INTRODUCTION:

MYSTERY BABYLON AND THE WONDERS OF ATLANTIS REVEALED!

The positive feature of monotheistic religion historically is located in the correspondence between the Logos and the religious believer's impassioned empirical certainty of the existence within himself of that self-moving quality which he rightly identifies as his essential, universal human quality of self. Hence, more or less generically, that aspect of monotheistic evangelical religious belief is the principal available means to which alienated man resorts to mobilize his human qualities of ego-strength against infantile “incestuous,” “paranoid,” “wicked” pseudo-self.

The emergence of actual socialist leaders as individuals to resolve the internal paradoxes of evangelical Christianity, to liberate the Logos from its religious status as an internal psychological experience of actual humanity and realize it, free of religious chains of illusion . . . replicates the direct line of Karl Marx . . . Lyndon LaRouche, Jr.: “What Ever Happened to Integration” in the August 1975 Campaigner.
In December 1973/January 1974, Lyndon LaRouche, Jr. (“L. Marcus”) published the first of a two-part article entitled “The Case of Ludwig Feuerbach” in the NCLC’s theoretical journal, Campaigner. In it, he included an extremely long footnote on Judaism. He explained that his understanding of Judaism was grounded in his “analysis of the evolution from Egyptian-Mesopotamian ‘hydraulic’ into Hellenic culture.”

LaRouche then states,

Although A.D. Judaism is an outgrowth of the development of Christianity (e.g., the first such rabbi, Philo of Alexandria), there was a preceding Hebrew faith of sorts, elements of which were syncretically assimilated in the successive phases of manufacture of post-Philo Judaism. The earlier Hebrew doctrine is itself a synthetic hodgepodge of chiefly Mesopotamian legends. Rabbi Ezra, the author of the fictional personality of Moses, is exemplary of the circumstances and contents of Hebrew doctrine—a creation of Achaemenid [Persian] protection and edict. Ezra’s Persian version of Hebrewism was, in turn, significantly influenced by an earlier, pre-Pentateuch version, created in conformity with Babylonian edicts . . . From Ezra onwards, and even before, Hebrewism was an assimilationist doctrine developed to provide special juridical status (and ideological self-image) for a caste of merchant-usurers within a pre-capitalist society.

Ancient Judaism (or “Hebrewism”) was not a “real” religion but an ideological concoction designed for a special caste of “merchant-usurers” in oligarchic pre-capitalist Babylon.

As for “A.D. Judaism,” LaRouche continues,
Judaism is not a true religion, but only a half-religion, a curious appendage and sub-species of Christianity . . . Judaism is the ideological abstraction of the secular life of Christianity’s Jew, the Roman merchant-usurер who had not yet evolved to the state of Papal enlightenment, a half-Christian, who had not developed a Christian conscience, etc. Judaism is the religion of a caste of subjects of Christianity, entirely modeled by ingenious rabbis to fit into the ideological and secular life of Christianity. In short, a self-subsisting Judaism never existed and never could exist. As for “Jewish culture,” otherwise, it is merely the residue left to the Jewish home after everything saleable had been marketed to the Goyim.

In other words, Judaism at best is just “a half-religion” since it is merely the “ideological abstraction of the secular life of Christianity’s Jew, the Roman merchant-usurer.” Under Christianity, Judaism was “entirely modeled by ingenious rabbis” to adapt to Christian society following the blueprint first developed by Rabbi Ezra. Judaism therefore is the “half religion” of a special caste of merchant-usurers.¹

But what about LaRouche’s reference to his more general study of ancient Mesopotamian society?

During the late 1950s while LaRouche was still a member of the Trotskyist Socialist Workers Party (SWP), an internal debate broke out over China after Political Committee members James Cannon and Arne Swabeck submitted resolutions on the question of the Chinese peasant communes in opposition to the Political Committee’s majority position advocated by Farrell Dobbs and Murray Weiss. LaRouche used this debate as an opportunity for a more detailed study of
“Oriental Despotism” or what is more accurately referred to in Marxism as the “ Asiatic mode of production” (AMP). The controversy over Marx’s views of non-capitalist AMP-based societies had been greatly stimulated by Karl Wittfogel’s famous 1957 book, Oriental Despotism. (LaRouche’s “hydraulic” reference pays obvious homage to Wittfogel.)

LaRouche’s fascination with Mesopotamia, however, had even deeper roots. In a 1982 manuscript entitled Religion, Science and Statecraft: New Directions in Indo-European Comparative Religion, he states,

I must confess an orientation to historical philology promoted during childhood by my environment of Bible-thumping evangelical Quakerism, a Scottish-American grandfather, the Reverend George Weir of Ohio, who was variously directly and indirectly responsible for starting an enduring interest in Mesopotamian archeology. The interest led me, during the 1950s, to what I considered more or less conclusive proof that the original language of Sumer must have been interconnected with the pre-Vedic languages of the dark-skinned populations of India. Much of my own work in economics was premised earlier in efforts to reconstruct images of the rise and fall of Mesopotamian civilization. (My emphasis)

In his 1975 book Dialectical Economics: An Introduction to Marxist Political Economy, LaRouche reports that his research into the meaning of “caste” allowed him to work out his relationship “to the dominant conceptions of all so-called ‘Marxist-Leninist’ groupings, Stalinist, Trotskyist, etc. . . and became the approach to theoretical economics developed in the present text.”² He then explains,
In the socialist movement, the problem of defining a social category or *caste* was raised by the development of the Soviet bureaucracy . . . . This led to Trotsky’s formulation, in which the Soviet bureaucracy was likened to a trade-union bureaucracy risen to state power. The second approach, that emphasized by the author, uses the cases of commune societies (e.g., Mesopotamian city-states) in which the priest caste emerged as a distinct social formation without acquiring “property rights” to the means of production. . . . Such explorations have determined that caste is a distinct social category, distinct from class.³

Judaism, then, functioned for thousands of years as a caste ideology of a special sub-group of merchant/usurers who had an essentially parasitic relationship to the actual means of production, in much the same way that the Babylonian priesthood as a whole did. Since Babylonian religion lacked a higher concept of man since the actual political economy of AMP societies was premised on a caste priesthood treating the rest of the almost entirely rural population as little more than beasts of burden, neither it nor its offshoots could aspire to the Greek/Christian concept of the “Logos.” In *Dialectical Economics*, LaRouche informs us that

The Mesopotamian priest-caste and the trade-union bureaucracy of modern capitalist society are examples of castes, as is the semi-permanent social stratum of the Soviet bureaucracy. The Mesopotamian priest-caste did not alienate the product of labor—although it did alienate the Mesopotamian equivalent of universal labor. It therefore had no separate basis for existence as a social formation with the basic mode of social reproduction; it had no power to alienate the product of collective labor
form collective labor in ways determined by its own distinct mode of social production. . . . Such castes are distinguished as such by their privileged position as a social formation within another class (as distinct form a privileged position as individuals *qua* individual). 4

