
LaRouche on the Policy Crisis in Washington

The gods of Olympus are leading the U.S. toward self-destruction

This verbal memorandum was issued by LaRouche from prison in Rochester, Minnesota on Nov. 5, after U.S. Secretary of State Warren Christopher had affirmed his support for the new Russian military doctrine.

I think it extremely important to emphasize that we have every external piece of symptomatic evidence—and I think this evidence can be taken as crucial, despite its externality, its symptomatic character—that the President of the United States is being blind-sided by a coterie of “spin doctors.” This is clearest on the Russian situation; and the Christopher official misevaluation of the new Russian military doctrine underscores that in the most crucial fashion.

We have a similar situation on other fronts of international foreign policy, and another on financial policy, and additional ones which have tweaked the administration a bit: misinformation on the health care package and misinformation on the North American Free Trade Agreement, that is, on the implications of what NAFTA is.

The White House is being *blind-sided* by spin doctors. Most of this seems to come from the State Department, from the New York financial houses, including the Federal Reserve as such and the un-Magnificent Seven [U.S. commercial banks], as well as firms such as Goldman Sachs. There probably is also blind-siding in the intelligence community going on, concerning the military aspects.

What is happening, is that there is a buildup of disasters.

I don't think this is entirely Republican or similar influence from a partisan standpoint, trying to blind-side and thus discredit the administration. I think we have to look at this in another way. We have to look at the stratum of bureaucracy, corporate, financial, governmental, intelligence community, and the establishment interests that are utilizing these elements of the bureaucracy.

What has happened is the collapse of the Berlin Wall and the presumed establishment of the United States as a single superpower, which, through people like Margaret Thatcher, can be manipulated into some kind of geopolitical globaloney of a New Age or a post-modernist type. People of that type

are saying to themselves wishfully: Because we have seized the only pinnacle of global power in the world—the United States and what is tied to it in this Anglo-American combination—whatever we decide, will happen, because there is no credible political opposition anywhere in the world powerful enough to break our will. These fellows, who have separated church and state, have not only denied that God exists; they've also denied that nature exists. And thus they oppose natural law, as natural law used to be defined in respect to natural philosophy; that is, natural law really was understood as an expression of natural philosophy, the laws of nature, so to speak, as in Luke: “The very stones would speak.” If you don't believe in God, you're going to find out that nature acts according to laws which, according to the ontological proof, are the manifestation of God's will.

And thus we see that everything is crumbling; everything is a failure.

A consensus based on misevaluation

Let me point out two things. First of all, let's take the Russian situation. Step by step, each time the Russian situation moves toward the alternatives of pure chaos or a Third Rome imperium, the two being impelled in the same direction, the spin doctors around the administration say, “Yes, there is a possibility of some Third Rome tendency in and around Russia; yes, that is true. *But* that is not the predominant thing. You see, we have our influence there; and others have their influence there; and you will see that it does not go in a Third Rome direction—although we admit there might be a remote possibility that a Third Rome tendency could come to the surface under certain circumstances, which we think are unlikely, because we have control over the buttons and levers of enough places in Moscow, to prevent that from happening.”

That is the kind of spin which typifies the way this misinformation is manipulating the U.S. presidency—and undoubtedly the President himself, by virtue of blind-siding him on these realities. The Christopher statement on the Russian military doctrine is an example of that blind-siding.

I don't know whether Christopher is being blind-sided himself, or he's willfully trying to manipulate the situation; but the way the blind-siding works is: "We have a policy. We have an agreement to have a policy. None of us is going to tip over the apple cart. None of us is going to break that agreement to support a certain policy. This policy will include, for example, NAFTA generally, though there are some exceptions on that; and the Russian policy, and the global policy, and so forth."

