolivia, as administered by his employee, economist Jeffrey Sachs. Sachs's major claim to fame was "rescuing" the Bolivian economy, by shutting down industry, and building up the cocaine trade—in reality, building up the narcoterrorist murderers of the Synarchist international that had its heyday in Bolivia in the 1980s.

We provide in the Appendix a brief dossier on the low-lights of Soros's history of theft and drug-promotion.* If, after reading this, any Democrat still wants to take Soros's money, they should at least have the decency to put a bumper-sticker on their car that says "I support drug-pushing. I'm pushing cocaine."

*For documentation on Soros's drug and money operations, and much more, see *EIR's* April 1997 Special Report, "The True Story of Soros the Golem," and the website www.larouchepub.com.

APPENDIX

Soros, Dope, and Dirty Money

1. Soros the Speculator

Soros has been involved in financial speculation since the late 1960s, at which time he established the Quantum Fund, N.V., which manages the money of leading British and Swiss financiers, including the British Royal Household. The Quantum Fund is a private investment body called a hedge fund, headquartered off-shore in one of the leading centers of money-laundering internationally, the Netherlands Antilles.

1990: With the opening of the East bloc, Soros moves into Poland and Russia with the devastating doctrine of economic “shock therapy,” to be administered by Jeffrey Sachs of the notorious Bolivia project.

1992: Soros’s speculation makes big news, as he pulls off major attacks on the currencies of Great Britain and Italy, after which he brags of earning more than \$1 billion by hurting the currencies of these nations.

1993: U.S. Congressman Henry Gonzalez (D-Texas) calls for an investigation of Soros’s manipulation of foreign exchange markets, including the possibility that the same measures used against Great Britain will be used against the United States.

1995: The manager of Soros’s Management Fund, through which he controls the Quantum Fund, takes out an ad in the U.S. press, which urges the Congress (then controlled by Newt Gingrich), to proceed with its budget cuts, because such austerity is absolutely required for the financial markets.

1995: The Italian courts, in response to a legal brief by associates of LaRouche in Italy, launch an investigation of Soros’s role in the speculative attack on the lira in 1992. (The suit is dismissed in 1999.)

1997: Soros’s hedge funds launch a speculative attack against the Thai baht, in a move widely credited with triggering the great Asian financial crisis of 1997, which destroyed the economies of Indonesia and many other nations.

2. Soros the Drug Pusher

1992-1994: Soros creates the Open Society Institute, named for the book by his mentor at the London School of Economics, Sir Karl Popper. Through the OSI, he creates both the Drug Policy Foundation and the Lindesmith Center, funnelling more than \$15 million for their activities, which focus heavily on changing drug laws toward legalization.

1996: Ballot initiatives in favor of “medical marijuana,” funded lavishly by Soros’s front groups, are passed in California and Arizona. These are the front end of a campaign that involves up to 25 states.

1997: Soros’s Drug Policy Foundation pours money into a campaign to legalize euthanasia in Australia.

Meanwhile, in Ibero-America, Soros becomes a leading financier of the drive to legalize cocaine. He bankrolls a meeting on Oct. 8-9, 1997 in the Colombian city of Medellin, for the purpose of pushing drug legalization, at the same time as Human Rights Watch/Americas, another major beneficiary of his funds, attacks the national forces deployed against the drug cartels as “human rights violators.” It should be noted that the pro-drug guerrillas in Colombia are known to be bloodthirsty kidnapers and murderers, who terrorize the nation.

In the United States, Soros works with the pro-drug Mayor of Baltimore, Kurt Schmoke, to promote “progressive” drug policies, including needle-exchange programs. Soros “donates” \$25 million to spreading illegal drugs in the city.

1998: Another Soros-related group, the Andean Council of Coca Leaf Producers, begins to carry out an armed revolt in Bolivia, under the banner “Coca or Death.” (The Council was established by a European group called Coca 95, whose chief financier is Soros, and whose directors call for free trade in every narcotic on the face of the Earth: cocaine, heroin, marijuana, and synthetics.)

In June, Soros’s Lindesmith Center issues an Open Letter to UN Secretary General Kofi Annan calling for a “truly open” dialogue on illegal drugs, claiming that clamping down on them is worse than drug abuse itself, and demanding that legalization be put on the table.

2000: Soros moves, through Human Rights Watch, and through direct funding of Alejandro Toledo’s campaign for

President of Peru, to topple the successful anti-drug government of Peruvian President Alberto Fujimori. *EIR* forecasts that the new Soros-backed government will move to put anti-drug fighters in prison, and bring back the murderous Sendero Luminoso—which in fact it does, following Toledo's victory.

2001: In June, the *Wall Street Journal* gives major coverage to the decision by Soros, along with billionaires Peter Lewis and John Sperling, to kick in at least \$10 million for the 2002 elections, where they target Florida, Ohio, and Michigan for decriminalization referenda.

Soros also funds a drive for decriminalization of marijuana in Canada.

2002: Soros funds a referendum on the Nevada ballot, which calls for the legalization of marijuana use, and would mandate that the state begin growing and retail distribution of the drug to anyone over 21 years of age. The effort is run by a Washington, D.C.-based group, the Marijuana Policy Project, which receives direct funding from Soros, through the Drug Policy Foundation—which, in turn, has received more than \$15 million from Soros in recent years. The Drug Policy Foundation recently merged with the Lindesmith Center, a project of Soros's Open Society Institute tax-exempt foundation. The new, unified entity, the Drug Policy Alliance, is run by Soros employee Dr. Ethan Nadelman. Soros has poured at least \$25 million into various dope legalization schemes over the past five years, and has vowed to substantially increase his bankrolling of the dope lobby efforts.

The Nevada referendum is defeated by the intervention of Presidential candidate Lyndon LaRouche.

2003: Soros activates funds for the Bolivian "cocaleros" movement and its head, Jacobin Evo Morales, so that the government of Gonzalo Sanchez de Lozada falls Oct. 17, after a month of violent demonstrations against his rule. The ousted President had been Bolivia's Finance Minister in 1985, when the country was advised by Soros's Dr. Jeffrey Sachs. Now Sachs and the Soros apparatus are spreading the lie that Gonzalo Sanchez was ousted because he was waging a war on drugs (which he was not); a lie they are putting about in order to use the Bolivia case to fuel similar narcoterrorist uprisings in Colombia, Peru, and elsewhere.

Children of Satan III: The *Sexual* Congress for Cultural Fascism

The following was first issued as a LaRouche in 2004 campaign pamphlet in June 2004.

PREFACE

How 'The Sexual Congress of Cultural Fascism' Ruined the U.S.A. And Gave Us 'Beast-Man' Cheney

by Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.

During the 1964-81 interval, from the launching of the U.S. official war in Indo-China, through the inauguration of Paul Volcker as chairman of the Federal Reserve System, the United States of America was transformed from the world's leading producer society, into what became that presently, terminally bankrupt "post-industrial" wreckage, which has been bestowed upon the currently crumbling Administration of Vice President Dick Cheney's puppet, George W. Bush, Jr. So far, as the worsening horrors now reported from U.S. operations in Iraq attest, what the world has seen there, is a growing image of that U.S. display of a quality of sheer, literally Hitler-like "beastliness" toward mankind, of which only depraved man were capable of becoming, at home, and, therefore, also abroad.

The available remedy for these perilous conditions, would be a return to the successful precedents of the Franklin D. Roosevelt Administration.

President Franklin Roosevelt's strength was expressed in both his leading the U.S. recovery from the 1929-33 world depression, and the U.S.A.'s decisive role, under his leadership, in preventing the fascists of Europe, led by Adolf Hitler, from establishing their intended world-empire in that time. Roosevelt's resources for these purposes, were derived from what are, presently, certain poorly understood, often neglected, special features of the U.S. Constitution's Presidential system. His Administration expressed a Constitutional tradition of resistance to that Venetian-style practice of usury which had been the source of the 1922-1945 emergence of fascist power in Europe.

The advantage drawn upon by Roosevelt, was a U.S. Constitutional tradition which was rooted in the best parts of U.S. culture: that culture's shared commitment to the same Platonic, Classical forms of artistic and scientific culture which have been the root of all of the net achievements of European civilization since the great anti-usury, 15th-Century Renaissance.

The great afflictions which our republic has suffered since that President's most untimely death, have been chiefly the work of a faction, in both leading parties, which had sought to prevent that President's election in 1932. That was a faction whose faulty moral and intellectual character was subsequently expressed to a most notable degree, in the role of a source of moral and other corruption associated with a subversive phenomenon known as the Congress for Cultural Freedom (CCF). That project, CCF, reflects as much the result, as it did the cause, of the kind of decadence which has led to the increasing ruin of our nation, step by step, over the course of the recent four decades.

The characteristic feature of that deep moral corruption which the Roosevelt tradition's typical enemies of the Congress for Cultural Freedom came to represent, was its subversive commitment to fostering what became known as the "counterculture" launched during the middle to late 1960s. This development expressed CCF's commitment to uprooting all of those factors of U.S. culture which had been the determining factors of Roosevelt's leading the U.S. to economic recovery, and its leading role in the defeat of fascism.

There have now been 40 years of acceleration of that specific form of cultural decadence, since the mid-1960s rise of that rock-drug-sex youth-counterculture for which the work of the founders of CCF had done much to set the stage. It is that, and related developments of the mid-1960s and beyond, which have brought the U.S. to the point of both the presently onrushing monetary-financial-economic collapse, and the lunatic resurrection, as by Vice President Cheney, of the role of Bertrand Russell's doctrine of "world government through preventive nuclear warfare." This legacy of Russell et al., was that global strategy of perpetual nuclear-armed warfare, which the Cheney faction has revived, since 1991-93, from the aftermath of Hiroshima and Nagasaki.

In two earlier mass-circulated reports of this Presidential

campaign, my collaborators and I have already identified the specific characteristics of Cheney's policies. In those reports, I emphasized that it were impossible to understand the mechanisms shaping the policies and practice of Cheney's crew of so-called "neo-conservatives," unless we recognized that crew as of the same specific cultural quality of a collective "Beast-Man," which should be recognized from the character of the Adolf Hitler regime. We emphasized there, that the present U.S. Administration under Vice President Cheney's domination, is a modern echo of the consummately evil Count Joseph de Maistre's favorite Satanic figure, the inhuman Grand Inquisitor Tomás de Torquemada: the same Mephistophelean Grand Inquisitor implicitly, aptly, insightfully depicted by Fyodor Dostoyevsky's characterization.¹

As coming developments will show more clearly, Mrs. Lynne Cheney's adopted rogue, her husband, the brutishly bungling Vice President Dick, is no self-made man, and certainly no genius. That snarling creature on that lady's leash, is a consummately greedy and culpable creature, but not a notably intelligent one. When one speaks of that Vice President, think of something more along the lines of Mrs. Mary Wollstonecraft Shelley's lurching Frankenstein Monster.² In short: Dick Cheney did not create the beast he has become today. He is only a very bad actor, playing a part created by such cleverer men as Nazi "crown jurist" Carl Schmitt's one-time protégé, the Hutchins-appointed University of Chicago Professor Leo Strauss.

Now, in this third report of that series, our attention is focused on the way in which we, as a nation, were induced to allow this destructive transformation of our nation's institutions to

¹ See Helga Zepp LaRouche's speech to the Feb. 15, 2004 session of the Schiller Institute/ICLC conference, with reference to Fyodor Dostoyevsky's *The Brothers Karamazov* (speech published in March 26, 2004 issue of EIR).

² Lynne and Dick Cheney are closely associated with the Prime Minister Tony Blair-linked Baroness Liz Symons and their U.S. and other confederates, who have played a leading part, on behalf of the Cheneys' special influence, in their concerted efforts in spreading a wild-eyed, lying libel against me personally, throughout corrupted sections of the British and other press in Europe. Symons' activities are closely allied with the notorious fellow-travellers of the CCF, such as John Irwin III's American Family Foundation (AFF), in the U.S.A. (cf. Appendix).

occur. In the following pages, we turn attention now to the role of the rise of the youth counterculture of the middle to late 1960s, in pre-shaping events such as both the presently onrushing global monetary-financial collapse and the ominous, present Iraq quagmire. To that end, we expose the role and character of that Congress for Cultural Freedom which is exemplary of the circles which worked to induce us, at least many among us, to wreak such moral and economic destruction upon our nation, and such relative depravity upon ourselves.

The fact that such a fiendish, intellectually challenged wretch as Cheney, could become the virtual puppet-master controlling the pathetic, current President of the U.S.A., is merely a symptom, not the true source of our present national catastrophe. Every society has produced its nasty personalities; of which some are merely serious nuisances, but some others, national catastrophes. Cheney's access to his present role as one of our national catastrophes, is not the cause, but, rather, an included outcome of changes, including Allen Dulles's deals with certain Nazis, which we have allowed to be imposed upon our republic, and also upon the cultures of Europe, over the course of the more than 59 years, since the untimely death of President Franklin D. Roosevelt.

To cure that, our current catastrophe, we must show how this degeneration of our great republic was brought about over those intervening six decades. To recognize how we were transformed from the world's leading producer economy, into the sick, "post-industrial," economic parasite we have become today, we must focus attention on trends in both U.S.A. and global developments, which have appeared since the aftermath of the assassinations of such as President John F. Kennedy, the attempted assassinations of France's Charles de Gaulle, and the 1968 killings of the Rev. Martin Luther King and Robert Kennedy.

I repeat the point. We must ask ourselves: What evil principle, which enemy of everything our Constitutional republic was established to become, has brought about our presently catastrophic role, under Cheney's puppet George W. Bush, Jr. and his ally Tony Blair, the role of a grotesquely failed attempt at creating a global, Anglo-American caricature of the Roman Empire? If we, as a people, wish to escape the terrible consequences we have brought upon ourselves, when you allowed

such a caricature of a U.S. Presidency to come into that office, you must ask yourself: How was this evil, utopian dogma, of nuclear imperialism, deployed, especially since the closing moments of World War II, that in such a way as to bring about this awful transformation of our nation? How shall we, therefore, come to know, and to uproot that evil among us which now threatens us with our republic's self-destruction?

My intention here, is to aid us in identifying, and removing, that factor of principled evil which our present national catastrophe expresses. The case which I state and develop in the following pages, is, in summary, as follows:

For as far back into pre-history as we can trace the development of cultures, prior to the 15th-Century birth of the modern European nation-state, the practiced forms of the organization of society, were principally those forms of evil in which a relatively few men and women had subjected the majority of other men and women, to the condition of either hunted, or herded, human cattle. The 16th-Century launching of the African slave-trade into the Americas, by the Portuguese and Spanish monarchies, combined with the launching of that modern murderous anti-Semitism by Isabella I's Spain which was later copied by the Hitler regime, typifies the persistence of this evil into modern European times. Nonetheless, through the great achievement expressed by the outcome of the 15th-Century Renaissance, until the recent four decades, European civilization, with all its included wrongs and even evils, had nonetheless led, until recently, in raising the standard of living and freedom of the peoples of this planet. Now, during the recent four decades, we have reversed direction, turning back the clock of European history, economy, and culture, toward a now-threatened, new, planetary dark age.

So, in this process of the recent four decades, we have adopted changes in our popular and related culture, which have had the effect of causing the clock of human progress to run backwards. As the history of past slavery, and presently continued racial discrimination in the U.S.A. attests, still today, and as our currently prevalent doctrines of public education also reflect this, we live in a society which seeks to control the mass of its own people by, as we say, "dumbing them down." Like the decadence of doomed ancient Rome, the ostensible rulers of America today, seek to divert the attention of the

greater part of even the upper 20% of the population's income-brackets from the ugly reality of these days, with the bread and circuses of sexually and otherwise depraved forms of mass-entertainment.

As I and others shall show in the course of this present report as a whole:

This condition the U.S.A. is presently suffering, as a nation, increasingly, is the effect of the induced cultural transformation of so many of the men and women of the Americas and Europe today, who have been captured by the morally and intellectually corrupting effects of a post-modernist culture. They have become captives of a trend of change in mental life, in the direction of becoming herded human cattle, becoming the willing victims of a society of little bread and much entertainment, increasingly degraded entertainment, as the self-doomed Roman Empire entertained itself before us.

This trend of nearly two generations in our own culture, reflects a principle of evil which is merely typified by such precedents as the introduction of both peonage and the African slave-trade into the Americas, by the 16th-Century monarchies of Portugal and Spain. The principle of evil expressed by this reversal of the clock of human progress, continues the doctrine of perpetual conflict of Galileo Galilei's student Thomas Hobbes, a doctrine expressed in such forms as the practice of the systems of fascist government which were spread across Continental Europe from 1922 until the close of war in 1945.

This same principle of evil was given a concentrated expression in the widespread, influential practice of what has come to be regarded, unfortunately, as a highly respected U.S. organization, an organization known under such titles as the Congress for Cultural Freedom.

This corruption was set fully into motion, by influentials such as Allen Dulles, as soon as President Franklin Roosevelt was dead. Dulles, who conducted the secret agreements to bring elements of the Nazi SS within the postwar Anglo-American establishment, typified those who then worked to bring the ostensibly sanitized elements of Nazi existentialist doctrine back even into the Anglo-American/French government of occupied postwar Germany, as the roles of Theodor Adorno and Margaret Mead are examples of the spread of this specific form of corruption there. This was typified by the spread of that

same corruption in the U.S. itself by Adorno, Bertrand Russell's Mead, and Adorno's truth-hating, existentialist crony Hannah Arendt.³ As the evidence is documented, summarily, in the pages of this report, the CCF's radiated, bestializing influence to that explicitly intended effect, has dominated trans-Atlantic and other parts of our planet's civilization, increasingly, from the 1945 close of that war, until the present day.

The motive for the broader, systemic corruption of mind and morals which that *Commentary* magazine-associated CCF only exemplifies, has been to poison, and even eradicate the intellectual and cultural roots of the modern sovereign form of nation-state republic. The intent of that corruption has been, to do this in a way which clears the pathway for the subversion and replacement of existing sovereign states by a new name for imperialism, called "globalization."

One principal outcome of that mass-brainwashing by CCF-related influences, was the eruption of the mid-1960s "rock-drug-sex youth-counterculture." Since President Abraham Lincoln led the U.S. into its role as a continental power, through the defeat of Lord Palmerston's asset, the Confederacy, it has been the case, since President Lincoln's victory, that to conquer that powerful nation of the American people, one must first corrupt their minds, as the work of the CCF is thus more appropriately named the "Sexual Congress for Cultural Fascism." Our enemies, those from without and from within, must first induce us to corrupt and destroy ourselves, intellectually and morally. When that post-Kennedy youth-countercultural ferment fostered by CCF, is compared with its equally evil twin, today's right-wing "fundamentalist" insurgency of Pat Robertson, Tom DeLay, et al., we have in those combined, intertwined cases, a leading example of that which typifies the CCF-centered process of cultural corruption of the minds of Americans and Europeans alike.

The change of the character of the U.S.A., since the mid-1960s, from the world's leading producer nation, to its presently

³ Adorno, Theodor W., *The Authoritarian Personality*, John Wiley & Sons, New York, 1964. See Lyndon LaRouche, *The Essential Fraud of Leo Strauss*, *EIR* magazine, March 21, 2003; *The Roles of Church and State*, *EIR* magazine, May 16, 2003; *When Even Scientists Were Brainwashed*, *EIR* magazine, April 30, 2004.

looted condition as a lurching “post-industrial” wreckage, is an expression of the degree to which the intention of the CCF has been carried out in the U.S.A. and the United Kingdom, as also in Australia and New Zealand, as also in Continental Europe. For reasons which will become clear during the following pages of this special report by my campaign, I have preferred to designate that U.S.-based organization by a title more consistent with its typical role in crafting the characteristically inhuman, madly rutting, “rock-drug-sex youth-counterculture” of the middle through late 1960s: “The Sexual Congress for Cultural Fascism” (SCCF).

Now, you should ask yourselves: Who were the clever ones, who had begun to do this to us, even long before Lynne Cheney’s presently lurching monster had been born? Who has, thus, put the legendary “mark of the beast” upon our nation? How shall we remove that ugly, menacing stain?

That crucial information which your family’s protection demands so urgently, is the subject of the following pages of this present report.

What Does Culture Do?

by Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.

As we have documented this fact in locations published earlier, the turn in direction of pathway, away from President Franklin Roosevelt's leadership, toward the catastrophe which is our nation's terrible condition today, was begun as part of an operation in which the later head of our Central Intelligence Agency, John Foster Dulles' brother Allen, played a key role, toward the close of World War II. This is a role he played together, and over the later decades his life, with accomplices, including his James Jesus Angleton. Dulles and Angleton, typify those who played a key role in bringing a key part of the Nazi SS intelligence apparatus into the inside of what became, later, the NATO system.

This integration of key elements of the Nazi SS apparatus into our postwar intelligence system, was the outcome of a process which had begun when leading Nazis, such as some around Hermann Goering, recognized that the Nazi defeat at Stalingrad, when combined, in effect, with the U.S. naval victory at Midway, foretold the coming defeat of the Adolf Hitler phase of Nazi Germany. These Nazi circles are typified by Dulles' Geneva-based contact François Genoud, Walter Schellenberg, and former Nazi Economics Minister Hjalmar Schacht and his Otto "Scarface" Skorzeny, as Anglo-American-protected ex-Nazi assets in Europe, such as operations conducted through Spain's fascist dictator Franco. These assets, such as the notorious "rat-line," were used as channels for relocating significant elements of the Nazi apparatus in the Americas, where the circles built up around descendants of those Nazi assets are a key threat to the security of our hemisphere, including the interior of the U.S.A., today. Meanwhile, as the case of Falangist ideologue Blas Piñar's present leadership among Nazi relics in Europe and the Americas attests, the parts of the Nazi SS apparatus which were rescued by aid of Dulles et al., are presently an active influence and security threat, in the present

disguises of the Nazi International, in both Europe and the Americas generally.

Those Nazis themselves were only part of the problem. As we have documented this in earlier reports on the "Beast-Man" phenomenon, the fascist organizations which took over Western and Central Continental Europe during the interval 1922-45, were political assets of a network created and directed by a network of private financier houses, a network which was brought together in the context of the unworkable from of international financial-monetary system created, at the close of World War I, under the authority of the Treaty of Versailles. This apparatus, run top-down by these financial circles, is properly filed under the counterintelligence category named the Synarchist International. The Nazis were but one among the sundry brand-labellings included in the assortment of "left-right" political conspiracies created by this Synarchist International.¹

Once the probable doom of Hitler was apparent to relevant German leaders, as early as during the first half of 1942, the intent of those inner circles of Nazis around Hermann Goering, was to save the financial kernel and certain personnel of the Nazi system for a role in the postwar world. Their intention was, to create a system of universal fascism, an imperial system, a new version of the Roman Empire, to either eliminate all nation-states, or absorb them into an imperial system of what today's Michael Ledeen has designated as "universal fascism," his translation, for practice, of *Allgemeine-SS*. Those Nazi and other varieties of philosophically existentialist elements, were collected to form a combination of other Continental European fascist networks, and were integral to the Franklin Roosevelt-hating, Anglo-American networks associated with Henry Luce's already existing project for "A New American Century."

The integration of these elements into a common, Anglo-American-dominated, "right-wing international" network oc-

¹ Otherwise known by World War II-period U.S. military intelligence as "Synarchist: Nazi-Communist," a network then including the lists of such notable Synarchist assets as Houston's de Menil, Mexico's Soustelle, and Soustelle's former teacher Paul Rivet, in Ayacucho, Peru. This was also known by U.S. intelligence in France as the Banque Worms conspiracy. Soustelle's later operations, including the targetting of France's President Charles de Gaulle from bases in Franco's fascist Spain, are typical.

curred, all under the direction of the "Bilderberg" or kindred expressions of the fascist international financier syndicate. This same Synarchist International, which had created Hitler, also produced that subversive enemy of ours who later appeared under such significant labels as "The Congress for Cultural Freedom." To sell Nazism today, package it into a can bearing an Orwellian label such as "Project Democracy."

The history of the background to the connection between Synarchism and the Congress for Cultural Freedom, includes the following notably relevant historical features.

Like that co-founder of what became the fascism of Mussolini, Hitler, and Francisco Franco, the pro-Satanic Count Joseph de Maistre, and like the forerunner of Adolf Hitler, Friedrich Nietzsche, the characteristic of those forces of evil expressed both as fascism and as those followers of Allen Dulles promoting the philosophy of the so-called Congress for Cultural Freedom, is their "Silenus" cry of hatred against the legacy of progress of European civilization. So, Maistre expressed his hatred against the legacy of the 15th-Century Renaissance, by worship of the Beast-Man image of that Satanic anti-Semite Tomas de Torquemada. So, the Christ-hating anti-Semite Nietzsche harked back to the pagan brutishness of a Phrygian Dionysus.

To understand Synarchism today, we must recognize and understand that modern fascism then, as now, takes its origins from the Martinist freemasonry which worked with Lord Shelburne's London to organize France's Reign of Terror. This is the same freemasonic order which produced Napoleon Bonaparte, and the interchangeable parts known as Talleyrand and Fouché. It is also, today, expressed in the form of a modern fascism unleashed by the financier plotters of that 20th-Century Synarchist International which also gave us the legacy of Mussolini, Hitler, and Franco.

To understand this persistently recurring threat to modern civilization, we must focus attention on the historically specific characteristics of that European civilization which was first brought forth in Greece by what Socrates would have acknowledged as the midwives supplied by a great Egyptian tradition. The legacy of evil expressed by the image of the Congress for Cultural Freedom today, is the image of a potentially fatal infection which is the leading specific threat to a particular

species of culture, the specific culture of a European civilization traced in its original best aspects, as Plato did, from the images of Thales, Solon, and Pythagoras.

