
ADDENDUM TO THE PARADOX OF THE AMERICAN DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC

Pierre Beaudry, 11/30/2018

FOREWORD

I am always delightfully surprised by how prescient Lyn is. After 40 odd years of knowing Lyn and reading his writings, I should be used to his prescience. But each time it hits me like a thunderbolt from above.

Lyn's 1977 report on [**HOW TO EVALUATE A BRITISH INTELLIGENCE NETWORK**](#) is emphatically a case in point. I believe it should be made available far and wide, but especially to strategically minded leaders around the world who have a direct or indirect affiliation with the historical humanist faction that LaRouche is referring to.

The original overriding question that Lyn posed in that report was how to win against the British imperial faction and how to take the control of the current monetary system out of the hands of the City of London. Lyn explained how to accomplish that task in a very clear and unequivocal manner as follows:

“Move that sort of control out of the hands of the City of London and allied monetarists, by establishing world-rule for a hard-commodity, ‘Hamiltonian’ sort of monetary arrangement flowing from the principles of the American System, and the British adversary’s strength in-depth is decisively depleted. The adversary will therefore use every trick of which he is capable to prevent that blow from being delivered.

“He will deploy his networks and other influence within the policy, military and intelligence establishments of the United States and other nations to attempt to frustrate such a measure; identify those who will play that British-agent role and publicly expose and destabilize them as British agents-in-fact. He will rally his Sunni networks in the Arab world in the effort to frustrate us. Expose these networks as agents of British imperialism and otherwise take effective neutralizing action against them. He will attempt to manipulate the members of NATO into a hard confrontation with the Soviet Union; expose this, and blow enough British networks in the Warsaw Pact nations to decimate the British levers within those nations. He will deploy strikes, racial riots, and other major disruptions of that genre in the effort to destabilize governments as a preventive measure. So on and so forth. That defines the general nature of the adversary situation.”¹

THE FIGHT TO RECOVER MUSLIM HUMANISM

Of course, the more important of the two ways to discover this truth is to study the history of intelligence operations over the last three thousand years of European culture. However, since the task is arduous, and life is short, the brief answer that Lyn provided should provide an incentive to look into the history of the fight for a humanist outlook within the Muslim world.² Lyn gave a historical overview of the anti-humanist Islamic faction in the following manner:

“Another illustration of this is provided by the history of Islam. The prophet Mohammed was himself a humanist. After his death, his former opponents in such locations as Mecca made a coup from inside Islam. The center of resistance to this coup was soon located in Mesopotamia and later

¹ Lyndon LaRouche, [HOW TO EVALUATE A BRITISH INTELLIGENCE NETWORK](#), 1977, p. 69. See also: <https://larouhepac.com/sites/default/files/20181114-nbw-ctstfT.pdf>

²I am advocating the study of the Islamic angle especially because the most effective American-Russian strategic collaboration against the British goes back to the 1956 Suez Crisis, when the United States together with Russia stopped the danger of a third world war by putting an end to the British-French military takeover of the Egyptian Canal.

shifted to Persia and the newly-founded humanist Islamic city of Cairo. This humanist faction in Islam was known as the Ismaili faction, and was associated during the tenth and eleventh centuries with such leading scientists as Al-Farrabi and Ibn Sina. Against the Ismailis, the reactionary faction, which had taken over the Ismaili-created city of Bagdad, reached into the area of what is now Afghanistan, recruiting Seljuk Turks as mercenaries against the Ismailis. The Seljuk mercenaries in due course conquered Bagdad, organized an anti-humanist Islamic movement, the future 'Sufi' faction around an eleventh century religious fanatic, Al-Ghazali, and mobilized the most backward tribes within Islam in the effort to crush the humanist Islamic factions.

