124 Moracio Street, in the suburb of Polanco.

The way in which this office was opened — in an atmosphere of almost total mystery — its fortification with sophisticated equipment, with closed circuit television, 20 centimeter thick electronic steel doors, security guards who are all Israelis led by an Israeli major on active service, makes us suspect that Mexican territory is being used for the sale of aircraft, missiles, etc. to Latin American governments.

To this day, high functionaries of the Foreign Ministry and other ministries do not acknowledge the establishment of this office.

We charge, today, that Mexican territory is being used as the bridgehead for the sale of Israel weapons, and, what is more serious still, for the indirect application of a repressive North American policy.

We demand that the Mexican authorities reveal who, and for what reason, authorized a permanent commission for Latin America of Israeli Aeronautics Industries.

An open rebuke to Italy's Pajetta

LaRouche on the Shah of Iran's fight for industrial development

Gian Carlo Pajetta of the Communist Party of Italy (PCI) has presented himself as a spokesman for British secret-intelligence policies, by simultaneously endorsing the British monarchy's attempted coup against the government of Shahanshah Reza Pahlevi of Iran, and associating himself with the foreign policies of a co-accomplice in that attempted coup, the oligarchist faction currently ruling the People's Republic of China.

Such monstrosities I would have expected from Riccardo Lombardi, Bettino Craxi, Giorgio Amendola, Ugo LaMalfa, or from the bastard outgrowth of Admiral Horatio Nelson's looting of Naples, the PCI's Napolitano. Such insanity from the mouth of Pajetta has special significance.

It is true that the undereducated ordinary PCI members might easily fall prey to the view of the Shah as a "monarchical autocrat," and so fall prey to the delusion that a Jacobin insurrection, led by the "Father Gapons" of rural masses, must be an advancement of the political-historical process. Such delusions among such PCI members would be understandable, although no less dangerously wrong. Blunders are no less foolish merely because they flow from sincere ignorance.

The PCI members should look at Shah Pahlevi through the eyes of Niccolo Machiavelli. The Shah, leader of a nation dominated by rural illiteracy — by the "idiocy of rural life"! — is a *humanist Prince,* dedicated to using the marginal revenues of petroleum exports as the lever through which to bring Iran into modern life as a technologically advanced power, with modern cities, modern industries, and qualitative transformation of the countryside. *He is a humanist Prince,* using those means at his disposal to bring his people out of the "idiocy of rural life."

It is not the Shah which is the political anachronism; *it is the backwardness against which the Shah fights which is the anachronism.* Those autarchical peculiarities which so much occupy the sentimental, populist rantings of the foolish and wicked are the product not of the Shah's regime, but of the condition of the parasitical-landlord-poisoned nation against which the Shah's leadership has been directed.

Since Pajetta professes to be an expert in Russian history — among other topics — let us instruct him in Iranian realities from the standpoint of Russian history.

The Russian Parallel

Before the conquest of Constantinople by the allied forces of Muhammed the Conqueror and *Muhammed II's Roman-banker allies* (who supplied Turkish forces with the cannon used for the siege), the Italian-descended (Viterbo) Paleologue rulers of Byzantium had transmitted the wisdom of Plethon into Kievan Russia. Out of this Neoplatonic humanist heritage sprang Ivan the Great, and also, subsequently, the great humanist Czar Ivan the Awesome. It is not accidental that the British now slander Shah Pahlevi with the same lies British and British-influenced historians have long employed to slander the memory of Ivan Grozny.

Ivan Grozny launched the creation of Russia as a modern nation by conducting a struggle against the evil, parasitical, oligarchist *boyars,* the landed aristocracy. So, faced with the reality of a modern Iran subjected to reactionary, "boyar"-ridden institutions like those of Russia during the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, the Shah has followed the humanist policies of Ivan the Great, Ivan Grozny, Peter the Great, Alexander II, Count Sergei Witte and other Russian humanist leaders, in combatting the oligarchist forces of evil and rural backwardness. Ivan and his successors in policy were defeated through the treasonous alliance of the boyars with the outside oligarchist forces of Europe. Russia was set back into chaos through the

chain reactions of Genoese "black nobility" banking influences and policies, later reemerging from chaos with the establishment of the Romanovs.

Iran must not suffer the kind of setbacks Ivan's policies suffered. The Shah must prevail.

