

“STINKBOMB POLITICS”: THE DON VEITCH REVELATIONS

Introduction:

This series of FactNet posts features an exhaustive summary of a rare book by a former leading member of the LaRouche operation in Australia named Don Veitch. Veitch shows in great detail the way the organization functioned as a cult and, in particular, the way LaRouche’s early 1970s “Beyond Psychoanalysis” texts were used in the late 1980s and 1990s to organize the Australian group as a cult. Veitch also highlights the role played by Al Douglas, the “American controller” of the LaRouche operation in Australia which operated as the Citizens Electoral Council.

The overwhelming number of posts are by “Hylozoic Hedgehog” since HH summarizes the Veitch book in detail. However, this series of posts also includes the text from an article from the British journal *Searchlight* as well as a brief memoir by a former leading member of the Australian CEC. It also includes some mention of Robert Pash, a strange Australian supporter of Libya with whom the LaRouche group maintained ties with in the late 1980s.

A few of the texts have been lightly edited to exclude some extraneous discussions. The texts in their original form are, of course, available on FactNet.

HH POST

I just read the report posted by XLCER. It includes references to a study of the LaRouche group in Australia and it cites as a key source a memoir by Don Veitch. It is called

Beyond Common Sense: Psycho-politics in Australia

Veitch, Don
 Paperback
 Edition: 4th ed
 120 pages
 Published: 1998
 Publisher: David Syme Foundation

Unfortunately it is almost impossible to find in America. The LOC doesn't even have a copy. But it is all about the LaRouche group in Australia. The report also said that Al Douglas is more or less banned from New Zealand as well since he would face some kind of legal charge. Again, all this is news to me. My research ends in 1979-80.

Quote:

Originally Posted by **borismaglev** 

Are you kidding me? The CEC was anti-Semitic, neo-Nazi long before they knew LaRouche even existed. Their claim to fame was the theory that the Soviet Union was evil because it was controlled by a cabal of Jewish bankers. If anything, I would say that the CEC before LaRouche was even worse than the CEC after LaRouche. Xlcr4life, instead of you winning over the Troll From Down Under, he/she/it is winning you over to the dangerous idea that there ever was something good to the CEC before LaRouche got his hands on it. It's like saying that Roy Frankhouser went bad only after he hooked up with LaRouche. Gimme a break!

Right.

The CEC came from the same conspiratorial far-right mindset as the Franke-Gricksch CODE network in Germany and Carto/Spotlight/IHR in the US. It was arguably indeed worse before they met LaRouche which is saying a lot. The League of Rights was one part of the Carto Comintern and it is considered by almost everyone a far-right anti-Semitic organization whose politics are arguably a mix of white nationalism, fascism, anti-Semitism, etc. It fits the classic conventional definitions of a far right organization.

As for Eric Butler: He was an old-fashioned white nationalist type not unlike John Tyndall in England. Butler came out of the same basic world as the KKK and Aryan Nation types in the U.S., the Western Guard in Canada, and the BNP in England during the late 1970s. They never liked LaRouche even if they thought he had some useful anti-Jewish rants. Carto and Robert Miles were exceptions to the norm when it came to LaRouche. Like the far left, the far right remains deeply suspicious of LaRouche.

From Wiki [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Citizens Electoral Council](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Citizens_Electoral_Council)

The original CEC was established by members of the Australian League of Rights, an extreme right-wing group led by Eric Butler, in the 1980s in Queensland.[7] Its purpose was to lobby for binding voter-initiated referenda.[8][9] CEC candidate Trevor Perrett won the Queensland State seat of Barambah at a by-election, held after former Queensland Premier Sir Jon Bjelke-Petersen resigned from State Parliament in 1987. However, Perrett soon switched to the National Party.[10] By 1989, the CEC leadership was under the influence of the Lyndon LaRouche movement.[7] By 1992, the LaRouche movement had taken full control, renaming the organizational newsletter and moving the headquarters from rural Queensland to a Melbourne suburb, with direct communications links to LaRouche's US headquarters established.[8]

League of Rights publications now warn their readers to avoid the CEC, citing attacks on the British Royal Family for supposed drug connections and LaRouche's criminal convictions. They warn that the LaRouche movement is "strongly pro-republican" and that they have received reports that LaRouche's organization is being used by the Zionists.[11][9]

In 1996, then-Liberal Party MP Ken Aldred, often tied to the CEC, was disendorsed by the Liberal Party after using parliamentary privilege to make allegations of involvement in espionage and drug trafficking against a prominent Jewish lawyer and a senior foreign affairs official[12], using documents that were later found to be forged,[13] supplied to him by the CEC.[14][15][16]

In the mid-2000s, the party found support from Muslim groups opposed to anti-terror legislation.[17][18] In 2007, the CEC received the largest contribution of any political party, \$862,000 from a central Queensland cattle farmer and former CEC candidate named Ray Gillham.[19][20]

The CEC leader is National Secretary and National Treasurer Craig Isherwood of Melbourne, who has been a CEC election candidate three times. Other members of the Isherwood family are also prominent in the CEC; Noelene Isherwood is the party's National Chairman.

Last edited by Hylozoic Hedgehog; 03-02-2009 at 12:24 PM.

Dirty Deeds Done Dirt Cheap -- The Story Down Under

Back to the salt mines

The Don Veitch Revelations

Part One: Veitch's Background

After learning about Don Veitch's study of LaRouche's organization as a political cult, I managed to track down Veitch's two volume opus *Gangs, Counter-Gangs and Other Political Crimes* (published in Australia in 1997 by the David Syme College of National Economics, where Veitch worked.) Since *Gangs, Counter-Gangs* is also hard to find, I will summarize as much as I can that I think interesting.

On the book as a whole, it is around a thousand pages (although printed in fairly large type) and essentially is an attempt by Veitch (and a very idiosyncratic one at that) to alert people to to way various outside forces from spooks to kooks to various lobby groups to get in the way of serious political grassroots organizing that challenges the powers that be. I wasn't about to read 1,000 pages of the book but I did look at it enough to see if I could categorize it into any analogous category of thinking about politics.

Quite frankly, I couldn't.

It is a hodgepodge work that includes Veitch's take on the British Round Table and the Fabians and their influence in Australia, The Australian Labour Party especially Gough Whitlam, the Australian anti-Communist movement, the Soviet Trust, the Australian Jewish lobby, Social Credit/the League of Rights, the LaRouche Group, Frank Kitson

use of counter-gangs, MI-6 operations in Australia and the workings of the CIA. And even British infiltration of the Irish Republican movement in the 19th century. That said Veitch isn't so much a conspiracy theorist (he has no mono-causal explanation for everything) but more someone who is really a kind of well read but slightly odd political autodidact. Basically he wants to argue that Frank Kitson-like tactics are regularly deployed into the seemingly overt political world.

Born in 1948, Veitch was a staunch liberal anti-communist type at Melbourne University and supported Australia's military presence in Vietnam during the 1960s. He worked with an anti-Communist Catholic-influenced group called the Democratic Labor Party Club, headed by someone named B.A. Santamaria ([http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/B.A. Santamaria](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/B.A._Santamaria)) as one of "Santa's little helpers." He then joined the Australian Liberal Party and spent 1973-1990 as an activist in the party.

From 1969 till 1984, Veitch mostly was a school teacher. For a year, he worked for the Australian Defense Department in the Defense Signals Division as a traffic analyst decoding messages. In the 1980s, he regularly attended meetings of the Friday Club filled with "ex-spooks, Treasury men, right-wing think-tankers, USIS personnel, Jewish activists, Santa's helpers, and other assorted neo-cons." He was invited to the American Consulate a few times and met CIA pooh bah Vernon Walters. A real anti-communist, Veitch became an aide to Jim Short, a former Treasury assistant secretary then in Parliament for the Liberal Party.

At that time, Veitch became involved in exposing some alleged connections between an Australian leftist union and the Libyan government. During this period, Veitch and Short worked closely with the Australia-Israel Review on Libyan links. *The Australia-Israel Review* gave him access to their files as well. Veitch calls it "the mouthpiece for Revisionist Zionism" in Australia and it is closely identified with Jabotinsky, so presumably it was also close to Likud.

Veitch spent a year working for Short before some murky scandal forced him to resign that he said involved forged letters purporting to come from him over a financial investigation. So he resigned but remained a Liberal Party activist till the fall of the Berlin Wall. He also spent some time teaching in Indonesia.

After 18 years in the Liberal Party, Veitch quit and became involved in a more populist group called the Victorian Community Alliance, aimed at supporting independent candidates. The monthly meetings were held at the home of a Christian fundamentalist named Peter Olney. It was during this time that someone in the VCA mentioned the Libyan Peoples Bureau and its director Robert Pash and Pash will return to our story in a future installment.

Veitch said the VCA was smeared by the establishment press that claimed it was ultra-right, linked to the Australian League of Rights, and it was racist and anti-Semitic. "None of which were true." According to Veitch, the VCA was an eclectic mix of oddballs from Christian fundamentalists, populists, Leaguers, Freemasons "and the occasional

Rosicrucian.” He said the group was filled with people with “blinkered minds” and accomplished nothing.

Veitch spent a year in the VCA.

During that time, he met members of the Citizens Electoral Councils (CEC), a group that had remarkable success in winning the state seat of Barambah in 1988. It then grew to some 100 branches. [This revolt against the “established party system” in Australia may be similar to the rise of the “Progress Party” in Scandinavia as well as the right populist parliamentary-path groups in the rest of the Continent.)

However the CEC collapsed after its one elected official defected to the National Party (another rightwing group, I believe) and it fell into bitter factionalism. There was even an attempt by someone Veitch believed an agent provocateur to get the CEC into “armed insurrection.” By 1992, the CEC was ripe for LaRouche takeover.

Not knowing Australian politics, it is not easy to get a clear sense of Veitch. However, my sense is that Veich might have started out as a Catholic anti-communist or someone attracted to the mix of God and anti-communism that Santamaria was promoting during the 1960s. He may even have some Irish or Scottish background.

Veitch’s father fought the Nazis in North Africa during World War II and Veitch is clearly not a racial rightist. In his book he devotes a chapter to the Social Credit movement in England and its influence in Australia through the far-right League of Rights, which Veich suspects might also have some overlap with the “Loyal Orange Lodge” freemasons since the League frequently held meetings at the Lodge’s Melbourne premises.

Veitch also believes the League may have gotten CIA money through a man named Henry Fischer, a businessman who ran a publication called *Australian International News Review* that allegedly carried reports leaked by the CIA. According to Veitch, “the magazine was anti-Zionist and Fischer cultivated Arab contacts, one being Reuben F. Scarf, a man with extensive Middle-East contacts.” Scarf created an Australia-Middle East Foundation that became known in 1976 for attempting to launder Iraqi money to the Labor Party to the tune of \$500,000. (I believe Veitch thinks the Foundation was used by the CIA and/or the Brits to create a bribe scandal to bring down Whitlam.) What actually makes this story even more interesting is that this same Henry Fisher was a close associate of Willis Carto and one of Carto’s key lieutenants in the fight over IHR funds (“the Edison Trust” case) in the 1990s. (Veitch was unaware of this fact.)

From the Tom Metzger/WAR site

[http://74.125.47.132/search?q=cache:lcbZxkfAYQ0J:www.resist.com/updates/4.23.00ar yanupdate.htm+\"henry+fischer\"+carto&cd=12 &hl=en&ct=clnk&gl=us:](http://74.125.47.132/search?q=cache:lcbZxkfAYQ0J:www.resist.com/updates/4.23.00ar yanupdate.htm+\)

“Terrible Tommy says if you're in Southern California next Friday the 28th and can make it to the Vista, California Superior Court, you may witness Wee Willy Carto, guru of the

SPOTLIGHT newspaper, being brought to the bar for contempt of court. As you may know, Willis Carto who has lived not far from Terrible Tommy for several years has had his hands in the cookie jar for a long time. Carto has defrauded the right wing of at least 15 million and you wondered why the right never goes anywhere,. Carto and perhaps his great buddy, Jew Mark Lane, may show up in tandem, but we will have to wait and see. . . We understand his ex-partner Australian born Henry Fischer is on the verge of making a deal to hold onto his share of the loot. Looks like Wee Willy is going to have to go it all alone very soon. Most of those in the right wing still haven't gotten a clue at how much money Willy has squirreled away in offshore banks."

Strange that in 1975, Carto's future crony would be involved in a scandal involving money from Iraq.

Oh well . . .

Back to Veitch:

Veitch seem to see himself as an Australian nationalist and he clearly resents the way the Australian secret services gave deference to the British. He also says that although he joined the Freemasons at one point, he could never take them seriously but he does see the Freemasons as kind of an "old boys" network favoring close ties with England. (On the far right, the League of Rights was famous in Australia for its devotion to England and the monarchy in particular as a symbol of white rule over the world and Veitch is no fan of the League, which seems to have been composed of very old people by the 1970s-80s.) The ideology of devout anti-Communism and hatred of the Left united people like Veitch with everyone from the CIA to the Likud but with the end of communism, he clearly turned more and more in a populist direction. As he puts it, he wanted to represent "the little end of town" as opposed to the "high flyers" in the "big end of town."

Most important of all, however, is the fact that Veitch was in his late 40s when he met the LaRouche Org, he had been in politics and political controversy from his teens. Even more important, he was married and had two children, both boys. My guess is that he saw the CEC as a viable successor to the VCA and felt he could work with LaRouche to advance his own ideas of forming a political party that could challenge the Establishment elites. Hence he spent exactly ne year working for the VCA and after it collapsed, he spent two years (1992-94) with the CEC. After he broke with the CEC, he became its most powerful critic in Australia, as we shall see.

Veitch meets the LC:

Veitch reports that he became an executive member of the CEC and worked full time in its Melbourne office from December 1992 to April 1994. In 1992 and 1994 he also visited the United States to attend LaRouche "training schools."

Veitch also advances his own inevitable "conspiracy theory" attempt to explain

LaRouche. From *Gangs*:

“Whilst LaRouchintern agents present a patriotic façade to Australian target, and promotes itself to potential recruits with a wide range of worthy economic, social and cultural programs, the LaRouchintern . . . has a quite narrow priority: to wage war against a Jewish organization called the ADL. This narrow focus of “praxis” leads the outside observer to the conclusion that LaRouche forces are “anti-Semitic.” This is the most clever deception of the LaRouche organization, whilst recruits join to fight for a political agenda of economic reform in Australia, they end up doing nothing but skirmishing with ADL forces. . . . But what does the LaRouchintern do? No worthwhile political structure or achievement has ever been consummated. There is no membership with rights. Financial information is top secret. The leader, Lyndon LaRouche, is elevated to cult status. Little, if anything, of a real tangible nature has ever been achieved by the organization. These are the classic traits of counter-gangs. . . .

Any reasoned argument for a republic, or sensible objection to race vilification laws was largely discredited by LaRouche’s vocal support of such policies. The print media, in over 50 articles in a three year period 1991-94, pointed to the presence of LaRouche ‘extremists’ in rural protest movements, the gun lobby, bank protest groups, and race hate ‘gangs.’ All of this was nonsense, the LaRouche forces stayed ‘at home’ phoning people and soliciting money. This is the general gang role of such groups as LaRouche: to ‘tar-brush’ genuine protest with the taint of ‘extremism.’ The LaRouche forces have done their job, over the past six years!”

Veitch reports that LaRouche came to Australia in the late 1980s after the group built up contacts with Australians who may have given them money at airports. But nothing much came of their attempts until they recruited Craig Isherwood, a Christian fundamentalist and leader of the CEC into the organization. In 1993 they established a Melbourne-based HQ which moved to Coburg in 1994.

In 1990 the Seattle-based Pat Ruckert went on a tour of Australia where he spoke about “the need for a Golden Renaissance, dirigist economics, and the seedy history of George Bush. It was interesting, it was intellectual, it was political. I was interested. The next night I attended another talk by Ruckert at the Libyan People’s Bureau. The very organization which some six years before I had written speeches for the Senator, and had worked with the Zionist network to nobble. I visited the Bureau on a number of occasions , and soon found out that a regular habitu  of the Bureau was also a habitu  of the offices of the *Australia-Israel Review*. Strange I thought!”

