

Delphic cult of the Pythian Apollo. Not only did they have a form of imitations of the Sophist cults produced among Athenians by the ancient cult of Apollo, they embodied the effects of a system of conditioning, centered in the Congress for Cultural Freedom, which was an intended virtual copy of the ancient Greek Sophist cult.

The most essential distinction of Sophist cults is that they deny the existence of any knowable universal principle. Like the evil, real-life Thrasymachus of Plato's *Republic*, they believe that whoever has the power to impose arbitrary rules on society represents the only true force of law for society. In principle, they are best fairly described as pro-Satanic on this account, the assertion that no true principle exists, that, as for the Nazis, everything is allowed, including the denial of everything that distinguishes man from the beasts.

This kind of arbitrary power is used as a tool of manipulation of the society in two ways most relevant for our consideration here. To those relegated to the under-class, such as the lower eighty percentile of household-income brackets of the U.S.A. today, all is allowed: Steal their pensions, condemn them to death and torment by denial of essential care, destroy their children by virtually impossible conditions of life, including their drugging, and crush them generally, even kill off those deemed members of superfluous sections of the population. Kill for profit; kill for pleasure; kill, torture, and so on, for no other required reason, than delight in the effect this produces. Yet, to those who are, or approximate the members of an oligarchy, tempt them by affording them a sense of participating in the exertion of the power which the authors of this evil system, the modern neo-Venetians, deploy.

Like Carl Schmitt, the real monsters do not adopt Swastikas. They are the higher aristocracy of the empire, oligarchs, who dole out rewards and encouragements to those who do officiate in managing those masses degraded to the virtual status of cattle. When the captured Nazis and their like are punished, the real Venetian controllers return to the circles of the financier oligarchies of the world, to do the same evil all over again, this time, once again, as "most respectable" creatures.

The mass of people degraded as the typical "68ers" and their present-day victims were degraded, accept the condition into which they have been thrown as "the way things are," even such degraded mental states as the deluded defenders of the "Green cause." The oppressed thus adopt the chains of their degradation as the trinkets with which they are adorned. They now admire their oligarchs, like the slaves who would defend their masters against their masters' enemies. For them, there are now no principles; there is only whatever miserable bit they are left, by their degraded circumstances, to regard as their comforts and pleasures.

That is the way in which the new surge of love for the trappings of oligarchism has arisen within a Europe of lost principles today.

Strictly Speaking, There Is No Iran Crisis

by Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.

March 6, 2006

Twice, during recent days, I have been asked to speak publicly, in Berlin, on the subject of an alleged Iran Crisis. Strictly speaking, although there is an "Iran Incident," there is no "Iran Crisis." The actual crisis is best described as "A Crisis on the Global Chessboard," in which there are particular moves on the global board, moves which include the Iran gambit being played by the forces associated with Britain's Blair government and that government's set of particular U.S. accomplices. Those who profess the need to analyze an alleged "Iran Crisis," are simply demonstrating that they are not players in the situation, but are, rather, among those psychological-warfare objects which are being played.

The role of the Iran sector in this London-orchestrated affair, will be catalogued by competent analysts as a continuation of the evolution of what became known as Britain's Sykes-Picot gambits, most notably the role of the Sykes-Picot arrangement in luring Russia's Nicholas II into joining Britain and France in drawing Russia into a fools' alliance with Britain and France against Germany for what became known as World War I. When the matter of the current Iran gambit is located within that relevant historical context, and only then, one begins to understand the present Iran affair with at least a semblance of competent insight into the nature of the global strategic issues involved in that localized gambit.

That is to emphasize, that the targets of "The Crisis on the Global Chessboard" include Russia and China, Russia more immediately. However, the more immediate phase of the British-led game in progress, is the promotion of British Arab Bureau veteran Bernard Lewis's revival of the global anti-Islam strategy which had been the basis for the creation and perpetuation of that medieval imperialist alliance of the Venetian financier-oligarchy and Norman chivalry, known as "The Crusades." What is in progress, currently centered in Blair's and Jack Straw's Liberal Imperialist London, is the creation of that permanent state of warfare and revolution intended to be the organizing principle of a new form of global imperialism, a form currently labeled "globalization." A global, perpetual religious war against Islam, is the British imperial policy adopted currently, for this purpose, by the Blair allies associated with the U.S. Bush-Cheney regime.

