

The elite that can't think straight

LaRouche on the method and madness of the Council on Foreign Relations

I have just completed reading a most awful booklet, a 1974 New York Council on Foreign Relations production, authored by one Miriam Camps, a person the Council certifies at that time as chairman of one of its subsidiary concoctions, "The Council Group on International Order and International Institutions." The booklet was forwarded to my attention — for clinical scrutiny — by a friend. Excepting the duty of the clinician, which in all fields means occasionally getting through an accumulation of one sort of pus or another, the reading would be put down to a most unpleasant and fruitless expenditure of time. The book has a certain perverse sort of usefulness as a clinical subject.

The specific unpleasantness of the book was only secondarily that the author's opinions vary from utterly irrelevant mush-headedness to an occasional piece of outright evil. The worst of it is the sheer, schizoid scatterbrainedness of the authoress. The worst of that, in turn, is that the mental affliction she exhibits is unfortunately the commonplace of the institution that patronized her exertions.

Apart from the odd good chap drawn into those precincts, the predominant feature of the members of the Council on Foreign Relations is that they all write and gibber in approximately the same general,

ineffable style. When it comes to actual decisions, they rather consistently come out pure Tory, to a point not infrequently verging into the realm of treason. Otherwise, in the processes through which they purport to explicate their point of view, the flow of scatterbrained bits and pieces, of this and then that, is awful gibberish.

Once one has killed a menacing poisonous snake, it is not only permissible but commendable to experience a certain degree of regret over the affair. It was, after all, a creature useful in its own unsociable fashion. With a kindred feeling, contemplating the babble typical of CFR's precincts, one may venture the view: "After more than two thousand years, the heritage of Isocrates's Athenian school of rhetoric has come down to this."

One might parody the amusing title of a not-so-amusing little book of a few years back, and sum up the CFR as "The gang that couldn't think straight." As a gesture of kindness, and hence more pointed irony, I choose: "The *elite* that can't think straight."

If the reader at this point imagines that I shall now proceed merely to document the point, I am misjudged. To discern such a fact demands only what I regard as the lower order of the powers of an intelligent mind. It is frequently necessary to employ such powers in the course of doing a job. Yet, apart from offering classroom instruction in such arts, one must not prize such a task as of much value in and for itself. It does not merit an article on such a subject, unless taking up that subject is integral to an undertaking of some higher quality.

Perhaps a reader in suburban Detroit might object. He or she might propose: "Look, I work in a plant all day. I wish to know how those clowns around the New York Establishment think. Since my time and energy are limited, it would be a useful thing for me if you would do your job on my behalf, and sum up what you know on this subject in a way I can digest in an hour or so's reading and reflection."

The point is taken. I do not propose that that should not be done; I propose that I anticipate no satisfaction from the undertaking unless that part of the job is a means to an end that is still more important to us both. I shall do it my way, and in the end we shall both be better pleased with the aggregate result.

In this Section

The Carter Administration and others in the vicinity of the White House are not the only victims of an incapacity for sane policy-making. In this SPECIAL REPORT we present a clinical profile of the disease as it appears in its generic form in the Anglophile "New York Establishment," analyzed by Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr. Drawing on his own international political role as the chairman of the U.S. Labor Party, and on his intellectual expertise as this century's foremost political economist, LaRouche has provided a scathing look at how the Anglo-American adherents of the Cult of Isis operate.

Anglophiles have a keen sense for detecting a potentially useful fool, or a potential danger.

The case of Arthur Ross

That said, I shall now identify the deeper points I wish to develop for you, and then, having identified those, we shall turn to the first topic and develop it then with the deeper points in view.

Arthur Ross is my adversary. However, for special reasons, I bear him no personal malice. On the contrary, for special personal reasons, I hope to do a great service for him. I propose, sooner or later, to cause Arthur Ross to weep profoundly, and that in that weeping he should touch and grasp the quality of humanity that his services to the British cause have so far, so much denied him. That result would eminently please a number of persons, including — after the fact — Arthur Ross himself.

For the moment, politically, Arthur Ross is my adversary. He swims in circles that include Henry Simon Bloch of Warburg Pincus, is accepted among powerful, and profoundly evil, circles north of the U.S. border, and is reliably reported to have characterized me — back during 1976 — as “more dangerous than Hitler.”

Personally, I have met Arthur only once. He was an amiable and considerate host for about an hour. I found him well-informed, and palpably well-connected. The obvious net effect of the interview for him, combined with whatever else he took into account, was the conclusion I have reported just above.

The characterization I deem reliably reported not only because of the source through which it was reported to me, but because the sentiment has been verbally and otherwise expressed by leading spokesmen of circles in various nations to which Arthur Ross's circles are intimately connected. The summer 1978 estimate of Henry Simon Bloch, that certain of his acquaintances desired my early demise because they perceived me as a “potential danger,” and statements to the same effect given by leading spokesmen for Belgium's Lambert and Italy's Agnelli during the same period, have bearing on the point. It was for such reasons that the same circles projected my assassination by Baader-Meinhof terrorists during the summer of 1977, and have launched massive efforts to the same included purpose since last May.

It coincides with what a representative of the Hambro family stated to us during early 1976, and what has been fairly constant from allied sources

since. The British ruling circles regard the U.S. Labor Party and its chairman as representing extraordinary intellectual and political potentialities — and view those capabilities as all-too-efficiently directed toward results regarded with abhorrence in London.

Being what they are, their curious egos oblige them to communicate this point to us. Something slightly under a hundred times so far, topmost spokesmen for British and Anglophile institutions have said, in one specific form or another: “You are extraordinarily effective, but we shall defeat your efforts and crush you.” This has been no idle threat; those who have reported this view have expended massive sums and efforts in the international endeavor to accomplish just that. Perhaps it is a twisted sort of British sportsmanship to so treat an adversary for whom they have a perverse sort of respect.

