Lyndon LaRouche has served his federal prison term and is hotly campaigning as a Democratic presidential candidate while globally spewing out prescriptions for saving the U.S. economy. His influence is far-reaching in the U.S., Europe, Latin America, the Middle East, Australia and elsewhere, via print media, the worldwide web, radio and cable TV, electoral campaigns, and speaking engagements. He writes reams of treatises on everything from current political and economic issues to history, culture, science and philosophy—even crusading to revise the tuning of the musical scale.

There’s something strange and cultish about LaRouche—but it’s hard to figure out exactly what he’s up to. Much of his message appears to be innocuous, kooky, contradictory, esoteric or shamelessly inflammatory. But underneath the weirdness lies a far-right world view.

With an apparently inexhaustible supply of money for public outreach, LaRouche adherents are emerging in ever greater numbers on campuses and street corners—and finding recruits. What is the attraction? First of all, the LaRouchites appeal to people under false pretenses using progressive issues such as support for Palestine and opposition to war and corporate globalization. In addition, LaRouche’s vast and detailed treatises on economic and political affairs spark interest among those
who know something is terribly wrong with the system and are looking for big answers worthy of their big questions. Moreover, LaRouche’s practice of minutely addressing every issue with grandiose references to history through the ages and Greek and German philosophers strikes a chord with individuals who are sick of being condescended to by today’s dumbed-down, commercialized culture.

These people need to know that LaRouche is a far-right ideologue and that those who have studied him consider his message very dangerous indeed. Even though he furiously accuses all manner of people of being Nazis, his own brand of politics both employs standard elements of fascism and revisions that may initially throw some people off track.

For example, while fascist movements have historically been stridently nationalist, LaRouche is working hard to establish allies in many countries outside the United States, particularly on the question of opposition to free trade. But he and his co-thinkers want to replace capitalist globalism with protectionism, a cornerstone of nationalist economic policy. On this platform, a LaRouche crony from the Brazilian state of São Paulo, Dr. Eneas Carneiro of the rightist Party for Rebuilding of National Order (PRONA), was elected overwhelmingly to the federal congress in October 2002. In June of that year, Carneiro had endorsed LaRouche’s U.S. presidential campaign and awarded him honorary citizenship of São Paulo.1

American fascists have also traditionally been out-front white supremacists and anti-Semites. LaRouche is definitely racist and anti-Jewish. But he also is making overtures to African Americans and denies anti-Semitism. This reflects the increasingly diverse population of the United States, where Caucasians will soon be a minority. For any extremist movement to gain a mass following in today’s USA, it is going to have to find a way to bring people of color on board. And LaRouche is trying hard to make this happen.

The best analysis of fascism comes from socialist revolutionary Leon Trotsky, who witnessed its emergence as a new political phenomenon in Spain, Italy and Germany in the 1930s and ’40s. He desperately tried to get socialist parties from different tendencies to work together in a united front to defeat their deadly opponents, but he was not heeded.

Trotsky defined fascism as a mass upsurge based on the middle class that arises during periods of acute economic crisis and has the goal of saving capitalism by smashing the radical and labor movements. The middle classes are susceptible to fascist demagogues, because when small businesses and entrepreneurs seek the cause of their economic misfortunes, they are as apt to blame the workers as they are to fault the system. If the Left can’t win them over, the middle class can go to the far right.

The fascists first attack the most isolated or marginalized sectors of the working class: ethnic and racial minorities, women, queers, the disabled, and others. Far-right movements typically use the rhetoric of opposition to big government and big business, while defending “free enterprise”—a position similar to the libertarians. To add to their allure, nazis use mysticism, leader worship, and nationalism.

Once the fascists took power in Germany, Italy and Spain, they instituted totalitarian police states and austerity measures that reduced the working class to virtual slavery. (In Germany the fascists literally enslaved Jews, national minorities, radicals and others in forced labor camps, in addition to committing wholesale genocide.) The fascist states provided huge subsides to big business and took over the management of leading industries,
running them for the benefit of the owners—preserving free enterprise through state terrorism.

Two of the best guides to understanding this phenomenon are \textit{Fascism: What It Is and How to Fight It} by Leon Trotsky and \textit{Fascism and Big Business} by Daniel Guérin.\footnote{2}

The Trotskyist analysis of fascism is crucial in casting light on the political trajectory of the LaRouche movement. The LaRoucheites definitely have a Great Leader in the form of the all-knowing LaRouche. Their major appeal is clearly to the disgruntled middle class, given their lack of any program for labor or the poor. They are very upfront that they are on a mission to rescue the “American form of political-economy” (which is capitalist, even though LaRouche dislikes the term). They call for saving the presidency and saving the republic. They look for scapegoats and invoke Master-Race-type theories.

The definitive work on LaRouche is Dennis King’s extensive book, \textit{Lyndon LaRouche and the New American Fascism}.\footnote{3} Another valuable resource is a study by Chip Berlet and Joel Bellman, “Lyndon LaRouche: Fascism Wrapped in an American Flag.”\footnote{4} Both of these works, however, only cover LaRouche’s development as far as the 1980s.

\textbf{From the Left to far rightfield}

Because LaRouche is currently soft-pedaling his most extreme ideas, it is crucial to know his background in order to understand his real nature. His followers deny or are ignorant of this history, but it is well documented. A very brief summary:

Born in 1922, Lyndon LaRouche joined the Socialist Workers Party (SWP) in 1949 and remained involved for 17 years under the pseudonym Lyn Marcus. Clara Fraser, a Freedom Socialist Party founder who was also in the SWP during this period, recalled Marcus as a perennial nonentity at SWP national conventions. He never seemed connected with any particular branch, though he regularly contributed interminable and incomprehensible articles on economics and the united front to the party discussion bulletins.\footnote{5}

In 1965, LaRouche was expelled from the SWP for working with British Trotskyist Gerry Healy to brew internal dissension. Three years later, he founded a group called the National Caucus of Labor Committees (NCLC), which initially carried on in the Marxist tradition as a faction in Students for a Democratic Society (SDS).

