

World Debt and the World Social-Democracy

by Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.

April 8, 1987

*[Published in **Executive Intelligence Review**, Volume 14, Number 18, May 1, 1987. View [PDF of original](#) at the LaRouche Library.]*

Editor’s Note: *In the first part of this article (**EIR**, Vol. 14, No. 17, April 24, 1987), the author stated: “The current and past role of the Socialist International inside the government of the United States, and in the internal affairs of Central and South America, is a major contributing cause for the presently accelerating collapse of the international financial system. If we are to stop the spiral of collapse in agriculture, industrial employment, and incomes, inside the United States, our citizens must understand the wicked role of the social-democrats in U.S. domestic and foreign policy, and eliminate that dangerous factor from the shaping of our national policy.”*

LaRouche then outlined the urgent steps that must be taken to reverse the present economic depression. What follows is the second and final part of the article.

Economic Recovery As Such

The domestic and foreign measures just listed are the essential adjustments in monetary and related policies needed as preconditions for halting the financial collapse and beginning a general economic recovery. The needed economic measures begin with an urgent repeal of the Gramm-Rudman-Hollings legislation and repeal of the recently adopted, catastrophic tax bill.

The principal error of Gramm-Rudman-Hollings was that it addressed a symptom, rather than the cause of the problem. The expansion of the federal budget deficit under the Reagan administration, was a legacy of the Carter-Volcker measures inaugurated during October 1979, and of President Reagan’s adoption of this mistaken “Volcker” policy. The result of Volcker’s policy, in the context of a “post-industrial” orientation, was to collapse the real tax-revenue base more rapidly than government expenditures were being cut. At the point that further cuts in federal expenditures could have only a disastrous impact on the economy, and a catastrophic impact on national defense, Gramm-Rudman mandated cutting the budgets further. Thus, the collapse of the tax-revenue base was accelerated by Gramm-Rudman, so that Gramm-Rudman proved to be a cure worse than the disease.

What should have been done, was to address the cause of the deficit problem, the collapse of the tax-revenue base, a collapse caused, in turn, by the collapse of the economy. Unfortunately, the President and others were so zealous to maintain the reputation of a “Reagan economic recovery” which was nonexistent in fact, that the very mention of collapse of the economy was prohibited in those circles which should have been addressing this problem. So, the illusion of Gramm-Rudman was introduced to foster the conceit that a recovery was already in progress.

This paradoxical situation was promoted by a combination of both misreading published statistics, and some politically influenced cosmetic adjustments contained in the statistics reported as “official.” One had the compelling sense, that the President’s economic advisers were reading the charts while standing on their heads. The optimistic reports of the past four years have been what the presently depressed state of the economy now states so plainly, illusions manufactured and credulously adopted, in defense of a misguided, rather obsessive desire to believe that the President’s “economic agenda” was “working.”

The administration and Congress should have looked back to the success of the Kennedy investment tax-credit reform. Instead, a tax-reform was adopted which explicitly denounced, as well as merely rejected, the principles which had made the Kennedy tax-reform a great success. Tax incentives for investment in that which promotes general prosperity, is not a matter of coddling some “special interest.” Overall, the adopted tax-reform was even more of a national disaster than the unworkable Gramm-Rudman-Hollings policy.

The time has come and passed, that our nation could tolerate the substitution of special ideologies for common sense in the shaping of economic policies. By “common sense,” we should mean that a nation whose constitution commits government to promote the general welfare for present generations and posterity alike, can not regard as hallmarks of prosperity such conditions as we see in most of our major cities, in the looting of our farmers, the collapse of our industrial potential, the collapse into rot of our basic economic infrastructure, a continuing collapse in the general levels of real buying-power of our households, and a savage oppression of our senior citizens. To take a low-paid service job, to replace a skilled operative’s position lost, is not maintenance of employment-levels. To import cheaper foreign products, just because they are cheaper than domestic products, is not consistent with elementary notions of national security.

For 20 years, our drift in economic and monetary policy has been a catastrophic error. The ideologues have insisted that an orgy of “free trade,” if continued long enough, would be the only way to true prosperity. Our Founding Fathers were of the directly opposite persuasion, and rightly so. If we chose to ignore the writings of Hamilton, Carey, and others, today’s

reality should teach us what we should have known from history. “Free trade” has brought us to ruin, yet the ideologues say that our current economic policy will bring prosperity, because it is consistent with ideologues’ dogmas of “free trade.”

