

EIR Strategic Outlook

Let us mobilize to defeat the Conservative Revolution

by Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.

The following was delivered as the keynote speech to a conference of the International Caucus of Labor Committees and Schiller Institute in Eltville, Germany on Dec. 10.

I shall give you a report which is painful in large part but which is not without its *hopeful* quality and, I believe also you will find, its useful one.

I am in a privileged position in respect to knowing certain things which go on within, and which otherwise intersect the government of the United States, and the relationship of that government to what is going on in other parts of the world, and can therefore speak and report to you with some special authority on these matters.

In the first part of what I have to say, I shall take you on a visit to an area which was last visited, according to reports, by Dante Alighieri. We shall look a bit at the Inferno, and then we shall come to a less unpleasant place called Purgatory, from which one can see the possibility of building something.

I shall depart from focus upon three interconnected events, all involving one petty, very unscrupulous, very disgusting person, a British journalist. Not all British journalists are disgusting, at least, I don't know that; but this one is.

His name is Ambrose (the saint be forgiven for that name) Evans-Pritchard. He is the child of a sub-species called British anthropologists. His father was a British intelligence agent, and *he* is a British intelligence agent, who is employed, as a matter of cover, by a London publication, the *Sunday Telegraph*.

I'm going to speak about three things in which this particular, most unpleasant little worm is employed. Number one: He has recently proposed, on behalf of the British government, in the pages of the *Daily Telegraph*, that the world be

organized on the basis of a resurrection of the instrumentality through which World War I was organized by the British, the Triple Entente. This Triple Entente was composed of an obscene relationship between London and Paris begun in 1898, and the relationship of this obscene partnership, through the aid of a Balkan war then created by the British, to an alliance with Moscow against Germany.

This gentleman proposes that the present policy of the British government and the British establishment is to bring the resurrected Entente Cordiale of the London-Paris alliance against the United States, into partnership with Russia, against Germany, but primarily against the United States, to bring about a global conflict which would be to the pleasure, presumably, of the people who *own* Ambrose Evans-Pritchard of the London *Sunday Telegraph* and *Daily Telegraph*.

This same Ambrose Evans-Pritchard is also engaged, within the United States, in organizing the attempted assassination of President William Clinton. This is a matter of *fact*, not of speculation. He has been caught red-handed. The facts have been published. The information is known to the government of the United States. The government of the United States is presently aware that an agent of a faction of British intelligence at the highest level, has been engaged in organizing a projected assassination of the President of the United States.

The United States, despite its decrepit condition at present, is still the relevant superpower; so one must say something about the minds of those gentlemen in Britain who have deployed Ambrose Evans-Pritchard to assassinate or to help in organizing the assassination of the President of the United States, Clinton, *as the similar forces in Britain in 1963 organized and accomplished the assassination of President Kennedy*. And these facts are being scrutinized closely at the



Leading figures in the Conservative Revolution (left to right): Ambrose Evans-Pritchard, Newt Gingrich, Margaret Thatcher. "The crowd which is trooping into Washington, herded by a bunch of scalawags known as the Heritage Foundation, would be called in Europe fascist. They're led nominally by the new 'Squeaker of the House,' a fellow by the name of Newt Gingrich."

highest levels of the U.S. government today.

The third thing in which Ambrose Evans-Pritchard is engaged, of which I shall speak today (other things are less mentionable), is that he is associated with allies in the United States who are generally linked to the ensemble around former Vice President (he was President in charge of vice) and later President George Bush. And, as you probably have heard from the reports of the recent election, we elected the best thing we could find which would approximate a tribe of baboons as a new influx into our national Congress this coming year.

A fascist movement

These people have a designation which is well known to Europe; that is, the technical designation or *terminus* for this crowd would be Conservative Revolution, as described and outlined by the rather notorious Dr. Armin Mohler, whose book, *The Conservative Revolution in Germany*, has just been republished, in 1994, in a third edition in Darmstadt, with all kinds of appendices attached.

In other words, the crowd which is trooping into Washington, herded by a bunch of scalawags known as the Heritage Foundation, would be called in Europe *fascist*. They're led nominally by the new "Squeaker of the House," a fellow by the name of Newt Gingrich. Actually, he's called Newt because of the name "Newton," not because he failed his examination to qualify as a reptile. But I assure you that Mr. Gingrich is not a Newt. He is a chameleon. He changes color instantly upon being put against a new background. When

he was campaigning for office, he was a complete modern fascist, all the colors of insanity included. When he was being interviewed [after the election] on a nationwide broadcast in the United States, he had changed his color. The ABC network was prepared to interview the Newt Gingrich who has campaigned for election to become "Squeaker of the House." He said, "I'm not that person any more, I'm about to become Squeaker of the House, and I have to change my responsibilities." So he disavowed any of the questions which pertained to what he had just said in the election campaign, and he now proposed to represent an entirely different constituency than he had represented putatively for the election campaign.

So, one must understand that Mr. Gingrich is not the leader of this fascist movement, he is simply an evanescent creature who is passing through the office of Speaker of the House. But behind him are some very nasty things, who fully qualify as *fascist* in the worst sense. But to understand this fascist movement, you must understand, in full, the term "Conservative Revolution," as Armin Mohler, a man whom I dislike, nonetheless describes in a useful way.

In Europe, during the 1920s and 1930s, there were over 100 different varieties of known fascist organizations which were called parts of the Conservative Revolution. And Mohler describes a great number of these. You would also have to include among the fascist organizations of the 1920s and today, the Frankfurt School. For example, not merely did the Nietzschean Nazi philosopher Martin Heidegger, who was still, in his postwar period, completely a fascist, a Nietzschean; not only was he living and sleeping with Hannah

Arendt, but there is no difference in epistemology between the extreme left represented by the Frankfurt School, and any of the fascist movements. I shall indicate why that's the case, shortly.

But before coming back to this question of the Conservative Revolution, let me indicate one fact about it, and then go back to the other two activities of Evans-Pritchard.

The lesson of the mid-term U.S. election

We had the privilege a few years ago of assisting Harris Wofford in Pennsylvania, in his campaign for Senate. His organization collaborated with us then, and won. Following that election, Wofford came under pressure from groups including the Anti-Defamation League, which is an American organization linked to organized crime. It's also an extreme right-wing organization of the category called neo-conservative, and, in the United States, would be classed among those organizations closely associated with George Bush or his entourage in fascist enterprises and policies to the present day.

Mr. Wofford decided to compromise and rely upon making peace with the Anti-Defamation League, and to break off from collaboration with us; and as a result of this, he went down to defeat, because in this election, the Anti-Defamation League deserted him to support his fascist adversary. And he failed to do any of the things we would have recommended and therefore was defeated, and a very nasty gentleman succeeded to his office in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

However, we resolved, during the recent elections, to defeat one of the most disgusting specimens produced by this fascist movement insurgency in the United States, also a former close associate of George Bush, who supported this man's candidacy for Senate; but after we began to destroy this candidate's potentiality of winning, George Bush decided to distance himself from his protégé, Lt. Col. Oliver North (ret.), one of the most disgusting creatures that ever slithered across the landscape in the United States. And I assure you, we've produced a great number of disgusting people in our time.

