

JANUARY 14 SYMPOSIUM

The Beastman: Fascism, Synarchy, and the Threat Today

by Cliff Kiracofe

This is the edited transcript of the remarks of Dr. Kiracofe on January 14, in the U.S. holiday weekend honoring Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., to the Schiller Institute's online international symposium titled, "Resurrect the True Mission of JFK and Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.: Stop NATO's World War, Dismantle the 'International Assassination Bureau'." He is an author, an educator, a professor, a former senior staff member of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, and an expert on the international terror networks deployed for assassinations. Following the transcript, we include some of Mr. Kiracofe's remarks during the question and answer segments, in dialogue with Schiller Institute President Helga Zepp-LaRouche, and Ray McGovern, former CIA analyst, whistleblower, and founder of Veteran Intelligence Professionals for Sanity (VIPS). The full four-hour symposium is available [here](#).

It's great to be with you, and thank you to our viewers for watching. Today, I'll have some brief remarks, less than ten minutes I hope, that focus on globalists and world politics: the new fascism that we're confronting today around the world.

Who are we talking about, as the globalists? Principally, we're talking about high finance, bankers, and big



Schiller Institute

Clifford Kiracofe

business. These transnational elites form a transnational oligarchy, and this trans-Atlantic oligarchy is a major part of that structure. Next week, the globalists are meeting in Davos, Switzerland, for the World Economic Forum (WEF), and you can follow it a little bit perhaps in the local press, or on the internet. This is a consensus-building mechanism for the global elites. There will be high-level American officials participating, as well as other

American representatives.

These consensus-building mechanisms, like the WEF, build consensus for policy—internal policy, domestic policy, as well as foreign policy and international policy, military policy. So, this is policy-oriented. There are other such mechanisms—the



WEF/Boris Baldinger

World Economic Forum Annual Meeting, Davos-Klosters, Switzerland, Jan. 20, 2023.

Bilderberg Group, the Trilateral Commission, Le Cercle Pinay, and a number of other organizations that coordinate and build consensus for policy among these global elites.

I'd like to talk briefly and introduce a little bit of historical context. Helga got us through the 1970s and '80s really well, and '90s. I'd like to go back to the 19th century and European intellectual currents that actually form the basis for fascism in the 20th century. Some of these ultra-conservative intellectual currents included Joseph de Maistre, [Louis] de Bonald, Friedrich Nietzsche, etc. Napoleon himself constructed a police state very carefully. So, the background for 20th century fascism we can see beginning in the 19th century, which we need to bear in mind. Back then, in this era of the late 19th century into the 1920s and '30s fascism, there was a shadowy group of high-level, high-finance and business men who formed clubs, and behind this is an ideology called "synarchy," as they called it. That's the opposite, in their view, of anarchy; they didn't want anarchy or communism, or any other form that they couldn't politically control, so they developed intellectual ideas, concepts, and techniques for imposing synarchy, that is to say, a controlled society. Orwell, of course, talked about that in his 1984 book. This idea of a controlled society—just what the folks at Davos will be talking about next week.

The development of the synarchy movement was a secretive movement in Europe, and it formed the basis of various fascist formations in Europe in the 1930s. France was a key actor in the synarchy movement; various French elites—banking elites, business elites, etc., were involved in this sort of shadowy elite policy making. They also had links to Nazi Germany, and they



Joseph de Maistre (1753–1821)
François le Villain



Harvard University Yearbook, 1946
William L. Langer (1896–1977)

had further links to the United Kingdom, particularly the Fabian Society in England, another shadowy kind of group.

So, what we see then developing in the 1920s, the 1930s, are intellectual trends supporting fascist politics. And of course, in World War II we fought to oppose that and end it. But after World War II, these networks re-established themselves, so World War II really didn't eliminate these synarchist, Nazi, and other sorts of networks. They just sort of reorganized and repackaged themselves.

I'm just going to take a couple of minutes and illustrate this. I'm an historian and political scientist, so I like my

books. I'm going to refer to a book written by a Harvard professor, published in 1947—just a couple of years after the end of World War II. It's by Professor William Langer [*Our Vichy Gamble*]. He was a famous professor

during his day at Harvard and nationally; he served in World War II in the OSS, the intelligence organization back in that day, and he later advised our intelligence community after World War II. He states about his book that its publication has been authorized by the Department of State, the War Department, and by the director of the former Office of Strategic Studies—OSS, the intelligence service we had at that time. I'm going to turn to pages 167-8, and I'm going to read what he wrote in 1947 about these fascist elites that we had just defeated in World War II. He's talking about the policy of collaboration of a famous