When that matter is placed in that historical light, the history of the problems of the globally extended European culture, since ancient Greece, can all be defined in an appropriately elementary way. One feature stands out in significance above all others: How does that European civilization define, or reject, the existence of a fundamental, principled distinction, of man from beast? How does this conception function, in principle, as in practice? What crucially relevant lessons does history, real history, show to the actually thinking U.S. citizen whom I address here? What does it show him, or her, about the crucial issue posed by the influence of CCF and its like?

Are You a Man or a Monkey?

Closer, modern study of the astrophysical principles expressed by the architecture of Egypt's Great Pyramids of Giza, has provided crucially typical, scientific evidence bearing upon the way in which Egypt contributed to the specific quality of greatness achieved by what we call today the Classical Greek culture of Thales, Pythagoras, Solon, and Plato. Since the birth of the modern Europe of the sovereign nation-state, an institution which emerged from the Italy-centered 15th-Century Renaissance, European civilization, as defined by that Classical heritage, has been expressed, typically, as the modern notion of a sovereign nation-state republic. With this 15th-Century emergence of a new institution, the sovereign nation-state, demanded by such preceding leaders as Dante, and described, as to essential points of principle, by that century's Cardinal Nicholas of Cusa, had become the most effective form of existing institutional power for improvement of the condition of mankind.

The distinction of the emergence of modern Europe, through the struggles against the shackles of an ultramontanist form of medieval imperialism, is that, for the first time, in the shadow of Filippo Brunelleschi's crafting of the cupola of the Cathedral of Florence, the bestializing legacy of empire gave way to the notion of a community of sovereign nation-states each and all

committed to promotion of that general welfare of mankind. This was the same prescribed goal sought since Solon of Athens, as defined by the Classical Socratic Greek, and Christian, principle of *agapē*.

Unfortunately, as the role of the pro-Satanic Tomás de Torquemada illustrates this, the Venice-orchestrated, ultra-montane forces of reaction against that Renaissance, struck back with bestial, homicidal fury, as typified by that interval of A.D. 1511-1648 religious and kindred warfare which was brought to a close only through the leading role of France's Cardinal Mazarin in bringing about the great 1648 Treaty of Westphalia. That principle of the Treaty of Westphalia is the achievement upon which civilized modern European life has depended, since then, to the present time.

Unfortunately, the conflict did not end, as settled, in that treaty, then and there. A fresh threat to civilization arose in the rise to power of a new imperial pretender, the 1688-1763 rise of the Anglo-Dutch Liberal party, as expressed by the British East India Company of Lord Shelburne et al., to the rank of a global imperial power. It is the issues defined in the rising conflict between that Company's imperial power and those patriots gathered around the North American colonies leading intellect, Benjamin Franklin, which has been implicitly the principal axis of reference for all notable, long-term forms of global conflict since 1763, to the present day. Although the British East India Company has passed on, its legacy, like the effects of an epidemic infectious disease, has continued its impact on modern, globally extended European history, up to the present day. The impact of that legacy has continued to define the matrix of world conflicts, from 1763 to the present day.

To understand adequately what the legacy of Allen Dulles et al., continues to represent, as a continuing threat of fascism in the world today, we must place our finger on the subject of the origin of Martinism, and its outgrowths such as Synarchism. What we know as 20th-Century fascism, or Synarchism, as we fought against it under President Franklin Roosevelt's leadership, lies in a persisting effort to overturn those principles of civilized relations among sovereign nation-states which were adopted by the 1648 Treaty of Westphalia.

As I shall explain summarily, now, and conclude discussion

of that point later in this present section of the report, what was called, interchangeably, the “Venetian Party” or empiricists’ “Enlightenment” of 18th-Century England and France, emerged as a newly attempted form of worldwide successor to the Roman Empire. This imperial role was established with the British East India Company’s triumph at the 1763 Treaty of Paris. The Martinist freemasonic order which led the unleashing of the French Terror of the 1790s and Napoleon Bonaparte’s tyranny, was itself a joint instrument of the imperial British East India Company’s Lord Shelburne (1737-1805) and anti-U.S.A. forces of continental Europe. The Martinist order was an instrument created with the initial intention, as assigned by the Company’s Lord Shelburne and his flunky, Adam Smith, to play a crucial role in wrecking the cause of the English-speaking colonies in North America and bankrupting and destroying Liberal London’s most potent continental rival, the great Louis XI-Mazarin-Colbert tradition which was the best of France at that time.

Leading U.S. patriots in the tradition of the early Cincinnatus Society had come to understand this more and more clearly, especially since the time John Quincy Adams began to clear his own head in such matters, during the period he virtually created the functioning form of the U.S. State Department.² Notably, John Quincy Adams went on from there, as later President and senior member of the U.S. Congress, to launch what later became the Abraham Lincoln Presidency and the tradition which I, personally, represent, as an informed spokesman, as a U.S. Presidential candidate, today.

As I have said above, the roots of modern European civilization go much deeper than modern times. In the history of European civilization, it was from the Egypt of those Pyramids

² The collapse of the U.S. Federalist Party was, most immediately, a result of the blunder of the Administration of President John Adams, in being taken in by a fraudulent propaganda-piece, Sir John Robison’s *The Roots of the Conspiracy*, crafted and circulated within the U.S. by French Terror-controller Jeremy Bentham’s British Foreign Office. The issue of the Alien & Sedition Acts, as posed by the circulation of Robison’s hoax, is typical of that folly, President Adams’ toleration of his wife’s, Abigail Adams’, foolish, continuing tirades against the most clear-headed U.S. leader of that time, Alexander Hamilton, typifying the state of confusion which led to the self-inflicted doom of the Federal and Democratic-Republican Parties.

and of the founder of the ancient nation of Israel, Moses, that European civilization adopted a specific quality of rigorous notion of a fundamental, principled distinction of man from beast. The initial realization of what became known as European civilization, occurred principally as the impact of that same conception associated with the universalized, Mosaic nature of man, in forming the Classical tradition of what we call ancient Greece today.

Although the nature of the human species is the same everywhere, and although there is, therefore, a necessary, long-ranging tendency for convergence of nations upon common principles of mutual conduct, the history of the development of a European culture, by that name, as rooted in the history of ancient Greece, has a distinct quality of historical specificity, from beginning to the present date. This requires competent thinkers to treat the internal development of the offshoots of ancient European cultures since Solon's Athens, as an historically specific process which must first be studied as a distinct subject of converging cultural developments in its own right.

The most essential feature of that history is the long struggle, as since Solon's Athens, between the effort to establish a true nation-state republic of citizens, and the opposing effort, typified by Sparta under the Constitution of Lycurgus, or the Babylonian, Persian, Roman, Byzantine, and ultramontane forms such as medieval, Venice-centered Europe. The backers of the CCF project represent the latter, imperial impulse, an impulse toward eradicating the existence of sovereign nation-states, as the presently wildly utopian thrust toward plunging the planet into the doom of imperial "globalization," attests.

The issue so posed by the CCF legacy, in particular, is the nature of the functional, constitutional distinction between men and apes. That principled distinction is defined as follows.

Egyptian science as echoed by that of the Pythagoreans, Thales, and Plato, was associated with a pre-Aristotelean conception of mathematics, which was derived from astronomy, a conception of physical geometry, rather than an aprioristic mathematics such as that of Euclid. This pre-Euclidean, and, implicitly anti-Euclidean method of physical science was then known as "spherics." This notion of a physical geometry, rooted in the concept of "spherics," rather than an aprioristic, merely formal geometry, provided the basis for defining an experimen-

tal proof of the existence of a fundamental physical principle, principles designated as what we call today “powers” (Greek: *dynamis*), as Carl Gauss’s 1799 attack on the frauds of Euler and Lagrange, in Gauss’s first statement of The Fundamental Theorem of Algebra supplies an implicitly geometrical statement of the mathematical-physical representation of “powers.”

Typical proofs of powers so defined, included the notion of the doubling of the line, of the square, and of the cube. Added to this was, most notably, the notion of the construction of a series of Platonic solids, as this was reported by Plato, and was addressed by Cardinal Nicholas of Cusa³ and his followers, Luca Pacioli and Leonardo da Vinci, and the avowed follower of all of these, that founder of modern astronomy, Johannes Kepler, who set the pace for the singular achievements of such as Fermat, Pascal, Huyghens, Leibniz, and Jean Bernouilli.

The experimentally based discovery of, and willful use of such physical principles, expressed the provable, absolute distinction of persons from animals, the distinction between man and ape. These principles were of two general categories, principles of man’s intervention in nature, and principles of the social processes through which mankind increases our species’ power in and over nature.

Otherwise, the most significant implication of these considerations, is the Promethean way in which mankind transmits the act of discovery of such powers (experimentally demonstrable universal principles) from one person to another, and thus from one generation to another. Through the transmission of the replicatable act of generating such discoveries of universal principle, we have the only way in which the human species has been able to increase its potential relative population-density, above the level of the millions possible for a species of higher ape, to more than 6 billions living persons today.

These principles have three most notable qualities, as follows.

1. Although a valid universal physical principle is never, itself, an object of sense-perception, its experimentally proven universality of efficiency is an efficiently existing object of the mind. In other words, although the effect of application of a principle must be a subject of a mathematical description, the principle itself is not the mathematical formula, but is, rather, an inte-

³ E.g., *De Docta Ignorantia*.

gral, indivisible object of the mind, in the same way that the notion of an irreducible object of sense-perception is the idea of an object.⁴

2. The standpoint of “spherics” adopted by the Pythagoreans, et al., thus divided human experience of the physical world between invisible, but efficient principles, and their implicitly visible sense-perceptible effects. In modern mathematical physics, this set of ontological distinctions is expressed as the notion of the complex domain as introduced by Carl Gauss and refined by his follower Bernhard Riemann.

3. The true notion of a universal physical principle is never a way of merely explaining nature (contemplation), but is a method of acting efficiently to change nature in ways which only efficient comprehension of a discovered universal physical principle permits. It expresses an intention, whether an intention by the Creator of the universe, as Kepler defined the principle of universal gravitation which he had discovered, or by man acting in a way like that of that Creator. We must presume, at least to the present date, that all principles of the universe existed prior to man’s consciousness; however, when man discovers the power to deploy such a pre-existing principle, man’s action, as an intention, changes the ordering of the universe within which we act.⁵

The Prometheus Principle in History

However, in societies in which a relatively few hold others in the status of human cattle, the ruling strata of that society, like the Roman Emperor Diocletian before them, are careful to

⁴ Compare Herbart’s and Bernhard Riemann’s coinciding, but different, uses of the German term *Geistesmasse* (i.e., “thought-object”).

⁵ This view subsumes a notion which is at least as old as ancient Greek culture, that the universe is composed of three specific, interacting classifications of universal physical principles: non-living, living, and cognitive; the latter, although an existing universal, is a power unique to the human individual among mortal individuals of living species. This Classical Greek view was afforded its modern expression by the work of the great Russian biogeochemist, Vladimir I. Vernadsky, and his definitions of Biosphere and Noösphere. It is man’s discovery and employment of universal physical principles which accords with the notion of man and woman made equally in the likeness of the Creator, as in Genesis 1.

prescribe that society must not educate those we intend to condemn to the status of human cattle, above their intended station in life. The implication of that is, that the society committed to the notion of maintaining people in the status of human cattle, or, perhaps monkeys, does not wish to advertise the existence of those mental powers which set human beings apart from, and above the beasts. In European civilization since ancient Greece, this intention, to hold a large number of people in the status of human cattle, is expressed systemically by what is termed "philosophical reductionism," as this is expressed as the tradition of those opponents of the Pythagoreans known as the Eleatics, Sophists, and radical Euclidean, or the modern philosophical empiricists, positivists, and existentialists such as Nietzsche, the Nazi Martin Heidegger, and his co-thinkers Hannah Arendt, Theodor Adorno, and Karl Jaspers.

That issue is famously typified by the ancient Greek dramatist Aeschylus's *Prometheus Bound*. The evil gods of Zeus's Olympus captured the immortal Prometheus, chained him to a rock, and tortured him perpetually, to induce him to abandon the intention to give knowledge of universal physical principles to those human beings whom Zeus intends to hold in the status of nothing better than dehumanized, human cattle. This issue, as posed by the image of Aeschylus's *Prometheus Bound*, has proven itself to be the most important issue in the history of European civilization as a whole, since no later than the founding of that civilization in ancient Greece.

It is the issue of the individual person's right to discover, and to know experimentally, provable universal physical principles, and to apply these principles of knowledge to change man's relations to nature in ways which increase the potential relative population-density of the human species. It is, in other words, the right to know, and to practice that truth which the Satanic Olympian Zeus and his oligarchy hate with the fiercest hatred. It is the right of mankind to enjoy the blessings of progress, the right to improve the condition of the human individual in the broadest and deepest sense of that notion. It is the notion of *agapē* posed by Plato's Socrates, in opposition to the historically defined characters Glaucon and Thrasymachus, in Plato's *Republic*.

The transmission of knowledge of experimentally definable universal physical principles, from one person to another, and

one generation to the next, is the expression of an immortal character of the role of the mortal individual in society. As Plato insists, and as the Christian Apostle Paul emphasizes in his 1 Corinthians 13, this principle of *agapē*, so conceived, is the highest rank of moral and other law respecting human behavior. Jesus Christ's expression of the Creator's love of mankind, as *agapē*, is the essence of the principle of natural law in the practice of civilization. So, Leibniz, in repudiating the evil intrinsic to John Locke, placed *agapē*, as the principle of the pursuit of happiness, above all other law. So, the central Constitutional principle, and statement of intention of the U.S. 1776 Declaration of Independence, defined Leibniz's notion of the pursuit of happiness as the highest principle of our Constitutional law.

The term "Satanic" should be understood as controlled in its practical meaning as expressing a vicious form of practice of denial of the individual person's likeness to the Creator. Every person's life is therefore sacred. The Beast-Man behavior of captors in U.S.-run prisons in Iraq, is an example of people, those captors, as like Nazi concentration-camp guards, captors self-degraded into the likeness of inhuman predatory beasts. Similarly, the widespread attempt to interpret the U.S. Federal Constitution as a body of "contract law," especially among those mentally crippled by the burdensome tradition of the U.S. Confederacy, such as the radical "dictionary positivist" and U.S. Associate Justice Antonin Scalia, is an expression of that quality of the "Satanic," the degradation of human beings to the rank of property (e.g., "shareholder interest"). The treatment of any human being as a subject of "shareholder value" (i.e., Lockean property), as the current practice of the 1973 overturn of the Hill-Burton legislation by the HMO "reform," is therefore an implicitly Satanic mode of behavior. This Satanic quality is the characteristic feature of such evil British Fabian Society celebrities as H.G. Wells, Bertrand Russell, their crony Aleister Crowley, and their sorcerer's apprentices Aldous and Julian Huxley. The pollution of the U.S. by the relevant influences of Wells, Russell, et al., has become an expression of a Satanic influence in U.S. intellectual and other behavior.

In these matters of natural law, it is not the act as such which is crucial for law. It is the expressed intention underlying the act which is crucial. For this purpose, we must define "intention" as

Kepler defined the Creator's intention which is expressed as that universal principle of gravitation (His, not the empiricist Galileo's) which governs the composition of the Solar System. Ignorance of the intention by which an act might be judged, is, in a certain degree, exculpatory, as in the case of a person lacking the powers or will for knowledge, to distinguish between right and wrong. In human behavior, it is the person's assignment of an intention as the purpose of his, or her life, which is of crucial bearing on the way in which society must judge the degree of actual culpability in, and remedies for, violation of a principle of natural law.

This point is illustrated by recognizing the experimentally validated discovery of any universal physical principle, such as Kepler's uniquely original discovery of the principle of gravitation, as expressing the Creator's intention. Thus, we must intend to promote such forms of scientific progress, as discovering the Creator's intention, and must regard ourselves as morally, constitutionally bound by the intent to pursue that course, and enforce the implications of such discoveries, as effectively as might be possible.

This distinction is made clearer in nature and importance, when we consider those misguided persons who refuse to recognize the 1776 U.S. Declaration of Independence and the Preamble of the Federal Constitution as enforceable intentions to which all interpretation of any other features of that Constitution, its amendments, or Federal law, must be made subject. Any positive law, any contract which violates those intentions, such as Scalia's evil reading of "shareholder value," must be nullified, as if axiomatically, even as if retroactively. Or, a contract negotiated by the relevant parties in apparent good faith, must be nullified in those aspects which might be discovered to be in conflict with natural law.

For example, in the history of the U.S., and other nations, the fact that a person had been property (e.g., a slave), by prior determination, or birth, was treated under a reading of that pro-slavery doctrine of John Locke which had been repudiated by the language and intention of the U.S. Declaration of Independence. Similarly, as in the case of those current debts of the nations of Central and South America which were imposed arbitrarily, upon those states under the newly imposed rules of a post-1971 floating-exchange-rate monetary system, rather

than being incurred by the will of the debtor, are properly nullified under any judicial ruling consistent with natural law. No self-evident sanctity exists in any contract as such, except as there is no implied violation of natural law in the relevant terms at issue.

A true national constitution, such as our Declaration of Independence, and under the terms of the Preamble of our Federal Constitution, derives its authority from those its statements of intention which are comparable to the notion of necessity that man-made law must be consistent with the same principles of knowable intention attributed to the Creator's law. In this matter, mankind must hold itself and its nations accountable for herding the national law of sovereign states into channels of intended effects consistent with the same notion of intention properly attributable to the notions of universal physical laws.

In all this and related matter, the Promethean right of the human individual and society to participate in the benefits of scientific and technological progress, must be enforced as a matter of natural law. This principle of law of statecraft must be viewed from the standpoint of the absolute distinction of man from ape. (If you reject scientific and technological progress, as the Luddites did, then you might apply for status, under law, as a monkey: A witty judge might merrily grant your plea.) Man's nature is his likeness to the Creator of the universe, in the respect that man's power to discover and employ universal physical principles, is a quality of human nature shared only with the Creator, and that any suppression of that right, by Zeus or any other force, is Satanic by implication.

The implication is, that the only just society is one which fosters scientific and technological progress, in changing both nature and man's mode of practice to this effect. In the language of a science of physical economy, this signifies the development and application of knowledgeable practice to the effect of increasing the physical expression of potential relative population-density of the human species, per capita and per square kilometer. Therefore the related notions of economic growth, and of physical profitability, are restricted to measurements made in physical terms, rather than, and often in defiance of, monetary terms of financial accounting. The attempt to shackle the physical practice of a society to the accounting office, e.g., usury, is implicitly a form of Satanism, and has often proven

to be just that in many instances of practice. The only true profit is that which is an increase of good for mankind as a creature made in the likeness of the Creator.

The most essential consideration, therefore, is the need to promote the development of those mental powers of the individual which generate revolutionary changes in practice to the effect of increasing the net physical productivity of society per capita and per square kilometer.

For example, the greatest increase in the productive powers of labor, per capita and per square kilometer, was set into motion by the 15th-Century Renaissance's launching of the modern form of sovereign nation-state whose principles are prescribed in such locations as Cusa's *Concordantia Catholica* and *De Docta Ignorantia*. It was the achievement of modern forms of sovereignty by more nations, such as India and China, through their gaining the right to conduct their affairs in a way informed by the achievements of the European form of modern sovereign nation-state, which has made possible what has been already gained, as echoes of the anti-colonialist policies of the U.S. Presidency of Franklin D. Roosevelt, and greater foreseeable advances in the human condition among such peoples under a renewal of that President's intention today. This is the policy which affords us today, not only a way of escape from the threat of a global new dark age descending upon the world today, but a brighter vision of the future of humanity as a whole.

Shelburne's Evil Legacy Today

Through the mechanics of the British East India Company's orchestration of the so-called "Seven Years' War" on the continent of Europe, that Company diverted France's attention sufficiently from the larger world, to continental strife, that the British Company neatly snapped up control of what we know as Canada, India, and relevant other locations. Thus, the Treaty of Paris which acknowledged this outcome as a matter of law, established the British East India Company (rather than the British monarchy as such) as, in fact, a global, nominally British empire.

What became known to this day as the Bank of England's role as a keystone of a so-called "independent central banking

system” has been the dominant feature in the long-range unfolding of the history of both the United Kingdom and continental Europe, up to the present day. This system was known, during that century, as the system of “The Venetian Party.” The slime-mold-like concert of financier-oligarchical interests, which had exerted de facto imperial power with the medieval alliance of Venice and Norman chivalry, had, so to speak, reincarnated itself, from the late 17th Century on, as a new Anglo-Dutch-pivotted “Venetian” financier oligarchy, based in the maritime regions of Northern Protestant Europe. Intellectually, the imperial potencies of the Company’s empire, spoke Dutch, English, and so on, but they thought as Venetian, as Francesco Zorzi (a.k.a. Giorgi), Giovanni Botero, Paolo Sarpi, Galileo Galilei, Antonio Conti, Voltaire, and Giammaria Ortes had taught them to think.

In this setting, Lord Shelburne emerged as the frankly diabolical, rising figure of influence within that Company. Shelburne and his circle of personal lackeys, such as Adam Smith, Edward Gibbon, and the consummately pro-Satanic Jeremy Bentham, played key roles as Shelburne agents, in setting out the intended ground-rules for the consolidation of the Company’s empire as a permanent successor to the defunct Roman Empire.

Shelburne’s role and rules, so defined, set the dominant features of the patterns of Europe-dominated global conflict which has, predominantly, determined the course of the general flow of world history, from that time to the present.

The concerns of Shelburne and his circle were the potential dangers to the eternal perpetuity of that empire from the inside and outside, respectively. The chief external threat they feared, was the impact of the American Revolution as a model which might infect Europe. Otherwise, they continued the proven policy of the Seven Years’ War, a policy of keeping the nations of Europe more or less at one another’s throats, as a way of preventing the emergence of a continental-Europe-based power which might overturn the imperial power represented by the Bank of England. Within the latter context, the immediate concern of Shelburne’s circles was to destroy the power of the U.S. allies of 1776-83, Charles’s Spain and Louis XI’s France, chiefly the economic power represented by the Colbertiste tradition still alive within France.

President Abraham Lincoln’s victory over Lord Palmerston’s

asset, the insurrectionary, slave-holders' Confederate States of America, became a principal threat to the continuation of that British Empire's hegemony over the planet. Not only had the victorious U.S. emerged as a continental nation-state power which could no longer be crushed by the methods of external attacks and internal subversion which Britain had employed up to that time. The startling success of the U.S. economic model, over the interval 1861-76, was drawing leading powers such as Alexander II's Russia, Bismarck's Germany, and others, including Japan, during and beyond the late 1870s, into adopting leading features of the Hamilton-Carey-List American System of political-economy, as the preferred alternative to the British system.

The result was a massive emphasis by pro-British influences, on subversion of the Republican Party, in addition to assets already in tow from within the traditionally pro-slavery Democratic Party. Meanwhile, that Prince of Wales and later emperor, King Edward VII, plotted to unleash what we call World War I, which led to the subsequent plotting of what became World War II, by the British fellow-travellers of the Continent-based Synarchist International.

During the course of World War II, the leading intention for perpetuating the empire in the postwar world, was supplied by the circles of H.G. Wells and Bertrand Russell, as in Russell's public acclaim for Wells's 1928 *The Open Conspiracy* and Russell's key role in organizing the introduction of warfare with nuclear-fission weapons as the instrument for establishing a form of imperialism called "world government," then, and "globalization," today. These are the current forms of the proposed continuation of the imperial perspective developed under the leadership of Shelburne. The doctrine of a "perpetual war" in the guise of "preventive, nuclear-weapons-armed warfare," of Prime Minister Tony Blair's confederate, Vice President Dick Cheney, is the present expression of the imperial policy set forth by Wells and Russell.

Throughout the postwar period to date, the "Sexual Congress for Cultural Fascism" has complemented the development of nuclear-fission and nuclear-fusion weapons, as an integral feature of this same imperial intention to uproot and exterminate the institution of the sovereign nation-state. The intended function of that "Sexual Congress for Cultural Fascism" associated

with the CIA project linked to *Commentary* magazine and others, has been to destroy the institution of the U.S. sovereign nation-state at its root, its commitment to the American System of political-economy associated with the Constitutional founding of the U.S. republic and with the U.S.'s rising to a long-term world-power status under Presidents Abraham Lincoln and Franklin D. Roosevelt.

The corruption of the post-Lincoln U.S.A. in such directions, was premised on a political alliance between the London-allied, Manhattan-centered financier oligarchy and the relics of the slave-holding Confederacy. The legendary conflict between Republicans of the New York and Ohio varieties, is typical of this. The takeover of the U.S.A. to this effect, was accomplished through aid of the assassination of President William McKinley, and the domination of the next three decades of U.S. life by the impact of two Presidents in whom the tradition of the Confederacy was deeply embedded, Theodore Roosevelt and Ku Klux Klan enthusiast Woodrow Wilson. It was under the influence of this combination assembled around the Teddy and Woody show, that the origins of the U.S. role in the post-World War I Versailles Treaty, and the launching of what became the "Sexual Congress for Cultural Fascism," took shape.

Looking back at the history of the U.S.A. since the death of Franklin Roosevelt, we can appreciate why certain trans-Atlantic, English-speaking partners came to support Wells and Russell in placing such emphasis on the efforts to uproot and destroy the traditional U.S. commitment to the benefits of scientific and technological progress in development of basic economic infrastructure and modes of agricultural and industrial production and employment. To defeat the U.S.A., the imperialist must take the American commitment to the beauties of scientific and technological progress out of the American, as this process of extraction has been fully ongoing during the recent four decades.