We were told that Hong Kong was a model of prosperity, and, surely, we have given more and more of our citizens a taste of the conditions of life of the coolies of Hong Kong. Perhaps our citizens do not wish to be Hong Kong coolies; they seemed to have delivered such a message to President Reagan during the November 1986 congressional elections, although until now he seems not to have received the communication.

The first measure of economic policy must be an immediate revision of the tax code, to provide a substantial margin of advantage to those savers and lenders who promote employment of operatives in energy-intensive, capital-intensive modes of use of advanced productive technologies. Every job so created increases the tax-revenue base, lowers unemployment, raises average incomes of households, and increases national productivity. Those whose investments best serve the national interest lessen our tax-burdens, and should be encouraged accordingly.

An investment tax-credit policy, which shifts a significant margin of tax-burden from incomes invested in priority categories to those which compete with scientific and productive investments, has always proven successful, as it did during the early 1960s. Moderate Democrats, as distinct from the more radical, social-democratic currents, should insist that this be Democratic and national policy for promoting recovery.

The leading problem in our national economy today, is a lack of physical productivity, a deficit in per-capita physical output. This problem has two chief causes. First, too small a ration of our labor-force is employed in production of physical goods, as opposed to too high a ration employed in administration, sales occupations, and low-skilled services. Second, too low a level of average productivity among industrial operatives; this is caused chiefly by an accumulation of technological obsolescence and related wear-and-tear in our industries and basic economic infrastructure.

We should adopt the following employment objectives:

- 1) A rapid increase of employed operatives by about 5 million, with progressive increases of the employed-operatives percentage of the labor-force toward 50% of the total labor-force. This, by itself, will mean a very substantial and continuing increase in average per-capita productivity of the labor-force as a whole, and will bring our ability to produce physical output into conformity with our urgent needs.

- 2) A policy of increasing the percentage of the labor-force employed in various forms of technologically progressive research and development, from a reestablished base level of 5% to a medium-term target-level of 10%.
- 3) A policy of discouraging growth of employment in categories of administration, sales, and services, except in science, engineering, production management, education, and health.
- 4) A program for shifting marginally employable youth into large-scale employment-training programs in connection with development of urgently needed, larger-scale infrastructure building projects.

Our educational system is increasingly a disaster at all levels. We are producing larger and larger ratios of graduates who are either virtually unemployable, or trained for occupations which are variously marginal or useless, social services-oriented and kindred types. Our youth are being deprived of the developed capacity for rational thinking, and lack the developed capacity for efficient assimilation of the technologies associated with the productive workplaces of today and tomorrow. We must shift human resources from redundant administrative and service occupations, into education and health.

The growing AIDS-pandemic crisis points up the catastrophic collapse in our health-care system over the past dozen years. We must build up to the levels this pandemic implies, very rapidly, and plan to maintain a mobilizable reserve capacity of health-delivery and combined medical and biological research consistent with that. We can not pretend that adequate anti-AIDS measures are “cost-prohibitive” when many millions are faced with probable doom and great suffering because of this rapidly mutating infection. We can not say, “We can not afford it.” We must increase our national income to levels at which we can meet our moral and constitutional obligations to the general welfare.

Except among senior industrial managers and engineering professionals, the relationship between investment and increase of productivity is very little understood today. The subject is almost unknown among most professional economists, because the university economics curricula and professional journals have emphasized monetary theories, to the virtual exclusion of study of principles of physical economy. Therefore, I must “pull rank” and identify those rules of thumb, already more or less emphasized by Hamilton and others, which are generally unknown to most economics professionals today.

There are six conditions which must be satisfied, to ensure that investment policies in a national economy are those which promote sustainable rates of growth of average

productivity. Physicists and mathematical economists would label these six preconditions “constraints.”

