

Are Connally, Kissinger and Shultz—or you—entirely responsible for the second ‘Herbert Hoover’ depression?

by Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.

Not for nothing do some jokers in Germany describe the famous Hamburg newsweekly, *Die Zeit*, as “Die Steinzeit” (“The Stone Age”). The Aug. 27 edition of that influential, ultra-liberal weekly, unbuttons itself, like a pyromaniac dancing at the fiery death of a great city, in exuberant contemplation of the present arrival of the second “Herbert Hoover” depression of this century.

Yet, the British-chic, oligarchical exterior of Marion Countess Dönhoff, the weekly’s commanding figure, never exaggerates her own importance. Not long ago, the Countess and this writer interviewed one another—“psycho-profiled one another,” were more accurate. That lady would serve tea with aplomb at *Götterdämmerung*. *Die Zeit* has contributed as much as any German publication to bring the new world-wide depression into being, but that lady would prefer quiet, British understatement of her weekly’s small part in bringing about the end of Germany’s industrial age.

“Let others take the credit for this new holocaust,” is the modest, implicit editorial policy of *Die Zeit* for this joyous occasion. The plebeians of the weekly’s financial staff—Peter Christ, Richard Gaul, Karl-Heinz Janssen, Michael Jungblut, and Heinz Michaels—are exuberant. Yet, they make no claims to have caused this new depression; they merely gloat over its occurrence.

More to the point, these writers join forces to ridicule the folly of the world’s bankers, governments, and major political parties. The march into this new depression—and its probable consequences—has been entirely foreseeable, and yet those bankers, governments and parties have done nothing but cling to the policies leading the world to this new economic apocalypse. **Whom the gods were wont to destroy, they first drove mad.**

Funniest of all, ringing across the Atlantic, are the fateful, recently televised words of poor, tragic, President Ronald Reagan: the recession has bottomed-out.

The second great, worldwide economic depression is here. The leading bankers of London and Switzerland have been saying so to their clients, and in background-briefings discussions with the *Executive Intelligence Review* (among other specialist publications) for months. Now, poor President Reagan has been induced to swallow—and regurgitate publicly—the lies of his economic advisers. Now, the London press, especially the London financial press, is loudly proclaiming the new depression, not only openly, but with satiric euphoria.

Worse, or funnier still—depending upon your point of view—President Reagan has turned U.S. monetary policy-making over to George Shultz, the man whose 1978 book claims, in effect, that he, Shultz, is chiefly responsible for organizing the present, global financial collapse. Shultz has brought in his sidekick of 1975, former Secretary of State Henry A. Kissinger, and Kissinger’s old mentor, Helmut Sonnenfeldt: the old Nixon-Ford gang, centered around the deeds of John Connally (1971-72), George Shultz (1972-75), and Henry Kissinger, the trio that did more than any other three to bullwhip Western Europe into accepting the gold-free monetary policies which have caused this new depression.

Once again, Kissinger et al., are slugging politically toe-to-toe against this writer, as they were back during the period from April 1975 through the Colombo, Sri Lanka, Non-Aligned Nations conference of August 1976. Now, Kissinger et al. are aided against LaRouche by the notorious gangster, Roy M. Cohn, and Cohn’s partner, Tom Bolan, both from the Cohn front-organization of big-name crime-figures and

fascists, New York's East Side Conservative Club.

The question of the moment is: Will some of the nations of Ibero-America form a "common market," and use their "debt-bomb," to force rescheduling of otherwise defaulted debts? Or, will Kissinger, Gen. Vernon Walters, and others, succeed in crushing, and dismembering those nations, one by one?

Will Kissinger et al. succeed in establishing a worldwide, supranational dictatorship of the forces behind the Bank for International Settlements, or will the world turn, at the last moment, to the depression-reversing monetary reforms LaRouche first proposed at a Bonn press-conference of April 1975?

If the statesmen, parties, bankers, industrialists, and trade-union leaders prefer Kissinger to LaRouche, let them all revel in the apocalypse they have chosen for themselves! They will then enjoy the consequences of their preference for Kissinger, Shultz, and so forth, very soon.

Then, Marion Countess Dönhoff's *Die Zeit*, can mock the doomed bankers, governments, parties, industrialists, and trade-unions at greater length; these respectable gentlemen will have proven themselves to have learned absolutely nothing of importance from the experience of 1931.