So whenever there's a threat, where reality throws a bad light on the policy agreement, the participants in these federated blocks of support for these policies, rush in to give an interpretation of the facts—a misinterpretation—to demonstrate that they are remaining loyal to the bureaucratic style of institutional or cross-institutional agreement, to uphold that policy. The theory being, that if nobody breaks ranks on the policy, the policy will hold. Why? Because the *will* of the united forces gathered around the superpower is so strong—like the will of the gods of Olympus—that there is no law of nature which could really upset it, *unless* those gathered around the center of power, were to divide ranks on the issue.

That's the kind of logic you get.

Feminist logic

Now you get this combined with a special kind of feminist logic. I think it's very important when we speak of feminism, as we must, to make clear exactly what we mean by this, because many people have come wrongly to equate women's equality and feminism. I've said it before, but I think it's important to say it in this context: Women's equality signifies that women have a brain; and therefore, since they have a brain which functions in this unique species form we call *imago Dei*, they have the quality also of *capax Dei*. So therefore, if women are *imago Dei* and have *capax Dei*, as the first chapter of Genesis insist, contrary to constructions which some put on the Adam and Eve business, then women should have essential political equality before God. Women are not a different race, they're not a different species; they are part of mankind, and equally part of mankind, as *there are no different human races*. There is only one human race, because all members of the human species have the quality of *imago Dei* and *capax Dei*. That is their potential quality, and therefore, in the characteristics of the species, there are no distinctions; skin color and so forth don't mean a blasted thing in this respect.

There's only one human race; there are no human races. There are historical-cultural lineages which come down through families and family groupings, which are *significant* in a different way—as long as you don't start calling it *ethnicity*; you simply call it different cultural strains, or *different histories*, or different long-range histories going back 3,000 years, and so forth. That's the only difference: national histories, cultural histories, which have no biological basis

Christopher on Russian military doctrine

In a Senate Foreign Relations Committee hearing on Nov. 5, Secretary of State Warren Christopher said that "the United States and its allies never took the old Soviet doctrine ['no first use' of nuclear weapons] as a serious indication as to what the U.S.S.R. might actually do with its massive arsenal of nuclear weapons. In the new doctrine, Russia has said essentially that it will not use nuclear weapons against non-nuclear weapons states who are parties to the NPT [Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty]. In fact, the nuclear doctrine announced in this statement is not very different from our own."

Christopher went on to comment on the Russian provisions for outside "peacekeeping" along the periphery of the former Soviet Union. Said Christopher: "Our preliminary understanding is that this new doctrine has a very important proviso, and that is that such operations—that is, operations by the military along the borders of Russia—will be only in cooperation with the other states involved." Christopher then stressed that Russian operations outside of Russia must conform with all international norms. "In short," he said, "Russia must be part of the solution and not part of the problem with respect to the regional conflicts. Nothing that we have seen in this new doctrine—as I say, we're just beginning to study it—contradicts that crucial principle."

For *EIR*'s analysis of the Russian military doctrine, see our issue of Nov. 12, "Russian Military Shapes Yeltsin's Imperial Policy," by Konstantin George.

whatsoever. They have only a human and only a cultural basis—not a biological one.

The feminist comes along, and the feminist is not a woman. Everything which, say, in Victorian society, defines the woman as *inferior*, is what the feminist upholds! The feminists deny rationality: they call it "authoritarianism." The feminists uphold *irrationality*, emotion.

For example, the feminist is self-professed, by the logic of Shockley and Jensen, to be racially inferior—that is, not capable of *cognitive* reasoning, not naturally disposed to cognitive reasoning, but naturally disposed to *irrationality* in the form of emotion-driven or prejudice-driven, associative argument. Thus the feminist is racially inferior, self-professed. The feminist says, in order to have equality, there-

fore, we must castrate the males. This is sort of like the Isis-Osiris story. We must call male qualities "authoritarian," unfeminine, and we must demand that all males be feminine.

Thus our problem today, is not so much the feminist as a woman, but the feminist male. When you start to look at the feminist male, including the irrational homosexual who, by virtue of disorder, shows the same qualities as the feminist among women, you've got the picture pretty clearly, or in a more limited way.