The great potentials of Russia were embedded afresh in that nation through the influence of the great Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz, and the influence of humanist thinkers such as Leonhard Euler and the Bernouillis in the Petrograd, Leibniz-designed, academy. It was these Leibniz-linked networks in Russia, later linked to the international networks of Benjamin Franklin and Lafayette, which served as the center of continued humanist policies in that nation, and which network's heritage of scientific and technological progress is embodied in the accomplishments of V.I. Lenin and Soviet science today.

As Lenin himself made emphatically clear, in opposition to the Trotskyists and Mensheviks alike, the choice of socialist transformation of Russia was presented to Lenin as an objective, concrete challenge of 1917, because both the Czarist rule and the London-controlled Russian capitalist class set themselves into opposition to breaking the power of the landed estates and to launching a general scientific and technological progress in the forced development of industry and agriculture.

The Shah is not Nicholas II, nor Kornilov, nor Kerensky, nor a Menshevik. The Russian analogies are Ivan the Great, Ivan Grozny, Peter the Great, and the Alexander II who freed the Russian serfs and allied Russia with President Abraham Lincoln against Britain and Britain's puppet Napoleon III. *One does not make a "progressive" revolution against a humanist Prince who is not only dedicated to the cause of progress, but who is besieged by evil "boyars" and their foreign, oligarchist allies.*

The British Plot

Do not, Pajetta, instruct me that the monarchical order in Iran is an anachronism. Iran itself is an anachronism, whose condition demands forms which must seem therefore anachronistic. Otherwise, you argue like a Trotskyist, with some nonsensical doctrine of "permanent revolution."

The prime anachronism of the world for more than two centuries to date is the British monarchy, whose creations, the City of London, the "Holy Alliance" under Metternich, the Bismarckian form of unification of Germany, the spread and perpetuation of colonialism, imperialism, and now neocolonialism under the IMF and World Bank, are the cause for all of the principal other anachronisms which exist in the world today.

How Pajetta attacked the Shah of Iran

As a result of mammoth pressure on the leadership of the Italian Communist Party, PCI Central Committee member and "foreign ambassador" Gian Carlo Pajetta has taken up the British line of attack on the Shah of Iran. Speaking at the Italian Communist Party's Unita festival in Milan, Pajetta made the following remarks, reprinted in the Sept. 10 PCI daily Unita.

The events in Iran constitute a tragic proof of the incapacity of imperialism to find solutions to the problems of development and liberty of peoples. Iran is one of the emerging powers like South Africa or Brazil, which have at their disposal the most advanced technologies, which have even entered the number of the nuclear powers. But all this at the cost of making their people pay the unacceptable price of misery, torture, slaughter, oppression. Iran today has a key function at the international level, has modern and sophisticated arms, an American-trained and armed police force and army, and has used its power to crush, beyond its borders, the democratic revolution of Oman.

... The president of the Chinese Communist Party, Hua Kuo-feng, was in Teheran even while this deep crisis was exploding, and the president of the Socialist Republic of Romania, Ceausescu was there shortly before that. Certainly there exists a politics of relations among the states, certainly to refuse to furnish alibis for oppression cannot mean to isolate oneself, economic boycott; but we should know that there also exist other roads for international cooperation that would not obfuscate severe judgment on tyrannical and oppressive regimes.

Are all of us in Italy able to occupy ourselves with this tragedy even if it isn't useful for electoral polemics? Are we all capable of understanding that relations between states have their laws, but that there is an unwritten law that we call liberty?

... To fight for detente does not mean only to make pronouncements, but also to work to find political solutions. And we have said that this is valid for Eritrea, for Palestine, for Lebanon, for the Sahara. If our solidarity with the workers and the people of Iran is only made up of tears, then that is not enough.

Our solidarity should be made of a fight for justice, for peace, for freedom. For the defense and the conquest of these values, now in face of the events in Iran, the government and international organizations must therefore pronounce themselves and pledge themselves.

Independence is not only the refusal to oppress, but is also the pledge to stop the hand of whoever tries to oppress and exploit.

It is consistent with the evil, anachronistic character of the British monarchy that it should be the author of the current insurrections against the Shah.

