

## EIRBooks

# Limbaugh: philosopher-clown for the new world order

by Doug Mallouk

---

### See, I Told You So

by Rush H. Limbaugh III  
Pocket Books, New York, 1993  
364 pages, hardbound, \$24

---

The obese multimedia megastar Rush Limbaugh is very big—in more ways than one. He has 20 million weekly listeners to his nationally syndicated radio talk show, a late-night television show that is also booming, and his first book was America's number-one bestseller for months last year. A swelling number of middle-class Americans, enraged over ever-rising tax burdens, New Age perversion of public education, radical environmentalist lunacy, and omnipresent Hollywood pornography, have hailed him as the conservative prophet who will point the way out of this political-cultural desert.

But in the wilderness with Limbaugh, there is no manna falling from the sky—just globaloney. And Rush is leading his flock, not to the promised land, but to the new world order, for which he has become both public apologist and “right-wing” border guard.

### The old Limbaugh and the new

Limbaugh's rise to a position of veritable cult-like stature has always been based on his ability to manipulate the frustrations of his middle-America audience. He directs them not against the oligarchic cabal whose policies have brought the nation to the brink of moral and economic collapse, but simply against “the other guy.” He gives his listeners easy (and therefore most often wrong) answers that require little thought and even less political courage.

Fed up with the huge government deficit? Don't blame the Federal Reserve System that hands out hundreds of billions of taxpayers' dollars to a clique of financial parasites; instead blame “welfare loafers,” the homeless, and similar low-life. Outraged at rampant crime in the streets? Don't even think about knocking out the international bankers behind America's biggest business, Dope, Inc. Instead, bring back the death penalty to “solve” the problem, and perhaps even relieve prison overcrowding. Exasperated by a federal government that seems to have become the enemy of those it supposedly represents? Never mind that both major parties have been promoting the deindustrialization of America for 30 years. Just pretend that the problem began at 12:01 p.m. on Jan. 20, 1993 with the inauguration of President Hillary Clinton and her house-husband Bill.

For those few Americans who have not yet caught Limbaugh's act—and there may be two or three dozen of them scattered across America—it includes the following elements:

- Far-ranging target selection: Limbaugh's staff digs very deep to dredge up the most demented ravings from the lunatic fringe of the radical feminist, multiculturalist, or eco-fascist movements in order to score easy points by attacking them. For example, he's had all kinds of fun with the man-hating “feminazi” psychotics who want to canonize Lorena Bobbitt as a great women's heroine. It plays very well in Peoria.

- “Shock humor”: Rush has perfected a technique of making outrageous remarks with a straight face, calculated to throw his liberal adversaries into a frothy rage, while his supporters guffaw, knowing that it is all in jest. He has proclaimed, for instance, that if any woman is not deeply attracted to him, it proves that she is a lesbian!

Other “cutesy” Rush-isms include his now famous dic-

tum, "There is only one sure way to get rid of nuclear weapons—use 'em. All of 'em. Then there won't be anyone left to make more." It is precisely his penchant for this kind of bluster that caused Lyndon LaRouche to quip that the bombastic Russian Third Rome frontman Vladimir Zhirinovskiy is "the Rush Limbaugh of Moscow."

● "Right-wing" transposition of classical Frankfurt School media brainwashing techniques: Limbaugh brags that his show is a successful synthesis of "Saturday Night Live"—a longstanding bastion of televised countercultural comedy—and William F. Buckley, the "conservative" who boasts of smoking marijuana on his yacht outside U.S. territorial waters. Buckley's *National Review* has been a major sponsor of Limbaugh's TV venture. A former failed disc jockey, Rush makes liberal use of rock music, constant repetition of the same themes and jokes, and even counts Heavy Metal rocker Ted Nugent as one of his "Dittohead" camp-followers.