This pattern of change in British strategic outlook since the 1861-76 developments in the U.S.A., is signalled by the emergence of the circles of Thomas Huxley, and of the related circles of George Bernard Shaw and other notables of the history of the Fabian Society. Huxley's personal *Zauberlehrling*, H.G. Wells, a key figure in preparing for World War I, typifies this. The post-World War I reconciliation of Wells and Bertrand

Russell around a common evil intent, expresses this in the continued life of the postwar world whence Wells and Russells have now long departed.

Roosevelt's leadership of the U.S. economic recovery, and the role of the U.S. under him at war, showed that the earlier attempts to subvert the U.S. had failed, failed because the earlier attempts to crush the American patriotic character had failed to uproot it. This time, they, decided, they would uproot it. The Congress for Cultural Freedom project, and the closely related "Frankfurt School," like the Fabian Society, typify the subversive modes employed to the latter purpose.

The 'New Dark Age' Syndrome

Relatively speaking, those who, like bellwethers Cheney and Tony Blair, have come into key positions of Anglo-American power, are not notable for qualities of intelligence, nor even sanity. Their principal dupe, poor President George W. Bush, would be sympathetic as a poor, pathetic person of less than meager intellect, were he not so damnably mean about it all. Even if they conquered the world, as they have conspired to conquer and loot Iraq, they would fail more or less precisely as the lessons of the continuing asymmetric warfare in Iraq forewarn intelligent professional observers in the U.S. and elsewhere today. Their success, were it to occur, would mean nothing but the collapse of the planet as a whole into a prolonged new dark age of humanity, during which world population-levels would drop toward something substantially less than a billion miserable souls, perhaps even much, much less. These would-be tyrants would make Genghis Khan retch in disgust at the poor quality of monster, such as those, the world is apparently capable of producing today. These are not true leaders, even evil ones; these are a kind of demented slime-mold.

There is no victory for the U.S.A., Britain, or anyone else, under a continuation of their combined present reign over much of the world's policy-shaping. Those incumbent governments are failures, catastrophes from the outset. The issue is, whether or not we choose to send our posterity to Hell with them.

There is nothing particularly exotic about foreseeing a new

dark age as the consequence of failing to dump what Cheney and Blair represent today. The distinction of the human individual from the beasts, lies in the development of those creative cognitive powers of the individual from which Classically scientific and artistic powers of composition spring. In former times, when most men and women have been subjected to a more or less brutish existence as virtual human cattle, a relatively few individuals have escaped from that prevalent dementation, to become the creative personalities on which the potential basis for progress is provided, even under mean conditions for society at large. What "The Sexual Congress for Cultural Fascism" has attempted to do, and, to a large degree, already done, is to eradicate even those relatively limited institutional arrangements under which some creative individuals were produced in sufficient supply to keep society in a manageable state of more or less continued progress. The attempt by the freaks of *Commentary* and their like to devise a perfect program for preventing the reappearance of generalized scientific and cultural progress, has been all too successful. The continuation of the proposed form of imperialism, called euphemistically "globalization," would mean the virtual eradication of any remaining, institutionalized capability for organizing a recovery of mankind's potential relative population-density, until such time as the present system of rulership had died out by the effect of the works of its own hand.

Throughout the history of European civilization, the relatively effective approaches to bestializing at least a large part of the human population, have always taken forms which converge upon a formal method of thought and argument which is called reductionism. One example of this is the introduction of derivatives of what is called Euclidean geometry today, a flawed notion of geometry which was introduced to eliminate the method of scientific discovery associated with Thales, the Pythagoreans, and Plato, the method associated with "spherics." All efficient forms of intended systemic corruption of the European human mind's potential for scientific thought, have taken the tactic of Euclidean geometry as a model of reference. This tactic occurs, in various times and places, in a more or less radical form; but, the underlying principle is the same fraud introduced, as what we know as Euclidean geometry, to replace "spherics."

Whereas, in Classical pre-Euclidean notions of science, the form of geometry associated with the Pythagoreans, as with Plato, and, for example, Kepler and Bernhard Riemann later, was not abstract geometry, but, rather, physical geometry, a concept of physical geometry implicitly defended by the 1799 Carl Gauss against the reductionist sleight-of-hand of d'Alembert, Euler, and Lagrange, a defense later developed into the view of the complex domain provided by Riemann.

However, the essence of the dirty trick copied by Euler, Lagrange, et al., was to adopt the outgrowth of Euclidean geometry known as the Cartesian Model, an abstract, *a priori* model of space, time, and matter, based on the set of unproven, but arbitrarily asserted definitions, axioms, and postulates of a Euclidean, or like form of schoolbook geometry. In this way, by excluding the way in which discoverable universal physical principles are expressed in the forms of the complex domain, the reality of the existence of fundamental physical principles, is replaced by a linearized mathematical approximation. Thus, the essential act of discovery, and related quality of actual proof of principle, is banned from the typical classroom and textbook. In this way, the real notion of the act of discovery of a universal physical principle is more or less banned from the knowledge of even the putatively highly educated ranges of the population.

The same crime is committed by sly plagiarist Galileo's wicked pupil Thomas Hobbes, who bans Classical irony and the related role of the subjunctive from speech! I explain this critical point.

In oral communication, especially as in Classical poetry and drama, the audience is presented with principled conceptions for which no name pre-existed in the known vocabulary of that audience. These previously unknown conceptions are the pivotal subject-matter of any Classical form of drama or poetry. The bridge provided for inventing, and imparting the name for the previously unknown conception, is Classical irony. Classical irony uses the creation of a paradox (e.g., "ambiguity"), by means of which the mind of the hearer is challenged to make a discovery of a kind tantamount to an experimental discovery in physical science, such as Kepler's discovery of a principle of universal gravitation. The mind of the member of the audience is motivated, and induced to discover the needed new idea by being challenged with that artficed paradox of the author

and speaker. The recognition of that paradox now becomes the utterable name of the newly discovered idea, just as the name of an original discoverer is often attached to the notion of the relevant discovery as an cognizable object in communication. Reenacting the process of discovery of the thought-object called principle, as experienced by the putative original discover, becomes the experience which the student must relive, to make the same unified thought-object (*Geistesmasse*) his or her own. So, the idea enters the vocabulary through the mechanisms of Classical irony, just as the discovery of a universal physical principle, and that principle's recognition as a definite object of thought, proceeds in the work and teaching of physical science.

A discovered principle is not a mathematical statement by means of which an idea of principle is constructed. A discovered principle is a physical principle which exists outside previously known mathematics. It is an integral, indivisible object of the mind; the mathematics which may be properly associated with the expression of that principle, is not the principle itself, but, rather, the trail it leaves behind in its motion. One does not derive a principle by mathematics; one derives a new mathematics, as Riemann prescribes this, by the discovery of a form of object of the mind known as a universal physical principle, a principle whose trajectory can be mapped in a newly recreated, enriched mathematics.

The degradation of education and communication to systems of deductive/inductive derivation from putatively self-evident definitions, axioms, and postulates, is the most effective way of turning putatively well-educated populations into persons ignorant of, and hostile to, actually creative human thought. The people so brutalized, are like the people to whom Zeus forbade Prometheus's efforts to educate them in their native powers of creative thought. Thus, even the educated strata of society are induced to degrade themselves in a likeness of their mental behavior to that of human cattle.

In ancient Greece, such methods of reductionist brainwashing were known as the work of the likeness of the Eleatic school and, later, the Sophists whose way of thinking and behaving led Athens toward doom in the course of the Peloponnesian War.

What is being done to the U.S. population today, under the more radical programs of the "Sexual Congress for Cultural Fascism," is an extremely radical version of the same type of

“dumbing down” of an entire generation, which we associate with the ancient Sophists of Athens.

The frequent effect of such practices of “dumbing down” masses of people into the likeness of human cattle, is a propensity for the spread of wild-eyed religious and other cults, such as those of the right-wing U.S. religious fanatics of today. For example, the use of reductionist methods by the 18th-Century Enlightenment, produced the related lunacies of Physiocrats such as François Quesnay and of Adam Smith. Quesnay’s notion of “laissez-faire” was premised on the insistence that the profit of the estate was not produced by the action of the human cattle, called serfs, but by the magical powers of the landlord’s title to his “shareholder value.” This particular piece of lunacy, as advocated by Quesnay and Turgot, was plagiarized by Shelburne’s Adam Smith as “the invisible hand”—the hand that Cheney and his cronies put into your personal pocket, for example. In such cases, arbitrary choices of clusters of words “Which I have chosen to believe,” however arbitrarily, however fancifully, became a substitute for truth. The result is a form of mass-insanity, reminding us of the spew of Flagellants in the 14th-Century New Dark Age.

The actual conceptions of Christianity are well known, beyond doubt, from not only reading, but reliving the historically specific experience of the New Testament against the background of the Platonic influence pervading the educated strata, such as the Apostle Paul, as also of Philo of Alexandria, of the Hellenistic culture of that time. So, J.S. Bach composed his St. Matthew and St. John Passions, that the congregations might relive that historically specific experience on a suitable occasion. That Christ was sacrificed by the Roman occupying authority of Judea of that time, as Christ’s followers, such as many of his Apostles acting in the imitation of Christ, like Jeanne d’Arc and the Rev. Martin Luther King, is the kernel of belief in Christianity as a doctrine of the Creator’s love for a mankind which that Creator esteems as redeemable, because it is the noblest creature in his Creation, a creature made in His Own likeness. Christianity is a faith based, not in the Satanic qualities of hatred expressed by a Grand Inquisitor or a John Crowe Ransom “Fundamentalist,” but in the form of love for mankind which Plato’s Socrates identifies as *agapē*.

By contrast, the thundering cacophony of hate spewed cur-

rently by the indecent union of war-like pseudo-Catholics and Protestant neo-flagellants, like the anti-Semitic rants of Grand Inquisitor Tomás de Torquemada, has nothing to do with Christianity, but has a great deal to do with the more or less Satanic depravity which has been greatly increased in depth and scope by the spread of the virulent irrationality fostered by the transit of the culture of the Americas, and elsewhere, during the recent 40 years.

Thus, considering the effects already displaced by the regime directed by "true believer" Vice President Cheney, no sane person who could honestly propose sincerely that the program we have denounced here, is anything less evil than literally Satanic.

The only remedy is to impel the leading institutions responsible for recent trends in policy to simply "Give it up!" Sooner or later, of course, a Renaissance will come, as it did after the New Dark Age which Venice and its Norman allies bestowed upon Europe's 14th Century. Human nature is divine in that sense; unsuppressed, since man is naturally good, mankind will seek out its reconciliation with its Creator. On that account, Satan can not triumph in the long term; precisely the contrary outcome is ultimately inevitable, because it is man's nature to work to bring that about.

My point is, therefore, that the onrushing New Dark Age is not as inevitable as the poor weak-brained commentators suspect. It is not inevitable, if we choose to prevent it from happening.

We have come to a time in the development of humanity, at which the principle of the 1648 Treaty of Westphalia must be consistently applied to the effect of establishing a world order premised upon a community of perfectly sovereign nation-state republics, each and all committed to the guiding principle of "the advantage of the other." We of the U.S.A. must heartily recommend this change to our neighbors in the United Kingdom, for example: "Give it up! You have been at it much too long; look where it has brought us now! Empire in any guise, by anyone, is an expression of the most deadly of the childhood moral diseases of humanity." The essential self-interest of any person, and of any nation, is not what he, or she, takes away from life, but what his or her developed talent gives to humanity at large. We are each and all born, and shall surely die, sooner or later. Let us be accordingly wise; let us not hope to keep

what dies with us, in any case, but treasure that which lives after, especially that which has come into existence because we have lived.

A wonderful person, Getrude Pitzinger, one of the great singers of the past century, who had become our friend during a preceding decade, received my wife and me, her brother, and a friend, for some hours spent together, during a time shortly before she was to die. She organized those hours to such effect, that she instructed my wife Helga, who is known in Germany as a person of exceptionally appropriate insight into the German Classic, to go to our host's library, to draw a book containing a poem which Frau Pitzinger wished Helga to recite. Then, Frau Pitzinger would select one of her own recorded performances of a song-setting of that poem. As those hours of that meeting drew to a close, Frau Pitzinger exclaimed with a special kind of satisfaction, "I have lived to sing these songs." She died a short time later.

A great artist, born of simple background from Olmütz, the place where Lafayette had once been imprisoned as a favor to the British, with an extraordinary talent, a familiar of the greatest artistic performers of her time, could sum up her life happily: I have lived to give these things. Her performance of the Brahms Four Serious Songs and the Schumann *Frauenliebe*, are among our outstanding memories of her. She was, as Schiller and my wife concur, and I too, a beautiful soul, who gave much, much more than she took, as every patriot who is also a world-citizen, should do.

That, simply summarized, is the kind of world state of affairs which we should be content to build. It is time that a new President of the U.S.A., who has a deep devotion to such things, step forward as the rallying-point for a world which, by now, should be more than tired of the experience of the foolishness to which I have pointed here. Let us bring the sovereign peoples of the world together, for the kinds of collaborative developments of which a President Franklin D. Roosevelt would not have been ashamed. Let us give something good, and timely, to future humanity, before we, in our turn, pass on.

The Congress for Cultural Freedom

Making the Postwar World Safe For Fascist 'Kulturkampf'

by Steven P. Meyer and Jeffrey Steinberg

Theodor Adorno and Max Horkheimer were two of the earliest leaders of the Frankfurt School, and were co-directors of that Authoritarian Personality project of the late 1940s, that willfully engineered the Baby Boomer drug/rock/sex counter-culture two decades later. These two were brought back to Germany in 1950, to reorganize and “de-Nazify” the postwar German educational system and cultural institutions, under the auspices of Occupation High Commissioner, and leading American Synarchist banker, John J. McCloy. In that assigned capacity, Adorno and Horkheimer were pivotal players in the overall project to wreck European and American culture. This project was known, hypocritically, as the Congress for Cultural Freedom (CCF).

Far from “de-Nazification,” the efforts of the Congress, and related early-Cold War “*Kulturkampf*” (“culture war”) fronts, were aimed at destroying the last vestiges of European Classical culture, and replacing it with a culture of perversity, bestialization, and pessimism. This was done under the preposterous guise of “fighting godless communism” and other forms of “authoritarianism.”

In reality, the mission of the Congress for Cultural Freedom was to make the world once again safe for a renewed Synarchist assault against that type of modern nation-state system that had most recently and successfully been represented by the U.S.A. of President Franklin Delano Roosevelt, who, more than any other figure of the middle half of the 20th Century, had

defeated the Synarchist drive for a worldwide Hitler-led fascist empire. With Franklin Roosevelt's untimely death in April 1945, everything changed. Even Soviet dictator Josef Stalin grasped the significance of FDR's death, declaring, "The great dream has been lost." Roosevelt had vowed that he would usher in a postwar world free from the shackles of European colonialism. As former U.S. Secretary of State Henry A. Kissinger was to emphasize in his May 10, 1982 address at London's Chatham House, on this issue, FDR and his wartime ally, Winston Churchill, stood on opposite sides of the barricade.

The mission of the Congress for Cultural Freedom subsumed the commitment to ensure that no future FDR could ever emerge in the United States or Continental Europe. This CCF mission was to be accomplished by creating such a cultural wasteland of dumbed-down conformity, and pursuit of sensual gratification, that any isolated case of genius could be easily isolated and destroyed.

The presence of Lord Bertrand Russell as one of five honorary chairmen of the CCF was emblematic of this mission at the CCF's inception. Russell, the author of the post-Roosevelt, pre-Eisenhower, Truman Doctrine of "world government through terror of nuclear weapons," had written a 1951 book, *The Impact of Science on Society*, which spelled out his vision of the future. It was a far more precise, more revealing "mission statement" for the Congress for Cultural Freedom than anything that the CCF would ever publish in its own name:

"I think," Russell wrote, "the subject which will be of most importance politically is mass psychology. . . . Its importance has been enormously increased by the growth of modern methods of propaganda. Of these the most influential is what is called 'education.' Religion plays a part, though a diminishing one; the press, the cinema, and the radio play an increasing part. . . . It may be hoped that in time anybody will be able to persuade anybody of anything if he can catch the patient young and is provided by the State with money and equipment."

Russell continued, "The subject will make great strides when it is taken up by scientists under a scientific dictatorship. . . . The social psychologists of the future will have a number of classes of school children on whom they will try different methods of producing an unshakable conviction that snow is black. Various results will soon be arrived at. First, that the influence

of home is obstructive. Second, that not much can be done unless indoctrination begins before the age of ten. Third, that verses set to music and repeatedly intoned are very effective. Fourth, that the opinion that snow is white must be held to show a morbid taste for eccentricity. But I anticipate. It is for future scientists to make these maxims precise and discover exactly how much it costs per head to make children believe that snow is black, and how much less it would cost to make them believe it is dark gray.”

Russell concluded with a warning: “Although this science will be diligently studied, it will be rigidly confined to the governing class. The populace will not be allowed to know how its convictions were generated. When the technique has been perfected, every government that has been in charge of education for a generation will be able to control its subjects securely without the need of armies or policemen.”

In the same book, Russell also advocated a level of genocide that made Hitler look tame by comparison. Ranting about the population growth among the darker-skinned races, Russell offered a solution: “At present the population of the world is increasing at about 58,000 per diem. War, so far, has had no very great effect on this increase, which continued throughout each of the world wars. . . . War . . . has hitherto been disappointing in this respect . . . but perhaps bacteriological war may prove more effective. If a Black Death could spread throughout the world once in every generation, survivors could procreate freely without making the world too full. . . . The state of affairs might be somewhat unpleasant, but what of it?”

The Post-FDR Paradigm Shift

FDR’s untimely death on April 12, 1945 had left an ill-equipped crude political hack, Harry Truman, in the Presidency. Within months, under the overwhelming influence of a group of pro-British Synarchists, Truman needlessly dropped atomic bombs on Hiroshima and Nagasaki, at a moment when Japanese surrender was already imminent. Thus, the era of thermonuclear terror was launched, an era which had been promoted for decades by H.G. Wells and Bertrand Russell, as the pathway to world Fabian dictatorship.

Shortly after the close of the war, Russell, soon to be CCF honorary chair, wrote an infamous article for the September 1946 *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists*, advocating a preventive U.S. atomic bomb strike on the Soviet Union (Russell collaborator Edward Shils would be a founder of the Bulletin and a later director of the American branch of the CCF). Already, prior to that 1946 statement, Russell, following the events at Hiroshima and Nagasaki, had written similar sentiments to his mistress Gamel Brennan: "There is one thing and only one thing that can save the world, and that is a thing which I should not dream of advocating. It is that America should make war on Russia during the next two years, and establish world empire by means of the atomic bomb."

Roosevelt's death had fully cleared the path for the leading Synarchist elements within the wartime U.S. intelligence structures to pursue their "separate peace" with leading Nazis, who were to be fully incorporated into a postwar crusade against the Soviet Union, all in line with the Russell schemas. To make the postwar world safe for the Synarchist revival, individuals like Allen Dulles, Whitney Shephardson, John Foster Dulles, William Draper, John J. McCloy, and Averell Harriman schemed to purge the wartime and postwar intelligence services and postwar German occupation authority of any FDR loyalists.

Within days of the President's death, a whole contingent of European-based Office of Strategic Services (OSS) officers, including the entire command structure of the Italian OSS theater, were summarily fired. OSS documents reveal that a meeting had taken place in the south of France, involving Allen Dulles, Shephardson, and others, to draft the purge list, prior to Roosevelt's death. Later the same targeted individuals were blackballed from ever serving in U.S. intelligence, and were subjected to media slanders and other dirty tricks. Their crime: their opposition to the Dulles brothers' "separate peace" treachery, which enabled such leading Nazis as Hjalmar Schacht, Otto Skorzeny, Licio Gelli, Klaus Barbie, and countless others, to join the Cold War Western intelligence circus.

In Germany, under McCloy and "General" William Draper, the wartime chairman of the investment house Dillon Reed, the power of the German military-industrial cartels was fully restored, a scandal recounted in the 1950 book *All Honorable*

Men, by postwar occupation decartelization chief James Stewart Martin. Martin catalogued that Americans like Allen and John Foster Dulles, Draper, Harriman, and the J.P. Morgan interests, in league with British, French, and Belgian bankers and heavy industrialists, had been the secret wartime partners of the Nazi banking and business barons, and had helped fuel the Nazi war machine, even after Pearl Harbor brought the United State directly into the war. The Dulles brothers had been longtime collaborators of Schacht, and the notorious Kurt von Schroeder, whose Stein Bank in Cologne, Germany handled all of the funding of Himmler's SS, through business groups like the "Keppeler Circle."

But it was not just the fascist cartel bosses and apparatchiks who were spared the gallows at Nuremberg. Fascist culture was embraced as the weapon-of-choice in the Cold War battle of ideas, and the Congress for Cultural Freedom was the chosen Anglo-American vehicle for the cultural "re-Nazification."

Schizophrenia and Necrophilia

One of Theodor Adorno's specialties was music. A promising future concert pianist in his youth, he had later studied in Vienna under the atonal composer Arnold Schoenberg. In 1946, while in the United States, working on the Frankfurt School's "Cultural Pessimism" agenda, the former Soviet Comintern (Communist International) asset, now living on the largesse of the Rockefeller Foundations and other Anglo-American fondi, wrote an infamous book, *The Philosophy of Modern Music*, a barely intelligible diatribe against Classical culture. Ostensibly a commentary on the musical compositions of Igor Stravinsky and Schoenberg, the Adorno book made clear the purpose of modern music:

"What radical music perceives is the untransfigured suffering of man. . . . The seismographic registration of traumatic shock becomes, at the same time, the technical structural law of music. It forbids continuity and development. Musical language is polarized according to its extreme; towards gestures of shock resembling bodily convulsions on the one hand, and on the other towards a crystalline standstill of a human being whom anxiety causes to freeze in her tracks. . . . Modern music sees

absolute oblivion as its goal. It is the surviving message of despair from the shipwrecked.”

Adorno continued, “It is not that schizophrenia is directly expressed therein; but the music imprints upon itself an attitude similar to that of the mentally ill. The individual brings about his own disintegration. . . . He imagines the fulfillment of the promise through magic, but nonetheless within the realm of immediate actuality. . . . Its concern is to dominate schizophrenic traits through the aesthetic consciousness. In so doing, it would hope to vindicate insanity as true health.”

To bring about the total disintegration of postwar European and American society—which, he argued, was the precondition for the defeat of the authoritarian impulse—Adorno insisted that all forms of beauty had to be purged. Instead, he argued for a steady cultural diet of “Top Forty” pop music and other degenerate forms of “mass culture,” which, he argued, over time, would trigger various forms of mental breakdown, on a mass scale.

Adorno itemized these: 1. depersonalization, the loss of connection to one’s own body; 2. hebephrenia, which he defined as “the indifference of the sick individual towards the external”; 3. catatonia (“a similar behavior is familiar in patients who have been overwhelmed by shock”); and 4. necrophilia. Adorno declared, “Universal necrophilia is the last perversity of style.”

Adorno summarized his case for the exploitation of “Top Forty” music: “The authoritarian character of today is, without exception, conformist. . . . In the final analysis, this music tends to become the style for everyone, because it coincides with the man-in-the-street style.”

Adorno had practiced what he preached. During the 1940s, he had ventured to Hollywood, where he teamed up with Igor Stravinsky to compose motion picture scores. In Hollywood, Adorno and Stravinsky were part of the “British Set,” a collection of *avant-garde* cultural degenerates which also included Aldous Huxley, whose fictional and non-fictional writings propagandized for the use of brainwashing and psychotropic drugs to pacify whole societies, and create “concentration camps without tears”; Christopher Isherwood, author of the Berlin Diaries (later adopted to the stage as *Cabaret*), which promoted that degenerate Weimar culture of drugs and perversion that

helped usher Hitler into power; Alexander Korda, protégé of Frankfurt School founder Georg Lukacs, later a leading figure in Britain's wartime Special Operations Executive (SOE) and a leading Hollywood movie producer. The "British Set," particularly Isherwood, were the "Hollywood connection" for British literary perverts W.H. Auden and Stephen Spender, who would play pivotal roles in the CCF, and, later, in the 1960s Counter-culture project, in league with such Frankfurt School cultural icons as Herbert Marcuse and Erich Fromm.

Adorno had written his *Philosophy of Modern Music* prescription for producing a society of necrophiliacs, through the perversion of music and culture, while also working, with Horkheimer, on *The Authoritarian Personality*. This effort was, at the time, the most ambitious mass social profiling of the American public ever undertaken. The project, part of the larger Studies in Prejudice series, financed by the American Jewish Committee, aimed at "proving" that the American people, despite their heroic sacrifices to defeat Hitler and Mussolini, were intrinsically fascist and anti-Semitic, and that advanced techniques of psychological manipulation were vital and justified for purging the populace of these evil, "authoritarian" impulses. The two key weapons for this cultural lobotomy: Conformity and Eros, or what is known today as the tyranny of "political correctness."