The domestic Iranian forces being deployed against the Shah are essentially the "boyars," the parasitical landlord powers who continue to resist the Shah's land reforms and other modernization of the nation. *(See what forces you are allied with, "Communist" Pajetta!)*

As is usual in such landlord insurrections, the oligarchists employ "Father Gapons" or "Dantons" and "Marats," the "Friends of the People," to play upon the backwardness of the most brutalized strata of the rural and lumpen populations. They deploy the brutalization created by landlord oppression as a "Jacquerie," a *sansculottes* forces of terror against those humanist forces who are fighting to end the very oppression which causes such brutalization. In this case, elements of British intelligence are working through their leading dupe, the Shi'ite Imam resident in Iraq, and the Imam's influence over the misled local Shi'ite religious leaders, the *mullahs*.

Since your statement shows how limited are the powers of comprehension you command, Pajetta, I shall not overly tax your mind by informing you also of the light Islamic history casts on this mode of organization of an insurrection. The British, who orchestrate this insurrection from Cambridge and Oxford, do, however, know that history, and are applying its lessons to the present attempted insurrection.

It is not, however, the Imam based in Iraq who motivated this attempted insurrection. He is merely the dupe of the British infidels. You can imagine the agonized moral dedication of an Oxford High Episcopalian to the securing of the purity of Shi'ite conservative religious dogma in Iranian national life!

For those who achieve the highest degree of organismic ecstasy in the mysteries of the "materialist theory of history," the manifest vulgar-material interest of the City of London in the Iranian affair is represented by British Petroleum. At this juncture, there is a bitter negotiation between the Shah and British Petroleum concerning prices and terms of Iranian petroleum. If the Shah is deposed or reduced to a figurehead, British Petroleum profits massively. *(Ah, Pajetta, British Petroleum's profits are perhaps the cause which excites you to such revolutionary fervor?)*

The immediate agency of British intelligence involved in the affair is the Bahai cult. The Bahai cult was created as a synthetic religion by British intelligence during the nineteenth century, and is one of the important intelligence covers used by the British monarchy even to the present date. The Bahai cult has a base in Iran, and major centers in London, Chicago (USA) and *in Israel*. To be exact, the Bahai cult is a joint operation of British and Zionist intelligence services. The Bahai cult is jointly operated with British intelligence networks in international Freemasonry. (Pajetta, if you are by chance a Freemason, you belong to the same British faction as the eighteenth-century Duke of Orleans.)

Also, the USA-based Aspen Institute, a branch of British intelligence, has been caught red-handed by Iranian police services in complicity with the insurrectionary effort — as well, of course, as Henry A. Kissinger and Zbigniew Brzezinski.

Not insignificantly, Peking intelligence services are up to their Great Han chauvinist ears in the affair. Hence, the forces involved are, in fact, British, Israeli, and Peking intelligence, with Kissinger, Brzezinski, and the Aspen Institute inevitably performing their customary services to the cause of the Union Jack. By pedigree and manifest habit of practice, U.S. Ambassador Gardner should be supporting the same line as Craxi, LaMalfa, and Kissinger — *do you know Mr. Gardner, Pajetta?*

Bukharinism

You must forgive me, Pajetta, but after considering the facts I have laid before you, if you are a Communist, as I understand you profess to be, then I must be so frank as to state that *you smell like a Bukharinite*.

As you ought to know, Bukharin was an Anglo-Dutch agent from his training under the teachers of Hayek at Vienna, through his attachment to Rudolf Hilferding, until the unpleasant conclusion of his miserable life. Like Karl Radek, G. Riazanov, and others, Bukharin was, during the pre-1917 period a subagent of Anglo-Dutch "superoperative" Parvus. During the time Bukharin was a leading figure within the Bolshevik government, he was a direct agent of the Anglo-Dutch intelligence services, with emphasis on Royal Dutch Shell financier factions within both the British and Dutch services.

Considering Shell's special advantages in the Soviet petroleum output under Bukharin's anti-industrialist policies, and British interests in an anti-industrialization policy generally, there is no mystery concerning the true motivations of Bukharin during the period from 1923 to the point that Stalin broke him in 1929. Putting to one side the way in which perceived state interest governed the trials of the principals indicted in the Moscow Trials, behind such misleading shaping of the advertised indictment Bukharin was fully guilty of treason, meriting the same severity of judgment he incurred through the actual indictment.