What of you, dear influential reader? Are you also partly responsible for causing this new worldwide depression? Where did you stand on the writer's proposals for international debt-rescheduling back in 1975, when the present debt-problem was far more manageable? Did you support Kissinger and Shultz at the 1975 Rambouillet conference, or the opposing policies of LaRouche—the latter policies then accepted by governments of some key developing nations? Have you blindly supported the governments and parties which opposed both LaRouche and the August 1976 resolution of the Non-Aligned Nations' group? What was your excuse? Did you excuse yourself, that Kissinger and his cronies had told wild lies against LaRouche, declared LaRouche to be "controversial"?

Tell me, sweet little citizen, what have you done to prevent this repetition of the follies leading into 1931, and perhaps, a new Hitler's coming-to-power?

Perhaps such matters were too complicated for you? You were busy with family-matters? The family of three children perhaps: one now dead of drug-overdose, the daughter off with the Baghwan, and the third now in the middle of a sex-change operation? You were busy securing your career—on the burgeoning unemployment-lines of today, no doubt? You were busy preparing to enjoy your pension?—Alas, the government budget demands certain cuts, and the private pension-fund may go bankrupt during October. You were too busy with such "practical matters" of personal life, to examine the policies of bankers, governments, and parties?

Of such "little people" as you, the greatest political thinker of the recent 200 years, Friedrich Schiller, wrote: This century (the 18th) has produced a great moment, but that moment has found a little people. Yes, we insist upon Schiller! This age is but an age of epic tragedy, and you

"little people"—like poor, misadvised President Reagan playing Philip II in a parody of Schiller's *Don Carlos*—are merely actors, reading your script, proceeding like sheep to your doom.

Is this European civilization still morally fit to survive? Will you, will your family, survive?

First, the plain facts

In February 1958, this writer first compiled the long-range economic forecast which has chiefly governed his policy ever since. That forecast, narrowly circulated during the 1958-59 period, has received increasing United States and international circulation beginning 1966, and since 1971-75, has been widely circulated among governments, as well as before nationwide television audiences in the United States, and in widely circulated publications.

That 1958 forecast, in its updated 1959 form, has been this writer's consistent view over the intervening 23 years to date. This is the most accurate long-range forecast produced by any economist—as present events demonstrate.

In the revised, 1959 version, I stated that, **unless a profound change occurred in international monetary policies and institutions**, the following sequence of major developments was almost inevitable:

1. That the United States would recover from the 1957-59 "recession," chiefly because of economic growth in Western continental Europe and Japan.
2. That general economic growth would be interrupted approximately the middle of the 1960s.
3. During, or following slowing of growth about the middle of the 1960s, the first of a succession of worsening international monetary crises would erupt.
4. Unless institutional changes in the monetary order reversed this trend, the succession of monetary crises would lead into a new, general economic depression, worse than that of the period between the preceding two World Wars.
5. That the attempt to preserve existing monetary policies and institutions, would cause the introduction of the kind of austerity policies associated with those which Nazi Finance Minister Hjalmar Schacht imposed upon Weimar Germany (under direction of Britain's Montagu Norman), and under the first period (circa 1933-38) of the Third Reich.

More recently, beginning the final quarter of 1979, this writer and his associates have published a regular, quarterly forecast for the U.S. economy: the quarterly LaRouche-Riemann forecast, published by the international political-intelligence newsweekly, the *Executive Intelligence Review*. By measure of performance, this quarterly forecast has been the only competent forecast produced by a governmental or private agency during the entire period up to the present quarter. It has been consistently accurate, whereas every competing governmental and private forecast has been consistently absurd by measure of performance.

This quarterly forecast has been available to every government and leading industrial, financial, and political institution of the world. Many governments have studied it closely.

Yet, most among those governments, and banking, industrial, and political circles have continued to support economic and monetary policies consistent with those quarterly forecasts which have been proven absurd.

So much for the wisdom of governments, bankers, industrialists, and so forth. So much for those government officials, bankers, industrialists, and so forth, who seek to persuade us that their policy-making is variously rational, professionally informed, and based on facts of experience.

The 'free market economy' cult

The argument from some influential quarters is that, although the LaRouche-Riemann analysis may be scientifically superior, it is **politically unacceptable**. This objection is not a rational objection; it is in the form of an arbitrary, "religious" objection. Not the Christian religion, but a heathen variety: the pagan, hedonistic, cult of "free market economy."

