

World Nuclear War When? McAuliffe's Deadly Delusions: Or, How Harry Truman Defeated Himself

by Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.

August 17, 2003

*[Published in **Executive Intelligence Review**, Volume 30, Number 33, August 29, 2003. View [PDF of original](#) at the LaRouche Library.]*

August 17, 2003 (EIRNS)—The following is the text of a Democratic campaign policy paper released today by the LaRouche in 2004 Presidential campaign committee.

On Today's Failed Candidates:

At this moment of history, a virtually bankrupt U.S. government is challenged by a deadly complex of economic and other crises which neither the Bush Administration nor the Democratic National Committee is willing, so far, to acknowledge. The pivotal feature of this situation, is the reality, that the world has reached the terminal phase of existence of the International Monetary Fund (IMF)'s 1972–2003 “floating exchange-rate” monetary-financial system. Official Bush Administration Snow-jobs aside, the economic collapse in progress now, is, as a matter of fact, neither a recession, nor a mere cyclical depression, but the terminal phase of a general breakdown-crisis of that financial-monetary system. It is the failure to face the present reality of that economic breakdown crisis, which, as during 1928–1933, generates the explosive potential for spreading of wars and terrorist attacks around the world.

As I emphasize in the following pages, Vice President Cheney and his company of neo-conservative rascals have been committed, for more than a decade, to the use of nuclear weapons for so-called “preventive wars,” against even minor-power targets. The impulse to begin using such weapons “early and often,” is coming toward a boil with that crew, even while we are speaking. That is already bad enough. The additional danger, which I shall address here, is that the U.S. government's current tolerance for Cheney's virtual criminality, is producing a qualitative reaction around the world. His antics are provoking other nations to craft the near-to-medium-term potential for a new quality of nuclear-armed warfare beyond the implications of such elements of the current strategic nuclear Triad as carriers

and today's nuclear-powered submarines. Unless we stop Cheney's antics soon, this development, which is now in progress, would confront the President of the U.S.A. elected in 2004 with problems beyond the present comprehension of most of our political leaders today.

It happens that I was engaged in studies of such new capabilities back during the early through middle 1980s, when I ran across them while I was in the middle of work with some relevant professional military and scientific circles. I must point out in that connection, that, sometimes, as in the past, when the brush is too wide, small things which could change history, such as atoms and nuclei, were not painted into the picture of what passes for conventional strategic assessments. Such changes, to a state of affairs beyond today's operating military doctrines, are already haunting the future, at least among those who know how to look for small anomalies which have a featured potential for production of strategic surprise.

However, once their existence is acknowledged, the technical nuts and bolts of this matter become of relatively secondary significance when compared with the economic and cultural strategic factors which will decide whether the threatened type of warfare is used, or not. Those economic and cultural factors are the principal object of this report; the rest is a matter of taking into account unavoidable related technical details.

From where I sit as a Presidential candidate, today, I begin this report by situating the way those strategic considerations intersect the current shaping of U.S. policy, as follows.

Under these conditions, at a time when the Democratic Party's presently sitting political opponent, President Bush, lacks the intellectual and emotional capacities to see either that world economic crisis, or rational solutions for even much lesser challenges, my putative rivals for the 2004 Democratic Presidential nomination have responded to Bush's blunders, by producing a statistical miracle of political folly as bad, or worse than his own.

When 2004 victory over an economic-crisis wracked, Bush re-election campaign should be almost a walk-in, these Democratic pre-candidates have, so far, flunked each and all of even the most elementary of those test-questions of today which would measure those Democrats' qualifications as candidates for their party's nomination. Statistically speaking, their collective, consistent failure to get right any question involving an actually needed policy-change, even by accident, must be seen as virtually miraculous, unless you knew what is going on in the Party's backroom, behind the scenes.

If this trend continues, the slaughter of the Democratic party in the next election could be not only certain, but awesome. Already, that slaughter might seem to be virtually inevitable,

unless my candidacy reaches the floor of nominating convention next Summer. Even so, today's threatened virtual disintegration of the Democratic Party under its present leadership, is, unfortunately, not the worst part of our nation's situation.

I take a few moments here to preface the body of this report with some relevant observations on the effects of that failure of leadership currently rampant in the back rooms of the Democratic Party organization. Start with the following sketched images of some of those candidacies whose existence has been approved by the National Committee so far.

At first blink, the failure of each and all of those nine candidates—certainly eight of them (that is, excepting the worst, Lieberman)—might appear to have been the result of a set of coincidences. A closer look at all of the evidence says, "This was no coincidence."

To visualize the collective problem of the party now, compare the instinctive expertise with which a real-life, professional jackass herds cows or sheep (see the Figure). Compare that image with the way in which the Democratic National Committee sheep-herder, Chairman McAuliffe, supervises his bleating flock of selected, eminently cullable Presidential contenders. No policy which the National Committee would presently allow those candidates to utter, nor any debate which that Committee would even permit them to enter, has any beneficial relevance for the grave problems actually menacing our republic and its people today. The appearance is: these candidates are to be seen behaving less as men or women, than as McAuliffe's flock of dutifully doomed political sheep lining up for business at the slaughter-house gate! Some might even wonder, if that line-up was not, at bottom, a Karl Rove trick; it certainly appears to be the bottom of something.

For example, so far, at any meeting called for discussion of those points on which any candidates for U.S. President should show himself as one fit to assume leadership of this nation, those party-certified candidates now rival one another, chiefly, in their intellectual distance from the crucial issues of today's real world. As I have just said, these candidates not only lack the answers; so far, except for some isolated occasions, such as a particular action by Dennis Kucinich, they have failed, so far, as candidates, even to recognize any of the leading dangers.

Kucinich, for example, was functioning on that relatively exceptional, exculpatory occasion, as a member of Congress, rather than in his other capacity as a candidate. There is a growing show of spunk and sense among some members of the Congress, some of this truly admirable, but not when the members are acting as part of the approved list of candidates allowed under the present control of party boss McAuliffe's National Committee machine. It is as if McAuliffe refuses to permit any Democrat who could win the next Presidential election, to campaign for that office.

Take, for example, the case of one of the candidates with a convincing record of conservative predilections, banker-bred Howard Dean. At a time when increasing rations of entire categories of our people are threatened with increased death-rates through the impact of the HMO law, Dean shows his liberal enthusiasm for the practice of a law which must be urgently repealed and its murderous underlying "triage" policies expunged. Maybe, the voters sensitive to health-care problems would wish to put the "shareholder value" candidacy of Howard "toothpaste" Dean back into his tube, while they are still able to do so.

Don't be fooled by Dean's supposed anti-war position. On the matter of Cheney's wars, Dean has been the sincerely duplicitous self to which his record attests.

Ask Dean, "Hey, Howard, where's the beef?" Confidence-man Dean pretends to bake for the edification and nourishment of the young anti-war suckers, but, even as those suckers drool admiration at Howard's figurative bake-in, his figurative hot oven is scrupulously empty. He has slithered around the practical challenge of working to actually pull the lead nuclear warrior, the President's current controller Cheney, out of government, now, when new Cheney wars could have been actually prevented, but for lack of a little more help from the Democratic Party's National Committee.

In the smoking ruin of a post-nuclear-war Hell, Dean would doubtless insist, throughout eternity (wherever he might spend it), "Look at my record. I am on the record as having been a critic of that war." However the wind might spin weathercock Dean, that born-and-bred sly banker implies promises which he does not oblige himself to fulfill. Before you pay his penny, read the fine print. What seems to some people to be his anti-war rhetoric, is only the rustle of the political wrapping-paper inside an empty box, a box whose contents had therefore, prudently, cost him nothing. In HMO booster Dean's political kitchen, love for humanity is all sizzle, no steak.

I have referenced the cases of Kucinich and Dean, and implicitly Senator Graham, in terms which make mere passing reference to that fading candidate, rabid war-monger, and the ipecac of the current slate, Joe Lieberman. Senator Kerry, from whom I had hoped for better things, has, meanwhile, apparently sold his political soul to Stephen Vincent Benet's "Scratch," when he moved from evasive to awful, with his reach toward an arrangement to replace Joe Lieberman's role in the alliance with Lieberman's emotionally unstable Republican twin, Arizona Senator John McCain. McCain and Lieberman, notably, were leading among the earliest cosponsors of the current war-policies of Vice-President Cheney at Europe's Wehrkunde conference, and both have been the choice of candidates for a 2004 Presidential ticket of British war-hawk publisher Conrad Black's American Charenton, the Hudson Institute. Meanwhile, Representative Gephardt is himself.

As for candidate Senator Edwards, he is a man former President Clinton could safely endorse, because the Senator is in no presently visible danger of winning anything but a position as a just-in-case Vice-Presidential nominee. Under some conceivable circumstances, he might be proffered to balance the ticket with a Southerner. Edwards' current significance, is that the former President's endorsement might tend, for the moment, to free Clinton from pressures to endorse any other candidate.

As for the others, including Carol Moseley Braun and Al Sharpton: Had they wished to be serious contenders, their only chance to gain national significance of substance, was my invitation to them to participate as rivals in my July 2 campaign event. They ducked the opportunity, and more or less dropped from sight for the time being.