We organized the destruction of North, a demagogue who was nationally supported by all kinds of people around the country, who were giving money to him, millions of dollars, because we knew that he was one of the minor Mussolinis of the upcoming fascist movement. We destroyed him; and when we began to destroy him, a lot of courageous people, after we got him down on the ground, came in to kick him in the head, and that was the end of Oliver North. That's the way politics sometimes works in the United States: somebody knocks somebody down, and then courageous people come to kick him in the head. It's called politics.

But the point is that we have now resolved to employ the methods which we used to destroy Oliver North, which was a major setback for this new fascist insurgency, over the next 18 months, to destroy the fascist movement in the United

States. We just had some help in doing that, from a place called Orange County, which some people in financial circles, I understand, this morning are beginning to call "Lemon County," because of the quality of its financial paper.

The people who are behind George Bush, who are behind the funding of the Conservative Revolution, have just looted a number of counties and local governments of the United States and California. What happened in Orange County, in the looting of public funds by financial speculators using a Chapter 9 bankruptcy procedure—a derivatives scandal looting—also represents the same problem which many other communities in the United States face. The tax rolls and securities and budgets of communities throughout the United States, are being looted by the financial bubble called the derivatives bubble.

You will find the same thing is going on in Europe, where a similar process is under way, in the name of privatization, in the name of deregulation. The word is now going out that these Wall Street-centered financiers who are behind the funding of the Conservative Revolution movement in the United States, have taken over many communities. You are going to find that communities now *panic* in pulling their assets out of these funds *as rapidly as possible* before foreclosure procedures allow these peoples' financial interests to loot them as it's looting those communities which had placed their funds as security with the Orange County trust.

So the bubble has been pricked; the international financial bubble has been pricked in Orange County, California. Not because of the size of the bubble in California, but because, as I warned some time ago, the thing that would bring down this bubble and start the chain reaction of reverse financial leverage to collapse the international speculative bubble, would be the point at which the collapse of this bubble intersects political institutions, institutions of government. At that point, you have an automatic political chain reaction, where the game can no longer go on.

So already, it has become clear to many American voters, and more rapidly over the coming period, that the bankers, the speculators behind the derivatives bubble, behind these operations, are using this new fascist movement for their privatization schemes, for their other schemes; and 80% of the people of the United States will now soon be aware, consciously, that *this is their mortal enemy*, the person who is going to deny them the right to life by taking away the funds, as pensions, as Social Security funds, as health care funds, by which they maintain life. And there will be a revulsion against the Conservative Revolution which exceeds anything, in terms of the passion exhibited during the recent U.S. mid-term elections.

We are going to see to it. We have the capability to do this, with others, and we're going to do it. We are going to *destroy*, over the period of the next 18 months, the Conservative Revolution in America. We're going to crush it politically. And we will have some help in doing that, from people

who have to join us in crushing it, in their own vital self-interest.

Assault on the institutions of the Renaissance

Now let's look at the other two businesses. First of all, for point of reference, let's look the British Crown at the highest level, which means above the government, which means at the level of the Club of the Isles or at subsidiary levels, at the level of the 1001 Club, or at the higher level which represents the Club of the Isles, the World Wildlife Fund or the World Wide Fund for Nature, which is headed since 1961 by the Prince Consort of the British monarchy, Prince Philip.

This institution, typified by the World Wildlife Fund, controls the left and the right wing of the global fascist movement today. There is no difference, in terms of this fact, between the "greenies," so-called, and what you recognize as the extreme right wing. They're the same thing. They have the same master, they are deployed to the same purpose. There's no difference between the neo-Nazis and Greenpeace. They are just different arms, different species of weapons, of the same force.

The Conservative Revolution, as I shall indicate, is actually best described as a *neo-feudalist movement*. It's a movement which has existed since 1440, when financial interests then centered in Venice, decided to crush in the cradle the new form of modern western European Christian civilization which was established by the agreements at the ecumenical Council of Florence. That is, the institution of the nation-state, the institution of scientific progress, and the institution of science itself.

These three institutions, created by the Renaissance in the setting of 1440, the Council of Florence, gave us the nation-state, the institution of science, the institutions of scientific and related cultural progress; these are the three characteristics of modern western European civilization. It is *this* institution which has lifted mankind globally out of a condition to which all previous mankind had been subject.

Beginning with the Renaissance, *for the first time in all human existence, mankind began to be freed* from a tradition in which 95% or more of the population of every culture, of every nation, of every part of the world, had been condemned to live in bestiality in the condition of daily and family life, a condition in which societies had been ruled by tiny groups of powerful families which may come and go, but the principal remained the same. Oligarchical families ruled over the subject 95% in virtual serfdom or slavery, through the mediation of a group of lackeys—priests, military, administrators, whatnot. And in 1440, for the first time in all history, mankind began to free itself in its political institutions from the condition to which every culture, every nation, every part of this planet, had subjected all human existence prior to the Golden Renaissance.

And the oligarchy of Europe, then centered in Venice—

in the St. Mark's *fondo* of Venice and the little *fondi* which, like little pigs at the sow, gathered around it—these forces set out to destroy the Renaissance, to destroy the struggle to create the institution of the nation-state, the institution of true citizenship, the institution of science, the institution of the right of all nations to free access to the benefits of scientific and technological and cultural progress.

We created in the Renaissance the most powerful culture that mankind has ever conceived. If you look at the population charts, the demography of this planet before 1440, and what has happened under the influence of western European Christian civilization since 1440, you will see that *there is a hyperbolic rate of growth* until about 1963.

Wherever the institutions of western European Christian civilization stretched, there has been a hyperbolic growth in not only the population potential of society; in a lowering of the death rate of the young; in more people living to become parents; in the elevation of every culture of this planet through the infusion of the benefits of European culture. You see that whereas all humanity, prior to 1440, never exceeded at any time a global population of a couple hundred million people, of whom 95% were living in absolute abjection, that since then, we now have a population of over 5 billion people who are living, even today, in a *better average condition* globally than mankind has ever lived before. There is no brutality on this planet which objectively is as brutal as the characteristic brutality to which man was subject before modern western European Christian civilization's emergence 550 years ago, in the context of the Golden Renaissance.

A war against the nation-state

What we call the Conservative Revolution is something which began with Venice in 1440, as a reaction, an attempt to destroy this new thing, the institution of the nation-state, the institution of science, which was invented by one man, essentially; granted, on the basis created by Plato and Plato's Academy. But one man, Cardinal Nicolaus of Cusa—in a work entitled *De Docta Ignorantia*—*singlehandedly established modern science*. There were elements of science, elements contributed to that from many cultures over many thousands of years before, including, most notably, the contributions of Plato's Academy at Athens, minus Aristotle. But the idea of science as we are able to understand it with the examples of Leonardo da Vinci, of Johannes Kepler, of Leibniz, or Riemann or Gauss: that notion of science did not exist prior to 1440, which was the date of publication of Cusa's *De Docta Ignorantia*.

The idea that the creative discoveries of man in science and technology and culture should be immediately the right of every nation and every human being on this planet, was also a policy of the Renaissance, which did not exist as even an idea before that Renaissance. So we created the most powerful and the best culture mankind had ever seen, in the context of the Council of Florence of 1440.

We have a potential today to sustain in comfort and prosperity, with existing technology which we had available as late as, say, the late 1960s, by the time of the Moon landing, over 25 billion people on this planet right now, if we used it, if we were not destroying it as another notch of the destruction of civilization occurred last week in Germany, in the shutting down of another major technology in the name of "environmentalism" [a reference to the delay in constructing a high-speed rail link in Germany, since it allegedly infringes upon the well-being of the rare great bustard, a species of bird—ed.].