The Christian religion's bearing upon economic policy centers entirely upon two central principles. The first is from the Book of Genesis, that man must "Be fruitful and multiply, and fill the earth and subdue it," a Christian policy which can not be satisfied except by means of what we name, since Leibniz, technological progress. The second is the principle of the potential divinity of the human personality, the principle of developing those creative-rational potentialities (as Wilhelm von Humboldt proposed in his educational reforms), and of providing fruitful expression for the individual's development of such potentialities.

The policies of Adam Smith, Thomas Malthus, David Ricardo, John S. Mill, William Jevons, Alfred Marshall, John M. Keynes, Hjalmar Schacht, the Fabian Society's reactionary ideologue, Friedrich von Hayek, and rabid hedonist Milton Friedman, are all virulently anti-Christian on precisely these two points.

Smith, Malthus, Ricardo, and Mill were all in the employ of the colonialist British East India Company. The famines which the British organized in India under their rule are, like the Victorian bestialities of 1857, adequate measures of the British "Christianity" of Smith et al.

During the latter part of the 19th century, it became worse. Mill and Jevons explicitly based their economic doctrine on what the British East India Company's Jeremy Bentham described as his "hedonistic calculus." The doctrine of Bentham, Mill, Jevons and Marshall, is the so-called utilitarian doctrine. This is the hedonistic doctrine, that the only proper measure of economic value is the hedonistic measure of individually perceived pleasure and pain, associated with buying and selling oneself or particular products and services.

The British political economists all deny that there are any higher values, purposes for economy as a whole. They deny the injunction of the Book of Genesis: they are therefore, anti-Jewish, anti-Christian. They reject the development of the divine potentialities of the individual for creative reason, and for such practice. They reject such moral purpose

of existence of society and its economy.

The British "free trade" doctrine is the hedonistic, heathen dogma of "blood and soil," the Epicurean dogma of the ancient Roman imperial cults. It rejects the policy of reinvestments of profits to improve the scale and quality of production. It demands world supremacy by the feudalistic landlord and the renter-of-money-at-a-usury. For free market economists, the price of money in usury is the only permitted morality in political economy.

This hedonistic dogma is the central dogma of "free market economy." It is by embracing or tolerating that heathen, anti-Judeo-Christian dogma, that European civilization has destroyed itself once again, has expressed in a new depression the moral unfitness of nations and peoples to survive.

Tell me, what have you done to prevent this repetition of the follies leading into 1931, and perhaps, a new Hitler's coming to power? Perhaps such matters were too complicated for you? You were too busy with 'practical matters' of personal life, to examine the policies of bankers, governments, and parties?

Listen to what these wretches say! One says to them, "Millions are dying of famine and epidemics in Africa," because of the policies Henry A. Kissinger demanded at Rambouillet in 1975, and Shultz at the Azores conference, earlier. They shrug: "There are too many people, anyway. Unfortunately, the free market economy demands that the less successful must die."

It comes home. The U.S.'s Midwest is dying. The German industrial giant, AEG may also be dying. The productivity of Dortmund is dying. Kissinger is determined to murder Ibero-American nations one at a time: killing Europe's exports, so that Europe may die, too.

Moscow will not interfere, except with malicious pleasure, in encouraging its avowed NATO-nation adversaries to destroy themselves with aid of such "conservative's" policies.

In short, the nations of European civilization are dying

because of, chiefly, an immoral monetary and economic policy. They are dying because they have preferred those “free market economy policies” to the bedrock of fundamental Judeo-Christian principles.

Such people of these nations may have become already morally unfit to survive, because they have accepted the heathen bestiality of “social Darwinism.” Human life is no longer sacred for them; and, so they shall discover soon enough that their own lives are not sacred in the policies of practice of their own nations.

There is no recognizable Judeo-Christian morality in the “free market” dogma. There is no earthly, “materialistic” variety of rationality, either.

Modern economy’s successes were the outgrowth of three successive accomplishments. The first, was the establishment of the new form of sovereign nation-state committed to scientific and technological progress, by the Augustinians, the followers of Dante Alighieri and Cardinal Nicholas of Cusa, during the 15th-century Golden Renaissance. The second was the discovery of economic science by Gottfried Leibniz, beginning with his 1671 *Society & Economy*. The third was the worldwide impact of the republican mobilization of 1766-83 on behalf of the American republican conspiracy led by Benjamin Franklin. It was Leibniz’s economic science, especially as incorporated in the American System of U.S. Treasury Secretary Alexander Hamilton. This American System launched the successful 19th-century industrialization and agricultural development, of not only the United States, but France (1794-1814), von Cotta’s and Friedrich List’s Germany, Cavour’s northern Italy, and Meiji Restoration Japan.