In capitalist society there are only two real classes, the working class and the capitalists. These “two great classes of capitalist society reproduce themselves as classes (species), and yet neither possesses all the features necessary for social reproduction.” 5 All this occurs because mercantile capital over time eventually mutates into industrial capitalism. Prior to its transformation in the industrial era, mercantile capital “has been in existence, with ups and downs, since at least as early as the Hittite period . . . but the principal source of capitalist accumulation of wealth was non-capitalist production.” 6

Mercantile capital also reflected a merchant caste social formation in both AMP and feudal societies:

mercantile capitalism . . . was not the dominant or characteristic form of those societies, but existed as a more-or-less parasitical or symbiotic grown within non-capitalist societies. 7

While still a Marxist, LaRouche saw capitalism and the capitalist ruling class as a single united system with the credit system (“finance capital”) integrated into the productive process as a whole. Capitalism would enter into periodic crises, however, when the paper values of capital became subject to depreciation, a process that capitalism could postpone either by accessing new markets outside of the otherwise closed system or by implementing massive internal austerity measures against its own populations. Hence in his Marxist phase, LaRouche refused to radically split “finance” capital off
from “productive” or industrial capital. For related reasons, he also still views Judaism as an “antique” belief system from a mercantile capitalist era incapable of representing “Logos” because it ideologically reflects and is a by-product of the political economy of a long-gone pre-capitalist age. Only Greek-influenced Christianity could advance a “Logos” concept image of the divinity more appropriate to modernity with the rise of Reformation Protestantism but even here it could only do so in a highly alienated way.

RISE OF THE MARXIST ÜBERMENSCH

If Judaism inculcates a backward view of man that reflected its ideological genesis in an AMP-type society, Christianity represents a transitional phase to a new higher form of man best symbolized by a Promethean genius such as Beethoven or Marx. Precisely because the Promethean genius remains an isolated figure in modern society, he or she underscores the deeper alienation of capitalist social forms. Therefore the challenge of the Promethean is to alter such a society that currently marginalizes genius. Hence Karl Marx is the greatest Promethean genius of our time. Marx’s view of revolutionary class consciousness radically differs from simple-minded notions of “organic class consciousness” as argued by conventional Marxists. The real basis of class consciousness lies in what LaRouche labels “species consciousness.”

In Marxian economics, classes are primarily distinguished by methods appropriate to the differentiation of biological species.8

The elementary definition of a class is equivalent to a rigorous definition of a species in the plant or animal kingdom. Thus, Marx’s definition of class-consciousness
is, contrary to Engels, a definition of species consciousness.¹⁹

Unlike the reductionist simpleton Engels, Marx grasped the fundamental point that the struggle for socialism:

does not spring originally from a vulgar muckraker's concern for relieving the material oppression of “downtrodden workers,” or creating rationalizations for irrational revolts against such conditions. The origin of Marx's world outlook . . . is that of one who as a creative intellect, one of the privileged few, had thus tasted in more than an ordinary fashion the imminent possibility of humanity. He seeks to effect a new form of society in which the Self is no longer bestialized to be an “Id,” but rather in which the locus of the healthy self-conscious social identity is the now-diseased “unconscious” Self of alienated man.¹⁰

True class consciousness rather than being an epiphenomenon of an alienated class society was rooted in the far higher concept of universal labor. The Promethean genius also was the true midwife of a new society yet to be born. Marx was one such genius; Lenin was another.

There have always been advanced and backward societies and throughout history:

The phylogenesis of societies, respecting the range of culture so determined, corresponds to the genetic evolution of higher orders of species from lower forms of life. This immediately suggest a hypothesis which, if not correct in itself, sufficiently satisfies certain necessary conditions to provide access to the general approach
required: that the significance of creative mentation as universal labor is equivalent to genetic variation of a deliberate form, and thus that what we regard as intelligence must be akin to a general genetic alteration of the physiology of mentation after birth.

This must be the case,

because the quality of intelligence differs from society to society despite the absence of a genetic variation and because individuals of different genetic hominid stocks are susceptible of equal intelligence. If it were established that cognition is a reification of genetic determination of tissue growth, then the answer to the hypothesis would lie exactly in that direction without need to explore other approaches.

If this were the case, the findings would readily correspond to strong evidence that memory is not located in storage of specific images, but rather each experience is recorded as a “genetic” alteration of the physiological processes of mentation with the effect of altering a Gestalt, such that these processes can reproduce such organs (e.g., images) in the same way that genetic determination produces the elaboration of organs. It would also locate creative mentation as a reification of genetic “evolution,” which would be a happy discovery since individual creative judgments do alter mentation as a whole.\(^{11}\)

Although much of the above is highly murky, my sense is that LaRouche is stressing the idea that the genius really does represent a “new form” of mankind who can, in essence, mutate over time to a higher order relative to other lower forms.
As with individual men, so too can new social formations organized on a Marxist political and economic basis can rapidly accelerate the growth of geniuses in the population at large. Such highly evolved beings will be able to continue mentally to grow in extraordinary ways. In the Feuerbach Campaigner, for example, LaRouche states that

Once an educated (acculturated) self-conscious intelligence has gained willful access to its fundamental emotion, it has the power to begin “re-growing” the entire mental processes to the effect of virtually eliminating the Ego and totally eliminating the witch.

Societies with the lowest and most backward forms of consciousness also correspond to their level of political economy (primitive communism/AMP/feudalism) and lack the cultural ability to develop genius in the sense of universal labor. In such societies, most men are condemned to lives as simple beasts of burden. Writing about European feudalism, LaRouche comments: “There is no notion of productivity except in the bestial sense. Feudal man has no notion of humanity except that provided by his religious beliefs. Whoever does not share his religion is therefore a mere beast.”

Hence more advanced but still transitional societies (Christianity/feudalism) worship the Logos concept but in an alienated or external way in the form of an outside savior – a failed and suffering “human” god like Jesus Christ. Hence such societies avoid internally locating the highest form, the Logos/dialectic symbolized in Christianity by the Holy Ghost and realized in secular culture in the mythos of the god-like Promethean genius. In “The Passion and Second Coming of L.D. Trotsky” first published in the summer 1974 Campaigner, LaRouche states that
To the “Trotskyist,” in particular, like Feuerbach’s God of the pure understanding, Karl Marx and V.I. Lenin are too purely rational, too perfected, too potent to be directly comprehended by ordinary men and women . . . the “Trotskyist” movement cannot directly comprehend Marx or Lenin; it requires a flawed God-become-mere-man to mediate its relationship to the incomprehensible deities.

For this reason “Trotskyists” (like devout evangelical Christians) can’t imagine themselves capable of being able to “change the fixed laws of the universe” in a revolutionary manner through sensuous praxis. From the Trotsky Campaigner,

Self-consciousness . . . demands rejecting the view of a fixed order of reality, a view of merely recording the existing elements of reality. It demands hubristic (i.e., Promethean) overthrow and the willful qualitative changing of worldwide reality by each individual.

