

Letters to the Editor

Fairness to Baha'i

I was surprised by the gross inaccuracies contained in the article by Mark Burdman concerning the Baha'i faith [*EIR*, Aug. 28, 1992, "Pagan Baha'i Cult Plays Leading Role in U.N.'s Human Rights Meeting"]. A reading of the article indicates Burdman to be very unfamiliar with the Baha'i faith or that he was intentionally making an effort to knowingly discredit Baha'i. Considering Lyndon LaRouche's dilemma, it would appear that your writers should be careful to represent or present others with the fairness and justice which Lyndon espouses.

People who have kept up with world religious trends know that Baha'i is recognized worldwide as a religion—not a cult—and that it is the fastest growing religion in the world. If Burdman has an opinion other than this (in fairness) it should be stated, by you the editor, that his opinion flies in the face of what is widely accepted all over the world.

In the first place, Burdman misses the core tenets of the Baha'i faith and focuses on peripheral activity and attempts to equate George Bush's "one world" with the Baha'i "one world." Actually there is no connection or any intention of there being a connection.

It is not my purpose here to lecture on the tenets of the Baha'i faith. I would rather suggest that Burdman ought to have studied Baha'i in some depth before writing the article. . . .

Ray Minert
Springfield, Oregon

The author replies: Mr. Minert fails to respond to the main point of my article. What the article documents, in significant part from Baha'i literature, is that the faith massively and enthusiastically worked for the success of the June 1992 Rio Earth Summit. My article presents a tiny fraction of evidence available to demonstrate that point. It is my view, and certainly Mr. LaRouche's view as well, that the Rio Summit was an abhorrent event, promoting values that are antithetical to humanity. Rather than question my understanding of the Baha'is, I would hope Mr. Minert would question the Baha'i leadership as to its activities in this respect. Worse, as my article documents—from Baha'i literature itself—the faith promoted the views of a man, Arne Naess, who openly supports the reduction of the human

race to somewhere around 1 billion people. Evidence of that is amply available in the public domain, i.e., from Naess's own writings. Similarly, the "anti-anthropomorphic" ideas of the cited Robert White are put forward by the Baha'is themselves as representative of their worldview.

Baha'i activity, as advertised by themselves, has been in the service of an outlook, a worldview, expressed by the abhorrent neologism "sustainable development." As *EIR* has frequently documented, the concept of "sustainable development" is the polar opposite to the political economy of Mr. LaRouche, and the promotion of that idea has caused many of the malthusian horrors to which our human race is today subjected. If other Baha'i activity and advocacy promotes more positive values, that should be made known. But in view of the overwhelming evidence of their leading role in the Rio event, I hold that a retraction is not in order.

Conspiracy theories

Leif Johnson's review of John A. Stormer's updated version of his original *None Dare Call It Treason*, 20 years later, was well written, but is essentially, a first-class hatchet job [*EIR* of June 26, 1992]. I was shocked, and forced to consider it, and ask: Why?

The original work written in 1963 and published in 1964 with 11 additional printings in the same year totaling 1,400,000 units. Seven years later in 1971 Gary Allen wrote and published in 1972 *None Dare Call It Conspiracy*, which in three printings sold 1,800,000 units. These books, written in plain everyday language, were discussed on campuses and [in] the many places where the people discuss and attempt to evaluate such information. Gary Allen's book had two advantages; he followed Stormer, and he did not use religious morality to point [out] his arguments. . . .

I believe that my own experience has been duplicated by a great number of people who were alerted to the dangerous direction our esteemed leaders were, and are, continuing to take our country. Messers. Stormer and Allen spurred me to continue my investigation to determine in greater depth the causes for the obvious deterioration of western civilization. Thus, once I discovered him, I became an advocate of the philosophy and policies of Mr. LaRouche. Twenty

years ago many more of us ordinary people could read!

The review by Mr. Johnson follows the classic pattern of the hatchet-job. Character defamation succeeded by a hysterical denunciation of the text, "out of context quotes, fallacies of composition, sheer falsehoods, bespeak a pathological disregard for truth." Mr. Johnson seems to be imitating the most blatant experts who do the reviews for the *New York Times* and the *Washington Post*. . . .

I have in my library a dozen volumes by well-qualified historians and journalists, which collectively and individually validate the assertions made by Stormer with the mass of information available from 1976 to 1987 through declassification and the Freedom of Information Act—the period most of these books were written. Stormer's documentation covers ten and a half pages of fine print in the back of the book. Where is yours, Mr. Johnson?

Les Bosley
Homestead, Florida

The editor replies: Mr. Johnson did not question John Stormer's facts. He questioned his interpretation of those facts, noting the strange fact that Stormer expressed great admiration for George Bush and Oliver North, who stand out for their roles in abetting the subversion of Central America and South America by drug-running, pro-communist terrorists. Johnson pointed out (among other things) that Stormer never even mentions the role of the drug trade as the most effective destroyer of our nation!

How is it that millions of well-meaning Americans have been taken in by such a swindle? The problem is *populism*. Writers like Stormer appeal to the justified rage of many Americans against the corruption they see all around them in government and social life. But when it comes to the deeper issues, of how one is to govern, in coherency with the Christian notion of man in the living image of God, they fail—or as Leif Johnson pointed out—they turn out to share the same degraded, bestialized image of man as the Marxists they otherwise attack.

Populism's historical record is frightening. Consider the difference in outcome between the French and American Revolutions. France's uprising was captured by populist demagogues, and culminated in the tyranny of the mob, followed by the tyranny of Napoleon, a tyranny which then spread out all over Europe.