There is one subject that the free-wheeling Limbaugh has deemed absolutely forbidden. It has long been his inviolable rule that any caller to his show who even mentions the words "new world order" or one-world government will be screened off the air, and he likens such "paranoid conspiracy theories" to UFO sightings.

Limbaugh's first book, *The Way Things Ought to Be*, (reviewed in *EIR*'s Jan. 29, 1993 issue) was little more than a printed version of his radio and TV broadcasts—lots of gags and skits interspersed with his right-of-Bush brand of political conservatism. Certainly he was fronting for the new world order crowd even in early 1992 when it was written—but it was mainly by omission, by completely writing out the role of the Anglo-American oligarchy in creating the wretched conditions that so enrage his middle-class audience.

Limbaugh has clearly been retooled. In *See, I Told You So*, the jokes are mostly gone, the gag-man now esteems himself a philosopher-clown, and the polemics on behalf of the one-world Anglo-American financial clique are all too explicit. Despite a few feeble barbs he throws at the ex-President himself, Rush has devolved into "Bush Limbaugh," as Lyndon LaRouche put it.

How this happened is hardly any mystery. In mid-1992, Limbaugh (who once styled himself a co-thinker of conservative Bush opponent Patrick Buchanan) was suddenly invited to stay overnight at the White House—in the Lincoln Bedroom, no less—with the desperate George Bush even volunteering to carry his bags. At about the same time, a deal was finalized to bring in Roger Ailes, longtime hatchetman for the establishment wing of the Republican Party, as the producer of Limbaugh's new TV show. Suddenly, there was a moratorium on Limbaugh's public attacks on Bush. His metamorphosis is made manifest in the new book.

### 'Hedonomics' 101

There is a howling irony in Limbaugh's effort to define (and market) his world-outlook in his latest literary opus. He



*Rush Limbaugh emerges retooled, following an overnight stay at the White House. His attacks on George Bush have ceased, and his bad jokes are now a thinly disguised defense of the establishment's new world order.*

scores the most points, and, indeed, comes the closest to the truth, in attacking America's capitulation, under the regimen of post-1960s liberalism, to a morale-sapping culture of decadence and hedonism, reflected, for example, in Hollywood and in academia. He then turns around and, seemingly oblivious to the contradiction, promotes with fanatical fervor an economic policy based on pure, unrestricted marketplace hedonism!

Limbaugh-nomics is nothing new, of course. A whole slew of 18th- and 19th-century Venetian-British perverts posing as philosophers and economists created the theory that if everyone just went out and sought maximal, near-orgiastic dosages of sensual pleasure, while deliberately ignoring any higher considerations, then the "invisible hand" of the free market would magically sort things out to achieve the greatest harmony and bliss possible—unless the dread shadow of Government Intervention upset the delicate balance. But these earlier degenerates at least had sense enough not to

wrap this thoroughly anti-Christian ideology in pseudo-moral packaging. With a wave of the hand to an infinitely distant Creator who would, of course, take no direct interest in human affairs, Adam Smith openly advocated turning the Carolinas into a giant opium plantation in his much-touted *Wealth of Nations*. Jeremy Bentham demonstrated the complete coherence of economics and morality by writing tracts that explicitly defended both usury—"loan-sharking"—and pederasty, or "consensual" child molestation. And both these ideologues, along with David Ricardo, James Mill, and John Stuart Mill, et al., were professedly nothing but hired pens for the original "Dope, Inc."—the British East India Company.

Rush is a devout worshipper at the shrine of the Invisible Hand. Over and over he drones on in his book: Big Government—Bad; Rugged Individual—Good; State Intervention on Behalf of Fairness or Equality—Very Bad; Unbridled Competition in Marketplace—Everybody Wins, No Losers; Big Danger to America—Getting Bogged Down in Swamp of Mediocrity, Sameness, "Equality."

