

## The U.S. Constitution's New Life

by Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.

February 25, 1997

[Published in *Executive Intelligence Review*, Volume 24, Number 12, March 14, 1997. View [PDF of original](#) at the LaRouche Library.]

There is no competent reason to doubt, that, during his present term in office, President William Clinton will be called upon to provide global leadership through acts of great pungency and force. He and other relevant leaders will be called upon, to act quickly, and effectively, with that quality of great resolution, which U.S. President Franklin D. Roosevelt promised in his first inaugural address of March 4, 1933. Those leaders must bring forth, quickly, a new economic, monetary, and financial system of trade and other cooperation, among a consort of sovereign nation-states, to supplant a rotted-out, collapsing, speculative bubble of globaloney.

The moment for such epoch-making decision is near. Two interrelated questions are thus posed. Might this President, and his prospective partners in such decision, find the will to act, in time? If so, might they act wisely; might they approach that awesome moment adequately prepared? The provision of schematic working-papers, such as scenarios and programs, is no substitute for clear conception of principle. We who are qualified, must now supply such decision-makers with those notions of principle, upon which the choice, between success and ruin, depends absolutely. To that end, the following is supplied.

The deepest principles of law embedded in our U.S. Federal Constitution, compel me to say: I can not accept the claim of the widely travelled Michael Novak, nor U.S. Associate Supreme Court Justice Antonin Scalia, to be a Christian. I speak not as spokesman for a church, but only of facts, as a botanist might assure us that no bush could comprehend a truly human interest. Nonetheless, Christians ought to accept my authority in this case, on such axiomatic premises as those underlying the Apostle Paul's celebrated *I Corinthians* 13.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> In Latin, those premises are *imago Dei*, *capax Dei*, and *caritas*. The original, Platonic, pre-Byzantine Greek of St. Paul's *agapē* should be preferred to its Latin translation, as *caritas*, on account of the bowdlerization which the term *caritas* (and, also, the English translation, as "charity") has suffered from those who unable to find that true, Platonic meaning of *agapē*, which is accessed by passing through the "needle's eye." Paul's use of the latter term, coincides with Plato's notion of the quality of emotion expressing absolute passion for justice, and therefore for truth, a passion lacking in Justice Scalia, for example. See Socrates vs. Thrasymachus and Glaucon,

The crucial issue prompting those references to personalities, here, is defense of the fundamental law of the U.S.A.: most emphatically, the “Welfare clause” within the Preamble of our Federal Constitution.

It is already known to some, that, since about the age of five or six, at the latest, I have abhorred the contemptibly polite custom of “company manners,” the which evades crucial issues, as by shifting the discussion to today’s weather, by lying outrightly, or by agreeing, implicitly, from the outset, to limiting utterance to what is termed, with lying euphemism, the “civility” of ambiguous, impersonal *speaking in mere generalities*. To assure my readers that I mean business, I convoke here that pungency and force, the which is rallied by relevant, sharp, references to the relevant, disgusting *personal characteristics* of Novak’s and Scalia’s influence in public life.

I do not gloat over the unhappy spiritual estate of Biblical goats, into which the public figures Novak and Scalia have permitted themselves to fall. I do but warn the sheep, not to be misled by those widespread, false claims which are all too commonly attached to the names of these two, or other influential goats of kindred, stray persuasions. As the lawyer would put his questions in the following colloquy:

“Is there a carrier of that disease in this room today?”

“Yes.”

“Name one ... name a second.”

I employ the focus upon specific personalities, to illustrate a most timely, most crucial issue of constitutional law, a principle which Justice Scalia violates, again and again, and that, sometimes, with a manifest, virtually demonic passion. His violations, are not crimes of first impression, but, by their morbid implications for practice of government, must be placed in that category of a Locke-rooted, radical positivism in law, the which is genetically akin to the culpable practice of law by Nazi judges such as the notorious Roland Freisler.<sup>2</sup>

---

in *The Republic*, Book II, *passim*. For the model for Thrasymachus, and Scalia, see Plato’s presentation [*Apology*] of the prosecutor Meletus, in the celebrated political trial of Socrates.

<sup>2</sup> Officially, Freisler’s titles as an official of the Nazi system, were General Prosecutor (Generalstaatsanwalt) of the People’s Court, and State Secretary in the Reich Justice Ministry. See *Der Prozess gegen die Hauptkriegsverbrecher vor dem Internationalen Militärgerichtshof* [“The Nuremberg Trials” of November 1945–October 1946] (Munich, Germany: Delphin Verlag GmbH, 1947–49), Vols. I–XXIII; X 84, XII 203, XVIII 300, XX 301]. He is most often recognized for his conduct of the trial of the “July 20, 1944 defendants.” Freisler is a product of the radical-positivist legal tradition of G.W.F. Hegel’s political co-thinker, the notorious neo-Kantian, Carl Friedrich von Savigny. The irrationalist current of positivist law which Scalia represents, that derived from the axiomatic premises of John Locke, is even more radical, more immoral, closer to the brutish doctrine of *The Republic*’s Thrasymachus, and the prosecutor of Socrates, Meletus, than that of Carl Schmitt, the latter the principal architect of that *Notverordnungsrecht* employed to establish Nazi dictatorial power.

So, the political advocacies which Novak cloaks deceitfully with the colors of “the Christian right,” are of the same philosophical characteristics as Scalia’s perversities: adherence to the putrid meaning supplied to the term “democracy,” by John Locke, and by Meletus of Athens before them both.

My referencing those matters, is prompted, in lesser part, by certain, most recent, ongoing discussions with representatives of Russia, Ukraine, and other eastern European nations: on the subject of those practical problems of constitutional law, the which are forced to our attention by the recent years’ horrifying experience in such nations. My experience, over several decades, in dealing with these and related problems of statecraft, persuades me that the only efficient approach to discussion of such matters, is to adopt the original intent of the U.S. Federal *Constitution* as the benchmark from which to survey the issues of constitutional law as they might arise in any region of the planet.

