

‘Reading from Right to Left’: Part II

What Is a Left-Wing Liberal Fascist?

by Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.

[Published in *Executive Intelligence Review*, Volume 11, Number 17, May 1, 1984. View [PDF of original](#) at the LaRouche Library.]

As in politics, so in childish play, many different kinds of objects may be constructed from the same set of bricks, or the same collection of Erector set parts. Sometimes, it is possible to construct an image of some particular kind of object from either bricks or Erector set parts.

In such a case, the two objects, one constructed of bricks, the other of Erector set parts, which resemble one another more closely than the first resembles any other object made of bricks, or the second resembles any other made of Erector set parts. Yet, these appearances are deceiving; a topologist could show readily, that all objects constructed from bricks belong to one species, a species entirely different from all objects constructed from Erector set parts. The same “principle of topology” applies to such political objects as those called “right,” “liberal,” and “left.”

In this moment of global crisis, when few parties and policies are really what they might seem to be, it is important to provide decision-makers at all levels of responsibility with what might be described as a “political first-aid kit” for uncovering “consumer frauds” disguised as political parties, or as the candidates, issues, and policies of those parties. This week’s report is a follow-up to our earlier report that the generally accepted way of analyzing the “political spectrum,” “right, center, or left,” is, although a popular delusion, very much a delusion [*EIR*, April 3, 1984, “Right to Left: A Guide to Perplexed Voters”].

Since few readers have mastered topology, we illustrate the principle of political-intelligence evaluations by a simpler analogy. Everyone who has studied geometry will recall that a two-dimensional person living on a flat surface will experience life differently than the same person living on the surface of a sphere. This person’s experience would be slightly different living on the surface of an ellipsoid, or on a surface generated by either a parabola or hyperbola. In each case, a person setting out in what might appear to be the same direction, at the same pace, would arrive at a different ultimate destination, and would progress at a different rate, varying with the kind of surface on which he was moving.

It is a useful analogy to compare different philosophies with different kinds of geometrical surfaces. When two persons, of different philosophies, make what appear to be the same decisions for action, the ultimate outcomes of what merely appear to be similar decisions will be quite different from one another. Thus, although fascism, British 19th-century liberalism, and communism appear to be mutually exclusive political forms of belief, they tend to arrive at the same ultimate destination, because they are secretions of the same underlying philosophy (geometry).

Thus, an American “conservatism,” reflecting the philosophical standpoint from which the U.S. Constitution was composed, might be classed by a liberal as lying between “right” and “center,” but leads in practice to a result entirely different than that of either fascism, liberalism, or communism. Similarly, because traditional U.S. republicanism is “dirigist” in economic policy, liberals often compare this “dirigism” to a “command economy” of the communist type, as they do in cases of anti-communist developing-nation states with relatively large sectors of industry as state enterprises, as in the case of Brazil, for example. In such cases, liberals generally classify such products of traditionalist republican philosophy as either “communitistic” or “fascistic,” both of which judgments are more or less equally absurd.

The Hedonist Dogma

Consider first, the philosophical equivalence of fascist, liberal, and communist philosophies of practice. For sake of relative simplification, let us consider this common philosophy in economic-policy terms of reference.

The paradigm of “liberal economics” is the “Invisible Hand” of Adam Smith’s *Wealth of Nations*. As Smith himself showed, and as his successors, such as Jeremy Bentham and John Stuart Mill, concurred, this doctrine is derived directly from the moral philosophy of Smith’s mentor and patron, David Hume. Smith himself identified the governing principle of all “liberal economics” in his 1859 parody of Hume, *The Theory of Moral Sentiments*:

The administration of the great system of the universe ... the care of the universal happiness of all rational and sensible beings, is the business of God and not of man. To man is allotted a much humbler department, but one much more suitable to the weakness of his powers, and to the narrowness of his comprehension; the care of his own happiness, of that of his family, his friends, his country.... But though we are ... endowed with a very strong desire of those ends, it has been intrusted to the slow and uncertain determinations of our reason to find out the proper means of bringing them about. Nature has directed us to the greater part of these by original and immediate instincts. Hunger, thirst, the passion which unites the two sexes, the love of pleasure, and the dread of pain, prompt us to apply these means for their own

sakes, and without any consideration of their tendency to those beneficent ends which the great Director of nature intended to produce by them.