- 1) The quantity and quality of the per-capita market-basket of combined physical goods, science and engineering services, education, and health-care must rise only less slowly than advances in both the levels of technology and productivity. Otherwise, growth of productivity can not be sustained in a general way. This was first pointed out in Leibniz’s first of many contributions to economic science, his 1672 *Society and Economy*, and is proven valid over the centuries since.
- 2) The quantity of usable energy, both per capita and per hectare, must increase in correspondence with advances in the levels of technology and productivity. Given two economies at the same level of technology, such as the U.S.A., Japan, and West Germany of the early 1970s, the energy required per capita shrinks in proportion to the increase of population-density, chiefly because of the factor of energy-consumption measured in energy per unit-area developed. The two factors, per-capita and per-hectare, can be measured together, as energy-density per per-capita unit of population-density, which gives approximately the correct estimate for economies of varying population-density. At the same level of technology, this per-capita value is approximately constant.
- 3) The level of temperature-equivalent of energy applied must increase secularly, in correspondence to advances in general levels of technology and productivity. The past 500 years of history of productivity in the iron and steel industry is the textbook illustration of this point. Carnot’s famous rule of thumb is another textbook illustration. Today, we say that the relative “energy-flux density” and “coherence” of applied energy-stocks must be increased. A standard quantum of some selected frequency of coherent electromagnetic radiation, is the best yardstick for use, from a physics standpoint.
- 4) The agricultural percentage of the total number of labor-force operatives must decrease, on condition that the food and fiber production per capita for the entire population is increased. This was stressed in Hamilton’s 1791 Report to the Congress, “On the Subject of Manufactures.”
- 5) The percentage of the number of urban operatives employed in production of producers’ goods, must increase, on condition that per-capita production of households’ goods increases for the population as a whole.
- 6) Technology, as Leibniz first defines the meaning of this term, must advance.

These are the constraints which must be satisfied by combined investment and employment patterns, to achieve sustainable growth of productivity in a technologically progressive, energy-intensive, capital-intensive mode. Investment in any other mode will lead to a fall in productivity. Investment in this mode which fails to satisfy these six constraints, will tend to be unsuccessful in producing the desired, optimal result. This assumes that the ratios of employment in sales, administration, and unskilled services do not expand excessively.

Government has three inalienable responsibilities in promoting such economic progress.

- 1) Government is responsible for basic economic infrastructure, either through direct government investments, or regulated public utilities. These include the social infrastructure of education and health-delivery institutions. They include, otherwise, fresh-water management, general transportation systems, generation and distribution of energy-stocks, general communications, and urban-industrial infrastructure.

Infrastructure is properly classed as part of the basic capital investment of a national economy, and is integral to other capital investment, functionally, since agriculture and industry can not develop and function unless infrastructure is developed and maintained at an adequate corresponding level of technology. Infrastructure is a very large ration of the total capital stock of a national economy. The rates of improvement of infrastructure determine, by a lag-factor of 12 to 18 months, the rates of growth or decline of productivity in the postwar U.S. economy.

- 2) Government must elaborate its monetary and tax policies, as well as expenditures, in ways which promote flows of money, credit, and debt into the relatively more desirable aspects of private investments.
- 3) Government must take leading responsibility for promoting scientific and technological progress in the economy. Traditionally, this role of government in the U.S. economy has been concentrated in three areas: a) education and research, b) development of improved infrastructure, and c) technological progress transmitted into general production through military research and procurement. The case of the Apollo space program provides an excellent example of a non-military program which amplifies the role traditionally assigned to military procurement. The SDI advanced-technologies program is an example of a model military program of this type. The Mars colonization project is the new Apollo program of the coming 50 years.

Respecting scientific and technological progress, government functions properly as a key participant in shaping a national consensus on long-range technological perspectives for the

economy as a whole. Industry and agriculture must be assured that government's combined monetary, taxation, educational, infrastructural, and technology programs and policies, over the span of approximately a coming generation, will continue to favor a certain direction in national technological progress. If that assurance is given in a credible way, private investment is able to commit itself to medium-term to longer-term risks in those directions.

During the initial period of recovery from the present economic catastrophe, the President of the United States must be qualified and disposed to devote a large portion of his time to working with scientists and entrepreneurs on medium- to long-range technology policies. If elected President, I intend to make this a major included function of the National Security Council's staff, and to recruit scientists and leading engineers to that section of the staff, to coordinate the Executive Branch's work with committees of representative entrepreneurs and research institutions. The consensus on national technological and related employment and educational goals developed through such channels, must be incorporated in the deliberations of the relevant committees of the Congress, as well as the Executive Branch as a whole.

It is clearly foreseeable, that the main science-driver of the U.S. economy over the coming 50 years should be the Mars colonization project. Apart from the massive astrophysics and related economic benefits which the completion of that project will bring to Earth, beginning 40 years from now, each step of the project's completion will mean sweeping advances of technology (and productivity) on Earth about every five years.

