

New 'universal fascist' movement is formally launched in Geneva

by Our Special Correspondent

The campaign by international financial circles and British-centered social engineers, to deconstruct the institutions of the sovereign nation-state and to create a new "universal fascist" movement, has taken on an ominous new dimension. On July 12-14, the first Communitarian summit, sponsored by the Washington, D.C.-based Communitarian Network, was held at the University of Geneva, in Geneva, Switzerland. The aim of the organizers of this event was to transform "communitarianism" from the somewhat amorphous ideology and social-political tendency that it had been in the earlier 1990s, into an organized, directed political movement, with tentacles all over the world.

Some 300 political leaders, sociologists, psychological profilers, and community activists gathered for two simultaneous extravaganzas, the summit as such, and the eighth annual meeting of the Society for the Advancement of Socio-Economics (SASE). The founder-guru of SASE and the Communitarian Network, and the leading light at the July 12-14 events, is George Washington University Prof. Amitai Etzioni.

Etzioni is a leading figure in the international social-psychological networks centered at the Tavistock Institute and Tavistock Clinic in London. He was among those Tavistock propagandists in the 1970s, who promoted what *they* called "fascism with a democratic face," or "fascism with a human face," i.e., to get people to accept vicious austerity, but without some of the messier features of Hitler's Nazi regime. (Such an ideology has been dubbed "universal fascism" by some of its promoters, such as former State Department official Michael Ledeen.) The magazine that led the charge in that campaign, *Challenge*, is one that Etzioni has written many articles for; it was prominently on display at the summit. In the 1970s, the LaRouche movement conducted a no-holds-barred offensive against this brainwashing propaganda. Already in the latter 1960s, LaRouche had warned that movements for "local community control" were the precursors of a new fascist movement.

The speakers at the summit included Etzioni; Dr. Kurt Biedenkopf, the minister-president of the German state of Saxony, and a leading figure in the ruling Christian Demo-

cratic Union; U.S. Undersecretary for Personnel and Readiness at the Pentagon Dr. Edwin Dorn; former U.S. State Department Policy Planning Staff member Francis Fukuyama, currently at the Rand Corp.; British Conservative parliamentarian David Willetts; and British Chief Rabbi Dr. Jonathon Sacks. German Social Democratic Party Deputy Chairman Rudolf Scharping was unable to attend, but submitted a paper, enthusiastically endorsing the aims and principles of the movement.

Over the weekend, hundreds of panels were held on themes ranging from "The Economic and Human Costs of Cutting Down on Public Welfare," "Fairness in the Crunch: Can Advanced European Welfare Societies Survive?" and "Social Networks and Sociological Interventions," to profiles of "community"-based movements in the United States, Mexico (Chiapas, Guerrero), Russia, Spain, Holland, and Israel. The Israeli kibbutz was featured at the summit, including at the Communitarian Network book-table, as a model of "communalism," for possible imitation in various parts of the world.

What is communitarianism?

Communitarianism has been carefully designed as an ideology to appeal to the growing number of disaffected people around the world, in the conditions of the latter 1990s, characterized by worsening fiscal and economic crises, the impotence of governments in dealing with problems, and the spread of cultural pessimism. When we say "carefully designed," we mean that quite literally: At the precise moment that Etzioni began to launch communitarianism as a movement inside the United States in 1990-91, he had just joined the editorial board of *Human Relations*, the journal of the Tavistock Institute!

In their literature and speeches, Etzioni et al. put forward a delphic argument, that the rampant individualism of the 1970s and 1980s, caused in significant part by Thatcherite-Reaganite economic policies, has led to a breakdown of the moral structure of societies, evidenced by the spread of drugs, crime, teen pregnancies, and the like. This process is particularly virulent in the United States, but is rapidly spreading in

Europe and elsewhere. A function of this individualism, is that there is an epidemic of people asserting "rights" of all kinds, without accepting "responsibilities." To reverse this, they say, means strengthening the institutions of family, school, and neighborhood. If not, "extremists," whether the "Christian Right" or "Islamic fundamentalists," will hijack the social-political agenda. What is needed, is a new "consensus," that can draw in "centrists" who agree on established "democratic values."

If that were all there were to it, communitarianism might seem to be relatively innocuous, a kind of "moral-ethical uplift" movement, with Etzioni being the philosophical variant of those travelling medicine men, who would go from town to town in the United States earlier in this century, promising miracle cures for all sorts of ailments.