In the greater part of that which is to be said below, one might reference the opening passage from the 1776 U.S. *Declaration of Independence*: “When in the Course of human events, it becomes necessary...” So, now, as then, and in the time of the grandfather of our own U.S. Constitution, that of Solon of Athens, we have entered a most extraordinary time in history, a time when tectonic events are shaking and toppling long-standing institutions, and new ones must be crafted to replace them, lest civilization achieve the ultimate political extreme of “free trade,” that state of turbulent, perfect entropy, the which is otherwise recognized by the name of chaos. At this moment of writing, the world as a whole has reached the brink of the greatest, most deadly, global financial implosion in history.<sup>3</sup> As we shall explain more fully, later in this report, that clause, as excerpted from the opening passage of the *Declaration of Independence*, and as compared to Solon’s constitutional poem, has a very rigorous sort of significance in the proper method for adducing the intent of expressed constitutional law.

---

Experience shows that the U.S. Federal Fourth Circuit bench is a hot-bed of Scalia-like, radical-positivist practices.

<sup>3</sup> Throughout this report, our use of the term “history” refers to the known correlation between explicitly given “subjective” history, as supplied by the surviving shards of language and art, as those are sustained, or corrected by what might be adduced from a scientific quality of experimental knowledge of past or present, referenced ideas and events. A more rigorous reading of such combined subjective and experimental evidence of history, is implicit in B. Riemann’s 1854 habilitation dissertation. In that latter approach, the emphasis is upon those reconstructable, revolutionary discoveries of underlying principle, the which account for the increase of mankind’s *potential relative population-density*. The notion of a *science of history* depends upon that Riemannian, experimental-physical approach to the efficient history of ideas, or true history. A science of history bases its account upon man’s struggle for truth; it relegates mere opinion, however popular (and usually erroneous), to the category of pathological, clinical phenomena.

In this present time of global, systemic crisis, the only decisive issue before us all, is whether or not we are able to escape from institutions as powerfully entrenched, and as doomed, as Belshazzar's Babylon, to escape into the safety of durable new institutions. As the principal composers of the U.S. *Declaration of Independence* and *Constitution* showed, by their practice, civilizations existence rests upon a cornerstone in law, a notion of law which must be preserved throughout that *Platonic* process of change, the which is represented by a *deductively discontinuous* transit, from a doomed old order of law, into the choice and realization of a new one. So, Solon understood, in writing the poem which stands as the first true constitution in history; so, with aid of reference to the U.S. Eighteenth-Century revolutionary experience, we must comprehend the tasks which confront the true leaders of all mankind, today.

A principal obstacle tending to prevent that necessary approach from being adopted, is the fact, that, outside the U.S.A. even among the putatively best-educated strata, there is not more than a tiny minority, today, which is not totally misinformed in the matter of the strategic historical setting and original intent of that U.S. Constitution. This is notably the case among the nations which have emerged from the former Comecon association. On such accounts, we must begin by clarifying that history.

### ***The History Which Underlies the U.S. Constitution***

The intent which underlies the 1787–1789 composition of the original U.S. Federal Constitution, is found in the history of the cumulative experience of English-speaking American colonists, from “the Course of events” during the preceding two centuries, most emphatically since the accession of King James I (Stuart) in 1603. For the purpose of situating the original intent of the U.S. Constitution, we must distinguish three general periods in pre-1776 American history: 1) from the accession of James I, through the ouster of James II; 2) from the accession of the imported English tyrant, William of Orange, until the accession of William's protégé, imported George I, as first monarch of the United Kingdom, in 1714; 3) the preparation for the establishment of a sovereign American nation-state, over the years beginning approximately (slightly before) 1714, through the first election of President George Washington, with Alexander Hamilton as the first U.S. Secretary of the Treasury.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>4</sup> For background on these periods of the common history of Britain and English-speaking North America, see H. Graham Lowry, *How the Nation Was Won: America's Untold Story* (Washington, D.C.: Executive Intelligence Review, 1988). It is notable, that the third period coincides with near exactness to the life-span of Benjamin Franklin. This was the Franklin, known in Europe not only as the father of the American Revolution, but, also, as “The American Prometheus” of Georg Forster's tribute. In his tribute to Franklin's included Promethean role as a scientist, Forster employs the celebrated *Götterfunken* [“Divine Spark”] of F. Schiller's *An die Freude* [“Ode to Joy”]. Forster's tribute provoked the reference to Franklin's “sparks,” expressed by an

Beginning with the founding of the Plymouth colony, and the Massachusetts Bay Colony, the English colonization of North America was accomplished by parties which, like the great tragedian William Shakespeare,<sup>5</sup> typified the literate, relatively more than “plebeian” strata of the populations of England, Scotland, and Ireland, and also the Netherlands, and Germany.<sup>6</sup> Although some of the colonists had been victims of religious, or other forms of political persecution, in their nations of origin, the underlying issue which defined the wars of 1776–1865, between the U.S.A. and the British monarchy,<sup>7</sup> was the fight between the English

---

asset of British Foreign Service head Jeremy Bentham, Franklin-hater Mary Wollstonecraft (Godwin) Shelley, in her famous anti-Franklin, anti-Percy Bysshe Shelley (i.e., of *Prometheus Unbound*), propaganda-tract, *Frankenstein, or The Modern Prometheus*.

<sup>5</sup> The Erasmian development of the English language to the level of the usages of William Shakespeare, represents the high-point of development of the cognitive potentials of that language, to the present date. His English is a product of the influence of Dante Alighieri and his followers, most notably by the way of the Fifteenth-Century Italian, “Golden Renaissance.” As the Venetian Party’s Cecil family, and Cecil rogues such as Francis Bacon, gained added power under the reign of James I, the great English Sixteenth-Century, Erasmian Renaissance in Classical art, science, and language, was aggressively brutalized by the influence of such agents of Paolo Sarpi’s anti-Renaissance “Enlightenment” as Francis Bacon, Thomas Hobbes, John Dryden, Alexander Pope, Samuel Johnson, *et al.* Thus, England’s greatest composer of the period, Bacon-hated John Bull, remained in exile, and Shakespeare, relegated to virtual internal political exile from the stage for the concluding years of his life, died, under highly suspicious circumstances, after a dinner shared with Bacon’s three-penny playwright, Ben Jonson. [“On the Death of Shakespeare and the Case of the Rime-Encrusted Dryden,” presentation by Webster G. Tarpley, to the ICLC/Schiller Institute semiannual conference, Feb. 16, 1997.] Thus, the great tradition of Classical tragedians Aeschylus and Shakespeare could be continued, and advanced further, only outside England, by a German, Friedrich Schiller.