So far, the snarling Democratic dog continues to herd its cullable sheep. That National Committee, like the dog in the story of "The Bone in the Brook," has organized what is, in effect, political protection for the impeachable "yellowcake" war-hawk Cheney's re-election chances, arguing that beating the irresponsible Bush in 2004, were a bigger bone than preventing the already culpable Cheney from unleashing more wars in 2003. The Committee argues against stopping impeachable war-maker Cheney now, in the Summer of 2003, on the pathetic pretext of pretending to save their ammunition for damaging the November 2004 re-election prospects of President Bush. As former President Nixon might have said it, that National Committee makes it "perfectly clear" that the only thing it has actually been doing recently, is running interference on behalf of Cheney's, or, perhaps, McCain's 2004 candidacy.

So, while our nation sits on the edge of Cheney's threatened new wars for the immediate future, including nuclear wars, wars aimed against targets such as Syria, Iran, and North Korea; and, while the United States' current policies are pushing it toward early national bankruptcy, McAuliffe's National Committee and its package of pre-selected candidates is aimed at the prospect of a miraculous defeat of its own party, that by a President Bush whose record on matters of the national interest is already, objectively, far worse than Herbert Hoover's, and failing fast.

Thus, each and all of these nine would-be rivals of mine, are already failed candidates from the start. Despite the actual differences among them, they have continued, in fact, to share one fatal flaw in common. That fact is, that the existential quality of our present national crisis, reflects the fateful outcome of certain changes in habits of national political behavior which had come to dominate our nation's policy-shaping practice, increasingly, since the fearful aftermath the 1962 Missiles Crisis and the assassination of President Kennedy. Those

habits are the anchor to which these candidates cling, the anchor of a ship which is now rapidly sinking.

Those changes in habits since the early 1960s, are the cause of our nation's degeneration from the house that Franklin Roosevelt built, the world's leading producer society, into a mass of self-inflicted, post-industrial, "consumer society" wreckage today. Those accumulated habits of more than three recent decades, have become the choice of fantasy which each of these candidates regards today as that body of traditionally accepted popular opinion to which he or she is appealing. Kissing the backside of that recent forty years of U.S. cultural history, since the 1962 missiles crisis, in this way, had blocked their view of the future.

Future historians will probably write: "Refusing to see real world, those candidates acted like confused fish flopping on the beach, left behind by the outgoing tide of recent history."

That present show of indifference to reality by the Democratic National Committee brings our attention back to a relevant focus upon the practical political implications of that deadly topic announced at the beginning of this report: the danger of some general outbreak of a new dimension in nuclear warfare, now coming up as the relevant threat somewhere not too far down the line. Put the matter of the Democratic National Committee's diversionary defense of Cheney into the setting of that larger, nuclear-warfare perspective.

To see those issues of warfare more clearly, begin the following report with of review of the story which you must know in the context of today's nuclear-war dangers: of how the President Truman who was first to unleash the monster of nuclear war, was replaced by Dwight Eisenhower, and why both Truman and an anguished post-war U.S.A. so richly deserved that change to Eisenhower then.

1. Cheney & Rumsfeld: 'The Unpopular Mechanics'

In August 1945, the U.S. air and sea blockade had successfully cut off the island nation of Japan from efficient access to the imported materials on which the continued existence of its economy, and its war-making capability depended. General MacArthur's leadership had brought the Japan military to its knees, doing to the military forces on the main island what MacArthur's strategy had done to Japan forces on many bypassed islands earlier. Great commanders are sometimes forced to order ferocious battles—as MacArthur had commanded in some during that war—but the object of modern strategic defense is not the slaughter. The object of the policy of strategic defense followed by all competent modern commanders since Lazare Carnot and Gerhard Scharnhorst, must be, as MacArthur chose, to

win that peace which we must build upon the surviving foundations of victory, without any avoidable destruction of the enemy nation and its people, or our own.

In mid-1945, there was never any rational military need, under a policy of strategic defense, for our making a forced entry into the main island of Japan. The Emperor had already sought peace through the channel of Monsignor Montini's Vatican office; it was a matter of waiting out the Japan military's willingness to submit to the Emperor's will. In August, the sweating-out time would be in the order of weeks, perhaps between then and October. Unfortunately, the fire-bombing of Tokyo had already prolonged Japan's desire to fight, or peace might have already come. All the relevant available reports indicate that former Captain Truman did not consult General MacArthur, the relevant commander, on the matter of using nuclear weapons; but, the military implications of the reports from MacArthur's staff were clear. General Eisenhower, in Europe, was consulted, and did warn against such a use of nuclear weapons; but Truman went ahead, anyway.

That Truman decision was the beginning of the official status of that same utopian tradition of strategic lunacy which has seized the office of the President of the U.S.A., under "Svengali" Cheney's poor "Trilby," Bush, today.

The wind-up for that 1945 nuclear bombing of explicitly civilian targets, had been test-run during the last months of the war in Europe. Planned bombing of civilian populations of targeted cities, under so-called Lindemann/"Bomber Harris" doctrine, had, like Montgomery's "Market Garden" hoax, actually prolonged the war—and, thus, also killed more U.S. soldiers—by resuscitating what been Germany's fading willingness to continue to fight. The fire-bombing of Tokyo had been a similar piece of strategic folly. The needless use of the only existing nuclear weapons in the U.S. arsenal, was not the beginning of what became known as the Rand Corporation's post-war "utopian" revolution in military affairs. That evil uncle Bertrand Russell whom confused children have adored as a fighter for peace, was the actual inventor of that United States' doctrine of "preventive nuclear war" which was the actual motivation for the bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki. What that bombing accomplished, for the long run, was to set the precedent needed to institutionalize that utopian dogma of a U.S. nuclear revolution in military affairs, which is Cheney's doctrine today.

Apart from his exculpatory act of defeating Tom Dewey in the 1948 general election, Truman's actions, and support for utopian policies, created what became known as McCarthyism and led into the Korean war. The nation reacted to Truman's record by electing his successor, the military traditionalist Eisenhower, for two terms, rather than trying another Democrat, and breathed a deep sigh of relief when that was done.

That bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki thus divided the military and related factions of the U.S. chiefly, between the supporters of the U.S. traditional doctrine of strategic defense—as represented by those such as post-war Generals of the Armies MacArthur and Eisenhower—and, their opponents, the utopian followers of “preventive nuclear warrior” Bertrand Russell. Rumsfeld and his crew typify the “military-industrial complex” utopians at their worst, and most stupid today. A misguided President Truman had leaned toward the side of the same utopians who gave us, later, the 1964–72 Indo-China War, and have also pushed that so-called revolution in military affairs, which dumped us, by means of fraudulent pretexts, into both the 1964–1972 Indo-China war and the presently suppurating folly of rising bloody, irregular warfare attrition in Iraq.

That fact focuses attention on the cases of rabid utopians Dick Cheney and his Bobbsey Twin, Donald Rumsfeld. This pair represents a type known in the trade as what organized-crime studies term “mechanics.” Both of these not-so-merry pranksters, a kind of contemporary Burke and Hare of the intelligence craft, have been known for their coup-cooking specialty since the mid-1970s, back during Ford Administration days. Either or both could be dumped, the sooner the better, but as long as they and their pack of “Chicken-hawk” neo-conservatives remain on the loose in key positions in government, neither the United States nor the world at large is a safe place in which to live.

I explain.

The Case of Cheney

As the Washington legend has it, in public, that taciturn parody of straight-man Bud Abbot, Dick Cheney, is usually not a runaway babbler like his clownish, motor-mouthed sidekick, “Lou” Rumsfeld. Contrasting that pair to Abbot and Costello, is like emphasizing the difference between Hollywood’s “Three Stooges” and the Marx Brothers.

Cheney, for all his pure meanness, is no mental giant, and Rumsfeld certainly is not a “lovable Lou.” Usually, it only by exception, especially when he is panicked, or ordered to do so, that Cheney chooses to risk exposing his intrinsically hateful self to lengthy public speaking appearances. Typical such imprudent exceptions were his recent appearances at locations such as the friendly family setting of that neo-conservative rats’ nest known as the American Enterprise Institute. At other times, when he has the choice, he has had the strength of nerve to keep his mouth shut in public; then, his public appearances tend to be limited more to a Dickens image of him sitting and scowling at the cameras, seeming to knit ominously, while waiting for heads, even of entire nations, fall from the knife of his Terror’s guillotine into the waiting basket. He is, in a word, essentially a “mechanic.”

As I have said, Cheney is not one we could describe as “excessively bright”; the twisted kind of substitute for genius he harbors, definitely does not lie in the domain of science or artistic cultivation, but in his Dracula-like predilection for nasty actions which moral folks would have tended to abhor as unspeakable. Adolf Hitler was of that Wagnerian type, although he did talk a lot. When you say “Cheney,” think “Freddie” Cheney, as like a monster from the political zoo of Synarchist Alexandre Kojève. He is, as Kojève described such would-be tyrants, the type ruled by unstoppable surges of Nietzschean-like rage, who would rather kill than speak, and, like a succession of Liberia's post-1980 tyrants, will not shrink from deeds so monstrous that they would astonish and disgust the imagination of merely wicked men.

Although Dick is “no genius,” one does not have to be a genius to share Cheney's record for pushing “preventive nuclear warfare.” That is the danger. However, being no genius, he is also, at the same time, like his co-thinkers, a pathetic fool in precisely the area of his greatest desire, strategic planning. It is important to understand this Cheney. Therefore, compare “Bugsy” Cheney with Murder, Incorporated's Abe “Kid Twist” Reles, but a “Kid Twist” using nuclear weapons instead of icepicks. Always remind yourself: the fact that he is vicious, does not mean that he is also intelligent. In short, he is ultimately as much a major security risk to the U.S.A. as to any of his choices of targets abroad.