But beyond the sales pitch, the dangers, and fascistic potential, become readily apparent. Communitarians are vehemently antagonistic to the institution of the sovereign nation-state, their primary reference-point being communities, whether they mean by this, the "global community," "local communities," or various "spiritual" or "intellectual" communities.

Under conditions of economic and financial collapse, there are fascist potentials in this, as locally defined communities are pitted against each other for survival. One Communitarian Network activist confided, in a private discussion, that she fears that communitarianism, as it is evolving in the United States, is becoming a movement of, and for, an increasingly anxiety-ridden upper-middle class, seeking to band together against the poorer elements of society. She reported that one of Etzioni's pet ideas, which he prefers not to broadcast from the rooftops, is that communities issue "identity cards," to check who is coming in and out. "This could become very dangerous," she fretted.

A leading social profiler in Britain, formerly stationed at the Tavistock Clinic in London, put it this way: "The growth of the communitarian movement reflects the growing helplessness, the turn to self-help groups, 'small is beautiful,' withdrawal into self, growing anxiety, narcissism. This is why a crude form of what I call 'popular Darwinism' is now so popular. Crudely speaking, survival of the fittest, directed against the other."

Sacrifice in the post-welfare-state era

Communitarianism's leading proponents promote it as the belief-structure appropriate to a "post-welfare-state" era, in which austerity will be the central policy thrust. The most shameless public expression of this viewpoint was put forward in Geneva by Saxony Minister-President Biedenkopf, who gave an outrageous portrayal of Germany as a country uniquely fit for communitarianism. Unlike France, it has had only a short history as a nation-state, he boasted, somehow sidestepping the noxious issue that, before it was

unified, the territory of the later Germany was divided into hundreds of petty principalities, ruled by feudal oligarchs. Because of this history, Biedenkopf proclaimed, the Germans had learned to favor "small units."

Coupled with this, is another reality, according to Biedenkopf. Over the past years, largely due to the rampant assertion of "individual desires," the welfare state had grown massively, in Germany and in other parts of Europe. Now, there is a "need to reform the welfare state," and "communitarianism derives a lot of its prospective value from the crisis of the welfare state. . . . The welfare state can no longer overcome its contradictions. . . . We are faced with choices. Communitarian thinking is very important. The welfare state has reached its limits. No one disagrees with this. . . . How do we cope?" That is a "very practical" matter, which depends on "returning responsibility to where it belongs, small units." He called for a "highly decentralized system of sharing responsibilities."

What Biedenkopf and other communitarians mean by "responsibilities" here becomes clear: When personal disaster strikes, such as a health breakdown, it is your own fault, you are "responsible" for dealing with the problem, and you should stop turning to "the state" for help.

The same message, in substance, was delivered by Etzioni in an article in the March-April 1993 edition of *Challenge*, written at the time when the Communitarian Network was being formed, entitled "Deficit Reductions in a Populist Age: How to Sell Shared Sacrifice." He insisted that the electorate would only tolerate "pain," if it were allowed to participate in decisions imposing austerity. He recommended a system, in which the public is "accorded time . . . without any government prodding," to discuss how cuts would be implemented, and under conditions in which the media is mobilized to discuss "*what* we should cut, rather than *whether* we should cut" (emphases in original). According to Etzioni, "without finding some way actively to involve the re-engaged public . . . significant deficit reduction is unlikely to muster the broad and strong civic support it requires. . . . Once one accepts that 'real' cuts must be made if the deficit reduction is to be achieved and the public trust is to be assured, there is a long list of devices that could help enforce the belt-tightening commitments. . . . Only if the public is truly involved, will it support the considerable belt-tightening the accumulating debt seems to require."

Against the 'totalitarian nation-state'

It is not simply *local* communities that communitarians refer to, but also to a global "community of communities." The communitarian belief-structure is, in essence, an updated, 1990s variant of the one that became popularized in the "New Age," "futurist," and United Nations/world-federalist movements of the 1970s: "Think globally, act locally."

The communitarians treat the nation-state with abhorrence. That the era of the nation-state has come to an end, is, for them, self-evident, and a favorable turn of events. Those who defend the nation-state are dismissed as either “statist nationalists,” or even “totalitarians.” In his speech, the vastly overrated Fukuyama, who never lets any facts get in the way of his thesis that “we have reached the End of History, liberal democracy has triumphed forever,” said that a proof that the days of “statist nationalism” and “centralized economies” (interchangeable concepts, for him) are over, is that “even building large dams” is no longer on the agenda. Obviously, neither the nation of China, nor its famous Three Gorges Dam project, exists for this former State Department hack-ademic.