“Potential danger” is precisely the predominant British view. It is a characterization first awarded to the U.S. Labor Party's initiating cadre force, the National Caucus of Labor Committees, a decade ago, then at a considerably lower and more localized echelon of the British apparatus overall. The complicity of Caledonian Airways and MI-5 in a complicated, costly, and rather nasty operation against Labor Committee leader Christopher White back in December 1973 was our first knowledge that the British monarchy's institutions proper regarded us sufficiently as a potential danger to warrant their direct attentions.

Henry Simon Bloch's cited characterization during this past July was on the mark. The U.S. Labor Party has achieved much, and has gained a certain sort of influence — and hence *limited* genuine power — in certain aspects of affairs. However, the party commands no committed patrons or allies, and embodies no power as such within itself as an organization. What influence it has established is so far only of the order of a noticeable *potential* danger to British strategic endeavors as a whole.

However, the British view the Labor Party as being presently on the threshold of threatening to break out of such limitations. Matters have reached the point that they have elected to eliminate the problem — still, the perceived “potential danger” — before it goes any further in the direction secular trends imply.

The British oligarchy and British-intelligence-conditioned Anglophiles may not be able to think straight, but in their own curious way they have a keen sense for certain things — especially the early detection of a potentially useful fool, or a potential danger.

It is the nature and significance of that British oligarchist's feral perceptions that I wish to make clearer. What did Arthur Ross adduce from his encounter with me during 1976? What is it that the British oligarchists see — with alarm — in the U.S. Labor Party as a whole? What is it that these oligarchists see that well-situated other leading circles tend not to see?

The Cult of Isis

The British oligarchists have two principal intellectual advantages over Americans — for example.

First, increasingly over the present century, the British have taken over control of key U.S. institutions with emphasis on policy-formulating and policy-making institutions. Americans condition themselves not to see this — perhaps one might attribute such blindness partially to reaction-formation. The British oligarchists lead Americans by the nose, up and down and across streets, while Americans pretend that all such peregrinations involve nothing more than the Americans' independent judgment.

Second, the British empiricism and Vienna positivism that foolish Americans (among others) imagine to be essentially a debatable issue of better or worse scientific method have nothing to do with science or scientific method — except in the same sense that cyanide affects life. Empiricism generally, and the positivist varieties, is a very specific form of *theology*, the pagan theology of the Cult of Isis. Or, to show the most relevant facet of that pagan theology, it is the theology of the cult of Stoicism — the "Unitarian" form of the Isis cult.

The British — at least the British inner circles — know both points. Americans, among others, do not — and would, ordinarily, rather hysterically deny that any such arrangements exist. The spectacle so represented by the American resembles that ox harnessed to a treadmill who might imagine himself to be displaying his free-willed desire for exercise.

The case of Henry A. Kissinger is exemplary. Why is Henry Kissinger important? Solely because Americans are foolish enough to believe he is important. His intrinsic importance is essentially analogous to the naked Emperor's "new suit of clothes," which exists only in the delusions of the duped beholders. Even so, in the manner of such things, the fact that deluded Americans imagine that Kissinger is important makes the use of those delusions important to the British. So a worthless political creature, Kissinger, becomes important both to Americans, and so to Kissinger's British puppet-masters.

Let us, keeping the spectacle of fat, neurotic, sulking Kissinger still in view, look a bit into his background. There we find persons of the sort the British would consider truly important. For example, recently retired Fritz Kraemer, the immigrant German oligarchist who plucked Private Kissinger up out of the Louisiana mud and started Fat Henry on his career. Fritz Kraemer — without whose counsel James R. Schlesinger would not have dared light his pipe or blow his nose, who could play Franz-Josef Strauss like a set of drums — was important. So was Harvard's Professor William Yandell Elliott, the American-born British agent who manipulated the

The Kissingers, like yesterday's discarded Hollywood sex symbol, have essentially no intrinsic importance.

youthful careers of both Zbigniew Brzezinski and Kissinger.

Kraemer and Elliott were important. In his own right, Arthur Ross is more important than Fat Henry. So is Henry Simon Bloch of the Warburg Pincus investment bank. These men are the puppet-masters; Fat Henry is merely a puppet. The puppet-masters live outwardly quiet lives — at least, insofar as the glare of public relations distinguishes notability from obscurity. They do not run the world; on that point, they are merely the puppet-masters, the hired controllers in the background. They are not the visible litigants in public affairs; unless one knows when and where to look, they are almost invisible to the public eye. They are the behind-the-scenes arbiters, who manipulate the puppets, which puppets in turn, deliver the actual speeches and utter the pronouncements.

Like a motion-picture actor or actress in the Hollywood star system, or some tin-eared hooter-and-groaner on the rock circuit, mere puppets such as Henry Kissinger are the manipulated properties of those who own them. By making Henry Kissinger, otherwise a bad-tempered, bad accountant, into a celebrity — each promotion artificially rigged — they "built up" Fat Henry into a political-entertainment commodity, just as a producer might afford a girl a brief apotheosis as a national sex symbol. The property, being made salable, commands the efforts of the manufacturer to keep it salable. In that fashion, the object possessed possesses the possessor. If a drug manufacturer successfully promotes a worthless, flavored piece of compacted chalk-powder into a prosperous venture, the manufacturer is possessed by the very success of his own worthless creation.

Yet, through all such complications, the puppet still remains merely the puppet, whose importance, cultivated over years to become seemingly an object of unassailable durability, can be destroyed almost in a week.

The case of Senator Joseph McCarthy is exemplary. McCarthy was politically, essentially a sodden blivet, cultivated by certain interests as a usable fool, a *political-entertainment commodity*. Came the time the puppet-masters received orders to demobilize their creation, McCarthy's efforts to hold the power he had been given wilted under the TV lights in weeks. The once-feared McCarthy crawled from those — actually, relatively few — sessions a broken,

discredited man. The same could occur to a Kissinger, and the termination of his importance would be executed with far, far less effort than was required for the mass-following-based McCarthy.