As the continuing aftermath of Cheney's war in Iraq shows, the fact that the Vice-President is evil, does not mean that his desperado's schemes will actually work out as he proposes. At bottom, he neither knows, nor cares whether his war plans are competent or not; like a brutish professional killer who enjoys his trade, it is doing the dirty deed which fascinates him. If one of his crimes is a strategic failure, like the aftermath of the Iraq war, what does he care? The failure of one of his crimes merely impels him, as we have seen, to distract attention from that, by going ahead with a second military atrocity, perhaps more ambitious than the first. Those of us who are serious and responsible, must study the manifest stupidity of Cheney's long-standing, since 1990–91, design for the now escalating, ongoing phase of continuing war in Iraq. We are not looking for signs of genius, or even competence. We are determined not to underestimate his predilection for fatal miscalculations of even vast strategic implications.

For that reason, we must recognize that what he describes his intentions to be, are not exactly the same intentions which motivate his behavior. His actions are chosen as a means to an end. What end? Not what many of our citizens are misled to believe, so far.

This and other evidence warns us, that Cheney, Rumsfeld, and their neo-conservative crew are essentially fantasists, playing with deadly toys. They are madmen like one holding a sawed-off shotgun he has aimed against a captive family of hostages, desperadoes far removed

from competence in the axiomatic features of strategic assessment and planning. Do not, do not, make the potentially fatal blunder of assuming that their stated motives, or those of any other follower of Nazi Carl Schmitt's protégé Leo Strauss, are their true ones. That pack of perverts should remind us of some immature, emotionally off-balance boys shooting down fellow-students, for the sheer sport of real-life acting out of point-and-shoot video games. They are true utopians; it is the recipe, not the meal, which is their passion for cooking foul dishes. They are of the same type of menace to public welfare as deadly homicidal lunatics, whose primary motive is their existentialists' pleasure in their choice of act, not their often almost accidental choice of target.

In the course of *EIR*'s report on Synarchism, the reader will come to recognize the apparently psychopathic behavior-pattern of these so-called neo-conservatives, as typical of the participants in an international association known since the early Twentieth Century as the Synarchist International. That is the association which produced dictators Benito Mussolini, Adolf Hitler, Francisco Franco, the Laval and Vichy governments of France, Belgium's Degrelle, Romania's Iron Guard, and the German Nazi Party-directed organizations of Mexico and South America during the course of the 1930s and World War II. This is the same Synarchist International which U.S. military intelligence and OSS classified as "Synarchist; Nazi/Communist," operating in Europe and throughout South and Central America during the 1930s and 1940s.

The reader will learn, that that same Synarchist International, which figured in the terrorist waves of the 1970s and 1980s in Europe, is one of the principal sources of actual terrorist threats against the U.S.A. today. Go back to the 1780s, when that occult freemasonic association of Cagliostro, Joseph de Maistre, and others, which created Napoleon Bonaparte's career, was organized: You find precisely that pro-terrorist mentality, sometimes recognized as Nietzschean, which produced the Jacobin Terror, the bandit-Emperor Napoleon Bonaparte, Mussolini, Hitler, Franco, and others. This was the association which become known, approximately a century later, as the Synarchists.

It is that mentality which is now known as Synarchism—not any ostensibly practical form of criminal objective—which prompted Hitler's Nietzschean holocaust against the Jews of Europe (Richard Wagner, Hitler's forerunner, did not say "the Jews;" he wrote, repeatedly, "The Jew," designating not persons, but, instead, a depersonalized collective object.) It was a crime typical of the Synarchists since July 1789, and of the Jacobin Terror in general. It was a crime, as described by Alexandre Kojève, the Synarchist collaborator of Chicago Professor Leo Strauss, whose governing intent is to perpetrate a crime of such unbelievable horror as to reduce all who knew of it to terrified submission. What happened on September 11, 2001, expresses that same quality of intent, the pleasure of committing a horrible crime, which we

recognize as typical of Torquemada's Inquisition in the past, or of the contemporary Synarchist.

Only when you recognize that Nazi holocaust as specifically Nietzschean in motive and character, do you understand the danger to humanity in general, which it typifies, now as then. It is that same method which is to be recognized as the thermonuclear madness expressed by Synarchist accomplices Cheney, Rumsfeld, and their neo-conservative accomplices today.

That Cheney and his pack are currently impelling President Bush, a man of remarkably limited intellectual qualities, toward a build-up to a situation of medium- to long-term nuclear-warfare risks of a qualitatively new kind, risks of which neither they, nor that President, have the slightest comprehension. Nor, apparently, do any among those nine sheep being herded by the jackass-like kicks of McAuliffe's Democratic National Committee.

The question so posed is: How should we diagnose and cure the danger which that specific political form of madness poses to the world at large? To define the answer, there are several distinct elements which must now be considered, in succession. First, a crucial lesson from the referenced case of President Harry Truman.

The Trouble with Harry

To put these issues into a relevant historical perspective, I point our attention to a set of extended remarks by a relevant British military historian Correlli Barnett, as to be found beginning page 13 of the fourth volume of his series, his 2001 ***The Verdict of Peace***. My purpose in referencing his work, is to emphasize a relevant comparison between the present logic of today's medium-term threat of major nuclear conflict, and the strategic situation which existed in 1949–1950 East Asia. I identify the character of the situation then, by reference to a quote which Barnett excerpted from President Truman's Undersecretary of State George Kennan:

...the U.S. [Truman] Administration did not consider that the Russians were preparing to enter the war. There were signs that they intended to leave themselves a way out and it was a reasonable assumption therefore that the Russians were merely making an important probing. There was no evidence that this adventure contained the seeds of a major war and it was important to cope with it in such a manner as to restrict it to minor proportions.

Thereafter, Barnett continues to develop the case in that location; you should read and study his argument, for its own sake, for yourselves. What I summarize is my own view of the

matter, keeping Barnett's argument in view as I am doing now. With that reference in mind, look at those circumstances referenced by him from a slightly different vantage-point than his, from my already referenced view, above, of the situation inside the U.S. Government at that time. After that, return to the relevance, to the Democratic Party's way of choosing leading candidates, of Barnett's thesis, as it might be applied to the circumstances implied by Cheney's policies today.

Cheney and his Synarchist accomplices are fatally blinded by their bi-polar, brutishly egoistical, orgasmic faith in the imagined cleverness of their pathological impulses. They are also self-blinded, that to a most crucial strategic effect, by that kind of self-inflicted utopian folly which Barnett identifies with the Truman Administration's plunge into the setting of the war in Korea. The Bush Administration's lunatic policy toward Korea today, shows that Cheney's role in that administration is also an historical irony, a policy impelling the current Bush Administration toward an awful caricature of Truman's own earlier blunders.

Worse than the danger in their Korea policy itself, Cheney and his crew are impelling the United States toward a spread of the kind of nuclear warfare which no one, including the United States, could actually win by standards acceptable to the U.S. population. Nonetheless, such a new variety of doomsday war is, most unfortunately, possible under appropriate circumstances; but, for reasons I shall identify below, no side would win it in terms any sane member of modern European culture would consider acceptable. Cheney's continued presence in the Bush Administration now, could lead to such awful results, because he cares not about the outcome, but cares only for the evil satisfaction he derives from doing the deed.

As Barnett's account might imply to you, the trouble we face with Cheney began for us with Harry: President Harry Truman. Barnett's insights into those earlier British and Anglo-American predicaments in economy and military affairs, has a certain exceptional usefulness as background for studying the economic-policy aspects of the present strategic situation of the Americas and Europe today.

President Franklin Roosevelt had rescued the U.S. economy from the wreckage which the disastrous policies of the successive administrations of Presidents Calvin Coolidge and Herbert Hoover had produced. Hoover had been technically competent on numerous detailed accounts, but, as my associate Richard Freeman has documented, was on the wrong side—the Morgan-Mellon-Dupont side—in his choice of all turns in the forks of the economic road. What Hoover did to the U.S. economy paralleled the destruction which ministerial Chancellors Bruening and von Papen were doing to ruin Germany during most of that same period.

The chief external enemy which a recovering U.S. economy faced during the entire sweep of 1932–1945, was a legacy of the French Revolution and Napoleon Bonaparte which became notorious, during the period following the First World War, as the Synarchist International. This was the same Synarchist International, controlling important private banking houses on both sides of the Atlantic, which had put Adolf Hitler into power in 1933.

Consequently, by the time of the British flight from Dunkirk, in 1940, Roosevelt was faced with the following global threat to the U.S.A. itself. That global threat came from a organization known then as that same Synarchist International which, as I have already indicated above, had not only created and installed Hitler in Germany, but had put Mussolini in power in Italy earlier, had created the fascist Franco regime in Spain, and had created a network of smaller, but nonetheless incredibly nasty similar tyrannies elsewhere. In 1940, these Synarchists were about to establish fascist regimes in Laval's and Vichy France. This included a network, run from Nazi Party headquarters in Berlin, through fascist channels in Spain, directing the anti-U.S.A. Synarchist organizations of Mexico and South America, the ones impatient to be rid of Pope John Paul II today.