In terms of Christian doctrine, this is to violate the first of Rabbi Ezra’s ten commandments. It is to place Lucifer (Prometheus), the potent god who changes the laws of the universe, above the Apollonian Father-God, the apotheosis of unchangeable laws of the “outer world.” (Zeus)

LaRouche then flies into a remarkable all italicized paragraph:

*Lucifer, not Satan! Thorough and far-reaching capitalist Christian doctrine properly identifies Satan as the patron essence of witches. It is Satan, the unifying symbol of the Big Whore-Mother of the World, who exactly fulfills the*
theological and psychoanalytical qualifications of Satan: ignorant, boorish, superstitious, sensually sadistic Stalin is a perfect Satan. It is “the God of Light,” Lucifer, which is hated by all whores.

Those few who have achieved such Lucifer-like heights have not just abstractly and externally accept dialectics as “the hypothesis of the higher hypothesis.” They understand that human action particularly in the form of “universal labor” sensuously realized in “concrete praxis” can alter or transcend allegedly “fixed” laws of both human and natural history. In short they grasp reality as ever-developing hylozoic monism. From Dialectical Economics:

In is only as Feuerbach solves the Cartesian-Spinozan notion, situating Kant and the Hegelian paradox in it, that the more advanced outlook of Spinoza begins to emerge in its proper realized form. By locating the existence of God in the immediate self-perfection (creative mentation) of man as a product of the material relations of man to man, the self-subsisting positive (creative mentation) becomes implicitly coherent with a natural self-subsisting positive: mind and substance are reunited in their essential nature, and God as mind alienated from substance disappears. . . . With Feuerbach, the hylozoic principle is freed from Hegel’s fixed universal laws and fixed categories, although in a stillborn guise.13

Hegel’s great failure was that following the regression of the French Revolution into the dictatorial rule of one man, Napoleon, he could only understood dialectics from the outside looking in. Hence Hegel took a passive view of history; Minerva’s Owl only flies at dusk. Unlike pale Hegel, Prometheans like Marx and Lenin sensually internalized
dialectical worldview (self-developing hylozoic monism) that united mind and matter as the emotional core of their own self-identity. In his September 1973 “Beyond Psychoanalysis” essay in the Campaigner, LaRouche writes that Prometheans realizes that

the entire universe was subject to a single principle of lawfulness, which subsumed all other, more particular forms of law. Kepler expressed this view in the argument that God’s infinite (i.e., unique, comprehensive, existent) Will was rational, i.e., susceptible of being mastered as human knowledge of even human individuals.

Yet the path to the emotional internalization of a once formerly held abstract belief in scientific lawfulness as exemplified by the brilliant paper pusher Hegel can only come in the form of the “fundamental emotion” and must first pass through a fiery brook,

In Feuerbach, a great advance is made. Feuerbach exposes the great fraud of Hegel, the fraud of the abstract Logos . . . For Feuerbach, and this the kernel of his genius, the thought exists as actualized thought only as it is determined object-image in the impulse for a sensuous act in the sensuous world.

Feuerbach introduces passion, feeling, and materialist flesh and blood to the gray abstractions of Hegel. Feuerbach, in a word, “realizes” the dialectical method as lived praxis and by so doing makes the Word now Flesh.

LaRouche’s assertion in the Feuerbach Campaigner that “an educated (accultured) self conscious individual” (i.e., himself) had essentially “re-grown” his entire mental processes to such
a degree that he had virtually eliminated the Ego and “totally eliminated the witch” also meant that our new Prometheus was himself also now liberated from any “dirty” Id-driven drives such as the drive for power, domination, glory or self-worship. While the Id had a certain “ideological” truth, Freud failed to grasp that the Id was a product of class history and not trans-historical. In *Dialectical Economics*, LaRouche asserts that

In a “sane society” this sense of (infantile Ego) “I” would begin to be superseded by self-consciousness “I-ness” during the post-infancy socialization of the individual, and the Ego would essentially disappear at the age of approximately two or three. Hence, the “normality” of the Ego-sense of “I” in adult members of capitalist society is the primary clinical symptom of the pathetic condition known as bourgeois ideology.¹⁴

Freud suffered from a different kind of “reductionist” tendency than Engels. While Engels only grasped “class consciousness” in a limited sense as a historical expression of social resentment or jealousy against Marx and Lenin’s far more transcendent vision, Freud’s mistake was that he saw human psychology only in supra-historical and “instinctual” terms, as opposed to dialectical/historical ones. From *Dialectical Economics*,

The newborn infant’s psychological apparatus need not include any “instincts” in either the mechanistic or Freudian sense of the term.¹⁵

Accepting for a moment the premise that the Id corresponds to some natural existence, as in a supra-historical sense (which we do not) . . . ¹⁶
Thus Freud's notion of repression, although false as a delineation of universal human nature, reflects the immediate, diseased form of psychological life of persons whose characters have been determined by capitalist social relations.\(^\text{17}\)

Freud's interpretation of the related evidence (on Ego/Id) is obviously reductionist in bias, reflecting the ambivalence in certain features of his work. . . . It is important to note that Freud's own evidence lends itself in part to a social ontology for the Id. On premises external to his evidence, we know that the social valuation is the correct one.

And, finally,

It has been determined by qualitative changes in "human nature" in the course of social evolution [the "phylogensis of societies"] that the Id, for example, is entirely a social product, and that the entirety of human character, insofar as we limit the term to signify the universal for actual behavior, is created after the moment of birth. . . The Id, of course, exists as a psychological existence. So does ideology, which is entirely false from an epistemological standpoint but which, by determining the real human behavior of the ideologized person, is actual. Cancer is also actual, though false to the principle of healthy tissue. The Id is thus not a natural human phenomenon, but naturally an actual product of disease.\(^\text{18}\)

LaRouche’s claims his about having transcended the limitations of bourgeois consciousness in the “Beyond Psychoanalysis” series of Campaigners and Dialectical
Economics – not surprisingly – also corresponded to his ultimately successful attempt to transform the NCLC from a somewhat unconventional leftist political sect into his own personal cult.

Anyone who dared protest LaRouche’s near total assertion of power was accused of “blocking.” Their objections were interpreted as arguments coming from a witch-like Id that invented seemingly plausible-sounding rationalizations to avoid the fearful challenge of Prometheus-like self-transformation from a “little me” Ego/Id sense of “I” into a true revolutionary consciousness.

It was just this claim, however, that a then-leading NCLC member named Christine Berl attacked in her 1974 Resignation Statement. A highly educated composer and classical musician, Berl had been quite close to LaRouche for some years – indeed she was one of his special protégées - and she actively participated in his “Beyond Psychoanalysis” T-group sessions that LaRouche orchestrated to break any potential resistance among leading cadre. Berl, however, began to realize that LaRouche’s claims to have transcended bourgeois mental identity for a higher form of consciousness simply meant in practice that he had rigged all the sessions:

(At the sessions) the leaders were asked to withstand what was described by LaRouche as a stripping away of the persona before the entire group. In actuality, what was stripped away was their very identities. (Then) LaRouche counterposed himself; for it was never disputed during the course of the sessions that all true self-consciousness emanated from his own person
“THE JEWISH QUESTION”

LaRouche’s footnote in the Feuerbach Campaigner clearly shows that he thought Judaism was not a “real” religion capable of articulating a universal “Logos” concept even in alienated form. Yet, paradoxically, LaRouche’s contempt for religious Judaism served in the pre-1977-1978 period inhibited the emergence of the NCLC as a kook anti-Semitic conspiracy cult.  