How many people do you have to kill "for the sake of the environment"? Every species that Prince Philip has set out to save with the World Wildlife Fund, he has nearly destroyed. We caught him, for example, in Tibet with his pandas down. The species of panda is almost extinguished, as a result of the policies of Prince Philip. He moved in to save the rhinoceri in Africa, and he's almost exterminated them. He moved in to save the elephant, and created similar problems. He probably will get a human being disguised as a hippopotamus climbing certain mountains in Africa, but that's about the extent that the World Wildlife Fund has made any contribution to culture.

So this force throughout history, which has resisted the Council of Florence, the nation-state, the progress of science and culture, the right of every person and nation immediately to the benefits of scientific and technological progress; that is the Conservative Revolution, as Mohler has described it.

The first nation to be hated by the conservatives, was France, the France of Jeanne d'Arc and the France of Louis XI, the first king of modern France.

From the time of Louis XI's accession and defeat of the interests of Burgundy in creating the first modern nation-state of France in the latter part of the 15th century, until 1815, when France became totally subjected to the Holy Alliance, and became a conquered nation, culturally and in every other way, the prime enemy marked for destruction by the Venetians and the successors of the old feudal order, was France.

From 1666, for example, until 1814, there was a perpetual state of war against France, organized by a Venetian circle typified by the famous 18th-century leader of Venetian intelligence, Abbot Antonio Conti, who gave us such disgusting things as *Revoltaire* in France, and so forth and so on.

This was organized. The campaign against Leibniz's influence, the puffing-up of this pseudo-scientist Isaac Newton; all of these things were done by this group to destroy human society.

But from the time that France was destroyed, the nation which was most hated by the oligarchy, as the writings of Prince Metternich and his great admirer Henry Kissinger attest, was the United States of America.

The reason for that hatred of the United States, which is expressed in the desire to destroy its President, to murder its President, again, today, is the fact that on the shores of North

America, there were communities of semi-autonomous nations called chartered colonies. At least 10 of the 13 colonies which made the United States had based themselves largely on the influence of the ideas of the Renaissance.

For example, the general welfare clause which characterizes the Preamble of the United States Federal Constitution, can be contrasted with the preamble of the constitution of the Confederate States of America, and with the Locke-designed constitutions of the original colonies of North and South Carolina. And one sees, in the contrast between the Lockean notion which is the Enlightenment notion (Locke is perfectly consistent with all Enlightenment figures) and the Federal Constitution's Preamble, the fight between the influence of Leibniz, as against Locke and the Enlightenment.

As with Leibniz, the nation-state is the agency, the surrogate agency which has the responsibility of being the father of the people, a relatively less mortal agency of great power which can care for all of the people and all of the nation; which can contribute to the welfare of civilization as a whole, as we individual mortal persons cannot, individually. It's an institution which takes into account responsibility for the consequences of its policy upon future generations, upon other nations, the world as a whole.

As Charles de Gaulle said in his memoirs, he found a France which had degenerated under the Fourth Republic into a people in a condition like that of calves grazing in a pasture on a hillside, a people who were deluded into thinking the rivers and the valleys and the pastures of France, the scenery, were France; a France which had to be reminded that France's national interest as a nation was its national purpose, a national purpose which could only be found in the role of France in contributing to the maintenance and enhancement of civilization.

A nation has no interest in material things as such; a nation has an interest *in its contribution*, both to the service of its own posterity, but also to contributing to preserving and improving, and protecting, global civilization. And it's that for which a nation must fight. If it must go to war, it must never go to war for any different purpose than to fulfill its true purpose: its mission of protecting its posterity and of, at the same time, contributing to the preservation and improvement of global civilization.

This is that against which the Conservative Revolution was mobilized. This was that against which Metternich fought. This is that against which total British agent (and he never was anything different from the time he reached maturity) Henry Kissinger admires in Metternich and in Castlereagh.

The unique role of the United States

The United States, despite its weaknesses, was, because of its lack of an entrenched oligarchy, which was still the condition of Europe as the Holy Alliance typifies that; the United States became the experimental ground for the follow-

ers of Leibniz, for the followers of the Renaissance, in utilizing a grand assortment of religious groups and so forth, to bring forth a nation on this planet.

We had Quakers. I know what the Quakers are, I won't even tell you. There are children present. Quakers, Catholics, Calvinists, the whole lot, formed the United States, but these sectarian features of our population *did not define our nation*. What defined our nation, were the ideas of the Renaissance, which found in the soil of North America a place relatively free of oligarchy, in which a true nation-state republic could be founded.

You will find no constitution in any part of the world which does not look poor and ridiculous by contrast with the meaning of the Declaration of Independence, as reflected through the instrumentality of the Federal Constitution as originally presented between 1787 and 1789.

There is no nation which has a constitution of which it could be proud, from point of law, in comparison with that constitution. That is not because of any peculiar, exceptional condition of the United States, geographically or otherwise, *except* that in the relatively freer domain, in the territory of North America, in the outpost of European civilization which was North America, there was found the opportunity, relatively free of control of the kind of oligarchy which still controlled Europe, to create this great experiment, a more advanced form of nation-state republic.

The one thing which distinguishes the American people, with all their bawdiness, their disgusting characteristics, and so forth, is that *we do have this particular tradition*. And if you wish to understand what the Clinton presidency is, you *must* understand this. Without that, you understand *nothing* about the Clinton presidency, which will play a very crucial role in world history in the coming two years, for reasons I shall indicate.

Despite the weaknesses of Clinton himself, Clinton, as I shall indicate, is an *American* President. He is an American phenomenon, as Bush was not; as Reagan had aspects of, but really was not. To understand Reagan's support of the Strategic Defense Initiative, as I know it uniquely from the inside, you have to understand American history. Not as it's taught in Europe by the U.S. Information Agency, but the real American history. These guys at USIA are not really Americans, they don't know what it is.

To understand what Kennedy did, with all his complications: Why did the British kill Kennedy? Again, Kennedy was an American phenomenon. To understand the difference between Franklin Roosevelt and his cousin, a complete British degenerate, Teddy Roosevelt, and why the quarrel between Roosevelt and Churchill during World War II; and why Truman dropped the bomb on Japan whereas Roosevelt would not have done that, you have to understand this tradition, the American tradition.

Teddy Roosevelt was not an American, he was British. Woodrow Wilson in point of fact has characterized the fact

that from the White House, *he founded, or refounded, or launched the refounding of the Ku Klux Klan in North America*. Don't talk about "Wilsonian Democracy in Europe." It's a fraud! The founder of the Ku Klux Klan, who sponsored the founding of the Ku Klux Klan in the United States from the office of the President, is the adopted symbol of democracy? No. He's not an American. He doesn't belong to the United States. He's a disease, and we don't give our diseases citizenship in the United States, I hope.

Coolidge? Bad joke. Hoover? Bad joke. Truman? Unfortunate fellow; fool. Eisenhower? Apart from the Suez crisis and his Atoms for Peace, I don't think he did much. He had a couple of good moments, but he wasn't a good man.

Kennedy, despite himself, had greatness, and for that he was killed. Johnson thought he had three rifles aimed at his head; he was probably right. And therefore, he didn't fight them, after what had been done to his predecessor. Johnson was not as bad, personally, as history seems to represent him. If you've got three rifles aimed at your head and not much courage, you do what you're told.