Next in 1991 Veitch visited LaRouche’s operations in San Francisco, Seattle, Montreal, Chicago, Washington” and Leesburg. He met LaRouche twice and visited Mike Billington, then in jail. Veitch writes:

“Despite my subsequent hatred for certain LaRouche movement behavior, I think that certain LaRouche activists have in fact been railroaded to jail. I also must put on record that some of the most intelligent and worthy people that I have met have been in the

‘grassroots’ of the LaRouche movement. It moves me to tears to think about what has happened to some of these people! They have acted honorably, but have been betrayed from above by their leaders (but then that is always the case with gangs and counter-gangs). Billington and Hecht are two of the finest and most honorable people I have ever met. LaRouche, personally, is a self-indulgent, self-obsessed fool.”

Veitch later gives this fascinating overview of the group:

“The LaRouche-CED is now, despite its protestations of being politically ‘active,’ primarily a money raising outfit, and a PR firm for the cult leader Lyndon LaRouche. It attracts adherents using the promise of political action as the ‘bait.’ It does not have an effective membership, accepting only subscriptions and donations, with funds ending up in private companies. In four years it has achieved nothing of importance, despite having raised upwards of \$3-4 million. In this, it shares a trait of all ‘counter-gangs’; namely, political impotence.

Through its questionable activities the LaRouche-CED operation has fanned anti-Semitism and ethnic tensions in Australia. Dissidents within the organization who have attempted to direct the organization along more productive paths, have been ruthlessly purged.”

Veitch then writes:

“The LaRouche-CEC gang is difficult to categorize, or finger, as it has somewhat of a chameleon quality about its behavior and propaganda. It is many things to many people: for LaRouche the ‘organization’ (if it can be called that) is primarily an extension of his own ego, a vehicle for his greater glorification in history, and a network to square-off old grudges against former Marxists and leftists; for ‘modernist’ Jews in the leadership networks it is a vehicle to attack other sections of Judaism, especially Lubavitchers, Likudites, and the B’nai B’rith networks; for black Americans like the Reverent James Bevel . . . the organization is a new evangelical network to proselytize a new Baptist-like tent show; for another faction within Leesburg it is a meal-ticket, and a career in politics; for the vast bulk of activists, doing the dog-work of fund-raising, it is an organization of economic change and cultural renaissance.”

Trying to make sense of it all, Veitch continues:

In the closed world of LaRouche, it probably fulfills many of these goals in some way. Viewed objectively, from the outside, it is a counter-gang thrown into ‘grassroots’ politics to provide an enemy for mainstream forces. It is a whipping-post for organizations such as the ADL. LaRouche forces, despite their fund-raising ability and undoubted political experience, are no threat to ‘the powers that be.’ As a former long-serving American activist with LaRouche stated: If you wanted an enemy in politics, you would choose LaRouche. Stupid and ‘blocked,’ and above all, ‘impotent.’”

TO BE CONTINUED

HylozoicHedgehog@gmail.com

Dirty Deeds Done Dirt Cheap -- Part Two

Note: This is part two of series on Don Veitch's description of LaRouche's activities in Australia which will end with a final article "Vetting Veitch" on his claims. Ultimately Veitch's importance-- for me at least -- lies in the fact that the most brutal return of "Beyond Psychoanalysis" mind-control techniques first seem to have been incubated in the Australian organization by Alan Douglas and took place during the time, ironically enough, when LaRouche was in jail. In my view, the fear that the FBI arrests and jail terms that the NCLC faced may actually have led to the "rebirth" of BP-type techniques as a kind of defensive measure by the political cult to continue during LaRouche's own "Babylonian exile" so to speak. These practices then mutated after LaRouche's release and formed the foundation for the intense cult-style indoctrination formation (and success) of the LYM a few years later. Hence Veitch's testimony is of particular interest because the kind of mental control techniques first developed "Down Under" returned "with a vengeance" a few years later with the LYM. Hence Veitch gives us an important eye-witness account from his own experience from approximately 1991-94. HH]

In Volume One of *Gangs, Counter-Gangs*, Veitch discusses LaRouche both in his introductory chapter as well as in a separate chapter entitled "LaRouche Unlimited" that takes up some 38 pages of large-print type.

Throughout the book, Veitch tries to come to some understanding of LaRouche. He draws for some of his history from Dennis King but doesn't think much of King's "Nazi" line. As Veitch puts it: "To the enemies of LaRouche, the organization is a convenient political punching bag for its own propaganda. The LaRouche forces are variously portrayed as "fascist," "racist," "ultra-right," "lunar right," and, of course, "anti-Semitic." Much of this is nonsense, and evades the true nature of the LaRouche gang. Because of the publicity, and fund-raising benefit it gains with such misleading epithets, the LaRouche leadership goes along with the charade."

Veitch at times seems even to believe that because LaRouche is fundamentally a money-making political operator that he actually likes to be labeled anti-Semitic because it helps him to fund-raise in the Arab and Muslim world but that because the organization remains so heavily Jewish in membership it is a farcical charge. In Veitch's own "Brand X" version of the organization, at the core it is a group out to get money for its leader.

Veitch draws in his sections both on King and John George and Laird Wilcox's chapter on LaRouche in their book on extremist organizations [Wilcox, it should be noted, is basically a hard to easily categorize eccentric type of libertarian and despises Berlet and King as "Watchdog"-type fabricators.] Veitch also cites Frank Donner. Veitch mentions that Donner wrote that LaRouche was "a veteran of World War II military intelligence" but then adds that Donner "offers no evidence to support this claim. But "if

in fact LaRouche was originally picked up by American intelligence whilst in the army, it would help explain his subsequent propensity to split left and right politics, and his organization's intelligence connection."

[NOTE: The best I can tell, Donner took this wrong information about LaRouche in "military intelligence" by King or Berlet. However, to be fair, I don't think they ever claimed that LaRouche was in military intelligence but that because WerBell was in Southeast Asia working for the OSS, and LaRouche was in the India-Burma theater as well, therefore it highly very likely that this might be the case. (In reality, LaRouche spent his brief time in Burma giving shots to GIs bitten by animals.)

If Veitch's citation is accurate, somehow LaRouche's "military intelligence" legend wandered into Donner's book *Age of Surveillance*. I make a point of this also to show just how often unfounded speculations take on a life of its own. I will give another example of this same thing happening later in this text. HH]

Now we return to Veitch's text.

Veitch points out that the NCLC had gone through various phases and that until the mid-1970s, it was committed to Marxist revolution. "This was its 'anti-gang' stage, a genuine (although misguided) [you don't say – HH] call to overthrow capitalism." Then "from the mid-1970s, LaRouche made an attempt to integrate himself with senior American intelligence networks, this was his 'counter-gang' stage: he posed as a dissenter but was serving 'the system.'" But by the mid-1980s, "the LaRouche organization had turned into a ruthless fund-raising and trouble making organization with an intelligence gathering capacity. It had 'bucked' the counter-gang role and was out of control. It had now entered what we will call its 'rogue-gang' phase."

For Veitch both the League of Rights and the CEC/LaR group have "similar counter-gang traits." They are "a cult leadership; secretiveness; a subscription base rather than membership; an amorphous and vague 'structure'; a lack of financial accountability; a propensity to stir-up ethnic discord; [both are] suspicious and paranoid; apocalyptic views; intolerance and deductive thinking; rural activism; politically ineffective. The only real 'difference' is that Leaguers are sycophantically pro-British whereas LaRouchies are blindly anti-British; but that in itself could be viewed as a 'gang and counter-gang' posture." Both the League of Rights and LaRouche-CEC have 'poisoned' democratic politics in Australia."

Veitch also believes that LaRouche has never really abandoned his Marxist views when it comes to economics but that he "is still peddling the same Marxist economics. In this he is guilty of deceitful packaging, merely having changed the labels on his old Marxist dogma." Veitch also takes seriously LaRouche's later claim that "he is a self-confessed informant for the FBI" from the 1950s.

Hence Veitch writes: "Dennis King in his book on LaRouche works overtime to 'prove' LaRouche is a fascist, is crazy, is an anti-Semite, and an ultra-rightist. And the same

mis-information is promoted by journalists and columnists in Australia. However King is less than honest, as just like LaRouche, he is a former member of the Maoist PLP. [This attack is courtesy of Wilcox who “outed” King as a former Maoist. Also remember that Veitch is very anti-communist and considers Marxism dangerous lunacy. – HH]

Veitch continues: “King also works overtime to debunk the idea that LaRouche was a government agent, claiming that the FBI’s activities against LaRouche, code-named COINTELPRO, shows that LaRouche activists were targets and not victims. Veitch dismisses this with the argument that the FBI had totally penetrated the CPUSA at its highest levels as well but that didn’t prevent the FBI from generating thousands of pages on the CPUSA as well. Again in Veitch’s view: “Revelations that LaRouche was targeted, also help his organization to present themselves as enemies of the establishment, and victims. It is good camouflage, typical gang and counter-gang play-acting.”

Again all this [to me anyway] underlies the fact that Veitch is really groping for one explanation of the LC and instead comes up with many, a phenomenon not atypical in this particular “field of study” to put it mildly.

Veitch is at his most far out in my opinion when it comes to his attempt to explain the NCLC’s anti-Semitism but he is certainly no further far out than the idea that the NCLC is a huge Potemkin Village concealing a group of hard core neo-Nazi fans of UFO’s from Ultima Thule..

Veitch writes: “The most persistent charge against LaRouche and his forces is that they are ‘anti-Semitic.’ Yet here we have another paradox, for LaRouche brags of his earlier connections to Jewish political networks Earlier Veitch had commented that in *The Power of Reason*, “LaRouche confesses in his memoirs that in the late 1960s members of the radical Zionist outfit, Hashomer Hatzair, recruited LaRouche to the leadership of Students for a Democratic Society (SDS) chapter on a campus he was attending.”

Needless to say all this is total fantasy. But where did Veitch get this fantasy?

First, HaShamer HaTzair (“The Young Watchman” or “The Young Guard” [HSHT]) was a Marxist-Zionist organization founded in Galicia during World War I. It encouraged the formation of socialist Zionist kibbutz settlements in Palestine after World War I. By the time of World War II, it had an estimated 70,000 members. It is most known for the leading role it played in the Warsaw Ghetto uprising one of whose key leaders Mordecai Antelwitz was a HSHT leader.

Strangely, Veitch’s source seems to be a November 1992 article in *Without Prejudice*, a journal of the Australian Institute of Jewish Affairs. The article, “Lyndon LaRouche Down Under” was written by David Greason. It is very important and will be cited in our last article “Vetting Veitch” as it gives important information on both Veitch and the LaRouche movement. (It can be found at <http://lyndonlarouchewatch.org/larouche-australia.pdf>, at Dennis King’s website.)

Unfortunately, the article also includes this statement from Greason which is not footnoted but goes: “LaRouche has given varying reasons for his involvement with the SWP. In *The Power of Reason*, he claimed that he initially joined on the request of friends in the Jewish socialist group Hashomer Hatzair, only to leave and then rejoin at the request of the FBI, which sought his assistance in monitoring ‘subversives.’ On other occasions, however, he has claimed that his membership in the Trotskyist party was always legitimate.”

Somehow Veitch translates this erroneous statement and places it in the 1960s with SDS and not the late 1940s with the SWP. In short he misquotes a real source from a respected journalist in a well regarded journal that itself is both painfully false as well as mildly comical. Again, Veitch makes the same mistake with Donner.

We bravely soldier on . . .

Veitch proposes the notion that since so much of the NCLC leadership is Jewish and Jews like Tony Chaitkin seem obsessed with the ADL (Veitch says that the book *The Ugly Truth about the ADL* was largely written by Chaitkin), “Could it be that there is a civil war within Jewish politics and that LaRouche backs one faction” against the “Revisionist Zionist line of the heirs of one, Vladimir Ze’ev Jabotinsky.”

Presumably Veitch wants to argue that LaRouche still has ties to his mythical HSHT mentors and the “good Jews” like Abba Eban and Nahaam Goldman of the World Jewish Congress. Veitch then points out that “among true anti-Semites such as White Aryan Resistance (WAR). LaRouche is anathema.” Veitch even quotes Tom Metzger as saying in the June 1993 issue of *White Aryan Resistance*: “No healthy white separatist would touch the LaRouchies with a ten foot pole” and that “a high percentage of LaRouche officials are Jews” and that “LaRouchies continue to fool many right-wingers simply because the ADL hates them with a passion.”

And with good reason since Veitch also notes that “LaRouche forces identify the ADL with all manner of evil, and are obsessed with its activities. LaRouche claims this group is behind the illicit drug industry, pornography, liberalism, Satanism, and everything else that is bad.”

TO BE CONTINUED

hylozoichedgehog@gmail.com

Last edited by Hylozoic Hedgehog; 04-28-2009 at 08:18 AM.

Hi both chator and the rest of the gang.

First, I would say that what I am trying to put forward is more of a guess than a theory and I'm using FN to get responses.

As for Al Douglas and Australia: the Veitch saga (which still will take some more posts) shows at least to me that via Al Douglas, the organization used really brutal BP tactics to build the Australian organization and in some sick way, they worked, unfortunately. Australia became a real money-maker for LaRouche.

As for Al Douglas in particular: He led this madness where BP tactics were brought down from the lofty levels of the NEC being mind-f-cked in 1973 by LaR -- while the rest of the organization didn't go through such brutal sessions -- to making them habitual for even low-ranking members. This is what I think Veitch shows.

In fact, everyone in Australia was reading the BP texts that we first saw in 1973 but that no one either read or discussed seriously in the years following. (Does anyone remember really arguing about Part Two of the *Feuerbach Campaigner*?)

In my view -- and I may be wrong -- the MOST traumatic "bonding" process came through the mass terror unleashed by the Chris White affair and its aftermath. It was the notion that the KGB, FBI, MI-6, the CIA, the Tavistock Institute and the Nazi-Rockefeller cabal were out to get us that seems to me to have had much more impact than the idea that the notion of "mother's fears." The "double-bind" was that "mother's fears" actually by 74-75 was used to stifle doubts when you failed to fully recognize real fears, namely the CIA, Rockefeller, world collapse, etc. In short, it functioned as a kind of internal mental cop.

But the fact was that all this was itself rooted in *real* fears of organizers who had been arrested on assault charges by the government for the assaults on the CP or picked up on weapons charges or had to tangle with the lunatic types like Baraka. BP took on a kind of background explanatory role and in my mind played a kind of internal censor role. In short, if you weren't worried about the world ending or had doubts about this policy or that, your problem was mental. But the ACTIVE T-group type group confrontations seemed to recede in the background particularly if you weren't subjected to LaRouche on a regular basis. And by the early 1980s, as far as I can tell, all psychological explanations had lost their kick because the new means of thinking about reality took on more and more a kind of religious form. BP, however, was still very much rooted in a kind of secular discourse. In 1973, Satan was a kind of mental image promoted by the feudal Catholic Church following an imaginary world constructed out of the Cult of Isis and ultimately leading back to Babylon to keep peasants and workers backward. Recall that the ideological heart of BP was an attack on Catholics, not Jews. In fact, it argued that Protestants were the modernists and were closer to Marx's ideas. (Sort of LaR's crackpot read of the somewhat dubious Max Weber.)

But by 1983, a lot of this had changed. Now there were real Satanic cults, etc. In fact, as early as the late 1970s, I recall LaRouche writing an article endorsing the practice of Catholic exorcism. these cults were backed by the British oligarchy and their Jewish

servants/masters (one can read it either way). They in turn carried out orgies, ritually murdered children caught in openly Satanic pedophile rings, etc. (Again such views were by no means unique to LaRouche as the "Satanic Panic" craze of the 1980s shows.)

Anyway, for whatever reason, BP texts had fallen by the wayside and were covered with dust.