<sup>6</sup> Exemplary is the fact, that, during the 1790s, the U.S. adult population had a literacy above 90%, in contrast to a rate of somewhat-higher-than 40% in the United Kingdom. This superior literacy of the U.S. adult was qualified by European eyewitnesses’ references to the U.S. “Latin farmer,” an expression of the quality of educational practices first established in such places as the Seventeenth Century Massachusetts Bay Colony and William Penn’s and Jonathan Logan’s Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and pursued most energetically by the publishing and other programs of Benjamin Franklin. There is no factual basis for today’s widespread, credulous acceptance, throughout western Europe, for example, of myths which are consistent with the fraudulent theses of rabid Anglophile President Theodore Roosevelt’s favorite historian, Frederick Jackson Turner, of *Frontier and Section* notability. The key to the issues of the U.S. *Declaration of Independence* and *Constitution*, is that the typical citizen of English-speaking North America, was vastly superior to the typical English subject in moral and intellectual attainment: from the Seventeenth Century to approximately the present time.

<sup>7</sup> The U.S. Civil War was a surrogate war with the United Kingdom of British Foreign Service chief Jeremy Bentham, Bentham’s protégé, Lord Palmerston, and Bertrand Russell’s grandfather, Lord John Russell. Britain used a cabal of Bentham’s and Palmerston’s agents from among the “Tory” faction of wealthy U.S. drug-trafficking and slave-owner families, to organize a London-directed break-up of the U.S.A., and recarving of the map of the Americas (as the correspondence of the traitor August Belmont reveals the purpose behind London’s, and his own sympathies for the Confederacy). See Anton Chaitkin, *Treason in America*, 2nd ed. (New York: New Benjamin Franklin House, 1985). The allied fleet of the British, French, and Spanish navies, which invaded and occupied Mexico in 1863, was the fleet whose deployment had been intended to include forcibly breaking the United States’ naval blockade of the Confederacy. The British backed off from the intended battle with U.S. forces directly, when the U.S. ally, Czar Alexander II of Russia, sent his fleets, under

patriots and the encroaching influence of that so-called “Venetian Party” which first *consolidated* power in London with the accession of King James I.<sup>8</sup>

Venice’s displeasure with the Restoration Stuarts’ reluctance to give full support to Venice’s orchestration of wars against France,<sup>9</sup> opened the second phase of the relations between London and English-speaking North America, the which began with the toppling of James II, and the accession of the bloody tyrant William of Orange. It was during the reign of William and Mary’s successor, Queen Anne, that the influence of the leading scientific mind of Europe, Gottfried Leibniz, served as the center of reference for a few years’ efforts by English patriots, to wrest control of England, Wales, Scotland, and Ireland from the alien grip of the usurpatious Venetian Party.<sup>10</sup>

By the time of Queen Anne’s death, the English patriotic cause had been defeated in London. From that point on, the English patriots looked chiefly to the semi-autonomous colonies in North America, as the place from which to organize a base for freeing the United Kingdom from the grip of the victorious Venetian Party.<sup>11</sup> During that entire period, through and beyond the establishment of the Federal Constitution, the political struggle within English-speaking North America, was the work which enabled the followers of Gottfried Leibniz’s influence to establish their supremacy, over the influence of John

---

sealed orders, to New York and San Francisco, and threatened to unleash war throughout Europe, should Britain and Napoleon III’s France take any action in support of the Confederacy. Britain, later, organized the assassination of President Lincoln, an act of war against the U.S.A. which President Andrew Johnson was not inclined to notice.

<sup>8</sup> Throughout the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries, the political current identified with the modern British monarchy’s ruling Privy Council, was commonly identified as “the Venetian Party.” Although Venice’s oligarchy seized top-down control over the Sixteenth-Century English monarchy during the reign of Henry VIII, the present-day form of British political culture is rooted in the influence of Venice’s Paolo Sarpi, from the 1580s onward. From the death of Queen Anne, on, throughout the remaining entirety of the Eighteenth Century, the policies of the British monarchy were controlled, top-down, through the continuation of Sarpi’s strategic aims, by the network of Venice’s spy-master Antonio Conti and his followers.

<sup>9</sup> Summarily: the process of the Tudor Reformation supplied an added dimension to the British monarchy’s already longstanding, endemic, bloody-fisted claims to Scotland. England’s fresh, Venice-directed break with France, the Stuarts’ Sixteenth-Century, dynastic alliances with France, and the circumstances of the Venice-orchestrated Cromwell dictatorship, played upon the shaping of the foreign policies of the Restoration Stuarts, in the manner which has occupied the attention of certain later British historians.

<sup>10</sup> Lowry, *op. cit.*

<sup>11</sup> The principal Seventeenth-Century English colonies, established under charters issued prior to 1688–89, were not governed by England, but, rather, like today’s semi-independent nations under the British Commonwealth, were semi-autonomous states owing allegiance solely to the monarchy (then, as Commonwealth states to the monarchy/Privy Council today). The key issue leading into the U.S. *Declaration of Independence*, was a succession of efforts, by London, to nullify those charters under which the English colonies enjoyed approximately that degree of independent self-rule nominally awarded to Commonwealth members today.

Locke.<sup>12</sup> Beyond reasonable objection, the anti-Locke characteristics of both the U.S. 1776 *Declaration of Independence* and the 1787–1789 Federal *Constitution*, attest to the intellectual and moral supremacy of the Leibniz party, in determining the intent of law upon which the U.S. Federal Republic was founded.<sup>13</sup>

The two crucial examples we cite in evidence of that, are the following. From the Declaration, “life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness,” a phrase which was the virtual war-cry of the international Leibniz party (and its American branch) against the “life, liberty, and property” of the pro-slavery, Locke party.<sup>14</sup> From the *Constitution*, we excerpt, as evidence, the following passage from within the Preamble: “provide for the common defence, promote the general Welfare, and secure the Blessings of Liberty to ourselves and our Posterity....”<sup>15</sup> These conceptions persist in Leibniz’s writings on economy, philosophy, and law, from his 1671 *Society and Economy*,<sup>16</sup> through his posthumously published *New Essays on Human Understanding*.<sup>17</sup> These conceptions were those adopted, as acknowledged refutations of, and antidotes to Locke’s dogma, among the leading American patriots, such as Franklin.

