

Anti-American Roots of the ‘Leo-Cons’; What the New York Times Won’t Print

by Barbara Boyd

While newspapers throughout the world have republished Lyndon LaRouche’s exposé of the fact that the neo-conservatives presently running the White House occupied by George Bush—such as Donald Rumsfeld, Dick Cheney, Abram Shulsky, Paul Wolfowitz, Gary Schmitt, and John Ashcroft—are maniacal devotees of the late University of Chicago Prof. Leo Strauss, many of them have also sought to blunt the horrified political reaction which this revelation should create.

For example, the May 4 *Sunday New York Times* features Paul Wolfowitz dressed as a Roman gladiator, and carrying a copy of *On Tyranny*. That book is the correspondence between Leo Strauss and Alexander Kojève, the Paris-based Synarchist and Satanist, to whom Strauss regularly sent his American students. The *Times* makes a single (and unexplained) mention of Kojève—whom LaRouche has identified as “Dick Cheney’s French Connection”—in its exposé of the Straussians, and blots out any reference to Strauss’s intellectual godfather, Carl Schmitt, the Nazi Crown Jurist, whose fascist writings are receiving major play in this country, and are internationally funded, in large part, by Straussians at the Lynde and Harry Bradley Foundation (see box).

Kojève, an ideologue of universal fascism, Satanism, and purgative violence as the means to revitalize social order, was also a leading figure in the most powerful fascist circle of 20th-Century France, the Synarchists. Indeed, the Movement for Synarchist Empire, founded in the early 1930s, was part of a Europe-wide apparatus of businessmen, bankers, and government officials dedicated to a fascist unified Europe, with Adolf Hitler as their instrument (see *EIR*, May 9, 2003).

Schmitt was dubbed “Crown Jurist of the Third Reich” by the Nazis, because of his role in subverting Germany’s Weimar Republic Constitution, and providing the twisted legal theories which legitimized each step in the creation of the Nazi totalitarian state and its drive for imperial conquest. Strauss, a student of Schmitt, received a Rockefeller Foundation grant to emigrate from Germany, based on Schmitt’s efforts. Strauss’s fawning notes on Schmitt’s most famous book, *The Concept of the Political*, which reduces all political relations to that of the friend and the foe, continues to be circulated in the United States today.

Like the Straussian U.S. Attorney General John Ashcroft today, Schmitt cited the “exceptional situation” of the Reichstag fire—a terrorist act actually staged by Hermann Göring—to justify suspending German civil liberties, launching

its descent into Hell. As part of the drive to render all of Europe fascist, Schmitt met with and promoted Benito Mussolini, exchanging commentaries on Hegel with Il Duce, and played a leading role in creating the fascist mythos for Francisco Franco’s Spain, through his revival of the Catholic medievalist Juan Donoso Cortés.

After the war, Schmitt corresponded with the Synarchists and Kojève, explicitly targetting the American nation-state and its cultural paradigm of scientific and technological progress for elimination and replacement by a fascist feudal system of empires, whose subjects are governed through myths and disinformation.

This author got a taste of the Schmitt revival, U.S.-style, in a call to *Telos* magazine on May 14. *Telos*, founded as the theoretical journal of the American “New Left” in May 1968, is dedicated to being a forum for Schmitt’s views, working with such proponents of universal fascism as Thomas Fleming of the pro-Confederate *Southern Partisan*, Alain de Benoist of the French New Right, and Norberto Bobbio and the Italian separatist movement Lega Nord. When I called, I explained that I was deeply intrigued by Carl Schmitt, but I could not get past the fact that he was a Nazi. “You stupid Americans,” the *Telos* staffer answered, “you are ignorant of and never read Schmitt’s post-war writings.” My interlocutor made it clear, however, that he was not claiming that Schmitt had stopped being a fascist. “Yes, yes,” he explained, “Schmitt was a horrible criminal, and despicable morally; but, don’t you see, horrible criminals very often have the most interesting ideas.”

Intrigued by this definition of Schmitt as the Hannibal Lector of modern politics I pressed on, learning that part of this group’s fascination with Carl Schmitt stems from his violent hatred of the United States, and his post-war promotion of the Southern Confederacy as a political model.

Carl Schmitt’s Post-War Career

Following his arrest, interrogation, and release by the Americans at Nuremberg, Schmitt retired to his home in Plettenberg. As punishment for participating in Hitler’s rise to power, and for his refusal to undergo de-Nazification, Schmitt’s library was confiscated and he was banned from teaching, on the grounds that his teachings were “seductive” to young students.

Schmitt lived on subsidies from the German industrialists

and oligarchs who had otherwise supported the imposition of Hitler. Schmitt told Kojève, for example, that he was in frequent contact with Hitler's Economics Minister Hjalmar Schacht—the agent of Montagu Norman, the Bank of England, and the Harrimans, who was the bagman for the Hitler project. Schmitt bemoaned the fact that Schacht could not be present for a speech which Schmitt arranged for Kojève at the Rhein-Ruhr Club in Düsseldorf, which was frequented by Schmitt, Schacht, and former Nazi industrialist financiers.