This dogma of irrationalistic hedonism, is the essence of Smith's "Invisible Hand," Jeremy Bentham's "hedonistic calculus," and the utilitarianism which John Stuart Mill, William Jevons, and Alfred Marshall constructed entirely, and explicitly on the basis of what Bentham called his "hedonistic calculus" or "felicific calculus." All modern monetarism, and mathematical econometrics, is based entirely on the same immoral dogma as Smith's "Invisible Hand."

In the case of fascism, such as Nazism, the same hedonistic doctrine takes the same racialist form prescribed by the nominalistic irrationalism of William of Ockham: the imposition of the irrational will of one race or class upon other races and classes. In traditional Marxism, liberalism's characteristic immorality appears as the doctrine of "class struggle" and "class dictatorial rule." In modern Soviet philosophy of practice, the two elements, racialism and class-dictatorship, are combined, placing the Soviet bureaucratic caste, as a variety of ruling oligarchy, as the ruler of a Russian race which is, in turn, conceived as becoming the ruling race throughout the world.

There are distinctions, of course. Karl Marx's variety of hedonism ("materialism") is rationalistic in form, like Bentham's "hedonistic calculus," and is morally superior to Smith's and Bentham's (or, Mill's) doctrine insofar as Marx demands that the actual material needs of the human population be the measurement of value in his version of Bentham's "hedonistic calculus." However, Marx's "rationalism" is essentially that of René Descartes and the followers of Descartes, Voltaire, and Rousseau among the 18th-century's "French (materialist) Enlightenment." Mixed with traditionalist Russian racialism, such as that of Fyodor Dostoevsky, the rationalist element within Marx has become subordinated to a variety of "Bolshevism" which is in all essential features indistinguishable from the "national Bolshevik" faction of the Nazi party itself, except that "Russian" is substituted for "Nordic" ("Anglo-Saxon"). Hence, the present-day alliance between the Nazi International and the Soviet KGB expresses the underlying philosophical consistency of the two currents, just as Henry A. Kissinger's role as a Soviet agent of influence reflects the convergence between Kissinger's adopted philosophy of feudalistic irrationalism (e.g., of Prince Metternich's Holy Alliance) and Soviet imperialism.

The implications of this commonly underlying philosophical convergence of fascism, liberalism, and communism, are made clear from the standpoint of contrast to Western European Judeo-Christian philosophy.

Judeo-Christian Culture

Whereas Smith insists on the “Invisible Hand,” the Bible demands precisely the opposite policy, as the famous 28th verse of Chapter I of the Book of Genesis stipulates this most emphatically. Mankind is enjoined against being indifferent to the “beneficent ends ... intended;” mankind is enjoined to “Be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth, and subdue it....” On this point, Smith and all liberalism reject fundamentally Judeo-Christian morality, as fascism and communism reject, and hate, Judeo-Christian culture in the same way as do Hume, Smith, Bentham, Malthus, Mill, Friedrich von Hayek, Milton Friedman, and Henry Kissinger.

Judeo-Christian culture is economically “dirigist.” The individual, and state, are enjoined to delimit their policies of practice, to practices which pre-calculably serve pre-specified ends.

It is fairly estimated, that in the most primitive condition of the human species—without technology, mankind living in a primitive sort of “hunting and gathering” culture, an average of 10 square kilometers of habitable territory is required to sustain an average individual: a global population level of an approximate maximum of 10 million persons. And a miserable collection of persons they would be. The life expectancy would be way below 20 years of age: a society of babbling, brutish, pre-adolescent children, in the main. It would be a society of small extended-family groupings, each grouping living more precariously than a troop of stronger, faster baboons.