True, Britain became powerful during the 19th century, but solely by looting of colonial peoples and, more broadly, through practice of usury by the powerful City of London. No modern nation successfully developed modern agriculture and industry, except either by the British method, of looting other nations, or the “dirigist” methods of Leibniz and the American System.

Only by aid of methods of national banking, by state-supported, large-scale infrastructural projects, by funnelling credit preferentially to development of agriculture and basic industry, and by protecting those farmers and industries with a climate of fair prices and fair wages, can any nation develop by means other than looting its neighbors.

Neither morality nor experience stands in support of the “free market economy” advocates. Their beliefs are arbitrary sorts of religious intuitions: not a Judeo-Christian religion, but a heathen, theosophical cult.

So, led by blinded political figures, the nations march toward the imminent brink of the precipice of financial collapse. They are not being pushed. They are marching to destruction of their own collective free will, slaves to nothing but their own governing delusions, their ideologies.

Show the people, as *Die Zeit* mocks the Germans: “See, you are doing today as you did during the last days of Wei-

mar.” The people are irritated with this threatened interference. The people are resolved to march over the cliff. *Die Zeit* calls out, “Hey, you silly people. You are marching over the cliff again, like the last time.” The people march stubbornly ahead, and the writers of *Die Zeit* are so gripped with amusement at the sight of such foolish people marching to self-destruction, that they fall, rolling with laughter, upon the Olympian fields of higher Hamburg society.

Germans are amusing in their folly, but foolish Germans are empyreal geniuses compared to the mass-lunacy of the United States. Do not mention the United States to the financial writers of *Die Zeit*; you might provoke them to kill themselves with their own laughter.

Ask almost any spokesman for the Republican Party in the United States, “Aren’t you supposed to be pro-capitalist?”

He is insulted even by the question itself. “Then, why is the ghost of Nikita Khrushchev splitting its sides with laughter, over the way your Republican ‘free-market economy’ policies are wiping-out U.S. farms and industries?”

The Democrats, on the other hand, inform us that they are dedicated to the little people. Ask Lane Kirkland of the Trilateral Commission: “Why are you and that California banker, Charles T. Manatt, defending Volcker’s policies? You are causing mass unemployment and misery with your policies.”

Manatt leers his reply: “The depression will ensure a landslide victory for Democrats in the November elections.”

A leading economist rebukes us: “Computers and communications are the new industries.” What are we going to count: bankruptcy and unemployment data? What are we going to communicate, but misery? Shall the masses of unemployed play video-games, as the grey, rotting flesh of famine drops from their skeletons?

Another economist says: “The old, energy-intensive industries must go. They are obsolete. We need labor-intensive employment, using soft, alternative energy-sources.” What obscene lunacy that argument is!

The number of persons who can be sustained per average square mile of the world’s habitable land is, in fact, determined by the amount of usable energy produced for human consumption per square mile. A European level of population-density requires approximately 35,000 kilowatt-hours per year per person of either electricity or process-heat generated.

You say, “solar” and “biomass” energy-sources? Will you be consistent, at least, and draw up a list of names of the neighbors you propose to kill to make your energy policy feasible?

It is worse. Solar-energy technology requires a greater investment of energy in producing the equipment, than the total energy produced by that equipment in its entire lifetime of use. You call that “energy conservation”? My friend, you are insane!

Ah, you suggest “biomass” as an alternative? Just how many kilowatt-hours per year can you retrieve from your own

garbage and dung? Oh! You propose to use wood-chips, bagasse, and special crops? Let us calculate the hectares of solar-energy consumed to produce one kilowatt-hour of energy for your consumption. Let us multiply that by the number of people to be served. Sir! You have just proposed to turn Europe into a desert! Sir! I believe that you are insane!

“Never fear,” he responds. “I shall live quite happily on a vegetarian diet.” At least, until you have popped your last neighbor into your kitchen-pot, on condition that your neighbors are all citizen-like turnips.

Now, that citizen feels backed into a corner. “You are a fanatic,” he spits at us. “You have no sensitivity to my feelings!” Then, he reminds us of his leaders; who are we to cast doubts on the mysterious wisdom of such leaders? He refers us to the “scientific authorities,” whose books and lectures have articulated the policies we have just proven to be insane; who are we to insult such Olympian authorities?

He will resort to the ultimate argument: He is a loyal supporter of either the left-wing or the right-wing of this or that movement, or, at least, a devoutly concerned “environmentalist,” filled with unquenchable admiration for the great scientist-actress Jane Fonda.