There are many "Bukharinites" in the socialist movement. This does not usually occur through the influence of Bukharin, but rather through the same forces which shaped Bukharin. "Bukharin" is not the name of a current, but the name given to a disease in memory of one of its notable victims.

The socialist movement is broadly divided into two underlying currents. One springs from the heritage of Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz. The other springs from the

pedigree of Hobbes, Locke, Jean-Jacques Rousseau and Jeremy Bentham.

The first is Neoplatonic humanist, is dedicated to the fostering of scientific and technological progress, and to scientifically determining the forms of political order and political transformations necessary to continuing such progress through all the successive transformations of society's development.

The second, the followers of Benthamite and Rousseauvian "socialism," is anti-humanist, anti-Neoplatonic, *and oligarchist*. It is concerned with the "redistribution" of existing wealth at the expense of the social accumulations necessary for technological progress.

Since British intelligence created Robespierre's Jacobins, in collaboration with the Orleanist "black nobility" of France and Switzerland, the currents of "socialism" which have flowed from the Jacobin Terror of British intelligence agents Danton and Marat, and Swiss (Necker, Madame de Staël) protégé Robespierre have been nothing but the tools of the European "black nobility" generally and the British monarchy specifically.

This sort of Benthamite "socialist" — to which included pedigree Trotsky confesses in his autobiography — is used by British intelligence as a social battering-ram against the pro-industrialist forces of scientific and technological progress. It is deployed as an expendable instrument of British policy, to be bloodily crushed according to the principle of the "sons of Brutus" once its disruptive work against the forces of progress has progressed as far as British satisfaction desires.

The exemplar of such British "socialism" is the Maoist faction. The intersection of Maoism and kindred forms of lunatic anarchist irrationalism with British-Israeli-controlled international terrorism today is lawful, not surprising.

What was Mao's policy, especially the policy of the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution? It was an assertion of the cultural roots of "Old China" against the "New China" heritage of Sun Yat Sen. It was an adaptation, reeking with the most hideously racialist Great Han chauvinism, of that ancient, Confucian Mandarin culture which made China for thousands of years the principal breeding place of those forms of plagues — cholera, bubonic plague — which have ravaged our species during the Christian era.

Maoism is nothing but the worst expression of the ancient oligarchical policy under the trappings of nominal "socialism." It is the doctrine of the worship of the "idiocy of rural life" apotheosized as "socialism."

To those of us who know that a penguin is not the Duke of Savoy in dress for the opera, the "socialist" pretensions of the evil oligarchist promoter of new world war, Hua, do not persuade us that the penguin is anything but the lower form of life he is in fact. Hua is an oligarchist, a modern embodiment of what the New Testament precisely identifies as "The Whore of Babylon."

Are you willing to be a "socialist" pimp for the Whore of Babylon, Pajetta?

—Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.

The plot behind the Iran crisis

London sees Shah's ouster as key to Mideast cold war drive

The strife ravaging Iran, though manipulated through deep domestic tensions, is not primarily an internal struggle. Rather, Iran is the battleground for a military-strategic fight that could determine the prospects for war or peace throughout the Middle East.

Behind the crisis in Iran is a conspiracy involving British intelligence, U.S. National Security director Zbigniew Brzezinski, and CIA director Stansfield Turner. Their aim is to overthrow the Shah of Iran and replace him with a government amenable to their anti-Soviet cold war policies or blackmail the Shah through a continued round of bloodshed and destruction of the country. The strategic goal of such an operation is the establishment of a Chinese-allied bloc of Asian nations under the guise of Indian Ocean security. This bloc would be linked to a Middle East Treaty Organization (METO) which would comprise an anti-Soviet belt of nations surrounding the USSR's southern flank.

The demonstrations and riots which erupted throughout Iran last week, culminating in large-scale clashes between the Iranian military and demonstrators Sept. 8, came after a visit to Iran by Chinese leader Hua Kuo-feng. Reportedly, the Shah responded coolly to Hua's overtures for an anti-Soviet alliance, and the ensuing outbreak of violence forced the Shah to cancel a planned trip to East Germany. Over 1,000 have died and countless businesses and banks have been destroyed over the last seven months as a result of growing antigovernment actions. As a result of the disturbances the Shah last month appointed a new cabinet and last week imposed martial law in 12 Iranian cities, including Teheran, the capital.