The reason for this economic "chemistry" of the Mars project, is that once we recognize that man can not safely travel in space at less than a large fraction of one Earth gravity, we are forced to recognize that every frontier of scientific progress being developed on Earth today, will be an integral part of the Mars project. This centers on four areas of technology now in various stages of development:

- 1) Very, very energetic controlled electromagnetic plasmas, both as new sources of power for general use, and as a revolution in metallurgy and production of vastly improved qualities of materials for all kinds of uses.

Using the standard deuterium/helium-3 fusion model, we have the means, now in development, to create engines with the power of trillions of watts, more than 1,000 times the largest power station on Earth today. This is the necessary technology for manned exploration as the necessary technology for colonies on Mars, and a giant leap in productivity on Earth. All limits to growth within our solar system, are smashed by the development of such engines.

- In the meantime, far short of the terawatt engines used for manned travel to Mars (in about two days' travel as opposed to a two-year round-trip with rocket technology), the same methods will begin to pay off on Earth during the 1990s, both as sources of power and as the basis for a revolution in metallurgy.
- 2) Very energetic, coherent electromagnetic radiation, such as high-powered lasers. We are already entering a phase of building new types of machine-tools using laser principles for cutting, surface-treating, and so forth. This is the machine-tool industry of the coming 40 to 50 years, beginning now.
 - 3) Optical biophysics. This is a branch of science actually begun by Leonardo da Vinci and his friends, nearly 500 years ago, revived and advanced by Louis Pasteur, and now being revived as the biological science of the present and future. Space exploration will depend upon it. Modern optical biophysics is an indispensable part of the biologist's battle to conquer AIDS today, and is the key to revolutions in medicine during the next decade.
 - 4) Two revolutions in design of computers and related control devices. Present designs of digital computers and of the architecture of such systems, are far short of the capabilities we need for many applications, including aspects of AIDS research today. We need a technology now being brought toward success: "parallel processing," to produce computer modules capable of performing a billion, or many more floating-point-arithmetic operations per second. For more advanced problems, including those arising in instrumentation of ultra-high-temperature production processes, we need a revolutionary new type of analog computer, an optical computer capable of solving nonlinear problems directly (explicitly). The first prototype of an optical-analog/digital hybrid computer is just a few years or more down the pike, if we force development in this direction.

Science can conceive no masterable problems during the immediate decades ahead, which do not lie within one or a combination of these four branches of technology. (Possibly, the development of the more advanced matter-antimatter technologies must wait until Mars-based astrophysics helps us break through some rather fundamental problems of physics-knowledge.) All four are required for the Mars colonization project.

My proposal is to use the Mars project as a way of developing these technologies, providing efficient channels for delivering each new discovery to industry rapidly, as each is developed. That ensures that our industries would always have available the most advanced technologies possible.

This means a carefully thought-out approach, by both the President and the Congress, to the purpose of ensuring that government expenditures on the Mars project promote the emergence of new branches of industry in all regions of the United States, such that private industries working with Mars-project technologies are able to transmit those technologies broadly throughout the private sector in each region.

Those Troublesome Social-Democrats

The Russians have always been opposed to rapid economic development of the developing sector, because Moscow sees such development as strengthening the economies of the United States and its friends. Obviously, the sooner we collapse, the happier the ghost of Nikita “we will bury you” Khrushchev will be; so, anything good for the United States is not pleasing to Moscow: The social-democrats, not all of whom exactly like the Russians, are a different kettle of fish.

Obviously, as I said earlier, I am emphasizing the so-called social-democratic “intellectuals,” the “bankers’ socialists,” and not necessarily the typical rank-and-filer of a European mass-based social-democratic party. I mean, in our own country, the “Project Democracy” crew: Jay Lovestone’s gang of cutthroats, the League for Industrial Democracy, the Anti-Defamation League cronies of Robert Vesco, and the AFL-CIO’s international department and its nest inside Charles Wick’s U.S. Information Agency, among others of that collection. In Western Europe, I mean the leadership of the SPD, the Friedrich Ebert Foundation, the left offshoots of the Adorno-Horkheimer-Marcuse Frankfurt School, the Brussels staff of the International Committee of Free Trade Unions, and the British Fabians.

The ideology of the British Fabians is fairly symptomatic of these so-called “social-democratic intellectuals” as a whole.

British socialism was a creation of Oxford University’s John Ruskin and his circles. The avowedly pro-feudalist Pre-Raphaelite Brotherhood was the center of this operation, the mother-cult for legions of socialists, spoon-benders, necromantics, back-to-nature freaks, and curious religions, of the English-speaking world, down to the present day. Ruskin spawned British socialism as “guild socialism,” signifying thus a return to the guild societies of the feudal period, as well as rejecting every bit of political, scientific, and artistic development in Europe since approximately 1420.