Nixon was elected President after he was politically dead, and he showed remarkable courage at the end, when they tried to oust him. He dug his heels in and fought, and showed more manliness than a number of people.

Ford was a nice guy who was too nice to understand bad things, even when he did them.

Jimmy Carter was in there as a stalking horse for something; he didn't know what was going on.


Reagan had a couple of good aspects, which come from American history, but overall, he had a very bad background, and some very bad ideas. On certain things, he'd open his mind up and listen, at least for three paragraphs' worth. On other things, if it sounded like something he didn't agree with, he'd just close his mind off, and it was as if he weren't there; you couldn't get through to him.

Bush, of course, was about as evil as they come. He was in the tradition of such traitors as Franklin Pierce and James Buchanan, and Barbara, his wife, used to claim she was descended from Pierce. We wondered if there was more taint to the blood than we had imagined earlier.

So, that's the kind of thing we have to bear in mind, in understanding the role of the United States and why this occurs. But let's go into the question of the assassinations.

The British killed four U.S. Presidents

We know in four cases that the British monarchy killed the sitting President of the United States. The first, the famous one, which is beyond doubt, is the case of Abraham Lincoln. Abraham Lincoln was shot by a British agent, John Wilkes Booth, who was acting on orders. We have the codebook. As a matter of fact, you can go into Ford's Theater in Washington, D.C., and you can see the codebook. The codebook was one which was used for messages by the former secretary of state of the Confederacy, Judah Benjamin,



British troops set fire to Washington, D.C. during the War of 1812. The British oligarchs never accepted their defeat in the American Revolution, and have made repeated efforts, over more than two centuries, to bring the wayward "colonies" back under their rule—including the assassination of American Presidents who threatened to sabotage their imperial designs.

who was a British agent then resident in London, who, by way of Canada, had transmitted the orders to John Wilkes Booth, which sent Booth, in collaboration with a Hapsburg agent by the name of John Surat and his network, into the attempted wipeout of many members of the government of the United States on that night, the same night that Lincoln was shot; and Booth shot Lincoln on orders from London, from British intelligence at the highest level.

James Garfield was also shot, for a similar reason. He was shot in the middle of a conflict with the British on policy, and was shot by people who were part of a British intelligence network.

The case of William McKinley is much more notable, particularly for the history of Europe. If McKinley had not been shot, you could not have had World War I. So that's not an unimportant event for Europe.

From the time of Lincoln and even before, until the assassination of McKinley, the United States had three principal friends outside the United States. The first was Prussia (Germany). And this was an organic relationship. Remember there was a point at which the United States almost spoke German. It came very close, by one vote in Congress at Philadelphia. We had so many German immigrants in the United States, that we were on the verge of actually choosing between German and English as our national language. So there was a very close relationship.

Also, the Civil War is relevant to that. The British were on the side of the Confederacy, as were the French of Napoleon III. Napoleon III was nothing but an agent of Palmer-

ston. He was put into power by Palmerston. He was controlled by Palmerston and Palmerston's agents. The entire Confederacy was nothing but an Anglo-French operation to destroy the United States, pure and simple.

Prussia was an ally of the United States. Close friends. Not so much from the monarchy, but from the other institutions. Russia had been, off and on, very close to the United States. There was the tradition of Leibniz's influence in Russia on Peter the Great. Despite the fact that Admiral Bentham, the brother of Jeremy Bentham, had been influential in Russian politics, the fact is that so had John Paul Jones, the enemy of Admiral Bentham, who had been sent by the United States to assist Russia in building its navy in the 1790s, as a part of a repayment for the Russian assistance with the League of Armed Neutrality in bringing about the freedom of the United States from its British oppressor.

It was Catherine the Great's organization of the League of Armed Neutrality, on appeal from a Leibnizian circle in St. Petersburg, which defeated the British Navy in the North Sea, which enabled the United States to realize the defeat of Cornwallis at Yorktown, and to bring about the peace which recognized the independence of the United States.

This close relationship of the United States to Russia, which had been broken by Alexander I and Nicholas I, was resumed by Alexander II, who revived the program of reforming Russia to bring it out of feudalism, that is, out of the Conservative Revolution, and to bring it into modern society.

There's a continuity in Russian history which resurfaces with Alexander II after the so-called Crimean War, when he

figured out what the Anglo-French were trying to do to Russia, of a progress to modern society which continues through the influence of Count Sergei Witte.

The third notable friend of the United States was Meiji Restoration Japan, from the time of the appearance of the Great White Fleet, until the assassination of McKinley. The significance is that the assassination of McKinley, which was done by the British, changed the policies of the United States fundamentally.

Whereas the United States, from 1861 until 1901, had recognized Great Britain as the principal enemy of the United States, and had recognized France from 1815 on as being nothing but a lackey for the British Empire, which it is today, they reversed the relations under Teddy Roosevelt. Teddy Roosevelt's uncle, of the Bulloch family, who trained him for the U.S. presidency, in point of fact, was a British agent. He was a traitor to the United States who came from Atlanta, Georgia, who during the Civil War was resident in London in running operations against the United States.

This uncle trained Teddy Roosevelt in his policies, and won Teddy Roosevelt to these policies. When Teddy Roosevelt became President, he switched the alliances of the United States from friendship with Russia, Germany, and Japan, to adopting the United States' former enemies, London and Paris, as allies, and making Russia, Germany, and Japan the enemies of the United States. Without that shift, World War I would not have been possible.

The case of McKinley

McKinley was famous for the 1890 McKinley tariff, which was strongly objected to by London. It was a protectionist tariff. McKinley, like all American patriots, was opposed to free trade. Every American patriot is traditionally opposed to free trade, and is traditionally committed to what is called, by some, protectionism. That is, to the use of tariffs not simply as a source of income for governments, but the use of tariffs to protect domestic infrastructure, domestic agriculture, domestic manufacturing, and other industry. That is the American tradition, that is the Leibnizian tradition. Teddy Roosevelt was relatively a free trader, McKinley not.

McKinley was forced to accept Teddy Roosevelt as vice president under pressure, over the strong objections of McKinley himself and Mark Hanna, a senator who was a key figure behind the McKinley administration.

Mark Hanna opined that forcing President McKinley to tolerate Teddy Roosevelt as his vice president, meant there was probably a mortal threat to the life of President McKinley. So Mark Hanna organized an attempt to check the security of President McKinley.

In response to Hanna's efforts, there came from the police commissioner of New York City a report that the Henry Street Settlement House, then headed by a woman called Emma Goldman, was engaged in plots against the life of the

President of the United States, McKinley.

Despite that warning, Emma Goldman brought a terrorist of the Mazzinian variety from Europe, took him to bed, as she was wont to do in those days of sexual freedom (she was an anarchist), and took him out with her to Cleveland, Ohio, where she gave one of her speeches about killing tyrants. And this terrorist, an imported terrorist, a professional killer, in point of fact, went up to Buffalo, to a fair there, in which the President was participating, and shot the President, who died several days later. Thus, Teddy Roosevelt became President.

Later, the police commissioner was watergated, as we call it today, by the Anti-Defamation League in one of its first acts after its constitution. The police lieutenant who had investigated the assassination threat against the President, was shot in Sicily, on a trip there.

