LaRouche Replies To Bartley Column

by Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.

June 10, 2003

This letter to the editor of the Wall Street Journal *was written in response to an attack on Presidential candidate LaRouche by* Journal *editor emeritus Robert Bartley, over LaRouche's internationally followed exposé of the "Straussian cabal" in the Bush Administration. LaRouche titled it, "Re: 'Joining LaRouche In The Fever Swamps,'* Wall Street Journal, *June 9th".*

My old adversary, since 1973, your Robert Bartley, acknowledges that my Presidential nomination-campaign pamphlet, "The Children of Satan," has been widely influential; but he refuses to address that central issue of that pamphlet which has gained replication within some leading parts of the U.S. press and elsewhere around the world.

I make three points.

First, the subject of the pamphlet is the evidence that the faction in government currently headed by Leo Strauss follower Lynne Cheney and her husband, Vice-President Dick Cheney, is a continuation of what U.S.A. diplomatic and intelligence services of the 1930s and 1940s classified under the rubric "Synarchism: Nazi-Communist." This Synarchist network, then tied to circles in Germany, Italy, France, Spain, and heavily infiltrated in Central and South America, was a principal security concern of the U.S.A. during the 1930s and 1940s, and was the source of the Nazi-centered threat to the world at large which prompted President Franklin Roosevelt's personal alliance with the United Kingdom's Winston Churchill during the 1940-1941 interval preceding the December 7th Pearl Harbor attack.

The point of the pamphlet to which Bartley referred, was the fact that a so-called "neo-conservative" network of the Vice-President's lackeys, organized around the influence of Professor Leo Strauss—a follower of the Nazi existentialist Martin Heidegger, Nazi legal figure Carl Schmitt, and Hegelian Alexander Kojève—are the core of the current pro-war faction inside the current Bush Administration's Defense and State Departments, in addition to the office of the Vice-President himself. Bartley evades these facts, the facts of the very issue which made the pamphlet as influential as he describes it.

Second, in an included afterthought, Bartley finds my exposure of such Nazi traditions as suggesting "anti-semitic" motives.

The common quality of those lackeys who do have putative Jewish pedigrees is not that they are Jewish, but that many of them had been professedly putative Trotskyists, either of the Max Schachtman pedigree, or, in the case of Bartley's Wohlstetter, products of the successive leadership of the *Wall Street Journal*'s former writer, "B.J. Field," and Leo Strauss later.

Third, my exposure of those synarchist roots of Vice-President Cheney's Straussian lackeys, also underlined the importance of recognizing that Strauss, like his Allan Bloom, were in fact haters of Plato in the same tradition of Nietzsche as Strauss's teacher Martin Heidegger.

In fact, the strained argument of self-described "slow reader" Strauss was a copy of the Sophist method, of those Greek sophists who were the bitter enemies of the historical Socrates and, by name, the principal targets of attack in Plato's dialogues. The formal key to the interpretation of Plato's method of hypothesis has always been recognizable, whether in Greek or translation, in Plato's treatment of key

LaRouche points to the core of the argument that drew the Wall Street Journal*'s Bartley to publish attack on him; his campaign's exposé of the Straussians around the Bush Administration as synarchists—the type identified as a major fascist danger by U.S. intelligence in the World War II period.*

topics of pre-Euclidean, Pythagorean traditions of geometry. Plato's most famous application of that same dialectical method occurs in *The Republic*, in which the concept of *agapē* is presented by Socrates in opposition to the contrary principles of both Glaucon and the evil Thrasymachus. This is the same principle of *agapē* explicitly adopted as the core of Christian practice by the Apostle Paul, and enshrined under such terms as the Latin "caritas," or the English "common good" or "general welfare," in all commendable features of law and other practice in the subsequent course of globally extended European civilization.

I stand for defense of those overriding principles of our Federal Constitution expressed as its Preamble. I stand for the principle of the general welfare, as Plato's Socrates, the Apostle Paul, and as Franklin Roosevelt did. The Straussians, as typified by Cheney's Chicken-hawks, stand by the side of Thrasymachus. Once again, in his June 9th piece, Bartley demonstrates that his method is the sophistry of Thrasymachus.