“A resurgence of humanist power developed around an incredible figure known in the history-books as ‘The Old Man of the Mountain,’ the ‘Assassins.’ This new resurgence of the Ismaili faction (the Brothers of Purity) developed espionage, intelligence networks, and special operations to the highest degree, consolidating their influence and power in the Middle East until they were finally destroyed by the Mongol conquests. Meanwhile, one of the centers of Ismailia humanism emerged in Spain, as well as the residues of Ismaili (Fatimid) influence in Cairo.”³

Such an overview of the Islamic fight over the question of humanism is merely to identify the different factions which have been continuously at odds with each other for centuries, and especially since the collapse of the Charlemagne-Haroun al-Rashid Islamic Renaissance moment of tenth century Bagdad.⁴

The interesting aspect of this historical fight, however, is that it also coincides with the beginning of the division of Europe which the Venetians initiated and the British have continued to orchestrate, since Henry VIII was captured by the Venetian intelligence agent, Francesco Zorzi, in 1529.⁵ The most

³ Lyndon LaRouche, [HOW TO EVALUATE A BRITISH INTELLIGENCE NETWORK](#), 1977, p.76-77.

⁴ See my reports [THE ABBASID CALIPHATE OF HAROUN AL RASHID](#), and [KHAZAR KINGDOM, CHARLEMAGNE, AND HAROUN](#).

⁵ See my report on [THE HISTORICAL TRUTH BEHIND THE AMBASSADORS OF HOLBEIN](#). The turning point was identified by Lyndon LaRouche as follows: “*The essential evil of the present British Royal regime’s imperial system of government, can be traced in modern history to deep roots in a time as early as that of the*

relevant aspect of this coincidence, however, is located in the epistemological fight between Plato and Aristotle, especially when one investigates the economic principles involved in the monetarist policy control of world trade.

ARISTOTLE: AN AGENT OF THE CULT OF APOLLO AT ADELPHI⁶

“Unfortunately, money tends to corrupt everyone; why can't it be used to improve the mind?”

Dehors Debonneheure

In the last forty pages of his report, Lyn goes through the ancient history of intelligence gathering in the agrarian Sumerian and Semitic cultures and trades, going back to 2,300 BC, following the directives identified by Alexander Hamilton in his 1791 *Report on Manufactures*. The last section follows a line of thought which can be traced back to ancient intelligence gathering, and which is based, from the vantage point of epistemology, on the difference between the principles underlying *oligarchical agrarian trade* and *humanist city building*. That is the central epistemological issue to be considered here in this addendum.

The individual who was groomed to become the principal agent of the oligarchical agrarian faction in ancient Greece was Aristotle, and who was deployed as an asset of the Cult of Apollo at Delphi against Plato's Academy and

process of degeneracy of King Henry VIII (b. 1491-d.1547), a decadence which was orchestrated by that King's then newly arrived (A.D. 1529) sexual-councilor, the Venetian intelligence authority Francesco Zorzi (aka Giorgi) (b. 1466- d. 1540). In some respects, it is necessary to trace matters in such attention to details of overlapping times, if one is to locate the background of necessary reference for understanding England's key role in the process of modern European history, from a time about A.D. 1529, through the February 1763 Peace of Paris, and, the subsequent, Eighteenth-century British imperialist tradition.” Lyndon H. LaRouche Jr. *We are a Republic, Not a Democracy*, January 23, 2010, EIR, Morning Briefing, Sunday, January 24, 2010.

⁶ Today's Oracle at Delphi has been transferred to the British Royal Society and one of its latest propaganda institutions is hidden under the NGO name of [Integrity Initiative International](#), which claims to be fighting against corruption while promoting war by supporting, for instance, Ukraine's provocation against Russia.

against Alexander the Great. Historically speaking, it was Aristotle who became the ideological source of all anti-humanist forces throughout Western Civilization. Lyn summarized the case of Aristotle briefly as follows:

“Essentially, Aristotle was an intelligence agent of factions within the Macedonian court. Applying modern espionage laws to the case of Aristotle’s residence in Athens, he would have been properly executed as a Macedonian spy many times over. The work of Aristotle and his associates in developing lurid synthetic religions and in developing the practice of practical poisoning (including the assassination of Alexander the Great) are but the more isolable particulars of Aristotle’s significance. The key to Aristotle’s role as a Macedonian master-spy is provided by what are usually termed his philosophical works, the combined efforts of Aristotle and his school to codify the body of existing knowledge to the purpose of extirpating the influence of the Ionian and Platonic (humanist) science from culture. This is the central feature of the new British intelligence system founded during the 1660-1815 period, and points to the crucial significance of the British Royal Society as the principle ‘mother’ organization for British intelligence as a whole.”⁷

As Lyn pointed out, Aristotle was not a creative thinker but a compiler of knowledge that already existed before he was born. Lyn hit the nail on the head when he identified the subversive Aristotelian “philosophical” function as follows:

“Although Aristotle was a clever fellow, he was not a creative intellect in the sense of a scientific discoverer. The cultivation of Aristotle’s reputation for discovery depends upon ignoring the surviving evidence bearing upon the scope and included features of the extent of knowledge known to educated Greeks immediately prior to Aristotle’s birth. Furthermore, Aristotle did not originate but directly or indirectly supervised the writing of much of the literary material attributed to him. What he did was to assemble existing knowledge in various fields – aiming at something

⁷ Lyndon LaRouche, *Op. Cit.*, p. 80.

like a prototype for the seventeenth century *Encyclopedia Britannica*, while editing this material in such a way as to extirpate the Ionian (humanist) world-outlook from the matter so transcribed and codified. [...]

“To this end, Aristotle travelled to various locations, reminding one in this connection of the contemporary Italian journalist Oriana Fallaci, gathering together political and other doctrines already developed, and then appropriately distorting the information gathered to this purpose, much as Fallaci writes the fruits of her interviews with celebrities. As a political-intelligence complement to this proceeding, the Aristotelians and their patrons attempted to isolate spokesmen of the humanist faction and eliminate the influence of humanist writings.

“Aristotle did not invent the technique. The cult of Apollo and relevant activities of the sophists show that the technique of castrating and banalizing ideas, as a way of neutralizing the influence of scientific and related conceptions, was always well developed. Aristotle and his associates merely systematized that practice on a grand scale. This, as we have already emphasized, was the technique emulated by the British Royal Society.”⁸

The case of Oriana Fallaci⁹ is really an exemplary case of British-agent-of-influence. In a 1979 New York Times interview with Ayatollah Khomeini, she demonstrated that the issue of war and peace was really located in the “impossibility” to solve the paradox of the *democratic republic*. The “fallacy” of composition she employed, under her disguised identity, was based on having Khomeini admit that there can be as many different ideas of democracy as there are democrats and that Islam could not agree with that. The relevant part of the dialogue went as follows:

“FALLACI: At this point, Imam, I must ask you what you mean by freedom.

⁸ Lyndon LaRouche, *Op. Cit.*, p. 84-85.

⁹ See Fallaci's 1979 interview with Khomeini on the subject of democracy in Iran: [AN INTERVIEW WITH KHOMEINI](#). The New York Times.

“KHOMEINI: Freedom; it is not easy to define this concept. Let us say that freedom is when you can choose your own ideas and think about them when you please, without being forced to think something else. Let's say that freedom is to live where you want, and to do the work that you like.

“FALLACI: To think, not to express, or to make your thoughts concrete? And by democracy, what do you mean, Imam? I'm asking this question with much curiosity because — in the [March 1979] referendum on whether there was to be a republic or a monarchy — you prohibited the expression “Islamic Democratic Republic.” You banned the word democratic, saying, “Not a word more, not a word less.” As a result, the people who believe in you use the term “democracy” as though it were a dirty word. What's wrong with this noun, which seems so beautiful to us in the West?

