

Newt's Jacobin battle-cry

On Jan. 20, 1995, Speaker of the House Newt Gingrich delivered a blood-curdling call to arms before the Republican National Committee in Washington, D.C. in which he explicitly equated himself with Robespierre and Danton:

"We need to understand that the scale of revolution that we need is so great and it is so dramatically different. . . . This is a real revolution. In real revolutions, the defeated faction doesn't tend to convert. It tends to go down fighting. . . . I mean, if you look at the Bourbons, in France, they didn't rush in and say, 'Oh, please, can I join the revolution?' They remained Bourbons. In fact most of them learned nothing and forgot nothing, and 50 years later were still locked into a world that was dead. . . . I am a genuine revolutionary; they [the Democrats] are the genuine reactionaries; we are going to change their world and they will do anything to stop us, they will use any tool, there is no grotesquerie, no distortion, no dishonesty, too great for them to come after us. . . . The future of the human race for at least a century rests on our shoulders. If we fail . . . then Bosnia and Rwanda, Haiti and Somalia are the harbingers of a dark and bloody planet."

itself a relic of the generic fascist movements of the 1920s and 1930s, as fascism is identified by Prof. Armin Mohler's standard reference on that subject, *Die Konservative Revolution in Deutschland, 1918-1932*.⁵ Our report documents that program's neo-conservative following was organized, top-down, by the bloated network of indoctrinating and funding organizations constructed under the overall coordination of the branch of British intelligence services which created Friedrich von Hayek's Mont Pelerin Society and deployed it against the United States.

If one sees, that a branch of the fascist Conservative Revolution, the Mont Pelerin Society, assembled and packaged Limbaugh's neo-conservatives, that shows the deployment of assets by a fascist movement, but does not yet prove that those assets themselves are also fascists in their own inclinations. ("Could they not be misguided dupes, instead?") Amid today's public controversies over labelling, is the content of these neo-conservative followers as fascist as

5. Armin Mohler, *Die Konservative Revolution in Deutschland, 1918-1932*, 3rd edition (Darmstadt: 1994). The Siemens Foundation's Mohler wrote the first edition of this (1949) as a doctoral dissertation under the postwar patronage of existentialist Professor Karl Jaspers.

the Mont Pelerin Society control over them implies?

Any public description of a person or movement as fascist in content, incurs the difficulty for the layman, that, with few exceptions, the academically generally accepted sources on the inner nature of fascism fall into three classes. One class is made up of tendentious frauds concocted predominantly by socialist, communist, or freudian-marxist⁶ ideologues. A second, is composed of documentary studies devoted to protecting various of the high-level persons and agencies which brought Hitler to power: including such complicit figures as the Bavarian royal family and related elements of the Thule Society, Hjalmar Schacht, Rockefeller's and Royal Dutch Shell's Auschwitz-creator August von Knierem, circles around the British monarchy, and President George Bush's father, Prescott Bush.⁷ It is fairly said that these preserve the Nuremberg Trial hoaxes describable as "Hitler-as-a-lone-assassin" mythologies. The third, factually more useful sources of insight are provided by German veterans of Nazism, both former Nazis such as Mohler, or his opponents from among veterans of that German anti-Nazi Resistance so often betrayed to Himmler by Britain's Vansittart et al.⁸

This author, over much of the past five decades, and his associates, during the recent quarter-century, have virtually exhausted study of the three types of available scholarly and related sources on the subject of 1920-1930s fascist movements. On the basis of that collaborative experience, the author can say with authority, that, even when they are accurate in what they document as fact, those sources share the fatal scholarly error of fallacy of composition.

It is said fairly, that the common fundamental error of virtually all published texts on the subject of fascism, is that they suggest the apocryphal case of the ichthyologist who presented a general theory of the behavior of fish without once considering the role of water. They are chiefly efforts to explain away decisive developments within modern history by resort to fictional sociological or psychoanalytical "spin": a "virtual reality" within which astounding historical events occur, but without ever engaging any historical principle. The specialist must study such secondary sources, but, if taken by themselves for forming the opinion of the layman,

6. Such as the hoaxes of putatively anti-fascist Hannah Arendt, she the intimate admirer of Nazi ideologue and nietzschean "liberation theologian" Martin Heidegger.

7. See Webster G. Tarpley and Anton Chaitkin, *George Bush: The Unauthorized Biography*, pp. 26-62. (Washington, D.C.: EIR, 1992).

8. The presently available document shows that the policy of betraying the German Resistance to Himmler was also that of British Prime Minister Winston Churchill, who was "ravidly geopolitical" on the point of protracting the mutual slaughter of Germans and Russians for as long as possible. This is also the avowed basis for the Germany policy of Margaret Thatcher's and John Major's governments since the dogma of reunified Germany as a "Fourth Reich" was first publicly uttered by the fascist Mrs. Thatcher's Conor Cruise O'Brien and Minister Nicholas Ridley during late 1989.