My advice to Bartley: don't complain about the small size of the mental shoes you are trying to fit onto a man with big feet.

Sincerely,

Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.

Documentation

Journal's Column On LaRouche

The Wall Street Journal*'s June 9 "Thinking Things Over" editorial-page column by its editor emeritus, Robert L. Bartley, was entitled "Joining LaRouche in the Fever Swamps: The* New York Times *and the* New Yorker *Go Off the Deep End." We publish excerpts here, sufficient to show that LaRouche is clearly understood to be, and opposed as, the initiator of the world-wide exposure of the "Straussian cabal" running Bush Administration war policy.*

"It does seem to be true that the LaRouche screed was first in line in thrusting Leo Strauss, author of such volumes as *Natural Right and History*, into the middle of the debate over the Iraq war. The theme was later sounded by James Atlas in the *New York Times* and Seymour Hersh in the *New Yorker*.

"Mr. Atlas's article on 'Leo-Cons' included a photo essay with shots of Mr. Strauss and presumed disciples including Edward Shils, Allan Bloom, Saul Bellow, Albert Wohlstetter, on to Clarence Thomas and Leon Kass. . . . Mr. Hersh's 'Selective Intelligence' basically aired one side of an intelligence debate, defending dovish (or if you prefer, intellectually conservative) CIA analysts. It described the other side as 'the Straussian movement,' citing Mr. Wolfowitz and Abram Shulsky, head of a special Pentagon shop set up to review intelligence on Iraq. And it included a quote from an academic about 'Strauss's idea—actually Plato's—that philosophers need to tell noble lies not only to the people at large but also to powerful politicians.'

"Looking at the striking similarities in these accounts, the conspiracy-minded might conclude that the *New York Times* and *New Yorker* have been reduced to recycling the insights of Lyndon LaRouche. . . .

"To those of us who have lived this history over the decades, the notion of a Strauss conspiracy is totally unhinged. Leo Strauss, I learned as graduate student in the 1960s, was a champion of ancient philosophers, a critic of attempts at empirical political science if not of modernity itself. While this is centuries and leagues removed from Saddam Hussein, it's true that Mr. Strauss did influence Irving Kristol and his wife Gertrude Himmelfarb, and through them other neo-conservatives.

"It happens that I did a lot to put this term on the intellectual map as the 1970s dawned, with profiles of Mr. Kristol and Norman Podhoretz. The 'neo' meant that they were conservative converts from earlier radicalism. . . .

"It also happens that I had a long association with the late Albert Wohlstetter, who was in fact the key intellect in promoting new defense policies, in particular the accurate weapons that dominated Iraq, and also in mentoring Mr. Wolfowitz, Mr. Perle and others. But his background was as a mathematical logician and advocate of operational research. Despite Mr. Atlas's ludicrous classification of Wohlstetter as a Straussian, the two had nothing in common except the University of Chicago campus.

"While Mr. Wolfowitz took two courses from Mr. Strauss, he was in fact a student of Mr. Wohlstetter. . . .

"As one of the few people who ran with both neo-conservatives and the Wohlstetter circle, let me testify that they did not appear at each other's conferences or dinner tables. But prominent members of each are Jewish. This is what the recent conspiracy charges are ultimately about. . . .

"This is the ugly accusation an alert reader should suspect in encountering the word 'Straussian,' or these days even 'neo-conservative' in the context of the Iraq debate. Paul Wolfowitz and Richard Perle find their Jewish heritage a point of attack. But George Bush, Dick Cheney and Donald Rumsfeld are gentiles. Condoleezza Rice and Colin Powell don't look Jewish to me, but they also helped draft the basic statement of the Bush Doctrine, the September 2002 'National Security Policy of the United States.'. . .

"The impulse is so strong that Leo Strauss gets exhumed, words are twisted from their meaning, and the *Times* and *New Yorker* make common cause with Lyndon LaRouche."