There are other facts, but there's no question that the British monarchy directly assassinated President McKinley, in order to bring its favorite, Teddy Roosevelt, to power in the United States.

A similar thing is true of the Wilson administration, which is nothing but a creation, a total property of London. It's not in the American tradition.

Only three 'American' Presidents since 1901

In point of fact, there are only three Presidents since 1901 who have not been essentially Anglo-Americans, that is, British puppets. These three were: Warren Harding, in a sense, but Harding didn't last long enough to show his teeth. He died in a mysterious way, shall we say, to bring Calvin Coolidge to power.

But clear assassination: the attempted assassination of Franklin Roosevelt, who, unlike his cousin, was an *American*. I don't like many of Franklin Roosevelt's policies, but he was an American President, and represented, in his own conscience, an attempt to represent the interests of the United States. And also, he was an anti-colonialist. He was for the freedom of oppressed peoples, as Harry Truman was not.

Eisenhower, in a couple of moments, with his Atoms for Peace and his Suez responses, was independent, but otherwise, he was controlled by London. As a matter of fact, he'd been owned by Bernard Baruch. The way he got to be commander-in-chief of U.S. forces during World War II, was not because of his military skills, but rather because when Winston Churchill was faced with the embarrassing fact that he would have to have an American commander-in-chief for the Allied forces in Europe, he went to people like Baruch and said, "Who do you own?" And Baruch said, "I own a young colonel by the name of Eisenhower." "Well, we're going to have to do something about making him the commander of U.S. forces in Europe, aren't we?"

So, Eisenhower was a political appointee in a deal which the White House struck with Churchill. It was not his military capabilities that made him a general, there were many other

generals who were much more qualified, but rather, his political capabilities. And that showed as his strength and his weaknesses as President.

The Kennedy assassination

But Kennedy was actually independent. The Irish question was only a tip of that, an aspect of that. He was shot. He was shot on British orders. Let me just detail that, because that is key to understanding how the assassination of President Clinton is being organized today.

Let me go back to a famous trial in the 1960s in New Orleans. The prosecuting attorney is William Garrison. The person in the dock is a fellow by the name of Clay Shaw, alias Clay Bertrand. Many of you have probably seen the movie produced recently, which, insofar as what I've seen, from my knowledge, is perfectly accurate, as far as it goes. The movie as broadcast leaves out a couple of very important facts, though it alludes to some others.

Clay Shaw would have been convicted, had the evidence been presented. For some mysterious reason, the photographs which existed, which would have convicted Shaw, were not presented at trial. The case was as follows.

The prosecution had proof that a man, alias Clay Bertrand, was also the Clay Shaw who was head of the Permanent Industrial Exposition organization in New Orleans, and had known that Clay Shaw, together with a former FBI official by the name of Guy Banister and another fellow, Dave Ferrie, had been involved in a plot, a conspiracy, to assassinate the President of the United States, John F. Kennedy.

Shaw was prosecuted on the basis of this, but the judge in the trial ruled out certain evidence, including the confession in a police interview on apprehension of Clay Shaw, which admitted to these connections. Shaw on the witness stand *denied* that he knew David Ferrie, and thus said that he had no association with any conspiracy, which the then-deceased David Ferrie had been part of, or with Guy Banister.

The judge instructed the jury, that since it was the testimony of one government witness against the defendant, Shaw, who under oath had testified that he did not know Ferrie, that the jury, if they found this was the case, would have to give the benefit of the doubt to the defendant, even though they may otherwise believe the defendant to be guilty.

The jury pronounced Clay Shaw innocent on the basis of this instruction, and said that they otherwise believed Shaw to be guilty. The judge, before he died, expressed the same view of the case. But all the time, sitting in the court, was a reporter from a newspaper who had photographs of a homosexual party at which Clay Shaw and David Ferrie had consorted, in fact had embraced, so that Shaw's testimony at trial was perjured.

Now, if the jury had been presented with those photographs in place of the evidence which the court had ruled out of the evidence, then he would have been convicted. Had Shaw been convicted, then it would have been apparent that

the organizer of the assassination against the President was the head of Permindex, one formerly Maj. Louis Mortimer Bloomfield.

Now Bloomfield was a member of an organization, Permindex, which had been kicked out of France for its involvement in the attempted assassination of President Charles de Gaulle. So Permindex was an international assassination organization based in Montreal, Canada. It was a branch of British intelligence, of a British intelligence unit which was set up in Canada in conjunction with the Special Operations Executive by the Churchill-Beaverbrook apparatus during World War II, and actually earlier.

There was also further evidence that, within 48 hours prior to the assassination of the President, an agent of the FBI and of Naval Intelligence by the name of Lee Harvey Oswald had sent a telegram to J. Edgar Hoover (we call him "Gay" Edgar Hoover) of the FBI warning him of an immediate mortal threat to the life of the President in the Dallas-Fort Worth area, and that the director of the FBI should get in contact with him immediately for the details of this conspiracy—48 hours before the assassination.

Now, Oswald was a well-known figure of the intelligence community, and had been since prior to his defection to Russia. That was an organized defection. Oswald had been recruited into the intelligence service of the United States as a boy, as an adolescent, in the Civil Air Patrol. His coordinator at that time was a fellow called David Ferrie, who later showed up as a prominent figure in the Kennedy assassination.

When Oswald had gone into the Marines, he had been immediately recruited into the intelligence units. He didn't even learn to shoot a gun before he was put into intelligence training, to learn Russian, and to learn signals. As soon as he completed his course in Russian and signals, he was sent to the Soviet Union as a spy. There he married a Russian woman, and when the time came to leave Russia, he left with no problems with the Soviet authorities, and no problems with the U.S. authorities. As a matter of fact, a U.S. congressman intervened on his behalf. He walked back into the United States, with his Russian wife, with no impediment from the Soviet government, no impediments from the U.S. government.

He wandered to New Orleans, where he went to work for the former special agent-in-charge of the FBI in Chicago, Guy Banister, who was running the Cuba operations, first for Castro and then against him, out of New Orleans. A *well-known agent of the U.S. intelligence services* sends a letter to Gay Edgar Hoover 48 hours before the assassination, warning of a conspiracy in the Dallas-Fort Worth area to assassinate the President.

The head of the FBI, Gay Edgar Hoover, does nothing about the telegram. Furthermore, after the assassination has occurred, and every intelligence agency is told to cough up everything it has on Lee Harvey Oswald, Gay Edgar Hoover

still does nothing.

It was obvious circumstantially, as well as from other evidence, that Lee Harvey Oswald had nothing to do with the assassination. And thanks to Lee Harvey Oswald's death at the hands of an agent of Guy Banister, for whom Oswald had been an agent, Jack Ruby (who had been an agent of Banister since Chicago days, as an organized-crime snitch for the FBI), there was no trial in Texas. Therefore, the facts about Lee Harvey Oswald were never forced into court, but rather a fraudulent body called the Warren Commission closed the book on the assassination of a President, covering up for the fact that the U.S. President had been assassinated by the British Crown.

Incidentally, this fellow, Maj. Louis Mortimer Bloomfield, had been, since 1938, a special adviser of the British government to Gay Edgar Hoover. So Hoover was covering up for his associate until 1963. Bloomfield was also the lawyer for the Bronfman interests in Canada, enemies of ours.

That's how politics are played. Assassinations.