The significance of Iran as a targetted locality within the broader, global scheme, is principally two-fold: to trigger a



North Atlantic Council

British Foreign Secretary Jack Straw (left) and Prime Minister Tony Blair are at the center of “the creation of that permanent state of warfare and revolution intended to be the organizing principle of a new form of global imperialism, a form currently labeled ‘globalization.’ ” A perpetual war against Islam is now British imperial policy.



EIRNS/Stuart Lewis

British Arab Bureau veteran Bernard Lewis revived the global anti-Islam strategy which was taken up by Zbigniew Brzezinski, Samuel Huntington, and other U.S. “Crusaders.”

collapse of the present world economy, by creating a devastating, global petroleum crisis within the general region of Southwest Asia, while spreading the forces of chaos, through the Caucasus and Central Asia and Ukraine, to wreck that current revival of Russia’s influence with which the government of President Putin is currently associated. Hence, the efforts by Russia’s government, to stabilize the situation in and around Iran, are the target of desperate energies currently being deployed globally by the forces of chaos, the Blair government and its accomplices in the U.S. Bush-Cheney government.

The current form of the “Great Game” is premised on the virtual success, since the post-Adenauer, post-Kennedy, and virtually post-de Gaulle middle to late 1960s, of the efforts to wreck both the U.S. economy and Franklin Roosevelt’s fixed-exchange-rate, Bretton Woods monetary system, by change to a “post-industrial” orientation among the industrialized nations, and a “free trade” system for the world as a whole. The development of radical versions of the Lockean doctrine of “property” and of Adam Smith’s “free trade” doctrine, has created a situation in which private concerts of financier interest rape and dominate existing, nominally sovereign governments: creating thus, already, a virtual condition resembling the medieval *ultramontane* system then dominated by the alliance of Crusaders with Venetian financier oligarchs.

A collapse of the present financial system would wreck existing governments, including, potentially, that of the U.S.A., thus leaving the principal concerts of “property holders” as the absolute rulers of the entirety of the planet. It is

only when the interest of those behind the so-called “Iran Crisis” is defined from the standpoint of that neo-feudalist, current global strategy, that one can judge what interests the financier oligarchs controlling governments such as that of Blair and Straw, will prefer to defend. The worst possible strategic blunder would be made by those who

are deluded into believing that the controlling motives of those oligarchical forces are in any sense what normal people would consider rational perceptions of self-interest.

How Supposedly Rational People Are Easily Deceived

Today, as for Pericles’ Athens, which plunged itself into the ruin of the Peloponnesian War, the resulting doom was, as Plato emphasized, the corrupting influence of Sophistry on the mind and morals of foolish leading and other layers of the population. Instead of being governed by a quality of reason defined by regard for knowable principles of science, pandering to what are perceived as prevailing trends in popular opinion, especially the opinion predominant among the more powerful social strata, paves the pathway to self-inflicted doom. Such has been the trend in Sophistry among university products of the 1968 U.S.A. and Europe since the riotous events of that year.

Today’s compromised leading layers of influence, as in Europe and the U.S.A., reject the existence of those kinds of universal principle we would associate with Kepler’s uniquely original discovery of universal gravitation, and choose prevalent currents of current mere opinion as substitutes for principle. Agreements reached among some such leading currents, then tend to shape the evolution of current history, just as such devices of Sophistry sent Athens to its willful choice of doom in the Peloponnesian War.

In the case of the relevant “68ers,” the most conspicuous cause of presently resulting economic and related great fail-

ures among the leading nations of Europe and the Americas, has been the way in which anti-labor, anti-farmer, anti-experimental-science trends among the most vocal of the 68ers led to the shift from highly successful producer economies, to presently rotting “services” economies. Worse than the obvious physical collapses which “post-industrial” trends in opinion have produced, is the destruction of the ability of the mind of the typical member of society to think rationally. Now, nearly four decades after 1968, the lurch toward ruin of society which erupted then, has virtually taken over Europe and the Americas, with more broadly radiated effects which now menace the planet as a whole.