In the final last-ditch defense of his policies, he will spit at us: “You are like fascists! You have no respect for our inner, psychological needs! You are trying to oppress those who share widely-held, sincere beliefs!” With that, he breaks off his discourse with us. “I should never have wasted time talking with you, anyway!” He lurches to overtake his companions. He stops a moment, to shout one last yell of defiance against us: “Besides, I like the depression! It will force the world to accept a post-industrial society!”

With that last gesture of defiance, he resumes his place as one of the steadfast throng marching forward to the world of its dreams. His identity is soon lost from our sights, as he prepares for that glorious moment of gregarious ecstasy, that soaring moment of consuming belief, when, like lemmings, all plunge into the abyss together.

“Tell the Reverend Jim Jones; they are coming!”

The eyes of Shakespeare and Schiller

In the bygone years, when public schools were still places of education, U.S. youth who did not consider themselves failures studied Shakespeare’s tragedies, and, in Germany, those of Friedrich Schiller. In the case of the United States, almost no public-school teacher or university instructor of the present century actually has the slightest understanding of what Shakespeare’s principles of dramatic composition represented, but at least most such teachers made an honest effort to make the student familiar with the plays. In those days, in the United States and Germany, before 1968, the graduate had at least a sense that history existed.

Not today’s youth. “Who needs history? Who wastes his time, thinking about history? With amphetamines, I can destroy my mind biologically; then, we shall watch you attempting to indoctrinate me in this thing called ‘history.’

With this needle filled with heroin, what do I care for history?”

Look back to 1603. William Shakespeare’s circle of friends had been decimated during the bloody coup d’état of the 1589-1603 period. Kit Marlowe was murdered. Robert Dudley dead. The Cecils’ dog, Francis Bacon, had hounded John Bull out of England, and then destroyed every musical composition and other writing of Bull’s on which he could lay hands. All the hopes for an Erasmian form of monarchical republic in England had been smashed, as the Genoese puppet, James I, ascended the newly created throne of Britain. Genoese tax-farmers, some speaking the dialect of the Orange Niedergängländer, looted the defeated nation of England.

In this moment, Shakespeare presented his great tragedy, *Hamlet*: Hamlet, part Robert Dudley, partly Queen Elizabeth I. This play was an account of the ruin of England by the Genoese-financed, Cecil-led plot, which brought the descendants of the Genoese puppet, Robert Bruce, to the throne and financial centers of London. On the stage, replete with incidents taken directly from life, was placed the consciousness of England—Tudor England’s erstwhile leaders and the popular consciousness. To those seated in the audience, witnessing that drama, it was their own tragedy that was enacted upon that stage.

How are nations destroyed? By invaders? Sometimes. More often by their own follies. In our European civilization, beginning with the great Aeschylus, it has been the great classical dramatists, typified by Shakespeare and Schiller, who have most efficiently placed before a people the proofs for the causes of its own tragedy.

Nations are destroyed, it first appears, by bad decisions of statesmen, or the popular folly of parties which place bad statesmen in power, or the folly of people which gives power to morally weak or corrupted mass-parties.

Yet, it is never a single decision which destroys a nation from within. A nation is destroyed as the Aug. 27 issue of *Die Zeit* implies. It is destroyed by the flaws in its prevailing culture and ideology, which cause a nation—its government, its parties, its people—to make that succession of fateful decisions leading toward its own destruction.

It is the function of classical drama—whether comedy or tragedy—to show the audience its own consciousness upon the stage, and to demonstrate by the play, that it is that consciousness itself which leads the people (the audience) either to simply folly (comedy) or to the self-destruction of a nation and its people (tragedy).

To see one’s own consciousness placed so upon a stage, is to become conscious of that consciousness, and, at best, to acquire so the willful power to change oneself.

We have had no good dramatists in European civilization in more than a hundred years. If only one had existed, to show the people of the United States the tragic consequences of those beliefs they today hold as self-evident truths! The truth about Hitler’s rise to power was never put upon the German—or, any other—stage: only the fairy-tales concocted by Wilton Park. So, with Shakespeare almost banned

and Schiller almost vanished from our schools, and no competent dramatist in more than a hundred years: who has worked to hold up the mirror of classical drama, the mirror of comedy and tragedy, to the popular audiences of European civilization? Who has shown them how and why they marched into the Great Depression (unnecessarily), how and why they marched into two World Wars (and perhaps a third), or how they march, committing the same senseless, irrational follies, once again, today?

