

'Prometheus' LaRouche Sends Reply to Would-Be Gods of Olympus

by Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.

December 20, 1988

*[Published in **Executive Intelligence Review**, Volume 16, Number 2, January 6, 1989. View [PDF of original](#) at the LaRouche Library.]*

This statement was released on December 20.

The would-be “gods of Olympus,” who claim to control the Reagan administration, the incoming Bush administration, and the U.S. judicial system up to the level of the Supreme Court, have chosen to dispatch me a series of messages. For reasons to be made clear, my reply is being transmitted via the public news media, via this and other appropriate publications.

The first message, delivered a few weeks ago, was in the nature of a “calling card.” This message predicted the rigged, corrupt verdict which those agencies claimed they had prearranged in the Alexandria federal court case concluded on December 16. That message was an accurate prediction of results accomplished by means of “sleepers” planted inside the jury.

As that predicted result was occurring, a second message was sent from the same source via the same channel. This message predicts that I have approximately thirty days to accept the terms of submission to be proffered by the messenger’s principals, or see myself and those associated with me destroyed through the U.S. courts. The messenger stated that his principals control the U.S. courts up to the highest level in this matter, to the effect that everything is already fixed up to the highest level of both the courts and the Reagan and Bush administrations.

I am informed that the proposed terms of my submission are to be the subject of a third message. The second message states that I must now indicate whether or not I am now prepared to negotiate such terms, whatever they might be.

For reasons explained below, it is necessary that I deliver my reply publicly, in the manner I do here.

My Message in Reply

The answer to that message is "No."

I am willing to discuss any policy on the merits of the policy itself; I am always open to be persuaded to alter my views on the basis of reason, provided reason shows such alteration to be more consistent with my principles than my present tactical and strategic postures, and also provided that it is understood I will never change policies in important matters without making the reasons for those changes clear to all supporters and others to whom I am morally accountable.

However, say, that with the image of Christ in the garden at Gethsemane before my mind's eye, I will never compromise my principled commitments at any price.

For clarity through emphasis, I restate what I consider negotiable.

I am not perfect, and therefore recognize that there may be better tactical and strategic measures for realizing my principles than those I have conceived thus far. On this specific account, I am open to reason.

There exist, doubtless, concerns of which I am not adequately informed, in respect to which my policies should be amplified to take these matters into account, and that in a manner consistent with my principles.

In such matters, I am open to reason, provided this involves no compromise of principle.

However, I recognize no highest authority on this planet excepting the Creator and His natural law. The very existence of bodies of wealthy powerful families, which consider themselves as families in the likeness of the mythical gods of Olympus, represents in and of itself an insolence against both God and man which is anathema to me. On these matters, no compromise is possible.

Those Principled Commitments

Although I am a leading figure of an ecumenical association of Catholics, Jews, Protestants, Buddhists, and others, that association is committed to practical means of realization of policies set forth in such papal encyclicals as the 1967 *Populorum progressio* and the more recent *Sollicitudo rei socialis*. No one who knows those encyclicals and knows my policies of practice during the recent 20-odd years could have any reasonable doubt of this fact.

Specifically, on account of the latter of the two cited encyclicals, I concur most emphatically to the reference to the "structures of sin" currently dominating, respectively, the East and the

West. The tradition of constituting powerful wealthy families prone to sundry forms of usury, as a form of power over nations cast in the image of the gods of Olympus, is the essence of those "structures of sin" which have engendered the greatest evils afflicting the community of nations today.

I am content that such families should prosper, and enjoy such prosperity for themselves. I will never accept their efficient conspiring to constitute themselves a power above representative governments of sovereign nations, to such effect that they cast themselves in the image of the mythical gods of Olympus. The former status of such families is a set of matters which is negotiable with me; the latter is not.

My particular commitments ought to be very well known from both my published statements and the consistency of all my policy formulation in consistency with those statements. I list the most relevant of those commitments here, to ensure absolute clarity of the import of this message of reply.

I am essentially a Christian philosopher, and, with that specific qualification a "philosopher king" in the sense defined by Plato. This role has emerged as a kind of metamorphosis of the central personal developments in my life during the years 1934–52. Those developments are essentially two; they are distinct, but closely interrelated.

