

The Cato Institute: a Washington think tank of dope and 'decoupling'

by Mark Burdman

One of the more graphic signs of the moral and cultural decay that the Washington, D.C. policymaking process has undergone since the early 1970s is that a think tank in the nation's capital that openly supports legalization of drugs, the dismantling of the American military presence in Europe and Asia, the dissolution of the Central Intelligence Agency, and an overturning of our nation's constitutional commitment to natural law and state-encouraged scientific and technological progress, is gaining increasing respectability among D.C.'s "conservative" milieu.

Founded in 1977, the Cato Institute is the meeting-point for the various breeds of "libertarian" movements that have sprouted up since the founding of the Libertarian Party in 1971. Were the backers of these movements to have been perfectly honest, they would have named the new party the Infantile Regression Party, the Hedonists' Party, or the Party of Benedict Arnold, since these would more properly connote what the libertarians represent.

The Libertarian Party was founded in 1971, out of an amalgam of 1960s college campus ferment of the anarchist, leftist, and British "free-trade" liberal variety represented by the marijuana-puffing William F. Buckley.

That amalgam is today preserved in the Cato Institute. One of its more famous Advisory Board members is Austrian free-trade monetarist Friedrich von Hayek, the mentor of Milton Friedman. Another Advisory Board member, Earl C. Ravenal of the Georgetown University Foreign Service Institute, is by his confession "friends from way back" with Marcus Raskin and Richard Barnett, founders of the left-terrorist Institute for Policy Studies, and is "on good terms" with leading Soviet policymakers from the U.S.A.-Canada Institute in Moscow. The Cato Institute has also drawn upon the resources of one of the leading anarchist-terrorist ideologues in the United States, Noam Chomsky of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

"Libertarians are essentially anarchists," one Cato Institute insider reports, citing Russia's 19th-century anarchist-terrorist Prince Kropotkin as one of their idols.

Liberty for drug merchants

The Institute had most recently come to the attention of *EIR* when it was discovered that a late-September 1984 series in the Rev. Sun Myung Moon's *Washington Times* advocating legalization of heroin had been composed by a *Times* reporter, Glenn Garvin, who had earlier been a Cato Institute staffer and an editor of the (now-defunct) libertarian mouth-piece, *Inquiry* magazine.

EIR discovered that Institute director Ed Crane has at his disposal no fewer than four projects directed toward the legalization of drugs, all promoted under the rubric of "free trade," "individual freedom," and "liberty."

Crane perceives the pro-drug mobilization as an explicit attack on the tradition of state-encouraged scientific and technological progress that is the backbone of the American Republic and the American system of economics created by Benjamin Franklin, Alexander Hamilton, George Washington, Mathew and Henry Carey, and others. Referring to Hamilton's seminal 1791 *Report on Manufactures*, Crane says: "I don't think much of Hamilton. He was in fact a reactionary Tory who was fundamentally opposed to the Revolution. . . . Washington was a mixed bag, a compromise; I'm not too keen on him either."

The Institute adopts its name from a series published in the 1760s called "Cato's Letters," the name "Cato" being taken from the Roman stoic philosopher Cato the Younger. Stoicism is a philosophy that encourages despair and a sense that man is incapable of intervening to change and develop the laws of the universe, and was a critical tool in the hands of the degraded rulers of the Roman Empire to banalize and control subject populations.

Stoicism is indeed the opiate of the masses. It is not surprising that Cato's nominal descendants today would be so vociferously in favor of legalization and proliferation of drugs.

Using the "free-trade," "private-enterprise," and "budget-cutting" verbiage popularized by pro-drug propagandists such as Milton Friedman, Friedrich von Hayek, and chief libertarian-guru Ludwig von Mises, the Cato Institute aims to dupe manipulable conservatives in the political base of President Reagan, and potentially even intimates of the President himself, into accepting what their moral values otherwise lead them to abhor.

'We agree with Kissinger'

From the same standpoint, the Cato Institute is lobbying for the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of American forces from NATO and from a significant military role in the Asian-Pacific theater. This idea has been put forward in a 1983 Cato analysis of the Reagan defense budget done by the Soviet-connected Professor Ravenal of the Cato Advisory Board.