Things changed dramatically in the 1970s. Provoked by the rise of the feminist movement, LaRouche literally and publicly went berserk. He published outrageous ravings in the pages of his newspaper, \textit{New Solidarity}. These venomous articles were overflowing with sexist, racist, homophobic and paranoid pronouncements.

In 1973, LaRouche became convinced that the CIA had brainwashed NCLC members with a subconscious directive to kill him. In response, he subjected his followers to “deprogramming” sessions in which they were locked up, deprived of sleep and food, and tormented with accusations that they harbored homosexual, incestuous, and homicidal tendencies.

The same year, LaRouche launched “Operation Mop-Up,” in which NCLC members in numerous cities physically attacked members of the Communist Party, the Socialist Workers Party and Maoists with metal pipes, clubs, chains and brass knuckles.

LaRouche swung definitively from the left to the very, very far right. He established links to white supremacists. He buddied up to Mafia-connected Teamsters union bureaucrats and helped sabotage rank-and-file dissidents in Teamsters for a Democratic Union. His group created a
 mega-million-dollar empire as paid informants for the U.S. and other governments (including the white regime in South Africa, the Shah of Iran, the Marcos government in the Philippines, plus Iraq, Italy, Thailand, Mexico, Argentina, Taiwan and others). LaRouche had a warm friendship with the Reagan administration, based on shared support of the “Star Wars” space-based missile defense initiative as well as intelligence and advice proffered by LaRouche to government departments including the National Security Council.

In 1989, LaRouche was convicted of tax evasion and of bilking $34 million from senior citizens. He served only five years of a 15-year sentence. Since he got out of prison in 1994, he has rebuilt his network of misinformation and propaganda—but in a much subtler mode.

An examination of his past exposes LaRouche’s true politics. Although the most Nazi-like elements of his ideology are currently undercover, not much has really changed. In fact, his early obsessions chillingly reappear as consistent symbols in his current writings. The following pages analyze LaRouche’s stance on key issues.

Savior of the “American system of political-economy”

Because capitalism is oppressive by nature, attempts to produce a “kinder, gentler” free enterprise system inevitably fail—especially during the economic downturns that are endemic to this chaotic, unplanned, wasteful method of operation.

Fascists like LaRouche gain strength during these periods of economic collapse. They attempt to bail capitalism out by building a mass movement that undercuts such gains as labor standards and human rights—thus allowing free rein to corporate profiteers. At the same time, however, the fascists masquerade as opponents of big business in order to gain the support of the masses of people who are abused by the system.

Thus, it is a typical fascist deception when LaRouche contradictorily derides capitalism as a British invention while simultaneously calling for a return to the “American system of political-economy.” This ruse lures critics of capitalism into a nationalistic viewpoint that is capitalist through and through. LaRouche’s economic writings address how to make capitalism work better, rather than providing a critique of the system.

As part of his attempt to recruit from the Left, LaRouche opposes free trade. But he does this on the grounds that it downgrades the importance of national economies, rather than denouncing capitalist plunderers whether foreign and domestic. He wants to maintain old-style protectionist capitalism. He demands: “End the lunatic use of the term ‘capitalism,’ as used by Karl Marx and others, and define our economic policy as that of the sovereign nation-state system.”

In reality, we live in an increasingly global society, and a retreat into national borders is inevitably reactionary. “Globalism” is not the problem, but capitalist globalism. An international economy under workers’ control would be a liberating repudiation of imperialism and economic piracy and would be able to deliver the best the world has to offer to poor and working people everywhere.

LaRouche continues his efforts on behalf of capitalism with an insistence on infrastructure, infrastructure, and more infrastructure. He spends enormous effort trying to fix capitalism. Charts, maps, and diagrams illustrate his proposed global railroad lines and continent-wide systems of water canals. Another pet theme is the “Eurasian Land Bridge”—actually a proposed tunnel under the Bering Sea to connect Europe and North America.

A well-known refrain is the call for a “New Bretton
Woods,” which he defines as the establishment of an international monetary and financial system based on a protectionist scheme of fixed exchange rates similar to that of the Truman and Eisenhower models.

To advance infrastructure and salvage the economy, he promotes the colonization of space. In a 1996 policy statement titled “Space: The Ultimate Money Frontier,” he affirms his commitment to establishing a settlement on Mars as an essential part of strategic defense and global economic recovery. “The immediate target, to be reached within an estimated 40 years lapsed time, is the establishment of a permanent ‘science city’ colony on Mars.”

LaRouchites see a Messianic role for the United States and the U.S. president:

Faced with the specter of the worst financial and real-economic collapse in centuries, and imminent danger of the outbreak of war on several Eurasian fronts, the very survival of the planet depends on effective leadership policy of the President of the United States...

...the McCain-Lieberman cabal must be crushed now ...to allow the Bush Presidency to make the Constitutionally approved, but revolutionary policy changes, upon which the fate of humanity hangs. ...No salvation is possible, unless the United States takes the proper leadership role among the community of sovereign nations.9

So it’s the Democrats who are keeping George W. Bush from delivering humanity! LaRouche doesn’t seem to realize that the rest of the world has had its fill of invasions, occupation, dictates and pilfering by Yankee “saviors.”

Of course, the best person to take on the role of redeemer is LaRouche himself, speaking in March 2003:

The exceptional political, as well as scientific and artistic leader remains, to the present time, a crucially indispensable leader of society, especially [in] a society gripped by a time of self-inflicted tragedy, like the U.S.A. today. It is a role, which for lack of qualified substitutes, I am obliged to fill. I present to you, the future. See, here, your children, their children, and those yet to be born. Protect them from the evil...10

The conspiracy theory of war

LaRouche opposed the 2002-2003 U.S. war drive against Iraq, not because it was rank imperialism, but because he thought it was the work of a conspiracy seeking to destroy the U.S. economy. He also bent over backwards to blame U.S. aggression on everyone except President George W. Bush: LaRouche always holds the presidency to be sacrosanct. In a March 2002 press release, he described militaristic neo-Cons as the source of terrorist attacks on the U.S. and more:

A cult of utopian military lunatics, typified by Zbigniew Brzezinski, Samuel Huntington, Henry Kissinger, or the current Undersecretary of Defense Paul Wolfowitz...are the real masterminds behind the attacks of September 11. Watching their power crumble under the weight of the collapsing financial system, their aim is to drive the world into a racist global religious war... They are... diverting attention from their own culpability in an ongoing coup against the interests of the United States.11

Vice President Cheney is usually listed as one of the utopian cohorts. Other conspirators against “the Presidency” and “the Republic” are Senators John McCain and Joe Lieberman. All those LaRouche names, plus
Bush, are certainly warmongers, however their purpose is not to sabotage the establishment but to advance its interests.