Outcome-based education is *feminism* carried to its satanic extreme. Remember, modern feminism comes out of Jeremy Bentham and the Benthamite circles, and comes to the surface in such forms as Bachoven and the existentialists generally. This is feminism as a branch of fascism, as a branch of existentialism, the mother of fascism.

So what you have, is this kind of reasoning in the name of the New Age or post-modernism, so-called deconstructionism, which is the same thing as feminism. This comes into Washington and says, "There is no authority to reason, there is no natural law. Thus, whatever we decide, by virtue of irrational prejudice and associative methods of arguing among ourselves, is policy, and will rule the world." So you can say in that sense, that the entire collection of the mythical gods of Olympus, were a bunch of irrational feminists.

That is the way you can understand what's happening around Washington. We have a layer of the population, particularly those who come from the post-1970 generation, who have risen to influence in institutions, who run whole sections of universities, notably the Modern Language Association crew. These deranged people are now leading the institutions of government.

The irrational gods of Olympus

So this is our problem, that the kinds of institutions and universities, entertainment and news media, elements of government, but also in general corporate life as well as the so-called cultural media, all are dominated by people of this particular deranged stripe. They share in common this kind of irrationalism. And it's these people who represent the constituency for the idea that "whatever we adopt as policy is truth. There is no truth except the policies which we adopt as truth. We call them truth. We have no standard of proof which would correspond to truth. Whatever argument we use and we agree upon, that is the proof."

What happens to a society which takes that view? Go back to Aeschylus and the *Prometheus* plays. Take the first part of Aeschylus and take the other things we know about the Aeschylus idea in Classical Greek literature and its treatment since.

You have the gods of Olympus, who decided they have a policy which they have the power to impose upon men, as long as men worship them: this irrationalism. But then, in steps Prometheus gives fire to man. He's an anti-environmentalist of his time! Prometheus says that there is a God Who is

higher than these self-proclaimed gods of Olympus, and this God will not tolerate the pranks of these gods of Olympus forever.

So what happens is, this crew of would-be Olympians rushes on, convinced that it can impose its policy willy-nilly on the heavens themselves; and then the heavens break them. So they cannot bend; they can only break, when it comes to this issue. And that is the kind of crisis toward which this civilization is heading.

If we allow these spin doctors, these prophets, the sooth-

This is our problem, that the kinds of institutions and universities, entertainment and news media, elements of government, but also in general corporate life as well as the so-called cultural media, all are dominated by the idea that "whatever we adopt as policy is truth. There is no truth except the policies which we adopt as truth."

sayers and the sybils of this crew, to continue to erect a spin doctor screen around the presidency, that is, to defend derivatives, to defend deregulation, to defend similar things, and to come up with such things as the insane, lunatic, suicidal policy which Christopher apparently represented to the public and to the administration on the Russian military division, what you get to is not a *bending* of the policy, but a breaking of the very institutions which *refuse* to bend to reality.

Slash-and-burn economics

Finally, take the free trade case. Now, by virtue of this radical free trade—exporting jobs to whatever part of the world has the labor that is cheapest; exporting your production to the Auschwitzes of the world, which is what the trend is, where the slave labor, of course, *is* the cheapest—you destroy those parts of the world which need nourishment.

It's very much like saying, well, the land we maintain for crop growing, through fertilizers and improvements, that's too high-priced; in a kind of slash-and-burn program, we can loot the pent-up resources of various parts of the world, loot them down to the level of desert, and then move on to another part of the world and do some slash-and-burn there. So this is essentially like slash-and-burn agriculture. You do not *improve* the soil; you simply let nature restore itself and then you come along and you burn down a whole section of the

forest, and for two or three years, you have crops there. Then the land begins to run out, because you've leached it out and worn it out; so you move on, let the thing go back to forest, you find some other area and you slash and burn there.

That's what this free trade is. You go out and destroy an area of the world, loot it of its productive potential in the form of cheap labor. Then you move on and loot and burn something else.