But in Australia, practices that seemed dormant for years took on a new life. Al Douglas brought them into Australia but I don't know why he did so or what was the trigger. This is just an empirical question that I can't answer.

However, what I find fascinating and will just throw out as a guess is that the FBI arrests and jailings enormously terrified the LC. For years the group was making money via the phone lines, LaRouche had a big house in Virginia, Helga had her castle in Germany, there were rumors (some true) of high connections in the Reagan NSC, they were getting traction in the dope right by claiming Gorby was planning to invade Europe, they were flirting with the Pope, etc. and life was good. Then they were slammed by the wave of state and federal attacks, which must have been terrifying. Finally, King Bee Lyndon himself went off to the hoosegow. (Thank you Molly!)

During this period, it seems in America that under Fernando and Helga, the group tried to reinforce social solidarity in classic Durkheimian fashion by fostering an even more intense identification with Lyndon/Jesus. Anyone who has looked at Mike Billington's bio can see that his own self image of himself is shaped around the notion that he is somewhat like an early Christian martyr. (And if I were facing spending 70 years in jail, I might think the same way.)

However in Australia -- and also New Zealand one imagines since Al Douglas was involved there as well -- a lot of the organizing focused not on some reworked version of Christianity -- and as an aside, I am compelled to mention that I once heard Robert Stiegerwald (the ideological leader of the West German DKP) say that a German "invented" modern dialectics -- that German being of course Nicolas of Cusa -- but a return to the long forgotten texts of BP.

As for why that happened in Australia, I don't know. What I do know is that it did happen and "worked." The post-BP session Aussies raised tons of money there. I also don't know if Al Douglas on his own reintroduced the BP model or whether he was following orders from someone else. Again, I just know it happened and proved a real money maker. But my impression is that in Leesburg and the rest of the States, the "boomers" didn't go through renewed BP sessions although maybe I'm wrong. But I somehow don't see Fernando and Helga doing this and you can correct me if I am wrong.

However it seems that after LaRouche returned and decided to develop the LYM, then the same techniques that were used in Australia (and which are pretty standard "cult 101" methods BTW) now played a leading role in the creation of the LYM.

So that's my guess. Given the "success" of Australia -- where the LC was recruiting NEW members after all -- LaRouche made a "business management" decision and decided to use these techniques to invent the LYM. And so some creepy boomer goofs were given the go-ahead to build the LYM around BP methods and hold "sessions" analyzing the sexual fantasies of 20 somethings etc.

Ultimately this stuff is a version of return to the worst of the Comintern with the worst of pseudo-Freudian jargon blended in with the kind of weird world views more associated with the witch-hunt fantasies that swept Europe in the 17th century.

Part of it may have been triggered by the fact that in Australia proper a lot of the LC-targeted recruits were people who actually came from Fundamentalist Christian backgrounds to begin with. (Many of them seem to have roots in the rural farm movement.) So they may already have accepted the notion of Satanic cabals and such. If so, you were already dealing with people terrified of homosexuality, "orgies," "child molesters," sexual fantasies, etc. and their links to a demonic ruling elite. As anyone who has read Norman Cohn knows, much of this is hard-wired in the more wacky versions of the Judeo-Christian world view. It may also prove the case that Douglas had the idea that in order to recruit from this strata, it made sense to re-translate these apocalyptic fears of hard-scrabble fundamentalist Protestant farmers who felt economically and culturally threatened but in the context of a LaRouche-determined world view, and that BP gave him a vehicle for it.

Or maybe not. I don't know. Maybe the whole thing was a total fluke. Contrary to Hegel, everything that happens is real but not necessarily rational so it's important not to offer a "rational" pseudo-explanation "back story" for events we still know little about.

But in Australia, the LC's targets were clearly older people, many of them with considerable experience in the populist right. But with LYM, these same brutal psychological methods were used on youth.

Again this is all a guess and not a theory or even a hypothesis. But what is not hypothesis is the fact that BP methods took over Australia with a vengeance and that Veitch documents this process in great detail.

Last edited by Hylozoic Hedgehog; 04-29-2009 at 02:17 PM.

Dirty Deed Done Dirt Cheap: Note on the LaRouche/Libya Connection

[To the reader: While our series continues on the Don Veitch revelations, here I want to add a commentary that doesn't fit easily into the general narrative, on the curious encounters between the NCLC and Libya. This will be Note One. I will try to do a second note on the NCLC's tangle with the League of Rights. – HH]

Both in GCG and BSC, Don Veitch makes a point of mentioning the NCLC's links to one Robert Pash. In BCS, Veitch writes that when Pat Ruckert first came to Australia in 1989, one of his initial contacts was "the enigmatic Libyan Bureau man Robert Pash." He then claims that Pash in turn was close to the investigative journalist "and ADL asset" David Greason, whose article on LaRouche we have cited numerous times. As we shall see, Pash seems to be a "Roy Frankhouser"-type personality whose entire life is one long string of murky connections and extremist views, almost anything is possible.

From BCS:

"Ruckert arrived in Australia in 1991, and on advice from Leesburg, advice that was to prove bad, made contact with the Libyan representative Robert Pash. In a visit to the People's Bureau office in Sydney, Melbourne, by Ruckert, the Australian EIR subscription list was stolen. Details later appeared in an article written by David Greason attacking LaRouche down under. Names on the list were harassed. Some time after this setback, Ruckert was withdrawn from the Australian theatre. He was later given elective duties in Alaska. A new Australian Controller entered the scene, Allen Douglas."

As we have already seen, Al Douglas was actually involved in Australian organizing well before Ruckert arrived there and the NCLC ties to Pash clearly predate Ruckert's arrival.

In GCG, Veitch reports: "The next night I attended another talk by Ruckert at the Libyan People's Bureau. The very organization which some six years before I had written speeches for the Senator [the Liberal Party's Bob Short – HH], and had worked with the Zionist network to nobble. I visited the Bureau on a regular number of occasions, and soon found out that a regular habitué of the Bureau was also an habitué of the offices of the Australia-Israel Review [allegedly David Greason – HH]. Strange I thought!"

However, there is no doubt that a computer printed list of EIR and *New Federalist* subscribers was stolen or sold precisely because in his article on LaRouche, Greason cites extensively from the list. Other leaks were not from the computer print out but from a "mole" in the government if Greason is to be believed. In his article he writes that "LaRouche documents seen by senior police contain a number of allegations about Australian Jewish community figures. Police believe these documents are based on Internal Security Unite and Bureau of Criminal Intelligence material." Greason mentions the name of one "Paul Gill" as a likely source and states that Gill "was said to have gained access to police files when working for Operation Iceberg in the mid-to-late 1980s."

["Operation iceberg" seems to be some convoluted investigation of police corruption. See:

[http://74.125.47.132/search?q=cache:rq_VdEQFk1oJ:www.smuggled.com/Writ2.htm+paul+gill"+operation+iceberg"&cd=1&hl=en&ct=clnk&gl=us](http://74.125.47.132/search?q=cache:rq_VdEQFk1oJ:www.smuggled.com/Writ2.htm+paul+gill)]

Whatever the sequence of events, it is clear that Robert Pash as the organizer for Col. Q's Libya came under considerable scrutiny from Australian intelligence sources. (Indeed, as we have seen, Don Veitch himself worked some years earlier to reveal covert Libyan financial aid to a radical trade union.)

Of course Veitch might also have been drawing on Pash's apparent reputation as an informant for the Australian Security Services. Jim Saleam, an Australian far rightist who knew Pash, wrote a very detailed Ph.D. thesis for the University of Sidney entitled "*The Other Radicalism: An Inquiry into Contemporary Australian Extreme Right Ideology, Politics and Organization 1975-1995*" available at <http://ses.library.usyd.edu.au/bitst...82202whole.pdf>.

Saleam reports that Pash told him that in 1984 he had infiltrated the Queensland Nuclear Disarmament Party, stole its mailing list, and passed the list on to Special Branch (p 168).

In short, while Ruckert's EIR list may well have been stolen during his presentation at the Libyan People's Bureau, it is not at all clear who stole it. However because the list eventually wound up in David Greason's article, Veitch neither proves nor disproves the notion that either Greason or Pash had anything to do with the initial theft, certainly it is quite possible that Veitch is right. Curiously, in his article Greason seems to go out of his way to give Pash the benefit of the doubt writing that "Mr. Pash has since distanced himself from the LaRouche movement, declaring his opposition to all forms of racism and discrimination. The LaRouchites have also distanced themselves from Mr. Pash, partly because of his former membership of the US far-right outfit Aryan Nations." However Greason later notes that Pash later went back to publishing LaRouche material in his paper *New Dawn*.

ROBERT PASH

According to Jim Saleam, Pash was born in 1962. He became a member of Aryan Nations and published his own paper named Vanguard but in 1983 he adopted Libyan "Third Universal Theory." He also received funding from the Libyan Embassy to distribute Gaddafist propaganda. He also ran his own Australian National Vanguard [ANV]/Australian People's Congress [APC] group from 1982-1988. According to Saleam: "It was the overdone loyalty to Libyan strictures which brought ANV attention from Jewish, police and Left organizations. Pash's courtship of Libya was original. He had outmaneuvered the pro-Libyan Socialist Labour League [Was this a Healyite grouping? – HH] and Bill Hartley's Australian-Libyan Friendship Society."

Despite attacks on Pash as a con man and provocateur, Pash led various delegations to Libya and "retained a Libyan stipend." In 1987 the ANV became the APC. In 1988, Pash first helped arrange a trip to Libya by British members of the National Front [including Nick Griffin. These events, BTW, were covered extensively at the time by the British publication *Searchlight* – HH]. He then arranged trips to Libya for the Australian

SWP leaders! [I think these are the Tony Cliff followers -- HH]

By 1988-91, Pash dropped his activist side and became “more a Libyan information agent” before going off to found *New Dawn* magazine. According to Saleam, Pash’s “projected synthesis of Australian labor-nationalism, Third Universal Theory and Maoism required a nimble ideologue and a real base of support. The less than 100 [ANV/APC] recruits (1984-88) were not a cadre.”

Nexus and New Dawn

Since the *Australia-Israel Review* is much cited, here is one of its takes on Robert Pash and his friend Duncan Roads from a 1997 issue that mentions two magazines very much in the CODE framework, *Nexus* and *New Dawn* :

“*Nexus* and *New Dawn*. These grand relics of Colonel Gaddafi's big spending days in the Pacific now run reams of psychotic twaddle about CIA conspiracies, real life X-Files, UFO's and, yes, the New World Order. *New Dawn* pumps it out courtesy of Mr Robert Pash, Colonel Gaddafi's former bag man down under while *Nexus* is produced by Pash's old buddy Duncan Roads. Pash, a.k.a. Rashid Robert Pash, caused great consternation during the 1980s running Gaddafi-funded operations from Melbourne. One of his many activities included coordinating Libyan government funded delegations to Tripoli. In the 1980s *Nexus* editor Duncan Roads tripped off to Libya several times courtesy of Colonel Gaddafi. He later established *Nexus*, which *The Review* revealed after the Oklahoma bombing to be running reports in Australia from senior figures in the US militia movement.”

([http://74.125.47.132/search?q=cache:k_AoIWHTSv4J:www.join.org.au/aijac/97-06-06/notebook.htm+\"robot+pash\"+australia&cd=4&hl=en&ct=clnk&gl=us](http://74.125.47.132/search?q=cache:k_AoIWHTSv4J:www.join.org.au/aijac/97-06-06/notebook.htm+\))

It also turns out that Pash was a friend of Louis Farrakhan, who also maintained close ties to both LaRouche and Libya:
“Farrakhan's Australian Friend

On October 23, 1986, federal Opposition leader, John Howard, urged the government to refuse a visa to Abdul Akhbar Muhammed (also known as Larry Prescott) of Chicago, who announced his intention to visit Australia as an emissary for the Nation of Islam. On October 28, Mohammed, who had reportedly missed detection by Australian immigration authorities as he used his birth-name, Prescott, on his passport, stated on national television that there was “definitely” a place for political violence, and that it was “In our holy book, the Koran” (Ray Martin Show, TV9). Following this comment and an announced intention to spread separatism (“subversion”) in Australian Aboriginal groups, there were high-level calls for his deportation, but before the government acted he left for Papua New Guinea. According to *The Australian* newspaper, (20/3/87), Col. Gaddafi had offered “millions of dollars” to militant Aborigines in Australia. In

federal parliament in May 1987, the Aboriginal Affairs Minister, Clyde Holding, claimed that Australian Aboriginal activists, particularly separatists, were being "used" by white supremacists, a plausible argument given the on-going contact between Muhammed's host, Holocaust deniers, neo-Nazis and other open anti-Semites.

Muhammed's host was Robert Pash, the head of the quasi-diplomatic Libyan Arab Cultural Centre in Melbourne. Pash is the former Christian Identity Minister I referred to in my previous mailing.

In 1981 Robert Pash first came to the notice of the Jewish Community in Brisbane, Queensland, when he declared himself to be a Pastor of the Aryan Nations Organization of America "Church of Jesus Christ". He was involved in the founding of Australia's most prominent neo-Nazi group, National Action, chairing its Queensland Branch in 1985. Throughout the early 1980's he established a relationship with the Libyan government, who first organized visits by Pash to symposia in Libya and then arranged for Pash to arrange for delegations of Australians to go to Libya on free jaunts.

Although Libya is generally seen as a "left-wing" cause, Pash arranged for old racist comrades in Australia to have free trips and also arranged for Nick Griffin and Derek Holland from the British National Front to go to Libya. Robert Pash claimed that "the Libyans agree with me that one million not six million Jews were killed by the Nazis" (Willesee program, TV9, 22/5/87). An anarchist publication in 1991 reported that Robert Pash was selling "*The Protocols of Zion*" and Henry Ford's "*The International Jew*" from the Libyan Arab Cultural Centre office."

[http://74.125.47.132/search?q=cache:ncxl6Sw4KOwJ:h-net.msu.edu/cgi-bin/logbrowse.pl%3Ftrx%3Dvx%26list%3DH-Antisemitism%26month%3D9410%26week%3D%26msg%3Dk0NSPyG28pk5hdON2AuJUg%26user%3D%26pw%3D+\"robort+pash\"+Farrakahn&cd=1&hl=en&ct=clnk&gl=](http://74.125.47.132/search?q=cache:ncxl6Sw4KOwJ:h-net.msu.edu/cgi-bin/logbrowse.pl%3Ftrx%3Dvx%26list%3DH-Antisemitism%26month%3D9410%26week%3D%26msg%3Dk0NSPyG28pk5hdON2AuJUg%26user%3D%26pw%3D+\)

[On Duncan Roads and the CODE-like Nexus (and its international connections) see: <http://www.nexusmagazine.com/index.p...=24&Itemid=79>]

[*Pash/Roads and Holocaust Denial:*

Melbourne-based *New Dawn* is headed by Robert Pash, who was associated with Libyan activities in Australia in the 1980s. It peddles the Holocaust denial conspiracy that Hitler was a victim of a powerful satanic force, 210 with Pash declaring after a 1983 visit to Libya, "the Libyans agree with me that one million not six million Jews were killed by the Nazis." 211 John Bennett has had material from Your Rights published in *New Dawn*. 212

Queensland-based *Nexus* magazine is the most successful of the three new age racist magazines with international sales in the tens of thousands across North America and Europe. With Editor Duncan Roads “open-minded” about the Holocaust,²¹³ *Nexus* embrace David Irving as “one of the western world’s most acclaimed and respected researchers,” stating that “his research is impeccable, and none dare challenge him on it.” In a review of his book *Hitler’s War* they say “If you ever wanted an unbiased history of World War II, *Hitler’s War* is a must-read book,” and a review of Irving’s video *The Search for Truth in History* concludes that “It is high time to publicly debate some of the points raised in this video.”²¹⁴

From: <http://sicsa.huji.ac.il/acta25.pdf> (page 35).]