Six months later, this analysis was updated:

Lyndon LaRouche reports that there is now firm evidence that the ongoing drive to induce President George W. Bush to launch a war against Iraq, is a 1996 Israeli government policy that is being foisted on the President by a nest of Israeli agents inside the U.S. government.¹²

As Bush drew closer to war, LaRouche changed his assessment that the president was just a dupe of the British, Zionists, and utopian military lunatics. An October 2002 press release declared:

By their pattern of bizarre behavior, the President—and the Vice-President—of the United States, have shown themselves to be insane. ...No President of the United States could support such insane policies, unless he himself were clinically insane.

Therefore, the United Nations Security Council... should suspend its current debate and negotiations over the insane demands being made by the President of the United States. Stop negotiating over the demands of a madman! The United Nations should declare that the President of the United States is insane, and then proceed from that standpoint...¹³

You can see how this might have a certain resonance for some people. A week into the U.S. war with Iraq, LaRouche characterized the situation as:

...the de facto usurpation of the function of a still-sitting President by Halliburton’s Vice President Cheney, and by a gang of his organized-crime-linked lackeys polluting not only the Departments of Defense and State, but also polluting, and virtually castrating elected and other leaders of the nominal opposition, the Democratic Party...

However, like the Nazi SS enforcers, lackeys Wolfowitz, Perle, Bolton, Wurmser, Feith, and so on, are merely expendable hoodlums... You must look to those who created them and put them into their present positions. You must look to the London-backed [Nazis] of the modern U.S.A...¹⁴

As always, LaRouche is the defender of the U.S. government against nefarious evildoers.

**Labor saboteur**

Since turning to the right, LaRouche’s main connection to labor has been supporting corrupt, mob-linked union bureaucrats as an entrée to the power and money of organized crime. The fact that these bureaucrats repress their union members and act in opposition to labor’s interests means nothing to LaRouche—in fact, he has helped them along.

LaRouche has an especially long, dirty history with corrupt Teamster leaders. In the late 1970s, when the mob-friendly union officials were a bulwark against internal democracy, LaRouche cultivated alliances with top union bosses Jackie Presser, Frank Fitzsimmons, and many others at local levels. Teamster general organizer Rolland McMaster endorsed LaRouche for the 1980 presidential elections. LaRouchites provided invaluable services in smearing reform leaders in the Teamsters for a Democratic Union (TDU), roughing them up, and breaking up their meetings.

A pillar of LaRouche’s anti-Teamster intervention was
Richard Leebove, who ran for Illinois attorney general in 1978 on LaRouche’s U.S. Labor Party ticket. During the 1970s, Leebove traveled around the Midwest denouncing TDU at meetings of Teamster locals. Leebove’s assistance to the reelection campaign of John Cody, a mob-linked leader of a New York local of Teamster construction workers, included telling union members that Cody’s opponent was part of a dissident group that was getting money from London, Wall Street, the Rockefeller and the Kennedys. Cody won re-election, but later served two prison terms: one for racketeering and the second for plotting to kill a rival Teamster leader.

After Leebove left LaRouche in the early 1980s, he and George Geller, another ex-LaRouchite, went freelance with their expertise as union disrupters. In the 1990s, they were hired by old-school Teamster James Hoffa, Jr., son of the legendarily corrupt Teamster boss Jimmy Hoffa. As Hoffa’s agents, Leebove and Geller spied on and smeared the elected pro-reform Teamster president Ron Carey.¹⁵ Carey was reelected in 1996, but his opponents managed to overturn the election results because of campaign finance improprieties. Carey was disqualified from running again. A new election was ordered—and won by James Hoffa.

LaRouche’s attention was not limited to the Teamsters. He also made overtures to the Laborers Union and construction trades. Shortly before the 1980 Democratic Party convention, a group of California building trades union officials announced their support for LaRouche and launched a campaign committee. His labor platform focused on condemnation of high interest rates that were affecting jobs in home construction, promises to crush the environmental movement, and a plan to build hundreds of nuclear reactors.

In LaRouche’s current publications, it’s almost impossible to find any references to workers, unions, or the labor movement. This seems like an oversight for someone who spends 99% of his time writing about economics, but LaRouche is clearly not trying to build class consciousness among workers.

In one transcribed radio interview, a LaRouchite who was vice-president of a small Maryland labor council repeatedly pushed his leader for direction on how to appeal to other workers. Finally, LaRouche talked about how the labor movement developed as “a key part of the fight for the general welfare.” However, he said, the majority of the current Supreme Court “says there is no General Welfare. They say that it’s shareholder value... We have to have a movement, which is a movement of the revival of the American intellectual tradition, concretized as a fight for the General Welfare.”¹⁶ Not a very satisfying answer for someone who is trying to convince labor activists to support LaRouche.

The West Coast dockworker lockout in October 2002 was such a big issue that even the LaRouchite New Federalist newspaper had to cover it. Rather than offering any demands or strategies, their story focused on LaRouchite interactions with the strikers. Three LaRouchites soapboxed outside a large strike meeting in Southern California. Their speeches told how the collapse of the economy had cost jobs and pensions, and brought the country to the brink of war. They chastised the workers for having voted for Gore instead of listening to LaRouche. The author depicts the workers (who had mobilized the entire West Coast in an effective protest of unfair labor practices) as sheeplike:

Listening to this blunt message, the arriving workers became quiet and seemed stunned, but several workers could be overheard murmuring, “She’s right.” The more thoughtful stayed to hear the latest developments.
In Australia, the LaRouchite Citizens Electoral Council (CEC), founded in the 1980s, has tried to recruit from unions by milking anti-monarchist sentiment and tracing labor’s problem to an evil bunch called the Mont Pelerin Society, a supposed cult directed by British intelligence that LaRouche claims is running much of the Australian government in an attempt to destroy it.