Today, there exist an estimated 4.5 billion persons or more. If the Jane Fondas of the world would hie off to distant galaxies, as we would that all Barbarellas and kindred barbaric types should, the combination of existing and imminently developed technologies could sustain a global population of tens of billions of persons in greater comfort than would be imagined by the average American from the early 1970s.

Mankind has been able to satisfy the instruction of the 28th verse of Genesis I by means of scientific and technological progress. There was, first, the ocean-fishing revolution, out of which emerged the maritime-urban cultures which produced the agricultural revolution, and the riparian form of agricultural society. Early, out of the development of maritime-urban culture, before riparian agricultural cultures, there was the development of solar astronomical calendars which were provably more sound scientifically, and more accurate than any produced prior to the 16th century in Europe. Indeed, it is provably the case, that the original conceptions of science were obtained by aid of simple, sextant-like comparisons of solar and sidereal observations, which, compared with the progress of the equinoxes (the original measure of the solar year), and progression of shifting discrepancies between solar and sidereal observations, enabled very ancient peoples (such as the pre-Vedic astronomers)

to calculate with stunning accuracy very long astronomical calendar cycles, including cycles for progression of the geological and magnetic north poles. Then came the successions of advances in metallurgies, such as the Chalcolithic and iron revolutions, and mastery of animal musculature, of wind, and water, as a source of effort supplementary to the capacities of the human musculature. Beginning the work of Leonardo da Vinci, in founding several branches of modern science, including the principles of machine-design, there emerged modern science, and through the work of Christiaan Huygens and Gottfried Leibniz, the mastery of the principles of the heat-powered machine. Out of this work of Leibniz and others came the chemistry revolution launched during the 18th century. Out of the work of Benjamin Franklin came the roots of the “electricity revolution,” as well as Franklin’s crucial contributions to directing the development of the chemistry revolution. Out of the advances in mastery of thermodynamics and electrodynamics by France’s Ecole Polytechnique, and the work of Gauss, Riemann, and others in electrodynamics and functions of a complex variable, there came the electricity revolution, and also the foundations for practical mastery of the “fourth state of matter,” plasma physics.

A Republican Philosophy

Contrary to the heathens such as Hume, Smith, Bentham, Malthus, Mill, Bertrand Russell, and Milton Friedman, man is not merely an animal, not merely a creature of “immediate and original” hedonistic “instincts.” Man has proven our species’ ability to increase the potential level of human population, already, by approximately a factor of more than 1,000—“three orders of magnitude,” whereas no creature governed by “immediate and original instincts” could willfully increase its population-potential by even a tiny fraction of one order of magnitude. This superiority of mankind flows from a “divine potentiality” of each otherwise bestially irrationalistic and hedonistic newborn infant, the power of creative discovery through which mankind is enabled to discover with decreasing imperfection the lawful ordering of creation as a whole.

This unveils the deeper moral significance of technological progress, to the effect that a society which rejects governance by technological progress thereby loses its moral fitness to survive, and such a society must be destroyed by its own immoral folly unless it corrects this grave error.

A single individual who effects a significant scientific discovery, contributes to the advancement of all mankind, present and future generations, and is thus a person of universal value to all mankind. Similarly, those who develop the same kind of creative-mental powers, to the effect of assimilating, transmitting, and applying advances in scientific and related knowledge, or who merely nurture the development of such capacities in the child, are, similarly, individual persons who are of universal importance to all mankind.

By submitting to the instruction of the 28th verse of Genesis, we oblige ourselves to value and to develop the divine spark of human potentiality in each child and adult individual. Although the material benefits of such progress are obvious, and are indispensable, the essential purpose of this development is the production of a superior quality of individual personality throughout society as a whole.