Between 1949 and the early 1970s, Schmitt's notoriety as a Nazi and universal fascist meant that his ideas were freely appropriated by various U.S. nihilist and existentialist philosophers without public attribution. Leo Strauss was perhaps the most significant in appropriating whole sections of Schmitt's critique of liberalism, moralism, and modernity. But Herbert Marcuse, Hannah Arendt, and others of the Frankfurt School, as well as C.J. Friedrich at Harvard, Hans J. Morgenthau, Henry Kissinger, and Samuel Huntington, also adopted whole sections of the Schmitt corpus.

Whatever the secondary differences among Schmitt's appropriators, they all believe, with Schmitt, that man is incapable of knowing truth or of knowing God; and that Nietzsche's will to power accompanied by unconditional destruction and violence, and Hobbes' war of each against all, provide the appropriate framework for assessing the human condition and changing human relations. In a universe devoid of a knowable God, truth, or actual meaning, powerful myths and disinformation, promulgated by an elite to a labile and stupefied population, allow for governance and popular contentment. Outside of academe, however, Schmitt continued to write, circulating works in these circles until his death in 1985. These works largely focused on a fascist theory of post-Cold War international relations, positing federated blocs or empires in place of sovereign nation-states. Each empire would be culturally and racially heterogeneous, and a ruling dominant power would make decisions, as to who the enemy of any given federated area was, and as ruler would protect it both from other empires and from heterogeneous terrorist groups engaged in "world civil war."

By the 1960s, Schmitt had achieved veritable cult status among the "post-modernist" schools of nihilism which emerged from the 1960s social upheavals. Kojève for example, famously departed from a seminar in Germany, sponsored by the arch-Zionist Jacob Taubes, and publicly exclaimed that he was going to Plettenberg to speak with Schmitt, the only man "worth talking to in all of Europe." In the ensuing scandal in the German Jewish community, Taubes himself finally admitted that he too had secretly journeyed to Plettenberg to discourse with the infamous Nazi.

Rehabilitating Schmitt in the U.S.

The first steps were taken to making Schmitt's fascism acceptable to Americans in the early 1970s, when City University of New York Prof. George Schwab, a student of Hans Morgenthau, translated his works. Schwab and Morgenthau

The Bradley Foundation

The Lynde and Harry Bradley Foundation had over \$500 million in assets as of 2003. Initially a funder of the John Birch Society and William Buckley's *National Review*, Bradley changed dramatically in 1985, when Rockwell International bought the Allen-Bradley Company for \$1.651 billion. Bradley, along with the John Olin Foundation, the Smith Richardson Foundation, and others working out of the Philanthropy Roundtable at the American Enterprise Institute, have lavishly financed the imposition of the neo-conservative agenda in the United States, via university chairs and grants, journalists such as the *Weekly Standard*, and think tanks, such as AEI and the Heritage Foundation.

The Bradley Foundation began its significant targeted funding after it recruited Michael S. Joyce as director. Joyce had previously presided over the John M. Olin Foundation. Joyce, who also chaired the Roundtable, started his career with fellow-Straussian Irving Kristol and the Institute for Educational Affairs in New York City. Among the former and present members of the Bradley board are J. Clayburn La Force, (Rockwell International), William Bennett, George Stigler, and Frank Shakespeare.

co-founded the National Committee on American Foreign Policy in 1974, as a think-tank dedicated to Morgenthau's vision of "realism" in American foreign policy based on power relationships stripped of "illusory" notions of idealism or morality in dealings among nations. In recent years, NCAFP has been funded by the Olin Foundation and the Smith Richardson Foundation, which, like the Bradley Foundation, are more notorious as funding the "Conservative Revolution." NCAFP's officers include author of the Cold War "containment" policy George Kennan and former Federal Reserve Chairman Paul Volcker. Among the executive committee, trustees, and advisors are: Kenneth Bialkin, former chairman of the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith; former U.S. Ambassadors Thomas Pickering and Jeane Kirkpatrick; and former National Security Council Soviet affairs specialist Richard Pipes.

