

LaRouche to Cameroon: We must use oligarchy's financial collapse

On May 29, U.S. presidential candidate Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr. sent the following message which was presented to a conference in Cameroon:

The situation before us, at this point in the spring of 1992, is not a hopeful one.

If, for example, a George Bush were to be reelected or a Bill Clinton to be elected in the United States, we can be sure that the worst features of Anglo-American policy and International Monetary Fund [IMF] policy of the past period would be continued, and that a savage and actually murderous form of austerity would hit, as a new wave, countries in the developing sector, which have already been depleted by the policies essentially of the 1970s and '80s.

So there is no bright sign on the horizon for any developing country, in any part of the world, *unless* there is what many people would consider a very radical policy change in the world, in international economic cooperation, international financial policy, monetary policy, and so forth.

This fact must be faced; and if the fact is an unpleasant one, then that unpleasantness must be a goad to inspire us to take the necessary forms of action for nothing less than those rather radical necessary forms of action taken in concert by numbers of forces—not just the forces of any one nation. Without that necessary action, *there is no hope* of any improvement for any among the so-called developing nations in particular.

Like the early 1930s

The world is now going into, at this moment, a new phase of a general international collapse. The analogy is to the period 1933-34-35, in the Great Depression before World War II; but the situation objectively, economically, physically, for virtually all nations, is far, far worse than it was during the 1930s, the great pre-World War II Depression.

There is no recovery in sight. There is no amelioration in sight, unless, as I said, there is a very drastic, what some would call a very radical, change in policy. To believe anything else would delude oneself.

That does not mean there is no hope. That means we must

throw out what has been considered political realism up to this time, and discover true realism: the reality, that with the wrong policies, destruction and suffering are inevitable; and that without a change to the right policies, destruction and suffering will continue. That's true realism.

Therefore, if you don't accept the destruction and suffering, then you have to bring about the policy changes.

I'm not suggesting that a nation such as Cameroon could do this by itself; my experience with the developing nations and our fights against the IMF rape of the developing nations, against the Anglo-American bankers' rape of developing nations over the past 20 years and longer, has been that without cooperation and courage among several nations allied to effect policy changes, no good policy changes will occur.

There must be unity

I remind people, that in the summer of 1982, I was in the center of the effort to organize such a change in the monetary system, such a monetary reform, for the immediate benefit of Central and South America. There were a number of nations directly involved in this, and a number of nations were indirectly supporting it. The reason it didn't happen—it could have happened, very easily, and the world would be a much better place today, not only for Central and South America, but for nearly every part—is that the United States was able to divide nations which had been committed to the program from one another, and to force nations to accept negotiations of economic and monetary policy, one at a time.

Obviously, one nation at a time could not stand up to the combined Anglo-American power and the support rallied by the Anglo-American power through the IMF. They capitulated, one at a time. If they had stayed united, they would not have had to capitulate. The same thing is true today.

If developing nations and others do not stand up, united, and make a solid front, and refuse to negotiate these things any more one at a time, then I can assure you, the destruction will continue, and conditions will not become better, but they will become much worse, and that very rapidly.

The particular problem here, must be understood: that Europe, in particular—and as European civilization has

shaped the world, particularly since the 18th century, the world as a whole—has been dominated by a conflict between two forces, a conflict which has shaped history through the 19th century, shapes history throughout the 20th century. It's a conflict typified by the conflict between the ideas of Solon, the reformer of Athens, who threw out the usurers 600 years before Christ, and the contrary policies of Lycurgus' Sparta.

Spartan society

Look at Spartan society. Spartan society had three levels. At the top was the oligarchy. These were sort of a combination of communists and the rich. Rich communists, forming an oligarchical communist society of the rich. That's oligarchical Sparta at the top.

The rich would kill the greater part of the population, at pleasure, whom they held as virtual slaves, called helots. In between, in Greek society where the Spartan system prevailed, there was the middle layer. At the top, the ruling oligarchs were like gods in their own estimation and immortals (at least the families were immortal in their estimation, if not the individual members). Then these families would pick up people, generals and other officials and skilled people, who would run errands for them, who would do the administrative work for the oligarchs. These were the demigods, so to speak: the people who were not immortal, but were favored by the oligarchs. And then, beneath the demigods, were essentially the helots, those condemned to slavery, those whom the oligarchs killed for pleasure, for amusement. Or they imposed the malthusian policies of the day upon the population. They'd go out and decide there were too many helots; they'd kill a few off—for sport; and thus regulate the population, pretty much the way many backers of Eco 92 [the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development in Rio, Brazil, in June 1992] propose to do today, through various institutions, through the neo-malthusian Club of Rome and similar institutions.

On the opposite side was the view which we associate with Solon, and which is peculiar with us, for Christian civilization: that man, by virtue of his creative powers, which set him apart from and above any animal, is in the image of God the Creator. Not in the graven image of God, but in the imitation of God's creative powers. It is that creative power of reason by which we, among other things, develop scientific and technological progress, that man is distinguished from the animals, and is also cast in the true image of God the Creator.

The opposing view, which is associated with names such as Solon and Plato, and later with Christianity, is that every human being is in the living image of God by virtue of these creative powers; and that society and the protection of the family, and every family, must be based on recognition of that special nature of man as in the image of God. And thus there can be no helots, and there can be no oligarchs. There



can be no arbitrary law. There can only be a form of law which is consistent with the nature of man as cast in the creative image of God.

That has been the conflict in Europe, since the time of Solon, and especially since the time of Christ. Unfortunately, there are those who practice usury, who follow in the footsteps of Lycurgus, who divide society into big family foundations, the superwealthy and superpowerful foundations, who hire demigods such as Henry Kissinger and treat the rest of the population like slaves or beasts; that arrangement is of course the dominant one. That was the arrangement characteristic of the British Empire. That was the image which Napoleon Le Petit—later Napoleon III—cast when he saw France not as having a Grand Empire, but a Little Empire, an empire in partnership with and submission to the British Empire—of course, the British Empire controlled Napoleon III, which is the reason why he was so pro-British. His masters were British. Lord Palmerston helped put him into power, for example.

That's the conflict today. Some of us are fighting what many would consider a losing fight, for the sacredness of human life, the principle of society based on the knowledge that man, each individual, is *imago viva Dei*, in the living image of God—as opposed to the kind of society which people such as Kissinger rather famously represent, the bestial view of society which is not essentially different than Nazism or any other form of fascism, or any form of slave society. That's what Kissinger and his masters represent, and they're obviously on top.

And unless we're willing to face them, and use their weakness as their financial system collapses, as divisions arise among them; unless we're willing to exploit that weakness and our own unity, to bring about a change in policy back in the direction of the tradition of Solon, Plato, and Christian civilization, there's no hope for any of us—except a brutal dark age, out of which the numbers of mankind—if we're lucky—would be 1 for every 10 living today. The greatest hecatomb of human death this planet has ever known will ensue, unless we find soon the opportunity, the courage, and the unity, to wreck the kind of world rule which is typified by those who back the notorious Henry Kissinger.