Accordingly, every human life is sacred, and it is the obligation of the individual and society to foster the development of the creative-mental potentialities of every individual, to foster opportunities for fruitful employment of those potentialities, and to cherish and promote the good contributed by each and every individual. That is the Law of Equity under universal natural law, a law which may never be violated except to defend those institutions of society upon which the enforcement of the natural law depends. A society committed to scientific progress in a manner consistent with the Law of Equity, is a republic in the sense consistent with Solon of Athens, Plato, the Christian Apostles, St. Augustine, Nicholas of Cusa, and the fellow-conspirators of our own Benjamin Franklin. That is the proper usage of the term, “republican philosophy.”

A republic is obliged to direct its public policy, including the policies of practice of government, in a manner which serves and never violates intentionally such a “republican philosophy.” Just as the creation of the United States was prompted by specific rejection of the immoral economic doctrine of Adam Smith and those policies of practice of the British East India Company which Smith defended in his *Wealth of Nations*, so the mere adoption of the policies of Adam Smith by a republic, such as the United States, is a moral abomination contrary to the most essential intent of our Constitution. No man or woman can honestly take an oath to uphold our Constitution without rejecting implicitly the economic doctrines of Adam Smith *et al.*, and without rejecting implicitly every expression of 19th-century British liberalism in application to our domestic or foreign policies.

True, Presidents and others have baldly violated their oath of office on this account. On that account, we are now being destroyed as a nation, and imminently faced with the prospect of either general thermonuclear warfare, or the prospect that the abundant “Prime Minister Neville Chamberlains” of our Congress and Executive will capitulate to Soviet confrontation as Chamberlain kissed the foot of Adolf Hitler at Munich in 1938. Our toleration of liberalism is rapidly destroying us, and bringing us to the point of weakness that the Soviet empire, the new barbarian rulers, exerts dominion over this planet for an undetermined span of time to come. It could mean the extinction of civilization itself on this planet for generations, or even centuries, to come.

This brings us to the practical kernel of the question posed in this report.

The Transmission of Culture

The ordinary person in society today, including leading figures of government, suffers the delusion that he or she lives in a kind of Cartesian universe, in which individual decisions, and isolated facts, are the most essential feature of reality. Our people, generally, have no historical sense. Anyone who has studied history from the starting-point of reference of classical Greek culture, approximately 2,500 years ago, knows that the rise and collapse of nations, peoples, and empires, are determined by processes which unfold over successive generations.

The classic illustration of this point is provided by comparing Tacitus's account of Rome under the immediate successors of Augustus Caesar with St. Augustine's commentaries on the immorality of Roman law and culture from the earliest known period of the Roman Republic. Rome was, from the earliest known period, an immoral society echoing the same characteristic features as the sodomy-ridden slave-society of Lycurgus's Sparta. At the height of Rome's power in the world, during the period of Tacitus, Rome was already doomed to self-destruction, and there was no force within the Empire, excepting the forces of Neoplatonic Judeo-Christian resistance, by which the suicidal immorality of Rome might be repaired.

The crucial point is this. All the individual decisions made within a culture are, predominantly, individual decisions shaped by the culture which the individual has acquired through transmission from parents and society generally. In the very short period of time, such as even the span of a single generation, it may appear to be the case that it is the isolated individual decisions which are shaping the course of society, and little more than that. As we extend the span of our investigation over spans of a half century, a century, or longer, the power of the individual decisions made in any one generation appears to be tiny; it is the implicit philosophy permeating the culture shaping individual decisions which actually determines the rise and fall of nations, peoples and empires.

In the longer run, the decisive thing is not the differences in shapes constructed of either bricks or Erector set parts which determines the result; in the final analysis, it is the "topological" characteristics of either bricks or Erector set parts which determines whether a nation prospers or dies. It is the philosophy implicitly embedded in the culture shaping our decisions which finally determines whether our nation thrives or dies.