In the late 1970s, Heinrich Meier of Germany's Siemens Foundation also began working on a reformulation of Schmitt for purposes of the emerging Conservative Revolution. Meier, a Straussian, was also a protégé of German fascist Armin Mohler (he wrote the book, *The Conservative Revolution in Germany: 1918-1932*), who studied directly at university with Schmitt. Concentrating on Schmitt's post-war diaries, his early work with Leo Strauss, and Schmitt's

resurrection of Spanish philosopher Juan Donoso Cortés to legitimize Franco, Meier recast Schmitt as the theoretician of permanent religious warfare or world civil war on behalf of the God of revealed religion, which theory we scrutinize further. Meier was provided full access to the Strauss archives by his “friend,” Strauss’s lifelong collaborator and literary executor, Joseph Cropsey at the University of Chicago. That university published the English translations of Meier’s two books on Schmitt, under grants from the Bradley Foundation, facilitated by Hillel Fradkin. Fradkin, also a Straussian, taught on the Committee on Social Thought at Chicago, and was vice president of the Bradley Foundation from 1988-98, a program officer at the Olin Foundation, and currently heads a Straussian think-tank in Israel called the Shalem Center. He recently replaced Iran-Contra’s Elliott Abrams as the head of the Ethics and Public Policy Center in Washington. Chaired by Jeane Kirkpatrick, EPPC promotes itself as seeking to “reinforce the bond between Judeo-Christian moral tradition and public debate over domestic and foreign policy issues.”

The other major authors in the Schmitt revival have been centered at *Telos*. For years a bastion of Marxism and the Frankfurt School, in 1987 *Telos* declared the left and the Democratic Party politically bankrupt and undertook “a re-evaluation of 20th-Century intellectual history, focusing primarily on repressed authors and ideas beginning with Carl Schmitt and American populism.” Since then, *Telos* has devoted whole issues to Schmitt’s writings and discussions of his thought, and similar manifestations of Synarchism, while also providing theoretical backing for the populist anti-globalization and environmentalist movements in the United States.

Paul Piccone and Gary Ulmen, the two main proponents of Schmitt at *Telos*, advocate the dissolution of nation-states in favor of autonomous regional governing units. They and others at *Telos* have been particularly fascinated by Schmitt’s positing of a post-war order composed of Empires or *Grossraume*, replacing the modern nation-state, which represents, to Schmitt, the root of all evil. In Schmitt’s theory, culturally homogeneous states, each controlled by a larger state, will replace ungovernable nation-states. They have also resurrected Schmitt’s violent attacks on Alexander Hamilton and the American Constitution, and Schmitt’s praise for John Calhoun and the Confederacy on behalf of their Schmittian theory of populism.

Ulmen’s book about *Grossraume* is being funded by the Bradley Foundation. Until recently, *Telos* Press also published the papers of George Schwab’s American Committee on Foreign Policy.

Heinrich Meier draws on diverse aspects of Schmitt’s post-war writings to paint the Nazi jurist as a Catholic mystic whose critique of modern liberalism is fundamentally based in revealed religion—a view of Schmitt which provokes passionate resonance with U.S. Christian fundamentalists, and legitimizes religious warfare in the service of a return to the

oligarchical social structures of the Middle Ages.

What counts in maintaining any political entity, according to Schmitt, are drive, faith, hope, and courage, creating a mythology which will awaken and develop these forces with the greatest intensity in its subjects. Schmitt cites Mussolini’s October 1922 speech, in which Il Duce pronounced, “We have created a myth; the myth is a faith, a noble enthusiasm; it need not be reality, it is a drive, a hope, faith, and courage. Our myth is the nation, the nation we want to make a concrete reality.”

‘You Are Either With Me or Against Me’

Meier argues that by the end of his life, Schmitt had settled on revealed religion as the most powerful method of social control, and, by then, had singled out “Prometheus,” the titan who celebrated human reason, as his most bitter opponent. According to Schmitt, the hubris of man’s belief that truth is knowable, that God and the principles of the universe are discoverable through advances in human knowledge, has resulted in a godless age of chaos, moral neutrality, relativism, and bureaucratic sterility, in which life has been deprived of all meaning, politics impermissibly severed from nobility, honor, and religion.

Without original sin, stipulates Schmitt, there is no social order. Man is not naturally good but evil, dependent on God for salvation; man fell from grace by imbibing knowledge. If man is good, and not “evil and dangerous,” Schmitt argues, God loses his capacity to command absolute obedience, he loses his sovereignty. Put another way, but by Leo Strauss, “According to the Bible, the beginning of wisdom is the fear of the Lord; according to the Greek philosophers, the beginning of wisdom is wonder.” Mankind must take a stand, between these incompatible views, “Athens or Jerusalem.”

What is terrible about the Anti-Christ, Schmitt writes, is his devotion to science—“the sinister magician recreates the world, changes the face of the earth and subdues nature”—“and the promise of the “reality of peace and security—that men no longer need to distinguish between friend and enemy and therefore no longer between Christ and Anti-Christ. . . . Whoever wants to obey the commandment of historical action must not allow himself to part with or be talked out of his enemies, whom Providence uses and through whom it raises its questions.”

Revelation is the “only permissible path to God” because “only the incomprehensible God is omnipotent.” God obliges to do something not “because it is good but because he commands it.” Providence uses historical enmities and friendships to bring about order through what God allows or doesn’t allow. The role of man is not to understand God’s commands but to obey them unconditionally. In Schmitt’s view, the Crusades and the conquests represent the most significant political battles ever undertaken in history because they represent the triumph of the believers over the “enemy,” the heathen and the Jews.