Says Crane: "I would argue that the Western Europeans could defend themselves. It's an enormously expensive commitment for us. There's no Soviet threat to Europe. . . . I'd be in favor of withdrawal from Europe immediately. . . . Kissinger's call for phased withdrawal of American troops from Europe is correct, a step in the right direction, his timetable is just not fast enough."

Inside the Reagan administration, an associate of Crane claims that the libertarians' most sympathetic co-thinker is Undersecretary of Defense Fred Iklé, who believes that American military attention must shift to Central America and the Caribbean "in contradistinction to our European commitments."

In a piece published for the Cato Institute in 1979, "Strategic Disengagement and World Peace: Toward a Noninterventionist American Foreign Policy," Ravenal had argued for American unilateral surrender in terms that would have twitched Neville Chamberlain's umbrella.

"... Asia might be the earliest theater for the implementation of disengagement," he stated. "The United States would withdraw to a mid-Pacific position and observe—but not necessarily count on or promote—the probable emergence of an East Asian regional configuration of China, Japan, and Russia. We would seek no positions in the Indian Ocean; in South Asia a lesser regional array might emerge, consisting of India, supported by Russia and countered by China and the rump of Pakistan.

"In the Middle East, the United States would not attempt to impose a settlement on the contending local states. We would enjoy as long as possible the flow of oil on reasonable commercial terms, and would yield with decent grace and little brandishing of force if seriously challenged by local irresponsibility or outside intervention.

"In Western Europe, America would witness the continuing devolution of military power and fragmentation of political will, without making intricate efforts to control NATO or its deployment of forces—aspects that are obviously related. In fact, we would initiate the thinning out of our troops and *continue a measured and irreversible redeployment to the continental United States*, removing most of the redeployed units from our active structure and dispensing with most of the airlift and sealift and sea-control forces that are justified solely for reinforcement and resupply in an extended ground war in Europe [emphasis added]."

Today, Ravenal admits that the Green Party anti-American fanatics in West Germany and U.S. "neo-conservatives" like Irving Kristol of *Public Interest* magazine and "libertarians" of the Cato Institute stripe "are complementary. . . . The more the Greens attack the U.S., the more the neo-conservatives find justification for leaving Europe. . . .

"An American withdrawal from Europe, in a political and military sense, might be just over the horizon," he states.

Similarly, in a recent *Washington Times* piece, Ravenal admitted that his "Fortress America" recommendations might lead to "disorder in the world, but we are compensated by the fact that we are not implicated in it."

Destroy the CIA

Through the same budget-cutting and hedonistic arguments by which the Cato Institute can justify drug legalization and American unilateral surrender, the Institute's policymakers propose the dismantling of the American intelligence capability that has already been so drastically undercut by the KGB-directed Church Committee and other inquisitorial campaigns in the U. S. Congress.

In an Aug. 10, 1982 paper entitled, "The Reagan Budget: The Deficit That Didn't Have to Be," Cato Institute Vice-President for Public Policy Affairs David D. Boaz extends what appear to be legitimate complaints about the overweight Washington bureaucracy into a Khomeinac assault recommending the closing down of virtually all narcotics-monitoring and national intelligence estimates capabilities.

"The CIA," he writes, "has intervened in the internal affairs of countries around the world, imposing the Shah on the people of Iran, conspiring against Allende in Chile, and supporting socialists in a counterproductive attempt to 'fight communism.' In the process, it has created anti-American sentiment throughout the Third World and given communist insurgents an opportunity to blame their countries' problems on covert CIA activities and gain support they wouldn't otherwise have. The CIA has also exceeded its charter by harassing and spying on American citizens domestically. Legitimate intelligence-gathering needs can be handled by the Defense Intelligence Agency; abolition of the CIA would be a major signal that the American government is renouncing its policy of harassing American 'dissidents' and destabilizing foreign governments."

Similarly, "The Drug Enforcement Administration harasses and imprisons businessmen and their customers who engage in the voluntary exchange of goods and services, forcing otherwise honest traders into a life of crime—surely something an administration devoted to free enterprise should abhor. Of course, many of the people involved in the drug trade are not honest traders but members of organized crime. Drug laws help organized crime by keeping drug prices high and keeping most competitors out of the business."