Frenchman of the time. He said, "His policy of collaboration with Germany could count on more than enough eager supporters among French industrial and banking interests—in short, among those who even before the war had turned to Nazi Germany and had

looked to Hitler as the savior of Europe from communism.... These people were as good fascists as any in Europe. They dreaded the Popular Front like the plague and were convinced that they could prosper even under Hitler's iron rod. Many of them had long had extensive and intimate business relations with German interests and were still dreaming"—wait for it—"of a new system of 'synarchy,' which meant"—according to Professor Langer—"government of Europe on fascist principles by an international brotherhood of financiers and industrialists." He said, "Many important banking groups must be included in this category," and he named a number of French banking groups, and pointed to a particular one—the Banque Worms—headed by a banker named Hippolyte Worms, but also other famous banks in France. I would point out that the Banque Worms was linked to the British through the Anglo-Dutch Shell interests, but that's another story.

Our own ambassador to London, Ambassador Biddle, himself said in early 1942, "This group of synarchists should be regarded not as Frenchmen, any more than their corresponding members in Germany should be regarded as Germans. For interests of both groups are so intermingled as to be indistinguishable. Their whole interest is focused upon furtherance of their industrial and financial stakes."

So, next week, as you read the newspapers and check the internet for news about the World Economic Forum—you can google it—and the literally hundreds if not several thousand people who are meeting in Davos, Switzerland next week, among that group are going to be the inner circles, which we could call the synarchists or the globalists, laying out policies that are to come.

So, with that, I'll conclude my remarks, and just emphasize that Professor Langer was not imagining things. He was a leading figure in U.S. intelligence. For those in the French



Hippolyte Worms (1899–1962)

audience who are watching, I'll hold up my little book, *Synarchie* by Geoffroy de Charnay—which is a pen name. This little book was written in 1945, exposing these networks of businessmen and bankers. I would point out finally, that one of the leading vectors of this synarchist ideology in the United States in New York City among the bankers, was particularly the Lazard Frères Bank in France. So, what we see again is the networking of businessmen and high finance, and creating policies for the politicians under their authority or influence.

Thanks for listening. Thank

you, Harley.

Segments from the Q and A sessions

Question: From the description of synarchy, it sounds very much like General Eisenhower's description of the military-industrial complex. Would you agree?

Kiracofe: Well, sure. Eisenhower, let's remember, was the Supreme Allied Commander in Europe, fighting the Nazi military-industrial complex. And if you



U.S. Army Europe

Dwight Eisenhower as a Major General, 1942.

look at Eisenhower’s military intelligence, one of his key officers, I believe he was a colonel, he thoroughly understood the nature of the German war machine and military-industrial complex, which was banking and industrialists backing up the military machine.

So in response to the question, yes, Eisenhower thoroughly understood, from his own background. As a matter of fact, he was involved, very early, even after World War I in the 1920s and 1930s under MacArthur, founding what was then called the Industrial College of the Armed Forces. That had an analytical dimension to analyze orders of battle, and industrial growth, etc., of potential enemies like Germany. So, yes.

And the synarchy; as I pointed out, Professor Langer’s book is called *Our Vichy Gamble*. Langer was advising the OSS in World War II and then the CIA and intelligence community after World War II. Langer specialized in modern European history, wrote several very fascinating books, and what he’s revealing here about this synarchy network is quite interesting. Because what’s happened is, while we were fighting in World War II against these people, post-World War II they penetrated the United States! Not only the United States business community, through Lazard and other networks in New York—not only penetrated the United States business community, but penetrated the United States government. So it’s a counterintelligence problem that we face today.

As we look around at various banking and business interests in the United States, or various high-level officials in our government, who are they really working for? Are they working for some foreign, transnational oligarchy? Or are they working for the American people? A point which Garland Nixon brought out so well: Who are some of these people working for?

Question: This question, I would like to direct to Helga and to Cliff. Since both of you are on the Ukrainian kill list, what is the connection between the Center To Combat Disinformation (CCD)—which essentially is a NATO/Ukrainian kill list—and the assassination of Kennedy? Helga?

Zepp-LaRouche: The aim of it, I think. Also John Perkins, in his book, *Confessions of an Economic Hit Man*, describes it, and he says “confessed,” because he said he was part of this apparatus: It’s a way to control the system. And he describes how an emissary of this banking order, or however you want to call it,— they first send people to Third World leaders and tell them,

“You’d better cooperate. Here is a bribe.” And if the leaders don’t take the bribe, then they’re being assassinated, or there’s a threat of assassination. If their security is too good to do that, then the final level is to actually conduct war against them.