In early 2000, the CEC linked up with the Municipal Employees Union of Western Australia to form the “Curtin Labor Alliance” political party. Many of the party’s planks were standard labor demands, but the platform also included LaRouche’s ubiquitous call for a “New Bretton Woods.”

The Australian Labor Party (ALP) was outraged by the Alliance’s attempt to pass itself off as associated with ALP and to cash in on the name of John Curtin, a union organizer who rose through the ranks of the ALP to become Australia’s prime minister during World War II.

**Women as witches**

Socialist feminist leader Clara Fraser attributed LaRouche’s swing to the far right to his hysteria over the feminist movement. There is plenty of information to back up this analysis, even though Dennis King ignores the issue of women and Chip Berlet only mentions it in passing.

In the article “LaRouche: Sex Maniac and Demagogue,” Clara Fraser recounts that when women’s liberation exploded on the scene, many male leftists opposed it, but LaRouche went berserk:

LaRouche developed such an acute case of political sunburn that all his Marxist skin peeled off and his quivering Napoleonic nerves were painfully exposed to an incredulous world. LaRouche went ape.

Feminism is shit, roared *New Solidarity* one day. Mothers arefuckers, the enemy, witches. Women are the Achilles heels of revolutionaries, the cause of IMPOTENCE. Women turn men into deviants, queers, schlemiels.

And then in an explosion of Nietzscheanism…[he] uncorked his pièce de résistance: the Leader must be Superman… Superman is the hope and salvation of the revolution; woman must cast off her intrinsic sinfulness and restore VIRILITY to her Master. And on and on…

At this time, LaRouche still identified himself as a Marxist, and he blamed all the problems of the Left on women. In one lengthy 1973 article he described it thus:

Capitalist ideology within the individual is primarily matrilocal and matrilineal…

Mother’s magic, perpetuated as fantasy through the dependency of Ego-identity on the internalized voice of the superstitious mother-image, is the basis for the hostility to “theory” among workers, the bitter invective against Marxist “elites”…and the general hostility to revolutionary socialism generally. “Who do you think you are to imagine you can go against the system?” mother’s voice warns.

In this treatise, LaRouche also says that witches are real in the sense of being the subconscious image children have of their sadistic and dominating mothers, making them apt symbols of the feminist movement:

The witch image is the associated quality of the female
Ego otherwise identified with female sexual impotence and its correlated forms of social impotence generally. Hence, the clinical significance of the acronym, WITCH, for the cited radical feminist group. Such variety of “radical feminism,” as distinct from its sane bitter factional opponent, Women’s Liberation efforts, is essentially an outbreak of the most pathetic, most sadistic form of lesbianism. The method of indoctrination used by groups such as WITCH, so-called “consciousness-raising sessions”...represented the...most efficient means for turning a merely intensely neurotic young woman into a virtual psychotic.

...A woman reduced to this psychotic state, must tend to become a prostitute, or a lesbian, or both.21

(WITCH, the Women’s International Terrorist Conspiracy from Hell, was a New York City group founded on Halloween 1968 by feminist author Robin Morgan and others. It conducted theatrical feminist actions such as putting a “hex” on Wall Street to oppose the Vietnam War and capitalist war profiteers.)

In 1973, LaRouche also published an extensive psychosexual diatribe against the Puerto Rican Socialist Party. Women were to blame, LaRouche said, for the supposed impotence and emasculation of men in Latin culture:

The oppressor is the mother-image, an internalized monster within the mind of the child, a monster based not on the existent woman, the mother, but the mother’s bourgeois-family relationship to her husband and children...

The woman who is banalized and otherwise degraded by capitalist culture is stripped of every possible power over society except the role of the female sadist. Until she is confronted with her real oppression—her banality—and her real oppressor—her internalized mother image, and unless she is also offered a real alternative, human role in society, she will cling with rage and terror to the one power—female sadism—bourgeois society offers her.22

Since these glory days, LaRouche gives the impression of having pulled himself together on the woman issue, at least publicly. Many of his supporters and leading cadre are women. Searching LaRouche’s websites for the term “women,” “feminism,” and “abortion” turned up only a few times where he revealed himself.

In a campaign FAQ issued in 2002, he allowed himself to be pinned down as opposing abortion:

I am against single-issue politics. I defend life, including opposition to “death with dignity,” “death sentences,” and “population control.” Those who do not oppose all of these methods of terminating life, but only one or two, are hypocrites...Can a plea of innocence under law save a fetal infant from the needle?23

The statement about single-issue politics is one of the typical ways LaRouche avoids revealing his positions on various issues.

In a 1998 article, he also targeted women as the source of bipolar disorder and domestic violence:

Contrary to certain feminist myths, not infrequently, it is the mother, who is the primary transmitter of patterns of bi-polar violence within the family. In some of the most pitiable cases of such victimized women, it is as if she were addicted to soliciting such violence! Otherwise, she is often either the principal agent of the violence, or in-
cites it, as an act of dependency, with persisting determi-
nation to bring such an incident about.24

More incendiary results turned up through a web-site
search for the term “witch.” Very recent writings make it
clear that LaRouche has not lost his pathological hatred
of women. The Queen of England and ex-British Prime
Minister and arch-conservative Margaret Thatcher, are
often labelled witches, as are LaRouche’s male oppo-
nents. This is not mere name-calling.