It is all reminiscent of the puerile outpourings of Ayn Rand, again with the difference that that unhappy woman had the simple philosophic honesty to acknowledge that her radical Aristotelian-Darwinist outlook was absolutely incompatible with anything resembling the Christian conception of God. Limbaugh, on the other hand, pounds one fist on the table in support of pagan "hedonomics"—and slams down the other to decry the collapse of traditional morality in America!

In one particularly hilarious passage, he upbraids modern liberals for pushing the zero-sum game theory of economics—the notion that the "pie" is finite, so that if my slice increases, yours must correspondingly decrease. He accurately says this completely misses the point that with the creation of new wealth, the whole pie grows, and we all get more. He then holds up as an example of such new wealth creation: the growth of his own radio show audience, which, he explains, has had the beneficial spill-over effect of reinvigorating other AM-dial programs, so that everyone is much happier. It never occurs to Rush that by the same cash-register criteria of economic growth, every "successful" porno movie, every money-making "gangsta rap" recording, constitutes real new wealth, and cash-cow Michael Jackson or superwhore Madonna must be numbered among the greatest creative entrepreneurial geniuses of western civilization. In fact, the only reason that narcotics sales would not also be found in that same wholesome category is the mere technicality that dope is currently illegal—a condition that Limbaugh's free-market soul-mates William Buckley and Milton Friedman propose to remedy.

Limbaugh is obviously suffering from a virulent case of what Lyndon LaRouche terms the disease of Economics 101. Symptoms include the inability to distinguish between the growth of healthy tissue (capital-intensive industry and agriculture, for example); factors that promote such healthy

growth, such as infrastructure, scientific research, great culture; and the growth of a cancer, typified by the last 30 years' spiraling financial speculation, useless "services," and other forms of parasitism, emphatically including that Sodom and Gomorrah swamp known as "popular entertainment."

Is it any wonder that as a victim of that affliction, Limbaugh would volunteer to become, in his own expression, a "cheerleader" for the Reagan (actually Thatcher) economic policies of the 1980s? Difficult as it may be to picture Rush in a short skirt and pom-poms, he spends an entire chapter in his book cartwheeling and backflipping through a statistical "proof" that, since monetary categories of personal wealth supposedly increased across the board during that period, it was a great decade. Apart from the fact that the post-1983 government figures Limbaugh cites are massively, shamelessly fudged, as *EIR* has regularly demonstrated, Rush manages to circumvent the essential point: Whatever monetary "gains" were registered during the 1980s happened not as a result of any technologically driven increase in industrial production, but through cheating. America "saved" literally trillions of dollars, for example, by not maintaining the most basic infrastructure—power plants, freshwater management projects, road and rail systems, etc.—from the early 1970s onward. Other trillions were "saved" by draining what used to be called the developing of its wealth, forcing poor nations to sell their raw materials and labor to the United States at prices far below the cost of production in order to pay a ballooning, illegitimate debt—with the result that many American productive enterprises were driven out of business, and Third World nations were turned from potential market partners into hotbeds of disease, terrorism, and violence. All this is entirely akin to a man becoming steadily richer by draining and selling his own blood, until, upon reaching the very pinnacle of accumulated lucre, he collapses and dies.

The fact that *See, I Told You So* would subject its readers to an unrelenting, humorless hard-sell for the policies that have reduced Britain, and now the United States as well, to industrial rustbuckets, while repeatedly attacking the economies of postwar Germany and Japan as "statist" failures, indelibly stamps its author as the consummate ideologue, obsessively determined to defend his "system" against any intrusion from the real world.

### **The British-led Clinton-bashing**

Despite Limbaugh's prediction in late 1992 that his horse George Bush would stage a dramatic stretch run to defeat Bill Clinton, Rush could barely conceal his glee when the Clinton team won the election. Figuring he had enough target material for the rest of the century, Limbaugh took aim at Hillary Clinton's menagerie of warmed-over leftists and feminists, Al Gore's tree-hugging environmentalist proclivities, and the new President's numerous pratfalls in both domestic and foreign policy matters, while a good section of middle America roared its approval. He even made on-the-air wise-cracks about how "ugly" 13-year-old Chelsea Clinton is (and

if there is anything Limbaugh is expert on, it is ugliness).