That same philosophical division, between the patriotic followers of Leibniz and the “Tory” tradition of Locke, is the only standpoint from which competent views may be adduced on the characteristic features of post-1789 U.S. history, down to the present, London-steered, “neo-conservative” efforts to destroy the U.S. *Constitution*.

---

<sup>12</sup> Lowry, *op. cit.*

<sup>13</sup> Philip Valenti, “The Anti-Newtonian Roots of the American Revolution,” *EIR*, Dec. 1, 1995, pp. 12–31.

<sup>14</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>15</sup> The inclusion of “and our Posterity” has pervasive implications for our argument throughout our defense of the U.S. *Constitution* here. The crucial point to be emphasized on this account, is implied by the mooted question, with which the patriotic prosecutor challenges the accused malefactor, the radical democrat: “By what means is the opinion of our unborn Posterity represented within the institutions of self-government?” (That accused perpetrator might be a representative of the U.S. National Endowment for Democracy, or its putative progeny, the International Republican Institute.) The Preamble thus makes the existence of right respecting the presently living adult individual’s, or majority’s opinion, *today*, contingent upon accountability to unborn Posterity, *at any distantly future time*. To show the U.S. Federal *Constitution*’s intent, we are, thus, like those Classical scholars who shaped its design, forced back to review of issues posed by Plato’s Socrates, in Book II of *The Republic*. The interpretation of the principles of constitutional law, must never flow from so corrupt a source as a so-called “electoral mandate,” or other momentary whims of “popular opinion;” that law must be derived, as Leibniz and the chief framers of our Constitution recognized, from the reasoned notion of the natural rights of *all* persons, and the rights of society itself, as a unifying entirety of those persons, past, present, and yet unborn.

<sup>16</sup> Nancy Spannaus and Christopher White, *The Political-Economy of the American Revolution*, 2nd ed. (Washington, D.C.: Executive Intelligence Review, 1996), pp. 247–262.

<sup>17</sup> *Cf.* P. Valenti, *op. cit.*

Throughout the pre-history and history of the U.S.A., the division between American patriots and Tories, the war of patriots such as the Careys, Henry Clay, John Quincy Adams, Abraham Lincoln, and others, against, principally, the British East India opium-trader and slave-owner interests of the U.S. oligarchical families, was a division between the axiomatic standpoint of Leibniz, against the persistence of that alien infection, the heritage of John Locke. With some exceptions, such as that psychologically, and, therefore, politically complex, devotee of Locke, Thomas Jefferson, most of the Lockceans, such as the New England opium-traders, and the treasonous authors of the constitution of the Confederate States of America (C.S.A.), were rabid Anglophiles. These treasonously inclined Anglophiles, devotees of Locke's dogma, form the kernel of the Wall Street Liberal American Establishment, down to the core of U.S. President Clinton's most savage adversaries, such as the Mellon family's Richard Mellon Scaife, of today.<sup>18</sup>

Thus, Bank of Manhattan founder Aaron Burr, an agent of Jeremy Bentham personally, as also of Bentham's British Foreign Service, led that pack of opium-trafficking traitors known as the 1814–1815 “Hartford Convention” plotters, from Boston, Newburyport, Salem, Yale, and New York, who organized financing for a British military invasion of the U.S.A., during the U.S.'s second, 1812–1815, war against the British Empire. The same pack of traitors from the “Hartford Convention” oligarchy, at the same time they presented themselves as “abolitionists” in New England, supplied traitors, such as the founder of the later Ku Klux Klan, General Albert Pike, who were, from the 1820s on, a key part of the slaveholder conspiracy which created the C.S.A.<sup>19</sup> President Theodore Roosevelt, was a product and continuation of that treasonous, rabidly Anglophile Confederacy tradition; President Woodrow Wilson was a fanatical devotee of the memory, and co-author of the revival of the Ku Klux Klan.<sup>20</sup> The force behind the “Contract with America” of the corrupt, confessedly revolting Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives, Newt Gingrich, is that same Confederate slave-owner's tradition of “Life, Liberty, and Property,” which was the chief

---

<sup>18</sup> Anton Chaitkin, *op. cit.*

<sup>19</sup> *New Federalist* pamphlet, “Bring Down the Pike Statue Now: Why the KKK National Monument Must Fall,” April 1993; and, Anton Chaitkin, “National Park Service Historian Is Chief of ‘Aryan’ Secret Society,” *New Federalist*, Vol. 7, No. 17, May 10, 1993, p. 12.

<sup>20</sup> Chaitkin, *op. cit.* U.S. President Woodrow Wilson, a person with well-documented affinities to the memory of Albert Pike's original Ku Klux Klan, launched the birth of the second Ku Klux Klan from the White House, through public endorsement of the film, originally entitled *The Klansman*, later renamed *Birth of a Nation*, which was used to bring the 1920s Klan membership up to an estimated 4.2 millions adult Americans. The production and immensely profitable distribution of that KKK recruiting-film, involved the founders of the Hollywood Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer organization; the film established the paradigm for Hollywood's use of feature films to brainwash the U.S. and foreign film and TV audiences into accepting utterly fraudulent, Anglophile propaganda as “history.”



point of difference between the U.S. Constitution and the abomination known as the constitution of the CSA.

The issue of two, 1941–1945 and 1950–51, battles of the Pacific, between the patriotic General Douglas MacArthur, on the one side, and Winston Churchill, Averell Harriman, and Harriman-directed President Harry Truman, on the opposing side, is another instance of the continued, often bloody division between the patriotic heritage of Leibniz's influence and the perennially treasonous impulses of the Locke tradition.

This battle between the immiscible constitutional heritages of Leibniz and Locke, throughout the combined, post-1714 pre-history and history of the U.S., is brought to the surface in the clearest terms by the continuing battle between patriot and Tory over crucial issues of economic and related policy.