The main paper circulated in Geneva on the subject of “Communitarian Economics,” authored by Norton Garfinkle of the Oxford Management firm, asserts that “communitarian philosophy holds a centrist position on the social order that mediates between totalitarianism and libertarianism. Totalitarianism argues that *the collectivity in the form of the nation-state* has superior needs and objectives, and that individuals only exist to serve those collective needs. . . . Communitarianism seeks to mediate the tension between these two forces of extreme autonomy and extreme centralized authority” (emphasis added). He redefined American history, as expressed in the Declaration of Independence and the U.S. Constitution, as a function of “these values which define the American Community.”

Consistent with this, communitarians abhor the idea that men, and societies, can act on the basis of intelligible, knowable, and scientifically ascertained truth. Intelligible truth is rejected, too, as totalitarian. Not accidentally, at a July 14 panel, the philosopher promoted as the earliest “communitarian,” was Aristotle, who is lauded for having undermined the “statist” perspective of Plato. For the communitarians, solutions to society’s problems are to be achieved through “consensus.” The managers of that “consensus” are sociologists, social engineers, psychologists—exactly what Tavistock’s founder Dr. John Rawling Rees described as “psychological shock troops.”

‘Global change organizations’

Etzioni and his Tavistock friends had already put together the ideological infrastructure for communitarianism before the 1990s. In November 1989, some months before he was to join the editorial board of *Human Relations*, Etzioni gave the keynote speech at a conference at Case Western Reserve University, on “The Organizational Dimension of Global Change.” This conference produced a series of policy papers, with related initiatives, that were published, in updated and redrafted form, as a special series in *Human Relations* in 1991. The general consensus at that gathering, was that the nation-state represented the last vestiges of the old, industrial paradigm; it must be removed as

an institutional form, and replaced with a new form of tribalism or communalism, that is universal and global in fashion. The new structures of governance would have to be “global,” but organized “communally,” with the key instrumentality being “global change organizations,” more commonly known as non-governmental organizations (NGOs). This was all shaped to fit the imperatives of the emerging “new British Empire” (see *EIR*, May 24, “The Sun Never Sets on the New British Empire”).

In his keynote, Etzioni spoke of a new global civilization being born. He called for the development of a new economic paradigm, which supersedes the simple post-industrialism of the 25 years up to then. A new belief-structure is required, to place priority on the emergence of the new order of “global change organizations.” Etzioni proposed that all social sciences now work together to create the new order. He proposed a new communality, a so-called “I and We” paradigm, which, he said, anchors the self-interested “I” with the broader “social collectivity” of the “We.” What is needed, he concluded, is the creation of a “new Kantian work ethic” of communality, replacing what he says is the “hedonistic utilitarianism” of the industrial paradigm, which still infects the post-industrial era.

Etzioni and others emphasize that communitarianism draws heavily on environmentalism, both in its search for a model of how political movements might be built, and for elements of its belief-structure: The earth, or Mother Earth, should be conceived as the source and inspiration for the ultimate “community.” Precisely this polemic was made in Geneva by University of Tübingen “theology of liberation” Prof. Jürgen Moltmann. In 1993, in his book *The Spirit of Community*, which is a kind of bible for many communitarians, Etzioni had written: “The communitarian movement . . . is an environment movement dedicated to the betterment of our moral, social, and political environment. . . . And Communitarians are dedicated to working with our fellow citizens, to bring about the changes in values, habits, and public policies that *will allow us to do for society what the environmental movement seeks to do for nature*, to safeguard and enhance our future” (emphasis added).

In his writings, Etzioni draws attention to the historical precedent of how the “environmental movement” was launched, with such “dramatic actions” as Rachel Carson’s publication of *Silent Spring*, or the writings and initiatives of Ralph Nader.

Who is Etzioni?