The Kraemers, the Henry Blochs, the Arthur Rosses survive such changing of the casts of political (and other) actors. They have an intrinsic importance; the Kissingers, like yesterday's discarded Hollywood sex symbol, have essentially none. The puppet-masters, too, are vulnerable to their masters. However, they are initiates of the Stoic cult, the Cult of Isis, in which precincts the mere puppets never achieve more than the courtesy-title of novices. The puppet-masters have, in their fashion, an essential importance.

The Stoic cult — the Cult of Isis — is approximately 22 centuries old. The Stoic cult itself (as distinct from the more theatrical Isis rituals) was established during the second century BC by Aristotle's heirs in Ptolemaic Egypt. These heirs were in fact the debt-collectors throughout the Mediterranean for the banking and tribute-collecting operations of the Cult of Apollo, ran the Cult's political-intelligence operations, and manufactured new, synthetic cults and prophecies as takeovers of one culture after another required the cooking up of such concoctions.

How it works

The circumstances and purposes of the synthesis of the Isis cult and Stoic doctrines are crucial to understanding how the damned thing works, and to what purpose.

The collection of Aristotle's Peripatetics that landed in Ptolemy's Egypt — after being booted out of Athens for complicity in the assassination of Alexander the Great, among other offenses — had been agents of the Cult of Delphi. At Delphi, the Cult of Apollo had had the same cult and banking functions it perpetuated from his Egyptian headquarters, and had been then the principal political-intelligence agency for what was designated as the "Western Division" of the Persian Empire. Its principal functions, apart from general banking and intelligence activities, was to effect the defeat of the forces committed to scientific and technological progress — the *city-builders*. It was identified during the 4th century BC with a policy then termed the "Persian model," which can be summed up as a feudal utopia perpetuated with the aid of an environmentalist's hostility to urban-dominated cultures and technological progress.

The institution that had created this form of the Delphic Cult of Apollo was the Babylonian priesthood. Hence the Cult of Apollo, the Stoic cults, and the oligarchical faction generally were dubbed the *Whore of Babylon* in the Christian New Testament.

The ruling forces represented by the Babylonian priesthood (and the Cult of Apollo) were composed of two categories. The first was a landed aristocracy, a military nobility. The second was an aristocracy of

finance, families occupied chiefly in usurious tax-farming of governmental revenues, but controlling most of the financing of trade as well.

Experiences during the period prior to the great migrations of the "Peoples of the Sea" had included the emergence of great city-state cultures. The Tyre of Hiram and Tyre's promotion of city-building by King Solomon in Israel exemplify the adversary that the Babylonian priesthood worked to destroy at approximately the beginning of chronicles generally available to us today. They had learned that the urban-centered promotion of science and technology produced developments in society that threatened the extinction of the oligarchical order.

Who is the Council on Foreign Relations?

Founded in 1921 as the U.S. branch of Britain's Royal Institute of International Affairs, the New York Council on Foreign Relations and its journal *Foreign Affairs* today represent the *creme de la creme* of the Anglo-American alliance.

So, the oligarchical faction defined itself, from then down to today's environmentalist-terrorist cults, as the deadly adversary of policies of general scientific and technological progress. Over the millennia, the oligarchists have regarded it as expedient to make use of existing technology to the end of strategic requirements. However, they have been dedicated at the same time to halting the impulse of further technological progress, *especially in other nations*. By halting technological progress in other nations, they could impose a halt to technological progress in their own — and thus perpetuate a feudal order in perpetual bucolic imbecility indefinitely.

The characteristic means that faction has employed from ancient Babylon down to the present day is as follows. It has relied heavily on deploying backward rural and pastoral forces as a mass battering-ram against the forces for progress, even bringing bucolic foreign invaders to conquer their own nations if the forces for progress grew too strong at home. It also developed urban cults among the most-wretched poor and susceptible adolescent youth, using predecessors of "rock music," erotic play ranging into sodomy, and

psychotropic drugs. These urban cults, often "back to nature" cults, were generally modeled on the proven success of the Phrygian cult of Dionysus in transforming a mixture of urban slum-layers and adolescent youth into a social battering ram of crazed irrationalism against the political institutions and forces of the city-builders.

This sociological method was complemented by the designing of myths and cults which were esteemed as representing a belief-structure (as some would term it today) antagonistic to scientific thinking and to promotion of technological progress. Critics have exaggerated the aspect of pagan cults that tended to induce submissiveness to a ruling caste or class.

In fact, anarchism was a very efficient instrument of British intelligence into the World War I period, deploying its assassins largely from Swiss safe-houses (as international terrorists in Europe today) to ritually reduce the Hapsburg population to British-manageable proportions, and, in one instance, via Emma Goldman's New York City Henry Street Settlement House, to assassinate President William McKinley.

Anarchism, a model for a modern Dionysian cult, does not contain any emphasis on dutiful worship of kings, counts, or local officialdom — yet it serves the oligarchists' purposes all the better precisely for reason of omission of such features of cult-belief. The

Among the Council's approximately 1,600 members:

Walter Mondale
William Paley
C.L. Sulzberger
James Reston
John J. McGloy
Henry Kissinger
Joseph Califano

Dean Rusk
William F. Buckley
Walter B. Wriston
Stephen Bechtel
Lane Kirkland
Leonard Woodcock
Gen. Alexander Haig
Daniel Ellsberg

Arthur Ross
Zbigniew Brzezinski
Douglas Dillon
Cyrus Vance
Theodore Hesburgh
David Rockefeller
Paul C. Warnke

Those features are often present and important, but they are not the essential feature of cult-design generally.

Exemplary is the case of modern anarchism.