Since the factional battle within the mid-1780s U.S., to supersede the failed U.S. Articles of Confederation by the 1787–1789 U.S. Federal *Constitution*, the consistent correlative of this ongoing battle between patriot and Tory, has been the patriots' adherence to what the first U.S. Treasury Secretary, Alexander Hamilton, identified as the U.S. commitment to a policy named "The American System of political-economy," and the Tories' contrary commitment to the policy against which the War of Independence had been fought, the "free trade" policy set forth in the British East India Company propaganda-tract otherwise better known today as Adam Smith's *Wealth of Nations*.

In brief, what Hamilton (like the Careys and Friedrich List after him) identified as "the American System of political-economy,"<sup>21</sup> combined chiefly two elements.

Respecting the principles of a physical science of economy, the American System is derived in all crucial features from the work of Leibniz, his founding, and original elaboration, of economic science as a branch of physical science, during the interval 1671–1716.<sup>22</sup>

However, the Seventeenth-Century Massachusetts Bay Colony pioneered in discovery of the effective policies respecting the use of a state-created productive credit in the form of a paper currency. This, and the prosperity it had fostered, were crushed under decrees of the hated

---

<sup>21</sup> Allen Salisbury, *The Civil War and the American System: America's Battle with Britain, 1860–1876* (Washington, D.C.: Executive Intelligence Review, 1993). Friedrich List, *Outlines of American Political Economy* (1827), with Commentary by Michael Liebig and Epilogue by Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr. (Wiesbaden, Germany: Dr. Böttiger Verlag GmbH, 1996). [Epilog is also published as "Leibniz and the List Hypothesis" in *EIR*, Vol. 23, No. 35, Aug. 30, 1996.]

<sup>22</sup> For a taste of the connection between the economic policies of Leibniz and U.S. founder Benjamin Franklin, see Spannaus and White, *op. cit.*, pp. 214–227, pp. 262–276. In that location, note (pp. 390–454) Treasury Secretary Alexander Hamilton's elaboration of Leibniz's "productive forces of labor," in Hamilton's celebrated, Dec. 5, 1791 *Report to the Congress on the Subject of Manufactures*.

British Governor Andros and the policies continued under the English butcher, William of Orange. The tried and proven principle of such a paper-currency policy, was kept in the colonists' public view, through the notably included efforts of Cotton Mather and his follower Benjamin Franklin.<sup>23</sup>

Both of these converging tributaries, from the wellspring of Leibniz and that of the Seventeenth-Century Massachusetts Bay Colony, flow into the common stream of what the first Administration of President George Washington defined as the anti-“free trade” policy known world-wide, throughout the Nineteenth Century, as “The American System of political-economy.”<sup>24</sup>

Under the Washington and John Adams administrations, the American System was the policy practiced by the U.S, with stunning success.<sup>25</sup> The philosophically complex Jefferson and the husband of Aaron Burr's asset Dolley (Payne Todd) Madison, President James Madison,<sup>26</sup> had come under effective control of the circles of their Secretary of the Treasury, the British agent Albert Gallatin, who attempted to destroy the United States as his cousin and anti-American political ally, Jacques Necker, as Treasurer of France, had bankrupted France.<sup>27</sup> Gallatin was the “Svengali” who duped “Trilby” Presidents Jefferson and Madison into a “free trade”-premised, Newt Gingrich-style destruction of the U.S. economy, over the 1801–1814 interval.

---

<sup>23</sup> On Cotton Mather's part: Lowry, *op. cit.*, pp. 40, 302–303. On Benjamin Franklin's part: Spannaus and White, *op. cit.*, pp. 247–262.

<sup>24</sup> Spannaus and White, *op. cit.*

<sup>25</sup> Although, under President John Adams, the circles of Aaron Burr's Boston allies, around the Lowells, were already deployed on behalf of a British Foreign service operation, Sir John Robison's lying *Proofs of a Conspiracy* (New York: George Forman 1797). They aimed, successfully, at bringing down the Federalists through the folly of the Alien & Sedition Acts fostered by the hoax of Robison. [See Chaitkin, *op. cit.* See, T. Jefferson on Robison, p. 105, Note 10.] Robison was an Edinburgh-based, former British ambassador to Russia, and a personal agent of the British foreign intelligence service head Jeremy Bentham, and Jeremy's brother, Russia's Admiral Sir Samuel Bentham.

<sup>26</sup> Anton Chaitkin, *op. cit.*

<sup>27</sup> Necker had caused the bankruptcy, thus triggering the 1789 Revolution, and, after that, played a key part, together with his crony, Philippe Egalité, Duke of Orleans, in organizing the obscenity celebrated as the Fall of the Bastille, and, later, in triggering that series of events, which, subsequently sent Philippe's cousin, Louis XVI, to the guillotine. The family of Mallet (a.k.a. Mallet-Prevost) is a member of the notorious 200 families of Geneva, the Geneva-Lausanne-Paris-London extended family of Mallet, Prevost, Mallet-Prevost, Schlumberger, and DeNeuflize. This entity has been prominent internationally, as one of the leading elements of the Great European “Venetian Party,” since the period of the Eighteenth-Century network of salons of Voltaire, *et al.*, established by Paris-based Venice spy-master Abbot Antonio Conti. Albert Gallatin and Jacques Necker, the man who, as Treasurer of France, bankrupted Louis XVI's France for the benefit of London, were cousins of the Geneva Mallet-Prevost family. E.g., Chaitkin, *op. cit.*

To trace the experience of the U.S. Constitution from the time of the second (1812–1815) of a series of wars, the which Britain either fought or otherwise organized against the U.S., it is indispensable to put to one side, as virtually Hollywood-style political fiction, both the currently “politically correct” academic accounts of the so-called “two-party system,” and also the putative, mythical autobiographies circulated on behalf of either the Democratic and Republican parties of today. The 1812 revolt of the “Warhawks,” led by Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives Henry Clay, is the first of a series of turning-points in the species-character of the predecessors for what are presented as the two leading U.S. political parties of today.