Out of the combined influence of Ruskin and the British East India Company’s John Stuart Mill, came that curious collection of theosophical mystics and “guild socialists” known as George Bernard Shaw’s Fabian Society. The general dedication of the Fabians, as professed socialists, was to mobilize the working class and lower middle class of Britain into a force

dedicated to destroying both industrial entrepreneurship and technological progress. That is the essence of social-democratic ideology generally today.

In the case of the mass-based social-democratic parties of Europe, the day-to-day image of the social-democratic leader may seem to deviate from Fabian kookishness. This ostensible difference reflects the fact, that having captured a trade-union constituency, the social-democratic leaders must adjust to what the traffic will bear among these adherents. So, the smaller the social-democratic organization, the higher the percentage of kooks, and the more nakedly Fabian it is. In the larger such organization, overt kookishness is the specialized craft of a handful of kept, academically oriented, more overtly leftist “intellectuals,” such as the Frankfurt School types around Marcuse, Horkheimer, and Adorno. “Intellectuals” who succeed in rising to positions within the trade-union or mainstream party apparatus, are essentially political thugs, whose thuggery distracts attention slightly from the kookishness beneath the surface. Hence, the social-democratic apparatus is an instrument of Fabian, or Fabian-like, feudalistic ideology. It is this combination of social-democratic academics and apparatus figures upon which we focus here.

This stratum of the social-democracy functions in the mode of an intelligence organization. A significant number of these were intelligence operatives or assets of government agencies (not necessarily their own country’s) in the past, and some key such, like Jay Lovestone and his old 1930s cronies of the International Rescue Committee vintage, were trained in Stalin’s secret-intelligence service over a number of years.

In the United States, social-democrats were given official respectability around the U.S. government about the time of Theodore Roosevelt’s presidency, notably in connection with the U.S. branch of the British Fabians’ Round Table organization, the National Civic Federation (predecessor to the New York Council on Foreign Relations). Since approximately the period of World War I, the leading strata of such U.S. social-democrats, like Walter Lippmann, functioned as “State Department socialists.”

I am not implying that financier circles associated with the National Civic Federation were infected with Fabianism through their opportunistic adoption of social-democratic strata. British Fabianism, for example, like Bertrand Russell himself, was a late-19th-century outgrowth of the same aspect of British liberalism which spawned the system of Hell Fire Clubs under Walpole.

The origin of this inside England, was the Venice-centered Lombard banking interest associated with the Venice-Genoa Levant Company, which took over the government of England over the period 1589–1603, and again, most emphatically, with the accession of William of Orange, and became deeply embedded in British society with the 1716 accession

of George of Hannover, following the 1714–16 defeat of the English Tory nationalists under Queen Anne. This Levant Company spun off, most notably, the East India companies of Britain, the Netherlands, and Denmark.

During the Napoleonic Wars, Britain's liberals established much closer relations to Venice, as expressed by the wildly kookish influence of the Actons, Bulwer-Lytton, John Ruskin, *et al.* during the 19th century.

As Anton Chaitkin has documented key details of this process, the roots of Fabianism were introduced to the United States during the 1830s and 1840s, through the establishment of the Harvard-based "Young America" offshoot of Mazzini's radical "Young Europe" insurgency at Concord and in South Carolina. Through the plottings of Swiss Jacobin insurrectionary and sometime U.S. Treasury Secretary Albert Gallatin, the Smithsonian Institution and the later-founded American Museum of Natural History on Central Park West in New York, became the center for spread of the Fabian kookery among wealthy Eastern Establishment families.

Social-democracy developed as a by-product of the effort to mobilize labor as a mass battering-ram for advancement of Fabian goals. So, it would be an error to suggest that social-democratic labor-based organizations "infected" rentier circles with socialism; the virus of "socialism" had already been spread to labor organizing from these wealthy strata.

The significance of the U.S. social-democrats' representation in the National Civic Federation, is rightly seen as consistent with the fascist movement already then spreading in Europe, in the form of "corporatism," a form of fascism directly, intentionally modeled on the feudal guild system, and rooted in the famous "socialist" decrees of the Eastern Roman Emperor Diocletian.