Until 1977 the very marginality of Judaism, its backward essence, meant that even seemingly-powerful Jewish bankers like the Rothschilds and Warburgs were best understood as conniving Fagins who never transcended the cowardly ghetto mentality of paying homage to their Gentile overlords be it Pope or King much as the Jewish “priest caste” in Babylon lived to serve their captors. In short, “Jewish” identity was that of a schlemiel, a peddler, and a Fagin; the Jewish analog to the “Stepin Fetchit”-like mentality allegedly found in oppressed ghetto blacks. LaRouche’s later demonization of Jewish investment bankers as all powerful Satan-like figures stood in stark contrast to his earlier views in which he stressed the sheer marginality of the Jews. That both views are anti-Semitic is not in dispute. However, LaRouche’s earlier version of anti-Semitism, like Marx’s scribbling in On the Jewish Question – a text that LaRouche clearly cribbed -- actually minimalized any notion of sinister Jewish power. LaRouche makes his connection to Marx evident in his final comment on the Jews in the long footnote in the same Feuerbach Campaigner:

Marx’s “dirty-Judaical” is emphasized here both to underline the characterization of Feuerbach’s lapse in the “Theses,” and to emphasize the epistemological significance of the infantile object-elation of the
devoutly-alienated religious Jew. The significance of the brutally-sadistic moral castration of the Jewish boy by the domineering “Jewish mother” is the basis for one of the most horrifying models of male sexual impotence, which expresses itself obsessively in the “business Jew.” He suffers a hideous sense of secret worthlessness which would be revealed without power over the fixed object in its (fetishistic) commodity-form.

The Jewish male, in short, is the ultimate “Mama’s boy”; Judaism lacks the status to be either a great religion or a great menace. Like Marx, LaRouche’s version of anti-Semitism argued against the promotion of modern political anti-Semitism. Similarly, few members of the KKK believe that a secret cabal of blacks operating behind the scenes really controls the destiny of the United States.

As this is an important issue, I shall quote at length from a LaRouche article in the 14-18 June 1971 issue of *New Solidarity* where in a subsection entitled “The Jewish Question” he opines:

Anti-Semitism, of the traditions of political and repression of Jews, is distinctly a product of capitalist development from about the fourteenth century onwards.

Feudal oppression of Jews, modeled after Charlemagne’s Jewish policy, had an essentially different form and content. A community of Jews was “kept” by rich feudal potentates; encouraged to thrive in order that they might be occasionally “milked” of their accumulation whenever such potentates needed funding. Feudal policy of periodic “milking” of Jews was seldom aimed at destruction of the Jewry – rather, after each milking, the Jews were turned
loose, so to speak, to accumulate afresh against the time
the potentate would wish to milk them again. Under this
influence, Jewish merchant financiers became aristocrats
and otherwise emerged as a distinctly privileged strata
within feudal society, despite the endemic political,
religious and other incidental hazards of this existence.

Exactly what LaRouche means in describing the Jews as “a
distinctly privileged strata” in feudal society is unclear but I
gather it may have something to do with the medieval Church’s
“Augustinian” views of the Jews and the Church’s opposition to
mass popular pogroms that famously occurred in the Rhine
during the First Crusade. Whatever his exact meaning,
LaRouche describes Jews as the oppressed beast-like
creatures who are regularly “milked” by their Christian
overlords. This is an obvious inversion of modern political
anti-Semitic belief about a world Jewish conspiracy which
regularly “milks” innocent Gentiles for the benefit of “the
Chosen People.” Here we are still dealing with an image of a
marginal and largely powerless people who Ahasverus-like are
eternally condemned to ceaseless wandering in hostile lands.

LaRouche then continues:

The position of the European Jew changed radically as
the Renaissance began. The change is exemplified by the
policy of the English monarchy from the end of the
thirteenth century onwards. Jews were abruptly
confronted with the choice between assimilation and
expulsion from England. The case of Spain is exemplary
as well. Large numbers of Jews ceased to be Jews, not by
physical extermination, but through forced assimilation,
the condition for retaining their estates.
In general, as “gentile” mercantilism and Italian banking took over feudal Europe during the fourteenth, fifteenth, and sixteenth centuries, the Jew was pushed out of his position. This was a result of the successful efforts of the Bardi, Medici, et al., and creditors of the emerging states, to force their debtor-clients to eliminate Jewish competition. The close interconnection between these banking houses and the papal treasury lubricated the process.

The Jew was then pushed into the hinterlands of Europe, subsisting miserably as a merchant and money-changer on the frontier of mercantile-capitalist expansion. The Jewish situation was molded further by what British historian E. J. Hobsbawm has characterized as a general crisis dominating Europe from the middle of the sixteenth through the middle of the seventeenth century. Beginning with the Spanish and Portuguese bankruptcies of the sixteenth century, the existing mercantile-capitalist transitional form of European society collapsed, clearing the way for the subsequent emergence of capitalism proper. Out of changes in the infrastructure of European society, capitalism proper began to emerge from the shattered mercantilist societies of the preceding three centuries.

In this situation, the small Jewish capitalist came to subsist in a twofold frontier of capitalist development; living marginally on both the geographic frontiers of European capitalist developments and within Western Europe, he assumed a twilight existence in the least desirable aspects of small-capitalist development. By virtue of the miserable capitalist functions thus imposed upon Jews, employed significantly in the most visibly
outrageous forms of primitive accumulation, the familiar pogrom against the Jew became the periodic safety-valve outlet of rage against the effects of capitalist development on peasantry, urban proletariat, crafts, and small capitalists in competition with Jews.

Despite the emergence of a significant Jewish proletariat and peasant population, Jewish culture remained a culture of small-capitalist accumulation, and even the worker Jew was never too far to become a small capitalist. This special Jewish capitalist tradition became more or less equated with Jewish culture and Jewish “nature.” This aspect of Jewish culture, as Marx himself treated it in his critique of Bruno Bauer's *Judenfrage*, remains key to the so-called Jewish question down to the present day. (my emphasis)

A short while later, LaRouche makes the considerably ironic remark given his future:

The [Meir] Kahanes are correct in asserting that the Jewish question is very much alive in the present day U.S. The Rothschilds of Wall Street, Lazard Freres, Lehman, et al., may be among the best-situated financiers of U.S. imperialism today, but even a Lazard or Lehman knows that the gentile client who comes begging for investment banking assistance may forbid him to join certain Wall Street clubs. The liberal Jew may console himself that “things are gradually getting better,” but the most extreme anti-Semitism is actually never that far beneath the surface.

