

during the middle to late 1980s, was chiefly pathetic by comparison with all predecessors. Sachs, and his milieu at Harvard, MIT, and elsewhere, typify the very worst results of this pathetic, downward trend in mental and moral qualities.

The nature of this mental and moral decay is typified not only by the phenomenon of a vicious ignoramus like Sachs; prior to the late 1970s, only a handful of querulous economics illiterates would have been duped into admiring something as banally fraudulent as Professor Milton Friedman's "Free To Choose" television series. In a saner time, when average concentration-span was significantly longer, the babbling of Britain's former Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher would not have been tolerated.

At first inspection, the cause of this collapse in the intellectual quality of our population has been neither genetic nor accidental. In short, the cause is "Buggery," perpetrated by "Buggers" ranging from William James and John Dewey, through Bertrand Russell, H.G. Wells, the American Family Foundation's roots in MK-Ultra, Brigadier John Rawlings Rees's London Tavistock Clinic network, and the Communist International project of subversion commonly known as Theodor Adorno's and Hannah Arendt's "Frankfurt School." The names of the projects by which the intellect and morals of the U.S. population were intentionally destroyed, include Hollywood, the "Radio Research Project," "soap opera," and the "rock-drug-sex counterculture," the "new math," "sensitivity training," and related mass-brainwashing modes.

This destruction of a large margin of the previously existing intellectual powers, and moral qualities of so large and widespread a ration of the post-1963 youth generations of the U.S. population, has been the explicitly intended result in a process of cultural subversion which began much earlier than CIA director Allen Dulles's adoption of a British intelligence-directed, mass-brainwashing project known by such official names as "MK-Ultra." The forerunners of MK-Ultra include such Communist International-designed subversion projects as the "Frankfurt School" of Theodor Adorno, Hannah Arendt et al., and also, related to the "Frankfurt School" the center of satanic orgies known as the mobster-directed Hollywood film and TV production colony. The 1963 launching of the mass-recruitment phase of the Tavistock-linked, Crowleyite, rock-drug-sex counterculture had roots older than the freemasonic "Young America" cult of satanic Giuseppe Mazzini and that treasonous degenerate Albert Pike.

The famous, thread-bare aphorism is, "whom the gods would destroy, they first make mad." In truth, whom the Satanists would destroy, they first seduce into destroying themselves. It is the same thing, in appearance, in the end. Your greatest enemy sits there staring at you, luring you to your mind's self-destruction; it is your television set. That television set, and the imagined countercultural pleasures which it symbolizes, is your fatal, Faustian pact with Satan.

Kennedy's promise development of

by Arturo Frondizi

The following excerpts are taken from the speech delivered on June 14, 1989 by former Argentine President Arturo Frondizi at the Argentine Academy of History. In it, Dr. Frondizi, who was President during 1958-62, reports on his conversations and collaboration with John F. Kennedy in 1961 and 1962, particularly on matters relating to the economic development of Ibero-America and the role of the Alliance for Progress. Dr. Frondizi's speech was later published in a pamphlet entitled "The President Kennedy I Knew."

I had the privilege of knowing John F. Kennedy with whom I had two meetings. The first took place during my second trip to the United States as President on Sept. 26, 1961. Kennedy flew to New York and we met at the Carlyle Hotel.

The profound admiration and esteem I felt for him was consolidated and strengthened as a result of the frank and lengthy dialogue we held. We exchanged ideas about hemispheric problems, and the American President discussed important aspects of the world situation as well as his thoughts about how to deal with them.

I placed special emphasis on the Latin American situation, on the seriousness of its problems, and on the urgency with which necessary solutions had to be applied. I expressed my disagreements with the Alliance for Progress's welfare focus, although I recognized the substantial contribution the program would make. We agreed on the dangers resulting from communist agitation and other extremisms, but I made no concession on the issue of repression [of Cuba] whose only outcome would be to stimulate tensions it sought to suppress.

I frankly explained that the [U.S.] policy applied to the Cuban problem would only lead to the continent's popular and democratic governments confronting the pincers' movement of the left and the extreme right.