Since approximately 1974, the Socialist International's leadership has openly professed its commitment to fascist society. Especially after the events of 1936–38, the Hitler regime, and Mussolini's submitting to client-status under Hitler, the very word "corporatism" was so closely associated with Hitler's fascism, that social-democratic "intellectuals" discreetly kept the word tucked in their closets. Only since 1974, have social-democrats ventured to present corporatism openly with such qualifying observations as that it was "fascism with a human face," or "democratic fascism."

Today, the Socialist International is campaigning full tilt for the establishment of such a fascist transformation. The arguments they advance, to indicate that such a fascist transformation is a timely one, show their motives for seeking to overthrow those

developing-sector governments sharing the current views of such figures as Peru's President Alan Garcia and Brazil's President José Sarney.

The social-democrats argue, that as long as society was committed to economic growth, relations between capital and labor were defined in terms of equitable apportionment of the benefits of such growth. The difference now, they insist, is that we must accept, and adapt to the reality of negative growth in population and economy. The difference now, they insist, is that "co-determination" by capital and labor must have the purpose of negotiating "equitable" forms of sacrifices of income and freedoms. This is a copy of the "corporatism" of Austria's Dollfuss, Italy's Mussolini, and Germany's Hitler.

In German-speaking Western Europe, the social-democratic drive toward fascist transformation takes the current form, inevitably, of a negotiated convergence of Protestant- and Catholic-sponsored varieties of "corporatism," in which the nominally Catholic model for such fascist transformation is the Austrian "corporatist" model of Dollfuss *et al.* Not accidentally, the professedly Catholic fascists are the leading opponents of *Populorum Progressio* and of Joseph Cardinal Ratzinger's November 1985 address to the "economists." The two, Protestant and Catholic adversaries of Cardinal Ratzinger and Pope John Paul II, are united in a current effort to defend Adam Smith against the Vatican's denunciations of the immorality of "economic liberalism," by means of purporting to show that there is an acceptable "bio-ethics" substitute for morality in Smith's 1759–76 dogma of irrationalist hedonism as the rule for political and political-economic behavior and policy-shaping.

This social-democratic fascism is threatened in an obvious way by any prospect for return to equitable allotment of the benefits of significant rates of economic growth. Fascism breeds upon austerity, and "equitable sharing" of sacrifices of both incomes and freedoms. Thus, the August 1976 and March 1983 resolutions, on equitable access to means of economic growth, and the policies of Presidents García and Sarney, are a deadly threat to the policies of the social-democracy. So are the relevant declarations on morality in economy, in Paul VI's *Populorum Progressio*, Cardinal Ratzinger's November 1985 address, the recent document of *Justitia et Pax*, and the efforts of John Paul II.

The core of the social-democracy's "intellectuals" is composed of "Nordic racists," who view the bleak-skinned populations of Northern Europe, from Muscovy westward, as a superior race, which must not be compelled to share scarce resources of the planet with the darker-skinned populations, from Spain and Italy southward. This is the stated policy of a leading founder of the malthusian Club of Rome, Dr. Alexander King, as it was the frequently stated policy of Britain's socialist Earl Bertrand Russell since the early 1920s.

Since rejecting malthusian methods of genocide requires a generalized resumption of technological progress and economic growth, the Vatican's denunciations of malthusianism and of economic injustice against developing nations, drives the social-democratic fascists (and racialists) into a hate-filled frenzy.

The social-democratic intelligence organizations, operating behind a Venetian-style mask of "leftism" and liberalism, are the mass-based social battering-ram through which this hate-filled, racist frenzy against the Vatican, Sarney, García, *et al.* is deployed most efficiently. These social-democrats, already key factors in every bloody coup in South and Central America since 1949, continue to slip in as purported friends of mass-based political forces of developing nations, the better to set up preparations for new political assassinations and coups.

Lately, the most important new aspect to these social-democratic subversions is the extraordinary activation of the Interaction Council, a Helmut Schmidt-linked body explicitly committed to malthusian "population reduction" of darker-skinned populations, and to Dollfuss-Mussolini-style corporatist approaches, in the name of "democratic fascism," to a more rational sharing of sacrifices in incomes and freedoms.

For such ideological motives, social-democratic intelligence operations are directed hysterically against generalized technological progress, against resumption of high rates of average economic growth, and, most emphatically, against any large-scale sharing of technological progress and economic growth with developing nations. In aid of this, they seek to befuddle the minds of patriots of developing nations, and others, by reasserting the old Fabian lie, that "technology takes away jobs."

In short, modern fascism is "bankers' socialism," social-democratic fascism. This is the face of humanity's most influential enemy within Western civilization.