

# LaRouche replies to the London Observer slander

*We publish here in full the text of EIR founder LaRouche's reply to the editor of the London Observer, in response to the Observer's Oct. 5 slander.*

Editor, *London Observer*

Re: ANSA/Lorana Sullivan, Oct. 3, 1982

Dear Sir:

I suggest the publication of this letter, to the purpose of communicating important information to a large number among your nation's policy-influentials.

Briefly, as to the article itself. Our Composer in His prudence, distinguished us from our dogs, to the effect that there are certain orifices of our bodies into which we are prohibited from inserting our noses. Marvelously, Lorana Sullivan defied the Creator on that point, in the subject, published item.

All among the leading philosophical differences between me and the certified British view are efficiently concentrated as to consequences in the matter of monetary-economic policy. That issue of policy has been the dominant issue for then-Secretary of State Henry A. Kissinger, and certain others, including the City of London, since this international brawl began, during 1975.

Over the years, it has been the repeatedly stated opinion of numerous among leading trans-Atlantic financial circles, that I embody a "serious potential danger" to the ruling monetary interest. Earlier, odd bits of covert operations spiced a prevailing tactic of containment against me and my collaborators. It is the more recent view, as stated by the same variety of my adversaries, that I have successively broken through walls of containment, and more energetic, more drastic means must be introduced.

Presently, my adversaries have worked themselves into a most uncomfortable fix. The supporters of prevailing OECD nations' monetary policies are presently occupied with what must be fairly described as an "hysterical bluff." To the extent I have the means to do so, I am causing the bluff to be challenged. My adversaries are most annoyed by my actions on that account.

To roll over the debts threatened with default, a minimum of between 500 and 700 billion U.S. dollars' value of new credit-issuing power would be required by some combination of the Bank for International Settlements and shards of the bankrupted Bretton Woods system. Lacking such new credit-

resources, which only concerted political decisions of leading governments could create, the attempt to continue present monetary policy means an early financial collapse of Western civilization, rather analogous to the 14th-century disaster of the Lombards.

The alternative to the collapse of that sort is a comprehensive reorganization of imperiled debt, at politically reduced interest-rates. Technically, such a debt-reorganization could be successfully accomplished, in the proverbial secret emergency conference of several hours' duration, if the political will to do so were predominant.

My game, if you choose to regard it as such, is to force nations to come to their senses on this matter, by confronting circles such as your patrons with a clear, unavoidable choice between immediate chain-reaction collapse of the entire financial system, or a sensible monetary reorganization. That is not a recent tactic of mine; it has been my consistent, continuing policy since that April 1975 Bonn press conference which triggered this international brawl.

Naturally, I have never presumed that I had the material resources to order such a confrontation on policy-choices. Rather, I have relied on the unfolding logic of events to produce a circumstance of the sort which several Ibero-American spokesmen described at the recent Toronto International Monetary Fund conference, and restated more amply, during last week's United Nations festivities. Sooner or later, if the 1975 Rambouillet monetary-conference policy-directions were continued, the pyramiding of refinanced indebtedness would lead to the point at which major debtors would suddenly, concurrently fail to pay debt-service, and that for the simple reason that they lack the means to make such payment.

My function, my tactic, has been to state the alternative to such a state of affairs. If certain governments and related influentials are persuaded that a sensible alternative exists, they will adopt that alternative under conditions no other choice actually exists for them. It is not necessary for me to be part of any conspiracy. As Presidents J. B. Figueiredo and José López Portillo have stated, and most accurately, it is similarity of circumstances which, chiefly, produces similarity and simultaneity of response.

In the end, which will prevail? Your materially advantaged circulation of false opinion, or the slower, almost ephemeral past circulation of my policy conceptions? If a mass of lemmings were to jump together from the edge of a

precipice, perhaps 999 out of 1,000 might continue to be persuaded that this policy of practice had succeeded up to the very moment they impacted upon the rocks below. Which would ultimately prevail? That prevailing opinion, or the view of one lemming who warned: "This policy is going to destroy our civilization"? The comparison is simplistic, but the essential point contained is both valid and most relevant to the policy issue at hand now.

Your patrons' circles were prudent to study the surviving fragment of Aeschylus's "Prometheus" as a metaphor for the present, Aeschylean tragedy, into which the leading rentier-financier families have inserted themselves. The Aeschylean aspect of the tragedies of Shakespeare and the more rigorous elaboration of the tragic principle by Schiller, were wisely studied in conjunction with reflections on "Prometheus."

Empires destroy themselves by persisting in policies of practice which they esteem on grounds of a statistical record of success. So, the policy which impelled prevailing opinion among lemmings toward the leap from the precipice, might prevail as the lemming-consensus even after the leap had actually occurred. "It has worked so far. It will work now," is the gist of the "hysterical bluffing" now deployed in support of the institutional authorities of the IMF, World Bank, GATT, and the BIS.

Over the recent hundred years, since the Treaty of Berlin and the U.S. Specie Resumption Act, the kind of monetary order illustrated by the subsumed case of Bretton Woods has been the prevailing political, as well as monetary-economic order in the affairs of the world. Those rentier-financier "families" which associated themselves more or less profitably with that policy, have acted as if they imagined themselves usurping Olympian immortals. They have assumed that their policies, their setting of Venetian fads in cultural opinion and practice, could defy the laws of the universe indefinitely. The acquired power to direct the evolution of popular culture, and so direct the judgments of populations, could so efficiently command the wills of peoples, that the laws of the universe could not intervene to counter that influence.

So, have all the fallen empires of the past been destroyed. So, the fall of empires has the flavor of Apocalypse, and the ruin of imperial power resembles the *Götterdämmerung* of Olympus.

If your patrons and others persist successfully in the present hysterical bluff over the coming weeks or even a few more months, the entire financial order will collapse. Nietzsche preached chaos and irrationalism, like Richard Wagner. Hitler brought chaos. Goebbels said to a people which had submitted to rule by the forces of chaos, "Total War!" With that chaos came the near-destruction of those who connived to unleash chaos. The present chaos, which Henry Kissinger professes to admire so devoutly, will not let civilization off as lightly as did the most recent enterprises of that general sort.

Your patrons imagine themselves to precalculate so very cleverly, almost as foolishly as those smug Swiss now aiding

in sending the forces of chaos marching northward from alpine redoubts and dark forests of Central Europe, north to Bonn and outward beyond.

Embedded in careful calculation is miscalculation. They were not clever enough to understand the wisdom reflected in Aeschylus's "Prometheus" fragment.

You wish to save Britain from this threatened apocalypse of folly? I wish to accomplish such a result. As for my British adversaries, I do not hate people as persons; even those I might be obliged to kill in warfare, I do not hate as persons. I do not admire you, but I care for the fate of your grandchildren and their grandchildren after them.

Are you so devoutly attached to the "Great Mother" cults of Phoenicia-Venice and Thebes, so attached to the "Persian Model" of families-ruled, Malthusian world-federalism, that you would prefer to destroy yourselves and perhaps most of humanity as well, rather than to survive successfully in a world whose monetary-economic affairs were ordered according to the design of a Leibniz, of Hamilton's "American System"?

If you are sensible, you will accept my proposed alternative. Then, get you to the rebuilding of your factories, your laboratories, and build yourselves a modern fleet. There are masses of capital goods to be produced and exported, and beyond that, the great exploration of nearby space.

The most truthful of the statements buried in the Sullivan libel is the fact that I did recently celebrate my 60th birthday, and did so according to the instructions given me by my Brahmin friends. Such old men put behind us the infantile dreams of earthly paradise, and the kinds of ambitions an infantile mind cherishes into old age. We devote the few remaining years of life to consequences measured in future centuries, and we so define our special notion of personal self-interest. We thus appear to live beyond pleasure and pain, and to some, we therefore appear to be dangerous.

The sole virtue I know among the ranks of leading British, Venetians, and some other oligarchs, is that some, as do I, approach the present with an historical sense. Even those among our politicians, in the United States and other nations, who are well-meaning, and sometimes able in the short-term, narrow occupations, are frighteningly childlike in their little-ness of comprehension. These poor pragmatists do not know that history is a process, and is the greatest fact which any true statesman must take into account in assessing any particular policy-matter of the present. Our little politicians imagine "history" to be what is said of them in future school-books. Although you employ your historical perspective often to malignant purposes, at least you have some sense of the fact that history exists as an efficient fact. Therefore, I would be most pleased if you would come to your senses; if you changed your policy for the better, as the present crisis dictates, you could be most useful.

Sincerely yours,  
Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.