On the occasion of the Dunkirk incident, British minister Winston Churchill appealed to President Franklin Roosevelt. He emphasized that the Nazi leadership in Germany was at work with the Nazi sympathizers among the leading aristocratic circles of Britain, to the purpose of bringing Britain into an alliance with the fascists of Italy, Spain, and France. The Laval and Vichy governments which emerged during that period, were products of the Nazi coalition known as the Synarchist International. Such a development would create a combined power in Europe exceeding any other, and including the combined navies of Britain, France, Germany, Italy, and Japan. The conquest of the targeted Soviet Union would thus be the final step toward consolidating a power capable of, and intent upon crushing Franklin Roosevelt's U.S.A.

Roosevelt and Churchill acted in time. As a typical, included immediate result, Germany's Admiral Canaris—who represented one of the most significant, if usually discreet elements of German military opposition to Hitler's rampage—warned Spain's Franco of what were in store for him if he did not refrain from the grab for Gibraltar which Hitler had demanded. The Hitler admirers in Britain's high-ranking circles were herded into line, or shot. Roosevelt and Churchill acted in concert, creating the extraordinarily difficult military alliance, later incorporating the Soviet Union and China, which won World War II. The unlikely allies, Roosevelt and Churchill, thus turned the tide against the Synarchist dreams of Hitler's world conquest. The war would continue, brutally, but what had seemed for a moment the assured victory of the Nazi-led drive for world empire, had already been snatched from the paws of Hitler and his Synarchist controllers.

But, the Synarchists had not been rooted out.

Unfortunately, the included effect of the successful Anglo-American Normandy breakthrough, was to assure those pro-Synarchist right-wing circles in the United States which had played a crucial role in putting Hitler into power, that the defeat of Hitler was now virtually inevitable. These pro-Synarchist circles of the U.S.A. and British Empire, which, for national-interest reasons, had reluctantly tolerated, and even sometimes cooperated with Roosevelt, especially during the early phases of that worldwide war, now turned to bring the Roosevelt era to an end. The successful push by them, to replace Wallace with Truman at the Summer 1944 Democratic Party nominating convention, set the stage for both Hiroshima and for the General Draper-led, post-war cover-up of that Synarchist financier cartel, pivoted on institutions such as Banque Worms, which had been part of the financing of Nazi Germany's war machine.

Truman's dropping the bombs on Hiroshima and Nagasaki was an effect, of the terrorist, Nietzschean type prescribed by Professor Leo Strauss's crony, Synarchist Alexandre Kojève. It typified the right-wing, pro-Synarchist turn of the post-Roosevelt U.S.A. That expresses the essence of the trouble with Harry.

A dear friend's eyewitness account of OSS chief General Donovan's emerging, deeply saddened, from a visit at the failing President Roosevelt's office, reports Donovan sadly murmuring to the effect: "It's over." Many among the accomplishments of the U.S.A. under FDR's leadership could not be rooted out by the Truman Presidency, but Truman cleared the way for those who would ruin the FDR legacy as early and often as possible, the right-wing which had used the victory in Normandy as the signal to dump, as much as possible, the policies of a Roosevelt they had always disliked, and who they no longer considered indispensable. Truman cleared the way for an attempted, top-down takeover of U.S. strategic domestic and foreign policy by those utopians President Eisenhower later identified as a "military-industrial complex," the followers of the "preventive nuclear war" doctrines of Bertrand Russell. The other name for that crew of utopians was, and is "The Synarchist International."

It is that Synarchist International, again, which is behind what Cheney and his neo-conservative rascals represent inside the Bush Administration today. So, to understand the nature of the impetus driving the world toward a new kind of nuclear warfare under the post-2004 U.S. Presidency, we must first understand the present-day form of that Synarchist International as its specific kinds of war-aims. In the course of supplying that needed clarification, the story behind the story told by Correlli Barnett's series of four books will be

brought into focus. The bombing of Hiroshima and the story of Truman's Korean war, then becomes transparent.

Now, consider the following summary of the essential relevancies of the Synarchist International. After that, I shall clarify the political-strategic developments, already under way, which define the probability for a new quality of warfare breaking out as early as under the next U.S. administration.

2. Economy and World-Wide Wars

"The Synarchist International" became rather widely known by that name about the time of the Versailles Treaty negotiations at the close of World War I. However, its existence dates, most notably, from the 1789–1815 interval of the successive rises of the "left-wing" Jacobin Terror and the "right-wing" tyranny of veteran Jacobin Napoleon Bonaparte. The right-left characteristics of the Synarchists, as illustrated by the case of Synarchist Jacques Soustelle, date from no later than that interval of France's history, to the present day. At first glance, the following picture might tend to appear arcane to all but qualified historians and intelligence specialists; but without this knowledge, no competent understanding of the present and continuing threat to civilization could be competently understood.

Both of those successive developments were orchestrated by a concert of private merchant-banking interests typified at that time by the like of the Schlumberger, de Neufville, and Mallet banking interests, as also Mallet du Pan, and also Jacques Necker, the crony and asset of Britain's Lord Shelburne. These private family bankers used a passionately occult freemasonic association, known as the Martinists, as their adopted political mechanism. The ideology of that continuing cult is typified, symptomatically, to the present day, by the influence of extremely eccentric Joseph de Maistre.

During the late Nineteenth Century, this continued association adopted the term "synarchism" as ostensibly a reaction to the British Foreign Office's launching of the late Lord Palmerston's asset Bakunin as the founder of anarchism. It was during the period following Versailles, that the term Synarchist International came in its presently continuing use. The Synarchists of Mexico and South America, still today, are an example of the present-day continuation of the Nazi-directed, Martinist-style freemasonic forces, with typical right-left characteristics, classified as "Synarchism: Nazi/Communist" by U.S. intelligence services during the period of the 1930s and beyond.

The U.S. neo-conservatives associated with Cheney and the legacy of the late, Nazi-like Professor Leo Strauss today, are an active product of that Synarchist International. Carl

Schmitt, the so-called “Crown Jurist” of the Nazi legal system and the original sponsor of Leo Strauss’s career in Britain and the U.S.A., was a key figure of the Synarchist operations in Europe prior to and during World War II. Cheney, his neo-conservative gang, and their policies of practice can be understood competently only as an expression of the U.S. Straussians’ adherence to that Synarchist tradition and its ideology.

Recently—over a period from late 2002 until recent months—the Synarchist International held a series of meetings, coordinated by veteran Franco fascist Blas Piñar, bringing together fascists from Italy, France, Spain, and South and Central America, for a campaign against the U.S.A. For those who know their history, the creation of the U.S.A. as a Federal Constitutional Republic, has been the chief target of Synarchism’s enmity since July 14, 1789, France, to the present day. The two conflicting systems, our constitutional form of republic and Synarchism, can not continue to inhabit this planet together for much longer. The Synarchists are once again on the march toward the goal of world empire, as they were, earlier, in Hitler’s time, in 1940. Cheney’s crew are part of that Synarchists’ utopian package.

The key to that conflict is expressed by that feudal relic of Venice’s former status as a financier-oligarchical form of imperial maritime power. That relic is expressed today by what is known as the independent central banking system. This kind of central banking system is key to understanding the dynamic of the relationship between a more or less global form of Anglo-Dutch form of general monetary-financial system and so-called world wars such as those two of the 20th Century.

Under certain conditions, the modern sovereign nation-state and modern echoes of Venice’s imperial system of usury tend toward a relatively stable, if uneasy peace. This state of affairs has prevailed during some periods of globally extended European civilization since the first emergence of the modern sovereign nation-states, Louis XI’s France and Henry VII’s England, during the period of Classical Greek revival, the Fifteenth-Century Renaissance. This Renaissance became possible under the circumstances of Europe’s struggle to recover from that Fourteenth-Century “New Dark Age” which had been detonated by the general collapse of Venice’s bankrupt Lombard banking system, a “Dark Age” in which one-third or more of Europe’s population had been wiped away by the consequences of Venetian-orchestrated usury. Out of that chaos, the Augustinian tradition in Christianity mustered what became the pro-Greek Classical Renaissance, superseding the burdensome, ultramontane legacy of the Emperors Diocletian, Constantine, and that “Julian the Apostate” who figures as a model for British imperial utopia in Shelburne lackey Gibbon’s account of the history of the Roman Empire.

The Fifteenth-Century emergence of modern European civilization was met by a resurgence of Venice's power. Since approximately 1511, what is presently globally extended modern European civilization, has been locked in recurring mortal conflicts between the emerging modern nation-states of Europe and the Americas, on the one side, and, on the other, the relics of that Venetian-Norman tyranny which had formerly dominated the Mediterranean region, and beyond, since the times of Mathilda of Tuscany and the Norman conquest of England. The leading reactionary role of Hapsburg Spain in the religious and related wars of 1511–1648, is typical of that conflict.

During the course of the Eighteenth Century, many of those leading minds of Europe dedicated to the cause of development of modern nation-states, came to view the development of the English-speaking colonies in North America as the best opportunity for establishing a new kind of true republic which could become a model for similar reforms in Europe itself. As the U.S. Declaration's principle of "the pursuit of happiness" attests, it was the influence of the ideas expressed by Gottfried Leibniz's condemnation of John Locke, as in Leibniz's *New Essays on Human Understanding*, which typified that European republicans' initiative toward North American intellectual leaders such as Cotton Mather and his most notable successor, Benjamin Franklin. As early as the 1750s, but emphatically the mid-1760s, the best minds of Europe—as only typified by England's Priestly, France's Lavoisier, and Germany's Abraham Kästner—worked to assist Franklin in developing that youth movement, in North America, which emerged as the intellectual political leadership of the young republic.