Illustrative of Rush's "attack therapy" approach to the administration is the following joke he told to a national broadcast audience without one iota of embarrassment. One day Limbaugh and Hillary Clinton got into an elevator together. The second the door closed, Hillary tore off her clothes, jumped on the floor, and cried out, "Rush, make a real woman out of me!" Limbaugh then took off his clothes, threw them at Hillary, and said, "Here, wash and fold these!"

Plenty of conservatives yuk-yukking with Rush just might find that the real joke is on them. The fact is, Limbaugh is in full support of the worst policy carryovers from the Bush administration which have infected the Clinton White House: specifically, the North American Free Trade Agreement, whose secret financial protocols seek to "dollarize" the world economy; and the International Monetary Fund "shock therapy" policies that have driven Russia and other former Soviet republics to the precipice of anarchy, dictatorship, and war. However, the White House, unlike Limbaugh, recognizing the disastrous results of the IMF policies, has begun to give out small signals that it might perhaps consider an alternative to IMF looting of the former East bloc, and slightly stronger signs that the poisonous Anglo-American special relationship could begin to unravel as a result of the disgusting game played by Britain in support of its geopolitical assets in Serbia.

In response to these really quite timid initiatives, the new world order hardliners on both sides of the Atlantic have gone hog-wild against Clinton. And their rabble-rousing point-man in America is none other than "Bush Limbaugh."

It should be noted that one of Limbaugh's biggest TV sponsors has been the *American Spectator*, the "neo-con" rag that is currently leading the Clintongate operation by trotting out a series of homosexuals and prostitutes, *National Enquirer*-style, each asserting on cue that he-she-it had some sexual tryst with the President-to-be. *American Spectator* includes on its editorial board the likes of Peregrine Worsthorne, the stepson of top British banker and Hitler-backer Montagu Norman. Worsthorne's *Daily Telegraph* and the rest of the British press have been loudly demanding Clinton's ouster by no later than Christmas.

Those U.S. patriots foolish enough to jump onto this bandwagon for partisan reasons should understand that their new British Tory allies are the very people who most passionately believe that the American Revolution itself was at best a tragic misunderstanding, or, more likely, an as-yet unavenged affront by the impudent colonial upstarts. Their operation would not simply result in toppling Clinton; it would complete the destabilization of the U.S. presidency itself, which was begun with Watergate, as Patrick Buchanan has admonished the *American Spectator*.

That Limbaugh is their mouthpiece is amply demonstrated in *See, I Told You So*. Blistering Clinton for his foreign policy vacillations with respect to Haiti and former Yugoslavia, Rush constructs the following argument: The incoming

chief executive promised to reverse the Bush policy of forcibly preventing Haitian emigrants from entering the United States, and of maintaining the international blockade in the Balkans that has allowed the Serbo-communists to rape the nation of Bosnia-Herzegovina. Once in power, however, Clinton got a crash course in global realities, and reverted right back to the Bush script. According to Limbaugh, Clinton's sin was not that he lacked the spine to follow through on his declared intent to undo some of this "one world" evil—it was that he had the gall to promise to do so at all!

Limbaugh's polemics are truly monstrous. First, great "conservative" that he is, Rush doesn't utter a peep in criticism of the policy decision that triggered the mass exodus from Haiti in the first place: the suffocating U.N. embargo imposed on the island by the U.S. in support of reinstating Jean-Baptiste Aristide—the crazed, leftist ex-President who counts Fidel Castro among his closest friends, supports IMF "conditionalities" looting of Haiti's anemic economy, and boasts of "necklacing" his political opponents. Exactly how does it serve U.S. interests first to create absolutely sub-human living conditions in that tortured nation through the blockade, and then to beef up the sea patrol to turn back the refugees fleeing the resultant hellhole?