The authors of *The Authoritarian Personality* let it all hang out in the concluding chapter of the book, in which they summarized their findings and spelled out their recipe for social transformation. The echoes of Bertrand Russell's kindred recipe for brutalizing the flock of human beings into a sheep-like psychological impotence, ring out in the words of the authors of *The Authoritarian Personality*:

"It seems obvious, that the modification of the potentially fascist structure cannot be achieved by psychological means alone. The task is comparable to that of eliminating neurosis, or delinquency, or *nationalism* [emphasis added] from the world. These are products of the total organization of society and are to be changed only as that society is changed. It is not for the psychologist to say how such changes are to be brought about. The problem is one which requires the efforts of all social scientists. All that we would insist upon is that in the councils

or round tables where the problem is considered and action planned the psychologist should have a voice. We believe that the scientific understanding of society must include an understanding of what it does to people, and that it is possible to have social reforms, even broad and sweeping ones, which though desirable in their own right would not necessarily change the structure of the prejudiced personality. For the fascist potential to change, or even to be held in check, there must be an increase in people's capacity to see themselves and to be themselves. This cannot be achieved by the manipulation of people, however well grounded in modern psychology the devices of manipulation might be. . . . It is here that psychology may play its most important role. Techniques for overcoming resistance, developed mainly in the field of individual psychotherapy, can be improved and adapted for use with groups and even for use on a mass scale."

The authors conclude with this most revealing proposition: "We need not suppose that appeal to emotion belongs to those who strive in the direction of fascism, while democratic propaganda must limit itself to reason and restraint. If fear and destructiveness are the major emotional sources of fascism, *Eros* belongs mainly to democracy."

Eros was precisely the weapon that the Frankfurt School and their Congress for Cultural Freedom colleagues employed, over the next 50 years, to create a cultural paradigm shift away from the so-called "authoritarian" matrix of man in the living image of God (*imago viva Dei*), the sanctity of the nuclear family, and the superiority of the republican form of nation-state over all other forms of political organization. They transformed American culture, step by step, toward an erotic, perverse matrix, associated with the present "politically correct" tyranny of tolerance for dehumanizing drug abuse, sexual perversion, and the glorification of violence. For the "anti-authoritarian" revolutionaries of the Frankfurt School, the ultimate antidote to the hated Western Judeo-Christian civilization was to tear that civilization down, from the inside, by turning out generations of necrophiliacs.

But the "Kulturkampf" project, aimed ultimately at stripping the United States of the entirety of its European Renaissance/republican heritage, would be unleashed, first, with lethal efficiency, on the already-shattered populations of a Western Eu-

rope, which had gone through two decades of depression, fascism, and war.

‘Kulturkampf’ in Paris

In April of 1952, CCF embarked upon its maiden voyage in mass brainwashing to spread cultural pessimism, when it held a month-long festival in Paris entitled “Masterpieces of the 20th Century.” Over 30 days, CCF presented 100 symphonies, concertos, operas, and ballets by over 70 composers of the 20th Century! The conference opened with a painful performance by the Boston Symphony of the “Rite of Spring,” by Adorno’s collaborator Igor Stravinsky.

Also getting top billing at the Paris conference were Adorno’s teachers, Schoenberg and Alban Berg, the leading atonalists; Paul Hindemith; and Claude Debussy. Other works performed were those by Gustav Mahler, Bela Bartok, Samuel Barber, Erik Satie, Francis Poulenc, and Aaron Copland, to name a few.

Paris saw its first productions ever of Alban Berg’s “Wozzeck,” Benjamin Britten’s “Billy Budd,” Gertrude Stein’s and Virgil Thomson’s “Four Saints in Three Acts,” with Alice B. Toklas attending (she was famous for handing out brownies laced with hashish).

CCF continued its assault in this field. In 1954, it held two conferences: one a festival at the Palazzo Pecci in Italy which was devoted almost entirely to atonal music and the 12-tone scale, and another, in April of that year—the International Conference in Rome, entitled “20th Century Music,” which was devoted solely to *avant-garde* music. The latter included prize competitions, and the winners were given American premieres by the Boston Symphony at its summer school at Tanglewood. The Symphony was hitched tightly to CCF, and eight of the 11 board members of CCF’s music project were associated with Tanglewood.

Classical culture—the tradition of Bach, Mozart, Beethoven, Schubert, Schumann, and Brahms—was repudiated as an “authoritarian” tool of Soviet Communism and wartime German and Italian fascism. For example, the CCF conducted a witch-hunt against the great German conductor Wilhelm Furtwaengler as a Nazi.

The month-long Paris show also showcased an equally grotesque modern art and sculpture exhibit which New York's Museum of Modern Art (MOMA) organized. It included works by Matisse, Derain, Cezanne, Seurat, Chagall, Kandinsky, and other masters of early-20th-Century modernism. Jackson Pollock and Alexander Calder were leading figures of the American Committee for Cultural Freedom.

MOMA, a project of Nelson Rockefeller and his family, played a big role in CCF and its art projects. In 1955, they ran CCF's "Young Painters" exhibit in Rome (and touring the continent), and in 1960, MOMA ran another European show exclusively showcasing abstract impressionism—which, like Adorno's work in music, was known to express mental schizophrenia. George Kennan and Allen Dulles were big supporters of modern art, and the Fairfield Foundation, set up to conduit CIA funds to CCF, also funded MOMA.

The maiden Paris "Kulturkampf" of 1952 also included literary debates with Nashville Agrarian "Fugitive" writers Allen Tate and William Faulkner; Fabian perverts Stephen Spender and W.H. Auden; and others.

The entire Paris show was run under the auspices of the Office of Special Plans of the State Department, run by the CIA's Frank Wisner and funded by the Fairfield Foundation, a CIA money laundromat.

Synarchist Spooks Launched CCF

Frances Stoner, the author of *The Cultural Cold War*, a history of CCF, documented that CCF was the 1950 brainchild of two prominent groups of private individuals, who would soon assume prominent positions in the Cold War intelligence structures.

The first was centered around Allen Dulles, longtime friend of the *Time* magazine empire's Henry Luce, who ran a group of activists and planners called "the Park Avenue Cowboys." Dulles and his group worked to establish a permanent intelligence organization in the aftermath of World War II. This group was comprised of Dulles, Frank Wisner, C.D. Jackson,

Kermit Roosevelt, Tracy Barnes, Richard Helms, and Royall Tyler, who would go on to head the World Bank.

CCF was created under the auspices of Wisner, who was then heading the Office of Policy Coordination at the State Department, which later transferred to the CIA as the covert action section. Dulles's personal liaison to the intelligence community who ran CCF on the ground, from its international headquarters in Paris, was Tom Braden, who had been Nelson Rockefeller's executive secretary for the Museum of Modern Art from 1947-49 before joining the CIA.

At an appropriate moment, in 1967, Braden was also the person designated to "out" the Congress as a CIA front. In a famous *Saturday Evening Post* article entitled "I'm Glad the CIA Is 'Immoral,'" Braden had written: "I remember the enormous joy I got when the Boston Symphony Orchestra won more acclaim for the U.S. in Paris than John Foster Dulles or Dwight D. Eisenhower could have bought with a hundred speeches. And then there was *Encounter*, the magazine published in England and dedicated to the proposition that cultural achievement and political freedom were interdependent. Money for both the orchestra's tour and the magazine's publication came from the CIA, and few outside of the CIA knew about it. We had placed one agent in a Europe-based organization of intellectuals called the Congress for Cultural Freedom. Another agent became an editor of *Encounter*. The agents could not only propose anti-Communist programs to the official leaders of the organizations but they could also suggest ways and means to solve the inevitable budgetary problems. Why not see if the needed money could be obtained from 'American foundations'? As the agents knew, the CIA-financed foundations were quite generous when it came to the national interest."

C.D. Jackson, an early "Cowboy," was one of Luce's top intelligence hands and executives. He had joined Time-Life in 1931 as an advertising executive. During the war he became the deputy chief of the Psychological Warfare Division of SHAEF (Supreme Headquarters Allied Expeditionary Force). After the war, he returned to become vice president of Time-Life.

Jackson left Time-Life to take on various intelligence roles for Dulles, becoming the president of the National Committee for a Free Europe, a Dulles initiative, which was the precursor

to CCF and which funded many CCF operatives. He was also instrumental in creating Radio Free Europe, a CIA project launched under the auspices of the National Committee for a Free Europe.

When Eisenhower took office in 1953, Jackson was posted special advisor to the President for Psychological Warfare. Here he approved the core of the CCF projects and personally helped create and promote the American Committee for Cultural Freedom, whose board he ultimately joined. Jackson laundered articles to Luce's publications to promote CCF activities.

The second grouping of private individuals was centered in the person of Charles "Chip" Bohlen. Regular meetings took place at his home in Georgetown with Isaiah Berlin, the British "philosopher" who was implicated in the early-1950s Kim Philby espionage scandal, and George Kennan. This second grouping was known as the "Sovietologists."

Bohlen had spent years in Russia and was posted after the war as Ambassador to France, where he helped direct the CCF's international secretariat. He was the mentor of Nicolas Nabokov, the Soviet exile and composer who became CCF's General Secretary.

Kennan was instrumental in creating the secret intelligence mechanism which would ultimately run CCF, and he was an influential participant in many of its international symposia. Author of the famous 1947 "Mr. X" article in *Foreign Affairs* announcing the Cold War, his philosophy was to outdo the Soviets in lies and deceit, for, in his estimation, truth and economic aid were useless in such combat! He authored numbers of National Security directives for the Truman White House, including PSBD-33/2, establishing the Psychological Strategy Board (PSB), whose papers are still classified.

PSB was established on April 4, 1951. Its first chairman was Gordon Gray. Its purpose was to centralize and coordinate the psychological warfare operations of the CIA, Department of Defense, and State Department. As Charles Burton Marshall, a PSB officer who became a vocal opponent, detailed, in a critique of its working principles and activities, PSB was run by a group of self-appointed elites in a totalitarian nature that was "in a manner reminiscent of Pareto, Sorel, Mussolini and so on. . . . Individuals are relegated to tertiary importance. The supposed elite emerges as the only group that counts. The

elite is defined as that numerically limited group capable and interested in manipulating doctrinal matters.”

By May of 1952, PSB took over the supervision of “Packet,” the code name for the CIA’s psychological warfare program to influence overseas “opinion leaders.” Under this rubric, PSB assumed the supervision of the American Committee for Cultural Freedom; the Moral Rearmament Movement, which had been a hotbed of wartime Synarchist activity, with Rudolf Hess and other top Nazis being among the leading members; the Crusade for Freedom, which was the funding conduit for Dulles’s National Committee for a Free Europe (NCFE); NCFE’s Radio Free Europe; and Paix et Liberté.

A PSB document from June 1953 defined these programs as necessary to “break down worldwide doctrinaire thought patterns which have provided an intellectual basis for Communism and other doctrines hostile to American and Free World objectives.”

C.D. Jackson, the Dulles-Luce operative, became the Delphic potentate for these programs. His detailed log at the White House showed PSB planners had to consult with him before their plans became operational. Jackson met regularly with Tom Braden to approve CCF operations.

The president of the CCF’s Executive Committee was Denis de Rougemont, a Swiss national who had introduced Paris to the works of Nazi philosopher Martin Heidegger, Soren Kierkegaard, and Karl Barth before World War II, through his magazine *Hic et Nunc*.

De Rougemont, known for his book *Love in the Western World*, wrote a Gnostic broadside attacking the morality of the United States under FDR, which can only be taken as an attempt to undermine the mobilization to defeat Fascism in World War II. Entitled “On the Devil and Politics,” and written while he was stationed in the U.S. working for the Office of War Information (OWI), it was published in the June 2, 1941 issue of *Christianity and Crisis*.

De Rougemont’s thesis is that all men have an inherently evil side to them which is at least an impulse. Every individual risks that his impulse might actually become real under certain circumstances, and an individual must know that evil resides in himself, or he is not a functioning human being.

“(American democracy) too believed and still believes that

the Nazis are animals of an altogether different race from Americans. She too risks discovering some day that after all, they are men like us. And it is quite true that they are men like us, in the sense that their sin is also in us, secretly. . . . It seems to me that the clearest lesson which emerges from European events is this: The sentimental hatred of the evil that is in others may blind one to the evil that one bears in himself and to the gravity of evil in general. The overly facile condemnation of the wicked man on the opposite side may conceal and favor much inward complaisance toward that very wickedness. I suspect a profound ambivalence in certain democratic denunciations of Hitlerism, for in the violence of the tone and the obstinate simplism of the judgements, we betray our bad conscience, our secret anxiety, our unacknowledged temptation. In regard to anti-fascists who wish only to be anti, I cannot help thinking that sooner or later the pro which slumbers in a corner of their soul will suddenly awaken and overwhelm them. . . . I believe that I know whereof I speak when I say to the honest democrats: Look at the Devil that is among us! Stop believing that he can only resemble Hitler, or Stalin, or Senator Wheeler, for it is you yourself that he will always contrive to resemble the most. . . . And then only will you be cured of your almost incredible naiveté before the totalitarian danger and be able to escape hypnosis."

How Dulles Ran CCF

CCF was run through Frank Wisner's Office of Policy Coordination (OPC), which gave CCF the codename QKOPERA. Reporting to Wisner was the CIA's Lawrence de Neufville, who worked at the Agency's French Labor desk. Michael Josselson of the CIA worked in CCF's Paris headquarters. James Burnham, the former Trotskyite, was hired as a consultant to OPC and was the primary liaison between the CIA and the intellectual community.

The bag man and paymaster for the operation was Irving Brown, who also ran CIA covert programs through European trade-union covers. Recently discovered archival material from the Federal Bureau of Narcotics indicates that Brown was under investigation in the mid-1960s for trafficking in drugs, or

money-laundering from drug-trafficking (which provided funds for covert operations). U.S. documents linked him to notorious French crime bosses and Italian mafia figures.

The Fairfield Foundation and several other foundations were created by the CIA as fronts to pass funds. Once programs were established, the Ford and Rockefeller Foundations took over major aspects of the funding, with the help of other leading U.S. family foundations. Former German High Commissioner McCloy had personally written to mid-1960s Ford Foundation president McGeorge Bundy, to secure funding for the Congress, at the moment that the CIA was exposing its former ties to CCF, via the Tom Braden *Saturday Evening Post* story.

Victor Marchetti, the former top CIA officer who wrote the first major exposé of the Agency's covert operations, the 1974 *The CIA and the Cult of Intelligence*, explained that the Agency had gone overboard in their use of front foundations: "The CIA's culture-loving, optimistic, freewheeling operators, however, made serious tactical errors in funding these 'private' institutions. Over the years, the Agency became involved with so many groups that direct supervision and accounting were not always possible. Moreover, the Agency violated a fundamental rule of intelligence in not carefully separating the operations of each organization from all the others. Thus, when the first disclosures of CIA involvement were published early in 1967, enterprising journalists found that the financing arrangements and the conduit foundations were so intertwined and over-used that still other groups which had been receiving CIA funds could be tracked down."

In 1954, Cord Meyer replaced Tom Braden at the CIA's International Organizations Division (IOD) as Dulles's personal liaison to CCF operations. Meyer had been the editor of Yale's literary magazine and a graduate in the class of 1942. His favorite poets were Allen Tate and John Crowe Ransom, who were at the center of the Nashville Agrarians.

Ransom's handful of protégés in 1938 were a special crew, known as "Ransom's Boys." Meyer recruited several to the CIA. Robbie Macauley, Ransom's assistant at the *Kenyon Review*, was posted to IOD to replace Lawrence de Neufville in the summer of 1954. He moved to Paris to oversee CCF operations. In 1956, Meyer placed another of the "Ransom's Boys," John "Jack" Thompson, as the executive director of the Fairfield

Foundation, a post he held for more than a decade. Needless to say, Tate, Ransom, and fellow Agrarian Robert Penn Warren all wrote for CCF's *Encounter* magazine.

The American Branch of the Congress

The American branch of CCF was founded in 1951. The principal force behind the American Committee for Cultural Freedom (ACCF) was Sidney Hook, its first chairman. Hook was then a contract consultant to the CIA, and he liaised with CIA director Walter Bedell Smith and PSB director Gordon Gray.

Hook had been an early student at the Frankfurt School, during his Marxist youth in the 1920s. His *From Hegel to Marx* was a compilation of lecture notes from the Frankfurt School founder, Karl Korsch, a leading Comintern operative at the time, and later a close associate of Bertrand Russell in launching the linguistics project associated with MIT's Professor Noam Chomsky today. When the Frankfurt School was to be redeployed to the United States at the point of the Hitler takeover in Germany, it was Hook and his mentor (and fellow CCF director) John Dewey, who provided the funding and political support for the emigré invasion, through Columbia University and the New School for Social Research, which later provided a home to fascist philosopher Leo Strauss, and Martin Heidegger's mistress and Frankfurt School/CCF ideologue Hannah Arendt.

Irving Kristol, managing editor of The American Jewish Committee's *Commentary* magazine, served as ACCF's first Executive Director. Kristol, in a 1995 autobiographical essay, touted himself as the godfather of neo-conservatism. He identified CCF founder Lionel Trilling, Leo Strauss, and Nashville Agrarian writer John Crowe Ransom as the three leading intellectual influences on his life.

ACCF board members included Sol Levitas, editor of the *New Leader*. Levitas was a protégé of Allen Dulles and C.D. Jackson. Dulles used Levitas's *New Leader* to promote the creation of a "commission of internal security" to investigate subversive influences in the United States. Levitas provided intelligence reports from his international correspondents to Henry Luce, for which he was paid. Philip Rahv, editor of *Partisan Review*,

was also a board member of ACCF. Luce became *Partisan Review's* financial angel when it was about to go bankrupt, and he also surreptitiously funded ACCF.

Close Encounter of the Third Kind

In early 1951, Frank Wisner travelled to London to meet with his counterparts in Britain's Secret Intelligence Service (SIS). Over a series of meetings it was decided to create a flagship intellectual journal for CCF.

It was agreed that the Americans and British would have joint oversight over the London-based *Encounter* magazine, and there would be joint funding. ACCF executive director Irving Kristol was chosen by Sidney Hook to become co-editor with British Fabian Stephen Spender.

Born in February 1909, Spender was orphaned in his early teens, and in 1928, he entered University College, Oxford. There, he was taken in by several leading literary giants with whom he formed close relationships. According to biographer David Leeming, T.S. Eliot and Virginia Woolf served as surrogate parents; W.H. Auden and Christopher Isherwood served as surrogate older brothers. Isherwood and Auden, both homosexuals, were British intelligence operatives, stalking the European and North American cultural scenes for particularly degenerate and vulnerable recruits.

Spender left Oxford without getting a degree, and travelled extensively through Europe, having numerous pedophilic affairs, living for a time in Weimar, Germany. He became a well-known poet and essayist in these circles, and his poetry contained allusions to his affairs. "Whatever happens," he wrote, "I shall never be alone. I shall always have a boy, a railway fare, or a revolution."

Spender worked for the British Control Commission in Germany after the war and then spent much of his time in the United States, where he was taken under the wing of John Crowe Ransom and Allen Tate. In later years, he would befriend "beatnik" poet Allen Ginsberg, the LSD advocate and sexual notable, who became one of the gurus of the counterculture movement of the '60s.

As time went by, CCF would add to its own family of maga-

zines *Kenyon Review*, *Sewanee Review*, and *Poetry*—all projects of the Fugitives and their associates—*The Journal of the History of Ideas*, which Luce supported; *Partisan Review*, *Paris Review*, and *Daedalus*.

Kristol moved to London in early 1953 to assume his new duties, and Sidney Hook went along to manage the editorial ideas and to oversee the start-up. By June, *Encounter* was up and running with a \$40,000 grant from the Fairfield Foundation. At the outset, it ran articles by Julian Huxley, Allen Tate, Lionel Trilling, Robert Penn Warren, W.H. Auden, Thornton Wilder, Jayaprakash Naryan, Mircea Eliade, André Malraux, and Guido Piovene.

Malcolm Muggeridge, a member of the CCF steering committee, was the liaison to British MI6. His funding conduits to CCF for this project were Sir Alexander Korda, the film director, and Lord Victor Rothschild, who remained close to *Encounter* up through the mid-1960s. Frederic Warburg, of Secker and Warburg, agreed to use his company as the publisher. Warburg was the publisher of George Orwell, who was also quite active in CCF.

Warburg was the treasurer of the British Society for Cultural Freedom (BSCF), whose founding members included T.S. Eliot, Isaiah Berlin, Lord David Cecil, and Richard Crossman, the Secretary General of the British Labour Party. IRD paid into a private account at Secker and Warburg; that account paid BSCF, which passed on cash to *Encounter*. In intelligence community parlance, it was a “triple pass” which paid Spender’s salary.

Rightwing Fabianism

Kristol published many Labour Party writers from *Encounter*, including Hugh Gaitskell, Roy Jenkins, C.A.R. Crosland, Richard Crossman, Patrick Gordon-Walker, John Strachey, Rita Hinden, Denis Healey (British correspondent of *Levitas’s New Leader*), and Roderick Macfarquhar. Many of these individuals were active participants in CCF international seminars; others, like Gaitskell, travelled on behalf of CCF projects. Crosland worked with Daniel Bell, who took official leave as labor editor of Luce’s *Fortune* magazine to plan CCF’s founding interna-

tional seminars. Crosland also joined CCF's international governing committee. CCF funded Rita Hinden to expand the Fabian Society's official journal, *Venture*. When the British Labour Party beat the Conservatives at the polls in 1964, there were half a dozen regular *Encounter* writers placed in Harold Wilson's new government.

CCF's Very Own Comintern

The working relationship between the British elites and their American counterparts, in what ultimately became the CCF, traced back to a 1948 tour of America by Arthur Koestler. Koestler was an experienced intelligence operative with a checkered past.

Born in 1905 in Budapest, as a young man he was an aide to Vladimir Jabotinsky, the self-professed Zionist promoter of Mussolini Fascism. When he was 27, he joined the Communist Party and went to Russia, where he wrote *Of White Nights and Red Days*, which was funded by the Comintern.

Koestler next operated in Germany, and was exiled to Paris when Hitler took power. There, he worked for leading Comintern agent Willi Munzenberg, and became an expert in running infiltration and neutralization operations against political organizations. In 1936, Munzenberg deployed him on a spy mission to Spain, where he was interned as a political prisoner. Though he was a well-known Soviet intelligence asset, it was the British who intervened to get Koestler freed. In 1938, he resigned from the Communist Party and went to Paris. During World War II, he was interned in France, and while in jail, wrote his "Damascus Road" repudiation of communism, *Darkness at Noon*. His book became one of the propaganda documents of choice for Dulles and company, circulated through the Congress for Cultural Freedom.

After release from prison, he made his way to England and joined the Ministry of Information, receiving British citizenship. When Britain created the Information Research Department (IRD) in February of 1948 to covertly fight the Cold War, Koestler became an official advisor and one of their most important agents. IRD purchased 50,000 copies of Koestler's *Dark-*

ness at Noon and distributed them in Germany. Luce's *Time* magazine printed his book in the United States.

During 1948, Koestler was sent on a tour of the U.S. with the cooperation of the U.S. intelligence community. His purpose was to solidify a network of operatives who would recruit America's intellectuals, many of whom were former fellow travellers of communism, to help the Anglo-American elites fight the Cold War. Koestler first went to Paris to meet with André Malraux and Charles Bohlen, the newly appointed Ambassador to France, to discuss his trip. While onboard ship for the U.S., he had extensive meetings with John Foster Dulles. James Burnham, who would become the *éminence grise* at William Buckley's *National Review*, was his permanent escort.

Koestler established a working relationship with the CIA, and together, they targetted what the State Department called the "Non-Communist Left"—intellectuals and trade unionists who were disillusioned with communism, but who were still faithful to the ideals of socialism. In Europe they would target the Democratic Socialist movement. In the U.S., their targetting included many of the supporters of President Roosevelt's New Deal.

Koestler, along with the CIA's Michael Josselson and Melvin Lasky, surreptitiously planned the founding Berlin Congress in 1950 to launch CCF. Koestler also wrote the founding Manifesto adopted at that conference. Lasky, an American, was an expert in cultural warfare and had been promoted by German High Commissioner John J. McCloy. Based in Berlin, Lasky ran *Der Monat*, a German-language anti-communist cultural journal which became a CCF publication. Lasky was also the correspondent for *Levitas's New Leader*, as well as *Partisan Review*.

New Paradigm: Deindustrialization and Depopulation

Vladimir Lenin once wrote that the Western elites would purchase the rope to hang themselves. CCF's venture into economic and cultural "reform" proved Lenin's point. Through a string of Cold War-era study groups, seminars, international confer-

ences, and books, the Congress became an early, leading promoter of the Malthusian ideas of the “post-industrial society.”

In 1956, Daniel Bell took leave from his post as labor editor of Luce’s *Fortune* magazine (the same magazine which promoted Italian fascist labor policies) to become the first director of CCF’s Seminar Planning Committee.

In April 1957, the first seminar was held in Tokyo entitled “Problems of Economic Growth.” Thirty economists from 12 Western, Asian, and African countries attended. According to Frances Stone Saunders in *The Cultural Cold War*, “The conference was the precursor of the impending shift by development economists from an emphasis on growth of per capita income to one on the quality of life, social justice, and freedom as the true measure of development.” Bell would later author *The Coming Post-Industrial Revolution*, ushering in the consumer society, and marking the end of the American System of productive economic activity. The “post-industrial society” was the perfect vehicle for the burgeoning drug/rock/sex counterculture, which had been the long-term cultural warfare objective of the Congress and its Anglo-American Synarchist backers.