In other words, when we are confronted with such evidence as the accelerating collapse of the power of the United States today, we must understand that it is our culture, our philosophy, which is leading us to destruction. We must recognize also, that earlier we were the greatest nation on Earth, a great and powerful republic, standing in rank above all other

nations, and also formerly a beacon of hope and temple of liberty for mankind in general. What change in our culture, our philosophy, accounts for the transformation of the United States from a thriving to a dying nation? Essentially, the cause of our decay is the corrupting, corrosive influence of British liberalism, and more narrowly, the decisions made during the period 1955–1965, under considerable influence of Bertrand Russell and the Oppenheimer-Szilard faction of the *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists*. As a concomitant of the Anglo-American “liberal Establishment’s” acceptance of the “New Yalta” agreements negotiated between Bertrand Russell’s circles and Soviet Premier Nikita Khrushchev, by about 1966–1967, the prevailing policy of the U.S. government and leading financier “families” had become the decision to transform the United States into a national junkheap with a computer on top of the pile of national refuse, a “post-industrial society.” Pornography, “recreational drugs,” obscene theosophical cults fostered by institutions such as the Lucis Trust and Palo Alto, and anti-technology ferment, are destroying us as a nation.

The only kinds of decisions which have any meaning today, are decisions to rid our policy-making and daily practice of all toleration of those evil cultural corrosions which have destroyed us: pornography, “recreational drugs,” theosophical cults, and “environmentalism.” Not only must we act to rid ourselves of the moral degradation such “beliefs” represent; we must rid our governing institutions of the persons and factions which are proponents of such degrading beliefs.

The Folly of the Pragmatists

To this, many will doubtless respond: “Look, buster, I’m a practical man. I can’t be bothered with philosophy. These political factions exist; you’ve got to deal with them realistically. What you propose will never work.”

If such a critic is right, that what I propose will never work, then pack your bags and start running; what I have proposed is the only action by which our doomed nation might be saved from the alternatives of either Soviet imperial subjugation or, simply, some other hideous destruction. Time is running out. If the time is past, that the people of the United States will not act to return to the scientific culture of Western European Judeo-Christian republican principles, then that itself merely demonstrates that we have already passed the proverbial point of no return.

In any case, the action I propose is the only kind of action which might save this nation, and civilization as a whole. Anyone who is acting differently is occupied with a pathetic waste of time and efforts. For myself and my colleagues, we shall act as I have proposed through the very end; while the so-called “practical” men and women are continuing to behave in the same foolish, tragic way they have helped to destroy our republic, year by year, over the past

15 years or longer. At worst, my colleagues and I will at least go down honorably—meanwhile, there is more than a mere chance, I believe, that there is still time enough to win. At the worst, it is the only thing worth doing; those who disagree with us are behaving uselessly.

In our nation's capital, the obsessive commitment to the path of national obliteration assumes chiefly a very distinct, commonplace form: adherence to preestablished "policies, methods, procedures" and "established channels" of influence, the same policies, methods, procedures, and "established channels" which have been successfully used in the past to lead our nation to where we are today: at the brink of destruction. Science, truth, and elemental personal morality, are still admired among some circles in Washington, but as one admires a great painting from the past; whenever the mere word "politics," is mentioned, science, truth, and elemental personal morality are locked away in another room or the duration of the decision-making. We are governed, you see, by "practical men." Like men dressed down to the waist, ignorant that they are naked from the waist down, such "practical men" pride themselves on asserting that "philosophy" has nothing to do with their day-to-day decisions. "These were steadfastly "practical men," would be the appropriate words for our Soviet conquerors to engrave on the tombstone of our nation. We tolerated British liberalism because we were practical men, and therefore we lost the moral fitness to survive, and, in due course, were, of course, destroyed.

Such is the probably tragic fate of men and women who measure the spectrum of political life in terms of "right," "center," and "left."