There's another organization which is today known as the Hollinger organization, which comes out of the same group of British intelligence interests as Permindex did.

The Hollinger Corp. was originally created in about 1938, in its first form, as a military supplies acquisition agency, an intelligence agency, which would operate contrary to U.S. law inside the United States, to get U.S. equipment for armaments. This organization, at the end of the war, had about \$1.3 billion in liquid assets. It continued its operation as a private organization under the name of the Argus Corp.

Later, the son of one of the British intelligence officers who founded this group during World War II, Conrad Black, took over the leadership of the Argus Corp. He then reorganized the investments of the Argus Corp., to move out of industrial investments and similar things, into taking over a newspaper empire. In the course of that change of corporate purpose, the name of the corporation was changed from Argus Corp. to the Hollinger Corp. In the course of this change-over, it took over publications such as the *Jerusalem Post*, various papers in the United States, and of course the London *Telegraph*, as well as papers in Canada. It just recently took over a major newspaper in Chicago. It controls the *American Spectator* publication.

This is the agency of British intelligence which controls Ambrose Evans-Pritchard. This is the agency which speaks for the tradition of Margaret Thatcher in speaking of the Triple Alliance. Now, let me just get through this part quickly and come to the other aspect of the matter, of this trip through Hell, or the Inferno.

The British started World War I

Let's look at the sequence of events. Why did World War I occur? It occurred, in part, because of a long-range policy of building up oligarchical interests in Europe, which would

take over the new form of nation-state institutions, in order to subvert and ultimately destroy them. This power came to be centered, over the course of the 19th century into the turn of the 20th century, in London. With the weakening of the Hapsburgs, London began to consolidate as the center of oligarchical power. This is not a creation of the British people, this was a creation of a group of parasites who descended upon London over successive centuries, and made it their playground, as Venice had been the playground of the European oligarchy in an earlier time.

In this period, this interest in London faced a major threat. The threat was in the form, on the one side, of a protégé of Pope Leo XIII, a fellow in France by the name of Gabriel Hanotaux. Gabriel Hanotaux had entered into discussions with Russia, specifically with Count Sergei Witte. These discussions had centered upon plans for the general economic development of Eurasia, which employed the kinds of ideas which were associated with Dmitri Mendeleev, the great chemist and railroad builder, and others who were friends of Witte, and from whom Witte got many of these ideas.

The idea was to build railways from Brest in France, through Moscow, to Vladivostok and beyond, into Japan, to link this Eurasian rail network to other rail networks, to free China of British subjugation, to engage Japan as an ally of this enterprise, and to draw the leading economic power of Europe, Germany, into collaboration with Russia and *this* France, in this grand scheme for transforming Eurasia through economic development. This arrangement was generally brought to a series of treaty agreements by about 1896.

For various family reasons, the Kaiser's household rejected the idea of supporting France and Russia, the France of Hanotaux, the Russia of Witte, against Britain. The wrong eggs had been laid in the Hohenzollern nest.

So, in 1896-98, Britain was on the verge of launching war against France over the policies of Hanotaux and Witte. This came up in connection with Africa. The policies of the more positive forces in France, from about the 1870s, had been to build a railway from the area of Dakar, Senegal to Djibouti, across the sub-Saharan region of the Sahel of Africa, to create a logistical base for the development of Africa. This policy came to a head under the situation of the 1890s, in the negotiations between Hanotaux and Witte.

The British were ready to go war against France. Germany refused to support France on this issue. In this context, the Dreyfus case was used in an attempt to destabilize France and to prevent France from having an alliance with Germany. Remember, the argument was, before, that the capital of anti-Semitism at that time was France, not Germany. And therefore French anti-Semitism was used against an Alsatian German of Jewish extraction, Dreyfus, in order to poison the well against German-French cooperation, and thus against the policies of a Leo XIII protégé, Gabriel Hanotaux, and against this Russian alliance.

So, in 1898, over an incident at Fashoda, the French

government, in order to avoid war with Britain, capitulated to Kitchener at Fashoda, and went further, in toppling Hanotaux and his faction, and bringing to power in France a group called the *revanchistes*, that is, the tradition of the British catamite Louis Napoleon III. This sodomite-catamite relationship between London and Paris, became known as an institution, the Entente Cordiale. The effort was then made to draw Russia into an alliance with the Entente Cordiale against Germany, in order to engage all Europe and Eurasia in a war which would prevent Eurasia from ever again being united in economic development projects which would become a threat to London's imperial global interests.

How the war was organized

The war was organized by the following steps. First of all, the assassination of McKinley, which removed from Germany, Russia, and Japan the friendship of the United States, and gave Britain the logistical basis for undertaking a war against Germany. The second stage of events was the Russo-Japanese War, and the Russian Revolution of 1905-07, which were organized from London, through British assets, including a fool called the Grand Duke Nikolai Mikhailovich, who was a stooge of British interests. He was a fool who was manipulated by family connections.

This was the end of Witte; and, although industrial development occurred along lines in part outlined by Witte later on, until later events, Russia never recovered from the effects of the 1905 Revolution.

At the same time, the British acted through Salonika, where they had an international B'nai B'rith Lodge, which was nothing but an outpost of British intelligence in Salonika. This Salonika freemasonic lodge called International B'nai B'rith created a government in a revolution, a government which was called the "Young Turk" government.

This is the Young Turk government of a B'nai B'rith Lodge which organized the Kurds to slaughter the Armenians in eastern Anatolia, promising them the land of the Armenians if they would slaughter them.

This Young Turk government, whose press officer was a fellow called Vladimir Jabotinsky, later the founder of the fascist right wing in Israel and of the Irgun and similar kinds of fascist organizations in Europe, was the trigger used to start the Bulgarian-Greek conflict over Macedonia, which was used to create the first Balkan war. In the same process, the British controlled completely Serbia.

Now, the British had inherited Serbia. Serbia had been originally created by the Byzantine Empire. Serbia had been taken over from the Byzantine Empire by Venice. The British had acquired control of Serbia from Venice, together with the French. There was a French faction, the House of Orleans, which was traditionally involved in this.

On the basis of this, they used in Russia the agents of Britain, called the Bakuninists and others, the Mazzini-linked people, to create a pan-Slavic movement, which was organized in part through Mt. Athos, the so-called Holy

Mountain in Greece.

So, in the name of pan-Slavism, Russia committed itself to support the Serbians against the other South Slavs, the Serbians being nothing at that point but British agents. This was used to engage Austro-Hungary in a conflict with Russia, and to involve Turkey through the Balkan wars also in a conflict with Russia, again.

This was used in order to create the situation in which Germany, which had a treaty of defense in case of an attack on Austro-Hungary, would be drawn into an attack on Russia. This led, thus, to the eve of World War I, where *Russia started World War I*. How?

By the general mobilization against Austro-Hungary and Germany, over the issue of the Balkan wars. Thus Russia had the honor of contributing the *casus belli* for World War I. But if you look more deeply at it, one would say that Britain, if it had the money (which it no longer does because it's bankrupt, it lives on "invisible earnings," a term we used to use to describe the income of criminals), would owe war reparations repayments to Germany for World War I. But that's a moot question, since they no longer have the money. But at least they ought to show some humility over the fact that the debt exists.

This crowd is proposing to do the same thing again today. It won't work the same way. But the fact that things have gone as far as this, illustrates the following.