The “Warhawks” forced President Madison to muster the ruined economy of the U.S. into a masterful naval defense against British aggression, despite Dolley and Secretary of the Treasury Gallatin.<sup>28</sup> John Adams’s disorientation in the affair of the Robison hoax, and the Gallatin-induced follies of both Presidents Jefferson and Madison, had discredited both the Federalist and Democratic-Republican political parties.<sup>29</sup>

From 1812 on, what became later, first, the Whig Party, and, still later, Abraham Lincoln’s Republican Party, was the result of the emerging alliance among 1) Speaker Clay’s forces within the Congress, 2) Franklin’s agent Mathew Carey, and his son Henry C. Carey, and, 3) the patriots who split out from the leading circles of the Federalist Party, led, and typified by John Quincy Adams. The opposition to the Clay-Carey-Adams, “American Whig” current of the Nineteenth Century, was an assortment of 1) the London-controlled slave-owners’ oligarchy, 2) London-controlled, Boston (and Yale) opium-trafficking “Brahmins,” and, 3) the London-controlled New York (e.g., “Wall Street”) financier oligarchy, the latter typified by the Martin Van Buren who was, variously, President Andrew Jackson’s controller, the creator of Jackson’s land-bank swindle (the cause of the 1837 Panic), and Jackson’s successor as President.

The conflict between the “protectionist,” Leibnizian patriotic principles of constitutionality, the which inhere in “The American System of political-economy,” versus the adversary influences of John Locke and Adam Smith’s empiricism and “free trade,” is the true test to be employed in all periods, and in respect to all crucial political, and foreign-policy issues.

Thus, only in name, was the Democratic-Republican Party of “protectionist” Presidents James Monroe and John Quincy Adams, the Democratic-Republican Party of “free traders”

---

<sup>28</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>29</sup> A study and comparison of the several successive editions of Mathew Carey’s *The Olive Branch* (Philadelphia: M. Carey and Son, June 1, 1818) [Select Bibliographies Reprint Series, Books for Libraries Press, Freeport, N.Y.: 1969] is the single most crucial source-documentation of the roots and initial phases of shaping of the policy-issues underlying the transformations of the U.S. political party-system during the 1812–1865 interval.

Jefferson and Madison. That party's evolution under the Presidencies of Monroe and Adams, produced the forerunner of the later American Whig Party of Clay, Carey, Adams, *et al.*, the which begat the Republican Party of Abraham Lincoln, James Garfield, James G. Blaine, Mark Hanna, and William McKinley.

The "free trader" Democratic Party of Jackson continued as the party of the slave-owner conspiracy of British agent August Belmont, and, also, Presidents Franklin Pierce and James Buchanan, and maintained that tradition until President Franklin D. Roosevelt. The assassination of patriotic "American Whig" President William McKinley, in 1901, brought that rabidly Anglophile spawn of the Confederacy, Theodore Roosevelt, into office. Although the patriotic, protectionist traditions of the U.S. Constitution continued to be represented by some members of Congress, in both leading parties, the Anglophile heirs of the Confederacy and Wall Street branches of London finance reigned.<sup>30</sup> The U.S. had virtually no patriotic party in the Presidency,<sup>31</sup> from the September 14, 1901 assassination of McKinley, until the March 4, 1933 inauguration of Franklin D. Roosevelt.

Throughout this process, of ebbs and flows in the ongoing conflict between "organic" patriotic and Anglophile philosophical currents in U.S. political and economic life, the Federal *Constitution's* Preamble found its constituency in the interaction among three key features of U.S. life: 1) the tradition of our wars against the hateful British imperial monarchy; 2) the traditional emphasis upon, and role of universal public education in fostering a citizenry qualified to vote intelligently, and to undertake new roles in the course of scientific and technological progress; and, 3) the emphasis placed upon public investment in basic economic infrastructure as, like a suitable quality of universal public education, a precondition for successful realization of increases in the productive powers of labor through investment in scientific and technological progress.

*However, in the United States, as in both eastern and western Europe, during the entire Twentieth Century to date, there has been no period of general prosperity in any of these nations, except as a by-product of preparations for generalized warfare among leading powers.* This is key to understanding the drastic political shifts in practice of constitutional law, and related matters, inside the United States, as it is also to understanding the history of political-economic changes inside North America, Western Europe, the former Soviet Union, and throughout the world taken as a whole, during the course of the Twentieth Century to date.

---

<sup>30</sup> E.g., Morgan, Kuhn-Loeb.

<sup>31</sup> There are, admittedly, actual, but subordinate, qualifying complexities in both the Taft and Harding administrations.

In our U.S.A., the persistence of a broad-based, effective constituency for those principles of our *Constitution* referenced here, depended upon the intersection of public education with the labor-force requirements of combined, interdependent, public development and maintenance of basic economic infrastructure, and large percentiles of the labor-force occupied in high rates of investment in scientific and technological progress in infrastructure and in production of improving qualities of physical goods.

As I have presented this case in earlier locations, it is the coincidence of requirements of scientific and technological progress in strategic machine-tool design of products and productive processes, with matching requirements in generalized public education, on which the sustainable increase of the per-capita productive powers of labor, and standard of household existence, depend.<sup>32</sup> Insofar as the contingency of possible general modern warfare was not in view, the empiricist political power centered in Venice-style financier oligarchy, worked to lessen the rates of scientific and technological progress to a relative minimum (thus, fostering economic recessions and depressions). In the case of the U.S.A. and Europe, this point is most readily, most dramatically demonstrated, by considering the history of ebb and flow in the development and employment of the strategic machine-tool-design sector.

When the number of credible military powers had been reduced to two, and when those two had entered into a process of so-called “détente” agreements, following the developments of 1962–1963, the dominant political forces, as typified by the Anglo-American-Dutch financier oligarchies, judged that generalized warfare among major powers was no longer likely. Through a sequence of 1966–1996 changes in policy, all motivated by “post-industrial” utopianism, the earlier U.S. and European commitment to progress, has been reversed. Per-capita scientific and technological progress has not only been arrested, but reversed; in consequence, the world as a whole is now at the verge of the worst world depression, and threatened cultural collapse, in history.