Take, for instance, a 1998 rant against the prominent
female and Jewish political philosopher Hannah Arendt,
a theorist on the nature of totalitarianism:

Hannah was a witch, and a very nasty one, too, the kind of
perverse creature who, one could believe, would have
found the satanic [existentialist philosopher] Heidegger
sexually attractive; but, she was also a smart witch, if never
an honest one, as the devil’s disciples sometimes are.25

LaRouche went completely over the edge in a 1999
opus on the Anti-Ballistic Missile treaty:

By the time the mid-1970s had been reached, our nation’s
enemy was not the Soviet Union, but rather certain evil
little giant girls, playing with dolls, which toyed with na-
tions, snickering wicked giggles all the time. They toyed
with, and tortured nations as if peoples were but playroom
marionettes. The doll-house game these evil little giant girls
played, in their satanic manner of giggling, was the game
of doomsday. It was what President Reagan derided as a
game of “revenge weapons;” it was a game which silly
wicked girls like the Queen’s own Henry Kissinger named
“MAD:” Mutual and Assured Destruction. The evil little
giant girls told the marionettes: “We are witches, come to
warn you; you must try to destroy the other marionette
before he destroys you, but you must not trigger a nuclear
war, in which you would both assuredly be destroyed.”
Such were the string of lies, by which the silly little giant
witches wickedly manipulated those foolish marionettes.26

He continues in this vein for six more paragraphs. The
“brutish queen, Elizabeth II” is identified as one of the
evil girls. Could the others be Margaret Thatcher and
Golda Meir, who were in office during the 1970s?

Not coincidentally, the last two quotations were from
LaRouche’s elite journal, Executive Intelligence Review,
which has only sample articles available on the web. Who
knows what other insights the publication offers to the
inner circle willing to pay $360 per year for an on-line
subscription?

Anti-Semitism and Anglophobia

Though he denies it, LaRouche is a staunch anti-
Semit. As with many ultrarightists, including Hitler
himself, LaRouche’s anti-Semitism is deeply linked to
anti-British sentiment. The connecting link between
Anglophobia and anti-Semitism is the timeworn myth
that Britain is run by a cabal of Jewish banking families,
as “evidenced” by the power of the Rothschilds. Thus
LaRouche’s statements against the British are often coded
attacks against Jews. Dennis King views LaRouche’s
Anglophobia as the cornerstone of a Nazi-like racialist
document, which identifies the enemy as an evil, non-
human species.

A 1978 article ties the two elements together:

…top circles of the B’nai B’rith are key controllers of both
fascist organizations and the…Ku Klux Klan today. The
B’nai B’rith was created, during the 1840s, in the United
States as a British intelligence cover coordinating with the Ku Klux Klan’s predecessor, in the plot to create the breakaway Confederacy—that itself was only one prominent element of a larger plot intended to accomplish British reconquest of all North America.27

(The B’nai B’rith began in New York City in 1843 as a self-help organization for Jewish immigrants. It currently reflects the conservative wing of the Jewish community and has strong ties to Israel.)

In the same article cited above, LaRouche’s berserk anti-Semitism came together with his misogyny in repeated bizarre denunciations of “chicken soup,” to LaRouche a symbol of incestuous Jewish gluttony and witch-mothers:

The “cult of chicken soup” in Jewish family culture exemplifies one of the important ways in which the susceptibilities for conversion to the Isis cult are maintained in those quarters. Thus, one uncovers the secret of the current alliance between Hitler’s Nazis and the government of Israel….

Pervading [various] psychosexual disorders, is a prominent incestuous element, an element closely linked to the “chicken soup” neurotic (incestuous) syndrome among Jewish males. It is a regression to the irrationalism of the child clinging to the mother’s skirts, relying upon its tantrums and other propitiatory methods of controlling the magical powers of a mother it views as a kind of “witch.”28

Another example from the LaRouche newspaper New Solidarity (1973):

“America must be cleansed for its righteous war by the immediate elimination of the Nazi Jewish Lobby and other British agents from the councils of government, industry, and labor.”

From the journal The Campaigner (1978):

“Zionism is the state of collective psychosis through which London manipulates most of international Jewry.”29

LaRouche’s Anglophobia includes blaming the British monarchy for Timothy McVeigh’s bombing of the federal building in Oklahoma City. In an interview conducted by his own Executive Intelligence Review, LaRouche concludes:

“This faction of the British Empire, the British monarchy, prepared and exploited a terrorist act against the United States…and they’re the ones who benefited. I’m certain that the President knows the British monarchy is the party that is responsible for this and other present, recent past, and possibly future events of a similarly gory quality.”30

LaRouche revealed himself recently in a September 2002 flyer titled “The Pollard Affair Never Ended!” (Jonathan Pollard was sentenced to prison in 1987 for spying on the U.S. for Israel.) The statement begins with the accusation previously cited that the U.S. war drive against Iraq is the result of Israeli subversion of the U.S. government. To rid the government of this “Israeli spy network inside the U.S. government,” LaRouche calls for a congressional investigation and purge.

Not only was Bush duped, LaRouche claims, but poor Bill Clinton was also subject to the devious efforts of Britain and Israel:

Beginning in February 1998, the British government of
Prime Minister Tony Blair launched a concerted effort, in league with the Netanyahu government in Israel, and the Perle Israeli agent-of-influence networks inside the United States, to induce President William Clinton to launch a war against Iraq. ...President Clinton rejected the February 1998 demand for war; sending both Netanyahu and Blair into fits of rage.  

Like other rightwingers, LaRouche is promoting an anti-Semitic message to antiwar activists and supporters of the Palestinian struggle. His propaganda advances the classic lie that U.S. policy in the Middle East is the result of pressure by the mythically powerful “Jewish lobby” or “Jewish bankers.” In fact, however, the U.S. war against Iraq and its open wallet for Israel’s occupation of Palestine reflect American capitalism’s true economic, political and military interests.

Despite all evidence to the contrary, LaRouche and his supporters deny anti-Jewish bigotry, claiming to simply oppose Zionism. They frequently put forward Jewish representatives to dispute charges of anti-Semitism.

Undercover racism

It is difficult to find explicitly racist references in contemporary statements from LaRouche (except against the British, whom he occasionally refers to as subhuman baboons). It is not surprising that the racism has been toned down, since LaRouche is attempting to appeal to Latin American and Arab countries, and to African Americans.