Will no dramatist show the titan Franklin orchestrating the strategic forces ensuring the victory of the young republic of the United States against the evil British monarchy? Will no dramatist remember Valley Forge? Will no one remember the battle of Fort Mchenry, where the United States was saved from British conquest? And will no dramatist put beside that memory, some smirking, probably homosexual, British diplomat, joking today about his assignment to the capital of the "unofficial colony," in Washington, D.C.?

Will no dramatist resurrect the memory of Central Europe of 1648-53? The Hapsburgs and their accomplices had reduced Germany to a nightmare, a festering, impotent collection of petty, feudalistic pigsties. Can no dramatist portray how the work of the Great Elector, Leibniz, Lessing, the Weimar-classic circles, and the Humboldts and List, worked to create a great civilization out of that miserable hodge-podge of feudalistic relics? Can no dramatist portray literacy of classical culture, the world's leadership in science, and great industries and revolutions in agriculture, rising in central Europe, aided by the inspiration of the American Revolution? Can no dramatist portray, then, how all this work of centuries is now being destroyed? Can no dramatist evoke on stage, the consciousness of those statesmen, those ordinary people, and others, which connives to effect its own destruction?

Can we not see ourselves, and see how our prejudices, our silly ideologies ruling our minds, lead us to the brink of the precipice, to be mocked for our tragic folly in the pages of *Die Zeit*?

This writer has been mocked, by certain leading strata among his enemies: "You are very clever, very resourceful, but we shall beat you. You are a tragic figure, you see."

Am I, then, a tragic figure, or a figure in a tragedy? Do they deceive themselves, that I am "Posa," from Schiller's *Don Carlos*?

Two things of special importance we learn from the successive work of Aeschylus, Shakespeare, and Schiller. That described summarily now, I situate the concluding observation to be offered to those of you who would not cheerfully march to the greater amusement of *Die Zeit*.

All classical tragedy poses to us three distinct levels of consciousness.

On the first level, there is simple consciousness. This is the kind of consciousness which blindly stumbles into our awareness, and causes us to speak and act without our reflecting on what fools we make ourselves by means of such

sincere, blind adherence to those habituated values which seem "natural" and "right-thinking" to all of us gathered at the family meeting or the local saloon.

That is the level of consciousness of simple fools.

There is a second level of consciousness, the consciousness of the audience watching such simple fools upon a stage. At the moment the audience is made aware that it is its own day-to-day way of thinking which produces such folly and tragedy upon the stage, the audience resolves to change its mind for the better.

Then, the dramatist produces a character, such as the better moment of Don Carlos in Schiller's drama, or Hamlet in his play. A character in the play resolves to change himself or a few others. Yet, this self-improved character is swept to destruction by the pervasive follies of the culture, within which he struggles to change his own direction.

It is not sufficient to change oneself or a few others. One must change the controlling direction of thought of one's society, as Schiller resolved to attempt by means of his tragedies. To see the whole culture as the sickness, upon the stage, is to see that it is not sufficient to be virtuous oneself, or among a few friends, in society. A few can not save themselves, unless they transform the doomed culture of which they themselves are an imprisoned part.

This brings us to the challenge of the final, the third available level of consciousness.

Can enough of us go directly against the prevailing ideology of our culture, to challenge that ideology on those points of prevailing delusions which are most dangerous to its own existence? Can we challenge relatives, friends, and persons of putative authority alike: "You are behaving as suicidal fools!"

Spain can not be saved? The grip of the evil forces of the Inquisition is too strong on the minds of Spaniards? Then, to Flanders. We shall fight the forces of the Inquisition where those forces are being fought. By defeating the Inquisition in Flanders, let us attempt to save Spain.

If you of the United States and Western Europe are so rotted-out morally, that you will not be called to save yourselves, to change your lunatic ways, then I have no recourse but to save civilization as best I can for your grandchildren's sake. I must act just as the republicans of Europe acted in concert, 1766-83, to establish a model, now-betrayed republic, the United States, by the defeat of the evil, oligarchical British monarchy.

I will do all in my power to awaken you to sanity, even at this very late moment. But, if you can not be saved, perhaps civilization can be saved in the colonies, among those people of the developing sector who are still committed to the injunction of the Book of Genesis.

They shall weep for you from there. The United States and the nations of Western Europe died, because their people—like Sodom and Gomorrah earlier, had lost the moral fitness to survive. That is the lesson of Aeschylus, Shakespeare, and Schiller.