And by the time he gets to Bosnia, Limbaugh is slinging out globaloney whoppers at a rate quick enough to make him the envy of any overworked fast-food franchise manager. He lies that the Balkans crisis is strictly a civil war, a sort of tribal conflict; that, unlike "Desert Storm," there are no well-defined, winnable objectives for the West; that only some unnamed "leftists" want an intervention of any sort, and this only because the aggressors are "non-communists"; and, biggest lollapalooza of them all, that western action is unneeded because there is no danger of the conflict transcending the regional theater! His policy alternative, in effect, is to build the *Limes* wall and let "them" kill each other off. The only honest thing Rush says on the entire subject is that he became such a strategic deep-thinker so quickly by studying the works of "experts" like Jean Kirkpatrick and—who else?—Henry Kissinger.

To set the record straight: The so-called civil war in the Balkans was set up by such Slavic tribal leaders as Margaret Thatcher, Lawrence Eagleburger, Brent Scowcroft, and James Baker, as *EIR* has repeatedly documented. Then-Secretary of State Baker's treacherous June 1991 trip to Belgrade was key. Arriving less than two weeks after Croatia and Slovenia had each voted by 90% majorities to split from the British-manufactured entity known as Yugoslavia, Baker insisted that, vote be damned, the U.S. would recognize only the central Yugoslav government, dominated by the Serbo-communists, as the ruling body for all the republics. With that green light from the all-but-official spokesman for the new world order, the Serbs launched war almost before Baker's bags were packed, and the ensuing arms embargo on "all combatants" has only served to perpetuate Serbian military superiority through nearly three years of unspeak-

able genocide.

Baker, of course, did not light this match out of pro-Bolshevik sympathy, although Serbian dictator Slobodan Milosevic and his cronies have excellent Stalinist credentials. (Just where does Limbaugh think these “non-communists” got their political pedigree from—the Vienna Boys’ Choir?) The point of his incendiary Belgrade action was later articulated by newly titled Baroness Thatcher in her memoirs: Post-reunification Germany and its potential allies, like Croatia, were becoming too strong economically, and needed to be cut down. The Serbo-communist machine was simply the most useful British pawn on the chessboard to do that. The fact that precisely this kind of geopolitical gamesmanship has led to two world wars this century never seems to deter the Anglo-American oligarchs from repeating those same mistakes. And for Limbaugh to pooh-pooh the danger of a global confrontation arising from this mess just weeks before the “Russian Rush,” Zhirinovskiy, pledged Moscow’s undying military support for its Serbian Slavic brothers, with Russian troops now entering Sarajevo under U.N. auspices—that would be a real knee-slapper, except that the punchline could mean World War III.

In short, globaloney is just too nice a term to describe Limbaugh’s wild un-truthing on foreign affairs. Perhaps “Goebbeloney” would be more appropriate.

### So, why do you like him?

Limbaugh’s liberal detractors have often accused him of representing a dark threat to “democracy.” Like most things liberals say, this is silly. The secret to any potentially successful destabilization or subversion against the U.S. (or any other republic) is that, regardless of its top-down sponsorship, it must be extremely “democratic” in nature. That is, the political movement or personality misleading a large flock has to genuinely express the “felt needs” of those constituents, however degraded or petty their identities may be. And it cannot all be smoke and mirrors, either: There has to be a modicum of actual truth mixed in with the Big Lie(s), or nobody would listen for long.

In that sense, Rush is exactly what he claims to be: “The Doctor of Democracy,” although there are those who would substitute “Master of Mass Manipulation,” or some similar title. The contrast between Limbaugh and, say, William F. Buckley couldn’t be more stark. Both have essentially the same politics, although Rush would like people to forget his past experiences with marijuana, whereas Buckley wears his own as a badge of honor. But the effeminate, patrician Buckley has always had the mass appeal of last month’s overcooked vegetables, while the very earthy Limbaugh has become nothing less than a cult figure.

