

The Secret Kingdom of Leo Strauss

by Tony Papert

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 Socrates *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?

Strauss vs. Socrates

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 his close attention to the texts.

Leo Strauss, born in 1899 to observant Jewish parents in Kirchhain, Germany, in the province of Hesse near Marburg, had lived in the United States from 1938 until his death in Annapolis, Maryland, in 1973. He had written at least 16 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 was 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.



The willful intellectual strategy of emphasizing Plato, but turning him into a “secret fascist,” characterized Harvard Prof. Allan Bloom, intellectual mentor of the Pentagon’s chicken-hawk leader Paul Wolfowitz. Bloom himself was a leading disciple of the late German-born University of Chicago professor Leo Strauss, whose followers now dominate Bush Administration strategic and legal “thinking.”

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 withstand 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; 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 Men’s 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.

‘Without Fear and Without Hope’

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 Nov. 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 terms 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 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.

Hiding From the Truth

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

Leo Strauss Chronology

1899: Leo Strauss was born to observant Jewish parents in the German town of Kirchhain, near Marburg, in the province of Hesse.

C. 1916: At the age of 17, Strauss was converted to "straightforward, political" Zionism.

1917: Strauss began his university education, but it was interrupted by his conscription for military service as a translator in occupied Belgium.

1919: Strauss resumed his university education at the University of Marburg.

1920: Strauss first met his three lifelong friends Jacob Klein, Hans-Georg Gadamer, and the emigré Russian, Alexander Vladimirovitch Kojevnikov (1902-68), later known as "Kojève," who had just left Russia to study under Karl Jaspers in Heidelberg.

1921: Strauss received his PhD. His dissertation, which praised the irrationalism of F.H. Jacobi, was supervised by Ernst Cassirer, the successor of Hermann Cohen as leader of the Marburg neo-Kantian school. By then, Strauss has also studied at the Universities of Frankfurt am Main, Berlin, and Hamburg. Later, Strauss said that Nietzsche so dominated and bewitched him between his

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* (see box). 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."

The Straussian Network

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

22nd and 30th years, that he literally believed everything that he understood of him.

1922: Strauss studied under Martin Heidegger, who impressed him deeply.

1920s: Strauss researched and wrote principally on Jewish topics. He also met several times with Vladimir Jabotinsky, the fascist leader of "reversionist" Zionism, whom David Ben-Gurion later called "Vladimir Hitler."

1925-31: Researcher and writer for the Academy for the Science of Judaism in Berlin. Between 1925 and 1930, Strauss wrote his first two books, which were on Spinoza.

1931: Applied for a Rockefeller Fellowship. Strauss' research on Thomas Hobbes brought him in contact with the future "Nazi Crown Jurist," Carl Schmitt. Schmitt was shown Strauss' unfinished book on Hobbes. Strauss wrote a review of Schmitt's little book, *The Concept of the Political*, which so pleased Schmitt that he got it published in the same journal which published the book. Schmitt's recommendation obtained for Strauss a Rockefeller Fellowship to study in France and England.

1933: In Paris, Strauss married a recently divorced German Jewish woman, Marie (Mirjam) Bernsohn, whom he had met in 1930, and acquired a stepson.

1934: Strauss and his family moved to London. He studied Hobbes in the British Museum.

1937: Appointed Research Fellow in the Department of History at Columbia University, New York, Strauss left his family behind in Britain.

1938-48: Brought onto the graduate faculty of the New School in New York, on the basis of a strong recommendation, and a subsidy, from Harold Laski. Strauss' family joined him in New York in 1939.

1948-73: Hans Morgenthau, acting chairman of the Political Science Department at the University of Chicago, brought Strauss over to President Robert Hutchins' office. Half an hour later, Hutchins had appointed Strauss a full professor, with a salary greater than anyone else in the department.

1953: Strauss was visiting professor at Berkeley. Offered a tenured position there, he declined.

1954-55: Visiting professor at the Hebrew University in Jerusalem. Visited Germany.

1956: Strauss suffered a heart attack.

1967: Strauss retired from Chicago at the end of the academic year.

1968-69: Professor of political science at Claremont Men's College in California.

1968-73: Until his death, Strauss was Scott Buchanan Distinguished Scholar in Residence, St. John's College, Annapolis, Maryland.



Leo Strauss' own mentor was the man known as the "Crown Jurist of the Nazis," Carl Schmitt, who drafted the emergency laws by which Hitler justified his seizure of dictatorial power.