Bakunin's anarchist international was created almost instantly through, principally, Rothschild funding. The Rousseauvian elements of Proudhon's doctrine were syncretically merged with the ultraegoistical irrationalism of Max Stirner, to create a cult explicitly modeled in all features of social composition and ideology on the ancient cult of Dionysus. The success of William Pitt's Secret Intelligence Service in deploying British agents Danton and Marat back into France from London, to lead the Jacobin terror, was also an immediate model of reference for the Bakunin project. Bakunin himself was directly funded through British agent Alexander Herzen, conduiting funds from N.M. Rothschild and Sons of London, under Rothschild orders. The branches of the new anarchist organization in other parts of Europe were assembled from petty police-agents and odd "radical" sorts sucking on the Rothschild tit in those quarters.

same point is to be made concerning the modern Bakuninite terrorists of today's international terrorism, or the environmentalist movement generally. The usefulness of such wretched degenerates to their actual masters lies in their deployment as a destructive force without morality or conscience, against the nations, institutions, and persons the oligarchists wish destroyed. By destroying the city-builders, the anarchists most efficiently aid the oligarchists' goal of a feudal utopia. By their own infantile dedication to smallness, the anarchists discipline themselves against any capability of developing as a potentially governing force.

The codification of the myths and cult-doctrines deemed most suitable for neutralizing scientific progress was accomplished under the supervision of the Apollo Cult's agent, Aristotle, during the 4th century BC. The Peripatetics moved from place to place, under orders of the Cult of Apollo, collecting and codifying the elements of the doctrine intended to serve as a permanent, comprehensive obstacle to scientific progress.

Any idea assimilated without experiencing polemical conflict is merely already known, or of no importance.

There are three key aspects of Aristotle's codifications to be considered here. The first is the Nicomachean Ethics, imported by the Cult of Apollo (which ruled Rome) as the basis for the Roman law. The second is Aristotle's doctrine of rhetoric. The third is the collection of so-called scientific works.

The Aristotelean method — by which commentators usually mean to emphasize the works bearing on scientific method — is *the perfect instrument of oligarchical brainwashing*. No one since has been able to improve upon Aristotle's work *in this respect*. Its specific, evil genius is that it demands the formulation of knowledge in such terms that the assumedly lawful form of knowledge is fixed, and that no new thing is ever created, except by composition with existing things. Its value to the oligarchists is that it is a procedure for codifying any sort of existing knowledge in such a fashion as to eliminate trace of the creative-mental processes by which that knowledge was created.

Readers who have not had the advantages of an advanced education probably do not appreciate how recent the encyclopedia and textbook methods of instruction are in fact. The basis for both is the work of the Royal Society, and other branches of British Secret Intelligence Service, under coordination of John Locke, in applying Aristotle's method of codification of collected knowledge according to the principle of *excluding acknowledgment of the existence of hypothesis*. The *Encyclopaedia Britannica* was developed by the Scottish branch of the Secret Intelligence Service as part of the general effort to that purpose. The organization of Newton's chiefly plagiaristic *Principia*, and of Boyle's publications, are exemplary of the same emulation of Aristotle's method.

The textbook has the same sort of brainwashing function. Instead of situating the development of scientific knowledge in terms of the actual social process by which knowledge was developed — the pretextbook method—the standard textbook connects the elements of what is adopted as existing knowledge by means of plausible explanations, the consistency of such plausible-explanation frauds achieved through emulation of Aristotle's method.

The connection of Aristotle's Nicomachean Ethics and Roman law to the Hobbes and Locke social models and to British legal doctrine tends to be obscured by a growing want of comparison in the

U.S.A. (in particular). The inability even to comprehend the ABCs of a constitutional law among even federal court judges today arises from a cumulative corruption of U.S. law doctrines and practices by British subversions. Originally, during the early decades of the United States, continuing under Justice Marshall, the notion of "natural law" immediately associated with Gottfried Leibniz was the doctrine of constitutional law. The doctrine was of a nation which had a unifying purpose in behalf of the existing population and its posterity as a whole; that purpose was progress, which was the fundamental interest of the individual member of society — his rights and liberties were his rights to develop his creative-mental powers and to express the fruitful contributions of those powers to the general (and his own) benefit. This republican principle is eliminated by Aristotle, by Roman law, and by British law.

The very notion of a rhetoric is intrinsically cultist. There are, indeed, uses of language which communicate conceptions of importance in a better or worse fashion. There is a role which elegance may contribute to that purpose. In that sense, one might think to speak of a proper "rhetorical art." However, the abstraction of the mere forms of argument from the nature of the content to be communicated, and the nature of the problem of bridging the conceptual inadequacies of an audience, is pure mystification, fraud.

The merit of a conception is not to be measured by the readiness with which it is generally accepted in any specific quarter. Often, the truth is directly the reverse, by the very nature of scientific conceptions, which, if important, go strongly against accepted prejudices. To acquire the power to eliminate the important aspects of a conception in order to give credibility more easily to the mere name one attaches to it is failure and fraud. Once communication is associated merely with velocity of persuasion — making friends and influencing people — all real intellectual life ceases.

The essence of all creative or otherwise important thought and communication is *polemical*. Once one goes beyond mere petty gossiping — "I saw a cow yesterday in Mrs. Jones's kitchen, but what a pretty cow!" — any important communication ventures into a kind of combat between the writer's or speaker's conception and the tendency of the reader or listener to be offended by such offense to his preexisting prejudices. To communicate important conceptions, one must make a war against the reader's or listener's prejudices, albeit with a lovingness felt and projected toward that reader. No reader who acquires ideas in any other way should trust his own judgment in accepting them. Any idea that is assimilated without experiencing polemical conflict is either merely an idea one already knew, or an idea of no importance.

Rhetoric does not appeal to the true cognitive functions. It proceeds: I will please you, and so you should please me. It is a crooked politician smiling

warmly as he presses the hands of the voters he is impatient to swindle as quickly as he is installed in office. *Rhetoric is the art of "pleasurable" intellectual sodomy.*

Now, we are close to the heart of the literary principles of the Council on Foreign Relations.

The formal features of Aristotle's work are not adequate to accomplish the oligarchist's purpose. To quench the creative-mental impulse within the person, one must reduce him — degrade him — from a reasoning person into merely a thinking person. One must wean him from the tendency to associate his human, social identity with the development of his creative-mental powers to rigorously develop or assimilate new qualities of contributions to general scientific and technological progress.