Against the nation-state

The various Cato Institute policy statements converge on one objective: dismantling of sovereign nation-state institutions and encouraging of heteronomic, local-control institutions. In reality, the content of their policies differs little if at all from the "New Left" projects for "community control" sponsored by McGeorge Bundy's Ford Foundation in the 1960s, or from those of the Green Party Nazi-communist fanatics in the Federal Republic of Germany. In this light, *EIR* has discovered, and is further investigating, the fact that leading U.S. libertarians are also activists in the world-federalist movement: imperial-dictatorial government on a global basis, mediated through tiny local sovereignties.

The free-enterprise line of attack has won the Cato Institute an entrée into the White House. Peter J. Ferrara, now on the staff of the White House Office of Policy Development, is an "adjunct scholar" of the Cato Institute, for whom he wrote a 1982 monograph, "Social Security: Averting the Costs." This presented "free-enterprise" arguments against the social security system and provided the basis for a "non-partisan commission" on social security, which is now being pointed to as the model for the kinds of nonpartisan commissions that Henry Kissinger and his KGB-Eastern Liberal Establishment friends are demanding be implemented in the areas of foreign policy, defense, and agriculture policy.

Trained at Harvard Law School, Ferrara had earlier been special assistant to the Assistant Secretary for Policy Development at the Department of Housing and Urban Development, from which position he had been one of the main architects of the "free-enterprise zone" project implemented in New York City and elsewhere in the country. Under this rubric, Ferrara and congressional "neo-conservatives" such as Jack Kemp (R-N.Y.) had put into effect a system of labor-intensive, sweat-shop economics modeled on the dope-based economy of Hong Kong.

The same kinds of arguments based on antipathy for science and technological progress and dirigist Hamiltonian economics have led Cato operatives into collaboration with various "environmentalist" organizations in campaigns against projects such as the Clinch River fast-breeder reactor in Tennessee. Libertarian-environmentalist collaboration was mediated through one Henry Sikolski, at the time an aide to conservative Republican Sen. Gordon Humphreys of New Hampshire and widely suspected of being a KGB mole within conservative circles.

Cutbacks in fusion

by Vin Berg

It has long been known, though frequently lied about for strategic-policy reasons, that there are no scientific or technological barriers to the realization of fusion energy during the 1990s. This is the judgment of international authorities on the status of fusion research. In fact, in the United States, the country best situated to realize this goal, the only barrier is the deliberate withholding of funds adequate to the task.

Efforts to destroy the program by the administration of James Earl Carter and his energy czar, James Schlesinger, were only offset by the political pressure built up in fusion's favor by the energy crisis, favorable expert-panel reports, and the actual scientific breakthroughs made by fusion researchers, sensational news of which could not be suppressed. Hence, although inadequate from the historic standpoint of fusion power's unlimited promise, funding for the program did gradually creep upward, even under Carter, as it had under preceding administrations.

But now, under an ostensibly pro-nuclear Reagan administration, for the first time in its 30-year history, the fusion program in the United States is facing savage cut-backs. The administration requested \$483 million for fiscal year 1985, a meager increase over FY84's \$470 million, and no increase at all after inflation. But Congress has cut even that request to \$437 million, which assures slow-downs and stretch-outs in the program. In 1986, the Tokamak Fusion Test Reactor at Princeton was to have begun using the fuel (tritium) required to produce more energy through fusion reactions than consumed in generating those fusion reactions, called "breakeven." But Congress's FY85 funding will make this impossible before 1988. And so on across the board.

The same KGB-influenced "liberals" and fiscal-austerity "neo-conservatives," both inside and outside the administration, who have wrecked America's industry, agriculture, and basic infrastructure, are now very close to sabotaging the nation's development of relativistic-beam technology, which is based on physical principles and areas of research and engineering very much the same as fusion energy. The military application, of course, could provide effective anti-missile defense against nuclear attack (the so-called Star Wars). That program also faces slowdowns if the benefits of an aggressive fusion effort are denied it.

What is fusion?

Fusion is the energy process of the stars, and a fusion reactor amounts to a miniature Sun on Earth. Conventional fission power is based on "splitting" the nuclei of atoms.