In looking at *Nexus* and *New Dawn* (and a magazine called *Exposure*) from 1993-95, Jim Saleam writes that they wrote about such things as “universal surveillance, UFO cover-ups, lost civilizations (Atlantis, Lemuria), anti-gravity technology, the CIA and the New World Order, cancer research, Martian pyramids, pyramidology, occult freemasonry, the ‘real authors’ of the Protocols of Zion and the AIDS conspiracy. Occasionally, these journals published sober material – the work of Noam Chomsky or current affairs analysis – which as bait brought readers into the cultic milieu.”

LAROCHE, THE FIRST GULF WAR, AND PASH (and RAMSEY CLARK?)

This is just some of Pash’s bizarre history. But what makes our story even more bizarre is that for a time not only was Pash inviting someone like Ruckert to speak at his Libyan-funded front organization but that this paid Libyan agent was active in supporting LaRouche causes.

According to Greason, the LaRouche movement created during the first Gulf War, something called The Committee to Save the Children in Iraq (CSCI). Greason states that an Australian group called “the South Movement” led by two former Maoists also ran a committee with the same name in Melbourne that distributed LaRouche literature but was not formally controlled by the LC.

Greason then notes: “The CSCI is also associated with the Australian People’s Conference [Congress – HH] in Melbourne-based pro-Libyan group led by former [if you say so David– HH] far-right activist Robert Pash. Mr. Pash, an APC colleague, and two South Movement activists were signatories to a US Committee to Save the Children in Iraq appeal, published by the LaRoucheites and released in early 1992. The Australian People’s Conference magazine, *The New Dawn*, has reprinted LaRouche material and Mr. Pash was quoted in the *New Federalist* as supporting LaRouche’s claims of innocence.”

In April 1991 yet another Pash front group (the Australian Green Institute) put out a special report defending LaRouche as George Bush’s “political prisoner.” Pash also sold LaRouche books like [i]Railroad.[/i]

And it was during a CSCI protest on 17 January 1992 that Greason reported the presence of Don Veitch as a speaker.

What is also fascinating about this story is that at the same time that LaRouche activists in Australia were organizing the CSCI, Ramsey Clark – the well-known attorney who had once been the American lawyer for Petra Kelly and the Greens – was both defending LaRouche in court as well as organizing for Iraq's Saddam Hussein as well.

CONCLUSION

Although Don Veitch in both GCG and BCS only briefly references Pat Ruckert's visit to Pash's organization and the reported theft of an EIR subscriber list, he never explains what in the world a known "third positionist" flack for the Libyan government like Robert Pesh was doing working with LaRouche in the first place. Presumably if the Libyans were opening doors to LaRouche in Australia they were pursuing the same policy in Europe and the Middle East as well. Again all this is both highly mysterious and puzzling. It is also noticeable that the Libyan money may have also helped found both *New Dawn* and *Nexus*, magazines with the same wacky occult/conspiracy themes favored both by *Spotlight* and *CODE*.

In short, Veitch's brief comments about Pat Ruckert and Robert Pash raise questions that remain unanswered to this day. One of them is why did "Leesburg" order Ruckert to meet with Pash in the first place? Although Libya's decision to push aboriginal rights seems antithetical to the LaRouche line and (as David Greason notes) the LaRouchies once accused Col. Q (with or without the assistance of Molly Kronberg) of plotting to kill Helga Zepp-LaRouche, the mystery only deepens. To me the real mystery is not that the LC and Pash had a falling-out but that they were even working together in the first place.

Finally, somewhere in this murk there also may lie some explanation of other bizarre LaRouche links such as his ties to Ramsey Clark.

In short, what in the name of Allah and Adolf is going on here?

Dirty Deeds Done Dirt Cheap -- The Don Veitch Revelations -- Part 3

AL DOUGLAS GOES DEEP DOWN UNDER

As we have seen the LaRouche group began trying to develop inroads into Australia since the late 1980s when LaRouche colonizers visited Melbourne and Sydney. But according to Veitch, "nothing much came of the initial forays" until Craig Isherwood, "one of the few remaining activists" in the CEC was recruited. "Isherwood was a fundamentalist Christian and keen to bring the message into politics."

With Pat Ruckert benched after the disastrous affair of the vanishing EIR subscriber list

at Pash's Quadaffi-funded Kasbah otherwise known as the Australian People's Congress (APC), Al Douglas now took over running the Australian LC branch. From GCG: "By 1993, the main operative in the LaRouche movement in Australia was the American Allen Douglas, who in his early days in Australia confessed that he was going to take over when LaRouche died. He was one of LaRouche's oldest campus recruits from the 1960s protest movement at Berkeley."

In a different section of the same book, Veitch writes about Douglas:

"He was an early recruit of LaRouche, dropping out from his economic studies in the early 1970s to work fulltime for the movement. He is an eager practitioner of LaRouche's mind control operations. In the mid-1980s Douglas was politically active in New Zealand where his exploits led to the collapse of the New Zealand LaRouche movement. A threatened civil law suit has prevented his return to New Zealand." (Unfortunately, Veitch provides no details to support his version of events.)

Veitch then continues:

"Under his direction LaRouche activities in foreign nations have a track record of chaos and collapse. . . . Douglas has no interest in actually changing the state of affairs or establishing a worthwhile political operation; he is only interested in fund-raising, bending the minds of cadres, and spreading LaRouche propaganda. Counter-gangs have their parallels in business where often bankruptcy of a business and stripping of its assets is more profitable than success."

As for Douglas's "knowledge," Veitch notes that:

"Douglas's main interest and activity is psychological warfare, and the techniques of mind-control. He has read widely and is an expert in topics ranging from Frank Kitson on Mau Mau counter-gangs through to Robert Jay Lifton on Chinese communist brainwashing techniques. He also has an interest in Marxist factionalism, Revisionist Zionism, the political history of Odessa [presumably a reference to post-war Nazis and not the city – HH], and guerrilla warfare in South Africa. He is a practitioner of LaRouche's 1970s psycho-theories, and cruelly implements LaRouche's discredited techniques upon vulnerable individuals. He has bragged that anyone who resists his politics and rebels is 'destroyed.' In recent times in America he has debriefed victims of sexual child abuse and intelligence mind control programs. He claims to be familiar with high level CIA brainwashing efforts and to know key words that trigger certain responses in CIA programmed zombies. [Shades of the Chris White Affair – HH] He uses his 'knowledge' to discipline cadres into absolute loyalty to himself and to crush dissenters who have the audacity to think for themselves. He is a self-proclaimed cult expert, and also an 'anti-cult' expert."

(Al Douglas –Quite a guy!)

Veitch continues: "Allen Douglas is the real force behind the LaRouche-CEC fundraising

network in Australia. In the initial stages of personal contact and recruitment, Douglas is reasonable and warm (the 'soft cop'), but at a stage where the recruit supports LaRouche ideas he will be persistent, bullying and will use all the psycho-manipulative devices he can muster in pursuit of loyalty to the cause, and to himself. Potential recruits who resist will later be denounced to others in the most vicious terms, Douglas has an intolerance for other views, and his behavior illustrates the Leninist principle of intolerance, to ensure total control of the secret movement.

Douglas presents himself as LaRouche's greatest supporter claiming LaRouche is 'the greatest mind since Leibnitz, an probably earlier,' a 'world historical figure,' a genius.' This apparent sycophancy and over the top "loyalty" assists Douglas in his claim to leadership of the organization within Australia and assists in silencing would-be dissenters. In [Robert] Michel's terms he is the dutiful 'Messenger of The Word.' Douglas poses as the anointed personal agent of LaRouche."

Using ego-stripping techniques, Douglas reorganized Australia. From GCG:

"The key criteria is to select those cadres who will be personally loyal to Douglas, and will inform on work colleagues, denounce his or her family, and hand across material assets. Senior office personnel and fund-raisers have previously been involved in drugs, theft, and suicide attempts. Fertile ground for manipulation. A number of cadres after confessing their innermost thoughts have handed across thousands of dollars in cash. Thus whilst working for about \$200 per week, they also donate to the CEC-LaRouche organization. In effect they then work for nothing, they are captives of Douglas, psychologically and financially."

As a result, the CEC-LaRouche org became astonishingly successful at fundraising. Again from CCG:

"He [Douglas] has been amply rewarded, as arguably he has the most effective fund-raising team in Australia, certainly this is true in the field of politics. The phone team makes about 100,000 phone calls a year and raises over \$1 million from contacts who buy subscriptions to the EIR magazine. An 'upgrade' team then works on extracting more funds. Donations of \$20,000 to \$40,000 are not uncommon. One is known to have donated \$80,000. With a compliant staff, stacked company directorship, no mass membership, there is no need to report publicly. In 1995 the CEC was deregistered as a federal party for breaches of the Electoral Act. It has since made it back onto the list of registered political parties."

According to Veitch, the fundraising team consisted of some 15 full-time members "all working like mindless drones under an American leadership that directed activities into mindless, useless 'stink bomb' politics (like disrupting a Conrad Black meeting, writing attacks on Jewish leaders). Perhaps the Americans never wanted anything worthwhile to emerge?"

AL DOUGLAS TAKES ON THE JEWS

With his fundraising team in gear, Douglas now launched various crazy campaigns although one against Australian Jewish leaders would prove costly. From GCG: “In 1993 LaRouche-CEC in Australia launched a major campaign to attack Jewish organizations and Jewish leaders in a program of spying, propaganda, and harassment. It was a bizarre campaign, ordered from Leesburg, which led to the inevitable defamation writ and retaliation in the media.

At the height of the campaign of attacks on the Jewish community, dirty tricks and smear campaign against others, Allen Douglas smeared, attacked, and then purged the organization under his control in Australia. [We will look at the purge which took place in May-June 1994 more closely in the next post – HH] He then capitulated and acknowledged defeat in a defamation writ in which he had ordered cadres to ‘play dirty.’ Douglas had ensured a costly fiasco in which more than \$100,000 in donations made by hard-pressed families and struggling farmers, was wasted.”

Also in GCG, Veitch gives more details about the disastrous campaign:

“Whilst working full-time in the LaRouche organization (1991-93), I argued the case for developing an economic reform program but in the end was told to go out and research what the Jewish community was allegedly “up to” in politics. The results were turned into a slander sheet against Jewish leaders, titled ‘*Is The ADC Spying on You?*’ [My guess is that this must have been linked as well to the San Francisco ADL story involving ADL spy Roy Bullock which broke big time in 1993 -- <http://articles.latimes.com/keyword/roy-bullock>. Ironically like LaRouche, the ADL/Bullock also sold information to South Africa. – HH]

Veitch continues:

“The document did little more than document the existence of the Jewish freemasonic movement called the B’nai B’rith. . . . My protests against publishing the document were a waste of time. Allen Douglas, the American controller in Australia, rewrote some of the document. He included a number of provocative comments which led to the inevitable defamation writ. I was a defendant because I was a director of the CEC publishing arm, Citizens Media. In the end the CEC, under its American leadership, spent \$100,000 to settle the legal issue. The lawyers on both sides cleaned up (the CEC side was represented by Terry Tobin, QC). The \$100,000 had been raised from the contributions of near-bankrupt Australian farmers, and was a shameful betrayal of them.”

DESTROYING KEN ALDRED

Al Douglas also became involved in yet another disaster with Ken Aldred, a member of the Australian parliament (MHR) for Deakin. In CCG, Veitch reports that “LaRouche forces even campaigned in the Liberal Party in support of his leadership campaign in the Federal Liberal Party.”

Aldred had been a member of the Federal Parliament for some 20 years. He also became involved in a controversy with a leading Jewish businessman named Mark Liebler, a tax lawyer and brother of a very prominent Jewish leader in Australia named Isi Liebler. (Isi Liebler, BTW, is also chairman of the editorial board of *Without Prejudice*, the journal of the Australian Institute of Jewish Affairs in Melbourne which published David Greason's November 1992 expose on LaRouche that cited from the EIR list allegedly stolen from Pat Ruckert.)

Then in 1995 Aldred self destructed, Veitch reports, after Aldred "made dramatic claims implicating Mark Liebler in nefarious matters emanating from the Central American country, of all places, Suriname. There were claims of bribery by Foreign Affairs officers, and all this was made at the same time that Aldred was making allegations about pedophilia in the Foreign Affairs department. Aldred's 'evidence' presented in an adjournment speech (under privilege) in Parliament, came from certain letters, that when shown to the Federal police later, were forensically analyzed and proven to be forged. Aldred still maintains that they are genuine.

The letters were undoubtedly provided by Allen Douglas and the LaRouche organization. CEC fundraisers later bragged of their involvement. The evidence was also presented on a '4 Corners' program on ABC TV in 1996. The 'Suriname' incident contributed to the end of Ken Aldred's parliamentary career. Once again, a nominal ally of LaRouche forces was 'destroyed.'" With anti-Semitism also introduced into the mix, LaRouche forces had "yet again poisoned the political environment, had destroyed their 'friends' and rallied community support behind their 'enemies.' This is the mark of LaRouche-CEC politics, 'stink-bomb' politics."

CONCLUSION: "STINK BOMB POLITICS"

Veitch comments about LaRouche tactics: "To the average citizen, such practices are just a bit 'off-color,' infantile and weird. Indeed to the average 'rank and file' associate of LaRouche they are also perceived as 'off.'" Yet "this is of no concern for the oligarchs that run the organization." This is because the rank and file "is dispensable. Over time, most leave, indeed purges are run to ensure a turnover, an to discipline those who are foolish enough to remain in the organization."

In fact, Don Veitch himself would be caught in one such disastrous purge that swept the Australian group in May-June 1994 in a process that the LaRouche group dubbed "peeling the onion."

TO BE CONTINUED

Last edited by Hylozoic Hedgehog; 05-02-2009 at 12:12 PM.

Dirty Deed Done Dirt Cheap -- The Don Veitch Revelations Part 4

“PEELING THE ONION”

In both *Gangs, Counter Gangs* (GCG) and *Beyond Common Sense: Psycho-Politics in Australia* (BCS), Don Veitch stresses the devastating role the introduction of “Beyond Psychoanalysis” doctrine had in Australia.

BCS is a 124-page book devoted to just that topic. It is divided into three parts. The first gives an overview of LaRouche’s background and extensive commentary on the BP texts. The second part of the book documents BP’s use in Australia while the concluding section discusses the LC as a totalitarian cult. For sake of this presentation, I will almost exclusively focus on Veitch’s discussion in his second section on events in Australia and reserve some comment on Veitch’s overall view of the LC in the final post on Australia.

That noted, there are also a few comments in GCG that I want to introduce first. In a section of GCG aptly titled “A Mind-Bending Counter-Gang,” Veitch reports that the LC practiced:

“its own version of ‘encounter’ sessions where new recruits are subjected to mind-boggling mental assaults, ‘peeling the onion’ as it is termed. The aim is to get to ‘the secret’ that everyone is hiding deep in their minds. What happens is that the hapless victims confess all manner of details about their personal life, which then is used to bully and cajole them into becoming unquestioning fund-raisers. In many ways, the technique has worked! Along the way it has wrecked havoc on many lives. Far from being a ‘brilliant’ innovation by LaRouche, it is a process similar to brainwashing techniques of Soviet and Chinese intelligence.”

In 1994, these BP tactics played a critical role in the purge of the Australian CEC/LaRouche organization. In CCG Veitch reports that year that they lost some 12 cadre due to BP. As Veitch puts it:

“At the time of our purging, matters were getting out of hand within the CEC organization and alarm bells were ringing loudly within the minds of a few of my colleagues. We were ‘purged’ before these wrongs could be righted, before we could effectively challenge many of the self-defeating tactics of the CEC.”