During a period of approximately thirty years, this reversal of economic progress, combined with normal demographic attrition, has brought about profound changes, for the worse, in the leadership of U.S. institutions, and popular opinion. This unfolding process of political, economic, and cultural degeneration, of our population and institutions, has removed from power most among the class of productive managers and related professionals who were competent in organizing production. The labor-force itself, has been transformed from its former orientation, production, to a parasite's view of consumption *per se*. The social basis for the U.S. Constitution is wasted near to the point of irreversibility; the very continued

---

<sup>32</sup> E.g., Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr., “Return to the Machine-Tool Principle,” *EIR*, Vol. 24, No. 7, Feb. 7, 1997.

existence of the United States as a sovereign nation, is in imminent jeopardy, a development devoutly desired by the doomed Belshazzar of today's Babylon, finance-oligarchical London.

Under what it finds to be such presently auspicious, determining, economic-cultural conditions, the "neo-Confederate" Rehnquist-Scalia U.S. Supreme Court, has put itself foremost, in its Hell-bent efforts to destroy everything for which the U.S. Federal Constitution had stood for more than two hundred years.

A similar trend has reigned in the former Soviet Union and Warsaw Pact, and accelerated to beyond the limits of semi-autonomous national viability, in Russia, Ukraine, and elsewhere, today.

### ***The Intent of the U.S. Constitution***

As I have elaborated this argument in a number of earlier locations, the presently ongoing process of disintegration of the world financial system, reflects a two-fold process.<sup>33</sup>

The immediate cause for this collapse is what has been described by some as a "cultural paradigm shift," introduced about thirty years ago, as a shift in axiomatic assumptions underlying all facets of policy-shaping, away from the traditional commitment to investment in scientific and technological progress, to the type of "post-industrial" utopianism associated with the "rock-drug-sex youth-counterculture" induced among susceptible "Baby Boomer strata" during the 1964–1972, foundation-directed operations to that effect.

The second, deeper factor shaping both the way in which that "cultural-paradigm" shift was introduced three decades ago, and the way in which this shift unfolded on a global scale thereafter, is a deep conflict between two irreconcilable conceptions of man and nature, which had dominated European civilization and its world-wide impact for about four centuries. This deeper conflict within the pre-history and history of the U.S.A., is that, between patriot and Anglophile, which I have summarized here, above.

As I have summarized the case in various published locations:<sup>34</sup> For approximately four centuries, since the accession of England's James I, not only the United Kingdom, but Europe and, increasingly, the world at large, has been dominated by a conflict between two irreconcilable forces within the reach of the powerful modern-European civilization taken as a whole. The most efficient choice of names for these conflicting forces, is the heritage of Fifteenth-Century Italy's *Golden Renaissance* versus the "Venetian Party's" Sixteenth-

---

<sup>33</sup> Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr., "Clinton Must Call a New Bretton Woods Conference" [Feb. 15 keynote address to the Presidents' Day conference of the Schiller Institute and International Caucus of Labor Committees], *EIR*, Vol. 24, No. 11, March 7, 1997.

<sup>34</sup> *Ibid.*

Seventeenth Centuries', English-French-Geneva *Enlightenment*. That global setting of the difference between the Renaissance intent of the U.S. Constitution, and the opposing, Enlightenment (empiricist, Cartesian, positivist, and existentialist) dogmas, of the British monarchy, the Holy Alliance, and Napoleon III's France, is the only standpoint from which comprehension of the internal and external features of U.S. history can be attained.

As I have given the case in various such locations, although the bloody fact of this specific slaughter is readily documented by relevant morticians of the historian craft, the conflict can not be understood, except by focussing attention upon the underlying axioms of the opposed philosophies, rather than resorting to the *post hoc ergo propter hoc* approach to "specific issues" which appear on the surface of wars, revolutions, and kindred tectonic events of history. In brief, just as the definitions, axioms, and postulates of a formal geometry pre-determine what types of propositions will, or will not qualify as theorems of that geometry, so, the immiscibility which prompts the theorems of Renaissance to irrepressible enmity against the theorems of the Enlightenment, and *vice versa*, lies not in the facts pertaining to theorems as such, but, rather, lies in the governing definitions, axioms, and postulates respecting the notion of man and mankind's relationship to the universe at large.

The only existing method for dealing rationally with continuing processes based upon discontinuities among differing systems of underlying definitions, axioms, and postulates, is that first developed by Plato, as employed by physicist Bernhard Riemann to effect a thorough-going revolution in physical science.<sup>35</sup> As I have elaborated this repeatedly, the difference between Renaissance and Enlightenment is rooted, axiomatically, in the view of human nature supplied in exemplary fashion by Plato and by Christianity: that man is created in the image of God, a fact demonstrated in the history of mankind by the use of the individual person's developed cognitive powers for validatable, original discovery of scientific and related principle. The entirety of progress in mankind's potential relative population-density, from the mere several millions living individuals never exceedable by ape-like hominids, is a demonstration of the *universal efficiency* of that developable, creative cognitive power, the which inheres in the newborn individual person.

For example: Using Riemann's referenced, revolutionary discovery in mathematical physics, these discoveries of principle may be represented for measurement of their effect, in terms of the measurable changes in effective Riemannian physical-space-time curvature resulting from their discovery and application. Each such change not only alters the array of definitions, axioms, and postulates on which a relevant mathematical-economic model might be

---

<sup>35</sup> Bernhard Riemann, *Über die Hypothesen, welche der Geometrie zu Grunde liegen*, *Bernhard Riemann's gesammelte mathematische Werke*, H. Weber, ed. (New York: Dover Publications, 1953). On this see, among other locations, Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr., "Return to the Machine-Tool Principle," *loc. cit.*

premised, it changes the characteristic effect, upon the economy as a whole, of every action or event occurring within that economy.<sup>36</sup>

The discovery of each of the principles on which such progress in potential relative population-density depends, occurs in a non-deductive mode, within the sovereign precincts of the internal cognitive processes of the original discoverer; the principle is made known to each student, or other person who replicates the original mental act of discovery, in the same way, using the same non-deductive cognitive processes. It is the function of the individual human mind in this cognitive way, which is the sole source of the increase of the productive powers of labor (e.g., physical-economic profit of the economy considered as a whole). This is the mode of individual cognitive life through which man obtains increasing degrees of obedience from the universe.