Once the individual is strongly attached to creative identity, he associates his identity with acts he perceives to be of universal benefit to society. He then, in turn, regards his fellow-human by the same standard, the same potentiality for contributing something of universal importance. On such persons democratic republics dedicated to progress are based — just as our own United States was created.

One must, if one is to ensure a stably oligarchical form of society, instill an emotional world-outlook and sense of personal identity corresponding to Hobbes's order of each against all, or its less provocatively formulated Lockean equivalent. The focal point of identity and personal judgment is shifted from universal acts to the appetites the individual associates with his or her mere biological individuality.

This potentiality for degradation into a Hobbesian or Lockean person exists in each individual. It is the world-outlook of the infant, the ill-tempered two-year-old child, the infantile person. Cultivate the individual's infantile sort of egoistical-sensual appetites. Lure intellectually deprived slum-victims and susceptible adolescent youth into dionysiac forms of prolonged dancing, the drums constantly pounding throughout. Occupy their minds with erotic play (pornography), and perhaps, to degrade them more, lure them into erotic activities proceeding from perhaps paired into group sex-play and sodomies. Infuse into the circles of these victims psychotropic drugs, or merely get them regularly drunk. Occupy them with the sensuality of sports, and induce them to prefer this over their mind's development. Then, you have degraded that individual, playing upon the residue of infantile egoistical sensuality within such victims to drive them into acutely neurotic infantilist conditions, in which the noises in their minds prevent them from maintaining any significant concentration span in thought.

John Stuart Mill, the evil Bertrand Russell's godfather and guiding light of the Fabian Society, outlines the procedures for doing this: it is called the "utilitarian philosophy," and with whipped-cream added, takes on the Viennese aspect known as

This degradation of a people is called sociology, or behaviorist psychology, or linguistics.

"transactional philosophy." This process of degradation of a people is called in academic precincts *sociology*, or *behaviorist psychology*, or *linguistics*.

That procedure is the Phrygian cult of Dionysus.

So, the Peripatetics in Egypt syncretized the Cult of Isis, by working in the cult of Dionysus into the "belief-structure" adduced from the Egyptian pantheon. The cult itself centers around the doctrine of reincarnation — which is the hallmark of many degraded oligarchist cults of the occident and orient alike. The Isis worshipper does not assuredly believe in the reincarnation of personality — except in the most extreme, mentally deranged cases. The notion of reincarnation is rather symbolic for the notion of perpetuation of the personality through the family, variously the biological family, the synthetic family-group and so forth.

This symbolic pathology of reincarnation is associated with a doctrine of obedience, of willingness to perform any sort of monstrous evil in behalf of the family, the cult itself, on orders of those who the family appoints to give such orders. The qualities of the degenerate feudal aristocrat and the anarchist assassin are thus compacted into a single doctrine and practice. All of this is wrapped in an atmosphere and rituals which expose the evil Marquis de Sade as probably an Isis Cult member, and not particularly original in his morbid extravagances.

There are two other points to be considered to comprehend the essential workings of the Isis Cult. These are the roles of superstition and the "secular" form of the Isis Cult, Stoicism.

The characteristic feature of the political-intelligence operations of the Cult of Apollo was its use of prophecy. The British borrowed a classic such method from the ancient priests of Apollo in the operation they ran to the purpose of discrediting Secretary of State William Rogers.

The British fed their agent in the National Security Council, Henry Kissinger, with a wild prophecy: the Soviets were about to deploy the Palestinians and Syria to overthrow King Hussein in Jordan, continuing to outline a wild scenario in which the Soviets took over the Middle East, the Mediterranean, and Western Europe in the ensuing developments. A similar line of nonsense was fed into Jordan.

Rogers ridiculed the prophecy. Rogers's argument was correct, except that it overlooked one thing. The

Soviets had no such operation in view; on this Rogers was correct. *However, the British did.* The British used British-Zionist agents within the Palestinian forces and British agents-of-influence in the Jordanian military to set up a gang-countergang escalation leading into the "Black September" massacre. A Syrian Palestinian armored force maneuvered for just long enough (conspicuously *without Syrian air support!*) to seem to correspond to that feature of Kissinger's prophecy. Nixon et al. were taken in. Rogers, and the prospect of the Rogers Plan, were discredited.

Obviously, President Nixon had not mastered ancient Greek history. The British may not be noted for any signs of creative originality, but they do study the classics zealously at Oxford and Cambridge.

Astrology is one of the most significant of the cults promoted for the purpose of destroying the cognitive potentialities of the credulous mind. The promotion of gambling — legalized or otherwise — is another trick proven most effective in promotion of irrationality, superstition in the minds of the ignorant and credulous. Show me a person who believes "there is something in astrology" or a person who gambles, and you have shown me a gravely neurotic person lacking coherent powers of rationality under stress.

Stoicism is the secular form of these features of the Isis Cult, and the mirror image of the bestialized order of society presented as axiomatic by Hobbes and Locke. It is, as we have noted, the "Unitarian" version of the Isis Cult.

The Scottish Rite

When the oligarchist Philip the Fair of France had crushed the Templars — awarding the properties of the Templars to the Knights of St. John of Jerusalem — the associated organization of Freemasons was left without a patron of importance. These Freemasons were, in fact, organized around the builders of cathedrals and other great works of the period into the late 13th century's ongoing general collapse. They persisted as a significant political force for humanism (city-builder policies of progress).

The oligarchists were determined to wipe out the humanist potentials of the Freemasons. So, the British Secret Intelligence Service cooked up the so-called "Scottish Rite" of Freemasonry. The principal degenerate engaged in this construction was one Ashmole, who made the centerpiece of his syncretism the Cult of Isis.

One must be cautious in leaping too quickly to judgment over the mere fact that the Isis and Osiris symbology is included in Freemasonry. As the case of Mozart's *Magic Flute* attests, leading European humanist circles were engaged in a countersyncretic effort, to neutralize the significance of the Isis and Osiris images — as Mozart attempts in that opera. For such reasons, Mozart was assassinated by poisoning.

(Years later, Salieri admitted to his part in that assassination effort. Poisoning was the preferred method of assassination by Aristotle.)

Nonetheless, without assuming rashly that every Freemasonic lodge tolerating the symbols of Isis and Osiris is a nest of perfervid Isis-worshippers, the hard-core British Freemasonic groups are. Another organized collection of Isis-worshippers are the British factions of the Order of Malta. Another notable set of Isis-worshippers are the hard core Zionists, who have reworked their Judaism into a thinly disguised cover for the tradition of Isis worship in their circles since Benjamin Disraeli's participation in that obscene, pagan worship.

It is for this reason that members of the Venerable Military and Hospitaller Order of the Knights of St. John of Jerusalem (British-Canadian branch), and the Sovereign Order of the Knights of St. John of Jerusalem (U.S.-Canada-based Russian, or "fascist international," branch) are known as "Christians who are not Christians." The adoption of the hideous blood-oath of the Cult of Isis is exemplary of the point. The same applies to the "Jews who are not Jews," the inner circles of the Jerusalem Foundation and B'nai B'rith.

The Bahai cult is another, British-intelligence-created concoction of the same hideous variety, as a the British-intelligence-created Hare Krishna cults.

Isis causes degeneracy

The effects of indoctrination in the world-outlook associated with the Cult of Isis causes a specific, recognizable pattern of intellectual and moral degeneracy. Although members of the Council on Foreign Relations are not all worshippers of that pagan cult, they represent, predominantly, an Anglophile association under heavy influence of Round Table circles which are intimates of the cult.

The eerie sort of scatterbrained patter common within Council circles' speech and writing is chiefly, directly the product of this influence.

A passage from an early section of Miriam Camps's book (pp. 12-13) suffices to pin down a preliminary identification of the kind of mental dysfunction to which we refer:

"Although today one is struck by the force of nationalism almost everywhere, the nationalism in the developed countries has an overripe smell to it, suggesting that it is, in part at least, a reaction to the fact of greater interdependence, to the loss of effective autonomy in many fields, and to the increasing remoteness of the effective level of decision-making. Not only has nationalism — which at the end of the Second World War seemed on the wane in the more highly developed countries, caught a new grip on life, but there is also a new vociferousness to ethnic loyalties at the subnational level, e.g., Flemings, Bretons, Welsh."

That, is by no means the worst of Camps's prose. This passage from the beginning of the book has been chosen because it has a greater formal resemblance to coherent articulation than usually occurs as she moves on into later chapters. Let us consider a few features of the quoted piece of gibberish and see what sort of criticism is possible for such drivellings.

Let us look at the passage backwards. The statement, "there is also a new vociferousness to ethnic loyalties at the subnational level." I do not know what Camps intended to say by that statement, but I know the recent history of CFR policy well enough to know exactly what *they* intended to say by that statement. Whether Camps knew what she was writing (in any meaningful sense) or not, that was a point she was supposed to make. The rest of the paragraph is pure garbage, variously meaningless, false, self-contradictory, essentially fustian. That whole, rotting jellyfish of a paragraph up to the end was merely a perverted sort of rhetorical slithering up to the one statement in the paragraph that has any sort of intent or sense to it.

The statement itself, if read at face value, is a lie. I do not know Camps, to determine whether she knew the statement was inherently fraudulent, but the leading forces of the CFR damn well know it. Nonetheless, unlike the rest of the paragraph, it is at least a definite statement with some sort of tenuous connection to the realities of a policy-discussion. After the sheer concoction of addlebrained babbling prefixed to it, one arrives at the concluding statement of the section with a sense of mental relief. The rest of the blather was simply an effort to create a plausible rhetorical environment for the single statement at the conclusion.

Now, as to the statement itself.

It is true that there was an upsurge of Walloons under the most-visible leadership of oligarchist agent-provocateur Renard in Belgium in the wave of the general strike erupting under the crisis-conditions of Congo independence. It also is true that a Fleming particularist ferment was reactivated with help of Renard's provocations among Walloons. There has also been a Breton particularist ferment — incidentally, entirely manufactured and controlled by British intelligence services. The British intelligence services also dabbled with a Welsh particularist movement. One could add many more cases, with the same qualifying observations on the origin of the particularist ferment in each case.

The top circles of the CFR are intimately informed on such matters. Now, knowing that they know that sort of fact, what are we to make of a statement such as "there is . . . a new vociferousness to ethnic loyalties at the subnational level"? Whatever Camps does or does not know, from the CFR such a statement is a fraudulent one. Correct would be: "We are so far committed to continuing a policy of destabilizing existing national governments through creating ethnic disturbances wherever we can define a suitable

minority for such purposes." The implicit further point arises from such a relative franker formulation of the point: "Therefore, policy-makers had better build their schemes around a British determination to continue to foster such obscenities."

This critical appraisal already affords the reader a sense of the difference between what the CFR intends to propose as policy and the involuted double-talk under which such a simple point of policy-formulation is buried.

Low on page 13, we encounter a brief statement which is properly understood not quite as written, but with aid of the sort of translation we have just performed on the selected passage from the foregoing citation.

"In instability of borders will not be the only, or indeed the main source of turmoil in the less developed countries. Population pressures, massive unemployment, rapid urbanization, indigestibly fast rates of social change, inexperienced governments, all promise continued turbulence."

Again, reverse the statement: "promise continued turbulence." That, as a declarative statement of intent, gives us the key to the paragraph. Turbulence where? "Promise continued turbulence . . . in the less developed countries." Let us summarily examine the means which Camps proposes will be used to produce this promised turbulence.

"Population pressures." Where? Latin America? No. Africa? No. the Israeli expansion into Arab territories and Lebanon? That is one case. The subcontinent of Asia? Yes, dear friend, a general wave of border destabilizations around India's borders is intended. China? Ah, now you have hit upon a biggie! Will population pressures cause these destabilizations? In fact, not at all; however, population pressures will be used as an explanation for the "factors" causing this destabilization, just as the magical phrase "sociological phenomenon" was employed by such as Willy Brandt and Henry A. Kissinger each time some investigator began nosing too efficiently into the British and Israeli intelligence services' control of international terrorism.

"Massive unemployment." That not only offers any intelligence service wonderful opportunities for generating all sorts of destabilizations of governments throughout most of the developing sector, but under IMF and World Bank programs, this unemployment is being massively increased.

"Rapid urbanization." This is a rather nasty bit of double-talk. Under British (and, hence CFR) policy, there is no allowance for the capital-intensive investment which would promote urbanization in the usual understanding of that term. However, driving the poor from rural districts into the cities, with the growth of massive slums of the sort that produces under a condition of declining general employment opportunities, and one has Jacobin-terrorist riots ready for the making.

'Security community' suggests the entire board of CFR sucking on the edges of a large blue blanket.

"Indigestibly fast rates of social change." That is a cruel way of putting the point. Slashes in consumption under London, Eurodollar, IMF, and World Bank "conditions," already under way by 1974, mean hideous social change.

"Inexperienced governments." In nations undergoing successive coups, a proliferation of "inexperienced governments" is the general circumstance.

Two excerpts from a paragraph beginning on the same page round out adequately our study of this specific sort of syndrome:

"Cultural separateness is harder to maintain, but so too is ignorance of the human costs of war and famine. . . . The edges of sovereignty seem likely to continue to shrink and to become more and more ragged and the remaining boundaries more permeable."

The first part of the excerpt refers to such projects as that of the Rand Corporation to launch a chain-reaction war throughout all South America, pivoting around a war between Chile and Peru erupting over the issue of Bolivian access to the sea. A similar operation for Central America was planned then, with the Panama Canal treaty being negotiated as part of the process of setting such a general destabilization into motion. There was a similar, Kissinger project for all of southern Africa, and a Kissinger destabilization project for the Horn of Africa — in which, as Kissinger originally planned it, the USA would encourage Ethiopia to attack Somalia, to which end London stirred up the Somalian Liberation Front concoction involving Somalia in troubles with Kenya as well as Ethiopia. The Kissinger austerity projects for the developing sector afoot during that period would generate sufficient famine to eliminate any well-being surviving from regional wars.

The second part of the excerpt simply reports the commitment of the CFR to pushing the doctrine of "limited sovereignty."

In the succeeding chapter, entitled "Security," we are confronted with the following lollapoolooza at the close of the opening paragraph (p. 21):

" . . . a combination of countervailing power and self-restraint born of recognition that major war is in no one's interest."

That conceptual atrocity is continued into such marvels of empty literary posturing as (pp. 21-22):

"The rhetoric of the unreal goals of general and complete disarmament and of collective enforce-

ment should be put aside and more thought given to ways of limiting and gradually changing the character of competition between states."

This statement, like the piece of refuse cited from the chapter's first paragraph, is properly recognized as "The Woodrow Wilson heritage."

I assure the reader I am not being unfair in selecting quotations. I know very well how the business of distortion through paring selected quotations to distort the original is affected. I have taken pains to avoid even an accidental slipping into a color of such practice. The selections given are a scrupulously fair representation of what I am getting at, which is the quality of her thinking.

There are two points to be adduced from selections of passages from page 25. First, to illustrate the way CFR policy is actually stated abruptly after a mish-mash prologue of — in this instance — Wilsonian schizophrenic babbling:

"There is in the Atlantic area not only the defensive alliance NATO but also the beginning of a 'security community'; that is, there is a relationship among the states of the area which is sufficiently close and confident so that the prospect of settling disputes among them by resort to force has almost disappeared. The 'security community' of the Atlantic area is not completely coterminous with the NATO area. For example, Austria, . . . although not in NATO, is probably included in the emerging security community, while Greece and Turkey, although members of NATO, are rather uncertain members of the Atlantic security community since war between them is still not inconceivable, e.g., over Cyprus."

There are two points to be made on this selection. The character of the paragraph as a whole is comparable to the first selection we considered from Camps's book. The whole thing is either gibberish, or trivial to the point of not being worth writing, until we reach the concluding "e.g., over Cyprus."

Remember that this is a 1974 publication. Here, again, we have a case in which the CFR is stating a chosen policy-perspective in a twisted fashion. It is projected British intelligence coups in Cyprus, which, CFR moots, will keep a possible Greece-Turkey conflict available as an option for destabilization of the Eastern Mediterranean. If one knows Cyprus's internal situation, as anyone with the resources of the CFR should, then CFR would not publish a text under the silly presumption that there was any *spontaneous* potential for Greece-Turkey conflict over Cypriot developments which could never occur *spontaneously* in the first place.

The point which we wished to introduce by citing that paragraph, and which we shall emphasize by the next citation we shall make, is the way in which the authoress qualifies the gobbledygook concerning "security community," all of which had no bearing on the Cyprus point, except as pure fustian to give her a

running start into uttering the Cyprus point, rather than coming out and stating it plainly in the first place. We find the key to the "security community" nonsense in a footnote to the cited paragraph:

"5. The concept of a 'security community' in this sense originated with Karl Deutsch. See Karl Deutsch, et al., *Political Community and the North Atlantic Area*. . . Princeton, . . . 1957, p. 2."

Ye Gods and little fishes! What a conniving way to work in a footnote, and to expand a single statement into a fustian-stuffed paragraph, all ostensibly to cut a recherché posture by referring, in 1974, to an inconsequential bit of nonsense allegedly first concocted on page two of a 1957 Defense Grub Street production.

One is already in a poor mental state if one must fill up paragraphs with fustian. To have to borrow a piece of worthless prose from some poor fellow's scribblings of 17 years earlier — on page 2, no less! — thus certifies one lacks even the imagination to invent one's own trivial nonsense! No doubt, one is supposed to be impressed with the aura of scholarship about the whole matter. "Security community" indeed! The very name suggests nothing so strongly as the entire board of CFR sitting in a circle, eyes glazed with childish serenity, while all join in sucking communally on the edges of a large blue blanket!

"Not only in Europe but elsewhere as well, we should be seeking to strengthen and expand the scope of existing security communities and to create new ones. As Kenneth Boulding has pointed out, we could be approaching a watershed where 'the international system passes from a condition of unstable peace, albeit with enclaves of stable peace, into one in which stable peace becomes the property of the general system, which still however may have enclaves of unstable peace within it.' "

This citation brings us closer to the kernel of the CFR method. I know what Camps means, and knew it when John Foster Dulles was proposing the same general sort of thing back in the 1950s. The general concept I treated in my *The Case of Walter Lippmann*. Like a particularly bad meal, the proposal has a recurring tendency to come back up. The proposal is bad, but to offer such a familiar policy under the veil of such double-talking! Either the reader will recognize the policy from the past, or he will recognize no policy at all. So, if one wishes to communicate, why attempt to seem to say something different than one is saying?

Now, to the Boulding business. At first glance, my reaction is to propose that if a man of his maturity must indeed masturbate, he ought to have the common decency not to publish the details of the event. The problem, like that of Camps's prose in the same paragraph, is that Boulding is unable to come out and state what he means. He must put it in an air of ivory-tower, algebraic-seeming generalities — hence the general aroma of masturbation. Translating the gobbledygook into some semblance of the reality to which he presumably refers, one sees what he is

Anglophiles recognize in the distinctions between the functioning of our minds a species difference.

trying to avoid saying intelligibly.

Let us translate this monstrosity into statements which bear some connection to reality.

"**A condition of unstable peace.**" Generally, this means the continued adversary relationship between NATO and the Warsaw Pact, with the China variable tossed in, and the various issues — especially in the developing sector, most emphatically the Middle East — which threaten to unstick the peace among the superpowers. Why not say so? Why this parody of Aristotelean abstraction of the "essence" of a "condition of unstable peace," then proceeding to attempts at linguistic algebraic tricks with mere phrases? Is policy-making then to be a matter of juggling phrases in that fashion?

"**Stable peace becomes the property of the general system.**" "Property" is the key term, the Aristotelean term, most emphatically. On what basis does Boulding propose that the "watershed" for such a "property of the general system" is about to emerge? It would exist only on the concrete basis that FDR's Soviet policy, or Eisenhower's Atoms for Peace, or the Rogers Plan were resurrected and adopted as the common policy of the USA and Soviet Union. Does Boulding see that occurring in 1967? Perhaps, at *that* juncture.

In 1974, after Kissinger has not only joined with the British to wreck the Rogers Plan, but has institutionalized various arrangements aimed at preventing any such developments in policy, where do any of the CFR crowd supporting Kissinger's wrecking-job see a "watershed" of that sort in 1974? Once we take Boulding's 1967 formulation out of the realm of phrase-mongering and identify the realities to be considered, Boulding's formulation becomes translatable into readable prose. Camps shows not the slightest comprehension of such an adducible reality of the 1967 statement in 1974. She is proposing a policy directly opposite to Boulding's "watershed" mooted, then appropriating Boulding's mere phrases as somehow an implication of her policy.

One properly presumes that the reference to Boulding has about as much relevance to her point as the genuflections before page 2 of a 1957 production of Karl Deutsch.

The same school of rhetoric-by-fustian pervades the book. On page 32, for example:

"Some years ago, Lincoln Bloomfield suggested that the superpowers pursue a 'spheres of

abstention' policy; a similar, if more modest, suggestion for 'spheres of restraint' was later put forward in a little-noticed speech by Elliot Richardson when he was Undersecretary of State."

Why no honorable mention of Milton Berle's friend, Harvey Keck?

The pattern in Camps's book is that of lawyers cribbing paragraphs from boilerplate contracts or one another's old briefs. The principles of Nicomachean Ethics, coming through one channel of education of these people, find an incestuous pleasure in diddling with their nephews and nieces, encountered in the increasing influence of British doctrines of law in our law schools and general court practice.

In this incestuous preoccupation the notion of the coherent history of ideas, policies, evolving interests — even reality itself — is misplaced, and policy scholarship becomes a nightly raking through the contents of the outhouse, looking for signs of what some former passerby might have had for dinner to produce results similar to one's own current productions. The whole business of arguing policy, the rhetoric approved around the CFR, is degraded into a mixture of linguistic schizophrenia with algebraic literary formulations, mixed with a form of "scholarship" that converges on the most banal, childish sort of dictionary nominalism.

Enough of Camps. The point is illustrated.

The point is that those folk usually go on and on that way in any policy discussion. I have met such persons,

especially during most recent years, among Americans and Europeans, and from sections of the developing nations. One can not fail to pick out the Anglophile once he or she begins to talk — no matter what nation he or she presumably represents. The same nominalism, the same linguistic phrasemongering in place of concepts of reality. Worse, one brief paragraph tumbles after another with some free-associative sort of connection between most of them, but no conceptual coherence governing the whole, or shaping the contents of the particular paragraph. It is a string of fragmented such pieces, the whole collection a string of mementos of the scatterbrained outpourings of persons with miniscule concentration spans.

In our encounters, the inner circles among these persons recognize in the distinctions between the functioning of our minds something akin to a species-difference. If they have studied such of their ancient enemies as Plato, Leibniz, and so forth at Oxford or Cambridge, and have a certain experience in the corridors of power, they recognize quickly in that distinction that exists between us evidence that I represent the ancient and feared adversary of their own evil species. The Whore of Babylon recognizes the mind of her potential destroyer. Seeing also the work of the Labor Party, the influence of our works, they tense, growling such phrases as "potential danger," "more dangerous than Hitler," "kill it before it succeeds in getting a real foothold in shaping events."