AL DOUGLAS: LOVE DOCTOR

Leading the purge was LaRouche loyalist Al Douglas, who worked closely with the fundraising staff in the Melbourne office. According to Veitch (GCG), this was Douglas’s MO:

“Douglas had personally recruited the staff of the Melbourne office and selected those individuals that are compliant, hard-working, many having personality flaws that can be

cajoled, bullied and possibly blackmailed. Douglas has a particular interest in the sex life of cadres, and especially if they fantasize whilst masturbating. Questions concerning masturbation, incest, pornography and similar sexual themes will be asked of all recruits in the ‘therapy’ sessions. In such probing sessions, Douglas will scream, abuse, make wild accusations and drive the target into a state of frenzy or submission. The aim is to ‘strip’ the person’s veneer and ‘peer into the soul.’” In such a manner, Douglas would weed out all but those members who were personally loyal to his desires, cadre who “will inform on work-colleagues, denounce his or her family, and hand over material assets.”

Douglas carried out his policies with the full support of Craig and Noelene Isherwood, who were the most important Australians in the organization. They also had been fundamentalist Christians. From BCS:

‘Craig Isherwood is in his mid-30s and managed a small retail business at the time he helped establish the CEC in 1988 [before the LaRouche takeover – HH]. Previously he was active in fundamentalist-charismatic groups, later converting to the Lutheran church. He has an authoritarian approach to colleagues and others, and since assuming the position of ‘General Secretary’ has only called party members to confirm his position or to expel members. . . . Douglas and Isherwood share a symbiotic relationship, work extremely closely and are dedicated to what they would call the LaRouche mission. . . . Using LaRouche’s 1970s psycho-techniques, they maintain a firm and effective grip on the Australian movement.’”

In GCG, Veitch writes about Isherwood this way:

"LaRouchintern agents visited Melbourne and Sydney. Nothing much came of the initial forays. The big break came when Craig Isherwood, one of the few remaining activists in a once relatively successful populist organization, the Citizens Electoral Councils (they had won a seat in the Queensland Parliament), was recruited to the LaRouche organization. Isherwood was a fundamentalist Christian and keen to bring the message into politics.”

“DEGENERATE” AUSTRALIA

Although Veitch stresses in his writings the disappearance of the EIR subscriber list as helping to pave the way for Pat Ruckert’s exit from Australian and his replacement by Douglas, in BCS he suggests that the decision of the LC to bring Douglas to Australia (even though Douglas had caused some sort of scandal in New Zealand earlier) reflected a decision in Leesburg to write off Australia as a viable state for real political organizing. Instead it would serve as a cash cow for Leesburg. Given that change, not just Ruckert but many people with both political talents and drive like Veitch became useless as well.

From BCS:

“The early Ruckert foray was thus judged to be a failure by LaRouche’s planners in Leesburg. A new approach towards Australia was to be tried. Investigations, and early teething problems, had revealed that the Australian psychological profile was ‘degenerate,’ the British psychological warfare experts had brainwashed the population too well. Politically, the landscape was a minefield of hostile gangs (for example: B’nai B’rith, British Israelites, ‘East India’ families) and counter gangs (for example League of Rights, Masons, racist networks). Alliances were apparently not possible. Thus a change of strategy was ordered. Ruckert was out and Allen Douglas was in. Douglas’ role would be to deliver a remedial psychological ‘purgative’ to the minds of Australian recruits.”

By 1993, Douglas would become the undisputed top dog (er, dingo) in the Australian organization. Thanks to Douglas, Veitch reports in GCG that the LC “had revealed itself as a tightly run Stalinist-like organization” whose “main obsession was to raise money” which it did quite spectacularly while at the same time showing itself “totally ineffective where it counts: political action.”

URGE TO PURGE

In GCG, Veitch – who had a front-seat in all these events having spent some 18 months working full time for the organization – recalls the “Purges” which seem to have first begun in 1993 but truly climaxed in May-June 1994. From GCG:

“After building the office staff numbers, developing its fund-raising capacity in 1992 and 1993, Douglas then turned his attention in May-June 1994 to a time-honored Bolshevik activity, The Great Purge. In that period some 14 people were eliminated from the organization. One ex-cadre was forced to the brink of suicide after being relentlessly attacked and hounded from the organization. She was viciously attacked as a ‘witch,’ a lesbian, and a trouble maker after a concerted effort of undermining by Douglas.

Douglas’ suborning of family members and finances has led to numerous family break-downs and financial distress amongst those who have parted with their money. He has no remorse in such matters and brags that people who do not submit to LaRouche are bestial, mere animals, and damned. Most of those purged were ‘old guard’ CEC loyalists, who failed to show complete enthusiasm for the American takeover. They were denounced as populists, fundamentalists and various other types of ‘deviationists.’”

As an executive member of the CEC who spent December 1992 to April 1994 working full time in the Melbourne main office in the Brunswick area (later moved to Coburg in 1994) and also someone who visited the US twice in 1992 and 1994 to attend “training schools” and meet LaRouche, Veitch had a remarkable view of the group’s inner workings.

From this point on, we will focus exclusively on Veitch's testimony concerning his experience from Veitch’s book *Beyond Common Sense: Psycho-Politics in Australia*,

first printed in Australia in December 1994 or about six months after Veitch himself was purged. (It went into three printings as a pamphlet before being released as a book edition in September 1996. All my citations are from the 1996 edition.) BCS, unlike GCG, is less concerned with trying to place the LaRouche group in a much larger political category; it is far more interested in documenting the disastrous role the BP doctrine played in reducing the Australian organization into a money-raising cult.

SPIES, SPIES, SPIES (AND LESBIANS TOO!) – OR “CHRIS WHITE” COMES TO AUSTRALIA?

Veitch reports that the first twinges of spy mania that would also be linked to BP came at an international LC conference held in Melbourne in 1993. This was also during the period that the LC put out its attack on the Australian version of B'nai B'rith, the pamphlet that would wind up costing the group some \$100,000 in legal costs. Outside the meeting, the journalist David Greason was involved in a public counter demonstration that apparently was attended by some Australian Trotskyists hostile to LaRouche. This demo apparently lent itself to feelings of increased fear inside the hall.

At the meeting, Douglas:

“dramatically announced the discovery of two alleged British intelligence agents at the Conference. In fact, one of the alleged spies [throughout the book Veitch frequently uses aliases that he identifies as such so I will skip over the fake names when possible – HH] as Douglas knew, had previously worked for SAS in New Zealand and Britain, but had been invited to the Conference at Douglas’ own insistence.” The man was also said to have been a “member of the British Israelite cult.” The other alleged spy “had been recruited from a rural church network. He had supposedly been overheard “plotting’ to suborn Conference delegates.”

With the Australian group in a panic, Douglas used the crisis mood to attack long-standing members that he wished to get rid of. A few days after the conference, Douglas focused his attention on a woman member who had relocated to Melbourne after spending time as a rural activist and who had been proposed as the new Chairman for the now more or less defunct CEC. This was “Jane Warren.”

From BCS:

“Warren and her family had been evicted from their farm by bank foreclosure and after organizing other farmers to defend their farms, she had joined the LaRouche network. Warren proved to be an excellent fund-raiser, but had an ‘independent’ streak.” As a result, she was sent to the US “to undergo psychological interrogation” by Douglas and others. “Immediately after the International Conference, and without a chance to respond, Douglas organized a Management Committee meeting [presumably Australia’s version of an NEC or NC gathering – HH], where Warren was hauled before a hostile prearranged ‘kangaroo’ court. Warren was expelled.”

But simple expulsion wasn't enough.

Douglas used this additional fake crisis to introduce a weird mix of BP sex psychosis. From BCS: "Douglas then continued a campaign, denouncing her as a 'wrecker,' 'disruptive,' 'a witch,' trying to set up a coven, and probably having a 'lesbian relationship' with another CEC activist. When confronted with these slanders a year later, the General Secretary, Craig Isherwood, conceded the accusations had been made to Warren, but defended them claiming that the comments were made 'for internal use only.' Douglas now appeared as the 'white knight' defending the organization."

Veitch concludes this section of BCS:

"The 1993 International Conference was a failure from many points of view, but organizationally it was a resounding success for Douglas. A number of threats had been 'discovered' and dealt with; cadres had been trained in threat psychology; the 'leadership' had saved the day and were white-knights; above all, Douglas and Isherwood consolidated their positions. Any potential challenger to authority, the need to present financial accounts was dispensed with. Almost two years later, the relevant financial documents remain hidden from general scrutiny. A precedent for future organizational discipline had been made."

As we shall see in the next installment, Douglas would now launch a relentless "BP-inspired" attack on the entire core group of the Australian organization culminating in the disastrous "Mad Monday" purge in the summer of 1994.

TO BE CONTINUED

Last edited by Hylozoic Hedgehog; 05-03-2009 at 05:50 PM.

Dirty Deeds Done Dirt Cheap -- the Don Veitch Revelations -- Part Five

BEYOND PSYCHOANALYSIS AND THE DESTRUCTION OF THE AUSTRALIAN LC

In BCS, Don Veitch reports that starting some time around March 1993 till he left in May 1994, "hundreds of thousands of dollars and endless hours were spent on the psychological 'training' of cadres." The May 1993 International Conference "spy scare" - and subsequent purge of "Jane Warren" -- proved mere dress rehearsal for what was now to come.

Over the next months, the LC led by Al Douglas began systematically reorganizing and purging the Australian organization using BP tactics to psychologically dominate individual members and reduce them to malleable slaves for the never-ending work of fund-raising for the group.

In one three hour lecture to the Melbourne office on 9 December 1993 [a typo gives the

date as 1994 – HH], Al Douglas used the text “*The Sexual Impotence of the Puerto Rican Socialist Party*” as a vehicle to begin to single out certain individuals in the Melbourne office who had “degraded emotions” that were “killing” them. According to Veitch, at this lecture Douglas more or less “had declared war” on the CEC.

In a section entitled “Psycho Probes” Veitch shows just how much BP doctrine had become institutionalized into the daily life of the Australian organization:

“Every new recruit to the Citizens Electoral Councils is observed in doctor and patient terms, and is probed for sexual peccadilloes. The relationship with the mother is of special interest: did she have affairs? Did she make sexual overtures to you? Is there any insanity in the family? What is her relationship with the mother?; and so on. Here are some examples of the probing.

“After prolonged ‘sessions,’ at first informal and friendly, one 50 year old recruit was ‘counseled’ that it was his mother who was the source of his ‘problem,’ yet he kept informing his ‘councilors’ that it was his father who had abused the family. Another younger recruit in his 30s was led to believe, after extensive consoling, that his mother had attempted to have an incestuous affair with him, but the ‘patient’ responded that it was the father who had brutalized and bashed him.

“A third recruit was informed that it was the relationship with his mother that had ‘blocked’ him from becoming a political organizer, the recruit informed the counselors that he never knew his mother as she had died when he was three years of age. This did not deter the interrogators who continued to insist that he had a ‘mother problem.’

“Thus despite the known facts, personal histories were reinterpreted to conform to ‘Lyn’s theories.’”

Not surprisingly all of this led to disastrous consequences:

“Cadres have voluntarily submitted to this interrogation process and a rich ore of psycho-problems has been tapped, ready to be worked on by the LaRouche ‘para-psychologists,’ each using the LaRouche handbook: alcoholism drug abuse, criminal convictions, abortions, adopting-out [not sure what this means – HH], attempted suicide, incest, beatings, homosexuality (lesbianism), even onanism.

“By ‘confessing’ a person had taken an important step in the process of ‘unblocking.’ He (or she) was a potential ICLC member. But that is not all, by confessing intimate personal details, a powerful tool of manipulation had been handed across to the organization’s self-appointed psychotherapists.”

According to Veitch, the LC put great stress on “unblocking.” In order to reach this state:

“On a number of occasions, the entire office has flown to Leesburg, USA, for extensive ‘training.’ The CEC trips to America are not for developing political contacts nor

consultation with American cadres on political tactics, policy making, or in fact the Australian members, on arrival in the USA, are generally quarantined from policy-making processes and operations. The two weeks of lectures is a cover for more in-depth counseling of selected members at headquarters in the USA. Six hour screaming sessions are not uncommon . . . “

Veitch states that the LC viewed Australians mostly as “head cases” and Australia itself as being more or less as “offal” from the British Empire. As a result crises were regularly triggered in the Melbourne office at CEC national HQ then in Sydney Rd., Brunswick.

CRISIS ENGINEERING

Here is Veitch’s description of the way it was done:

- “ an enemy or ‘blocking’ problem is recognized by the leadership (Douglas-Isherwoods) within the Australian operation;
- The leadership highlights an approaching external crisis;
- Depression, financial collapse, pandemics, WWII,;
- The general secretary highlights the crisis, and the need for a renewed effort in fund-raising;
- Mental ‘blocking’ by cadres is highlighted – people have ‘voices’ in their heads;
- Financial, economic, moral disaster is impending! A new Dark Ages has descended.”

Naturally only LaRouche can save the world.

After keeping the organization in hysterics for a week or so, Douglas would fly in to have in depth discussions on a “one-on-one basis” with targeted individuals who are told again that the organization must go on a “war footing” since “everywhere there are apparent enemies ready to pounce.” In this way, “a state of controlled hysteria is finessed within the national headquarters.”

Veitch continues:

“At this time, office members are encouraged to report fellow staffers who display ‘aberrant’ behavior (or thoughts). Such reports must be made to the management level, this means to the general secretary (Isherwood) or to the American controller (Douglas).

“Lengthy meetings are held behind closed doors after people are ‘summoned.’ At these meetings personality stripping begins (‘peeling the onion’), accusations, pleadings, weeping, anger, clenched fists, shouting, walkouts, denunciation of peers, family and friends is encouraged. A catharsis is arrived at. Confessions are made.

“The aim of all this is to get at the core of a person’s ‘problem.’ The aim is to arouse anger and emotions within the targeted person. An angry response is to be incited, because that means the psychoanalyst has hit a raw nerve, got close to ‘the secret.’ Everyone has a ‘secret.’ No one is ever found to have a ‘healthy’ background for such a

thing is impossible in a New Dark Age.” Through this process, the LC controllers either wind up purging or driving away troublesome individuals while extending their control over everyone else.

Again from BCS:

“What results is personality control: discovery of THE secret that (allegedly) lurks within each of us. Without this discovery in each person, mind control is impossible. Hence the hunt must continue until the member surrenders, or leaves! The process is not to help the individual, there is the ‘higher’ goal of ‘saving humanity.’ The process empowers the organization by discovering secrets of the person’s past. What eventuates are unquestioning devotees, serving the ‘higher’ goals as interpreted by The Messengers. Those who refuse to co-operate in the process of emotional blackmail are discarded, usually after a campaign of vilification.”

With BP institutionalized in Australia, “All recruits . . . are subjected to this psychoanalysis. It is methodical, relentless, premeditated, and essentially fraudulent and destructive. It leaves the vulnerable even more vulnerable and in the grip of a ‘higher’ force which can then be turned against them for control purposes.

“People are attracted to the CEC-LaRouche organization through an initial ‘soft’ approach: the ideas of the Golden Renaissance, music, geometry, dirigist economics, ‘saving Australia,’ and the like. What they stumble into after the initial commitment is a mind control operation.” If the person does not surrender to LaRouche-style attack (Veitch says that LaRouche in one of his writings advocates about “50 hours” for his special brand of “therapy,” then “he or she is dismissed, irretrievably blocked, and is ‘doomed.’”

This process would reach a climax in May-June 1994 when under the direction of Al Douglas, “members of the Melbourne office of the CEC underwent a program of LaRouche-style psychoanalysis and ‘behavior modification.’ The aim was to break through perceived psychological resistance (‘blocking’) in the office. Ultimately it would culminate in a series of insane personal attacks culminating in what Veitch labels “Mad Monday” and which we will examine in more detail in the next part of this series.

TO BE CONTINUED

Last edited by Hylozoic Hedgehog; 05-03-2009 at 11:12 PM.

Dirty Deeds Done Dirt Cheap -- The Don Veitch Revelations -- Part Six

“MAD MONDAY”

Don Veitch’s narrative of BP run amok inside the Australian LC finally climaxes (if that’s the right word) in 1994 when he reports that some 12 ‘old guard CEC activists (myself

included) were ‘purged.’” In CCG, he identifies one of them as John Seale who was expelled during a kangaroo court trial that took place on 30 May 1994, dubbed by Veitch “Mad Monday.”