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 told Bloom that the White House will announce the next day, that they're not going on to Baghdad. Bloom denounced 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 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 10-20 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 Sept. 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.

Documentation

Straussian Allan Bloom 'Interprets' Plato

These excerpts are taken from The Republic of Plato, an "interpretive essay" by Leo Strauss' student and Paul Wolfowitz' teacher Allan Bloom, published in 1968 and 1991.

"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 [that 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 thinkers 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 singleness of mind. 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)

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 Sen. 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, Sen. Robert Byrd (D-W.V.) 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



The obvious right-wing wrecking operation among the Democrats has been centered on candidacies of Sen. Joe Lieberman, who led even the White House in the Iraq war drive, and who headed up and now represents the Democratic Leadership Council (DLC). DLC senior advisor and strategist William Galston (right) is a leading American follower and “expert” in Leo Strauss’ writings.

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 its 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 advisor to the DLC, is a leading American follower of fascist Leo Strauss, and a specialist in Strauss’ 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 chicken-hawk 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 Sen. 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 Wittman wrote that “John McCain [seeks] to recapture the legacy of President Theodore Roosevelt, by advocating government as an agent of ‘national greatness.’ ” Wittman demanded that 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 Wittman is an advisor 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 advisor 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 April-May 2003 issue of Lindberg’s own magazine carries an article entitled “Leo Strauss and the Conservatives,” showing the reader why he must “appreciate Strauss’ 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 Frères), and McGeorge Bundy (Ford Foundation) to overturn America’s whole mission for industrial progress, and move toward erasing the American Revolution itself.



The potential “Bull Moose” partner of Lieberman and the DLC is Sen. John McCain (R-Ariz.), also backed and promoted by followers of Strauss. New Republic noted that front-line McCain backers William Kristol (right, the neo-cons’ Weekly Standard editor), David Brooks, and the Podhoretz family “are Strauss disciples. It’s easy to think that Kristol and Brooks are projecting their Straussianism onto McCain.” Another McCain promoter, Policy Review editor Tod Lindberg, just brought out “Leo Strauss and the Conservatives” in his magazine.

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 the 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 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 Leonard 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 Adminis-

tration.

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-wage 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-income Americans. Again, this “privatization” is a hallmark of the DLC neo-conservatives 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 right-wing 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 Mideast 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, Senator 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, AFL-CIO President 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, Senator 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 in Israel), assorted neo-conservative me-

dia men, and a representative of rightist spook Leo Cherne.

This Cherne was Moynihan’s close associate and former employer, and a government intelligence advisor. 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 José López Portillo for an anti-imperial banking program.

In July 1983, Louisiana Congressman Gillis Long and Harriman operative Bob Strauss began a U.S. tour to promote the “National Democratic Caucus,” demanding a rightist turn for the Democrats. Their main advisors 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 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 the party 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 Tory British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher.

LaRouche associates won the March 1986 Illinois Democratic primaries for Secretary of State and Lieutenant 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, “Senator 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 throughout the country.”

Mob Orders Cement Shoes for the Party

Lyndon LaRouche was falsely imprisoned in 1989, following a several-year attack by neo-conservatives corrupting



Sen. Daniel Moynihan (D.-N.Y., right) was a liberal imperialist intellectual of banker Averill Harriman, and a racist who shoved the Democratic Party to the right by linking up with the notorious “Southern Strategy” of Richard Nixon’s 1967-68 Presidential campaign. Moynihan in the 1980s spurred and ran “Operation LaRouche,” against Lyndon LaRouche’s growing influence in the Party—out of this operation, the DLC was formed.

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 in 1994 from his false imprisonment as soon as this was possible.

The mobsters raged. The DLC’s own, sanitized, authorized history (*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 advisor 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 Monica Lewinsky scandal. The LaRouche Democrats successfully counterattacked.

Steinhardt turned over the formal leadership of the DLC in 1995 to his co-factioneer, Connecticut Sen. 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 advisors. 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 Steinhardt’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 pow-

erful 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 Bilderberg Group meeting in Scotland. There Kissinger introduced her to Sir Evelyn with a lewd joke. Forester brought Rothschild to the United States 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 Senator 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 Steinhardt-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' 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 chicken-hawks' 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 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 organiza-

tion—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 telecom giant Global Crossing 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 March 27, 2003 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 the persons of 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 advisor 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 Senator 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.