In the process, the first thing you do, is you loot, then burn, the industrial-economic potential of your own industrialized nation, which is what the British have done. They've destroyed whatever industrial potential they had, and they've left behind, in large part, nothing but a bunch of Yahoos who are incapable of doing anything—probably not even of “changing their own napkins,” I believe, as the phrase goes. And we're doing the same thing now to the U.S. population, especially with the aid of these Goals 2000 education policies and similar things. We're going to destroy the U.S. population, turn it into a bunch of useless, baboon-like unemployable Yahoos; into slave labor, and nothing better.

The free traders essentially make the point that if it's cheapest, it has to be the best; the market decides. When the whole history of mankind shows it is an investment and setting a price for *replacement* and *maintenance* of something more advanced, which increases the productive powers of labor, population density, at a higher standard of physical living, as well as the possibility of higher standards of political life and human freedom.

So we say protectionism. They say, “That's bad! That's command economy.” But that's the only way the world has ever progressed: by protecting and insisting that a fair price be paid, a fair price being the price which you must pay to maintain improved land, improved productive facilities generally, and improved qualities of labor, which means, of course, improved qualities of life of the family household, higher standards of education, less child labor, a longer period of maturation in terms of educational and social and related development, and so forth.

These fools are destroying the very basis of civilization with their cheap labor, but they cling fanatically to it: “You will see that nobody who is a Nobel Prize winner (except Maurice Allais) will agree with you.” And so you have the crowd around Wall Street talking about free trade and the various kind of other nostrums, all amounting to the same thing, destroying reality, failing to see that the laws of nature are against free trade; and that if we cling to that policy still, and we do not bend to the imperatives of nature, then our institutions, if they will not bend, *will be broken* by the impulse of their own folly. And it is people committed to that belief in such folly, who refuse to pay any attention to anything which offends their sense of what their present policy compact is. These are the people who are leading the world and the United States, and more immediately the presidency, toward self-destruction.

Pike issue stirs up a revolt in Nashville

by Anton Chaitkin

Clergymen, students, and civil rights leaders spoke passionately, calling for implementing the ideals of the American Revolution. They were answered by spokesmen for groups which have fought against the Declaration of Independence. It was an extraordinary Veterans Day hearing of the Nashville Metro (city) Council, on a motion asking the federal government to take down the U.S. national monument in Washington which honors Ku Klux Klan founder Albert Pike.

Since summer 1992, the LaRouche political movement has led a growing coalition in the nation's capital and around the country fighting to remove the obscene statue in Judiciary Square. Several major U.S. city councils have passed resolutions pressing Congress and the President to act, but there has also been a heavy counter-deployment of forces behind the scenes by the Scottish Rite of Freemasonry, which claims Pike as one of its heros. In Nashville, for the first time, the Scottish Rite was forced to defend Pike in an open public forum.

Why defend a Satanist?

The first speaker at the Nov. 11 hearing was the Rev. James T. Morris, Sr., a leader of Nashville's black veterans, a Prince Hall Freemason, and an Army officer who had enforced federal desegregation injunctions and protected civil rights workers. Reverend Morris asked, “As a country which claims to be created as a Christian nation, why are we faced with the dilemma of defending the historical legacy of a self-defined Satanist?”

This writer spoke, identifying Pike as a “300-pound Satanist from Boston” who formed the KKK after having been arrested as a war criminal by his own Confederate Army, and having been indicted for treason by the United States. “As a leader of the New Age faction which has driven prayer out of our schools and replaced it with sodomy and drugs, Pike and his legacy are a disaster to our nation and an insult to the South.” I cited the disclosures on Pike's KKK role by Nashville's most prestigious and pro-Confederate historian, Walter Fleming, the dean of Vanderbilt University. I reported that the Prince Hall Masons had exposed Pike as a Satanist and Klan founder in spring 1992, at which time Lyndon LaRouche commissioned a thorough study of the question.

The Rev. David Shivers, a veteran and a Prince Hall Mason, said that he had been angered and moved to testify against the Pike statue when his five-year-old niece came home from the Veterans Day parade with a tiny American