The only possible, formal representation of this process of economic growth, per capita of labor-force, and per square kilometer of the planet's surface, is the Riemannian mode. The method which underlies that mode is Plato's method of hypothesis, as advances were built upon that Classical foundation, by Leibniz, Riemann, *et al.*

This developable potential within each individual, is referenced, in Latin, by the terms *imago Dei* and *capax Dei*.

As I have stressed repeatedly, in relevant earlier locations, every pre-historic trace of man known to us from archeology, and so forth, is qualified as human, only on the condition, that some correlated artifacts are found, the which betray fruits of distinctively, specifically human activity not possible for any conceivable "higher ape." Thus, the entirety of our knowledge of humanity, into the most remote portions of the accessible past, depends upon reconstructable proof of individual acts of original, or replicated original, efficient discoveries of principle, the which could have occurred, not through mere sense-experience, but only through that quality of discovery, or rediscovery of valid, axiomatic principles of nature, which is the specific characteristic of what Plato identifies as *ideas*. The motive-force of extended concentration, which enables the individual mind to break through paradoxes of an

---

<sup>36</sup> Consider a moot illustration which I used in a one-semester course taught during 1966–1973: the case of the plumber. Presume for the purposes of illustration, that the skills and techniques of the master plumber had altered only slightly over the 1946–1966 interval. Consider the significant advances in technology of production in general which had occurred over that same two-decade interval. Consider the proposition, that the value of the plumber's work had increased as a result of the advances in technology which had occurred outside his craft. Put it this way: The technological curvature of physical-economic space-time, had increased significantly during the 1946–1966 interval; therefore every necessary economic act occurring within that physical-economic space-time has a correspondingly enhanced value in 1966. relative to the benefit of the exact-same form of plumber action performed in 1946. As if to say. that the social value of the house is the service it performs for the useful people who inhabit that house.



ontological character, to discover, thus, validated, axiomatic qualities of principles, of Classical art and science, which solve such paradoxes, is the quality which Plato associates with the passion for justice and truth, *agapē*.

Hence, as we encountered these terms at the outset, the qualities of individual human nature, are the developable characteristics identified there by *imago Dei*, *capax Dei*, and *agapē*.

Although this is the principle, respecting human nature, upon which Christianity is premised, European civilization failed to establish political and social institutions meeting the requirements of human nature, until the Fifteenth-Century Renaissance produced the first modern form of nation-state, in Louis XI's France. This principle, which sets the individual person apart from, and above lower forms of life, is responsible for every achievement through which the human species has increased its potential relative population-density, improved the demographic characteristics of populations and their households, and improved the physical and cultural quality of individual and household life. Yet, until the Renaissance, and the associated emergence of the modern European form of sovereign nation-state, committed to universalizing education, and to fostering general participation in scientific and technological progress, less than five percent of the population, in any part of the world, in any culture, actually achieved a condition of life suited to the nature of human individuals.

The Renaissance's initiation of the modern European form of sovereign nation-state, assigned to the state the responsibility, as a virtual personality, for ensuring those rights of the individual person—past, present, and future, which are implicit in individual human nature as we have identified it here. The Preamble of the U.S. *Constitution* addresses that notion of law incumbent upon the virtual personality of the sovereign nation-state.

This obligation of the state is correlated with the problems posed by the fact that individual human life is mortal life, a finite span, within whose limits “justice delayed, is justice denied.” We each come into society as newborn strangers, and might hope to leave it as having been a blessing which had been bestowed upon that society which one's mortal existence has touched between the coming and passing. A life so lived, has met the “test of death.”

In contrast to the axiomatic presumptions of the Enlightenment, those of Hobbes, Locke, Adam Smith, and Jeremy Bentham's *Introduction to the Principles of Morals and Legislation*, what I have just stated here, is the fundamental self-interest lodged within the entirety of the individual's mortal existence. As Locke, Adam Smith's moral philosophy, and

the so-called “Newtonian,” Maupertuis-Bentham hedonistic calculus,<sup>37</sup> typify empiricist presumptions, the Enlightenment proffers a supposed “self-interest” located in the so-called instincts and senses of the bestialized individual, an interest which ends with the termination of that individual life. In fact, the outcome of one’s life depends upon its continuing outcome for mankind after its mortal passage has been concluded, and upon its part in enriching the meaning of lives lived before one were born. This, our fundamental self-interest in the consequences for mankind of our having lived, is the only standpoint of cognitive reference, the which defines persons impassioned to discover the nature of that interest which is common “to ourselves and our Posterity.” Only citizens agapically impassioned, so, are qualified to judge matters according to the constitutional law upon which the U.S. Federal republic was founded.

The individual comes with no built-in advantages for this mortal labor, except the developable powers associated with *imago Dei*, *capax Dei*, and, above all else, *agapē*. The natural right of such an individual, is that his or her potential of this sort be developed, expressed in a suitable way, beneficial to the society, and that the good he or she might bequeath, thus, be defended to the benefit of that society’s Posterity. That manner of living, is Leibniz’s state of *happiness*. That can be found in many vocations. In the best of circumstances, each individual must find that choice of vocation for himself, or herself. The function of society is to keep open the doors which permit every young and adult citizen to access, and practice such a vocation.

To the degree, that this individual passing through mortal life, might be developed into an adult personality which grasps the point we have just made, that individual is morally qualified as a citizen. The many such citizens, are each characterized by that same ordering principle which must govern the sovereign conscience of the sovereign nation-state’s unity as a virtual personality, thus bringing coherence between the Many self-governed and the One government by means of which their vital interest is represented.

All among these colligating considerations, are underlain by a deeper ordering principle, an ordering principle of the type which Plato associates with *hypothesizing the higher hypothesis*,

---

<sup>37</sup> Euphemistically said: “the felicific calculus.” Bentham’s idea of a “Newtonian calculus” of morals is, most immediately, the joint work of the Conti salons’ Giammaria Ortes (the originator of the Malthus hoax) and Pierre-Louis Maupertuis. The British East India Company’s Haileybury School of economics (Adam Smith, