

After Chirac had left London, London's International Institute for Strategic Studies (IISS) warned of the dangers posed by the zero-option to Europe; such warnings are an unusual turnabout for the IISS, which usually supports arms-control deals. In its "Strategic Survey 1985-1986," the IISS charged that "the superpowers pursued a chimera at Reykjavik: dreams and visions of a world without nuclear weapons, and also, for President Reagan, a world of perfect defenses. A sense of unreality pervaded the negotiations."

### Tass is not amused

The day after Chirac's departure, the Soviet news agency Tass, under the title, "Atlantic solidarity, obstacle to disarmament," and under the byline, Vladimir Bogachev, issued a violent denunciation of Chirac and Giraud. The nastiness and cynicism of the tone of the article contrasts with the oozing sweetness the Russians are reserving for U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz.

"Certain members of the French government," in particular Prime Minister Chirac and Defense Minister Giraud, Tass-Bogachev charged, have "taken the leadership of the offensive of conservative circles of NATO against disarmament in Europe." The French position in respect to recent Soviet proposals is "much harder than that of other NATO capitals, . . . according to Western observers themselves."

The attack went on: "The Soviet government had declared itself ready, to not take into account the British and French '*forces de frappe*' in the global equilibrium of forces in a potential accord on Euromissiles. This constituted an important concession, to the extent that French military planners calculate publicly the strength of their nuclear forces by the number of Soviet cities that they can destroy.

"But the Parisian high functionaries, who have the short view, fear that it would be more difficult to France to justify the existence of its nuclear forces when the Soviets will have withdrawn its theatre missiles from Europe."

Tass-Bogachev attacked Chirac for "having declared Sunday [in Britain] that the withdrawal from Europe of short-range missiles would be dangerous," and Giraud, for having spoken of a "nuclear Munich," in respect to Soviet disarmament offers.

The piece further attacked France for reinforcing its program of nuclear armament: "Paris is extending its zone of responsibility in Europe, and is replacing its Pluton missiles, of a range of 120 kilometers, with Hades missiles, capable of reaching targets in Czechoslovakia and the German Democratic Republic. The number of nuclear warheads with which the French missiles based on land and on sea are equipped, will reach 600 units in 1992. As an American journalist said, if the French *force de frappe* is a joke, it is less and less funny."

Not coincidentally, the attacks were issued while a French Foreign Ministry official was in Moscow, preparing the scheduled visit of Chirac to the U.S.S.R.

---

## British Press Asks:

---

# Are homosexuals a

by Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.

*This commentary was written on April 26, 1987:*

The British weekend press may be fairly described as somewhat dominated by echoes of Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher's disclosure earlier this past week, that former MI-6 spymaster Sir Maurice Oldfield had been an active homosexual, apparently since his days at Lady Manner's public school. One issue prominently debated, is whether the fact that a person is a lesbian, catamite, or sodomite makes her or him intrinsically too great a security risk to be entrusted with state secrets?

According to accounts, Oldfield, who died in 1981, had been on the MI-6 roster, initially occupied with battering Jews in Palestine, since 1946, and its spymaster from 1973 until he was exposed and discharged for having concealed his homosexual life, in 1980. He is described by *The Observer* as spy-novelist John LeCarre's model for the odious, fictional character of "Smiley."

The controversy appears to center around what should be viewed as merely a significant, but essentially tertiary aspect of the problem, that homosexuals are so much more readily subject to potential blackmail by Soviet or other nasty agencies, that to employ homosexuals for sensitive posts is far too great a risk to be tolerated. The contrary view, expressed by one of the weekend's columnists, is that homosexuals are blackmailable because of society's intolerant attitude toward them, and might not be intrinsically such risks otherwise.

Admittedly, that is the conventional view of the issue, as we might remember from those ironic days the homosexual ring of Sen. Joe McCarthy's Roy M. Cohn was exposing State Department homosexuals as "security risks." Homosexuals are persons, and thus entitled to the civil liberties of persons generally. Consequently, they have the right to seek

---

---

# security risk?

to qualify for employment in any field, on their individual merits, on condition it is not demonstrated that their homosexuality itself is a disabling disqualification. Although the observation that homosexuals are blackmailable is valid, that misses the essential point of the matter.

The fundamental question for policy-makers, is a question of fact: Is there something in the state of mind of being a homosexual, some impairment of the personal sense of social identity, which might also impair their loyalties in dealing with state secrets? This area of the problem was seriously considered by some in the psychiatric profession, until the beginning of the 1970s, when politically motivated decisions within the medical profession caused nations to cease classifying homosexuality as a painful and variously troublesome mental affliction, a disease in the proper sense of the term.

If we are to bring some sense back into the discussion of this sensitive problem, the phenomenon of homosexuality must be divided into two admittedly interrelated, but very distinct clinical problems.

The first is that aspect of intimacies with either animals or one's own sex, intimacies described, for what are, biologically curiously inappropriate reasons, as "sexual acts." Such intimacies fall within the provinces of statutes and morality. This is the aspect stressed by the current British press discussion, potential blackmail arising from the perpetration of such acts—presumably with one of the numerous, similarly disposed agents of the Soviet KGB.

The public attention to these statutory and moral aspects of the matter distracts attention from the second, more profound questions: What is distinctive about the state of mind of the person impelled to perpetrate such practices, and what might be the consequences, of relevance to security policies, of a person's being subject to such state of mind? Let us

concede, and thus put to one side, the issue of "potential blackmail"; let us concentrate on the more profound, psychiatric issue.

The conventional view of homosexuality (including lesbians, of course), is that it is "not normal." Unfortunately, "normal" usually carries the connotations of "statistically less likely," or "unconventional." Since, statistically, almost no person is precisely normal in those senses, such definitions are much less than useful. One says better, "pathological," in the sense earlier conveyed by the psychiatric profession's view of this matter.

The question is: Is the homosexual psychopathology, in some or all varieties of cases, associated with an endemic impairment of the capacity for patriotism? So, before focusing upon the impairment, we must define what it might be which might be so impaired.

## **Bertrand Russell, a paragon of treason**

Patriotism, and associated notions of loyalty, trustworthiness, and so forth, are really a way of speaking of the person's innermost sense of social identity. It is that which is associated with the person's innermost sense of social identity, which is that for which he will make virtually any sacrifice, rather than become an un-person to himself.

While I have no record of what the late Bertrand Russell did in his odd hours without the company of Ottoline, it is the treasonous state of mind of Russell which appears to be most typical of the high-ranking sort of post-Versailles British traitor in particular. The question is, whether something analogous to Russell's avowed proclivity for treason can be properly identified as a syndrome of either all homosexuals, or only of a more specific strain of homosexual pathology.

In the instances of both Russell and Blunt, and others, the point to be emphasized, is that the collapse of the British Empire, and the prospect of extended world-domination by the Americans, deprived them of the former sense of British identity which the grandson of Sir John Russell found acceptable, and that treason, in one guise or another, were preferable to tolerating British subservience to the whims and interests of the American Morloch.

If Earl Russell was not technically a traitor to Britain, this was only because his energies were fully occupied with crimes against both the Creator and civilization. Men of lesser evil are more suited to smaller deeds of mere treason against a particular nation.

It must also be taken into account, that draping the corpses of Britain's youth upon the barbed wire of the Great War, fostered a state of mind in Britain not dissimilar to the demoralization of those German veterans, the "rootless ones," on which Nazism capitalized. In the latter state of demoralization, during the 1920s and into the 1930s, the satanic influence of such as Russell, H.G. Wells, and Aleister Crowley met fewer barriers to its progress.

However, we can not separate this phenomenon of the

post-Versailles period from what leading Fabians themselves stressed as the role of the Darwin-Huxley scandals upon the religious faith of the self-styled intellectuals of the British middle classes and others. Nor, respecting the issues leading into the U.S. War of Independence, should an American historian overlook a similar pathology traceable to the Hell Fire Clubs of Walpole Liberalism, or the degeneracy rampant among influential circles within the court of James I.

Patriotism, as distinct from racialism, can not be separated from that idea of the modern sovereign nation-state, which spread from Renaissance Italy into Louis XI's France and Tudor England, as the alternative to the follies of late-13th-century and 14th-century feudalism. The tendency to substitute parodies of the two Roman empires for the institution of the modern nation-state, and a curious self-hate, which perceives that the institution of the family committed the folly of bringing oneself into existence, are also contributing influences for the erosion of patriotism today.

True patriotism does not negate personal self-interest, but is associated rather with the individual's sensibility of his own mortality, and thus recognition that the outcome of his individual life's work lies in that which a hopefully more durable existence, that of his nation, makes permanent. It is thus tied to love of self, nation, and humanity, all at once, a

form of love associated with "agape," not "eros."

The loss of a sense that one's nation has a higher purpose for contributing to the advancement of civilization as a whole, or the sense that one's nation is no longer committed to adopting and nurturing the good contributed by its citizens, either impels one to correct such flaws in one's nation, or else patriotism is cut away at its root. Similarly, the fault may originate within the individual, one who is so obsessed by personal eroticism for its own sake, that nation is reduced for him to at best a possible convenience, or, at worst, an encumbrance he tolerates as long as he fears to do otherwise.

Much is made of the supposed "idealism" of a Philby or other notable cases of traitorous defectors to the Russian empire. This presumes that Philby was some poor fool with an unresolved weaning-crisis, like some simpering idiot following the red banners in some peace march, with no knowledge of what Russia is on the inside, or of what Russia does in those nations which were either subjected to Moscow's overlordship, or misled into coming under Soviet control. Philby knew full well what he was doing. Moscow was evil, to his knowledge, and he consciously chose evil, conscious that the choice was an evil one. Philby, like Blunt, whom only silly people could consider "idealists," brings us to the essence of the matter.

### Homosexuality as the intent to do evil

The clinical essence of the homosexual pathology, is destructive rage, a Nietzschean, dionysiac quality of rage. In the pre-1970s psychiatric literature, this was frankly and extensively documented. The pleasure of the homosexual deed is the pleasure of doing evil, in that clinical sense. It is not the desire for the act in itself, but the pleasure of the destructive character of the act as an affirmation of the diabolical, which is controlling. This is a form of the *mens rea*; it is an evilly grimacing Eros with horns and hooves, an Osiris, a Siva, a Dionysos.

We should recall from the relevant authorities of a more honest past, that the etiology of the homosexual syndrome has two distinct elements. The first is the potentially homosexual disposition, as commonly the case of the boy victimized psychologically by a certain sort of mother. The second is the indoctrination into homosexual practices.

During the late 1960s and 1970s, the endemic incidence of homosexuality in the United States was greatly, and intentionally magnified, by systematic indoctrination in homosexuality as a cult, with a significant role by culpable circles within certain divinity and theological schools, as in the case of the role of Berkeley to this effect in the San Francisco Bay Area.

This cult-form of indoctrination into homosexuality demonstrated, that although the relevant mother syndrome is the typical history of endemic homosexuality, that incidences way beyond such endemic potential can be cultivated with a

## MIDDLE EAST INSIDER

*Weekly Confidential Newsletter*

*Executive Intelligence Review* has been the authority on Middle East affairs for a decade. In 1978, *EIR* presented a coherent profile of the "Islamic fundamentalist" phenomenon. *EIR* had the inside story of the Irangate scandal before anyone else: In 1980, *EIR* exposed the late Cyrus Hashemi as the Iranian intelligence man in Washington, organizing arms deals and terror.

*Middle East Insider*, created in November 1986, brings you:

- **the inside story of U.S. Mideast policy**
- **what the Soviets are really doing in the region**
- **confidential reports from inside the Middle East and North Africa that no one else dares to publish**
- **accuracy on the latest terror actions and terrorist groups**

A subscription also includes a "hot line," where you can call for more information on any item we publish.

Take out a three-month trial subscription for 1000-DM, and receive one of our recently published special reports as a gift.

Yearly subscription at 5000-DM. (Distributed only by European office.) Write or call: Middle East Insider c/o EIR Dotzheimerstr. 166, P.O. Box 2308, 62 Wiesbaden F.R.G. Tel: (6121) 88 40.

well-designed approach, under the circumstances appropriate for this. The rock-drug-sex counterculture's spread in the U.S.A. during the 1960s, had created such an exceptional, expanded potential by the end of the 1960s, especially in areas in which "New Left" political radicalism overlapped the influence of the rock-drug-sex counterculture in a concentrated way.