You've come to a situation where, if France continues to follow the policies of François Mitterrand, *France will be destroyed*. France cannot again play the game of Entente Cordiale, as it's doing in its criminal conduct in the Balkans. The U.N. is virtually destroyed, its moral authority is *utterly* destroyed, as a result of the Balkans.

We saw in Budapest recently the destruction of another institution, the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe, which blew apart over the issue of the Balkans, and over this Triple Entente arrangement. And that's the kind of situation we're in.

The oligarchy wants to destroy human creativity

What we're in, as I've said otherwise, is the end-phase of a collapsing dynastic cycle. On the one hand, as I've indicated, in 1440, around the Council of Florence, was created the greatest revolution in culture which has occurred in all mankind. That revolution in culture has many roots. The root was first recorded in the book of Moses, in Genesis, in verses 25-30, which was rightly read in the only way those verses can be read, by Philo Judaeus, in his commentary on the story of creation by Moses.

That is, individual man is in the image of God by virtue of a very specific quality present in man and absent in all animals. This is the quality of intellect, by which man creates new states of nature, first in the mind of man, and then realizes these ideas as states of nature which never previously existed in nature, in nature.

Had mankind been a higher ape, as Prince Philip often claims he is (“don’t monkey around with the British monarchy”), then mankind’s population on this planet would never have exceeded several million individuals at any time. Had mankind been a creature of blood and instinct and race, that would have been the best of our species; nothing better would have been possible.

The fact that mankind was able to reach levels of several hundred million people, even with 95% of the population of all peoples living in oppression and misery under their rulers, attests to the beauty of the human soul, a beauty which is located *entirely* in this creative ability which Aristotle professed does not exist, which Immanuel Kant professed does not exist. All of Kant’s work is based on the denial of the humanity of the individual person. That’s the essence of his *Critique of Pure Reason*, the proof that synthetic judgment *a priori* is impossible. “Synthetic judgment *a priori*” is Kantian doubletalk for creative reason. You cannot be human, and be a Kantian; or a Cartesian; or, above all, a British empiricist; or an Aristotelian—that is not human.

What distinguishes the human being from every other species in this universe? As Moses reports, and this is now about 3,300 years ago at least—a good Egyptian fellow, powerful fellow—walks in to the pharaoh and throws snakes at him one day; next time he goes back there, blood. Frogs in the well. The guy’s a pretty powerful guy. You couldn’t do that today with George Bush, I’ll tell you that. Some pharaoh—it is creativity.

But that’s the distinction of man, is this creative power. What is this creativity? What is it that makes man unlike the animal? What is this secret of this power that is unleashed in a new form by the Renaissance, a power known to Plato but defined in this way by Moses?

We all, I think, who are educated, have had an education in Euclidean geometry. And we learned, in Euclidean geometry, that if we start with a set of axioms and postulates as interrelated, and if we say that proof consists of showing that a proposition is not inconsistent with any among these axioms and postulates, then we have what is sometimes called a hereditary set, a type of idea.

Now, all animals are sort of Euclidean, in that sense. The animal is born with an opinion like that of Adam Smith, not quite as bad as Adam Smith, but close to that. We are blind, we have no knowledge of the ultimate consequences of our own behavior, we are creatures of blood and instinct, we simply respond with blood and instinct as individuals to these impulses, empiricist impulses, to the evidence of our sense perceptions. That’s an animal; or it may be insulting to an animal to say that an animal is that bad, as bad as Adam Smith describes man, but that’s the problem.

But what has man done? Man, as exemplified by fundamental scientific discoveries of principle, changes the array of imputable axioms and postulates upon which our behavior is governed. We test these principles to determine that they are consistent with nature, or not inconsistent with nature.

We then employ these principles to change human behavior. As a result of these changes in human behavior, which take forms of revolutions in culture, revolutions in technology, we increase *mankind’s power over the universe*, as expressed per capita, as expressed per household, as expressed per square kilometer of land. We increase the quality of life; we increase the number of surviving infants who reach adulthood. On the basis of longevity’s increase, we increase the term in which young people are educated. We increase the term of education as such, almost to the limit of biological maturity, to about the age of 25. And thus we produce an individual who is more ennobled in potentials, than any human being, on the average, could have been in any former time. *Only the rarest, most exceptional geniuses in former time could have access to the degree of development which potentially in modern society we can provide to every individual.*

We become rich in discoveries, because discoveries are things made by individuals, and the more developed individuals we have in society, the faster the pace of discovery and progress, because we interact, just as great crash programs accelerate the rate of scientific progress through the collaboration of many scientists. So, as more people in society become involved in intellectual activities, creative intellectual activities, the general level of all society is enhanced. That’s the great revolution.

But on the other hand, the oligarchy came to recognize this, and said the key thing that must be done to defeat this revolution, is we must *destroy* creativity. And so the oligarchy laid down the line that you can know *nothing* except what your sense perceptions teach you. That you can become the kind of *fool* who says, “I only know what I learn from experience.” That is the mark of the ignorant, illiterate fool, a man who “learns only from experience,” because animals learn from experience. That is man degrading himself to a parody of a mere beast.

The oligarchy said, “We don’t want you to take our peasants who are 80 or 90% of our population, and educate them above their station. We don’t want you to create the kinds of employment which change the kind of social structure upon which oligarchy rests.”

Think of the oligarchy as like the gods of Olympus in Aeschylus’ *Prometheus*. Here are these evil, immortal families who set themselves up as gods above mankind, and who played tricks on mankind, as the London tricksters manipulated the entire nation of Russia, the entire nation of France, the nations of the Balkans, manipulated the German monarchy, the Austro-Hungarian monarchy and so forth, in the first part of this century.

All these monarchies, these potencies, were nothing but *fools, manipulated fools*, in the hands of the gods of Olympus, who were fooling them and deceiving them and corrupting them all, as well as the people generally.

The people who write the history books, the history as taught in every country I know, the United States, Germany,

France, Britain, Italy, Russia, Ukraine; it's all *fraudulent!* What people think of as the truths, the verities of scholarly knowledge of history, are *fraud!* And these are the frauds by which people are manipulated, by belief in these.

There are people who even believe in free trade. There are people *foolish enough* to believe in the so-called reform which is now going on in Russia. There's no basis for believing such nonsense, it's a pure fraud. All they're doing is looting and ruining the country. And how can you say you can make the reform successful? It's like, how can you make the poisoning of people successful? By increasing the dosage!

So we've come to the point that the conflict between these two forces, the force of the Renaissance and the force of

The Democratic Party was not beaten in the last election, it threw the election. It clung to outmoded, discredited ideas and institutions. It divorced itself from the people, and pandered instead to the press, as the surrogate voice of public opinion. It did not knock on doors and try to educate the people. . . . It did not present ideas to the people, because in large part, they had nothing to give. They had no ideas.

oligarchism, have been locked in a life-and-death embrace. Because of the great physical power which western European Christian civilization gives to mankind, modern western European civilization has proven itself by far the most powerful, most superior culture ever devised by mankind.