So, who, or what, is Amitai Etzioni? He was born in Germany, some 65 years ago. His German Jewish family emigrated to Palestine when the Nazis came to power. He fought in the Israeli War of Independence. In the 1950s, Etzioni emigrated to the United States. From 1958 to 1978, he taught sociology at Columbia University. From very early on, he

was a participant in confidential discussions of psychologists, sociologists, and related types on how to build a “post-industrial” society, based on a new cultural paradigm. Already in 1962, he was huddled with the likes of Kenneth Boulding, the latter, together with his wife Elise, being among the early mentors of U.S. Conservative Revolution leader Newt Gingrich. Several among those who are, today, on the endorsers’ list of a statement of communitarian principles, were, back then, key to engineering the paradigm shift. For example, one endorser is Robert Theobald, chief author of the 1964 “Triple Revolution” study.

Etzioni was at Columbia University during the 1968 student strikes there. He was among those Ford Foundation-centered circles who opposed attempts by the followers of Lyndon LaRouche, in the nascent SDS-Labor Committees, to bring students and workers into common cause, in support of policies promoting economic growth and reversing economic decline. Having worked to neutralize a positive turn among protesting students, he then became, in 1968-70, a member of the American Council on Education’s Advisory Committee for the National Study on Student Unrest.

Throughout the 1960s and ’70s, Etzioni was a member of a vast array of organizations, or editorial boards of publications, involved in promoting the post-industrial paradigm shift. A very partial list would include the American Sociological Association, the Research Committee on Sociotechnics of the International Sociological Association, the International Society for Research on Aggression, the International Society of Political Psychology, and the Committee on International Order.

He was also increasingly active in the liberal establishment institutions shaping U.S. domestic and foreign policy. In 1976-88, he was a member of the New York Council on Foreign Relations, the American branch of London’s Royal Institute of International Affairs. In the late 1970s, he was an official White House adviser to the Carter administration. At various points, he has been a consultant to government agencies or commissions, including the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, and the President’s Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence.

Points of access

These biographical data underscore what makes communitarianism a clear and present danger: Etzioni has access to highest-level circles in many countries, especially the United States, Britain, Germany, and Israel. This reality is reflected, but only partially, in the Geneva speakers’ list published above.

The highest density of institutional penetration is unquestionably in the United States. In the recent period, Etzioni has been able to meet with President Bill Clinton, likely Republican candidate Bob Dole, and potential “third party” candidate Richard Lamm—in the latter case, one week before Lamm

announced for the Presidency. Vice President Al Gore has publicly endorsed the principles of the movement. When still a senator, in November 1991, Gore and Sen. Daniel Patrick Moynihan (N.Y.) were the two Democratic senators attending a teach-in of “community activists,” the which event, claims Etzioni, was a turning-point in launching communitarianism as a movement in the United States.

In June of this year, the Communitarian Network held a meeting, on the subject of “Character Education,” in the White House, addressed by First Lady Hillary Clinton. The main point of penetration, is through the White House Domestic Policy Council. Until about six months ago, their principal contact on that body was William Galston, who is now a professor at the University of Maryland, and a member of the editorial board of the main communitarian journal, *The Responsive Community*. In the early 1990s, Etzioni co-authored at least two articles with Galston, one for the *National Civic Review*, and the other for *Challenge*. The latter, for the magazine’s November-December 1992 edition, was entitled “Communitarian Economics: How to Cut the Deficit and Put Americans Back to Work.”

The Communitarian Network is currently in negotiations with the U.S. Department of Justice, to host a joint conference, early in 1997, on “community crime prevention.” The Network is hoping to promote a pilot project it is engaged in on this theme, in York, Pennsylvania. The Network hopes to prove, that the “community approach to fighting crime” can save the state and federal government money, especially if, as one member put it, the “sociologists on scene, can mobilize the local community to fight crime.”

The Communitarian Network has also held at least one event together with the U.S. Department of Education, for which it received funding from that government agency. Senior Pentagon official Ed Dorn’s presence in Geneva, where he extolled the American military as an “integrative force” that strengthens “community” in the United States, is testimony to Etzioni’s reach into the DOD structure.

Also reflective of official U.S. backing, is the fact that an upcoming Etzioni visit to Israel, is being coordinated by the American Embassy in Israel.