Bibliography

- “Benito’s Birthday,” *Time* magazine, Vol. 1, No. 23, Aug. 6, 1923.
- Coleman, Peter, *The Liberal Conspiracy*, The Free Press, New York, 1999.
- Fortune* magazine, Vol. X, No. 1, 1934.
- Minnicino, Michael, “The Frankfurt School and ‘Political Correctness,’” *Fidelio* magazine, Vol. 1, No. 1, 1992.
- Saunders, Frances Stoner, *The Cultural Cold War*, New Press, New York, 2000.
- Swanberg, W.A., *Luce and His Empire*, Charles Scribner’s Sons, New York, 1972.
- White, Carol, *The Plot To Destroy Civilization: The New Dark Ages Conspiracy*, New Benjamin Franklin House, New York, 1980.
- Zepp LaRouche, Helga, ed., *The Hitler Book*, New Benjamin Franklin House, New York, 1984.

Henry Luce's Empire of Fascism

In the Feb. 7, 1941 issue of *Life* magazine, founder and publisher Henry Luce authored and signed an editorial, "The American Century," announcing that the American Synarchists intended to rule the world at the close of the war and impose their own jaded version of "American values" on the world, through "any means necessary." Luce's thesis was reproduced and mass-circulated throughout the United States.

The populations of the world, exhausted from the destruction of war and the bestiality of Hitler, Stalin, and Hiroshima, naturally hoped for something better. But the universal glimmer of optimism, of being able to rebuild, was further shattered when Allen Dulles, John J. McCloy, and their associates, including Luce, deployed to create the Congress for Cultural Freedom (CFF), whose explicit purpose was to launch a fascist assault on truth as science and on Classical culture.

Henry Luce: Mouthpiece for American Fascism

Time magazine was created in 1923 as a mouthpiece for the American Synarchists, grouped around the banking interests of J.P. Morgan. It is hardly a coincidence that, simultaneous to the launching of *Time*, in Europe, Count Richard Coudenhove-Kalergi, another leading Synarchist, was launching his Pan-European Union, which would be a leading propaganda vehicle for the winning of support among Europe's financial oligarchy for the "Hitler-Mussolini" universal fascism project.

Henry Luce was just out of Yale University, where he was a member of the secret society Skull and Bones (class of 1920). Morgan funnelled Luce start-up cash, and Luce tapped numbers of his friends from his secret brotherhood to create and run what would become a propaganda empire. In 1930, for example, Luce chose Russell Davenport, an intimate Bonesman, to become *Fortune* magazine's first editor-in-chief.

Initial members of the board of directors of *Time* included

Henry P. Davison, Jr., a fellow classmate and Bonesman, whose father was a senior partner at J.P. Morgan. Davison brought in Dwight Morrow, another Morgan partner, to finance the start-up. Morgan interests were further strengthened, when in 1927, John Wesley Hanes was placed on the board. Start-up funding also came from William Hale Harkness, a board member, who was related to Rockefeller partner Edward S. Harkness.

Luce's personal lawyer, who would come to represent his entire media empire, was his brother-in-law Tex Moore, of Cravath, deGersdorff, Swaine and Wood, the same firm which deployed both Allen and John Foster Dulles to facilitate bringing Hitler to power in the early 1930s.

Luce was an intimate of Britain's Lord Beaverbrook and the Prince of Wales, who were notoriously pro-Hitler and members of the Cliveden set. He also formed an extremely close relationship with Winston Churchill, himself a promoter of Hitler in the early 1930s.

Americans were introduced to Benito Mussolini and Fascism in one of *Time's* first issues when the Synarchists decided to celebrate Il Duce's 40th birthday, and have Americans join them, by placing his portrait on the cover of the Aug. 6, 1923 issue of *Time*. This would be the first of five cover appearances.

Luce was America's fascist "Elmer Gantry." He toured the country selling fascism to America's business elite and upper class on the one hand, and using his mass propaganda outlets to "sell it to the mickeys" on the other.

Luce unabashedly promoted Synarchy. Appearing before business groups, he promulgated the idea that America's corporate and banking elites were more powerful and important than the U.S. government, stating, "It is not a seat in Congress but on the directorate of the greatest corporations which our countrymen regard as the greater post of honor and responsibility." Likening America's financial tycoons to Europe's aristocracy, he featured both in the pages of *Fortune* magazine.

In an article in 1928, Luce declared the U.S. Constitution obsolete and called for "a new form of government." What was this new form of government? In March of the same year, in a speech to businessmen in Rochester, N.Y., he stated "America needs at this moment a moral leader, a national moral leader. The outstanding national moral leader of the world today is

Mussolini." On Nov. 28, 1930, he stated to a Chicago audience that Mussolini's Italy was a success story: "A state reborn by virtue of Fascist symbols, Fascist rank and hence Fascist enterprise." Luce further declared, on April 19, 1934 in a speech to the Scranton, Pa. Chamber of Commerce, "The moral force of Fascism, appearing in totally different forms in different nations, may be the inspiration for the next general march of mankind."

While Luce organized the upper crust through *Fortune*, he fed the general population a carefully crafted diet of stories about Hitler, Mussolini, and Franco through the writings of his foreign news editor, Laird Goldsborough, a publicly avowed fascist, anti-Semite, and pro-Nazi who in 1933 interviewed both Hitler and Mussolini.

Luce had a visceral hatred of FDR and the New Deal. He attacked them both on his speaking tours and in print. Intimates reported that he became apoplectic with violent rage at the mere mention of FDR's name.

Luce's role in the Morgan-organized "Smedley Butler" coup plot against Roosevelt was significant. Luce prepared the entire July 1934 issue of *Fortune* as a detailed study of the political, cultural, and economic experiments of Italian fascism. This was unheard of. The issue was timed to appear as the coup went into its final month, and it was undoubtedly intended to rally upper-class support for the coup and the transition to an American form of fascism.

Although Luce later promoted the turn away from fascism, when it was necessary to defeat Hitler, he heralded the postwar policy of the Anglo-American Synarchists with his famous 1941 *Life* magazine editorial, "The American Century," which announced the Synarchist goal of Anglo-American world domination at the close of the war. Luce wrote: "We must accept wholeheartedly our duty and our opportunity as the most powerful and vital nation in the world and in consequence to exert upon the world the full impact of our influence, for such purposes as we see fit and by such means as we see fit." The editorial was mass-produced and circulated widely; it appeared in full in the *Washington Post* and *Reader's Digest*. Although he did not include the point in this editorial, Luce would soon argue, also in the pages of *Life*, for preventive nuclear war against the Soviet Union.

The outlook of today's Beast-Men, led by Vice President Dick Cheney, is a continuation of the policies represented by Luce and the fascists of the 1930s and 1940s. Cheney's inner core of neocons are all signers of the founding principles of William Kristol's Project for a New American Century, explicitly modelled on Luce's theme. The Children of Satan, as Lyndon LaRouche has determined they rightly be called, had Henry Luce as one of their godfathers. Luce's brothers at Skull and Bones gave him the secret name of "Baal."

The Congress for Cultural Freedom was created to implement Luce's "American Century." Luce helped finance its operations, and his trusted vice president at Time-Life, C.D. Jackson, oversaw much of its policy as special advisor to the President for psychological warfare.

—*Steven P. Meyer*

The CCF and the 'God of Thunder' Cult

by Stanley Ezrol
with Jeffrey Steinberg and Anton Chaitkin

In 1974, the well-known British psychiatrist, Dr. William Sargant, published a book, *The Mind Possessed: A Physiology of Possession, Mysticism and Faith Healing*. The book was a sequel to his 1957 study, *The Battle for the Mind: A Physiology of Conversion and Brainwashing*, the earlier book being a how-to-do-it manual for producing a “cultural paradigm shift” towards an existentialist, irrationalist dark age society, which was precisely the agenda of the Congress for Cultural Freedom.

In the 1957 study, Sargant had written: “Various types of belief can be implanted in many people, after brain function has been sufficiently disturbed by accidentally or deliberately induced fear, anger or excitement. Of the results caused by such disturbances, the most common one is temporarily impaired judgment and heightened suggestibility. Its various group manifestations are sometimes classed under the heading of ‘herd instinct,’ and appear most spectacularly in wartime, during severe epidemics, and in all similar periods of common danger, which increase anxiety and so individual and mass suggestibility.”

Dr. Sargant was a prominent British Tavistock Institute psychiatrist, who spent two decades, beginning in the mid-1950s, working in the Congress for Cultural Freedom-linked Cybernetics Group/MK-Ultra project on the use of psychedelic drugs and other forms of brainwashing for mass coercion.

The traumatic events of the 1960s—from the 1962 Cuban Missile Crisis near-eruption of global thermonuclear holocaust, to the Nov. 22, 1963 assassination of President John F. Kennedy, and the subsequent flagrant coverup; to the later assassi-

nations of Malcolm X, Dr. Martin Luther King, and Robert F. Kennedy; to the urban race riots, and the mass carnage of the American war in Southeast Asia—transformed the post-World War II Baby Boomer generation from an optimistic, future-oriented generation, into a collection of irrationalist, babbling counterculturalists and drug abusers, in total denial of reality, and living from one sensuous experience to the next.

When the dust finally settled on the 1960s, the Baby Boomers emerged with a new set of wildly irrational axiomatic beliefs, typified by the mass appeal of radical environmentalism, and the even more widespread belief in consumerism and the “magic of the global market.”

Such ideas would have been shunned but a decade earlier, when America was still a production-oriented society. But that was before the great “shock traumas” of the 1962-71 period.

American Dionysians

In preparation for the writing of *The Mind Possessed*, Dr. Sargant and his team had conducted exhaustive field research, profiling modern-day primitive religious cults, including a wide range of irrationalist, nominally Christian, denominations that particularly proliferated in the most backward rural areas of the American Deep South. This was the America of Elmer Gantry, of “barking dog” convulsions and circus-tent revival meetings.

The Sargant book drew the parallel between such primitive people under the influence of witch doctors, fundamentalist preachers and pagan gods, and the victims of the 1960s drug/rock/sex counterculture. Describing the historical accounts of the celebrations of the ancient Greek pagan god Dionysus, Dr. Sargant wrote: “Many of the other dancers approached very near trance, and showed states of increased suggestibility at the end of a long and intensive period of repetitive and monotonous dancing. They looked very much like fans of the Beatles or other ‘pop groups’ after a long session of dancing.” Indeed, a concluding chapter of *The Mind Possessed* had profiled the newest form of fundamentalist religious irrationalism, “Beatlemania.”

One of the clear lessons to come out of the Sargant studies, and other similar profiling work by such Cybernetics Group/CCF players as Dr. Margaret Mead and her husband, LSD-experimenter Dr. Gregory Bateson, was that the most efficient means of promoting irrationalist cults was to exploit existing movements and subcultures.

In the case of the United States, the British “Liberal Imperialist” mind-benders and their “American Tory” cohorts had a three-century track record of consciously promoting such irrationalist movements, to draw upon. Thus, one of the major forms of cultural warfare, directed against the republican tradition of the American Founding Fathers, through the British Fabian Society and its later Congress for Cultural Freedom spawn, was the revival and promotion of the “Great Awakening” and related forms of subversion, including, most prominently, the “Lost Cause” ideology of the pro-British, feudalist Confederacy, whose credo, taken from John Locke, was: “Life, Liberty, Property.” A medievalist Catholic version of the same credo, promulgated by British Fabians G.K. Chesterton and Hilaire Belloc, was later translated into “Tradition, Family, Property.”

Beginning early in the 20th century, in tandem with a U.S.A. top-down revival of the racist Ku Klux Klan, sponsored directly out of the Hollywood, with enthusiastic support from the Woodrow Wilson White House, the British Fabian Society promoted a Confederate revival, aimed not so much at secession, as at the subversion of the historical American commitment to the Leibnizian “pursuit of happiness” and the U.S. Constitution’s Preamble’s mandate to promote the General Welfare. Major players in this Confederate revival would later assume leading roles in the Congress for Cultural Freedom subversion.

The Great Awakening: The ‘God Who Despises Man’

During the colonial period, a student of Sir Isaac Newton and John Locke, the notorious Jonathan Edwards, backed by the land-owning “River Gods” of the Connecticut Valley, became the chief philosophical opponent of Leibniz’s Massachusetts Bay Colony leadership, led by Increase and Cotton Mather. In

his mass revival meetings of the 1737-41 "Great Awakening," Edwards conjured up a kind of monster God, and ordered those assembled to join and obey. Otherwise, he told the crowd, "[God] will not only hate you, but he will have you in the utmost contempt: no place shall be thought fit for you, but under his feet to be trodden down as the mire of the streets." Edwards ranted that not only would individual men be wantonly dropped into the fiery pit of Hell or trodden underfoot, but that God had capriciously elevated Christian Europe, while consigning Jews, whom he had previously favored, Africans, the "savages" of North America, and other whole nations and peoples to the Devil.

Edwards married his daughter to Aaron Burr, the president of the College of New Jersey, which later became Princeton University. Upon the death of his son-in-law, Edwards himself was appointed the third president of the College. His grandson, Aaron Burr, Jr., was to become, prior to Dick Cheney, the most vile traitor in our nation's history: our second Vice President; the assassin of the architect of our economic system, Alexander Hamilton; a secessionist plotter; and a founder of what became known as Chase Manhattan Bank and the New York Democratic Party.

After the Mathers' successor, Benjamin Franklin, led the nation through a revolutionary war, and the adoption of our Constitution, fanatical cults of the Edwards variety formented the insanity which led to Civil War. As Lincoln referenced the story in his second inaugural address, terrorists of the John Brown type claimed God's authority in hacking farmers' families to death to oppose slavery, and equally fanatical groups claimed Biblical authority to maintain slavery.

Following President Abraham Lincoln's defeat of the British-instigated Southern secessionist revolt, the United States emerged as the most powerful agro-industrial nation on Earth. No longer was it possible for Britain to defeat the former North American colonies militarily. The alternative path was long-term cultural subversion.

The primary institution through which the new British strategy was prosecuted was the Fabian Society, which operated in conjunction with Cecil Rhodes' "Round Tables" and other institutions. The Fabian Society, shortly after its founding in the late 19th Century, formed the "liberal imperial" right-wing

of the British Labour Party, on the model of Lord Shelburne's 18th-Century "utilitarian" Whigs. The Tony Blair "New Labour" neoconservative apparatus of today is a Fabian Society-dominated continuation of the earlier efforts. Hence, Blair's perfect-fit alliance with the Dick Cheney-led American neoconservative wanna-be imperialists.

Varieties of Irrational Perversion

In the United States Southern and Border states, survivors of the Confederacy, led by former Confederate Generals Albert Pike, Nathan Bedford Forrest, and others, organized the Ku Klux Klan, and a broader "Lost Cause" movement, to defend an agrarian, no-brains-required lifestyle.

During the long reign of Queen Victoria and her son, Prince Edward Albert (later King Edward VII), American collaborators of the Fabian circles, typified by William James (1842-1910), developed intimate relations with British Fabian institutions, including the "Cambridge Apostles," the Royal Colonial Institute and its associated Scottish Rite Freemasonic Lodge (now the Chatham House Royal Institute for International Affairs), the Society for Psychical Research, the H.G. Wells-allied *New Republic* magazine, and others.

As the founding chairman of Harvard University's Psychology Department, James helped launch a new dimension of religious insanity, beyond the earlier episodic "Great Awakenings." In a famous series of lectures at Edinburgh University, published under the title *Varieties of Religious Experience*, he proposed that Edwards' type of terror-induced "religious experience," be enhanced with drugs. "Borderland insanity, crankiness, insane temperament, loss of mental balance, psychopathic degeneration," he argued, were necessary for creative thought, including a sense of the spiritual. He pointed out that drunkenness has been traditionally the best way to "get religion," but added the suggestion that nitrous oxide, ether, and other drugs ought also to be used.

In these lectures, James also promoted the British oligarchy-sponsored occultist Theosophical movement of Madame Hel-

ena Blavatsky and Annie Besant, and other strange religions which had been promoted to prominence after the Civil War.

The Fugitives: The Fabian Society Joins the Klan

In 1917, Walter L. Fleming was appointed dean of Vanderbilt University in Nashville, Tenn. During the preceding years, the college, once Southern Methodist Church-sponsored, had been taken over by a consortium of Rockefeller and J.P. Morgan Wall Street financier interests. Vanderbilt, under Fleming, would provide the launching pad for the Fugitives, a literary mafia that would promote a revival of Confederate ideology and wage cultural war against the American System paradigm of scientific and technological progress and republican statecraft. Beginning in the 1920s, the Fugitives published a literary magazine of the same name.

Fleming's most famous work had been his 1905 history of the original post-Civil War Ku Klux Klan, which he prepared in consultation with many of the surviving "Tennessee Templars" who had led that organization. Fleming, along with other political, cultural, and spiritual leaders, had been instrumental in the 1915 re-launching of the Klan, which was promoted through the mass circulation of Hollywood's first full-length feature film, D.W. Griffith's *Birth of a Nation*, beginning with highly publicized screenings at President Woodrow Wilson's White House, and at the Supreme Court.

The Fugitive's high priest was a Rosicrucian mystic, Sidney Mtrron Hirsch. Its temporal leader, John Crowe Ransom, had just returned from his Rhodes Scholarship studies at Oxford University. Ransom was well known, at least by his family connections, to Dean Fleming, because his great uncle, Tennessee Templar and Ku Klux Klan founder James R. Crowe, had been Fleming's chief source on Klan history. In fact, the entire Crowe family were KKK, and Ransom cherished his childhood memories of mama Ella Crowe, and the other Crowe women, sitting around the family hearth, sewing sheets together for the rallies.

This was not an aberration. The core of the *Fugitive* circle, and their later literary and political collaborators, were descended from Tennessee Templars, officers of Nathan Bedford Forrest's Confederate Army "Critter Company." The small *Fugitive* circle, in addition to Ransom, included five others: William Yandell Elliott, Bill Frierson, Robert Penn Warren, Allan Tate, and Cleanth Brooks. All but Tate were also to be Rhodes Scholars. And Warren, Brooks, and Tate, along with Ransom's younger students, John "Jack" Thompson, Robbie Macauley, and Robert Lowell, were all to play leading roles in the Congress for Cultural Freedom.

At the time Ransom's *Fugitive* circle was formed, the main Fabian Society publication was a journal called *The New Age*, which was financed by the Fabian playwright, and promoter of Friedrich Nietzsche, George Bernard Shaw and published by a Theosophist, Alfred Richard Orage, who later became a disciple of the Russian mystic, Georg Gurdjieff. In *The New Age*, the works of Fabians Shaw, H.G. Wells, G.K. Chesterton, and Hilaire Belloc, appeared alongside those of the leading Satanist of the 20th Century, the self-proclaimed "Great Beast," Aleister Crowley, and assorted other pornographers and mystics like William Butler Yeats, future Fascist spy Ezra Pound, T.S. Eliot, and D. H. Lawrence.

Chesterton and Belloc, though associated with the Fabian Society early in the 20th Century, were to become the leaders, along with Maurice Baring, of a Synarchist, pro-Spanish Inquisition, pro-Roman Empire, pro-Fascist Catholic grouping known as the Distributists. Fellow New Ager (and later Nobel Prize winner and major figure in CCF operations) T.S. Eliot, was to ally with them in this effort, as were Ransom and the Fugitives.

During the First World War, Chesterton, Wells, and others of the *New Age* crowd worked for Wellington House, Britain's propaganda unit under Charles Masterman, which was taken over by Lord Beaverbrook in 1917.

The alliance between the *New Age* crowd and the Fugitives was initially forged by William Yandell Elliott. During his Rhodes Scholarship term, 1922-24, at Oxford's Balliol College, he came under the influence of leading Round Table and Fabian Society figure, A.D. Lindsay. Elliott's subsequent professional career at Harvard's Government Department, and in various

Congressional and Executive positions in Washington, centered on the idea that the United States Constitution should be scrapped, and the nation reorganized as a section of a "New British Empire," an idea derived from Lindsay's Round Table program.

At Oxford, Elliott had consorted with the occultist literary figures of *The New Age*. He was part of a late-night drinking circle including Aleister Crowley's one-time lodge brother, the Nobel Prize-winning poet William Butler Yeats, and long-time Fugitive intimate Robert Graves. Future CCF operative Graves is known today for his adoring history of the Roman Empire, *I Claudius* and his promotion of the cult of the *White Goddess*.

The God of Thunder

In 1928, Fugitive and later CCF leader Allen Tate, began a two-year Guggenheim Fellowship term, which took him to London and Paris, where he worked on a biography of Confederate General Stonewall Jackson. There, he became intimate with a most curious gentleman, Ford Madox Ford. Ford had been born into a family of leaders of John Ruskin's pro-Medieval Pre-Raphaelite Brotherhood, and had become a Fabian Society ally of H.G. Wells. Between 1908, when he was made editor of the *English Review*, and his death in 1939, he served as a manager and facilitator of the trans-Atlantic literary establishment. His duties included serving as unofficial Paris host to the expatriate American and British authors there, editing *transatlantic review* for them in the '20s, and serving as the European representative of the Fugitives. Significantly, Ford was responsible for forging ties between Tate and the other Fugitives, and the Distributists.

In between visits to the hashish-scented salon of later CCF associates Gertrude Stein and Alice B. Toklas, where he hobnobbed with Ernest Hemingway, F. Scott Fitzgerald, Nelson Rockefeller's later publicist John Peale Bishop, and others, Tate coordinated the launching of a new political movement, the Nashville Agrarians, under the leadership of Ransom, himself, and the other Fugitives. Eight years after Mussolini's March on Rome, the Agrarians promoted an American brand of Fascism, ideologically based on a nostalgic return to the culture of the

Confederacy, and an embrace of the Fundamentalist religious movements, which had been simmering for decades, but catapulted to public prominence by the 1925 Scopes Monkey Trial.

The Nashville Agrarians

The Agrarian movement was launched with the publication of two books in 1930, and one in 1931. The first was a formal symposium prefaced by a joint manifesto, titled *I'll Take My Stand: The South and the Agrarian Tradition* by Twelve Southerners—the Fugitives plus a few additional allies. This was wildly publicized nationally and internationally, and became the subject for mass radio broadcast debates. Its companion, John Crowe Ransom's *God Without Thunder*, was his bestial religious manifesto of the movement. The third in the series, *Bedford Forrest and His Critter Company*, by Oxford-trained scholar Andrew Nelson Lytle, who alternated with Allen Tate in editing the later CCF-funded Episcopal literary magazine, *Sewanee Review*, was an unabashed homage to Klan founder Nathan Bedford Forrest, which lied that Europeans had come to America, not for freedom from European oppression and religious warfare, but out of "nostalgia for feudalism," of which he declared that Forrest's Ku Klux Klan was the highest expression.

I'll Take my Stand was an anti-American, anti-industrial, pro-Confederate, pro-slavery, environmentalist tract. One of its authors, John Gould Fletcher, was associated with *The New Age's* Orage, and had been since 1924 an enthusiastic promoter of Mussolini's "New Caesarism."

The Agrarians' joint manifesto attested, "All tend to support a Southern way of life against what may be called the American or prevailing way. . . . Agrarian *versus* Industrial."

Ransom added, "In most societies man has adapted himself to the environment with plenty of intelligence to secure easily his material necessities from the graceful bounty of nature. And then, ordinarily, he concludes a truce with nature. . . . But the latter-day societies have been seized—none quite so violently as our American one—with the strange idea that the human destiny is not to secure an honorable peace with nature, but to wage an unrelenting war on nature.

"This is simply to say that Progress never defines its ultimate objective, but thrusts its victims at once into an infinite series. Our vast industrial machine . . . is like a Prussianized state which is organized strictly for war and can never consent to peace. . . ."

He went on to explain: "Slavery was a feature monstrous enough in theory, but, more often than not, humane in practice. . . . Industrialism is an insidious spirit, full of false promises and generally fatal to establishments. The attitude that needs artificial respiration is the attitude of resistance on the part of the natives to the salesmen of industrialism. It will be fiercest and most effective if industrialism is represented to the Southern people as—what it undoubtedly is for the most part—a foreign invasion of Southern soil, which is capable of doing more devastation than was wrought when Sherman marched to the sea."

The concluding statement of the Agrarian manifesto was by Stark Young, then the best-known of the group. Young had not been associated with *Fugitive* magazine, but he was a Mississippi gentleman, a notorious homosexual, and the son of one of Forrest's Critter Company. He was then 18 years into what was to be a lifelong friendship with H.G. Wells' student and collaborator, the top British cultural warrior, and later head of UNESCO, Julian Huxley. During the First World War, Young had taught at the University of Texas, where he became intimate with the circles of Woodrow Wilson's controller, Colonel Edward House, and, after his academic career was ended by the revelation of his sexual preference, he had joined the editorial board of the *New Republic*.

In his essay, Young bluntly promoted the Confederacy: "There was a Southern civilization whose course was halted with those conventions of 1867 by which the negro suffrage in the South—not in the North—was planned, and the pillaging began. At the outset we must make it clear that in talking of Southern characteristics we are talking largely of a certain life in the old South, a life founded on land and the ownership of slaves.

"The aristocratic implied with us a certain long responsibility for others; a habit of domination; a certain arbitrariness; certain ideas of personal honor, with varying degrees of ethics, *amour propre* ['self-love'], and the fantastic. And it implied the

possession of no little leisure. Whether that was a good system or not is debatable. I myself think it . . . better than a society of bankers and bankers' clerks, department-store communities, manufacturers and their henchmen and their semi-slaves, and miserable little middle-class cities. . . . Good system or not, from this Southern conception of aristocracy, certain ideas arose."

In *God Without Thunder*, Ransom issued a call to organize an inter-denominational fundamentalist super-cult, along the lines of what would shortly be launched as the Fellowship, and later as the Promise Keepers. "We wanted a God who wouldn't hurt us; who would let us understand him; who would agree to scrap all the wicked thunderbolts in his armament," he complained, "And this is just the God that has developed popularly out of the Christ of the New Testament: the embodiment mostly of the principle of social benevolence and of physical welfare. . . . It is the religion proposed by the scientific party."