[In BCS, Veitch uses a false name for John Seale (“John Simpson”) but I will use Seale’s real name. In GCG Veitch gives his real name. This was after both Seale and Veitch had gone very public in their attacks on LaRouche. I am almost certain that in BCS that Veitch uses the name “David Vincent” so I will use Veitch’s real name as well when citing from BCS as it makes the narrative more clear to readers. – HH]

BCS makes dismal reading, to put it mildly. It is, after all, about the micro-politics of a squalid purge campaign in an already loopy organization written by one of the purged; someone who – of course -- obviously has his own take on reality. Still, I think a closer look at the events from April-May 1994 are in order precisely because Veitch provides such a vivid picture of life inside the LC/CEC at such a micro-level. I would also argue that it is particularly fascinating how the “old guard” alpha males inside the CEC were disabled for showing signs of open resistance to Leesburg and its “American Controller” Al Douglas, although – as we shall see -- Douglas actually remained in Leesburg during the Mad Monday climatic events.

Our Mad Monday narrative, however, begins with Douglas returning to Australia sometime around April 1994 bearing strange news. Douglas – who Veitch says arrived “unannounced” – reported that he had just had a personal meeting with LaRouche in the United States “in the last 48 hours” before landing in Australia, a fact that further raised his prestige. But Douglas also brought grim news from America: “there was trouble on the West Coast and members had been thrown out.” More details followed: “One woman had sexual difficulties; she had plastic surgery on her breasts. The husband was found to be raising money through unorthodox means, and possibly (although it wasn’t said) it had gone into his own pocket. They had left the organization and so had others. Lyn rooted them out, and the organization would be stronger. Lyn’s method was working to protect the organization. The ‘fallen’ West Coast woman, only 6 months before, had an ‘affair’ with a younger Melbourne ICLC member (male). Douglas had discovered certain sexual innuendoes between the two and had pounced at that earlier time to root it out.”

[This is all that Veitch reports about events on the West Coast. Reading between the lines, it may have been that LaRouche discovered that someone on the West Coast was spending money on his or her self and not sending it straight to Leesburg.]

Veitch then reports that Al Douglas next began an intense campaign “gathering intelligence” on members:

“Over the next weeks, informants were encouraged to voice their problems to the leadership (Douglas and Isherwood), ‘in depth’ counseling took place. A stream of informants entered and left the (soundproofed) inner executive office. Late night drinking sessions between the American Controller and female ‘informants.’ People

were seen in huddles, longer lunch hours for the inner Executive. Copies of *The Sexual Impotence of the Puerto Rican Socialist Party* and *Beyond Psychoanalysis* were distributed. This fermenting of the staff was deliberate and with a goal -- the creation of an atmosphere in which certain events could take place. It was a behavior modification process in operation.”

The organization had undergone some experience with purges given the hysteria following the May 1993 Conference and expulsion of “Jane Warren.” Douglas had first begun giving lectures about BP including a notable one in December 1993 but now this same ideology would enter into the intimate life of the organization with a vengeance and make it a kind of mini-hell.

Douglas launched his “thought reform” campaign in detail in early May in the LC National Office in Melbourne. According to Veitch:

“Day long haranguing sessions were held at the Management Committee level. The Management Committee consists of 6 ‘older’ members and is responsible, in theory, for office management. In practices, it existed to ‘legitimize’ orders from Leesburg into Australia At an initial Management Committee meeting, called to discuss office administration,” Douglas began “the process of psychotherapy by denunciations.” Douglas “discovered certain behavioral problems; he judged some relationships as unwholesome; some behavior that was ‘endangering the organization’; he believed some committee members to be ‘enraged,’ ‘frightened,’ some showed ‘machismo’ tendencies; others were ‘blocked.’ Douglas indicated that this aberrant behavior had been documented and reported to ‘the leadership.’”

Some of these sessions lasted six hours and took on a surreal quality that reminds one of *Darkness at Noon* as staged on the Howard Stern Show. For example:

“In one psycho-session of the Management Committee the drug taking problems and ‘macho’ obsessions of an executive member were confronted. His witch mother was found to be the perpetrator of his ‘problem.’ In this meeting rumors about his behavior were raised as fact. But he confessed that there might have been incest with his mother, he couldn’t quite recall, but it might have been possible. Douglas proclaimed that his mother was probably active in a criminal child molesting ring.” Most interesting of all, Veitch says that “Pushing a political ‘agenda’” – presumably the purpose of a political organization after all – was denounced “as a Trotskyist perversion, the sick product of a blocked mind, for the real purpose of the movement in Australia is unblocking cadres and exorcising devils and witches.”

What I gather is that Veitch is really saying that he and some other members who were part of the older CEC apparat wanted to advance certain political projects and campaigns that they thought appropriate to Australian politics and that they had independently formulated but that these plans flew in the face of the desires of Leesburg. It is also interesting that one of the major *Campaigners* that Douglas used in Australia was “*The Sexual Impotence of the Puerto Rican Socialist Party*” with its attack

on “machos” – that is to say potential rival alpha males to the complete control of the organization by Isherwood and Al Douglas.

THE KVETCH ABOUT VEITCH

The Melbourne “psycho-sessions” stopped but were revived a week later with “an increased fervor” after one member of the executive Management Committee named “Martin Strange” informed Douglas and Isherwood that another Committee member, Don Veitch (“David Vincent” in BCS if I am reading it correctly) had been disloyal and had complained about Douglas.

“Martin Strange” turned out to be one of Al Douglas’s main agents in the group. According to Veitch, Strange was in his mid-30s “and had been recruited from a fundamentalist Christian group.” He had a compliant nature and “as a patient in the psycho-sessions he willingly confessed all.” He became a member of Australia’s version of “Security” after Douglas made him head of “counterintelligence work.” Strange “adapted well to infiltrating leftist groups and cult networks.” Having come from a background of drug addiction and trouble with the police and even some involvement in what Veitch opaquely describes as “private investigations” --- presumably PI work – Strange “now had a career where lying, spying, and subterfuge were encouraged.”

Strange told Douglas that Veitch had dared criticize him. Strange claimed that Veitch claimed that the CEC “didn’t need the Americans,” and that Vincent even attacked LaRouche’s criticism of Hannah Arendt (whom LaRouche apparently dubbed “The Harlot”). Veitch also said that Al Douglas didn’t know everything that was going on in Australia. Although Veitch denied the charges, Douglas shouted at him: “It doesn’t matter if Martin got it wrong . . . there are other things which are deeply disturbing. You’ve been targeted by British Intelligence and its affecting your work. Your writing is off, way off. Your research is wrong and incompetent and you have endangered the entire organization. You’re blocked! . . . And it all goes back to your relationship with your mother. . . I’ve seen you sitting there absolutely terrified, curled up on the floor terrified. . . .”

Douglas’ attack continued on Veitch for another THREE hours. At the end of it, Veitch pledged both to “improve,” to recruit his wife into the organization full time since recruiting a spouse was good proof that you were “unblocked” and to read more of LaRouche’s BP writings. “But the session was not a complete success for obviously the onion had not been peeled adequately, something was not being revealed! There had been no anger from the targeted cadre. More therapy would follow.”

“YOU’VE SODOMIZED THE WHOLE OFFICE!”

At this point, Douglas moved to attack yet another Management Committee member named John Seale (“David Simpson” in BCS). According to Veitch, Seale joined the Melbourne office in early 1993 after seeking the organization out in 1992 following a lifetime of activity as a successful businessman from Western Australia who had a

growing concern for Australia's future.

From BCS:

"After the initial 'training' period attending classes in geometry, music, history and economics in Leesburg, the decision was made to 'join' the organization. Seale sold the family farm and with his family moved to Melbourne. There was not financial benefit or prospect other than hard work. A 70-90 hour week and \$300 for a husband and wife team.

"Seale had been a successful businessman. On joining the office, Seale had pointed out that the structure of the organization was inadequate and could lead to serious legal ramifications if not changed. After extensive, often heated discussions, Seale was advised to drop the matter. . ."

Seale compounded his crimes when he said he found the Larouche PSP *Campaigner* "mumbo-jumbo." Therefore Seale "was suspected from the beginning: bourgeois background, forthright, independent and a person not to suffer fools."

At the early May Management Committee sessions, Seale was accused of being "enraged." Douglas would scream at him things like "You are an enraged man, you're crazy – and you can't even see it." Again the first screaming session against Seale went for three hours. During that time, Douglas "screamed a recurring theme: 'You are enraged,' 'You were out of your f-k mind.' And in a cascade of verbal abuse and histrionic obscenity with his fist raised he roared, 'And you've f-king well sodomized everyone in the office. You're enraged and you've f-king well sodomized everyone in the office.'"

Veitch reports that Douglas' performance "was powerful" and the Maoist-like session of condemnation continued since "Seale had apparently shown rage to many people: small children had shrunk in horror; adolescents fled and cowered, and grown women were pushed to the brink of a nervous breakdown, one senior office member had developed migraines."

After Seale fought back, Douglas next attacked his wife saying to her "You've been unhappy for some time – what's your problem? Is the problem with your marriage? Your work in the office? Is the problem with John's rage in the office?" Again these questions went on for another HOUR. Seale's wife also fought back and a few weeks later she announced that she had "retired" from the entire organization. Seale, in turn, was attacked for letting her quit. As Veitch notes: "This is a high crime in LaRouche psychoanalysis. It is a 'betrayal' of humanity and submission to the 'witch.'" In other words, Seale wasn't ready to sacrifice his marriage to LaRouche!

VEITCH FIRED AND HIRED

Sometime after the initial attack on Seale, Don Veitch was summoned to meet Al

Douglas. Douglas told Veitch (“Don Vincent”) that Veitch “was to be sent to America for a few months of more in depth training” because “he was under pressure, he had been targeted by British Intelligence and Mossad. Already probes had been made against him, he was vulnerable. It was possible he could become a danger to the office. Veitch was to travel back to America with Douglas who had ‘suddenly’ been recalled to Leesburg. Or so it was planned!”

But things didn’t work out quite the way Douglas planned. Veitch called for a meeting with Isherwood and Douglas and told them that he didn’t believe in the “threat” and would not return with Douglas to Leesburg. Incredibly, Douglas argued: “But if you were in an American company like IBM, you would have to do what you’re told.”

After Veitch didn’t accept this argument, he was ordered “to hand back his set of office keys.” When Veitch instinctively began to hand the keys to Craig Isherwood, Douglas grabbed them. Douglas then told the staff that Veitch “has resigned, he was under considerable pressure from British Intelligence agents . . . He just couldn’t take it anymore.”

Yet, farcically enough, Veitch was actually “rehired” by Douglas and Isherwood “within two days to do further journalistic work, ‘on a contract basis.’ But there were conditions.” Veitch “was not allowed to associate with other office workers any more” and was “effectively exiled and quarantined.”

Al Douglas then returned to Leesburg and for two more weeks things settled down more or less until the purge of John Seale on “Mad Monday,” 30 May 1994 with the Isherwoods now leading the charge but with Douglas helping to quarterback the attack via regular phone consultation with them from Virginia.

The Seale trial was in a sense Craig and Noelene Isherwood’s final “test” and by kicking Seale out of the CEC offices, they further proved their loyalty to Leesburg. Veitch also reveals that just two hours after the “Mad Monday” trial of Seale, he even got a call from Al Douglas himself from Leesburg ordering him not to talk to Seale. Douglas added that Seale had a “screw you” attitude to the “movement” and to Al Douglas in particular.

THE SEALE TRIAL: KANGAROO COURT AND MYSTICAL EXORCISM

On Mad Monday, Seale was charged with the crimes of being “a formalist” and possessing “a ‘Tavistock’ grin.” According to Veitch, Seale’s real crime was that he was seen “as a threat to the bureaucratic grip that Douglas and Craig (and his wife Noelene) Isherwood had on the organization, and its one million dollar cash flow.” However, Douglas and Isherwood claimed that many people in the office had been annoyed at Seale, a charge that Veitch dismisses as “a jumble of office ‘bitching’ and petty jealousies” that Douglas and Isherwood used to get rid of a potential rival. Whatever the case, on that Monday, Isherwood opened the session with a poem (“The Sacrifice”) before ordering Simpson’s wife to leave since she was no longer a member of the ICLC. Now “for the next three hours ICLC members ranted, raved, denounced another of their

colleagues in an orgy of hysterical, obscene and untrue accusations” that Veitch labels “a mystical exorcism.”

Very much in the manner of a Stalinist show trial, various LC members publicly denounced Seale. When Seale asked what he had done, one woman screamed at him, “I’ll tell you what you’ve done. What you’ve said to this organization is ‘f-k you.’ Well it’s you who have f-ked this organization. We’re in a f-king war and your f-king wife goes off to learn German.” The woman was so enraged that she later tried to justify her tirade by stating that Seale’s attitude caused her to have migraine headaches.

EARS AT THE WINDOWSILL AND FLOOR

Mad Monday continued with the testimony of one “Gay Pert” (not her real name). Gay Pert seems to have been another person much liked by Al Douglas who used her for informant purposes. Pert claimed that she had discovered that Seale and Veitch were secretly plotting to overthrow the leadership. What follows is so wild that I will merely quote it:

“Then she [Gay Pert] bragged that she had been assigned a job (presumably by Douglas and Isherwood) of spying on Veitch and Seale to check out their loyalty. Indeed, one night she had snuck out through the back entry of Seale’s house and huddled in the cold under the window sill of Seale’s house and heard Veitch and Seale ‘plotting.’ She had even taken notes. . . . Pert then related how she had taken notes of the late night meeting, she overheard Seale say to Veitch, ‘Let’s take Gay upstairs and f-k her!’ She also proclaimed that Veitch and Seale were in fact ‘homosexuals.’

“The meeting Pert referred to had in fact occurred two weeks before Mad Monday and 6 people were present, including Seale’s wife and Veitch’s wife. Douglas had earlier indicated that he was listening in on the conversation by keeping his ear close to the floor in his bedroom [!] which was above the kitchen where the meeting took place.

“After the meeting Pert continued her denunciation to another member proclaiming that Seale was also a ‘pedophile.’”

After Pert’s saucy intervention, the denunciations went on for another TWO HOURS. One member who himself had been accused earlier of having an affair with a 35 year old American organizer denounced Seale for (among other things) not wearing a suit at an ICLC convention in Washington, DC, in February [1994 presumably – HH]. “When things threatened to slow down, Isherwood’s wife Noelene would jump up and start screaming at Seale for “sitting there with a Tavistock grin” and being “enraged.”

ONAN, TEARS AND A FINAL ADIEU

When not listening to sounds coming from the floor below, as we have seen in an earlier posting in this series, Al Douglas showed a special interest in the masturbation fantasies of various members. Apparently admitting such activity and providing suitably

lurid and humiliating details proved to Douglas that you were a true party loyalist rather like someone at a show trial confessing to having been misled and following a Trotskyist or Bukharinist deviationist path against Stalin only this time with a LaRouche twist.

In the middle of Mad Monday, Douglas' concern with the specter of self-abuse Down Under surfaced in a comic way when an ex primary school teacher "jumped to his feet and proclaimed in an almost detached way" to Seale that "I tried to help you. I gave you that document" – apparently a photocopy of some LaRouche opus entitled "American Prometheus." But then he "snapped" and confessed that he had himself gone through a two hours session with Douglas and Isherwood who continually harped on his problem, masturbation. He then announced to the audience: "I changed, why can't you? I denied it for a long time, but they kept on telling me, I kept on denying it, I denied it for two hours and then I finally admitted it. It's true. I masturbate. It's true I masturbate. But now I'm cured."

To which Seale replied, "So what!"

According to Veitch (obviously drawing on the account of Seale and another member of the ICLC who also left the group in protest at what happened and who described the members "as a pack of wild dogs"), by this time in the proceedings "two of the young girls were in tears. The ritualistic denunciations continued and the obscenities flowed unabated." "Martin Strange" next chimed in and accused Seale of behaving "like a Nazi" and almost causing his wife to have a nervous breakdown. At each point that Seale tried to respond, he was "interrupted at every point by a howl of denunciations."