In Germany, in addition to Biedenkopf, Etzioni has met Chancellor Helmut Kohl, on a visit to the country during which he was formally hosted by Green Party big shot Joschka Fischer. The party that has moved most publicly to endorse communitarianism, over the past days, has been the Social Democratic Party (SPD). In his written statement to the summit, SPD Deputy Chairman Scharping stated: “The communitarian movement is attracting growing public interest, and is becoming increasingly popular. . . . Communitarianism began as an intellectual, moral and emotional movement in the United States. It emerged from within a morally bankrupt society characterized by rampant and apparently uncontrollable egotism. . . . Communitarianism seeks to revitalize the

dynamics of community life.” Then, in a July 18 interview, on Germany’s second television channel, ZDF, SPD Chairman Oskar Lafontaine praised the “new political movement” that has been developing most rapidly “in the United States,” namely “communitarianism.”

British monarchy promotes communitarian football clubs

In Britain, Etzioni is in touch regularly with both Labour Party leader Tony Blair and Liberal Party leader Paddy Ashdown, and has significant contacts in the Conservative Party.

It is in Great Britain that the nature of the sponsorship for communitarianism becomes most apparent. This is not surprising, given that the movement, as we have said, usefully serves the purposes of the new British Empire. The main advocacy group for communitarianism in Britain is a London-based think-tank, Demos. Demos’s director, Geoff Mulgan, arranged Etzioni’s two meetings with Blair. Mulgan portrays Demos’s activities as aimed at “grassroots” movements. But the people who run Demos, are not exactly grass roots.

The group’s advisory council includes Helen Alexander, chief executive, Economist Intelligence Unit; John Ashworth, director, London School of Economics; Ian Hargreaves, editor of the Fabian Society’s *New Statesman and Society*; Anita Roddick, managing director of the Prince Philip/World Wide Fund for Nature-linked Body Shop PLC; Martin Taylor, chief executive, Barclays Bank; and several leading British trades unionists.

Demos’s self-described “core funding” is received from such multinational giants as British Gas, Shell International, National Westminster Bank, and British Petroleum, all closely linked to the political and financial empire of the British Crown. Demos projects have been sponsored by, among others, the Gulbenkian Foundation, which ultimately draws its resources from the Royal Dutch Shell billions; IBM; and Prudential.

And what is the perspective of this distinguished grouping of individuals and British imperial institutions, for building a communitarian movement in Britain itself? According to Mulgan, a coming edition of the Demos journal will feature a study about how to use “local football clubs” as potential “agents of communitarian change” in Great Britain! According to Mulgan, “While the thesis makes me a bit queasy, given the recent hooligan behavior, the fact is, local football clubs have often been agents of positive community change, and are often the strongest local community organizations.”

The behavior of those lunatic English “football fans,” rampaging against any German targets they could find in Britain, after England’s loss to Germany in the Euro ’96 soccer semifinals in late June, gives a taste, in communitarianism, of the potential for a full-fledged fascist movement to be unleashed.

Mongolia: Elections bring shock therapy and geopolitics

by Mary Burdman

The “democratic” opposition victory in the June 30 elections in Mongolia, bodes ill for that nation. Mongolia, which lies between China and the Russian Federation, just south of Lake Baikal, has only 2.3 million people in a territory equivalent to that of western Europe. The economy, already very poor (Mongolia owed the Soviet Union approximately \$15 billion in 1990), has suffered greatly since the election of “former” communist Punsalmaagin Ochirbat as President in June 1993. Ochirbat began using “shock therapy” reform methods and sent the economy into free fall. Inflation hit 325% in the recent period, although it has fallen to “only” 50% since. He imposed a privatization plan modelled on that of the Czech Republic, the eastern European darling of the free marketeers, and called for opening Mongolian enterprises to foreign investors, even to the point of selling them 100% control.

One-third of the population are still nomadic herders, subject to the extreme weather conditions (temperatures stay above freezing for the full 24 hours for only one month a year). Average wages are the equivalent of \$35 a month, with 22% of the population living below the Mongolian poverty line.

Making matters worse

The Social Democratic government elected in the upset on June 30, is in no way capable of dealing with this situation. Most of the members are young and have never been in government positions before; they were totally unprepared to win. The seats held by the communists in the 76-member Hural (parliament) fell from 70 to 23, while the democrats went up from 6 seats to 48. Their campaign was for even faster economic liberalization and political reform.

The Social Democrats’ agenda could eliminate tens of thousands of jobs, although unemployment is already 10%. Their “reform” program includes raising electricity and gasoline prices (something the communists refused to do), selling off state-run companies, and closing unprofitable ones. The new prime minister, M. Enkhasaikhan, in order to attract foreign investment, said that new investors “should be able to