At the time the 1787 draft of the U.S. Federal Constitution was in the final stage of adoption, in 1789, France's monarchy was plunged into the bankruptcy brought on as a consequence of France's 1783, pro-free-trade Peace Treaty with Britain. Two leading patriots of France, Bailly and Lafayette, led in the drafting of a constitution for the monarchy of France based on the precedent of the U.S. design. It might appear that the American model of republic already so popular among the national patriots of Europe, was to fulfill its destiny, with a wave of true republics erupting there.

The intervention of the British Foreign Office, through assets in France such as Louis "Égalité" and Swiss banker Jacques Necker, organized the July 14 Bastille incident, which began France's descent, aided by British Foreign Office agents Danton and Marat, into the Jacobin Terror. Much of the core of those influential French figures who had been associated with American cause, including Lavoisier, died in that Terror.

Then came the rise of the so-called turn to the right, Napoleon Bonaparte. By close of the Congress of Vienna, our republic was isolated, endangered, caught between the guile and

threats from London, and the pure evil of the Habsburg-orchestrated Holy Alliance. The “left-right” syndrome typified by the succession of Jacobin Terror and ex-Jacobin Emperor Napoleon Bonaparte, became the model of reference for not only blocking the influence of the U.S. republican model in Europe, but seeking to crush it in the Americas, as by the Anglo-French orchestration of the Confederacy and the installation of the Habsburg butcher Maximilian in Mexico. Since those developments of 1789–1815, the special, occult freemasonic association known today as Synarchism, has been a leading factor in globally extended European history in general.

That role of that Synarchist pollution of modern society, has been fostered by the existence of a crucial difference between today's typical, Anglo-Dutch Liberal model of parliamentary democracy, and the Constitution of the U.S. republic. That difference is key for understanding the connection between the past hundred years economic crises and world wars.

Our constitutional system of government is defined, as to principle, within the Preamble of our Federal Constitution. This Preamble consists of three multiply-connected, universal physical principles to which every other feature of that Constitution, and all Federal law are properly subject for their interpretation. These three principles are: 1) the perfect sovereignty of the nation and its people over all their territory, in all their internal and foreign affairs; 2) The general welfare of all of its people; and, 3) Accountability for efficient care for our posterity.

This notion of “general welfare,” which rejects John Locke's and the Confederacy's notion of “property,” or “shareholder value,” is derived from the concept of *agapē* which Plato's Republic presents through Socrates, and the same concept as presented by the Christian Apostle Paul in *I Corinthians* 13. This notion of general welfare is sometimes stated as “the common good,” and is associated with the English usage of “commonwealth.”

Another synonym for “general welfare,” is Leibniz's “pursuit of happiness,” a concept taken by the circles of Benjamin Franklin from Leibniz's denunciation of John Locke, in their reading of the belated publication of Leibniz's *New Essays on Human Undertaking*. “Pursuit of happiness” is a more sophisticated, more scientifically precise way of expressing the concept of *agapē* or general welfare. It connotes the absolute distinction of man from beast; that the essential human need is to be human, to express that creativity, such as that of Classical science and art, which exists only in the human individual, and not in the beast. The efficient expression of that quality to the advantage of society, is that righteous state of happiness which the 1776 Declaration Independence commits our newborn republic to foster for each and all of our people.

Take the case of slavery as an example of the application of a constitutional form of natural law.

The recurring compromise expressed in connection with the original 1776–1789 approach to the intended process of eradicating slavery, was not a matter of principle, but of a compromise dictated by global strategic considerations. The restriction on elimination of slavery, was the need to defend the nation against our adversary's, the British monarchy's intent to destroy us, and to promote slavery, by playing among the heteronomic follies of the slaveholder interest within certain of the Federal states.

In principle, slavery was always an evil for us, from which our national economy never benefitted, although the British monarchy, the slave-owners, Spanish slave-traffickers, and the cotton manufacturers did. Indeed, the principal slave-taking nation of the Nineteenth Century was the Spanish monarchy. The British East India Company had abandoned its African slave-trade as unprofitable, leaving the continuation of the trade to Spain. Similarly, during the 1890s, our republic's principal treasonous faction of that time, the Essex Junto, had abandoned the slave-trade, to free their shipping for the role of partners in the more lucrative British drug trade. Slavery was, however, increased within the U.S.A., for the profit of British interests and allies, including Essex Junto textile manufacturers and the Spanish monarchy.

Our inability to make war on our enemies in Europe, held us hostage to that legacy of Portuguese, Spanish, Dutch, and British slave-trading interests, until President Lincoln led the United States to defeat Britain's Confederacy asset, to become the power which the combined pro-oligarchical powers of Britain, the Napoleonic tradition, and the Habsburgs could no longer crush.

Under this Constitution, whose principles are so defined, the sovereign, our government, has an absolute monopoly, and exclusive will, to utter money and national credit, or debt of the republic as a whole. Thus, as our first Treasury Secretary, Alexander Hamilton, clarified this intent for practice, our required system is based on national banking, not so-called "independent central banking." This signifies that our form of government must be what is called "protectionist," to the included leading purpose of preventing the increase of the price of money from exceeding the increase of the price of physical wealth produced.

Under our republic's Constitution, we awarded to our Executive Branch those great powers which were needed to defend us against the weaknesses and follies customary among parliamentary government; but, we also created powerful checks against abuses by that Executive, especially in the matter of powers to make war.

Under the Anglo-Dutch Liberal model of parliamentary government no efficient sovereignty is assured. The permanent apparatus of government is not effectively controlled, and the parliamentary institutions are vulnerable. The worst feature is the existence of the so-called “independent central banking system,” which is a kind of franchise, donated to private banking interest, to control the monetary and credit system of the nation. The interest embodied thus in such “independent central banking systems” or their functional equivalent, is the key to understanding the causes for two “world wars” in the last century, and a new one, or its like, threatened as early as sometime during the present decade.

The Factor of Financial Crisis

In the immediate post-war period, the protectionist features of the original Bretton Woods system, and the included provision of a gold-reserve—not gold standard—system of fixed exchange-rates, provided a check against the abuses typical of “independent central banking systems.” The changes, in the Americas, in western Europe, and Japan, from a producer-oriented set of economies disciplined by a fixed-exchange-rate system, which were already under way, in fact, even prior to the 1971–72 wrecking of the original Bretton Woods design, was the origin of the “floating exchange-rate” monetary-financial system which is crashing down upon us now, as the Versailles system had done earlier. The anti-Constitutional corruption of the United States by the establishment of the Federal Reserve System, and the post-World War II monetarist lunacies introduced by Arthur Burns and others, undermined those Constitutional provisions which made possible the self-destruction of our economy over the recent several decades.

The soaring of the nominal prices of financial assets, relative to investment in technological progressive development of basic economic infrastructure and capital-intensive investment in technological progress of production of goods, produced an accelerating general trend in financial and monetary inflation. This, continued long enough, reaches the point of becoming a systemic crisis, even a threatened breakdown crisis, of the system as a whole. The question then posed is: “Who is going to eat the debt, the nation, or the financier interest?”

To the degree that existing governments are accountable for the welfare of the population as a whole, it is the duty and natural impulse of those governments to defend the sovereignty, general welfare, and posterity of the nation and its people, to such a degree that a corresponding portion of the responsibility for eliminating debt falls upon the class of financier creditors. That is the juncture at which a mobilized financier interest is impelled to crush governments which do not put financier interest above even the lives of their populations.

The establishment of the first true sovereign republic, the 1789 United States under its Federal Constitution, represented a deadly threat to the combined feudalistic and Liberal-financier interest of Europe. The risk that the U.S. model might become the basis for a constitutional reform of France's monarchy, was therefore a development which the leading private financier interests were determined to crush at all costs. A leading circle of such financier interests, composed of the rival but connected interests of Lord Shelburne's British East India Company and a circle of chiefly Protestant French-speaking Swiss private bankers, such as Jacques Necker and Mallet du Pan, created in France then, what has become known as the Synarchist International of the Twentieth Century and today.

This concoction, composed of a process of "left-right" transition of Napoleon Bonaparte, from Jacobin leftist to imperial fascist, is the model of left-right encirclement which has become the world's principal organized, financier-deployed force, used to crush republican forms of government, whenever a general, systemic monetary-financial crisis threatens to compel them to eat their share of that new general bankruptcy which their own practices had, chiefly, produced.

No one could produce immediate prosperity. Roosevelt could not; I could not. Roosevelt offered recovery from a depression which had halved the U.S. standard of living, or worse, just as the standard of living of the lower eighty percent of our family-income brackets has been approximately halved since 1977 (post-1962, hedonistic Federal Reserve "quality adjustment" statistical swindles taken into account). I could lead an early entry into a recovery process which would bring back prosperity within about a generation. There is no magic involved; all that is needed is the competence in economics which my unique success as a long-range economic forecaster expresses.