For pro-capitalist Jews who are not Rothschilds, the Jewish question in the U.S. takes very much the same
form it did in Europe before Hitler’s holocaust. The small-business gentile competitor of the Jew does not see the Jewish small businessman and shopkeeper as merely a stooge for his own gentile creditors. The ghetto tenant does not recognize that the Jewish slumlord is essentially no more than a heavily-mortgaged front man for the Rockefeller interests behind New York real estate. In general, most American capitalists are petty capitalists, but Jews remain a symbol for the most miserable kind of small enterprises, such as the New York garment center. This is a major reason why the Jew in the U.S. is a most visible and thus “ripe” candidate-scapegoat for any proto-fascist populist upsurge among ghetto, petit-bourgeois and working-class strata.20

No matter what else one may think of these passages, they clearly are not written by someone intent on spreading a Protocols of the Elders of Zion-like message. Finally it is important to be know that when the NCLC had the easy opportunity to encourage a left form of anti-Semitism beginning with the New York City Teacher’s Strike in the fall of 1968, it stood with the largely Jewish AFT. The anti-Labor Committee factions in New York SDS both in the Progressive Labor Party (PLP) and the “Mark Rudd faction” that later formed one branch of the Weathermen tried to get then SDS Labor Committees expelled at a December 1968 National SDS gathering in Ann Arbor, Michigan, precisely because the Labor Committee supported Albert Shanker’s AFT during the famous strike.21

WAR ON THE WHORE

To begin to understand the NCLC debacle, it is important to grasp that the devolution of the sect into a cult came years before the group’s embrace of crackpot anti-Semitism. By late
1973 the NCLC began living inside its own demon-riddled magical world; a world then dominated by the Great Satan known as Rockefeller. As the sect deteriorated into a cult, LaRouche developed a new ideology based upon a strange mix of Christian fundamentalist views reinterpreted in a “secular materialist” way. Thus in the Feuerbach Campaigner, the real focus of LaRouche’s wrath is not the Jews -- who merely are relegated to a nasty footnote -- but a far greater evil: the Roman Catholic Church and its cult of the Virgin Mary. The NCLC’s self-proclaimed new Lucifer claimed that Feuerbach’s embrace of the concept of God as in some way female -- as personified in Catholicism's adoration of the Virgin Mary -- was a horrendous blunder. In the Feuerbach Campaigner, LaRouche also advances the notion that the Greek Logos concept was best preserved in evangelical Protestantism. For LaRouche, the concept of Logos is the Christian adaptation of the Greek philosophical idea of “nous.” As such, it represents an alienated approximation of dialectical thinking. Hegel also understood the transition from Catholicism to Protestantism as the way the “phenomenology of the spirit” progressed over historical time but he had blundered by seeing the process only externally and abstractly and compounded his error by announcing the final realization of the Spirit in Lutheranism -- coincidently the state religion of Prussia.

Feuerbach, in contrast, had trumped Hegel by viewing all religion from the lens of human anthropology in which the human capacity for development had been abstractly located in the image of a “creative” deity beyond man. The idea of the Holy Spirit as the expression of Logos continued the religious abstraction of what Marxists would call “universal labor” or the power of creative thought to alter seemingly fixed lower orders of reality through creative breakthroughs in science, technology and new forms of economic and social
organization. The highest expression of “universal labor” was in its continual realization in the revolutionary advance in the means of production. If Communism was the final secular realization of the dialectical nature of humanity as self-aware “species consciousness,” Protestant Christianity had laid the grounds for this final revelation. While Hegel was ultimately wrong, in works like *The Phenomenology* and *The Philosophy of History* he still got much right. Protestantism was indeed a great advance of the human spirit because it had finally thrown off the last vestiges of superstitious matriarchal miracle-believing cults from the ancient Levant that infected Catholicism. Christian doctrine had evolved “through numerous prolonged and hard-won struggles” to finally prescribe the fundamental trinity not as Jesus, God and Mary but as a “liturgical Trinity of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost.”

From the Feuerbach *Campaigner*,

Contrary to Feuerbach’s hysterical assertion, Jesus became sinful by being born of woman. He acquires an infantile ego . . . Through the death of the Ego, through the crucifixion of his body from the corruption of the Ego, his body becomes the perfect material extension of his self-conscious “I”; he has become one with God.

This line of thinking culminates in this extraordinary assertion,

Thus, ‘I love and respect my mother’ becomes the expression of the very essence of bourgeois ideology—and ultimately even the essence of fascism.

In “The Sexual Impotence of the Puerto Rican Socialist Party” first published in the November 1973 *Campaigner*, LaRouche writes that,
Feuerbach’s great flaw . . . is akin to the flaw of the superficial psychiatrist, who permits himself the consoling delusion that fathers, not mothers, are the underlying secret of neurosis, ideology, religion and the deity.

Also in *Feuerbach*, we are told in boldface type, “**Capitalist ideology within the individual is primarily matrilocal and matrilineal.**” Years later in a 19 June 1979 *New Solidarity* article (“*New York Times Pushes Isis Cult*”), LaRouche states that civilization is fundamentally impossible without male rule:

> There was never a “natural” matriarchal phase of human culture. The “old men of the tribe” have always ruled. [Matriarchy only exists in] the most degenerated forms of society. . . . In Christian theology, God is “masculine” not because society is ruled by men but to the extent that persons governed by Reason . . . acquire qualities in the image of God.

The reason that God is portrayed as male is because women are more creatures of feeling and intuition. “Politically equal women,” in fact, “are those who adopt the intellectual qualities associated with outstanding men.”

Feuerbach, in short, had the right general idea about religion, but he picked the wrong religion (Catholicism) to have the right idea about. It actually was evangelical Protestantism that advanced the Logos principle into the modern era. In discussing the superiority of evangelical Protestantism over Catholicism in the Feuerbach *Campaigner*, LaRouche states,

> The correlation between the emergence of Protestantism and cultural advancement is readily located, and that
location not accidentally touches the most essential aspect of Christian doctrine: the Logos. . . Protestantism is thus fundamentally distinguished as a broad movement from Catholicism by its humanistic bias, its emphasis on what the Society of Friends—the ultimate of the long-standing forms of Protestantism—regarded as the power of the “inner light” (the Holy Spirit immanent in the individual) to guide him or her in the proper insight into the Word of God. In broad terms, Protestantism represents especially in its general evangelical form and bias, a large step toward a pure Logos doctrine.

Later on in that same essay, he writes,

The importance of adult baptism in religion ought therefore to be obvious enough once we have identified the Logos-feeling aspect of the religious experience, and the correlation of the outbursts of the religious experience with evangelism. At the point of conversion (the onset of the religious feeling), immersion in water, or the very idea of immersion in water, is an abandonment of resistance to the forthcoming of the “oceanic” emotion.