Such extraordinary success in creating large numbers of homosexuals from otherwise improbable cases, forced the attention of observers to the fact that the Cybelene cult of Dionysos was no mere scholar's curiosity, but embodied very efficient means for destroying the youth of society, and turning them into assassins of their parents, the elite of the urban centers. This was Nietzschean stuff, and produced with well-informed calculation by "New Age" followers of Crowley and others. So, the methods of the ancient cult of Dionysos were replicated before our eyes.

The observation of this development, through aid of "sensitivity group" methods, and the evolution of the homosexual movements among men and women since, forced our attention back to the intrinsic psychopathological nature of homosexuality more generally. Granted, the behavior of the organized homosexual cults of California and elsewhere was mass behavior, akin to the effect of concentrating a pack of hungry locusts; the nature of the locust is embodied in the relatively more benign state of the same species. In the relatively more quiet homosexual, distinct from self-styled "Nazis in Leather" parading on California streets, the same potential is endemic.

The homosexual's sense of deep guilt about his homosexuality is a necessary part of his condition. He is wrong, but as long as he experiences a sense that this is indeed contemptible behavior, he can tend to function as a useful, reliable person in society, apart from the immediate impact of his affliction. The one grip on sanity available to the deranged person, is his inner awareness that his mind is not only an unhealthy one, but a threat to his chance of social identity. His hope of sanity, is his sense that his condition is a degenerate one, and his accompanying desire to overcome this flaw. Remove that painful sense of guilt, and he becomes unmitigated depravity.

Once the homosexual loses that sense of guilt about his degenerate condition, and thus gives up the idea of recovery, he is lost. Worse, if he becomes persuaded that he has a right to choose to be self-righteously a homosexual, he becomes a criminal mind in the strictest sense of the term. He becomes Nietzschean, and is ripe for acts of treason, simply because treason per se may afford him exquisite pleasure.

In such a state of mind, he might not become a traitor in fact: For example, if he is able to release his propensity for evil in other ways. He innermost character is that of an erotic egoist in the worst sense, a sadist and pathological liar by disposition, all the traits most intolerable in an agency as

sensitive as an intelligence service.

In this, as it bears upon the case of "Smiley," I have some expert experience. For years, my own principal function has been *primus inter pares* among a private circle of friends. One of our principal functions is in the mode of a private intelligence service. Considering our very modest resources, we are among the best in the world at what we do, right enough to give pain to relevant organs of those regular and private agencies who might often prefer to conceal what we reveal. This private occupation brings us athwart various intelligence services, and has brought us into that indescribable but very distinct demi-monde called the "intelligence community."

The fault in most major intelligence services today, is that they are more pragmatic tribes of Manicheans, than being dedicated to some clear purpose. They practice the slogan: "Neither actually win, nor actually lose, and never lose badly enough not to stay within the game to play another day." Some national intelligence services are technically proficient, in one or more aspects, and some are such pathetic bunglers in political intelligence such that even we, with our modest resources, are obliged to ridicule their habitual ignorance and clumsiness. Really good political intelligence, attuned to coherent and sound long-range strategies, generally does not exist. The Manichean pragmatism is the general flaw. Really rigorous political intelligence is lacking.

Good intelligence functioning requires moral qualities of judgment, and unbreakable loyalties to the welfare of one's collaborators. Otherwise, the free play of original thought essential to discovering the unexpected or overlooked, is not possible. The collaborators must be true collaborators, assembled to no purpose but a common devotion to search for useful truths, especially those extraordinarily important truths which are never the generally accepted ones. For such, a "Smiley," as novelist LeCarre portrays him, is intolerable; Le Carre's "Smiley" is recognizably a homosexual, without need of vettings, polygraphs, or other such diversions.

In brief, it is the dionysiac quality of defect in the psychopathology of the homosexual, which is the source of his attractions to the pleasure of the act of betrayal. It is this flaw, more or less developed, which renders the homosexual intrinsically a security risk in corresponding degree, not merely because he is potentially blackmailable, but merely because he is a victim of a homosexual's psychopathology.

To be a homosexual, is a terrible affliction; if we cared for the human rights of such persons, we should direct our efforts to curing them of that which makes them so unpleasantly distinctive.

Assuming that the disclosures in the British press are accurate ones, "Smiley" should never have been entrusted with the position, whether he actually betrayed or not. The damage he did, in one way or another, must have been enormous. Such was written in the character LaCarre describes.