Now, this system is really there, and anybody who’s knowledgeable about politics knows that there is an aura of terror. And the idea is that if you assassinate a couple of people, then maybe the others will be afraid and behave. So I think that when Kennedy basically dared to say the things he was saying, about international cooperation in space, about the Vietnam War, about the absolute optimism of believing in science and technology, being able to solve any problem the human race could face, all of these things are a violation of the order. Because it starts, really, with the image of man, and if you look at the new [Global Risks Report](#)—since Cliff was talking about Davos—I had the pleasure (or lack of pleasure, if you will) to read the *Global Risks Report* of Davos, which starts next week.

And it’s scare-mongering! The image of man is that man is completely negative. It’s an intrusion into nature, it’s creating problems. So if you dare to be an optimist and you dare to give people hope, and you dare to say that mankind is a creative species—what Kennedy did—then you’re already making yourself suspicious. Because the oligarchy works by keeping the population under control, based on fear, on irrationality, on lowering their instincts to be as low as possible, because the lower they are, the more manipulable they are. And I remember when I was in Poland in 1990, with the Paris-Berlin-Vienna Productive Triangle, people told me, “No, corruption is good! People who are corrupt are reliable.” So if you are not corrupt, you are already a danger to the system.

Anyway I think people have to recognize that this is an evil system, and that the so-called “rules-based order” is not so—well, nobody has ever seen these “rules,” nobody decides who makes these rules. But I think we have to return to a system of international law, the UN Charter, the Five Principles of Peaceful Coexistence, and the more people discuss these things, the better, and the more the chances are for humanity to get out of this.

Kiracofe: Sure, it’s a very interesting question. And I would basically say that that office in Ukraine is a psychological warfare office. Nowadays, it’s called “cognitive warfare,” and of course, it’s to misinform and disinform global opinion, about the situation in Ukraine.

Now: How does it relate to the Kennedy

assassination? I would point out that, just as Helga has just said, President Kennedy was trying to have better relations with Russia; better, you can say, major power relations, through diplomacy, rather than, as at present, military coercion.

The similarity, I think, is the following: The purpose, or the objective, of these international groups, the globalists, MICIMATT—MICIMATT doesn't put in the banking interests, and that takes you to a whole different place, which is the fundamental place—at any rate, the objective at the present time of the globalists, of these synarchy networks, the objective is to prevent the United States from having good relations with Russia and having good relations with China. That is to say, it's to prevent the cooperation of the three major global powers, on a basis of peaceful coexistence. And what you have is, you have this international oligarchy, we can call it the "overworld," who seek to maintain their power over sovereign states. For example, the United States is really an occupied state. It's not really the U.S. empire, it's the globalists' empire; it's the transnational oligarchy's empire. They're using us as a force, as a power. That's another whole discussion.

At any rate, this international oligarchy is over the policies of sovereign states, and this international oligarchy cooperates with the—we can call it the "overworld"—and this overworld cooperates with the international underworld, the world of the mafia, the world of criminal organizations, and that takes you to the Kennedy assassination and aspects of it.

So you have the overworld cooperating with the underworld. And what's in between, is the sovereign states are being squeezed, and the publics of the sovereign states are, like George Orwell warned in 1984, just becoming non-citizens.

Question: Do you see a connection between the assassination of former Prime Minister Abe in Japan, and the decision to remilitarize Japan to be used as a proxy against China? Why would the Japanese, who are the one country that's experienced nuclear war, be so interested in putting themselves in a position to be a target of a nuclear war in Asia?

McGovern: It's the military-industrial complex in Japan, for God's sake! They're making tons of money on this. These things are really insidious. It's not only a U.S. problem. It's a problem wherever armaments are made and sold and bought and so forth. That's the

bottom line in my view.

Kiracofe: The way to explain it in my view is the rehabilitation of Germany and Japan right after World War II. This is part and parcel of the Cold War rehabilitation of the Nazi state and Japanese militarism. Now, whether the Japanese people are happy or not with Kishida's kind of fascistic attitude here, I guess is irrelevant to the military-industrial complex of Japan. I find it personally rather offensive to see us remilitarizing Japan when many of our families—including mine—suffered death at the hands of the Japanese military in World War II in the Pacific.

But I remember since the Bush administration it was [Richard] Armitage and those characters; there's a network in Washington, D.C., the Japan lobby people—Mike Green and a whole Japan lobby. They've been working for the last 20 years or so to rehabilitate Japan, and to aim it against China. That's the idea, you aim Japan against China, and Kishida and company have fallen for that. As Ray was suggesting, it's good money for their military-industrial complex. But what I've seen is that the Japanese people themselves are not for this remilitarization and new militarism of the current government there.



Executive Intelligence Review now offers automatic monthly billing for its intelligence package. Receive *EIR's* weekly magazine and its *Daily Alert* in your inbox for \$50/month, billed monthly. Cancel anytime. Subscribe today!

Details at:
<https://store.larouchepub.com/EIR-Daily-Alert-p/eirpk-0000-000-001-std.htm>