LaRouche’s two statements are quite revealing. First, he directly associates the “Beyond Psychoanalysis” sessions with the same process that evangelical Christianity employs. The person in both environments is “born again” (“at the point of conversion”) as they abandon their older sense of “I.” Even more striking, LaRouche writes that the Society of Friends (and, as we shall see in the following chapter, he actually means his parents’ own tiny sect) is deemed the “ultimate of the long-standing forms of Protestantism” and, as such, the most advanced religious (and thus still “alienated”) expression of the Logos concept!
Since Protestantism is the most advanced form of Christianity (and Quakerism the most advanced form of Protestantism), Feuerbach’s affection for *gemütlich* Catholicism enraged LaRouche, who denounced the Catholic Church as the “whore of Babylon” and the Virgin Mary as a “whore.” From the Feuerbach *Campaigner*,

It is with this “mother’s religion,” the superstitious cult of witches and such, that the Catholic Church compromised [the Greek-inspired “Logos” image of God] to become the “Mother Church.” In this is located the secret of idolatry, headed by the cult of the Virgin Mary. The Virgin Mary is the archetypical witch, the mother of witches—the Madonna whose secret self is “The Whore of Babylon.”

LaRouche’s “Marxist” critique of the Catholic Church is hard to distinguish from the most virulent assaults on Catholicism by fundamentalist Protestants. He actually “rationally” validates such attacks with his own “materialist” interpretation of ancient political economy. From *Babylon Mystery Religion: Ancient and Modern* by the Protestant evangelist Ralph Woodrow:

The mystery religion of Babylon has been symbolically described in the last book of the Bible as a woman “arrayed in purple and scarlet color, and decked with gold and precious stones and pearls, having a golden cup in her hand full of abominations and filthiness of her fornication; and upon her forehead was a name written, MYSTERY, BABYLON THE GREAT, THE MOTHER OF HARLOTS AND ABOMINATIONS OF THE EARTH” (Revelations 17, 1-6).

When the Bible uses symbolic language, a “woman” can symbolize a church. The true church, for example, is
likened to a bride, a chaste virgin, a woman without spot or blemish. . . If it is correct to apply this symbolism to a church system, it is clear that only a defiled and fallen church could be meant! In big capital letters, the Bible calls her “MYSTERY BABYLON.”

The Roman Catholic Church with its cult of the Virgin Mary is (Woodrow assures us) just such a defiled and fallen church:

Perhaps the most outstanding proof that Mary worship developed out of the old worship of pagan mother goddesses may be seen from the fact that in pagan religion the mother was worshiped as much (or more) than her son! This provides an outstanding clue to help us solve the mystery of Babylon today! True Christianity teaches that the Lord Jesus—and HE alone—is the way, the truth, and the life; that only HE can forgive sin; that only HE, of all earth's creatures, has ever lived a life that was not stained with sin; and HE is to be worshiped—never his mother. But Roman Catholicism—showing the influence that paganism has in its development—in many ways exalts the MOTHER also.

As I shall show in the next chapter, the evil machinations of the Roman Catholic Church dominated the LaRouche family. LaRouche's grandfather, Joseph, was a Roman Catholic. His own father, Lyndon, Sr., however, converted to a fundamentalist sect of Quakers when he married Jessie Weir, whose father was the Reverend George Weir of Ohio. As we have already noted, it was during LaRouche's childhood -- when he was being raised in an environment “of Bible-thumping evangelical Quakerism” —it was none other than Reverend Weir who was “variously directly and indirectly
responsible” for LaRouche's interest in “Mesopotamian civilization.”

CONSPIRACY THEORY FROM NELSON TO NATHAN

Starting in late 1973 LaRouche began to claim that the very WASP Rockefeller family was intent on more or less exterminating the rest of the world as a logical consequence of the need to impose economic austerity to prop up its financial empire. New Solidarity now was peppered with headlines like “Rocky Drops Governorship to Prepare World Fascist Regime,” “Rocky Plans Mass Starvation,” “Rocky Spreads Plague,” and “Rocky Murders 20 Million in India.” Yet in a 31 August 1976 article in New Solidarity, LaRouche attacked the Rothschilds as “mercantilists” not capitalists. He also claimed that the Rothschilds backed Hitler. As a result: “More Jews died because of Rothschild policy than any other single cause over the last 100 years.” LaRouche’s article triggered a series of similar New Solidarity pieces that included one 28 September 1976 gem entitled “The Six Million: Rothschild against the Jews.”

LaRouche's public embrace of anti-Semitism, however, actually followed a very circuitous path. In his 31 August 1976 New Solidarity diatribe against the Rothschilds, LaRouche portrayed them as allied with the Rockefellers, still the NCLC’s true bête noire. In 1977 the NCLC even began flirting with the notion that the City of London was now moving to distance itself from U.S. finance power, namely the Rockefellers. In a 4 February 1977 New Solidarity article, LaRouche praised then British Prime Minister James Callaghan as an opponent of the Rockefellers. In another New Solidarity article on 29 April 1977, LaRouche lauded Israel’s Mapam Party and boasted about his 1975 meeting with Abba Eban. (This article also was meant as
a response to criticisms from the ADL that the NCLC was too pro-Arab.) At times the NCLC even floated the idea that the Rothschilds were planning to break with the Rockefellers. Thus one *New Solidarity* article on 27 May 1977 put forth the argument that the City of London and the Rothschilds had joined other European financial circles to create an anti-dollar “new monetary system.”

Simultaneously, however, the NCLC was making its ties to the radical right more and more visible. On 15 July 1977, *New Solidarity* ran an article defending the Liberty Lobby from “harassment” by the Carter Administration. The NCLC also publicly promoted Colonel Tomas McCrary, a Liberty Lobby and Populist Party organizer, whom the NCLC claimed had been a former Deputy Director of the CIA.

During most of this time, LaRouche lived in Wiesbaden, West Germany, where he spent almost two straight years. (While he was living in Wiesbaden, LaRouche secretly met with the Liberty Lobby’s Willis Carto.) In a *New Solidarity* article on 26 July 1977 written from Wiesbaden, LaRouche claimed that Jimmy Carter was “a Satan worshiper in the tradition of the Cult of Dionysus” and proudly boasted that, unlike Carter, he had been raised “under the influence of rigorous evangelical Protestantism.” He further described Judaism as a “synthetic” fake religion first created in Babylon, a view that in the *Feuerbach Campaigner* had been relegated to a long academic-sounding footnote. LaRouche now repeated the idea that the first books of the Jewish religion were created in Babylon to fabricate a “belief system” for Palestine. He then claimed that the Persians fabricated yet a second version of Judaism. Shortly after that article appeared, Labor Committee members were told about a massive assassination plot, this
time by the Baader-Meinhof Group, to kill LaRouche. This key period is worth looking at in a bit more detail.


- On 27 August 1977, a *New Solidarity* follow-up piece was virtually the last positive article to appear about England in the NCLC press. In this same issue, a “FLASH!” announced that LaRouche is now a “chief target” of the Baader-Meinhof Group that had just made front page headlines after it killed the banker Jürgen Ponto.