First, at the age of 12, I embarked upon a study of leading modern philosophers of the 17th and 18th centuries. Out of this, I came to abhor everything represented by Francis Bacon, Thomas Hobbes, John Locke, David Hume, and Jean-Jacques Rousseau, and to establish myself, since the period of my 13th and 14th years, a follower of Leibniz. My development as a philosopher, and all of my principal intellectual and related achievements since, was forged in my work of disproving the central dogmas of Immanuel Kant's *Critiques*, in defense of Leibniz.

Second, the intertwining of my youthful preparations for possible entry into the Christian ministry with these philosophical studies, prompted me to reject the evangelical form of devout Quaker faith in which I had been reared. I came to the painful realization of reason, that the Quakers, including my devout parents, erred fundamentally in holding God responsible for the condition of mankind; the Creator holds each of us responsible for the condition of mankind, to the limit of our means to remedy suffering and evils.

On the basis of my successful refutation of Kant, and my kindred axiomatic refutation of the anti-human dogmas respecting the human mind, of professors Norbert Wiener and John von Neumann, by 1952 I had produced important discoveries in the field of physical economy, respecting, immediately, the intelligible nature of the causal relationship between

scientific progress and increase of the potential population-density of the human species. As part of the same effort, I defined the intelligibility of the same creative processes responsible for valid fundamental scientific discoveries, as the basis for major creative works in the classical fine arts.

As the human individual is set apart from and above all the beasts, fundamentally, by the divine gift of the potential for rigorous forms of creative reason, it is in this respect that the individual person is in the image of the living Creator. This fact is the intelligible premise for defining the practical meaning of the terms truth and freedom.

Encumbered with this knowledge, it became more and more the dedication of my life to serve this principle: to defend those forms of institutions of sovereign nation-states which, like emphasis upon scientific and technological progress, foster the development and expression of those aspects of individual human nature which reflect the image of the living Creator.

Today, from this viewpoint I have so described, our planet is afflicted with two great evils.

The first is the spread of satanic evil in the guises of what is called variously "The New Age," the "Age of Aquarius," or simply the "radical counterculture." Fascism and Bolshevism, like the avowed Anti-Christ Nietzsche and Aleister Crowley, are but particular forms of expression of this subsuming satanic evil which is the New Age insurgency.

The avowed purpose of the New Age, is to eradicate the "cultural matrix" of Western European Judeo-Christian civilization from the institutions and even the memory of this planet.

The second evil, is the great and spreading social injustice, typified by the plight of the majority in the looted "Third World," and the growing poor inside the U.S. itself. Social and economic justice for these nations and their poor, is the great noble task placed before the post-war world. The would-be gods of Olympus, both as wealthy families of the West or the Soviet *Nomenklatura*, have not only rejected that task, but have brought this injustice to the most savage extremes, with their usurious looting, their crushing of the sovereignties of nations, and their evil, neo-malthusian "post-industrial" utopianism.

The clear mission of the United States is to assume its proper leading role in defeating the spread of the first evil, and in righting of the great wrongs of social and economic injustice against the poor of this planet, both within these United States and without. We have reached the point, that either the United States abandons the evil policies of usury, neo-malthusianism, and foul compromises with Soviet evil, which have dominated increasingly

the policy-shaping of the recent 20-odd years, or the United States will surely be destroyed during the relatively near-term period ahead of us today.

The point has been reached, at which the Creator will no longer tolerate the rule over mankind by those responsible for the condition to which mankind is being reduced. Our nation must change itself on these accounts, or be doomed. In any case, what is dawning now, is not "the Age of Aquarius," but the holocaust of extinction of those institutions which serve the rule over mankind by would-be gods of Olympus.

Hence, on this account, my frail person touches the most awesome power of this planet, a power greater than all governments, and greater than any would-be gods of Olympus. If such forces continue their efforts to exterminate the cause which I represent, their success on that account ensures their own extermination not long afterward. This power is not my personal possession; it is a power to pass final judgment upon all would-be judges, a power emanating from the Creator. It is not my hand, or that of my friends, which would destroy those who would destroy me and my friends, it is the Hand of Providence.

This Message

The first function of this message of reply is to provoke a suitable verification of the second message delivered to me, to ensure that the messenger has represented the views of those his credentials imply he does represent.

The second function, is to ensure that those principals have opportunity to reconsider their announced course, and to shape any further message to me accordingly.

The reasons for choosing this channel to make this reply, ought to be obvious to those whom the messenger represents.