Finally after a few hours of witch trial mania and without any vote, right of defense or right of appeal, Craig Isherwood proclaimed to Seale: "I just can't work with you. You are hereby expelled from the Citizens Electoral Council. Your membership of the ICLC is revoked and you are ordered to leave the premises, and if you don't then the police will be called and you will be forcibly removed."

With that pronouncement "uttered" (so to speak), Seale was escorted from the building and Mad Monday mercifully came to an end.

[TO BE CONTINUED]

Last edited by Hylozoic Hedgehog; 05-05-2009 at 03:51 PM.

Dirty Deeds Done Dirt Cheap -- The Don Veitch Revelations -- Part Seven

COUNTERATTACK

After John Seale was formally expelled from the CEC/ICLC on 30 May 1994, the LC telephone banks went into operation against him. From BCS: "For the next few weeks an intensive phone campaign was launched" to prevent Seale from presenting his case

to the wider membership. ICLC members were ordered not to talk to Seale while other contacts were warned that Seale was crazed, “dripping poison,” insane,” “vindictive,” “full of rage,” “didn’t want to change,” “hysterical,” and (horror of horrors!) possessed a “formalist Aristotelian attitude” [Gus take note, HH]. Craig’s wife Noelene Isherwood also opined that “John’s problem is that he doesn’t believe in God – he never has!” Seale was also presented with thinly-veiled (and rather un-agape like) threats to the effect that the ICLC had ways of stopping him if he caused trouble. It would later be claimed that Seale most likely was captured by “British intelligence.”

Yet instead of backing down, Veitch and Seale went on the offensive and began publicly exposing the insanity that the LaRouche organization had become. In December 1994 - - some six months after their expulsions from the CEC/ICLC -- the first pamphlet version of Don Veitch’s *Beyond Common Sense: Psycho-Politics in Australia* appeared.

Veitch relates in GCG: “Over the next two years, myself and my current colleague John Seale, also purged in an event I call ‘Mad Monday,’ battled to bring the truth of the matter to anyone who would listen. We contacted who we could. It took about a year before we drew blood. We wrote to the Securities Commission about possible company fraud but they weren’t interested. We spoke to the police about nasty goings on, but they weren’t interested. We spoke to the Electoral Commission, and they took about six months before they acted. We wrote an extensive expose and spread it to about 500 people, but it took about 12 months before someone responded.”

Eventually the media did pick up their story with nationwide media reports on the front page of the Australian paper *The Age*, ABC’s *7:30 Report* and finally the June 1996 *Four Corners* show, the Australian Broadcasting Company’s version of *Frontline*. Even *The Australia-Israel Review* “devoted an entire edition to our exposes and I spent perhaps thirty-hours briefing them on LaRouche activities.” Veitch even adds that “I also handed them some important documents and my personal diaries of my time in the LaRouche movement.”

Thanks to Veitch and Seale, then, the whole squalid goof ball Kafka story of the May 1994 purges became public knowledge. (This, then, was the real result of Al Douglas’ campaign.) As a pamphlet, BCS went through two more printings (in July and then November 1995) before being published in book form in September 1996.

The first 38 pages of BCS is largely devoted to providing some historical background on LaRouche – some of it inaccurate – as well as long quotes from various sections of from the BP series.

[In this context it should be noted that in his later book (*Gangs, Counter-Gangs*) Veitch – now relying on Dennis King’s book as an important historical source -- gave a more accurate description of LaRouche’s early years in both the SWP and the 1960s Left. Veitch, however, is less than thrilled by King’s overall presentation. In CGC he states that “King is good on many factual accounts of LaRouche activities and obviously has access to intelligence files. However the King ‘spin’ invariably is to discredit LaRouche

in outrageous terms, and to protect the CIA and FBI networks that LaRouche was working with” – a charge that in my opinion is absurd particularly since King goes out of his way to highlight LaRouche ties to people in intelligence agencies. Needless to say, Veitch never at any moment states that he was in a secret neo-Nazi cult or that LaRouche’s writings were really an elaborate code in almost palimpsest format meant to convey a Madame Blavatsky-like “hidden doctrine” of Hitler, Rosenberg, Yockey, etc. to the cognoscenti.]

THE LAROUCHE MOVEMENT AS A CLASSIC CULT

In the last section of BCS (pps. 77-101), Veitch attempts to put the LaRouche operation in Australia into some perspective. Although it is impossible to summarize all of his arguments here, his account is extremely shrewd and at times remarkable. Drawing from his lifelong background as an anti-Communist activist, Veitch essentially sees LaRouche as someone whose entire career mimics a “Leninist”-style cult. Drawing on the writings of Michels, Weber and Robert Lifton, Veitch vividly portrays the LC as a classic political personality cult centered on worshiping the charismatic Great Helmsman [Ghost of Milt Rosen this does not mean you – HH]:

“At all times the great feats and courage of LaRouche are promoted: he has claimed to be a communicant with God; he speaks to the great minds of history; he has changed the course of human history; he is at the forefront of every contemporary political issue; he is the central concern of evil forces for He alone can save the world in the areas of economics, philosophy, music, physics, mathematics, linguistics, and culture, LaRouche is claimed to have made dramatic breakthroughs, his feats are paraded before the loyal followers.”

Veitch then later quotes Max Weber: “Charismatic domination means a rejection of all ties to any external order in favor of the exclusive gratification of the genius mentality of the prophet and hero.”

Veitch quite insightfully remarks:

“Promotion of LaRouche to absurd proportions is just one of the tactics to keep office workers in line and hard at fund-raising activities. It is the organization’s role to convince the organization itself of this fact. With such blind assurance the organization can ask for the supreme sacrifice. The LaRouche myth has degenerated into an organizational tool in Australia, and susceptible people have gone along with it. The goal of the LaRouche movement IS the LaRouche movement. It exists for no other purpose than to perpetuate its own (self-adjudged) purity of method and doctrine.”

Veitch then continues:

“The major role of the organization is to maintain the organization, and this means maintaining The Leader and those who walk in His Image. A premium is placed on being more loyal than the loyal [Tony and Nancy this means you – HH]. . . . Thought

control within the organization is THE business of the LaRouche-CEC operation. And to this extent, purges are an organizational imperative. An annual purge against evil is conducted. No dissent is tolerated, for if it was, the charisma of the leader and his role as an Agent of History, would dissipate and the game would be over. . . . A compliant, unquestioning ‘lapdog’ attitude is encouraged [Tony and Nancy . . . HH]. Certain chosen members are encouraged to seek out and spy on potential trouble spots and to report back to the ‘leadership.’ . . . The consequence of this internal witch-hunting (the Australian LaRouche organization literally does hunt down the ‘witch-mother’), is the creation of an intimidated organization and a sterility of human thought, quite the opposite from what the organization claims fulsomely to be nurturing – a new Golden Renaissance.”

As a result,

“A main cultural feature of office practice at the CEC, a practice cultivated, encouraged and developed by the leadership, is the culture of the ‘underhand method.’ Such a culture encourages spying, denigration, undermining, paranoia. It is of an authoritarian and undemocratic nature. In any mentally sane organization it would be denounced as ‘backstabbing,’ ‘petty-minded,’ and office infighting, but in the Australian LaRouche organization it is an organizational tool, it is elevated to a semi-mystical process of cadre training. In the end it is corrupting. It encourages megalomania in its leaders [Tony and Nancy . . . Oh, never mind . . . HH], and entrenches their paranoia.”

As a result of this process the entire LaRouche project in Australia was rooted in fraud:

“The Citizens Electoral Councils is an organization which calls upon people to make great efforts for humanity. It considers itself revolutionary, challenging the axioms of society and battling to save the world from an impending holocaust, a New Dark Ages. It appeals to the finest traits of individuals, but in fact betrays them. . . . Whilst the ICLC members are willing to make the sacrifice, believing that this is the unselfish and high minded duty to humanity, what in reality is happening is that they are placing themselves into a controlled environment, and making themselves vulnerable to manipulation.” In short, “The CEC-LaRouche movement is merely repeating the errors of a thousand discredited sects and cults.”

SZU-HSIANG, KAI-TSAO, THE CULT OF CONFESSION , AND “COLLECTIVE UNDERPANTS SNIFFING”

At this stage in his discussion, Veitch turns to Robert Lifton’s study *Thought Reform and the Psychology of Totalism: A Study of Brainwashing in China* and its examination of *szu-hsiang kai-tsao* (ideological remolding).

Although it would be too much to reproduce Veitch’s discussion of Lifton and the way the CEC/ICLC mirrored “thought reform” models, it is worth listing the techniques Lifton cites and then some of Veitch’s comments. There are eight thought-control techniques listed by Lifton. The first four are: 1) Milieu Control; 2) Mystical Manipulation (meaning

that you are chosen by God or History – HH); 3) the Demand for Purity; and 4) the Cult of Confession.

On the Kafka-like Cult of Confession, Veitch writes:

“At the LaRouche-dominated headquarters, CEC individuals were encouraged to ‘confess’ their childhood experiences and search for the guilt that prevented them from becoming effective people. It was this inner secret that had to be located. Once this inner secret is located – incest, masturbation, child abuse, or whatever, then a person can be ‘unblocked.’

“In some cases such problems were indeed located, but if they weren’t located, then, those conducting the session invariably believed something was being hidden. More sessions followed. In the best of these outcomes, the leader of the psychological session would latch onto a few traits of the recruit and form a judgment which was simply ‘made-up.’ His (or her) personality was then arbitrarily categorized by these self-appointed ‘experts’ and this became an axiom of the organization’s belief in future interfacing with that individual. Any deviation from organizational goals, any dissent, any individual behavior was immediately denounced as ‘aberrant,’ but, of course, explained in terms of LaRouche Psychoanalysis. A formula for corrective behavior was implemented.

“The philosophy behind the interrogation at CEC was that everyone had something to hide. Everyone had a dark side. The probing was carried out on every office worker (ICLC member) and would-be aspirants to work full-time. If you didn’t reveal it, then you were ‘blocked.’”

Veitch then explains that

“According to Lifton, it was the victim who adopted the ‘psychology of the pawn,’ [I think Lifton means that the interrogated person will invent to please the interrogator – HH], but the reverse could happen whereby the character traits were invented by the CEC inquisitor. In exasperation, to prove the psycho-political theories of LaRouche, people were ‘forced’ into conventional categories by the self-appointed psychoanalysts, Douglas and Isherwood.”

Naturally enough, after people finally “confessed,” their personal history was used against them by the cult leaders:

“Everyone was ‘let into the secret’ about so-and-so. The confidences of the LaRouche Clinic were betrayed, especially if the individual proved ‘blocked’ and was to be eliminated. The information so obtained could be used to discredit them and hound them out of the movement. People’s inner secrets and ‘problems’ became common knowledge throughout the office. One person’s alleged ‘problems’ were used in psycho sessions as an example to help ‘reform’ other delinquents.

“One former member, who had undergone some 40 hours] of LaRouche psychoanalysis has called this ‘mass mind plumbing,’ and ‘collective underpants sniffing.’ He has since been thrown out of the organization and denounced as ‘fear ridden,’ ‘mother dominated,’ and ‘blocked.’”

“THE DISPENSING OF EXISTENCE” AND FINDING THE CHILD WITHIN

Veitch then returns to Lifton’s list picking up with 5) The Sacred Science (“the total milieu maintains an aura of sacredness around its basic dogma, holding it out as an ultimate moral vision for the ordering of human existence . . .”); 6) Loading of the Language; 7) Doctrine over Person; and finally 8) “The Dispensing of Existence” (from Lifton: “Existence comes to depend upon creed, believe in the creed and you will have life more abundant; disbelieve and you are doomed.”)

Veitch comments: “This means that in a Communist state, the party can murder you. In the LaRouche movement it simply means that you are expelled and live outside the pale. No one is allowed to speak to them, they are the enemy leading doomed lives.”

Veitch also quotes these words from Lipton on “thought reform” operations: “Rather than stimulating greater receptivity and ‘openness to the world,’ they encourage a backward step into some form of ‘embeddedness’ – a retreat into doctrinal and organizational exclusiveness, and into all-or-nothing emotional patterns more characteristic of the child than the individual adult.”

In short, mind-control techniques actually are designed to make people far more childlike and malleable by destroying their individual sense of “I.” (Recall in this context, LaRouche’s denunciation of all things “heteronomic” – HH]

CONCLUSION: MCDONALDS + MORMONS + SALVATION ARMY + COMINTERN + JESUS = "STINK-BOMB POLITICS"

In discussing the LC’s history, Veitch says that “Early editions of *The Campaigner* show the ego-centered LaRouche-cult was not a feature. The cult of the LaRouche personality has only grown in later days.” However Veitch also believes that there remains a great deal of Marxist influence in LaRouche in spite of his claims that he is now advancing a “Science of Christian Economics.”

From Veitch:

“Such a claim will help fund-raising efforts in the bible belts of rural Australia. But it is basically a fraudulent statement. LaRouche’s economics far from having a Christian source actually derive from the ‘atheistic’ Marxist concept of the rate of surplus value. . . . LaRouche’s ideas on the stages of history which are now promoted as ‘natural law’ and ‘Christian’ are merely a re-jigged notion of the Hegelian-Marxist dialectical process. Like LaRouche’s psycho-political approach, his economics are Marxist in inspiration.”

LaRouche's ideas, whatever their source, wrecked the group: “the CEC-LaRouche organization, far from energizing [an obvious typo has “enervating” in the original text – HH] the political process in America and Australia, as it first promised the potential recruit with ideas of economic reform and a cultural renaissance, has degenerated into an impotent troublemaking counter-gang” driven by what Veitch calls “stink bomb politics.”

Veitch concludes *Beyond Common Sense: Psycho-Politics in Australia* this way:

“The ‘freedom’ or input that adherents of LaRouche in Australia might have is the freedom and input of a McDonald’s Franchisee. When joining up you accept the corporate design, logo and product. There is not changing of the ingredients or the hamburger promotions and franchisors must be gratified in some way.

“One wit has claimed that the LaRouche movement is a combination of a McDonald’s corporate structure, Christ and his disciples, the tub-thumping and martial rules of the Salvation Army, the missionary zeal of the Mormons, and the zealotry of the Communist International (the ‘Comintern’).

“In all these you will find the essential ‘herbs and spices’ of the LaRouche political organization.”

Because the ICLC has become so ossified, the group “is now a self-perpetuating, self-congratulating, inbred, inward-looking oligarchy. Its techniques and technology are out of date. The brain has ossified. Little has been achieved [little that is outside of being sent to jail – HH]. The leadership is made up of ageing increasingly disillusioned misfits, still waiting. Members are, at all times, made subservient, unquestioning and regimented. For those deemed to be ‘backsliders,’ a campaign of psychological terrorism and abuse is directed against them until they either conform or leave. LaRouche in Australia now presides over an increasingly ineffective but deluded group of people.

“In the initial tilt for world power, the message was a Marxist one, in the second long march to world victory, the organization has crawled into a Catholic-ecumenical mould – in much the same way as a hermit crab occupies a new home. This strange mixture has created irreconcilable ‘contradictions’ within the LaRouche structure. This accounts for some of its bizarre behavior.”

The last page of BCS ends this way:

“This then is the story of how a promising start was made to a new political organization capable of challenging existing structures and orthodoxy, but was destroyed by a compliant party secretary, conniving to hand a promising structure over to a foreign organization espousing suspect psychological theories based on highly discredited Marxist dogma. The CEC in Australia is a ‘swamp.’

“That such a process should be allowed to occur is beyond psychoanalysis, beyond common sense, and well into the realm of self-destruction.

“It is impossible to start a renaissance of the mind through a vicious thought-control program.”

[This concludes the summary of Veitch’s book -- HH]

Last edited by Hylozoic Hedgehog; 05-07-2009 at 02:53 PM.

Another Inside View of the Australian LaRouche Movement

[What follows is a very slightly edited e-mail from a former leading member of the Australian LaRouche movement who managed to get out. He has given me permission to reprint his statement. He also worked very closely with Al Douglas, the "American controller" of the group. For more background on Australia, see the numerous FactNet posts by me on Don Veitch's book on the organization.-- HH]

This organization cost me my marriage and my health. Shortly after my wife and I left, I could not even work again. A few months later the marriage went down. I had a mental breakdown and walked out of my front door with just the shirt on my back and never returned to Australia since.

This organization destroyed me. I guess if I was not so strong I could have finished up like Ken Kronberg. Every time I was in Leesburg (which was 3 to 4 times a year), he always wanted me to come down to Sterling and spend some time with him. He did tell me the organization owed him a lot of money. So I would say he was driven into debt for all that printing.

To the story...

Don [Veitch] recruited me to the organization. I was his law student, and he kept always dropping hints about all these conspiracies and then he started feeding me 3 week old daily briefings, well I was hooked. I had heard all about this John Birch Society stuff, but this was amazing, they had the inside track on our news before it even happened, or so I thought at the time. There was no organization in Melbourne. Don found the building and then I met Craig and Noelene and we moved in. I had a thriving computer consulting practice. When I met Al, he accepted I could work 3 days a week. They soon pressured me into going to Leesburg and stop all business. My wife did not accept it, but I still did as Al wanted. A year later I brought my wife in, at the insistence of Al and the executive, to be a receptionist. They had her in the boiler room before long. I was very idealistic and after reading Lyn's *Science of a Christian Economy*, I was ready to save the world from itself.

Of course I worked extremely closely with Al, because I am the one Don referred to as

Martin Strange, head of intelligence and counterintelligence.

It started out just clipping newspaper articles and faxing them to AI in Leesburg and he would write slugs. AI was always trying to paint how bad things were there, and the slugs were spiced up to the point they were unrecognizable. Plus AI had newspaper clipping files of his own from years back and knew more about Australia than most. I was given BBS access before long and uploaded slugs I had written, firstly to AI, and then directly to the briefing editor.

I was a founding member of the Australian NEC and of course a member of the ICLC once I had been through their cadre school. I went to the classes with mostly farmers, but I was always called out to learn the finer art of counterintelligence. First it was undercover calls to the State Department or some Liberation Theology priest. It was a lot of fun. I met Lyn at the big house for 3 hours (all arranged by AI). In fact I met Lyn on about 6 occasions. I even interviewed him in prison for a few hours. I also visited Mike Billington in prison.

So basically I came back as a fully trained spy. Don is right. But I was basically doing the job that Don had done before. But Don did not enjoy this part of the work. He would visibly shake when he had to make an undercover call, and just wanted to get off the phone. AI always made me report on his calls which made him even more nervous. No one ever knew what I was doing there. I took my orders directly from AI in Leesburg or wherever he was, Russia, South Africa, Germany, etc etc. I was always off to libraries for months at a time. Infiltrating the Z-lobby or the IS [International Socialist Organization -- a Trotsky sect -- HH] time and time again, until they had all their guards up for me all the time. Always looking for that elusive scrap of proof their boss was a secret Mossad colonel. Well as you know he sued Don and the CEC for defamation of character. The embellishments AI put into the "Is the ADC Spying on You?" document assured a win for the Z-lobby. Yes I worked on that case for over a year too. Australia does not have freedom of expression particularly in slandering someone.

It became an almost surreal life, 5 hour national executive committee conference calls every day with AI from Leesburg. Suddenly I am flying all over the place meeting senior politicians, infiltrating CAN [Cult Awareness Network -- HH] operatives, you name it, I am under their skin. I never got caught, except I came close to infiltrating the Mont Pelerin Society director. He smelled something, but I still got him. I would spend hours on the phone doing undercover calls to a member of the House of Lords in England. They really hated me. The word was out on me. It became a big espionage game, but it was real.

Money was no object. I never got involved in fundraising, but of course everyone was a boiler of some kind, getting your contacts to sign up to EIR. AI just pulled me every way. I was his fix it man in Melbourne.

Now Robert Pash, I never met him, but I did meet Ali Kazak, the head of the PLO mission and use to meet him every time I was in Canberra (which was often). AI had

some strong connections with the PLO.

It's funny that after I had this nervous breakdown, most of the names become blurry. I guess I am blocking, huh. Don used to call these ego stripping sessions "Psychobabble". When I decided to get out I told Al exactly what he was looking for. He raved and ranted for hours, "I knew it, I knew it" and let him think his session had finally struck to the root. It had to be something to do with my mother. The whole Oedipus complex. I knew the revelation that I was in an incestuous relationship with my mother was just what he was looking for.

Anyway, Don's recollection of things is accurate. The *Searchlight* piece that described the CEC activities is biased, so I would not rely on this.

Today I am remarried and left Australia for good. One thing I am grateful for is the organization sponsored me and my then wife on a 50 day European tour, and it really opened up my horizons. We visited so many European locals in so many countries. The cultural aspect of the LaRouche organization was a good offset to the mostly wicked side. I guess they spent a lot of money on me and had big plans for me. What a disappointment I must have been to Al and Lyn.

I was more or less constantly with their top spies in Leesburg when I was there. I stayed at Tony Chaitkin's once, but also Jeff and Michelle Steinbergs. I always admired Rich and Mary-Jane Freeman for their long hours; Scott Thompson struck me as weird, as did Tony Papert. He always looked like he was ready to burst out in tears.

My life could have been destroyed by this organization if I had let them. They taught me to lie bare-faced, but I fooled them all. I worked out what they were looking for and gave it to them to stop them trying to strip me with that mind control stuff. Well actually I let them think they had stripped me.

Last edited by Hylozoic Hedgehog; 06-16-2009 at 12:21 AM.

The Reverend Bevel goes "down under": From *Searchlight*

In trying to close out the Don Veitch series, I recently looked at some back issues of *Searchlight*, the Brit anti-fa monthly magazine and still the best source in the English language on the far right in Europe. It also was the only publication that seriously covered LaRouche in Australia, in part because Robert Pash helped enable some Brit NF types – including Nick Griffin – to visit Libya in 1988. I looked at back issues of *Searchlight* from 1989 to 1985 and in all 72 issues, LaRouche was maybe mentioned five or six times at most.

However, the major references were all about Australia and *Searchlight* devoted two full stories to LaRouche Down Under in October 1991 and August 1994.

It is to the August 1994 *Searchlight* story ("LaRouchites pour money down Australian

drain”) that deserves to be immortalized here in part because it covers the travel travails of one Reverend James Bevel and in part because old issues of *Searchlight* are hard to find outside of a few academic libraries. It is also very funny especially when it comes to Bevel and Al Douglas.

(I should also point out that National Action was an Aussie neo-Nazi grouping -- yes, Australia has them as well. Another note: The Bevel Goes Bust tour seems to have taken place sometime in the early summer of 1994 which would have been shortly after the “Mad Monday” purge of Seale. Recall also that one of the big complaints of both Veitch and Seale was that the CEC was madly wasting its utterly unaccounted for money in idiotic ways.)

Some excerpts from *Searchlight's* tale of Rev Bev's not so gay time spent Down Under:

“The latest edition of *The New Citizen* [the CEC journal – HH] reports, typically, that both National Action’s demonstration and the counter-demonstration were organized by the perfidious Zionists. These Zionists (the CEC’s cozy codeword for Jews) are so powerful that they control everything, even anti-Semites. Of course, if this is true then it means the Zionists also control the Citizens’ Electoral Councils. Hopelessly confused? Not as much as they are.

“The CEC’s have kicked up a fuss over the continual linking of their organization with Nazi groups like National Action (possibly because they [the CECs – HH] came out of the anti-Semitic League of Rights and used to run advertisements for *National Action* in their paper), so they brought out the Reverend James Bevel, a black preacher and former civil rights activist, from the States to prove they’re not racist.”

The article then reports that Bevel had been a close associate of MLK but drifted first into the Chicago Republican Party and then flirted with the Reverend Moon before hooking up with LaRouche. The article continues:

“Even other conspiracy theorists don’t think too highly of the good reverend. When Kenn Thomas, author of the conspiracy fanzine Steamshovel Press heard Bevel’s ‘graphically anti-gay’ speech at the Midwestern Symposium on Assassination Politics (!), he was unimpressed. ‘Bevel certainly didn’t seem to have anything to say that had anything to do with what I imagine Martin Luther King stood for’ (*Incite Information*, July-August 1993).

“The CEC paid out more than \$25,000 for Bevel’s Australian visit. Bevel was scheduled to speak on the Labor government’s proposed racist vilification legislation – opposing it naturally – in three Australian centers: the country town of Bundaberg in Queensland, where the CEC claim something of a base; Melbourne, where the CEC are headquartered, and Murray Bridge in South Australia, a faintly obscure country town in the middle of nowhere, the geographical equivalent, one supposes of the CEC’s politics.

“They probably hoped that they could just hawk the Rev Bev around these places,

getting him unlimited media coverage on the back of his civil rights' work 30 years ago. It was not to be. Most media organizations were well aware of the CEC's reputation and history and had no intention of being fooled.

"He did get a run on the ABC Radio National program, but was so rambling that no one could understand what he was saying.

"They telephoned – from Melbourne – nearly everyone in Bundaberg to get them to come along to the meeting. (Melbourne and Bundaberg are 2,282 kilometers apart and long-distance phone calls don't come cheap in Australia.) They placed editorial in the local papers. They stuck leaflets under car windscreens in the main street. The hall seated 100. Ten people turned up. Two were security men for the Reverend. One was his daughter [**No surprise there, eh Rev?** – HH]. One was a journalist. One was the Reverend. That leaves five. Not good for an organization that claims to mail out 5,000 copies of its paper to the Bundaberg area alone.

"They then spent a considerable amount of money flying the Rev Bev down from Bundaberg, with an entourage of eight delivered to the plane – fashionably late – by a limo. Most of them were carrying mobile phones and walkie-talkies. They like that sort of thing, the LaRouchites, and it makes them feel important. The Rev Bev might have had a nicer flight had he not got into an argument with one of the entourage about homosexuality.

"Down in Melbourne, the CEC paid \$4,270 to *The Age* newspaper for a quarter-page advertisement. *The Age* is owned by Conrad Black of Hollinger Corp (publisher of *the Daily Telegraph*), which the LaRouchites claim is a drug laundering front for British intelligence. It has to be said that handing over \$4,270 is a funny way of showing your contempt for *Dope Inc.* and MI5.

"They spent around \$500 renting Melbourne's Clunies Ross Center. Their handsomely paid security adviser was placed at the door with a metal detector in case any of the audience was packing a shooter. As one observer at the meeting pointed out, however, 'after listening to Al Douglas [the LaRouche warm-up speaker] for 15 minutes, the only person you'd want to shoot would be yourself.'

"Heaven only knows how much their printing bill for the *New Citizen* is, but they must have a substantial print run, because copies were put in letter boxes in two Melbourne suburbs and mailed to virtually everyone who's ever been on a LaRouche/CEC mailing list.

"They handed out leaflets to students after their attempts to get this inarticulate homophobic bigot on campuses were thwarted by Jewish student organizations. . . . They even set up a couple of literature stands outside the Melbourne GPO, covered in placards announcing Bevel's imminent arrival and staffed by fresh-faced kids well drilled in haranguing passers-by.

“The Melbourne turn-up was a disaster even for the CEC. Between 130 and 150 demonstrators outside, chanting ‘CEC are Nazis!’ [Why does this remind me of the *Seinfeld* “I’m not Ryan” episode with George, Jerry and the free limo from LaGuardia? – HH]

“A woeful 40 people went inside. Seating was arranged for 300, with a copy of the *New Citizen* on every seat. Most of those were paid-up LaRouchites. The rest were spies. Some people who assumed from the *Age* advertisement that the Reverend was still a civil rights activist turned away after reading the well-researched hand-outs exposing the CECs, Reverend Bevel and Lyndon LaRouche.

“Inside, the Rev Bev managed to confuse anyone who could have been converted to the LaRouche cult, and confirmed the suspicions of everyone who has ever said that it is anti-Semitic.

“‘Hitler hated the Jews,’ we were told. ‘But he really hated himself. And he hated the German people even more. What Hitler did to the Jews was small. What Hitler did to the Germans was large. He hated the Germans and showed it be causing the country to be carved up by the Allies.’ So much for the Holocaust.

“Then they took him to Murray Bridge in South Australia [not all that far from Adelaide – HH]. Twelve people turned up here. They managed to get the local newspaper editor so offside that it is doubtful they will ever be allowed to advertise here again.

“You have to ask yourself, why do these people bother? Possibly because they know they’re on a good wicket, flying around the country, chatting away on their long-distance phone calls, playing away at being secret service agents and spending other people’s money like there was no tomorrow.

“\$25,000 spent for four or five new faces in the audience. That sort of gross financial negligence is usually reserved for government departments. That’s nearly a third of what the League of Rights spends in a year.

“We wouldn’t blame their supporters for wanting their money back. More importantly, though, we wonder how long Lyndon LaRouche will keep sending cash to this bottomless pit of incompetents?”

Today, of course, one can ask the same question a slightly different way: How long will the BP-pureed Dingos from Down Under continue to send money scammed from rural farmers to that peerless incompetent in Leesburg?

This just in: Larouche Aussie electoral stunner

B. Bunyip Cable News reports on the Fremantle by-elections in Western Australia. For the first time, the Australian Green Party won the vote in what had been an Australian Labour Party stronghold. Meanwhile the Citizens Electoral Councils/LaRouche electoral juggernaut (CEC) seems to have stalled just a bit.

Saturday, May 16, 2009

Varga (IND) 574 3.3%
Totten (CEC) 44 0.3%
 Ter Horst (IND) 145 0.8%
 Zagami (IND) 927 5.3%
 Boni (IND) 302 1.7%
 Du Plessis (FFP) 158 0.9% -0.8%
 Tagliaferri (ALP) 6,748 38.5% -0.4% 46.7% 47.1%
 Hollett (CDP) 300 1.7% -0.2%
 Lorrimar (IND) 136 0.8%
 Carles (GRN) 7,802 44.5% 17.5% 53.3% 52.9%
 Wainwright 400 2.3%
 TOTAL 17,536

Our American LNN (LaRouche Network News) Correspondent Comments:

If the electoral defeat of the Labour Party by the Greens wasn't stunning enough, observers mouths were agape (that's agape, not AG-a-pe LYMs) at the vote for the CEC/LaRouche candidate.

The CEC polled a whopping 44 votes, or 0.3% After a decade and a half of being in the public eye, the CEC lack of votes stunned even the most jaded political observers who could only puzzle over how much each vote must have cost the LaRouche operation down under. "It's almost like they want to come in dead last," one stunned commentator was reported to have muttered to himself.

It is still not known how LaRouche's controversial remarks about the Latin and the Etruscan languages may have influenced voter turnout.

Others worried whether or not the CEC's dead last showing might be part of some sinister plot. One well-known LaRouche expert from New York noted that the NSDAP also came in dead last in some early elections in Germany and ominously raised the possibility that the CEC might deliberately be following a sinister blueprint "first made in Munich."

Other LaRouche critics offered a somewhat less sinister interpretation of recent events.

One noted LaRouche's well known propensity for being a total jackass as a possible explanation for the low vote.

Reached by sonar, Al Douglas -- LaRouche traveling genius -- suggested that perhaps candidate Totten's unresolved conflicts with his mother had made him a less effective candidate than he could have been. On the other hand, Douglas noted that it was also more than likely that the CEC in fact won the election outright but that the votes were stolen and given to the Greens.

Douglas then generously offered to take an all expenses paid trip back to Australia in an attempt to resolve these problems given that the fate of the world (if not the universe) "was now clearly at stake."

Last edited by Hylozoic Hedgehog; 05-17-2009 at 05:25 PM.