It is this, he said, which led to "original sin," which he described as "strife between the animal species, when man began to enforce the fact of his superiority by militant aggression." He attacked the "race" of Israel, for its commitment to "cities and industrialism" and its "scorn of nature and the pastoral and agrarian life." His ire, was, however, soon directed away from Israel, and toward "Americanism," charging, "Science as a cult is something of an Americanism." In this, he attacked Franklin's student, the English poet Percy Bysshe Shelley, as the "prophet of the new God," who talks about "the triumphs of their science."

The horrible "critical moment" he identified, when "Occidentalism emerged . . . to glorify the rational principle and deny the irrational principle," thereby leading to "Western empire," "Western science," and "Western business," was "*the moment when the Roman Church sanctioned the doctrine of Filioque.*" Ransom repudiated a central doctrine of the Christian faith, in favor of an irrational God, unintelligible to man.

After dismissing the possibility that all men will unite under a single Thunder Cult—either a new religion, or one of the existing ones hijacked for this purpose, Ransom concludes with the following appeal, which echoes in many fundamentalist religious denominations today:

"With whatever religious institution a modern man may be connected, let him try to turn it back towards orthodoxy.

"Let him insist on a virile and concrete God, and accept no Principle as a substitute.

"Let him restore to God the thunderer. Let him resist the usurpation of the Godhead by the soft modern version of the Christ, and try to keep the Christ for what he professed to be: the Demigod who came to do honor to the God."

What the CCF recruiters liked about Ransom was his insistence that the purpose of poetry and all art was to re-direct any impulse toward this human quality back to the appetites which man shares with the beasts. In his 1938 book of literary criticism, *The World's Body*, he wrote, "We have elected to know the world through science, but science is only the cognitive department of our animal life. . . . What we cannot know constitutionally as scientists is the world which is made up of whole and indefeasible objects, and this is the world which poetry recovers for us.

"The aesthetic moment appears as a curious moment of suspension: between the Platonism in us, which is militant, always sciencing and devouring. . . . *Science gratifies a rational practical impulse and exhibits the minimum of perception. Art gratifies a perceptual impulse and exhibits the minimum of reason.*"

He was even more direct in a 1926 letter to his life-long friend, CCF leader Allen Tate: "Biologically man is peculiar in that he must record and use his successive experiences; the beasts are not under this necessity; with them the experience is an end in itself, and takes care of itself."

Decades later, Fugitive William Yandell Elliott, the trainer of Drs. Henry Kissinger, Zbgniew Brzezinski, and Samuel Huntington, amongst others, was even more direct. In a discussion including Tate and Fugitive Andrew Nelson Lytle, at his 1963 Harvard retirement conference, Elliott explained why he had always wanted the Fugitives to write epic poetry and create new myths. "Some uses of myths and symbols," he said, "are employed to condition people as you train animals, as you train a dog" (Elliott Archives, Hoover Institution, Box 1). In the same period, he was attempting to rouse military leaders against the Kennedy Administration, saying that although the leaders he needed had to be "tough," "If they are bred properly they are

gentle, just like a good race horse, or a good game cock, or a good dog" (Box 63).

A flavor of Ransom's religious view is provided by his friend Andrew Nelson Lytle's remark, "Prophets do not come from cities. . . . They have always come from the wilderness, stinking of goats and running with lice."

Joining the Synarchists

On launching their movement, the Agrarians entered into a formal, pro-Fascist alliance with the Chesterton-Belloc New Age "Distributist" movement, and an implicit alliance, through William Yandell Elliott, with the Round Tables, whose ideas he promoted from his new position at Harvard's School of Government, with a series of books including *The New British Empire*, and *The Need for Constitutional Reform*.

Stark Young was immediately invited to tour Italy, with stipend, by Count Volpi di Misurata, the Venetian oligarch who served as the Synarchist controller of Italy's Fascist dictator, Benito Mussolini. During what he told friends was his "mission to Italy," he met Il Duce and the other Fascist leadership, received a knighthood, the Order of the Crown of Italy, and sent back propaganda, "Notes on Fascism in Italy Today," to the Wellesian *New Republic*.

The alliance of Agrarian and Distributist groups was managed by Allen Tate; Chesterton's leading American disciple, Herbert Agar; and Seward Collins, a follower of sex psychologist and free-love propagandist Havelock Ellis. Collins wished to turn the *Bookman* quarterly, which he had purchased, into a Fascist propaganda outlet, and he brought on Tate and Agar as co-editors for this purpose. Between 1932 and 1937, the newly named *American Review* became what Collins called a forum for "Revolutionary Conservatives," including Ransom, Tate, Brooks, Warren, and the other Agrarians, as well as Agar, Belloc, and the Distributists, to provide a "sympathetic exposition . . . of Fascist economics."

The Agrarian-Distributist alliance culminated with the 1936 publication of *Who Owns America: A New Declaration of Independence*, edited by Tate and Agar, and including essays by Belloc, Warren, Ransom, Brooks, and others, including Distri-

butist Douglas Jerrold, whom Belloc identified as Francisco Franco's leading publicist. Jerrold wrote in defense of the military conquests by Hitler's Germany and Mussolini's Italy. Agrarian Donald Davidson wrote in support of Elliott's *The Need for Constitutional Reform*, which advocated replacing the American Constitutional Presidency with a parliamentary system, under the control of a permanent bureaucracy.

The Churchill Shift

When, as the '30s drew to a close and many British Synarchists, notably Winston Churchill, decided that they had to stop Hitler, the Anglophile Agrarians, and some of the Distributists, joined them.

This support for the war, however, came with terms. The terms were set forth in a 1940 joint manifesto titled *The City of Man: A Declaration of World Democracy*, which, after France had surrendered, and Italy had entered the war, urged the United States to join Churchill's Britain in the fight, but only for the purpose of establishing a global Empire, under a single "Thunder" cult, renamed the "Religion of Democracy."

The effort was coordinated by Bertrand Russell's top American agent and later CCF collaborator, University of Chicago President Robert Maynard Hutchins. The Executive Committee included Elliott and Agar. Other signers were:

- Thomas Mann and his son-in-law, G.A. Borgese. The German emigré novelist and the Italian refugee were part of a tightly knit circle including Hutchins; Agnes, the wife of *Washington Post* owner Eugene Meyer of Lazard Frères; their daughter Katharine, who, as Katharine Graham, would lead the *Post* to the powerful position it holds today; and Mann's daughter, Elisabeth, who was to become a top United Nations official and Club of Rome member.

- Alvin Johnson, an old Texas friend of Stark Young and the Colonel House crowd, and a leading figure in *The New Republic* and the associated New School for Social Research. He set up the New School's University in Exile and *École Libre des Hautes Études* with Rockefeller Foundation grants, which provided a base of operations for the entire Frankfurt School emigré apparatus, as well as for fascist ideologue Leo Strauss, who

openly promoted “official” Nazi Party theoreticians Martin Heidegger and Carl Schmitt. *The École Libre* was home to Raymond Aron, Denis de Rougemont, and others later in the CCF orbit.

Appealing to the new millenarian cult outlook, the manifesto declared, “In an era of Apocalypse we call for a Millennium. Universal peace can be founded only on the unity of man under one law and one government.” This effort, they insisted, must include conquering the “heresy of nationalism” and dismantling “the absurd architecture of the present world.” These, they would replace with “A Universal Parliament”; “a fundamental body of law prevailing throughout the planet”; and “a federal force ready to strike at anarchy and felony.”

This Empire, they insisted, is to be governed by English law. Calling for a “New Testament of Americanism,” they say, “Here, more precious than all the gold in Kentucky, the treasure of English culture is guarded.”

This New Order requires a re-shaping of “family, educational association, neighborhood, and church” under the direction of “a new religion. . . the universal religion of democracy.” They charge that all existing churches have “meddled in the anarchy of the nations and bowed to the powers that be,” and that “Therefore the hour has struck when we must know that limits are set by the religion of freedom, which is democracy, to the freedom of worship.” These ideas, if not the verbatim words, came from the pages of H.G. Wells’s *The Open Conspiracy* (1928) and Russell’s *The Future of Science* (1931).

“The pruning of this tree of freedom will not make it less fruitful,” the *Manifesto* continued. “The organization of learning” to train “democratic aristocracies” requires “a firm footing in inflexible principles and unshakable values.” All of this, they say, requires not only judges, but “sheriffs.” Their prescription for enforcement of this universal terror, is to start with a coalition of the willing, “entrusted to the good will of those groups and communities that are progressively disposed to adopt it,” as they say, “then enforced on the rebels, finally to become the common peace and freedom of all the peoples of the Earth.”

The City of Man manifesto led directly to the formation of the Fight for Freedom Committee, involving Agar and others, including James Warburg of the Synarchist banking family. Debates were arranged between Warburg of the Hutchins-inspired Fight for Freedom Committee and Charles Lindbergh of

Hutchins' America First Committee. Agar served in the wartime Office of Strategic Services, and helped found Freedom House, an organization that is, to this day, devoted to the idea of "imposing democracy by force."

Nashville Agrarian William Yandell Elliott remained, until his death, a proponent of this Churchillian "English-Speaking" world empire. Immediately after the war, in the *Virginia Quarterly Review* and in the *Western Political Heritage* textbook he edited for Harvard along with Kissinger, he advocated an English-speaking monopoly on nuclear weapons, for the purpose of imposing a world order of the type proposed in *The City of Man*.

'Warfare Theology' and the 'Fellowship' of Fascists

Yet another Anglo-American Synarchist operation was launched in the immediate aftermath of the "Churchill tilt" against Hitler and the Eurasian Fascist bloc. This operation aimed at penetrating Western military and political circles through the promotion of a sophisticated "God of Thunder" cult.

The ostensible initiator of this effort was Abraham Vereide, a fundamentalist Christian who had been a leading agitator in Seattle, Wash. against the so-called Red Menace during the 1920S and early 1930s. One of the weapons Vereide had introduced into the West Coast Palmer Raid psychosis was the prayer breakfast, a vehicle for bringing together business, finance, and government leaders, under a broad anti-communist umbrella.

In fact, the idea of such prayer-centered networks was first launched in the 1850s by British military officers posted in colonial India. They established the British Officers' Christian Union and, later, the Soldiers' and Airmen's Scripture Readers Association.

In 1930, delegates from four nations, Germany, Britain, Holland, and Sweden, met for the first time in Zuylen Castle in Holland and founded the Association of Military Christian Fellowship (AMCF). The first president of the group was a Dutch-

man, Baron Von Tuyll. The founders' aim was to establish a "non-political" international fellowship with no visible central organization, no budget, and no staff, except for the president. The AMCF, over the ensuing decades, would establish branches in 120 nations. The American branch, the Officers' Christian Fellowship, was headed, for years, by Marine Lt. Col. Tom Hemingway, who had been Oliver North's commanding officer in Vietnam, and who recruited North to the group.

Vereide arrived in Washington, D.C. in 1942 and, in collusion with the British Air Attaché and officials of the Anglican Church, launched the International Christian Leadership organization, later to be renamed The Fellowship Foundation. The group would directly promote the careers of such Christian Zionist fundamentalists as Harald Bredesen and his protégé, Pat Robertson, and would heavily penetrate the U.S. military, the U.S. Congress, and other powerful institutions.

International Christian Leadership was fully unfurled as a project of the postwar Anglo-Dutch Synarchists, when Vereide was insinuated as the "spiritual advisor" to the Dutch Royal Consort, Prince Bernhard, founder of both the Bilderberg Group and, with Britain's Royal Consort, Prince Philip, the World Wildlife Fund. As Vereide's leading protégé Bredesen wrote, Vereide had "won Prince Bernhard for Christ"—quite a claim, given that Bernhard had been a leading wartime Nazi, who had served as secretary to the board of directors of I.G. Farben, the Nazi chemical cartel. Upon marrying the Dutch monarch, Queen Juliana, Bernhard had purged the Court and installed another "former" Nazi as personal secretary to the Queen, Baron van der Hoeven. This Baron's son, Jan Willem van der Hoeven, obtained his degree in divinity from London University, and, in 1980, founded the International Christian Embassy in Jerusalem, along with Jerry Falwell and other American and British rabid Christian Zionist promoters of the imminent Armageddon.

Baron von Tuyll, who was to head the Association of Military Christian Fellowships, was also tapped by Prince Bernhard as the Lord Chamberlain for Queen Juliana.

The International Christian Leadership organization of Vereide, today known as the Fellowship Foundation, runs an international series of prayer breakfasts, maintains safehouse residences in world capitals, including Washington and London,

and claims a global membership of 20,000, and an official annual budget of \$10 million. In both the United States and Britain, the Fellowship also runs the Prison Fellowship Ministries of convicted Watergate felon Charles Colson.

The British branch, closely aligned with the Conservative Party, also maintains close working ties with another long-standing Fabian Society "religious" front, the Christian Socialist Movement, with which Tony Blair is closely affiliated.

Washington sources have identified both current Speaker of the House Tom DeLay (R-Texas) and Gen. William "Jerry" Boykin, the current Deputy Undersecretary of Defense for Intelligence, as leading members of the Fellowship. Boykin is under Pentagon investigation for comments he made in 2003 at a fundamentalist church, calling for a "crusade" against Islam, which he called a "Satanic" religion.

In March 2003, *Harper's* magazine published an eyewitness account by Jeffrey Sharlet of his tenure as a resident at the Fellowship communal mansion in Arlington, Va. Sharlet described a Fellowship session, led by the group's current leader, Vereide protégé Douglas Coe. Coe described the "covenant" of secrecy, made between members of the group, who operate in cell structures. Coe asked the participating Fellowship members for an example of such a covenant, and he received an immediate reply: "Hitler." Coe answered, "Yes, Hitler made a covenant. The Mafia makes a covenant. It is such a very powerful thing." Coe's son later gave the disciples a brief class on the life of Genghis Khan, describing a particularly bloody incident, in which he beheaded his enemies, stuffed the heads into a crate, and all the while, devoured his dinner. Sharlet quoted the young Coe: If you are a known friend of Jesus, "You can go and do anything. When you leave here," he continued, "you're not only going to know the value of Jesus. You're going to know the people who rule the world."

CCF and the Boomers' Shakespeare

KENT: I cannot conceive you.

GLOUCESTER: Sir, this young fellow's mother could:
 whereupon she grew round-womb'd, and had
 indeed, sir, a son for her cradle ere she had a
 husband for her bed. . . .

King Lear

Compassion alike for the afflicted and for those they then victimize in their turn, urges us to discover: Why is it that no Baby Boomer* can read a poem?—read, that is, except as farce: either like a nursery jingle, or with one or another crazy affectation? Nor read Shakespeare or Schiller, except as soap opera: Hamlet as an “adolescent crisis”; Portia as “pure goodness”; or William Tell without the crucial redemption scene of the last act.

While more intertwined causes come into play than I can indicate here, the Congress for Cultural Freedom deserves much of the blame. The first and earliest definition of art and high culture for every Boomer, whether PhD or grade-school dropout, came from some part of the CCF's artistic stable. It is not necessary to study Stravinsky or Schoenberg. (Almost no one does that, after all.) It should be almost self-evident that you need not to have read any of T.S. Eliot's poetry yourself, for instance, to absorb a precise impression of him or his equivalent, from the general cultural ambience.

To grant that much, however, only raises a second and more puzzling question. How is it that this first impression has perpetuated itself through so many decades, even among the most promising Boomer cases? What is it that has prevented these old greyheads, through the entirety of their lives to date, from ever being able to read Heine, Keats or Shelley, except through James Joyce's eyeglasses?

To begin to approximate the answer, step back a moment and remember some larger considerations. The commitment

*Americans and West Europeans unfortunate enough to be born during roughly 1945-1964.

which is natural to every human being, is an effective commitment to truth and to the good,—as two sides of one and the same thing, actually. Every man and woman is naturally a Platonist to that extent. And the artistic tradition of globally-extended European civilization is Platonic. The man or woman who is an artist, still more a great artist, has a greater commitment to truth and to the good, and greater power to make it effective.

But what do the spawn of the CCF say? Take the writers I was most familiar with as an adolescent, like T.S. Eliot and W.H. Auden. Go down the whole CCF list; take any of them, for all their many and real differences. With only the occasional odd exception which proves the rule, every one is a fanatic apostle of the dogma that effective commitment to truth and to the good is simply impossible! Every one, in some way, a crippled and perverted soul, pressing us to believe that such is the very essence of “art.”

But what then becomes of Keats and Shelley, Mozart, Bach, any great artist? An insuperable gulf separates them from the Boomer.

Indeed, every Boomer understood long ago, that the conviction that this natural human commitment was impossible, was the “open sesame,” without which no one could enter the Elysium of the “artists.” It is the Masonic handshake of the “artsyfartsy” subspecies of Boomer.

Prudence whispers: By all means adopt the best, the latest, and the most-approved opinions of whatever set you find yourself in. But do you really want to throw out that old, trusty magic ring once and for all? And to throw it out right now, just as you’re reaching retirement age?

There are other and perhaps deeper issues. Start with the fact that the Boomer is sincerely unable, no matter how he struggles, to find any difference between the sort of Platonic commitment I reference, on the one hand, and his endorsement of an approved list of “positions” on the other. This blindness of his, is the same as that of his near-cousin, the religious fundamentalist of the type of a Pat Robertson follower or Mel Gibson groupie.

Now Lyndon LaRouche has referenced the brawls over his punctuation as an illustration of what is at stake here. Indeed, I have a slightly older relative, who told me of two passionate

disagreements with LaRouche, virtually in the same breath, in a conversation some years ago. One was that LaRouche was involved in some of the same causes he was; he objected to that because “sometimes the messenger discredits the message.” The other was punctuation: He told me that LaRouche had a right to say what he wished in a certain document he had read (or something of that sort), but then added angrily, “but it should be punctuated properly!”

Those who accuse LaRouche of violating rules of punctuation, have completely missed what the whole thing is about. They want to make everything completely logical. They are saying, “You must explain this in ways which don’t offend my teacher.” They have the Aristotelean contemplative view: they believe that the universe can be somehow understood by privately manipulating symbols according to certain self-evident rules. Ultimately, that you can work your will on the universe in that way, as if by Babylonian magic. Or, that reality is ultimately mathematical equations, so that the written language can only represent reality to the extent it becomes a kind of mathematical notation itself.

The truth is that art, no less than science, exists in the complex domain. It is irony in art, in the broad sense, which, like paradoxes in nature, forces the prepared mind to make the discovery of an idea it never had before, or never placed in that context before.

But the artists of the Congress for Cultural Freedom swing back and forth between the soulless mathematical formalism of an Arnold Schoenberg, and the wild, irrational emotionalism of the Abstract Impressionist sociopath-psychopaths like Jackson Pollack.

Bertrand Russell once wrote that, having been reared in the age of Victorian stolidities, he found it difficult to accept, as an old man, a world dominated by America. Indeed, after the Civil War, the United States became the world’s great economic power, and was growing apparently without limit. The British Empire was becoming a has-been relative to these others, who even spoke English! Are we going to have a world dominated by these hicks and rubes? How do we stop it?

Now, from his fight with A.N. Whitehead around *Principia Mathematica*, Russell knew that there do exist axiomatic paradoxes, and that they are linked to scientific discoveries. Now,

how can we stop them? How? We must outlaw anything conceptual!

In this sense, the CCF goes back to Socrates' and Plato's opponents among the ancient Eleatics, the Sophists, and the Aristoteleans. To Paolo Sarpi of Venice, his puppet Galileo, and the latter's student, Thomas Hobbes. To Francis Bacon's campaign against Shakespeare, the Shakespeare who was actually rewritten to soap-opera in 18th-Century Britain, as the Boomers do today, only to be revived in Germany.

Thus, in this sense, the CCF is an old story, but, as Heine wrote, it is always new.

—*Tony Papert*
June 12, 2004

The American Family Foundation: Wardens In Dirty Bertie's 'Lethal Chamber'

by Barbara Boyd

Lord Bertrand Russell, one of the honorary chairman of the Sexual Congress for Cultural Fascism, spilled the beans on the network's efforts in mass social engineering in his 1951 book, *The Impact of Science on Society*. But this mind-control dictatorship was not a passing thought; Russell had been working on the idea for decades. Russell describes the program in a 1931 book, *The Scientific Outlook*—a totalitarian manual:

"In like manner, the scientific rulers will provide one kind of education for ordinary men and women, and another for those who are to become holders of scientific power. Ordinary men and women will be expected to be docile, industrious, punctual, thoughtless, and contented. Of these qualities, probably contentment will be considered the most important. In order to produce it, all the researches of psycho-analysis, behaviourism, and biochemistry will be brought into play. . . . All the boys and girls will learn from an early age to be what is called 'co-operative,' i.e., to do exactly what everybody is doing. Initiative will be discouraged in these children, and insubordination, without being punished, will be scientifically trained out of them."

"Except for the one matter of loyalty to the world State and to their own order," Russell explained, "members of the governing class will be encouraged to be adventurous and full of initiative. . . ."

Russell issued a strong warning: "On those rare occasions,

when a boy or girl who has passed the age at which it is usual to determine social status shows such marked ability as to seem the intellectual equal of the rulers, a difficult situation will arise, requiring serious consideration. If the youth is content to abandon his previous associates and to throw in his lot whole-heartedly with the rulers, he may, after suitable tests, be promoted, but if he shows any regrettable solidarity with his previous associates, the rulers will reluctantly conclude that there is nothing to be done with him except to send him to the lethal chamber before his ill-disciplined intelligence has had time to spread revolt. This will be a painful duty to the rulers, but I think they will not shrink from performing it."

The American Family Foundation (AFF), the secretive organization founded in 1979, and advised by the veterans of the CIA's and Army Intelligence's mind-control programs: MK-Ultra, BLUEBIRD, MKSEARCH, etc., are the "thought police" for Russell's dictatorship. Since its founding, the AFF has functioned as a lead agency in the black propaganda campaigns directed by the Anglo-American elite against Lyndon LaRouche. The central lie employed in this campaign is that LaRouche is the authoritarian leader of a political cult with anti-Semitic views. There is no basis for the allegation; it is merely the attaching of the label of the Frankfurt School's "Authoritarian Personality" onto LaRouche in order to intimidate his supporters, and contain his influence. It is the AFF's assigned role.

The AFF, which *purports* to be an "educational" and "theoretical" organization in a self-declared war against coercive "cults," is actually a clearinghouse for the "Reesian psychiatric shock troops" (after Dr. John Rawlings Rees of the British Tavistock Institute) who practice coercive techniques. In tandem with criminalized elements of law enforcement, and Anglo-American intelligence agencies, the AFF's associates, known as "deprogrammers," ran one of largest kidnapping-for-hire operations in American history. Providing the "theoretical" basis were the veterans of the CIA's MK-Ultra projects in the AFF's stable of experts. The combination of the CCF-MK-Ultra's cultural warfare created the "new religions" cults in the first place; and some of AFF's "anti-cult" experts were directly involved.

Wall Street's 'Fondi'

The AFF is financed by the Anglo-American financial elite—Wall Street speculators such as the House of Morgan, the Watson family of IBM founder Thomas “Pop” Watson, an overt collaborator of Hitler and Mussolini’s, and the ultra-rightwing Scaife Foundation of Richard Mellon Scaife, which funds the network of foundations and think tanks that controls Dick Cheney’s war party. AFF also received initial grants from the Pew Foundation; like Watson, members of the Philadelphia-based Pew family were Hitler sympathizers, and were secret funders of pro-Hitler organizations in the U.S. during the 1930s.

The single largest financial promoters of the AFF for the past decade have been the Bodman and Achelis Foundations, providing more than half a million dollars. These two separate foundations have overlapping trustees and officers and are both housed in the New York City law offices of Morris and McVeigh. The key operative for the foundations is John Irwin III, the chairman and treasurer.

Irwin III, a Wall Street speculator who also owns large tracts of land in Arizona and California, specializes in managing the charitable foundations of America’s patrician “families,” including the fortune of his grandfather, “Pop” Watson, the super-spook and collaborator with Hitler who headed IBM from the 1930s onward. His father, John Irwin II, was international legal counsel for the Morgan interests, and was Henry Kissinger’s chief deputy as Secretary of State. While Irwin III’s primary businesses have been two venture capital firms—Hillside Capital and Brookside—he is better known for managing private foundations.

In fact, each of AFF’s sponsoring foundations has a long history in dirty Anglo-American intelligence operations. Bodman, for example, funded the infamous New Age project, the “Temple of Understanding” at the United Nations, run by the Lucifer-worshipping Lucis Trust. On the “right,” it funded the International Rescue Committee of neoconservative icon Leo Cherne, and the late CIA director Bill Casey; the Manhattan Institute; Claremont College; and other neoconservative Straussian nests.

Bodman’s executive director, Joseph Dolan, is also executive

director of the Philanthropy Roundtable, set up by the Bradley Foundation to coordinate grants from all “conservative foundations” in the U.S. in order to win ideological hegemony on the nation’s campuses and in its political institutions. Another of John Irwin III’s foundations publicly campaigned, post-9/11, for the Samuel Huntington’s “clash of civilizations” justification for war against Islam.