I trusted, and said as much, that the solution to the Cuban problem consisted of urgently and effectively putting into place the plans for the Alliance for Progress. It was necessary to give the Latin American nations concrete proof that democratic regimes and Inter-American cooperation could create the conditions for their rapid development—otherwise offered them by communist propaganda.

We carefully analyzed our bilateral relations. Kennedy's

for the economic Ibero-America

idea was also mine: cooperation in the economic realm and independence and respect for self-determination in the political.

It was evident that never had Argentina's relationship with the United States reached such a high level. This was not the result of a simple agreement among governments. On the contrary, it was based on the dynamic role of the Argentine development process encouraged by the country's private and public capital.

My government thought that bilateral cooperation had made great progress but had yet to attain its optimal level. I thought that a political decision at the presidential level was indispensable to give this a real impetus. Moreover, that political decision had to evaluate the really difficult problems as well as the action of those general interests which hindered programs in the developing nations.

The El Chocón [energy development] project was an Argentine priority and it served as a type of symbol for the continent's development plans. Explaining its objectives, I told the President that El Chocón was an essential project for our national development, because it was the basis for the country's decentralization and could open up the richest half of the republic for development. I emphasized that it wasn't my intention to discuss technical details but rather to request the political support of the United States in order to build under more favorable conditions a project to which my government was already committed. In my message to the Argentine people on Oct. 9, 1961, I discussed this crucial project. "President Kennedy appreciated the profound significance for our national development which the building of the projects of the El Chocón system has, comparing it in importance to the development of the Tennessee Valley in the United States, built by the [Franklin Delano] Roosevelt administration to pull that vast region of the country out of stagnation."

I was deeply moved by Kennedy's fervent support for the cause of the Argentine people. I wish to remind you of what he said at the end of our meeting: "Mr. President, I want you to clearly understand what I'm going to tell you. Argentina's triumphs and failures are the triumphs and failures of the United States. Your success is our success. In that sense, the United States is irrevocably united with Argentina. On that, Dr. Frondizi, you have the word of the President of the United States."



Arturo Frondizi while he was President of Argentina (1958-62).

The first meeting was a private one held in the presence of the State Department translator. When we left our voluntary confinement and met with the advisers who were waiting in the next room to continue our deliberations, Kennedy looked at me smiling and said in a loud voice, "You're tough, very tough." Seeing by my response that the translation was incomplete, he added with a charming accent, "*Fortísimo*," and ended in English, "Now I know why you've survived so many attacks." I answered him right away: "That is the strength which I'll apply to make the Alliance for Progress a reality. . . ."

The second meeting

. . . On the morning of Dec. 24, 1961, Christmas Eve, President Kennedy greeted me at the Palm Beach airport. He quickly brought me to the car that would take us to his private home. . . .

We met alone, on President Kennedy's express orders, as he wanted to keep everything we discussed in the strictest confidence. The precautions he took for that meeting were a clear indication of the severity of the pressures he felt. More than ever, the tone of the meeting was one of total frankness.

As I had done previously with Ambassador Adlai Stevenson in Trinidad, I insisted on my thoughts on the Cuban crisis. The possibility of sanctions in the form of a collective break, by consolidating Cuba's isolation could determine that country's complete incorporation into the Soviet sphere, without the possibility of returning to the American community. I told Kennedy what, in my view, was the correct approach: Strengthen the continental system but through the positive route of representative democracy. Looking toward the convening of the Punta del Este conference, there were only two appropriate solutions: 1) an intense work of consultation among the American foreign ministries to seek a solu-

tion which would have the support of all countries, thus avoiding a split in the hemisphere which would only benefit Cuba; and, 2) a decisive, effective, and immediate push for the Alliance for Progress.

Another key issue discussed in that meeting was, logically, the Alliance for Progress. Kennedy was enthusiastic over his project. I told him that I had defended the program publicly because of its good and noble intentions, but that in private I would state all the objections I thought necessary.

I explained that the poor peoples of the world, among them those of Latin America, didn't need charity but capital for their development, and that the Alliance for Progress was a social welfare project. As an example, I mentioned that he was proud because he was going to send millions of dollars to Bolivia to build 100 schools, but I asked with what money would Bolivia pay its teachers and how parents would buy food for their children, or the clothing and other items they would need for school. I noted that if, instead of building the schools, he were to send investment capital for the purpose of building 100 factories to industrialize that country's raw materials, this would be a way to offer employment to the workers and then the country could build 1,000 schools. He listened intently and, with the humility of great men, said after five hours of conversation, "Mr. President, you have convinced me. From this moment on, your ideas are also mine."

He asked me to tour Latin America to explain the plan. I told him I would be pleased to do so as long as the plane carrying me from a country would be followed by another plane landing with the capital necessary for that country's development. The President asked me to send him a memorandum from Buenos Aires outlining the specific projects which we had discussed. I remember that he took paper from his desk and wrote down an address and the name of a trusted friend to whom I should send my correspondence. He decided to do it through one of his personal friends and not through the Embassy, because he didn't want either the State Department or the CIA or Pentagon to know about what we had discussed; he hadn't even allowed an interpreter to be at this meeting.

Later he accompanied me to the plane which would take me to where my delegation awaited me.

During that trip, some bystanders from that luxury beach resort weakly applauded him. Looking at them, Kennedy told me sadly, "Mr. President, those people don't like me, they hate me and wish to see me dead; those people will have me killed." These were prophetic words. He was assassinated on Nov. 22, 1963.

The Alliance for Progress

On March 13, 1961, in a famous speech, President Kennedy announced the launching of the "Alliance for Progress," in which he discussed the problem of continental underdevelopment in all of its dramatic dimensions. . . .

This plan reflected concern over the problems of social development. It was a political response to the political problem posed by the Cuban challenge. It denounced the evils of social injustice, translated into deficient nutrition, disease, illiteracy, lack of dignified housing, and the feudal structure of rural landowning. The President of the United States called on Latin America's governments and political classes to fight these ills. I embraced Kennedy's message and shared all of its positive aspects, but underscored the criteria by which the Argentine government was dealing with the problem of underdevelopment. . . . I always insisted that all the funds available for helping the underdeveloped countries had to concentrate on investments for the economy's structural development and be channeled into basic sectors and infrastructure—energy, steel, communications, etc. within the framework of national integration and full expansion of every community's potential resources. . . .

Kennedy's death

On Nov. 22, 1963, with John Fitzgerald Kennedy the world lost the possibility of advancing toward a solution to the plagues of hunger, ignorance, and servitude. He was aware of the abyss between the industrialized countries and the developing ones; he knew how to fight [against these plagues] and because he was the President of one of the world's great powers, he was in a position to put his plans into effect. . . .

The United States lost a great President. Latin America lost a friend; the world was deprived of a man who was determined to fight against injustice.

On Nov. 22, 1964, in Quémú-Quémú, a remote little town in La Pampa province in a corner of our country, we paid homage to that great man by placing the first stone of a monument to him. Given our friendship, I was asked to speak.

On that day I said, "This will be the first monument to John Kennedy built in the Argentine Republic. There is deep symbolic meaning in the fact that the site chosen is this little town in the Argentine pampas. Here, as in few locations, the intimate contradiction of the Latin American continent is felt, that which Kennedy felt so deeply and for the overcoming of which he offered his own life in sacrifice. Here we face the reality of underdevelopment and the potential which Latin America's wealth embodies. In this little corner of our Fatherland many of those Latin Americans for whom Kennedy sought a better future free of misery, hunger, and fear, struggle with their daily lives and concerns. . . .

"Kennedy was a leader of all peoples. And that is why when the hatred of his enemies killed him, he was mourned by hundreds of millions of men and women who had placed their hopes in him and who believed that after his death a somber twilight extended over the world which illuminated the nobility of his ideals and the great passion which he reflected. . . ."