Indeed, Republican anti-feminist maven Phyllis Schlafly once described a pro-Limbaugh rally at the 1992 GOP convention as “just like a rock concert,” adding quickly that this was her first such experience. Along the same lines, there is Rush’s highly revealing term of endearment for his flock.

Early in his radio routine, he coined the one-worder “Ditto” as shorthand for callers who would tend to gush on about how much they love him, think the world revolves around him, etc. (Clearly an astronomical error: Limbaugh is not quite as large as the sun.) From there, it was a short step to dubbing his camp-followers “Dittoheads,” a counterculture-type moniker proudly claimed by throngs of otherwise-normal Americans today.

Rush’s act is a classic Delphic operation, with just enough truth to be effective as deception. *See, I Told You So* reviews and renews his attack on the eco-fascists, appropriating in their entirety the anti-environmentalist polemics of Dixy Lee Ray, the recently deceased former governor of Washington State whose books accurately debunked the ozone depletion scare and other greenie myths. In fact, supporters of ozone-hole guru Dr. Sherwood Rowland have actually accused Limbaugh of being a mass-media mouthpiece for Lyndon LaRouche, since Limbaugh source Dr. Ray in turn cited LaRouche’s associates for much of her material. But the crucial difference is that Limbaugh scrupulously omits that the environmental “wackos” are massively funded by top Wall Street foundations. Similarly, his book trashes the evil outcome-based education “school reform” in straightforward fashion—but totally leaves out the role of the U.N.-Lucis/Lucifer Trust apparatus in concocting that witches’ brew. Most amazing of all, he manages to spend an entire chapter lashing out against the truly dangerous concept of “hate crime”—which would base criminal penalties on the “political correctness” of the perpetrator’s mind-set, rather than his acts—without ever once mentioning the chief promoters of this Orwellian legislation, the Anti-Defamation League of B’nai B’rith.

There is more than a small bit of evidence that Limbaugh is plugged into the same ADL-Ariel Sharon networks that spawned the so-called “neo-con” synthetic movement of pro-Zionist socialists turned pro-Zionist right-wingers. He did take a “vacation” trip to Israel last summer, which, according to reports, included a ride in an Israeli tank in the Golan Heights. More significantly, the ADL’s pawprints are found several times in *See, I Told You So*, notably the boiler-plated attacks on “the racist Louis Farrakhan,” the courageous leader of the Nation of Islam whom the ADL sees, along with Lyndon LaRouche, as its most dangerous adversary. In one of his more candid moments, conservative columnist Patrick Buchanan wrote a few years ago that ADL chief Abraham Foxman would regularly send him cut-and-paste tidbits on the very same Minister Farrakhan, before Buchanan’s short-lived fight with the British-controlled Zionist establishment around the Gulf war buildup caused him to fall out of favor.

Of course, Limbaugh’s “dittohead” followers know little of this. In general, they haven’t thought through his policies on international affairs or theoretical economics. But yet they insist that “he thinks like me,” and it is undeniable. So what is the actual underlying point of agreement?

In one of the early chapters of his book, Limbaugh ap-

provingly quotes 18th-century British monarchist spokesman Edmund Burke on the role of government: "Society cannot exist unless a controlling power on will and appetite be placed somewhere, and the less there is within, the more there must be without. It is ordained in the eternal constitution of things, that men of intemperate minds cannot be free. Their passions forge their fetters." This Burke, whom Limbaugh esteems as a forefather of modern conservatism, was a major enemy of the republican (not Jacobin) networks committed to spreading the ideas of the American Revolution back to the European continent. But he is merely the retailer, not the author of the idea embodied in the cited quote.