The issue is, therefore, essentially political, a political conflict inside the United States between those who share the Constitutional general welfare commitment of a Franklin Roosevelt, and those who share today the commitments of Coolidge and Hoover. There is also a more deeply rooted institutional resistance to such recovery measures in Europe.

To any informed American patriot, who knows the actual history of both our national economy and modern economy in general, the lesson of the economic recovery led by President Franklin Roosevelt points toward a clear type of solution for the general monetary-financial collapse ongoing today. From that standpoint, the crucial question is: "Who is going to eat the bad paper?" Will it be the financiers whose speculation has wrecked our economy? Or will payment of those financier's highly inflated claims come out of the living bodies of our own, and other people? We know where our fascist U.S. Supreme Court Associate Justice Antonin Scalia stands on this controversy; we strongly suspect, on the

premise of weighty evidence, where Howard Dean stands. We remember where Franklin Roosevelt stood; but so do the political heirs of Roosevelt's adversaries.

As a President, with the precedent of Franklin Roosevelt's and other U.S. economic recoveries in mind, I could lead our nation quickly into a long-term recovery phase today. No other visible candidate for that office could; they might learn, but, presently, left to their own devices, "they haven't a clue." They never learned the lesson of past recoveries from follies such as those of Coolidge, Hoover, Arthur Burns, Nixon, Brzezinski, and Volcker, the follies carried to an extreme by "Greenspin" today.

In Europe and elsewhere, the immediate source of resistance to any competent recovery program, is the strongly embedded prejudice of Anglo-Dutch Liberal traditions of parliamentary government, against any measures which violate the imagined sanctity of "independent central banking systems." That prejudice played into the hands of the Synarchists (fascists) in post-Versailles Europe; it is a crucial lever in the hands of the European and other Synarchist schemers today. It is desperate bankers, such as those behind the Martinists of 1789–1815, and the Synarchist International of the post-Versailles decades, or again today, who exploit the pro-monetarist mental weaknesses of governments and others today to bring dictatorships and wars upon the nations of modern European civilization, as Venice's bankers orchestrated the horrors of the medieval period from the launching of the Norman chivalry on.

These varieties of indicated resistance to the urgently needed approaches to general monetary-financial reform, are, therefore the principal factor pushing the world to general wars and dictatorships today, as prior to World War II.

3. If the Next World War Comes

Suppose you were, for example, Russia, China, or India. Suppose you knew that your nation was pre-designated for a medium-term nuclear-warfare attack, or for destruction by other means, if you failed to resist the attacker. Suppose that other nations of Asia shared that concern. How might you react?

How did Russia, China, and North Korea react, during the Korean War, to their conviction that they faced similar threats from the U.S. Truman Administration? How did they read a pattern of certain provocative moves from the Truman Administration. What did these nations, which believed themselves targets, read into the publication of the threat from the most evil living person of the world at that time, Bertrand Russell, in Russell's September

1946 publication of his argument for his doctrine of “preventive nuclear warfare” against the Soviet Union?”

Compare that with Cheney's repeated threats, since he was Secretary of Defense in the 1989–1993 Bush Administration, of nuclear warfare against, implicitly, post-Soviet Russia and other targets? Compare that with the impact of Cheney's escalating threats since the evening of September 11, 2001. If you knew that powerful enemy was intent upon crushing your nation, and also others, out existence, and if you were such a targetted nation, which had the potential means to wreak a terrible penalty upon that foe, would you seek to define a defense, even at the risk of losing half of your population? The history of land wars in Asia on this account, including China's role in the Korean War, and the case of U.S. experience with its war in Indo-China, should give the wary a hint of something to think about.

If, for example, you, from a targetted nation, knew of ways to slip deadly devices into places where their detection were very difficult, and their effect, if activated, could be monumental, would you, as the military command of such a threatened nation, be inclined to do it? Do you recall the ration of the death tolls of German forces and the Soviet population, respectively, during World War II? Or, do you recall a slightly different, but relevant case, Lazare Carnot's successful defense of France up to the victory he achieved in 1794? Under certain circumstances, people will fight in a way which expresses a willingness to put the future existence of their nation and its culture above their own lives. This is a quality of human nature which inhuman tyrants like Hitler and the Synarchists are prone to overlook. It is a feature of real-life strategy absent from a Rand Corporation sandbox, or from game-theory calculations.

The solutions for all questions of national strategy, will never be found on a sandbox, in a computer, or even the human brain. They exist only in the creative potential of an appropriately developed human mind.

The matter of the specific combat systems is not our subject here. Our subject is preventing such warfare from occurring. If we do not end what Cheney typifies, such warfare will probably occur; and, probably, the next President of the United States elected, will have to fight it. The principle is the same which led into utopian Truman's Korea war, from which military traditionalist, and Presidential candidate Eisenhower extracted us. With Cheney allowed to run loose, the U.S.A. may not get off so cheaply, next time.

Take one relatively obvious example of the kind of systems and their measures presently in the making. Take relatively very small, very quiet submarines, much quieter than today's nuclear-powered military submarines, smaller submarines loaded with small objects to deposit in places relatively most difficult for defenses to detect. Or, consider very, very

deep-diving submarines which can do special tricks. Meanwhile, nuclear and thermonuclear devices can be produced in a wide range of effects, many of these relatively small. Also, there are possibilities for producing global effects, which we, then involved in the proposed SDI, had considered, back during the mid-1980s, in our defining of the requirements to alter the environment for short, but significant intervals of time; that, on a relatively large scale.

The point being illustrated by the references made, is that there are many ways in which the U.S.A. nuclear Triad can be made relatively, asymmetrically obsolete; as by, in effect, bypassing it with warfare in a different technological space than it is designed to fight. This is not a matter of a particular weapons-system, but it could be a matter of a threatened adversary's dreaming up a feasible technological dimension which you, perhaps, had simply not thought about.

When a group of scientists is faced with what appear to be insuperable, technologically defined barriers, the ordinary scientist sees a boundary, within which all proposed solutions must be found; the other, true scientist, sees the vast universe of opportunity beyond that boundary, where he, or she knows all successful solutions to seemingly impossible barriers lie. The great military scientist, told that the adversary has a perfect, invincible weapons-system, smiles, and asks quietly: "Does he believe that?"

If the answer from the military experts is, "Yes," the scientist will smile, nodding: "Then, that is the way we shall defeat him."

The rampant incompetence in military and related matters shown by Bush Administration economists generally, and by Cheney's and Rumsfeld's pack of neo-conservatives—and, in that context, in events such as the recent, not really very secret meeting in Nebraska—demonstrates that any notion of an assumed invincible strategic doctrine in the intentions of these characters, is such that any capable, otherwise weaker nation, is intrinsically capable of discovering how to defeat, if they have not already defined such solutions.

The same stupidity on which the Bush Administration and others premise their absurd doctrines respecting the principles of economics, expresses precisely the kind of malady of their minds which would make an incumbent government like their own go down to self-inflicted defeat by its own blind faith in what it prizes as its super-weapons. The military incompetence shown by Cheney, Rumsfeld and their chicken-hawks in Afghanistan and Iraq, is an illustration of this factor of general scientific-technological incompetence permeating the Bush Administration, but not only that administration.

In some of the preceding paragraphs, I have listed a sampling of the directions in which some technological approaches to outflanking the current thinking of the U.S. utopians are already

in progress. I know of the existence of others, but think it both unnecessary and counterproductive, for several reasons, to promote a spread of such possibilities in print on this present occasion. On this matter of development and deployment of existing and new strategic technologies, I return to the reference to Correlli Barnett's treatment of the manner and effects of the systemic ruin of the United Kingdom's once formidable capabilities, a process like that the United States underwent since approximately the same time as the official beginning of its Indo-China war.

The folly of Cheney and other Bush Administration Synarchists today, should turn our attention to the analogous kind of error, to be recognized in the way the pro-utopian U.S. Truman Administration was taken by surprise in Korea, twice, first by North Korea's forces, and then by China's. Truman refused to understand, that by adopting the bullying policy of making an existential quality of threat against both the Soviet Union and China, Truman was walking the United States into a kind of war which it was not prepared to expect.

The essential folly of the Truman Administration was, that it did not understand the implications of the fact that its threats were forcing both the Soviet Union and China to choose to fight war against the forces of both the U.S.A. and NATO, or be dismembered. The cited excerpt from Kennan points in that direction. The same kind of fateful error of assumption prevails among the neo-conservatives today.

The combination of Truman's order for the nuclear bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, Bertrand Russell's publication of his September 1946 declaration of a policy of preventive nuclear warfare targeting the Soviet Union in particular, and President Harry Truman's endorsement of Winston Churchill's widely celebrated "Iron Curtain" address, had defined a situation in which both Stalin's Soviet Union and Mao Tse Tung's China shared the belief that the U.S.A. and Britain were determined to use nuclear weaponry to threaten them with virtual extinction as states. Against that background, the type of U.S. provocations conducted by the Truman Administration in Asia, as identified in the chapter of Barnett which I have referenced, brought matters to a threshold, in a way broadly analogous to the kind of "pre-World War" tension which the continuing antics of Svengali Cheney and the Trilbys of both the Bush Administration and Democratic Party have combined to create today.

Now, as Truman did in 1949–50, the Leo-Straussian neo-conservative bloc which still running its virtual puppet-Presidency of George W. Bush, is successfully forcing the deployment of operations which impel nations, including important powers from around the world, to perceive an intent to destroy both China and Russia; that, as the end-game phase

of a process of piecemeal dividing and destroying of the nations of Europe and Asia generally.