AFF’s official history claims it was founded in 1979 by a concerned parent, Kay Barney, the retired Raytheon International Affairs Director, and Dr. John Clark of Harvard Medical School, in response to the threat posed by violent and coercive cults, particularly in the aftermath of the purported mass suicides of the members of the People’s Temple Church of the Rev. Jim Jones, in Guyana in 1978. In contemporary language, this version of AFF’s founding is an “urban legend.” In reality, the AFF’s business is mind-control. Three of its “experts,” Robert J. Lifton, Louis Jolyon “Jolly” West, and Margaret Singer, did not merely *study* mind-control—they *practiced* coercive conditioning in the Nazi-doctor-style horrific secret experiments funded by the CIA’s and Army intelligence’s MK-Ultra. A fourth MK-Ultra veteran with AFF, Rabbi Maurice Davis, actually financed the psychotic Rev. Jim Jones of the People’s Temple suicide church, in Jones’s early years in Indianapolis.

However, in 1977, when a series of Congressional hearings in the Senate and House of Representatives forced the CIA et al. to close down the covert mind-control programs, Lifton, Singer, West, and others who had worked for years on the covert CIA payroll, were cut loose. They found a new home in the AFF.

To build up AFF, an extensive funding apparatus came into being after many children of the elite crossed class lines and succumbed to the counterculture, joining the Moonies, the Krishnas, the Scientologists, or similar entities that came into being in the counterculture explosion of the 1970s. For every new experiment in irrationality produced by the “Age of Aquarius,” there was to be an equally irrational inquisitor refining and playing with the new belief structures.

AFF’s role in furthering the MK-Ultra tradition of mind-control isn’t surprising. A faction of the financier establishment has always *preferred* intelligence operations to be under corpo-

rate, not government, control. In fact, after World War II, John Irwin III's grandfather, "Pop" Watson of IBM, planned exactly such a private intelligence empire. A "deputy director of the Office of Strategic Services" approached Watson "with a business proposition," writes R. Harris Smith in his book, *OSS*. "Why not form a private intelligence organization and offer its services on contract to the government? The two men raised the initial capital for the venture. . . ." However, the project was sidelined because Federal legislation, the National Security Act of 1947, was already being prepared to create the CIA. As the Iran/Contra affair showed in the 1980s, the financier establishment never abandoned its commitment to private intelligence operations.

The AFF is just such a private operation, which functions, in fact, as the controller of live psychiatric experiments conducted by a network of kidnappers for hire, con men, and body snatchers of limited intellectual means and criminal records who claim to be able to "deprogram" members of cults by application of aversive psychological conditioning techniques—while enjoying protection from prosecution for their activities.

These deprogrammers operate in tandem with a number of known criminal and mercenary-for-hire agencies, which at one time constituted perhaps the largest professional kidnapping ring in modern American history. Often, the kidnapping operations intersected the activities of criminalized segments of the U.S. law enforcement and intelligence community, and this complication allowed some members of the criminal enterprise to escape prosecution. Members of the Jewish Defense League (JDL), an organization whose Israeli affiliates are on the U.S. State Department's list of Foreign Terrorist Organizations, constitute one hard-core terrorist capability employed by AFF-related "deprogrammers." The Lubavitcher sect, the Hells Angels motorcycle club, and former U.S. Special Forces and British Special Air Services (SAS) commandos have also been employed in kidnapping operations. For example, Galen Kelly, dean of the deprogramming fraternity, who had no professional psychological or other training, utilized JDL terrorists in his kidnappings, and, until the 1990s, was so revered by his sponsors that he was given a seat on the Board of Advisors of the

Jewish Institute for National Security Affairs (JINSA). Another JINSA Board member was Vice President Dick Cheney.

AFF, its close associate, the Cult Awareness Network (CAN), and its cohort agency in attacks on LaRouche, the Anti-Defamation League, ran into turbulent times in the 1990s. CAN and its deprogrammer Rick Ross were convicted by a Federal jury of conspiracy and civil rights violations in their abusive kidnapping and deprogramming of Jason Scott, throwing CAN into bankruptcy. Galen Kelly was investigated and prosecuted federally for what Federal prosecutors called a garden-variety industry of kidnappings for hire. The ADL was revealed to be running a massive private political spying operation, collecting dossiers on thousands of Americans and groups whom the ADL viewed as subversive, or a potential threat to the policies of the insane Likud Party in Israel. Frederich Haack, the primary exponent and collaborator of the AFF in Germany and elsewhere in Europe, in November 1980, as international education director for the AFF, imported into Germany the Dennis King and ADL slanders against LaRouche in a collaborative effort with Kurt Hirsch, the editor of PDI (*Democratic Press Initiative*). Kurt Hirsch, after the fall of the Berlin Wall, was exposed as an operative of the hated and feared East Germany intelligence agency the Stasi, specifically, Stasi Division X.

As a result of these scandals, in which Federal prosecutors characterized CAN as little more than a band of extortionists and con men preying on the emotions of frantic parents, and with the deaths of Margaret Singer, former AFF president Herbert Rosedale, and others, the AFF and the CAN network have been reorganized. Deprogrammers now characterize themselves as “exit counsellors” and “interventionists” and forswear the techniques of the past. The name “Cult Awareness Network” was purchased by the Scientologists in CAN’s bankruptcy proceedings, and the organization’s former luminaries now operate under several different identities and websites. But AFF has recruited new officers and an international advisory board which extends into Mexico, Spain, Britain, and Europe, and is in a new aggressive mode.

A brief background sketch of the “professionals” who advise the AFF and CAN further demonstrates the project’s nature.

- Rabbi Maurice Davis: Advisor to AFF and CAN, participant

in the CIA's MK-Ultra mind control program in Lexington, Ky., and sponsor of the development of the Jim Jones cult in Indianapolis prior to Jones's move to Guyana and the ensuing mass suicide;

- Louis Jolyon "Jolly" West: Advisor to AFF, psychiatrist participating in the CIA's MK-Ultra LSD experiments and mind-control program in Oklahoma. West wrote that the government should supply drugs to control populations. "This method, foreseen by Aldous Huxley in *Brave New World*, has the governing element employing drugs selectively to manipulate the governed in various ways." West directly collaborated with Huxley in drug experiments throughout the 1950s and early '60s.

In 1961, in a speech at the California Medical School in San Francisco, Huxley elaborated his vision. "There will be in the next generation or so a pharmacological method of making people love their servitude and producing dictatorship without tears, so to speak, producing a kind of painless concentration camp for entire societies so that people will in fact have their liberties taken away from them but will rather enjoy it," lulled by "brainwashing enhanced by pharmacological methods." After the 1960s race riots in the U.S., West promoted implanting electrodes in people's brains and chemical castration to control violence and political activity.

- Dr. Margaret Singer: Advisor to AFF and CAN. Singer got her start as an Army psychiatrist studying Chinese society, Korean War veterans, and prisoners of war in association with A.H. Schein and Robert J. Lifton in the 1950s. The impetus for these studies came from "journalist" Edward Hunter's sensationalist account of "Brainwashing in Red China, the Calculated Destruction of Men's Minds," and subsequent accounts of Korean "brainwashing" methods. Hunter worked for Frank Wisner's Office of Policy Coordination in the CIA, and his propaganda campaign was used to justify the entire MK-Ultra mind-control program. Otherwise, Singer's writings were cited by the Society for the Study of Human Ecology, Inc., a CIA front operating at the same time as the CCF. Singer and Jolly West often collaborated, including on profiling the Haight Ashbury hippie drug "culture," interviewing drug-crazed hippies about their LSD-induced religious experiences. The LSD initially came from CIA and related intelligence projects.

- Eugene Methvin: An early board member of AFF and editor of the *Reader's Digest*. Methvin was a key promoter throughout the 1950s and '60s of utilizing private organizations to do the government's dirty work against "subversive threats." Methvin believed that the methods of the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, in using "guilt by association" and "calumny" to induce the desired popular opinion about targetted groups and individuals, were the appropriate "attack" prototypes.

The AFF's Totalitarians

While foundation money and media attention flowed to AFF for its activities, the theories of psychological coercion and cult activities advanced by Singer et al. on behalf of AFF were persistently rejected as being without scientific basis, in particular by the American Psychological Association (APA).

The AFF's definition of cults is drawn directly from Robert J. Lifton and his descriptions of "totalistic" environments and charismatic leaders—descriptions which themselves were developed in the CIA MK-Ultra context cited above and which also derive directly from Hannah Arendt, Theodor Adorno, and the Frankfurt School. Lifton states that the assumption governing all "totalistic" cults is "not so much that man can be God, but rather that man's ideas can be God; that an absolute science of ideas (and implicitly an absolute science of man) exists." Lifton credits the Frankfurt School's Hannah Arendt as his mentor on this subject. Lifton, a dedicated existentialist, otherwise characterizes his work as the study of evil, and shared with Margaret Singer a fascination with the creation of schizophrenia.

As described earlier, the Frankfurt School saw as its historical task the destruction of Western civilization itself, first by undermining the Judeo-Christian legacy through an "abolition of culture," and at the same time bringing into being new or counter cultures designed to increase the alienation of the population, creating "a new barbarism." In the "authoritarian personality project," funded by the American Jewish Committee ostensibly to explore the potential for anti-Semitism in the U.S., they attacked the "authoritarian character" of the American nuclear family, the "problem" of the American people's belief

in a transcendent monotheistic God, the underlying “fascist” character of all forms of American patriotism, and American culture’s excessive reliance on science, reason, and “abstract ideas.”

To transform the rational and productive society which was the legacy of Franklin Delano Roosevelt, they proposed “techniques for overcoming resistance developed mainly in the field of individual psychotherapy,” and proposed that Eros be the major emotional source of “democracy.” To hold the “fascist impulse in check,” people must be able to “see themselves” and “be themselves.” Thus was born the erotic, perverse matrix of drug abuse, sexual perversion, and the glorification of violence which permeates our culture today. In one of the first newspaper slanders of Lyndon LaRouche in the *Washington Post*, a February 1974 article, reporter Paul Valentine opined that LaRouche must be authoritarian because he rejects “the free-wheeling self-indulgence of . . . the radical counterculture.”

It is no wonder, then, that in 1987, the American Psychological Association categorically rejected the theories of Singer and her AFF friends. Singer, Jolly West, and Dr. Michael Langone, an executive with AFF and editor of the AFF’s *Cultic Studies Journal*, had managed to sit on an APA task force to study Singer’s theory of “Deceptive and Indirect Methods of Persuasion and Control” (DIMPAC). But when the DIMPAC task force issued its report, on May 11, 1987, the APA’s Board of Social and Ethical Responsibility (BSER) issued an official memo, saying it was “unable to accept the report of the [DIMPAC] Task Force. . . .” It lacked “the scientific rigor and evenhanded critical approach necessary for the APA imprimatur.” The decision stands to this day.

The methods of the MK-Ultra Nazi doctors come directly from the Frankfurt School, the CCF, and a project known as “the Cybernetics group,” which was the umbrella under which the CIA and British intelligence conducted their mass experimentation with psychedelics, including LSD-25, which eventually spilled out onto the streets of America’s cities, and every American college campus, giving us the counterculture paradigm shift of 1966-72.

On the government side, MK-Ultra was created by the same people who created the CCF: CIA Director Allen Dulles and Frank Wisner of the Office of Policy Coordination (OPC). MK-

Ultra was one of a dozen psy-ops programs with similar names using LSD-25, other hallucinogens, electroshock, planting of electrodes in the brains of subjects, sensory deprivation, and a host of other techniques in mind-control. The human guinea pigs were often unwitting. Dozens of deaths resulted, but the real number will never be known because then-CIA Director Richard Helms, who had worked with Dulles and Wisner, destroyed the files in 1977, when the U.S. Congress began an investigation.

But “the Cybernetics group,” which was intertwined with the Authoritarian Personality project of the Frankfurt School crowd, was much higher-level—and private. Two of the Authoritarian Personality project’s directors, Max Horkheimer and R. Nevitt Stanford, who headed up Stanford University Institute for the Study of Human Problems, were directly involved in the LSD-25 mind-manipulation scheme.

Horkheimer was not only central to the CCF, he was also a leading participant in “the Cybernetics group,” which began its work on mind-control, financed by the Josiah Macy Foundation, in 1942. The Cybernetics group was also known as the “man-machine project” because of its study of Artificial Intelligence based at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT). The leading participants in the Cybernetics group were Warren McCulloch, from the Research Laboratory of Electronics at MIT; Gregory Bateson, the anthropologist who became the director of research at the Veterans’ Hospital in Palo Alto, Calif., where he ran secret MK-Ultra experiments; Bateson’s wife, Margaret Mead, the anthropology “earth goddess” who became renowned as a proponent of negative population growth and primitive cultures. Several other leaders of the Cybernetics group were deeply involved in the CCF: John Von Neumann, Norbert Wiener, and Paul Lazarsfeld.

The MK-Ultra quacks also developed the arguments used today by George Soros’s massive drug-legalization apparatus. CIA mind-manipulator R. Nevitt Stanford, who was part of the MK-Ultra programs, makes the argument in his forward to the book *Utopiates: The Use and Users of LSD-25*, published by the Tavistock Institute in 1965. “Only an uneasy Puritan” could support treating drug addicts “as a police problem instead of a medical one, while suppressing harmless drugs such as marijuana and peyote along with the dangerous ones.”

The 'Get LaRouche' Operation

In fact, the two primary operatives employed by the AFF and the ADL in operations against LaRouche since 1978—Chip Berlet and Dennis King—are both lower-level operatives of the MK-Ultra-created drug legalization lobby. King was a featured “expert” speaker at AFF’s October 2003 meeting. “Chip” Berlet’s real name is John Foster Berlet, so named by his father because of the latter’s admiration for John Foster Dulles. Early in his career, Chip was exposed as working for the CIA at the National Student Association and *WIN* magazine—both productions of the CCF’s Tom Braden and Cord Meyer. King, a former Maoist, was directly sponsored in his early defamatory activities against LaRouche by Roy M. Cohn, the notorious counsel to Senator Joseph McCarthy.

In 1983 and 1984, when the Anglo-American Synarchists needed to contain LaRouche, who had influenced then-President Ronald Reagan to adopt a policy of strategic defense and cooperation with the Soviet Union, they turned to Manhattan investment advisor John Train, a trusted CCF hand and former OSS operative. Train, who had been prominent in the CCF’s *Paris Review* and worked with the likes of Stephen Spender, convened a salon of journalists, private foundations, and U.S. government national security officials in New York City for the purpose of creating and executing a sustained and massive media assault on LaRouche. The declared aims of the Train meetings were to destroy LaRouche’s political policy influence, disrupt his political organization, and set the stage for state and Federal prosecutions. A massive black propaganda barrage ensued from these meetings.

At the Train meetings were representatives of the *New Republic*, the *Wall Street Journal*, NBC television, *Reader’s Digest*, the ADL, Freedom House (a direct offshoot of the CCF run by Leo Cherne and operative Melvin Lasky in his later years), and Richard Mellon Scaife. Roy Godson, then employed by the National Security Council and heavily enmeshed in the Iran/Contra operation, was a leading participant. Godson, the son of CCF’s Joe Godson and inheritor of networks controlled by the CIA’s agents in the trade unions, Jay Lovestone and Irving Brown, had played a major role in operations against LaRouche dating back to 1975. Biographies of CIA counterintelligence

head James Jesus Angleton say that he was engaged in a “vendetta” against LaRouche at this time; and Angleton was a source in some of the stories which flowed from the Train meetings.

Chip Berlet and Dennis King’s attendance at the Train meetings was financed by British spook John Rees, a notorious rightwing police and FBI spy, who moved to the United States. And financing of King’s book-length diatribe against LaRouche by the powerful neoconservative Smith-Richardson Foundation was arranged at the Train meetings.

Henry and Clare Booth Luce Love Their LSD

The following is from the third chapter of the 1985 book *Acid Dreams, The Complete Social History of LSD: The CIA, the Sixties, and Beyond*, by Martin A. Lee and Bruce Shlain, published by Grove Press, New York.

‘Manna From Harvard’

“Henry Luce, president of Time-Life, was a busy man during the Cold War. As the preeminent voice of Eisenhower, Dulles, and Pax Americana, he encouraged his correspondents to collaborate with the CIA, and his publishing empire served as a longtime propaganda asset for the agency. But Luce managed to find the time to experiment with LSD and glean whatever pleasures and insights it might afford. An avid fan of psychedelics, he turned on a half-dozen times in the late 1950s and early 1960s under the supervision of Dr. Sidney Cohen. On one occasion the media magnate claimed he talked to God on the golf course and found that the Old Boy was pretty much on top of things. During another trip, the tone-deaf publisher is said to have heard music so enchanting that he walked into a cactus garden and began conducting a phantom orchestra.

“Dr. Cohen, attached professionally to UCLA and the Veterans Hospital in Los Angeles, also turned on Henry’s wife, Clare Booth Luce, and a number of other influential Americans. ‘Oh sure, we all took acid. It was a creative group—my husband and I and Huxley and [Christopher] Isherwood,’ recalled Mrs. Luce, who was, by all accounts, the *grande dame* of postwar American politics. . . . LSD was fine by Mrs. Luce as long as it remained strictly a drug for doctors and their friends in the ruling class. But she didn’t like the idea that others might also want to partake of the experience. ‘We wouldn’t want everyone doing too much of a good thing,’ she explained.”

—*Michele Steinberg*

APPENDIX

The Bizarre Case of Baroness Symons

by Jeffrey Steinberg

The following appendix provides a detailed account of a classic “black operation,” run through the present-day networks of the Congress for Cultural Freedom, and its offshoot American Family Foundation; and steered, top-down, from the London Fabian Society circles, who are the ultimate authors of the present sole-superpower imperial dogma associated most publicly with U.S Vice President Dick Cheney and the Washington neoconservatives. From the very outset, the politically driven “Get LaRouche” operations have been steered by the Congress for Cultural Freedom apparatus, beginning with the role of CCF founder Sidney Hook, in declaring LaRouche persona non grata following the December 1971 New York City debate between LaRouche and Prof. Abba Lerner, the dean of the so-called American Keynesian economists. LaRouche forced Lerner to openly defend the brutal austerity programs of Hitler’s own Economics Minister, Hjalmar Schacht, prompting Hook to deliver his pointed threat to LaRouche: “You are a potential threat now; you will never be allowed to become a genuine threat.”

Wall Street banker John Train, a founder, along with Stephen Spender and Edward Goldsmith, of the CFF publication Paris Review, was the private sector’s point man for the 1984-89 Justice Department witch-hunt against LaRouche and associates. The Cybernetics Group/MK-Ultra/CCF project, the American Family Foundation, was pivotal in the 1980s Train/Justice Department actions, and is once again, as documented below, at the center of the efforts to silence LaRouche and his political movement.

Read this as a case study of how those “Beast-Man” promoters of the “Sexual Congress for Cultural Fascism” operate today.

The LaRouche in 2004 Campaign has amassed a vast amount of evidence that the British Fabian Society “New Labour” inner circles around Prime Minister Tony Blair and the 10 Downing Street intelligence and dirty tricks apparatus, are engaged in a trans-Atlantic criminal intervention to disrupt the upcoming Democratic Party nominating convention, scheduled for late July 2004 in Boston, Mass.

The focal point of the effort is to sabotage the Democratic Party Presidential challenge to the incumbent Bush-Cheney Administration by blocking the full participation of Presidential candidate Lyndon LaRouche in the events, whether as the party’s nominee or as a leading policy voice, for restoring the Democratic Party to its historically successful Franklin Delano Roosevelt “American System” policy orientation.

The key issue of the trans-Atlantic fear of LaRouche’s voice, dates from LaRouche’s public defeat of then-leading Keynesian economist Prof. Abba Lerner in a celebrated 1971 New York City debate in which LaRouche forced Lerner to admit publicly that Lerner’s policy for the 1970s echoed the policy of the Nazi regime economist Hjalmar Schacht. Since December 1971, the Anglo-American line has been: No more public debates with LaRouche. The issue of that aggressive blacklisting by Anglo-American financier circles has been LaRouche’s continued attacks on the post-August 1971 revival of those Schachtian policies of “fiscal austerity.”

It is the view of candidate LaRouche and numbers of other leading Democratic Party figures, that only an “FDR turn” on the part of the Democrats, complete with a massive outreach to what FDR called the “forgotten Americans” of the lower 80% income brackets, can assure the defeat of the Bush-Cheney team in November. LaRouche’s opposition to the Schacht-like economic policies of influential trans-Atlantic financier interests, is the crucial issue of the leading policy-fight within the Democratic Party today.

Among the leading personalities identified as players in the latest “Get LaRouche” effort are British Fabian Society members—and Blair inner-circle operatives—Baroness Elizabeth Conway Symons of Vernham Dean, and her husband Phil Bassett. Baroness Symons may be fairly described as the London counterpart to Lynne Cheney, the wife of Vice President Dick

Cheney, and a leading figure in trans-Atlantic neoconservative circles.

Indeed, there is ample evidence suggesting direct links between Baroness Symons and the Cheney household.

The Cheney-Symons Connection

As Minister of State for Defense Procurement for Prime Minister Blair (1999-2001), Baroness Symons approved a contract of nearly \$500 million to Dick Cheney's Halliburton Corp., to transport British tanks and other heavy equipment to battle fronts. At the time of the contract, Cheney was already Vice President; however, his ties to his former company remain deep, and have become a point of controversy and scandal in recent months, particularly since recent revelations that Cheney lied to the U.S. Congress and the American people, in denying that he had any role in securing lucrative Administration contracts for Halliburton. Newly leaked Pentagon internal emails confirm that the awarding of a multibillion-dollar pre-war contract to Halliburton for the restoration of Iraq's oil industry, was "coordinated with the VP's office."

A year before the British contract to Halliburton, Dick Cheney, still the company's CEO, had keynoted a conference in Oxfordshire, England, on the outsourcing of military logistics and other functions. The conference was attended by several of Baroness Symons's deputies at the Ministry of Defence (MOD). In October 2001, Baroness Symons was involved in negotiating and approving a \$200-billion contract for the Joint Strike Fighter which went to Lockheed Martin, a company on whose board, at the time, sat Lynne Cheney. During April 2001, Lynne Cheney had travelled on several occasions to England, as an informal "cultural emissary" of the Bush-Cheney Administration, meeting with British intellectuals and promoting the "English-speaking partnership."

Ms. Cheney had completed her doctorate at the University of Wisconsin on leading 19th-Century British neo-Kantian writer Matthew Arnold, whose work inspired the later launching of the British Fabian Society, the principal 20th-Century arm of British imperialism. Contrary to public delusions, it is the Brit-

ish Fabian Society circles, presently grouped around self-professed “Christian Socialist” Tony Blair, who exert intellectual control over the Cheney household, and through it, the Bush Administration. It is not the other way around. On both the Republican Party side, and the Democratic Leadership Council/Democratic National Committee side, the neoconservatives are all assets, witting or duped, of the Fabians.

In October 2003, Baroness Symons appeared on the same podium with Elizabeth Cheney, daughter of Lynne and Dick, who was, at the time, a top State Department Middle East official. The conference was a London meeting of the Arab International Women’s Forum. In June 2003, Baroness Symons had been appointed Minister of State for the Middle East, International Security, Consular and Personal Affairs in the Foreign and Commonwealth Office. It is in that context that she has emerged as a pivotal player in the slander-and-worse campaign against candidate LaRouche.

Up until recently, her husband Phil Bassett was the head of the intelligence unit at 10 Downing Street, and was a central player in the so-called “Blair Dossiers” scandals, which were at the center of the Anglo-American disinformation drive, leading to the March 19, 2003 invasion of Iraq. Bassett’s name appeared frequently in the Hutton inquiry into the death of British weapons expert David Kelly. That Kelly case gets to the heart of why Tony Blair and Dick Cheney’s backers within the British Establishment are so intent on keeping LaRouche out of the Democratic convention proceedings at all costs.

A Tale of Two Timelines

At the beginning of April 2003, the LaRouche in 2004 campaign released a mass-circulation report, “Children of Satan: The ‘Ignoble Liars’ Behind Bush’s No-Exit War.” Over 1 million copies were distributed in the United States alone; another million copies were downloaded from the campaign and other websites; and hundreds of thousands of copies were distributed, worldwide, in Spanish, German, Italian, French, Arabic, Russian, Japanese, and other languages.

The release of the report intersected an escalating factional brawl over the Anglo-American Iraq war, and the larger issue

of the Cheney Doctrine of preventive nuclear war. That Cheney Doctrine had become the centerpiece of both the Bush and Blair Administrations' national security and foreign policy agenda, much to the disgust of leading circles in the United States, Britain, Continental Europe, Russia, China and throughout the developing world, particularly the Arab and Islamic world.

One key indication of the extent to which LaRouche had emerged as a pivotal American leader of the anti-neoconservative resistance to the Cheney Doctrine and the Iraq war, was his several high-profile appearances on BBC during the crucial Spring 2003 period of the Iraq war and immediate aftermath, when a brief, but intensive policy fight erupted in London, jeopardizing Tony Blair's Prime Ministership. The same faction fight, on the American side of the Atlantic, has continued and escalated to the present day, placing the survival of both the Bush-Cheney and Blair regimes in serious doubt.

While the opposition to Blair's own version of the Cheney doctrine of preventive war, first enunciated in a Blair speech at the University of Chicago in 1999, has not been totally crushed, and has erupted on scores of occasions since the crucial July-August 2003 conjuncture, the opposition inside the British institutions has been characteristically a rear-guard effort, from that point up to the present. The outcome of the accelerating political fight inside the United States will largely determine Blair's fate. In effect, a clean sweep of the neoconservative "Leo Strauss Kindergarten" inside the U.S.A. would most assuredly bring down Tony Blair and the entire "New Labour" faction inside Great Britain.

Hence, the crucial significance of the LaRouche BBC interviews during the Spring of 2003.

On April 3, 2003, LaRouche was interviewed on the BBC news program "Live Five." The subject of the interview was his leading role in the U.S.A. as a critic of the Bush Administration's Iraq war adventure. LaRouche was identified as a candidate for the 2004 Democratic Party Presidential nomination.

On June 9, 2003, LaRouche appeared again on the same news show, this time for 12 minutes. LaRouche, through his campaign, had just issued a call for Dick Cheney's impeachment from office, for his role in the intelligence hoaxes leading up to the Iraq invasion. The interviewer, Rhod Sharp, focussed his questions on LaRouche's targeting of Cheney. LaRouche

traced Cheney's commitment to a unipolar, English-speaking global empire, and to the overthrow of the Saddam Hussein regime in Baghdad, back over a decade, to his tenure as Secretary of Defense in the "Bush 41" Administration. He exposed Cheney's role in promoting the hoax that Iraq had been seeking uranium for nuclear bombs in the African nation of Niger, and linked Cheney's activities to those of the circles of Prime Minister Tony Blair, who had, on Sept. 24, 2002, issued a 10 Downing Street white paper on Iraq's quest for WMD, which contained the identical, knowingly false charges.

LaRouche told the BBC audience, "Now, this is a very serious matter. As I said, it's an impeachable charge against the Vice President of the United States, and right now, I think, there are some people in the United States who are of a disposition, if not to impeach Mr. Cheney, at least to persuade him that it would be time to go out and take care of his potato patch, and leave government alone."

Just days before LaRouche's second BBC interview, "the Beeb" had aired a news report by correspondent Andrew Gilligan, echoing the Democratic candidate's charges. On May 29, 2003, Gilligan, citing an unnamed British Ministry of Defence official, charged that Prime Minister Blair and his top aides, including Alastair Campbell, the PM's press secretary, had "sexed up" the Sept. 24, 2002 dossier with wildly exaggerated claims that Saddam could launch WMD in 45 minutes, and that Iraq had purchased vast quantities of "yellow cake" uranium precursor from Africa. The same BBC correspondent Gilligan had earlier been leaked evidence from the MOD, that the claims of Saddam links to al-Qaeda and the attacks of Sept. 11, 2001, were also vastly overstated by the PM's team.

The intersection of the LaRouche charges against Cheney and the Gilligan charges against the Blair team was precise. Weeks after the 9/11 attacks, the Bush White House and 10 Downing Street had launched a joint wartime propaganda effort, leading, in early 2002, to the creation of the Coalition Information Center, a London- and Washington-based coordinating unit charged with building public support for the Anglo-American "war on terrorism," including the soon-to-be-launched Iraq war. In October 2001, Phil Bassett and Alastair Campbell travelled to Washington, to confer with top White House officials on the joint intelligence/propaganda effort. On

Oct. 15, Bassett was appointed Special Advisor to PM Blair, reflecting his upgraded role in the war propaganda schemes. At the same time, the Bush White House dispatched Tucker Eskew to London, to work side-by-side with the Campbell-Bassett team. The Sept. 24, 2002 Blair white paper, containing the “yellow cake” and 45-minute-launch lies, was a product of the Coalition Information Center effort, and followed closely the themes struck in an August 2002 speech by Vice President Cheney at the Veterans of Foreign Wars convention, in which he first made the already-disproven claim that Iraq was aggressively pursuing a nuclear bomb. That Cheney speech and the Downing Street white paper were widely seen as the launching of the countdown phase for the Anglo-American war.

The Gilligan report triggered a massive damage-control effort at Downing Street. Throughout the month of June 2003 the PM’s Office conducted a frantic search to determine the source of the leak to Gilligan, eventually concluding that Dr. David Kelly, a top British expert in biological and chemical weapons, who had served as a member of the UNSCOM inspection teams in Iraq during the 1990s, was the MOD official who had spoken to Gilligan. Kelly himself wrote to his superiors at MOD on June 30, acknowledging unauthorized contact with Gilligan. Kelly was hauled before a string of House of Commons committees; his name was leaked to the media by Defence Minister Geoff Hoon, on orders from Blair, who chaired a 10 Downing Street strategy session on how to deal with the nascent policy revolt.

Was Kelly a Suicide?

On July 15, 2003, Dr. Kelly testified before a public hearing of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House of Commons. The hearing was televised. Two days later, Dr. Kelly was found dead in a wooded area near his home in Abington in Oxfordshire. Police and coroners ruled his death a suicide. Nevertheless, the British government ordered a probe into the circumstances of Dr. Kelly’s death, the BBC leak, etc., to be headed by Lord Hutton.

While Dr. Kelly was the immediate target of the Downing Street wrath, the larger issue was the factional brawl, behind

the scenes, within the British Establishment, symbolized by the recent role of the BBC, in promoting Lyndon LaRouche as a leading American voice of sanity against the imperial fantasies of the Cheney-Blair neocon alliance, and by the revolt of British military, Foreign Office, and intelligence mandarins against the falsification of intelligence to sell the Iraq war.

As intense as the British Establishment fight was, it was equally short-lived. By early July, BBC, the leading “Establishment” voice of the revolt, was coming under massive counterattack by the Blair team. On July 10, Jonathan Powell, the Chief of Staff to PM Blair, would summarize the situation in a 10 Downing Street email: “This is now a game of chicken with the Beeb,” he wrote. “The only way they will shift is if they see the screws tightening.”

While it would not be until the release of the Hutton Report, on Jan. 28, 2004, that heads would roll in the top ranks of “the Beeb,” the evidence of the decision by the British Establishment to close circles around Blair—for the time being—was all too clear by mid-July 2003. Some heads did have to roll at 10 Downing Street. On Aug. 29, 2003, Alastair Campbell stepped down from his post as communications director, claiming—unconvincingly—that his departure had nothing to do with the Hutton probe and the Foreign Affairs Committee hearings. In September 2003, Phil Bassett was transferred to a less conspicuous post, as aide to Labourite Lord Falconer; this, in the context of embarrassing revelations of his role as a principal contributor to the discredited Sept. 24, 2002 Blair white paper.

But the clearest evidence of the Establishment closing of ranks was the abrupt launching of a drive to disrupt the LaRouche campaign, via a trans-Atlantic orchestrated smear campaign, scheduled to erupt, full-force, on the eve of the July 2004 Democratic Party convention, and the role-reversal of BBC in now taking a prominent role in the “Get LaRouche” effort.

The Duggan Suicide

On March 27, 2003, the press office of the Police Direction of West Hessen, Germany, issued the following tersely worded press release:

“At the point where Berliner Street becomes Bundestrasse

455, an until-now unidentified pedestrian, obviously with suicidal intentions, ran into the lane, which makes a slight left curve. As the 56-year-old [driver] saw the pedestrian standing on the edge of the lane, he drove over to the left lane. The pedestrian jumped into the lane and against the car of 02 [second car] and hit it on the windshield, roughly at the side of the front right seat. Due to the impact, the pedestrian was thrown behind the car, landing in the left lane, and was run over by the oncoming car of the 48-year-old. Due to severe head injuries caused by the accident, the pedestrian died at the scene.

“In the course of the accident assessment, it became known that a few minutes earlier, but a few meters from the accident scene, a male person also attempted to jump in front of a passing car. The car driver succeeded in swerving away from the pedestrian but did have contact with the edge of his right-side mirror. In his rear-view mirror, the driver saw that the pedestrian, who fell due to the light impact, already had stood up and removed himself from the site of the accident. On the basis of the identical aspects of both incidents, the strong suspicion is that the pedestrian with suicidal intentions ran against the car of 02 and intentionally caused the accident.”

The unnamed suicide victim was 22-year-old British student Jeremiah Duggan. Duggan was studying in Paris at the British Institute of Paris, and was in Germany attending an international conference of the Schiller Institute, an organization dedicated to the revival of trans-Atlantic republican collaboration, and recently in a leading position among groups opposing the Cheney-Blair Iraq war. Following the three-day Schiller conference in Bad Schwalbach, near Wiesbaden, Duggan had remained, along with a large youth contingent from many European countries, as well as the United States, to participate in an educational cadre school organized by the LaRouche Youth Movement. (The Schiller Institute was founded in 1984 by Helga Zepp LaRouche, a leading German political figure and the wife of U.S. Democratic Party Presidential candidate Lyndon LaRouche.)

According to both eyewitness accounts of people who spoke to Jeremiah Duggan in the final days and hours before his suicide, and to statements made to the press by his mother, Erica Duggan, the young man had suffered psychological prob-

lems. At age 7, following the divorce of his parents, Jeremiah had been in family counselling, with his divorced parents, at the Tavistock Clinic in London, an institution long associated with radical experimentation in individual and mass psychological manipulation. (During World War II, virtually the entire staff of Tavistock had been absorbed into the Psychiatric Division of the British Army, an experience that Clinic head Dr. John Rawlings Rees had memorialized in a series of lectures published in the 1950s under the title, *The Shaping of Psychiatry by War.*)

In conversations with several youth attending the LaRouche Youth Movement cadre school, Duggan had spoken of being diagnosed with Obsessive Compulsive Disorder (OCD). At one point, on Sunday, March 23, 2003, Duggan had attempted to locate a pharmacy where he could obtain some prescription drugs. However, the following day, March 24, he spoke to his girlfriend in Paris, telling her that the lectures he was attending "had been interesting." The next day, March 25, 2003, he spoke to his father, to wish him a happy birthday. Again, there were no obvious signs of any problems.

Jeremiah Duggan's death, though tragic, had been treated at the time by his family and friends, as a personal matter. The only news of his death was the terse statement by the German authorities, and local coverage in England, at the time of his funeral. Both of Jeremiah's parents had come to Wiesbaden, Germany, the day after his death, and had met for several hours of close cooperation with sympathetic representatives of the Schiller Institute.

Things abruptly, and publicly, changed by July 2003.

While precise details are not yet known, it is clear that the mother of Jeremiah Duggan, Erica Duggan, a retired school teacher, came under tremendous pressure from the trans-Atlantic networks that had determined that LaRouche's leading role in the anti-Cheney/Blair insurgency had to be stopped. By no later than early May 2003, there is evidence, from published news accounts, that Ms. Duggan had come under significant pressure from British and American circles of the American Family Foundation, a purported "anti-cult" clearinghouse organization that was, in fact, an outgrowth of Anglo-American Cold War intelligence operations, including the Congress for

Cultural Freedom, the Cybernetics Group, and Project MK-Ultra.

On July 12, 2003, Britain's *Guardian* newspaper published the first of a number of ID-format slander stories, attempting to link LaRouche and the Schiller Institute in some sinister fashion to the death of Jeremiah Duggan. The *Guardian* story was written by Hugh Muir, a reporter who had previously written stories based on material from the AFF apparatus. In response to the initial Duggan stories, the Wiesbaden Prosecutor's Office issued a statement, aired on Hessen Radio on July 16, 2003, asserting, "On the basis of our investigations, we must conclude it was suicide."

On July 21, 2003, in the immediate aftermath of the Dr. David Kelly flap, the BBC aired a news segment, by Tim Samuels, smearing LaRouche and the Schiller Institute around the Duggan case.

Soon after the opening of the British media slander campaign, a number of Labour Party politicians stepped in to throw their weight behind the "Get LaRouche" effort. Rudy Jan Vis, the House of Commons member from Erica Duggan's home district, was the first to join in the effort. Another Labourite, who had been given a Peer-for-Life position in the House of Lords by PM Blair, Lord Grenville Janner of Braunstone, also joined the effort. A vice president of the World Jewish Congress, Lord Janner was most widely known as an occultist, a member of the Magic Circle grouping, launched at the beginning of the 20th century by circles of Britain's leading self-professed Satanist, Aleister Crowley.

According to news accounts, sometime in early November, MP Rudy Vis brought Erica Duggan to the British Foreign Office for a meeting with Baroness Symons, the Tony Blair intimate, who had also been given Peer-for-Life standing by the PM, in recognition of her political work for the neoconservative "New Labour." In a second, widely publicized meeting, following two successive waves of media propaganda on the Duggan affair, Baroness Symons met with Erica Duggan, MP Vis, and Lord Janner. Out of that April 1, 2004 meeting, Baroness Symons appointed a pro bono human rights lawyer to work with the Duggan family to squeeze German authorities to reopen the Duggan file.

Well-placed U.S. intelligence sources have warned that the “Duggan affair,” for lack of any legitimate basis for attacking LaRouche, has been adopted by a high-powered faction within the British Establishment and City of London financial oligarchy, as the vehicle for attacking LaRouche on the eve of the Democratic nominating convention. They fear a LaRouche political breakout, and are determined to prevent it. The objective of the media smear campaign, linking LaRouche-affiliated organizations to the Duggan suicide, is to build pressure in several Continental European countries, and eventually launch a major disruption of the LaRouche campaign, to drive a permanent wedge between the candidate and other leading factions of the Democratic Party, who, in concert, could assure the defeat of Bush-Cheney in November. The intent of the London crowd, and their Wall Street allies, is to assure that if there is a John Kerry Presidency, LaRouche will be nowhere near the premises.

Despite the efforts to date, including international proliferation of ID-format smear stories in the German and Italian media, and a longer BBC slander, German authorities have stuck to their professional assessment of the Duggan death, and expressed shock at the behavior of the British media, which, it is charged, misrepresented the views of British authorities, who have also conducted an inquest into the death of Jeremiah Duggan. Such a British coroner’s inquest is mandatory, in all cases of British citizens who die overseas, regardless of the circumstances of death.

On Nov. 11, 2003, the *Wiesbadener Kurier* newspaper published a story on the Duggan affair, under the headline “Why British Media Probably Wrongly Doubt the Investigations of the Wiesbaden Police.” The article, which featured official statements from a spokesman for Chief Prosecutor Dieter Arlet, began with a question: “Did a student from London really jump in front of a car with the intention of committing suicide? British newspapers have publicized doubt about this description of the Wiesbaden Prosecutor’s Office and base this on the conclusion of a coroner. But that judgment is in fact different than the way it is reported in Great Britain.”

After reviewing the details of the March 27, 2003 early-morning incident, and the subsequent British inquest by Coroner William Dolman, the *Kurier* article continued, “And here the

coroner's judgment on Jerry Duggan's death has nothing to do with the suicide which the Wiesbaden Prosecutor's Office is convinced of. Their press reports about it are combined with hefty attacks against the German police: The death has to be seen in connection with rightwing radicals, anti-Semitic circles."

Next, from the Prosecutor's Office. *The Kurier* wrote, "More than 20 interviews were given to British press representatives in the past week by Chief Prosecutor Dieter Arlet. 'One is perplexed about the interest in a case, which in our view can't be judged in any other way,' said the spokesman for the Prosecutor's Office in Wiesbaden. 'Our legal system requires concrete facts, mere suspicions are not sufficient.' In fact, according to his information, it seems that it isn't the Wiesbaden police, but actually the British press, who have made grave mistakes. Cause for this suspicion comes from research of the Hessen State Criminal Office. They inquired yesterday with the British liaison officer to the Federal Criminal Police (BKA) about the press reports. And the BKA official, says Chief Prosecutor Arlet, learned that the coroner has closed the case concerning the death of Jerry Duggan. According to the BKA account the judgment of the coroner had a wholly different tone than that presented in the British media. That version runs: 'Jerry Duggan died in a traffic accident as a result of great fear.' Arlet sees in that 'a completely neutral characterization, which provides no grounds for us to reopen the investigation.' It does not represent a contradiction to the decision of the Prosecutor's Office. That the word suicide does not appear in the judgment, he explains by citing the discretion that is usual in Great Britain, to protect the next of kin."

The *Kurier* story concluded with another question: "But what about the defamation of the German police work? For Arlet it is 'completely inexplicable how such a characterization could come into the media.' The source for this he could not find in any of the articles."

A Concise Timeline of The Symons-Duggan Affair

Early March, 2003: Jeremiah Duggan, a 22-year-old British student, meets LaRouche Youth Movement organizers in Paris at a book table, engages in a discussion, and takes some literature. Duggan is told about an international conference in Germany at the end of the month. He is particularly interested in LaRouche's strong opposition to the Cheney-Blair Iraq war and the imperial policies underlying that unjust invasion. Over the next several weeks, Duggan exchanges several email messages with LYM organizers, and arranges to travel to Germany for the conference.

March 27, 2003: Jeremiah Duggan, attending the Schiller Institute international conference and youth cadre school near Wiesbaden, Germany, is killed when he jumps in front of speeding cars on an autobahn. Wiesbaden police and prosecutors investigate the death, and conclude that Duggan committed suicide. Duggan had confided to his conference roommates, in his last days, that he was diagnosed with Obsessive Compulsive Disorder, an illness that can induce schizophrenic behavior, including paranoia. He had begun to show signs of emotional stress during the day before his suicide, March 26, and had fled the apartment where he was staying, March 27, at approximately 3:30 in the morning. When LYM organizer called Jeremiah's girlfriend Maya Villanueva in Paris, shortly after Duggan left the apartment, to see whether she had heard from him, she cynically asked, "Is there a river nearby?" Subsequently, both Erica Duggan and Maya Villanueva have failed, notably, to mention Jeremiah's diagnosed illness, fuelling the media fraud about the role of the Schiller Institute in his death. Erica Duggan has acknowledged to reporters that she, her divorced husband, and Jeremiah, had undergone group counselling at the Tavistock Clinic when Jeremiah was approximately 7 years old.

March 28, 2003: Jeremiah Duggan's parents meet in Wiesbaden with representatives of the Schiller Institute. Although they make no mention of Jeremiah's OCD diagnosis, the meeting is very cordial, given the tragic circumstances.

April 1, 2003: The LaRouche in 2004 campaign releases the first 250,000-copy run of *Children of Satan: The 'Ignoble Liars' Behind Bush's No-Exit War*. The glossy-cover pamphlet exposes the entire neoconservative cabal inside the Bush-Cheney Administration behind the Iraq war, and surfaces, for the first time, damning evidence that many of the leading Bush-Cheney neocons are protégés of the University of Chicago philosophy professor Leo Strauss, a promoter of Nazi Party fascist ideologues Carl Schmitt and Martin Heidegger. Within a short period of time from the release of the campaign report, mainstream media in North America and Europe pick up the basic themes of the *Children of Satan*, particularly the demonic role of Strauss in the neocon drive for empire, based on perpetual war.

April 3, 2003: Lyndon LaRouche is interviewed for six minutes on the British Broadcasting Corporation (BBC) news show "Live Five." LaRouche is introduced as a leading critic of the Bush Administration's Iraq war, and as a candidate for the 2004 Democratic Party Presidential nomination.

May 22, 2003: British Ministry of Defence weapons scientist Dr. David Kelly meets with BBC journalist Andrew Gilligan at London's Charing Cross Hotel, where he allegedly tells the journalist that 10 Downing Street operatives, including Alastair Campbell, "sexed up" the British government's Sept. 24, 2002 white paper, which accused Saddam Hussein of amassing weapons of mass destruction, in violation of United Nations resolutions.

May 29, 2003: BBC's "Radio 4 Today" news broadcast airs a report by Gilligan, levelling the charges about the "sexed-up" dossier as having been aimed at making a more convincing, albeit false, case for war with Iraq.

June 2, 2003: BBC "Newsnight" science editor Susan Watts broadcasts a second story, using Dr. Kelly as a source, and raising concerns about the Sept. 24, 2002 dossier's claims that Saddam could launch WMD on 45 minutes' notice.

June 9, 2003: Lyndon LaRouche is again interviewed on the BBC "Live Five" news show, this time for 12 minutes. The subject of the interview is LaRouche's recent call for the im-

peachment of Vice President Dick Cheney, for his role in the faking of intelligence, including making knowingly false claims of Saddam Hussein purchasing nuclear bomb material in Africa, to justify the Iraq invasion.

July 7, 2003: The Foreign Affairs Committee of the House of Commons, after a week of tumultuous hearings, clears Blair communications director Alastair Campbell of “sexing up” the 10 Downing Street white paper.

July 8, 2003: Prime Minister Tony Blair chairs a meeting at No. 10, where it is agreed that Dr. Kelly’s name will be released as the source of the Gilligan story. Former U.S. Ambassador Joseph Wilson publishes an op ed in the *New York Times* revealing, for the first time, that he was the emissary sent by the CIA to Niger in February 2002, to probe allegations that Iraq had attempted to purchase vast quantities of “yellow cake” uranium, to produce nuclear bombs. His conclusion: There was no truth to the story.

July 11, 2003: Erica Duggan meets with the London Metropolitan Police, to discuss the circumstances surrounding Jeremiah’s death. By this time, she has been contacted by individuals and groups affiliated with American Family Foundation (AFF).

July 12, 2003: The London-based *Guardian* newspaper publishes the first smear story linking Lyndon LaRouche and the Schiller Institute to the suicide-death of Jeremiah Duggan. The author of the story, Hugh Muir, has, in the past, written stories based on information provided by so-called “anti-cult” groups affiliated with the AFF.

July 15, 2003: Dr. David Kelly is called to testify before the Foreign Affairs Committee of the Parliament.

July 17, 2003: Dr. Kelly leaves his home in Abingdon in Oxfordshire, telling his wife he is going for a walk. His body is found the next morning by local police. Prime Minister Blair announces the launching of a judicial review of the Kelly case, to be headed by Lord Hutton.

July 21, 2003: BBC airs a slander on LaRouche and the Duggan suicide by Tim Samuels, under the headline, “Mother calls for inquiry into son’s death.”

Aug. 29, 2003: Alastair Campbell resigns as head of the communications office for Prime Minister Tony Blair, denying that he is quitting over the death of Dr. Kelly.

October 2003: The American Family Foundation holds a conference in Hartford, Conn. Among the speakers is Dennis King, longtime anti-LaRouche operative. After working in the early 1980s as a paid propagandist for Roy M. Cohn, the former chief counsel to Sen. Joseph McCarthy, King was bankrolled by the neoconservative Smith Richardson Foundation to write a booklength slander of LaRouche in 1989. During the same period, King's *pro bono* attorney was Steven Bundy, the son of McGeorge Bundy.

Nov. 5, 2003: Coroner's inquest into Jeremiah's death occurs at Hornsey Coroner's Court. Dr. William Dolman, HM Coroner for North London, presides over the inquest. The British media claims that Dr. Dolman has "rejected" the German authorities' view that the death was a suicide. Statements attributed to Dr. Dolman suggest that evidence was presented at the inquest by AFF circles, making wild charges that the LaRouche organization is a dangerous cult, etc. British media coverage of the inquest includes interviews with Dennis King and with Chip Berlet. (Berlet, former Washington, D.C. bureau chief of *High Times* magazine, the semi-official publication of the drug legalization lobby in the U.S.A., was a leader of the National Student Association. During the late 1960s, it was exposed for having received CIA financing, in a *Ramparts* magazine exposé.)

Nov. 11, 2003: *Wiesbadener Kurier* publishes an article challenging the coverage in the British media, and defending the assessment of the Wiesbaden Prosecutor's Office that Duggan's death was the result of suicide. Chief Prosecutor Dieter Arlet complains that it is "completely inexplicable how such a characterization could get into the media." A spokesman for the Prosecutor's office reports that the German Federal Police (BKA) had found that the British coroner's inquest had been closed, and that the British media coverage had misrepresented the findings of Dr. Dolman. Arlet says that, based on the BKA inquiry, there are "no grounds for us to reopen the investigation."

Jan. 28, 2004: The Hutton inquiry issues its final report, totally whitewashing 10 Downing Street's role in exaggerating the WMD dossier.

Feb. 12, 2004: BBC News airs further slanderous coverage of the Duggan affair by Tim Samuels.

Feb. 25, 2004: A meeting takes place at the British Foreign

Office between Erica Duggan and officials, who set up a followup meeting with Baroness Symons. News of the planned Duggan-Symons meeting is leaked to the British press.

April 1, 2004: Erica Duggan, Rudy Vis, Lord Janner meet with Baroness Symons at the Foreign Office. Symons announces she will appoint a *pro bono* international human rights lawyer to work with the Duggan family, to pressure German authorities to reverse their assessment of the case.

April 21, 2004: BBC "Live at Five," the show that had twice interviewed Lyndon LaRouche a year earlier, runs an interview with Erica Duggan and Rudy Vis.

May 6, 2004: Prime Minister Tony Blair provokes a firestorm of protests by appointing John Scarlett as the new head of the British Secret Intelligence Service, MI6. Scarlett, as the head of the Joint Intelligence Committee, was the principal author of the Sept. 24, 2002 white paper which lied about Saddam Hussein's ability to launch weapons of mass destruction "within 45 minutes," and his efforts to obtain uranium in Africa, for building nuclear bombs. Scarlett worked closely on the dossier with top Blair aides Alastair Campbell and Phil Bassett, the latter being the husband of Foreign Office official and Deputy Head of the House of Lords, Baroness Liz Symons.

May 20, 2004: *Corriere della Sera* Sunday magazine publishes a lengthy, vicious slander against LaRouche, centered around interviews with Erica and Hugo Duggan, by writer Agostino Gramigna.

May 23, 2004: Members of the LaRouche Youth Movement, distributing an "Open Letter to the Washington Post" by Lyndon LaRouche, in front of the *Washington Post* building in downtown Washington, D.C., encounter Michael Winstead. Winstead had briefly infiltrated the Baltimore chapter of the LYM, only to abruptly leave the group, and circulate a series of slanders. Accompanied by a *Washington Post* photographer, Winstead boasts to LYM organizers that he is working for the *Post* on a forthcoming slander on LaRouche and LYM, which will also heavily feature the Duggan suicide. (When Winstead departed from Baltimore, he left behind a large collection of pornography, which he had downloaded from the Internet.)