- In the next issue of *New Solidarity* on 5 August 1977, LaRouche reported that “shortly before 5AM I got word from high-level sources in the U.S.” that he was now on a Baader-Meinhof hit list.\(^{22}\)

The “threat” against LaRouche came at a curious time. On 19 July 1977, *New Solidarity* ran an important article denouncing CIA Director Stansfield Turner for purging the CIA. According to the story, on 2-3 November 1976 (when LaRouche made a national TV broadcast to attack Jimmy Carter), conservative circles “close to both the military and intelligence community” established a “briefing channel” to the NCLC. Now these same circles were being dismissed by the CIA’s Admiral Turner. If LaRouche is to be believed, these newly unemployed spooks were now warning him about the imaginary “Baader-Meinhof” plot.

Less than a month after the Wiesbaden “assassination” plot fairy tale, LaRouche began writing stories explicitly blaming the non-existent conspiracy on “certain Lower Manhattan
investment house circles" (New Solidarity 27 August 1977) and NOT on the Rockefellers. Revealingly, the article was a partial rewrite of an NCLC internal memo in which LaRouche attacked “predominantly Jewish investment banks in Lower Manhattan” for sponsoring the plot -- although he demurely omitted the word “Jewish” in the published text. The new line also surfaced in an important 19 August 1977 New Solidarity article entitled “What Actually Is Fascism?” LaRouche now claimed that the Nazis were “imposed on Germany” by London and New York circles but not by “German industrialists.” Finally, in a 2 September 1977 New Solidarity article (“Walter Mondale: British Agent”), LaRouche publicly praised both the Liberty Lobby and Spotlight by name for having “identified the conspiracy long before the USLP.” He also stated that “In effect, the affairs of the world are being run by a couple of miserable Queens,” namely Queen Elizabeth and Queen Juliana of the Netherlands. They ruled the world in league with the Warburg family and Lazard Freres’ (Jewish) boss Andre Meyer, who was said to be at “the center of the most evil things being done today.”

During this same period, even ancient Babylon returned to center stage at least in the pages of New Solidarity. In a 18 October 1977 New Solidarity story (“Newton Was a Hoax”), LaRouche writes that monetarist tax farmers caused Babylon to collapse while the key to the moral recovery of the West was the rise of a new “Pauline Neo-Platonic Christianity.” In a 13 October 1978 New Solidarity piece (“The Truth about ‘German Collective Guilt’”), LaRouche also praised Saint Paul for knowing that Judaism was really being run by Babylon. On 30 December 1977 -- one day after LaRouche and Helga Zepp were married -- LaRouche took time off from his nuptial duties to publish an article in New Solidarity which proclaimed that the current British monarchy was “genetically and morally Guelph”
and that the Guelph conspiracy began in the 11th century with an alliance between Matilde of Tuscany and a Jewish banker named Pierleone.

Some six months later, our Guelph War Vet extended the conspiracy back even further. In the 13 June 1978 New Solidarity, LaRouche stated that the British monarchy was “presently commanded by an oligarchical faction historically datable” to Babylon’s usurer tax-farmers. In fact, “the continuity of that faction over the intervening millennium of Mediterranean-centered civilization is unbroken to the present date.” In the 7 July 1978 New Solidarity, he would write that the British monarchy is “insisting on maintaining its feudal utopia with its historical alliance with usurious tax farmers speculating on the debt of nations.” In a speech to an NCLC conference around that same time, he stated that the British planned World War I; that “London, including the British bankers of London,” put Hitler into power; and that the Rothschilds and the British together created anti-Semitism. He again claimed that ancient Babylonian tax farmers engineered the “hoax” known as the Old Testament.

Scott Thompson -- a leading member of LaRouche's security staff and a regular NCLC liaison to the far right -- published an article in New Solidarity on 17 July 1978 that upped the ante. The chain-smoking spook wannabe claimed that Hitler was largely the creation of Rothschild and Warburg interests; the John Birch Society was being used by the “Zionist Gestapo;” George Lincoln Rockwell was funded by the ADL; the U.S. Nazi Party was an ADL front; Babylon used Israel to destroy Phoenicia; and -- last but not least -- the prophet Ezekiel was an agent of Babylonian imperialism. For his part, LaRouche contributed a 15 August 1978 New Solidarity article in which he claimed that from the eighth century B.C., “Jewish banking
families were all an integral part of the force of evil radiating from the Great Whore of Babylon.” Finally in a 22 August 1978 *New Solidarity* story, LaRouche dropped this bombshell:

Granted, the Nazis did not kill six million Jews, but they did kill upwards of a million and a half . . . Whether Hitler killed one and a half million Jews or more, which he did, or six million Jews which he did not, really makes little difference.”

**FROM BABYLON TO ATLANTIS**

Following LaRouche’s initial bold sally into Holocaust denial, he now trumpeted the virtues of a true “Christian conscience.” In a 13 October 1978 *New Solidarity* screed (“Is Jimmy Carter a Christian?”), LaRouche praises “the New Testament law against the evil order of life exemplified by the Jews of the Old Testament.” In other words, now all Jewish people—from the Rothschild “merchant/usurer caste” to the “1.5 million” murdered in the camps—who still followed the Old Testament worshipped both a book and a religion that glorified the “evil order of life.” Finally in an 8 December 1978 *New Solidarity* story, LaRouche declares, “The B’nai B’rith today resurrects the tradition of the Jews who demanded the crucifixion of Jesus Christ, the Jews who pleaded with Nero to launch the ‘holocaust’ against the Christians.”

Yet even now, LaRouche felt compelled to extend the conspiracy even further back to the misty dawn of historical time. He began his new and exciting exercise in creative fiction writing with an article in the 3 October 1978 issue of *New Solidarity* that included a convoluted reference to the cult of Isis. Not only was Judaism based on “ancient Babylonian cults” but these same cults served as the original inspiration for the
Egyptian cult of Isis. LaRouche also became obsessed with the idea that there was a vast witchcraft conspiracy associated with the New Age movement. (In the 19 May 1978 issue of *New Solidarity*, LaRouche even praises the Catholic Church for its exorcism rituals.) LaRouche even devoted a 13 October 1978 *New Solidarity* article to praise the ancient Egyptian Temple of Amon -- a progressive pro-Alexander the Great male-dominated cult -- for its war with the evil female/Whore of Babylon-inspired cult of Isis. In the 14 August 1979 *New Solidarity*, LaRouche attacked H.R.H. Elizabeth II, Queen of England, as “a worshiper of the temple of Isis.” Queen Elizabeth in fact (or in LaRouche fact) “regards herself as a high priestess of Isis.” Therefore “the Queen of England is theologically the modern reincarnation of the Whore of Babylon.” Q.E.D.