Since the circles around Cheney are clinically insane and also strategic blunderers in the manner and degree I have described up to this point in this report, their obsession with their own schemes tends to blind them, as it might psychotic terrorists, to any reality which might raise grave strategic doubts about the characteristic features of their scheme itself. As happened with Truman during a relatively saner time, in the cases of the Soviet Union and China, these fools are driving an increasing number of the targetted powers of Eurasia to think and pre-deploy in anticipation of making the kinds of close-encounter and other end-game responses to U.S. attacks which we must expect from among Asian cultures—Asian cultures of today, with weighty modern scientific-technological capabilities.

So, in summary of that point: what Cheney *et al.* are doing today, with the resonating and repeatedly reenforced echo of President Bush's January 2002 "Axis of Evil" slogan, has generated a mounting reaction around much of the world, a reaction which poses the threat of more war than the Bush government dreams possible; war which must be anticipated, under a continuation of present trends, to confront the President elected in 2004. It appears that this Administration remembers everything it has learned about history, all of which is conveniently minimal, and that mostly false.

What is the world's political alternative?

The Synarchist Drive to Nuclear War

Presumably, the war-crimes procedures at the close of World War II, and the formation of the United Nations Organization, had outlawed "aggressive war." Since that time, we have had reason to regret that we had not also discovered a means to prevent actions, by means of which a stronger power might force a weaker, such as the Soviet client North Korea, to attack, perhaps "aggressively," in defense of plausible threats to the existence of its nation, such as the threats of the Truman Administration to the Soviet Union and China. On the latter account, since 1945, there are two prominent challenges facing the power which seeks to avoid a war with some foreign power. The first is to avoid threatening a war against that nation. The other, is to avoid provoking that nation into a sense, as Cheney *et al.* are doing, that the preservation of its existential interests require it to attack. In August 1946, World War II had not yet ended, when, for the sake of his utopian delusions, President Truman began to violate both of those latter rules of prudence.

Today, the lessons of that experience should compel us to redefine the policy to be accepted among sovereign nation-states, a policy shaped to uproot the very real, immediate threat of

early wars whose ricocheting effects would be beyond the imagination of most leaders of the world's governments today.

In presenting a case for the alternative to such warfare here, we must begin by considering, at least briefly, the present-day practice of relics of ancient and medieval forms of imperialism. This must include some crucial highlights of that history since the exemplary imperial follies of Athens in launching the Peloponnesian war.

Today, Cheney *et al.* are violating every such and related lesson of the principal experience of ancient through modern European civilization. Duped President George Bush, for his part, is contributing to that folly with his frequent and foolish, schoolyard-bullying style in threatening "consequences." These cases are worse than those mighty fools who perpetuated the 1618–1648 Thirty Years' War, a war which was done by leaders for the sake of supposedly sacred, but evil oaths which had magically transformed the leaders of the contending forces, from men into the kinds of beasts which such as Cheney and his Chicken-hawks have shown themselves to be today. What Cheney represents is the worst imaginable form of that record of imperialism, one which, unless checked and uprooted, could soon destroy any form of civilization on this planet for generations to come.

From the onset of the Peloponnesian War until the Fifteenth-Century European Renaissance, the prevalent tradition of all Middle Eastern and European culture had been the kind of imperialism which had corrupted Pericles of Athens, had dominated the Roman and Byzantine culture, and, also, ruled Europe for nearly a thousand years since the Norman conquest of England, the latter under the imperial hegemony of the Venetian financier oligarchy and Venice's Norman partners. Today, the most poorly understood, but presently most influential form of imperialism in European history, is that inherited from a Europe under the boot of the Norman-enforced, ultramontane law associated with the so-called Crusades.

It is the power to impose some ultramontane form of law-making authority, which, as the experience of feudalism proves, is the essential feature of imperialism. The example of that Roman imperial doctrine of Pontifex Maximus traced from the Caesars, is the relevant model of imperialism, since Augustus and Tiberius, down to the present day. Today, ultramontane imperialism, akin to that of feudalism, is expressed chiefly in the specific interest of a specific, radically monetarist type of global financier-oligarchical monetary-financial system, the presently bankrupt IMF system.

Today, the general principle of civilized modern military and related strategy is, as I have emphasized above, a doctrine of strategic defense consistent with the definitions and practice of two great commanders, France's Lazare Carnot and Germany's Gerhard Scharnhorst.

Unfortunately, the Martinist (e.g., Synarchist) dictatorship of Napoleon Bonaparte revived the institution and methods of empire in a new form. This was a radically new form, later known as fascism, of an institution as imperial as the British and Habsburg empires, an institution of imperialism which had been the principal internal affliction of European civilization, since the Peloponnesian War in which Greece virtually destroyed itself. This was the affliction which modern Europe had momentarily banned with Cardinal Mazarin's leading role in bringing about that stroke of genius known as the 1648 Treaty of Westphalia. Today, since Hitler, that new form of imperialism introduced under Napoleon Bonaparte has often been identified by its pro-Synarchist proponents, such as Michael Ledeen, as "universal fascism."

As I have emphasized, earlier in this report, the birth of modern fascism in 1789–1815 France, was chiefly the ricocheted response of the combined forces of the both the emerging British Empire and its rival, the Habsburg tradition, to the mortal threat to those types of political systems which the American Revolution of 1776–1789 represented.

The immediate focus of this effort to crush the influence of U.S. Independence, was the 1781–1783 pre-orchestration of the French Revolution by the most powerful figure of the emerging British world empire, Lord Shelburne. Shelburne, who was the leading figure of both Barings bank and the British East India Company, was the chief original sponsor of this process of intervention leading into the French developments of 1789–1815. The most relevant developments which are to be attributed directly and explicitly to Shelburne, date from 1763. It was a network of private bankers and others, allied to Shelburne, a network built up and directed by that Shelburne, which operated through the Netherlands and down into the area of French-speaking Switzerland, which orchestrated the crucial features of the build-up toward and initiation of the French Revolution. This was most emphatically the case from the period of Shelburne's 1782–1783 role as British Prime Minister.

During the 1780s, Shelburne and, chiefly, his French and Swiss collaborators, had built up a lurid sort of occult freemasonic association, known as the Martinists, a cult including such notable figures as Mesmer and Cagliostro, which were among the key inside figures of both the Jacobin Terror and the rise to power of Napoleon Bonaparte. The case of the Queen's Necklace typifies the Martinists' role in preparing France for events including the decapitation of the same Queen later. This Martinist cult, together with Shelburne assets such as Philippe Égalité and Jacques Necker, set what became the Jacobin Terror of the Martinists into motion with the incident of the July 14, 1789, affair of the Bastille.

The historical point of reference for this Shelburne-directed scheme, is that elaborated by one of his numerous lackeys, Gibbon of *The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire* notoriety.

Not coincidentally, Gibbon was an associate of the circles of another Shelburne asset, Jacques Necker. The pivotal feature of Gibbon's proposal in that mammoth work, was a clearly implied apology for the notorious Emperor "Julian the Apostate." Gibbon's conclusion was that it was Christianity which had destroyed the Roman Empire from within, an empire which could be successfully restored by Shelburne's British East India Company as the British Empire, if only Christianity could be removed. The Martinist freemasonic cult was the chosen French-speaking instrument for the operations against France. The Martinists were well-suited to play that game assigned to them. Their handiwork appeared first as the left-wing Jacobin Terror, and then, as if by the hand of the Martinist Cagliostro, that Terror appeared in the "right-wing" uniform of the ex-Jacobin bandit-Emperor Napoleon.

It was not the Martinist freemasonic cult, with its Bavarian and other absorbed elements, which produced the left-right sequence of both the Jacobin Terror and Bonaparte's imperialism. The Martinists were selected by a network of European private bankers expressing the Venetian tradition, a network then led by Shelburne *et al.*, and chosen, largely, by him personally, as the kind of ideological instruments selected by the British East India Company's intention to eradicate the influence of the American Revolution. The Martinists, as their ideology is represented by such authors as Joseph de Maistre, had the specific quality of being the kind of instrument described by the obsessed admirer of Napoleon Bonaparte, G.W.F. Hegel, and as the tyranny of the beast-man described by Friedrich Nietzsche as his "Superman" assigned to destroy Christianity. The terrorist controller Jeremy Bentham was the working head of Shelburne's British East India Company "Secret Committee," which directed the Jacobin Terror. Bentham, personally, reflects the same mentality as the Martinists, as shown by his relevant published writings still rather widely extant today.

The procession from the stormed Bastille—bearing the bust of its hero, Shelburne's Jacques Necker, at its head, babbling poor lunatics from the Bastille on the mob's shoulders, and the heads of the victims on the procession's pikes—typified the Martinist spirit of the event from which the Jacobin Terror, and Napoleon's tyranny subsequently ensued. This was surfacing of what was eventually to become what is known by the precise technical term of Synarchism, in Hitler's time, and today.

Was that horror really France? Lafayette who witnessed it, would say, "No." The French Revolution is a complex of contradictions, featuring such virtues as the military and scientific genius of Lazare Carnot as its "Organizer of Victory," and the sublime Bailly martyred by the Jacobins. As to France itself, the conclusion to be reached is, that human beings are naturally endowed with goodness. This is shown in that time not only by the magnificent Bailly, or Benjamin Franklin's collaborator, the great Lavoisier butchered by the Terror, but also the

scientific work of the circles of Carnot and Monge. The proof is repeatedly delivered by that and other history, that human evil, while commonplace, shows itself, in the end, to be unnatural.

Which from that period, or any period, was man, and which was the disease which afflicted him?

To sort out more thoroughly than this summary of the evil done in that time; to separate more nicely what was done to France by Shelburne and the Martinists in this way, from what France accomplished; may be assigned to those, especially France's patriots, who make a fresh assessment of its history; writers who proceed in the light of crucial evidence which has been forced to broader attention by our fresh scrutiny of the combined evil represented by both Adolf Hitler's accomplices, and by Cheney and his accomplices today. In that same spirit, let U.S. patriots today look at the evil which Truman did after the death of President Franklin Roosevelt.

Apart from Hiroshima and Nagasaki, the most significantly tell-tale single piece of evidence against Truman, is that Roosevelt had intended to conclude the war with the liberation of the planet from colonialism and related practices. Truman acted to support the British policy of restoration of colonialism by military force, in places where it had been overthrown in the course of the war. Truman's action thus tipped the balance, to restore the institution of imperialism as a established feature of the United Nations Organization.

Not long after Truman's retirement, and the death of Josef Stalin, the most evil man of the world at that time, Bertrand Russell, negotiated an accommodation with the new Soviet leader Khrushchev, through the facility of a London Conference of World Parliamentarians for World Government. Russell's intention was, as usual for him, world government, and his own burning hatred against the existence of, above all, the United States. His often-restated intent was to establish the kind of world government which he and H.G. Wells had prescribed in Wells' 1928 *The Open Conspiracy*. It was on behalf of world government, explicitly, that Russell had explicitly proposed preventive nuclear warfare as the road to utopia and peace, publicly and repeatedly, from 1946 on.

Thus, after the succession of the Russell-negotiations around the 1962 Missiles Crisis, and the assassination of President Kennedy, the United Nations hosted an approximation of imperial world government in the emerging "detente" arrangements between the Anglo-American and Soviet nuclear superpowers. Wars among the superpower blocs were permitted, such as the U.S. Indo-China war, as long as they were "managed" according to the current vogue in Rand Corporation-type sand-box notions of "rules of the game." This

arrangement continued until 1989, with the collapse of the Warsaw Pact, and, soon after that, the Soviet Union itself.

The collapse of Soviet power lured Anglo-American utopian madmen into the lust for immediate consolidation of a single world superpower, an Anglo-American world empire to rule the world forever, thus bringing history to an "end." Cheney represented the most fanatical of the dumb jocks pushing that policy within the 1989–1993 U.S. Bush Administration. In 1991–92, that Bush, the father of the presently incumbent President, had turned Cheney down; Cheney was more successful on and following September 11, 2001. His intention is to use preventive nuclear warfare, as either threat or actual war, to bring about the imperial conquest of the world, including Russia and China, within his own lifetime. He pushes new wars now; some relatively cooler heads around that administration have proposed to postpone new wars until after the 2004 election.

If such a utopian military outlook as dumb jock Cheney's is not uprooted from the U.S. government now, the world as a whole is perched at the brink of an unfolding general state of warfare which will, rather soon, leave very little resembling civilized life on this planet, for a rather long time to come. That is, the prospect of a condition under which the elimination of as much as half or more of the population of a nation is a precalculated assumption of the kind of warfare which Cheney's impulses imply under those present real circumstances which the present Bush Administration stupidly refuses to take into account.

It is therefore urgent that the alternative should be made clear.

The Resort to Strategic Defense

Presuming that Cheney's plans for both wars and U.S. dictatorship are prevented, the principal option available to leading nations of the world, is a concerted decision to take the hopelessly bankrupt present world monetary-financial system into receivership. That is, the "floating-exchange-rate" IMF system. The general intent must be to re-establish a new, fixed-exchange-rate, protectionist form of monetary system, modelled upon the most successful features of the original Bretton Woods system.

Provided that new long-term, low-priced credit is generated, both by the combined means of government right to utter currency and by long-term international treaty agreements, the potential presently exists to expand productive employment substantially, somewhat as President Franklin Roosevelt combatted the Coolidge-Hoover-created U.S. economic depression, through an included heavy emphasis on public forms of development of basic economic infrastructure. Under those conditions, under the indicated reform of the world's

monetary-financial system, the preconditions presently exist for a massive expansion of hard-commodity trade among the nations of Eurasia.

Under a world affected by those beneficial reforms, the common feature of interest among nations is the fostering and preservation of such institutions of long-term economic-development cooperation. Such a state of affairs is conducive to the kind of order among peoples which was stipulated by the 1648 Treaty of Westphalia, an order subsumed by the treaty-principle of "the advantage of the other." Under those conditions, the military relations among nations assume the form of institutions and policies of strategic defense.

Reflection on such excellent long-term remedies for our planet's chief present peril, requires attention chiefly to two distinct but interdependent problems: The need to settle accounts with the systemic defects of any method of superseding control over government by organized private financier interest, and to affirm the principle of sovereignty of nation-state republics. I conclude this report with my address to those two matters in that order. The present circumstance of terminal bankruptcy of the existing form of world monetary-financial system, should be used as the health-giving opportunity to rid the planet, at last, of the vestiges of that same Venetian system of banking practices which produced the so-called New Dark Age of Europe's Fourteenth Century, and fostered the launching of that monster known variously as Synarchism or fascism today.

The error so dramatically demonstrated by the long term, now hyperinflationary degeneration of the world's monetary-financial systems since the change of 1971-72, is that the security of and among nations requires that sovereign governments administer the issue of and circulation of currency, taxation, and conditions of investment and trade, to such effect that the price of money does not increase more rapidly than the intrinsic value of produced goods and the socially most essential services. This requires a fixed-exchange-rate monetary system, under which necessary forms of well-considered changes in prices of currencies may occur, but under which free-floating fluctuations, especially financial speculation, are forcefully prevented.

The experience of the recent three decades should have warned us, that the system of independent central banking should be abhorred and terminated, and replaced by notions of national banking already implicit in the U.S. Federal Constitution of 1789. The nation-state must be fully sovereign, and the management of its vital national interests therefore made efficiently transparent to its government and citizenry.

In such an arrangement, a gold reserve system, as absolutely opposed to a gold standard system, is unrivalled in its utility, at least for the duration of the visible future. This is to be conceived by a concert of nations as President Franklin Roosevelt, then, applied the relatively

extraordinary power of the U.S.A. to such effect at that time. There is no natural price of gold other than its range of prices of production. For the case of the monetary gold of a gold-reserve system, the price of such reserve gold is determined by consideration of the amount of such gold required for the pool, as compared with the price of current production, on that scale, for investment and trade.

The proper function of banking in general, is the administration of a secure and regulated system of saving, directed toward investments in promotion of trade, production, and accumulation of useful physical capital of government, production, and households. The function of national banking is to coordinate the functioning of that combined system as a whole, with emphasis on both the monopoly of credit-creation authority exercised by government through national banking, and the relationship of this function to relevant matters of both the fostering of scientific and technological progress, and foreign relations.

This action removes the abuses, as by private banking in the Venice tradition, which have plagued civilization for centuries, and checks that power to do evil which is typified by the role of such banking in the Synarchist phenomenon.

The concluding topic to be addressed here, the matter of national sovereignty, is a matter in which law and other policy-shaping must be ruled by consideration of that higher authority represented by the ecumenical principle—as defined, for example, by biogeochemistry's V.I. Vernadsky—of the absolute physical distinction of man from beast.

There are chiefly two distinct, but interdependent principles at issue on this point. One, the need to eradicate the long-traditional practice of societies, to hunt down the relatively greater number of human beings as if they were wild or domesticated cattle, as the wicked neo-Cathar dogma of France's François Quesnay prescribes. The second, related consideration, is the essential role of the ironies peculiar to a culture in enabling the members of that society to participate in the conceptualization of such matters of principle as discovery and application of discoverable principles of physical science. The function of the sovereign nation in fostering the continuing, upward evolutionary development of such a process of national culture, is the prerequisite of the elevation of the individual from both the formal and virtual status, as human cattle, which the Physiocrats, and John Locke, projected for the families laboring on behalf of the desires of the shareholders.

The function of government which must be recognized as the purpose of the choice of the modern sovereign nation-state republic, is to free the individual person from subjection to those imposed conditions of life in which he, or she thinks of the individual as a variety of existentialist beast. This benefit is too to be accomplished through fostering all persons' sense of themselves as contributing willfully to the progress of successive generations to increased

degrees of mankind's mastery of the universe in which we live. This role of the citizen within that republic must become recognized as an essential, functional role of the republic, in furthering the corresponding common aims of past, present, and future mankind in general, each to the intended advantage of the other.

When we witness the resurgent horrors of Synarchism today, we must be inspired to resolve, not only to rid the world of policies such as those of Cheney and his Chicken-hawk warriors; but to establish a durable order of cooperation among sovereign nation-states, an order which not merely eradicates the present crop of the evil which the Martinists reflect, but uproots that evil by removing the preconditions under which such pestilences as those might recur in the future. We shall maintain the capabilities for strategic defense, but hope to employ this to prevent wars, rather than be obliged to fight them.