But unfortunately, at the same time, this same powerful, great European culture has been corrupted from the top by takeover by these oligarchical forces. As a result, the great power we have created, given birth in 1440 at the Council of Florence; this great culture has been used for a corrupted purpose: to bring about those conditions called colonialism, the conditions which are the conditions of the 20th century, *which has been one Hell packed on top of another*, including the two great wars in Europe, and *an impending global conflict at the end of this century, which is worse than any war Europe has experienced in the past century.*

Missed opportunities

We are now in 1994, one hundred years approximately after the high point of negotiations between Witte and Hanotaux. In that time, 100 years ago, humanity stood at the

verge of a great Eurasian economic development centered on railroad building, which would have liberated mankind from *all* the evils which had most inflicted it, including the British Empire. Because people were fools; because the French people were foolish enough to allow the traditions of that French-British catamite Napoleon III to dominate in France, and to create that filthy embrace between London and Paris called the Entente Cordiale; and because people in Russia were fools; because people in Austro-Hungary were fools; because the Ottomans were fools, because the Greeks were fools, because the Serbs were fools; because the German Kaiser was a fool; and the circles around him were largely fools, including young Graf von Moltke, they were *manipulated* into destroying the greatest opportunity which mankind had had up until that time.

And then, shortly after that lesson was learned, there was the new regime in 1932 which came to power in Germany, the regime of Kurt von Schleicher. Not a perfect regime, but one which had learned the lessons of the previous experience, whose natural tendency was to reach out to Russia, even under the Soviet system, and to attempt to change the configuration of forces to begin the economic development afresh of Germany.

So the British, using a Social Democratic figure, toppled the von Schleicher government; and the British, supported by a British agent, an agent of the British monarchy called Harriman in New York City, forced Adolf Hitler on the German people; and, by forcing Hitler to succeed von Schleicher, *ensured* the outbreak of World War II.

What this demonstrates, is not so much the criminality of the crowd in London who, after all, were only acting according to their nature, like an epidemic disease, like bubonic plague. Don't blame bubonic plague for bad motives, control it! We have the means to control bubonic plague. If we fail to control it, then it is *our* folly, not London's, which we have to blame and correct.

We have been duped repeatedly for over 100 years since the Witte-Hanotaux negotiations, into throwing away our birthright of progress. In November-December 1989, the doors were once again opened to launch Eurasian development. There were forces in eastern Europe, forces in Russia, forces in Ukraine, forces in China, which, among others, as well as the eagerly awaiting forces in Africa, who would have cooperated in that great venture, even more enthusiastically perhaps than in 1894.

But we allowed a member of the Conservative Revolution, a silly fascist ninny by the name of Margaret Thatcher, to tweak the beak of a fool, a fascist fool called George Bush, and, in place of the kinds of policies we proposed, or Alfred Herrhausen of Deutsche Bank proposed, we allow these fools, these fascist fools, to govern world policy, to impose upon Germany itself the looting of eastern Germany, which weakens all Germany presently; to reduce the level of production and consumption in eastern Europe to about 30% or less of 1989 communist levels; to unleash Serbian fascists in

bloody carnage beginning in 1991, against their brothers and sisters in the Balkans; and to insist that we must support those bloody fascists in doing this bloody business, all over again.

Our task: to change public opinion

We have been the fools, and we must correct it. We must realize that for physical reasons, we have come to the point that it is no longer possible, particularly after the events of the past 30 years under the counterculture, for the world to continue to live under the kind of system which has dominated the 20th century. We have come to the end of a dynasty. The threats of the termination of the British House of Windsor and other instabilities in various parts of the world, indicate that the institutions which we have been forced to adulate over these recent decades are *all finished*. They are *doomed*. And we are like people who have a choice of a ride on the "unsinkable *Titanic*"; and many of us, even after the vessel begins to sink, cling to it, or fight for a better stateroom, to seize that which had been vacated by a more prudent person just a few moments before.

And there are those who want to go down with the *Titanic*, to cling to dead, moribund institutions when their time has more than passed, and to take all civilizations down with us, down to the bottom of the Atlantic, rather than getting off the ship and getting onto a new one.

As you shall see tomorrow in particular [see speeches elsewhere in this issue], there are projects afoot which are feasible, which can be brought to realization, which, if brought to realization, would mean a revival of the dream of civilization as envisaged modestly by Hanotaux and Witte 100 years ago, which will liberate the greatest achievement of all human history, the founding of modern western European Christian civilization, in the Council of Florence, where the ideas of Moses spread by the Christian Apostles, were brought to all humanity as a matter of policy and statecraft. To free that which is good from the grip of that which is evil and dead, oligarchism, and to launch a new society which realizes the same aspiration which the best people in the United States and their supporters, had in 1776 and in 1789.

That is our opportunity, that is our choice. During the next two years, if they do not succeed in killing this President of the United States as they killed Kennedy and McKinley and Garfield and Lincoln before, as a way of stopping good things from happening, then we shall be living with whatever the Clinton administration becomes during these next two years, these next two difficult years.

Our job is to realize these facts, as I've simply indicated a relevant assortment of them to you today; to act upon that, and to recognize that our function is not to find a better way of *appealing* to public opinion, but rather to *changing* it.

Do not try to find better ways of propitiating popular opinion. Do not, above all, try to propitiate the historians, who are the greatest liars of modern history. Do not try to propitiate the economists, who are the most evil fools of modern history. Do not propitiate the professors of those

pseudo-sciences founded by the Enlightenment, such as so-called "political science," "sociology," "psychology," "anthropology," or any of the other pseudo-sciences which have become most fashionable in our universities today.

Do not propitiate Locke. Do not propitiate the sentimentality of free trade. When you meet a man who's espousing free trade, you're listening to a fool babble, a credulous fool.

So our job is to *change* opinion, not to adapt to public opinion, not to win the respect of public opinion, but to *demolish* public opinion in the minds of those it presently occupies. How?

As the events in "Lemon County" have demonstrated, as the threat of fascism in the United States demonstrates.

Remember, the Democratic Party was not beaten in the last election, it threw the election. It threw the election *because it clung to outmoded, discredited ideas and institutions*. It divorced itself from the people, and pandered instead to the press, as the surrogate voice of public opinion. It did not knock on doors and try to educate the people. It did not organize the people, it tried to organize the voices of public opinion and the press. It did not present ideas to the people, because in large part they had nothing to give. They had no ideas. They had only the idea of succeeding the way things have been working recently. They *threw* the election. They lost it. We *won* the election. We *beat* Oliver North. We organized his downfall. And that was a victory that suddenly had a thousand mothers. Whereas, everything else in the United States was generally a defeat.

But now, what do these monsters they put in power, wish? And all Republicans are not monsters. You're going to see a nice fight inside the Republican Party, and the Democratic Party.

They have now exposed themselves. Everything which people had believed was powerful and successful during the recent years, recent decades, during the course of this century; all of it is failing, visibly failing. And people will turn to new ideas.

Let me say, finally, this. Let me say, first of all, once again, mankind is not a creature of race, blood, and instinct. Mankind is in the image of God, such that every individual has potentially the creative power which has enabled mankind to come from a species of a few million potential, to a potential of 25 billion today, with the demography we can achieve.

This has been done through what Plato called ideas. Mankind is a creature of ideas. Mankind is a creature of the struggle between bad ideas and good ideas. We are creatures of ideas, not of blood, not of race. If we realize that—and to go out and realize it, you must remove the bad ideas from people's minds at the time that those ideas are being discredited in practice—and if you supply these people with the ideas which they *need* if they are to survive, that is the essential struggle.

And there's no time better to talk to somebody, than when they're in grave doubts about the way they've been leading their life. Shall we say, that modern European civilization has come into what is called fashionably today, a "mid-life crisis"?