LaRouche has made concerted overtures to conservative Black nationalists, including anti-Semitic cultural-nationalist leader Louis Farrakhan. Articles uncritically quoting LaRouchian viewpoints have appeared in Nation of Islam publications. Chip Berlet says that “LaRouche followers and representatives of the Nation of Islam have joined to present anti-Semitic public presentations describing an alleged conspiracy of Freemasons and the B’nai B’rith to create and control the Ku Klux Klan.”

Another prominent African American endorser of the campaign was Amelia Boynton Robinson, a civil rights veteran who was awarded the Martin Luther King, Jr. Freedom Medal in 1990. She is now, at age 91, LaRouche’s most high-profile Black spokesperson and is the “vicechairman” of LaRouche’s Schiller Institute, an organization to promote LaRouche’s cultural and artistic views, which is named after the 18th century German poet and playwright Friedrich Schiller.

A groundbreaking African American politician, Hulan Jack (elected in 1953 to Borough President of Manhattan; later served in the New York legislature) was on the board of the Schiller Institute until his death. Roy Innis, the National Director of Congress of Racial Equality (CORE) since 1968 and a rightwing Libertarian, appeared as a character witness for LaRouche in a libel suit against NBC and others in 1984. (LaRouche claimed he was libeled in a TV show, First Camera, which detailed LaRouche’s unsavory politics and his connections to the Reagan administration. Richard Morris, former National Security Council aide, also testified at the trial on LaRouche’s behalf and described the “good intelligence” he had provided to the government.) Nevertheless, the
jury ruled that it was not defamation to describe LaRouche as an anti-Semite, “small-time Hitler,” cult leader and crook.)

Despite these attempts to find people of color to shield his racism, the record is clear. LaRouche has well-documented connections to white supremacists and spied on the anti-apartheid movement on behalf of the white regime in South Africa. For a decade, beginning in the late 1970s, an influential LaRouche advisor was Roy Frankhouser, a former KKK grand dragon and government informer.

Dennis King discusses LaRouche’s master-race attitude toward people of color and quotes from his writings of the late 1970s:

The Chinese are a “paranoid” people who share, with “lower forms of animal life,” a “fundamental distinction from actually human personalities.” American blacks who insist on equal rights are obsessed with distinctions that “would be proper to the classification of varieties of monkeys and baboons.” Puerto Ricans are intellectually impotent representations of a culture based on “‘macho’ pathology” and crazed blood oaths...Tribal peoples, as in Brazil’s Amazon Basin, have a “likeness to a lower beast.”

...In discussing U.S. treatment of American Indians in the nineteenth century and the conquest of Mexican territories in 1848... LaRouche asked: “Was it...correct for the American branch of European humanist culture to absorb the territories occupied by a miserable, relatively bestial culture of indigenous Americans? Absolutely. Was it correct to absorb...the areas taken in the Mexican-American War? Historically, yes—for the same reason.” And the underlying principle? “We do not regard all cultures and nations as equally deserving of sovereignty or survival.”

A 1993 article, “The Evil Philosophy Behind Political Correctness,” captures some of LaRouche’s current cautious racism:

Most major universities now subscribe to quotas, to ensure a politically correct mix of whites, blacks, Hispanics, and homosexuals. Most schools now also have speech codes...which permit a black student to call a white “honkie,” but would punish a white student for calling a black “nigger.” ...All manifestations of “political correctness” are generated by a single core philosophy which is actively evil...a philosophy of evil that is responsible for genocide and untold human misery, and represents a danger not only to American education but also to the continuation of the American form of government.

LaRouche’s Citizens Electoral Council in Australia provides more blatant recent examples. In 1997, CEC published a document called Aboriginal “Land Rights:” Prince Philip’s Racist Plot to Splinter Australia. The pamphlet described aboriginal culture as “brutal” and comparable to the “ritual torture and cannibalism of the Aztecs.” When these statements were exposed by the Australian B’nai B’rith, LaRouche issued a rebuttal:

...the so-called “aborigines” of Australia, given the opportunities, can accomplish as much as would be reasonably hoped for from a child of any human household...

What I do oppose, is the wicked segregation of any class of persons into a virtual biological category of “aborigines,” and using such so-exploited captives of a “ab-
“origine” policy as an instrument for keeping those captives in a “primitive condition,” and waiting, sadistically, for them to die out “naturally”... Thus do some promoters of an “aboriginal lands” policy intend to gain control of the land areas assigned to such intended victims...

Those of us familiar with the practices against the so-called North American aborigines, the so-called “American Indians”...know first-hand the injustice bestowed upon the doomed inhabitants of an “aboriginal preserve.”

LaRouche is cynically using the genocide of American Indians as a reason to oppose land claims by Australian Aboriginal people, who have been refused any title to the continent they have inhabited for thousands of years. In addition, he is denying Aboriginal peoples their very identity—the ultimate act of genocide.

The Citizens Electoral Council also vehemently opposed the Racial and Religious Tolerance Act which was passed in the state of Victoria in 2001.

Unabashed homophobia

LaRouche regularly labels his opponents homosexuals, but homophobic diatribes are less pronounced in his writings than they were in the past. In 1974, for example, New Solidarity published a long hysterical rant by LaRouche that included statements like:

“Womanhood is the fellacio [sic] of the male mouth in a man who has been brainwashed by the KGB; that is sucking penises... Most women are to a large degree homosexual in this society. The relationship between daughter and mother is homosexual.”

LaRouche’s previously mentioned response to Australian opponents describes the supposed British conspirators of the Mont Pelerin Society as “that pernicious, neo-feudalist collusion of openly professional global parasites... properly to be classed as a modern revival of the ancient, neo-Manichean cult...known in popular English slang as ‘the buggers’ [sodomists].”

In 1986, LaRouche was the promoter of Proposition 64, a California initiative that was a witchhunt against the queer community. The proposition advocated quarantine of AIDS sufferers. It called for mandatory AIDS testing for people such as food handlers and teachers and a public registry of everyone who was HIV-positive. The measure was defeated by a two-to-one margin despite having been endorsed by then-governor Deukmejian.

In an August 2002 question and answer session, LaRouche revealed some startling truths:

Largely, homosexuality was induced by bad, evil, in a sense, psychologists.

There was a determination, which was made as part of the countercultural operation, to try to find ways to promote strange kinds of sexuality, which had been fringe in society, and promote them on a large scale. For example, the production of homosexuals by the divinity and theological schools in Berkeley, California, which is one of the great engineering places where they mass-produced homosexuals, from divinity students. It was a deliberate project, an experiment. And that’s why you had this concentration on the West Coast.

LaRouche goes on to say that the evil Berkeley psychologists found methods, such as child molestation, to encourage the development of homosexuals. Nevertheless, LaRouche claims he just treats homosexuals as
people and doesn’t try to “cure” them.

**Trashing environmentalists, ensnaring youth**

LaRouche says environmentalists are Malthusianists (proponents of solving “overpopulation” and poverty by killing off the poor) and terrorists with sinister ties to the British oligarchy and degenerate 1960s culture. His hostility has stayed intense over the decades.

In 1978 he wrote:

Dionysus, an epitome of the oligarchist (“environmentalist-terrorist”) cause, was destroyed by the city builders, his body fragmented...

The assembly of the fragments of the body of Dionysus is symbolic for the recruitment of susceptible youth into a bucolic retreat, where they are lured into various forms of sex-play, including sodomy, and into the use of psychotropic drugs. Through this erotic-psychedelic cult, the urban youth...are converted into a terrorist cult then launched to murder the city-builders...

The British intelligence networks’ creation of the “environmentalist” and related international-terrorist movements today has no mysteries...to one who understands the cult of Dionysus.42

More than two decades later, he’s singing much the same refrain:

...the essential argument made by the environmentalists, today’s so-called ecology argument, is an intrinsically anti-scientific cult-belief which could have spread as it did only through the combined impact of the post-1963 spread of the rock-drug-sex counterculture, and those so-called liberal reforms of education which have produced the present-day proliferation of university-educated scientific illiterates.43

His hostility does not stop at written attacks. In 1977, LaRouche supporters informed New Hampshire law enforcement officials that the anti-nuclear Clamshell Alliance was a terrorist group financed by the Rockefellers. As a result of these accusations, cops arrested 1,400 people at a peaceful protest at a nuclear plant.44

Stories featured in May 2003 in the LaRouchite on-line magazine, *21st Century Science and Technology*, praise the benefits of low-dose radiation, genetically engineered crops, food irradiation, and nuclear power.

Another LaRouche campaign calls for removing the ban on the highly toxic insecticide DDT. He claims the ban has caused the global resurgence of malaria and the West Nile epidemic. All the charges against DDT are a fraud, he says; and anti-DDT propaganda was just the first of many environmental hoaxes. A photo accompanying the article shows chemist Gordon Edwards eating DDT off a spoon to demonstrate its safety.45

In a further refutation of science, LaRouche opponents oppose evolution, calling it “Ape science” and the “Darwinian attack against man.” They view humanity as created in the image of god or “a purpose in and for itself.” They are very upset by claims that “Man has come from Apes” or statements that “*Homo sapiens* is a member of the animal kingdom.”46

LaRouche has also determined that the anti-globalist movement is run by “terrorists,” as he announced in an August 2001 press release regarding protests planned the next month against the IMF and World Bank.

All reports from reliable sources indicate that the inter-
national terrorist movement which surfaced at Seattle, mobilized itself at Porto Alegre, Brazil, and created bloody violence at Genoa, is now taking aim at the U.S. nation’s capital. It is extremely important that those elements of U.S. organized labor who have permitted their organizations to be entangled in sympathy for this terrorist gang, break openly from the terrorist-style riots now being prepared.47

In this way, LaRouche distances himself from the progressive movement against corporate globalization, while still denouncing free-trade policies. His anti-free-trade, pro-free-enterprise nationalism shows the urgent need for the anti-globalist movement to take a clearly internationalist stand against the capitalist system. The alternative to corporate globalism is not retreat into competing nationalist economies, but workers’ control of the international economy.

Followers of LaRouche are making a big appeal to youth. A three-page feature in the October 14, 2002 New Federalist transcribes the remarks of two adult organizers and 17 young LaRouche spokespeople at a Schiller Institute conference.48 Though many of the statements are frankly cultish and incomprehensible, what comes through is that LaRouche provides the young people with a sense of importance and purpose and a world view that provides unconventional and intellectually challenging (because they don’t make sense) answers to absolutely everything. Many of the youth are inspired by LaRouche’s emphasis on classical music and art and Greek philosophy.

Recruiters go to college campuses and urge students to drop out of school and join the movement. A student from Pasadena City College who was recruited by the LaRouchies, and believes he was brainwashed, said, “You get an intellectual euphoria, because you feel in a position of ultimate power. You can prove anyone wrong on anything… Everyday they reinforce what you are doing by always telling you that you are the best… What they do is feed your ego so much, you can’t see anything else. It’s comfortable; it’s like a womb.”49

The LaRouchites turn recruits against their families with the argument that “the babyboomers are evil and are corrupted by the British neo-liberal banking establishment.” There are also financial incentives. After leaving school and moving away from his family, the Pasadena recruit had his expenses for rent, phone, utilities and food paid by the organization.

A U.S. fascist

Though frequently dismissed as a nut, those who have studied LaRouche—from the right and the left—see him as a totalitarian, fascist nut. As Clara Fraser wrote:

The pundits are intrigued and puzzled by his amalgam of right and left politics, a tangled web of KKK, Freudian, encounter therapy, Populist, Ayn Rand-like, and Marxist notions. They needn’t be.

His is the prototypical face of fascism, which is classically a hodgepodge of pseudo-theories crafted for mass appeal and calculated to bring about the glacial-age law’n’order coveted by imperialists and impoverished super-patriots.

As a middleclass movement designed to make the world safe for giant capital, fascism has no theories of its own. It is by nature an intellectual pillager, derivative and vulgarized, a patchwork of illusion and reality, of myth and madness, of truth and absurdity.50

The more one learns about the LaRouche movement,
the more clearly its fascist nature appears. It is an attempt to preserve capitalism by building a mass middle-class movement on a dishonest program of opposition to big capitalism and big government. It is cultish and mystical and elevates an all-knowing leader. It undermines unions and anti-establishment organizing, and seeks scapegoats for society’s ills.

If the octogenarian LaRouche proves able to rally his followers into a full-blown Nazi upsurge, it will be crucial to oppose it the same way other reactionary and anti-workingclass movements must be fought: by confronting it with a militant united front of the Left, labor, Jews, women, people of color, immigrants, queers, civil liberties advocates, and others.

For now, it is imperative to expose LaRouche’s destructive and paranoid message. Just as important, a sane, humanitarian choice must be presented to the young people and others who look to LaRouche for answers to the devastation and alienation of modern capitalist society. The problems they see are only too real. And there are much better solutions than the lies that LaRouche offers.

The socialist alternative

There’s no disputing it: life under late capitalism is precarious, brutal and ugly. Struggling in an environment of war, unrest, and increasing poverty, people search with increasing desperation for answers. It’s obvious that “normal” liberal-to-conservative solutions aren’t working. So people look for more far-reaching explanations on the Left and the right.

The extreme right is very good at manipulating legitimate sources of discontent—such as joblessness, crime, exorbitant taxes, poor schools—into attacks on those who, far from being the cause of the problems, are the prime sufferers. For unemployment, the reactionaries blame people of color and women for “stealing” white men’s jobs or “greedy” unions for demanding too much. For crime, they once again blame people of color. For high taxes—“welfare cheaters” and “liberal” spending priorities. For poor schools—lazy teachers, undisciplined delinquents, immigrants, lack of religious curriculum, etc.

The Left needs to concretely and boldly put forward its humane and positive platform. For unemployment: nationalize failing industries and manage them under workers’ control; reduce the workweek without loss of pay to give all people employment while maintaining wage levels. For crime: attack poverty with guaranteed living-wage jobs, free education at all levels, and affordable housing for all; eliminate the underground, dangerous, and highly profitable drug trade by legalizing drugs, and provide rehabilitation for addicts rather than prison. For high taxes: end regressive forms that disproportionately hurt the poor and working class, such as sales tax and assessments on homes; replace them with corporate income tax and steeply increased tax rates for the wealthy; restore higher taxes on inherited wealth; close corporate tax loopholes and pork-barrel exemptions for industries. For schools: dismantle the war machine and corporate welfare and put the resulting money into books and educational resources, teacher training, salaries, recruitment of educators of color, and major staff increases to greatly reduce class sizes.

The inherently unstable, exploitive, bigotry-riddled profit system is not the only option. Socialism—shared wealth under a democratic, planned global economy—is the wave of the future and the only answer to mainstream defenders of capitalist injustice and misanthropic, ultra-right crackpots like LaRouche.

One of the most crucial lessons from last century’s
battles against fascism in Europe is that the brownshirts can rise to domination only if the working class proves incapable of uniting against them and seizing power in its own name first. As Trotsky said in 1930, the party of revolutionary hope must be counter-posed to the fascist party of counterrevolutionary despair. While LaRouche and other neo-Nazis pose a clear and present danger, they can—and will—be defeated if the Left, labor and progressive movements learn from and apply the teachings of history.

A LaRouche Chronology

1949 LaRouche joins the Socialist Workers Party, where he is known as Lyn Marcus.

1965 LaRouche is expelled from SWP. Builds a labor-oriented tendency in Students for a Democratic Society called SDS Labor Committee.

1968 The group is expelled from SDS and re-forms as National Caucus of Labor Committees (NCLC)—still part of the socialist Left. By 1972, they have 1,000 members in the U.S.

1972 Hysterical over the rise of feminism, LaRouche goes on a rampage against women and espouses homophobic, super-male, super-race theories in his paper, *New Solidarity.*

1973 NCLC forms an electoral arm, the U.S. Labor Party. LaRouche launches “Operation Mop-Up,” a campaign of physical assaults on members of the Left. LaRouche institutes grueling, cultish “deprogramming” sessions for members he claims are being brainwashed by the CIA and KGB (the Soviet secret police) in an attempt to assassinate him.

1974 NCLC begins to ally with far-right groups such as the John Birch Society, Young Americans for Freedom and the KKK, though it still claims to be Marxist. LaRouche theories revolve around New York Governor Nelson Rockefeller and the Rockefeller family as directors of a drug-pushing global conspiracy of banking interests.

1976 LaRouche launches his first presidential campaign on the platform “Impeach Rocky [Nelson Rockefeller] to prevent imminent nuclear war.”

mid-1970s LaRouche develops ties with paramilitaries, spies, and mercenaries. Begins to collect and disseminate intelligence on progressive groups. After Nelson Rockefeller dies, LaRouche repackages his theories to emphasize
the conspiracy of Jews, the Queen of England, and Henry Kissinger. He develops a multi-million-dollar political empire.

1980s LaRouche initiates contacts with officials in the Reagan government, especially in the National Security Council, CIA, the Drug Enforcement Agency, and the military, and among defense scientists. His group does extensive intelligence-gathering for the U.S. and many foreign governments.

1989 LaRouche sentenced to 15 years in prison for mail-fraud conspiracy and tax evasion. He and six associates are found guilty of soliciting $34 million in "loans" from elderly people.

1994 LaRouche released from prison after serving only five years.

2000s LaRouche’s well-funded organizations include the Schiller Institute, FDR Political Action Committee, International Caucus of Labor Committees, Citizens Electoral Council (Australia), Solidarité et Progrès (France) and Food for Peace (not to be confused with a legitimate organization that has the same name). Publications include the New Federalist, Fidelio Magazine, and Executive Intelligence Review.

Websites include:
www.schillerinstitute.org
www.larouchein2004.net
www.larouchepub.com
www.21stcenturysciencetech.com
www.ceaust.com.au
and www.larouchespeaks.net
American Almanac features from New Federalist are at http://members.tripod.com/~american_almanac
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