The "original stinker" in this case was Thomas Hobbes, who wrote the book *Leviathan* in 1651 while serving as secretary (and homosexual lover) to Francis Bacon, the head of the freemasonic-founded British Royal Society. Directly assaulting the Judeo-Christian notion of man made in the image and likeness of God, *Leviathan* argued that since men are merely animals struggling "each against all" for gratification of bestial impulses, then there is need for government—indeed for absolute dictatorship—to police the combatants through a "social contract" whereby the individual gets "protection" at the expense of submitting to total despotism. But since the idea of any common human or national interest is axiomatically excluded, the only role for the state is that of referee-enforcer.

The U.S. Founding Fathers staunchly repudiated the evil Hobbes-Burke conception of man and society with their pointed references to the "general welfare" and to the need "to secure the blessings of Liberty to our Posterity" in the Preamble to the Constitution. But lately, Hobbes has been making a sharp comeback, reflected in the popularity of a Rush Limbaugh. Is this because Americans have been suddenly seized en masse with the desire to grab up copies of his putrid tract? Of course not—this is merely the unconscious day-to-day outlook of "every man for himself" surfacing in a period of profound cultural pessimism born of three decades of decay.

Both the welfare state and the post-1960s war on poverty were designed by their oligarchic sponsors, not to uplift, but to pacify and police the poor in America, as well as to fleece mostly middle-class taxpayers, all under conditions of generalized industrial regression. But to conclude from the predictable, miserable failure of these programs that there is no knowable path to scientific or economic development other than the capricious whims of the pagan goddess of the Free Market, is dead wrong. To paraphrase economics professor and LaRouche collaborator Dr. Taras Muranivsky, it is like watching your drunken sot of a brother-in-law wrap his car around a telephone pole—and then deciding that all automobiles would run much better without drivers! It is obvious that this kind of thinking leads straight into a ditch.

Limbaugh says that his show is like an addiction, requiring some six weeks to become complete. *EIR* hereby proposes a detox program—although one does not by any means

have to be a hard-core dittohead to benefit from it.

## Don't say 'ditto' to the new world order!

The accompanying box provides a reading list including some original sources, and some works by LaRouche and his collaborators. Go through as much of it as possible. Especially important is the material on Hamiltonian economics. There will undoubtedly be readers shocked to learn, for example, that Limbaugh's brand of "free-market economics" is precisely what great Americans like Hamilton, Henry Clay, and Abraham Lincoln were fighting against in the struggle to build the nation. Also, the historic background on British geopolitics is crucial for understanding the outright treason of the new world order crowd for whom Rush is rah-rahing today.

Finally, the "LaRouche Was Right" Timelines that have been serialized in the weekly newspaper *New Federalist*, make it overwhelmingly clear that beginning as early as 1952, on subjects as diverse as stopping AIDS and other epidemics, defeating the old Soviet empire, developing the Third World, or reversing the economic and moral decay of the United States, there is only one leader in the world who has any authority whatsoever to say, "See, I told you so." And he sure isn't Rush Limbaugh.

## Suggested reading

A highly recommended summary of the history of the American System of political economy can be found in *EIR's* Jan. 3, 1992 issue, dedicated as a tribute to the bicentennial of Treasury Secretary Alexander Hamilton's *Report on Manufactures*. Other titles:

Lyndon LaRouche: *So, You Wish to Learn All About Economics?*

W. Allen Salisbury: *The Civil War and the American System: America's Battle with Britain, 1860-1876*.

Anton Chaitkin and Webster Tarpley: *George Bush: The Unauthorized Biography*.

Alexander Hamilton: *Industrial and Commercial Correspondence of Alexander Hamilton, Anticipating His Report on Manufactures*.

Henry C. Carey: *Harmony of Interests: Agricultural, Manufacturing, and Commercial and Principles of Political Economy*.

Friedrich List: *National System of Political Economy*.

Books can be purchased from Ben Franklin Booksellers, 107 S. King St., Leesburg, Va. 22075; (703) 777-3661 or (800) 453-4108.