Most fantastic of all, LaRouche decided to extend the conspiracy back even further. In a 26 January 1979 *New Solidarity* article, he proclaimed the existence of “a vast maritime culture called Atlantis” based in the Azores. Atlantis, however, was destroyed in 10,000 BC by the increase in sea levels at the end of the last Ice Age. LaRouche also provides his readers with other useful facts about Atlantis as well as the location of the Tower of Babel which would almost certainly be near the Azores. As for Atlantis itself, it almost certainly had a pyramid on it. Some other tidbits: Ulysses sailed from the Straits of Gibraltar; the Temple of Amon represented the good Egyptian faction; and the People of the Sea -- whose descendants are the Greeks -- journeyed from the Rhine and Danube into the Black Sea, which presumably meant that the original Greeks were Germans. In yet another LaRouche *New Solidarity* Atlantis opus (“The New Outline of History” published on 9 February 1979), he expounded still more on his armchair archeological achievements. We learn that when Ulysses left
the Straits of Gibraltar he visited the rim of the Bermuda triangle while the Greeks’ true ancestors, “the People of the Sea,” were originally from Helgoland. In a 23 March 1979 *New Solidarity* ditty (“The Truth Concerning Pre-Christian Cultures”), LaRouche confidently declares that the fact of Atlantis is “very well established.”

In 1982 LaRouche's wife Helga gave a speech to an ICLC conference in Wiesbaden, West Germany, entitled “The Lawfulness of Human Universal History” which was published in *New Solidarity* on 22-26 November 1982. Here, Helga Zepp-LaRouche reports that

In the middle of the Ice Age, there was a civilization which had the ability to make astronomical observations of a correctness which was later proven by Kepler in the 17'th century to be totally on target. . . These reports say that around this time (11,000 BC) in the North African region where Morocco is today and around the Straits of Gibraltar, was a population that called themselves the Atlanteans. Then, as the story goes, there was a king of this advanced maritime astronomical society whose name was Uranus.

Recall that in 1979 LaRouche stated that Atlantis fell because of a rise in sea levels due to a meltdown at the end of the last Ice Age. According to Frau Helga this was not so. Here is what really happened. Inside Atlantis there arose (what else but) a “faction fight” between the good pro-development “Titans” who contested the evil “Olympians” for control of Atlantis. The pro-science Titans developed astronomy; the bad Olympians pushed astrology. Therefore Zepp-LaRouche explained,
Whenever you see astrology, when you see your mother or your aunt or your grandfather reading a horoscope, you must immediately attack them and say, “What Satanic rite are you following?”

Zepp-LaRouche reported that in the war in Atlantis the Olympians defeated the Titan “city builders” and that the Olympian conspiracy continues to rule the world to this day. These powerful Olympians, however, are “to the body of human society as a cancer is to the body of a human.” In other words, they are a parasitic caste-like formation.

Yet the Titans were not the only “city builders”—there were also the heroic Aryans. The LaRouches’ seized upon the writings of a turn-of-the-century Indian nationalist named Bal Gandgahar Tilak for guidance. Thanks to Tilak, LaRouche now realized that during some “interglacial period in the Ice Ages” near the North Pole there existed an “urban maritime culture” which, as it swept south, became the Aryans. These valiant warriors managed to destroy “the Harapa culture, Shakti, the Harapa name for the Whore of Babylon.” In his May 1982 manuscript, Religion, Science and Statecraft: New Directions in Indo-European Comparative Philology, LaRouche also modesty notes that as early as the 1950s he had “more or less conclusive proof” that the original language of ancient Sumer must have been interconnected with the “pre-Vedic” (non-Aryan) language of the dark-skinned population of India.” The Aryan invasion destroyed the “Whore” cult in India but the “Whore” still managed to spread its evil into Babylon.

CONCLUSION

In a November 1986 interview with San Francisco Focus, LaRouche explained, “I was raised to be either a minister or a
scientist.” Through the NCLC, he became a parody of both professions. LaRouche’s project clearly involved the seemingly impossible task of reconciling Marxism and Christian fundamentalism. Thus his “Marxist” discoveries on the nature of castes in the late 1950s can be seen as “scientifically” validating the view of his parents, who could only express their correct opinions in an “alienated” or purely religious form. LaRouche once declared that the critical task of “actual socialist leaders as individuals” was to “resolve the internal paradoxes of evangelical Christianity, to liberate the Logos from its religious status . . . and realize it, free of religious chains of illusion.” With the New Revelation given in the Beyond Psychoanalysis series, it was now possible for the first time in history to liberate the soul as well as the body from their Babylonian captivity, and, in so doing, to destroy the priest caste of black magicians who had enslaved mankind to bow down before their false god, the Madonna/whore.

The origins and the emergence of the New Revelation, -- and the consequences wrought -- form the subject of this book.
LaRouche’s musings about the Jews and the ancient Middle East also leads back to his discussion in Dialectical Economics of “tax farmers” in an AMP-type society:

Capital comes into being as a social fact as the price of a license to loot. The Achaemenid tax-farmer is a useful prototype for pedagogical purposes. Assume that the Persian emperor is selling licenses to tax. Considering the amount that you, a merchant, might expect to squeeze from the farmers and other inhabitants of your tax district, how much will you bid for such a license?

The ratio of the expected gross yield to the price of the tax-farming permit determines a profit. The ratio of the profit to the price of the license crudely determines a rate of profit over the period of collection. To make a “management investment decision,” compare alternative “investments” for rates of profit, and determine the price to be bid for the tax-farming license accordingly.

More generally capital value is some multiple of the rate of looting made possible by possession of such a political patent, monopoly, or charter. This is to emphasize that the notion of the “face value” of capital does not intrinsically involve an obligation to values previously advanced. It is only in fables that capital is locked-up savings.

A crude but effective illustration of this point is as follows. Tax-farmer A buys a license for 10,000 shekels. He makes 20,000-shekels income after operating costs, and secures a bonus of 5,000 shekels in annual usury from lands he seizes for nonpayment of taxes. But, in pricing his bid for the license at the prevailing rate of merchants’ profit at equal risk, he expected to gain only 15,000 shekels. If the license is renewable, how much is it worth at the same rate of profit? The gain represents pure speculative appreciation, but the license is not worth a shekel less for want of previous advances of “savings” against this gain.

This point is fundamental: the existence of any correspondence between the masses of self-expanding use value represented by capitals and the relative valuations of those capitals among themselves can only be the result of some process which limits the rate of return on capitals to a rate at least indirectly determined, in some countervailing fashion, by the rate of expansion of self-expanding use values as a result of capitalist investments. There is nothing in the nature of capital as capitalist’s self-appreciating (income-bearing) property titles which determines any lawful connection between the valuations of capitals and production-determined valuations.
In *Dialectical Economics*, LaRouche tries to give some historical overview of the emergence of modern capitalism out of earlier forms like merchant’s capital and to show that as far back as Babylon we have examples of bills of exchange preserved in cuneiform tablets. Yet as I shall show he would later reframe his economic ideas to provide the “material basis” for a Jewish-“oligarchic” conspiracy that had its origins in Atlantis.
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Needless to say, LaRouche strongly rejected all forms of biological anti-Semitism.

For a similar profile of the Jews under feudalism in particular, see *Dialectical Economics*, 140.

For more on the strike, see the “New Mole Files” now posted on LaRouche Planet.

For more on this incident, see Dennis King’s book, *Lyndon LaRouche and the New American Fascism*, now available on the internet.