“KHOMEINI: To begin with, the word Islam does not need adjectives such as democratic. Precisely because Islam is everything, it means everything. It is sad for us to add another word near the word Islam, which is perfect. Besides, this democracy, which you love so much and that you consider so valuable, does not have a precise meaning. Aristotle's democracy is one thing, the Soviet democracy is another thing, the democracy of the capitalists is still another. We cannot afford to have such an ambiguous concept placed in our Constitution.”¹⁰

The intention of this interview is to show that it is impossible to have any agreement between Western and the Middle Eastern thinking on the ground that the radical Islamic ideology must have a universal control which requires that not a single individual deviate from the accepted norm of conduct and must abide by the Imam rule of “*going along to get along*.”

Fallaci knew that as long as she waved the “*do as you please*” flag of democracy, Khomeini would raise the sword of Islam. The dialogue was rigged in advance in order to precisely demonstrate that such a clash was the inevitable outcome when the *unity of opposites* is presented as impossible to achieve. This is

¹⁰ Oriana Fallaci, [AN INTERVIEW WITH KHOMEINI](#).

how the British have been able to control people's belief structure by using always the same method of divide and conquer. As Lyn concludes in his report:

“The British have studied the history of Islam as well as extensively profiling Islamic population. Knowing that England cannot impose the cult of Her Majesty the Queen and red beer on Arabs, British intelligence assigns itself the task of defining a form of Arab ideology through whose influence the Arabs can be manipulated to serve British interests even against the interests of the Arabs themselves.”¹¹

HOW THE COINCIDENCE OF THE OPPOSITES AND THE ONE OF THE MANY COME TOGETHER

The process that Lyn adopted as the means of understanding the principle of economic growth as the basis for peace and development in the world requires the understanding and resolution of two different types of paradoxes working together simultaneously; one is the ontological paradox of the *One and the Many*, and the other is the *Coincidence of Opposites*. The first is the goal to be reached and the second is the way to reach it. Lyn explained his method of solving such paradoxes in the following manner:

“4.0 Economics as the Only Science

“The preceding successive phases of this presentation have prepared us to introduce now observations which many readers will find the most shocking of all. At least, that will be a rather common initial reaction. We shall present the argument supporting the following such conclusion: *that all valid human knowledge rests upon demonstrations found empirically within the domain of physical economy*. As a first step, situate that proposition within those outlines of a *theory of knowledge (epistemology)* which are implicit in our arguments here thus far.

¹¹ Lyndon LaRouche, , *Op. Cit.*, p. 86.

“Thus far, we have indicated six levels of human knowledge, the five lower among which are accessible in intelligible form as human knowledge. These may be represented in the following order of ascending rank:

“1) The lowest, nearest to bestial level: sense-perception, naive, usually irrational reaction to experience.

“2) Formal knowledge, as cohering with the notion of judgment of experience by means of an axiomatically “hereditary principle.”

“3) Individual, valid, axiomatic-revolutionary discovery, overturning a body of formal knowledge: *hypothesis*.

“4) An ordering-principle, or cantorian *type*, generating a succession of valid hypotheses: *higher hypothesis*.

5) The notion of an in-some-sense orderable ranking of differing qualities of *higher hypothesis*: *hypothesizing the higher hypothesis*.

“6) Implicit certainty of the existence of a higher, non-temporal order subsuming hypothesizing of the higher hypothesis, as higher hypothesis subsumes hypothesis: Plato's *The Good*, and Cantor's *absolute*.

“On the premise of the argument elaborated during the preceding pages of this report, we focus attention upon a more restricted part of this epistemologist's array, the three Platonic “levels” of hypothesizing. Now that we have listed the six levels of what might be regarded as the range of knowledge, we limit our use of the terms “knowledge,” or “human knowledge,” to signify the products of a more or less successful use of consciousness of the intelligibility of the three levels of hypothesizing.”¹²

FIN

¹² Lyndon LaRouche, [*The Science of Physical Economy as the Platonic Epistemological Basis for All Branches of Human Knowledge*](#), EIR, original version February 25, 1994, current version November 30, 2018, p. 60.