This was not a result of some blindly chosen mistakes in policy-trends. These effects experienced today were broadly intentional back then, when the late-1960s shifts in policy-trends first erupted to the surface of great events of that time. Just so, the Sophistry by which those nations are being self-destroyed today, was planted with the intent to produce effects akin to the ruin being experienced today. The Delphic campaign of Sophistry spread among Athenian and other youth during the decades preceding the outbreak of the Peloponnesian War was paralleled, already, by a targetting of the generation born during the approximately 1945-1955 interval, in western and central Europe and in the Americas. The relevant forms of contemporary Sophistry were introduced chiefly in the form of existentialism, such as those systemically irrationalist trends of Bertolt Brecht and the Frankfurt School, under umbrellas such as the Congress for Cultural Freedom, and Dr. Alexander King’s 1963 OECD proposal for a (destructive) reform in European education. These modes of corruption, targetting the new-born generation of 1945-1955, were complemented and reinforced by the terrifying effect of “Cold War” moods.

So, today, political and comparable leaders in society will capitulate to policies which they know are wrongful, merely because they have been conditioned to believe that those policies correspond to trends which have become “inevitable.” It is therefore said: “We must accept the fact, that we must learn to live with current trends.”

Belief in the existence of a specifically “Iran Crisis” is typical of the effects of such expressions of the current influence of modern forms of Sophistry.

The remedy is always to outflank generally accepted trends in opinion, as Frederick the Great once, so famously, flanked a well-trained, superior number of ably commanded Austrian forces. Step outside the commonly shared assumptions of one’s time and place, to assume thus, a position overlooking the conventional follies of one’s time. Even among my own associates, I have rarely encountered a prevalent opinion which was not ruinous; most of my signal personal achievements have been the result of my resistance to the wrongness of popular assumptions, even among my closest associates.

The idea of an “Iran Crisis” is a case in point.

Documentation

Foreign Minister Lavrov: ‘Russia in Global Politics’

Moskovskiye Novosti (Moscow News), a weekly Russian newspaper, on March 3, 2006 published this article by Russian Foreign Minister Sergei Lavrov. An unofficial translation issued by the Russian Ministry of Foreign Affairs is published here. Subheads have been added.

The heading of the article reproduces the title of a journal published by the Council on Foreign and Defense Policy. As with the journal, the title is no accident; it is this topic that continues to disturb minds, both in Russia itself, and beyond its borders—perhaps more so in the last few months than before. And for good reason. The international situation continues to evolve, and with it Russia’s role in global politics. Moreover, the process of crystallization in world politics has intensified noticeably. Certain realities are becoming clear, that have a defining significance for the emerging new architecture of international relations. Among them is the significance of the Russian factor in the mainstream of international life. This gives rise to a number of questions, some of which I shall attempt to answer.

The Russian analysis of the international situation begins from the assertion that in recent years, events have been developing in line with our ideas and assessments, that is, in the direction of democratic multi-polarity. Also pointing to this are phenomena like globalization’s acquisition of an “Asian face,” and the expanding practice of engaging in “strategic dialogues.” In today’s conditions, the correctness of our foreign policy’s founding principles—pragmatism, multi-vectoriness, and the consistent advancement of national interests without sliding toward confrontation—has been confirmed. Formulated in the first year of Vladimir Putin’s Presidency, these principles have spread more and more widely to the foreign policy practice of other states, including the world’s leading powers.

Contemporary international relations are difficult to understand if one does not bear in mind that they are in a transitional state, which by definition excludes the possibility of there being any kind of status quo (other than the fundamental principles of international law). However, one does get the impression that some of our partners are trying to secure their own hegemony in any new world order. I’m convinced that an approach like this is anti-historical, an out-and-out utopia, and is based on one of the myths of which so many arose immediately after the end of the Cold War, including the myth of “victors and vanquished.” The “winners” syndrome is not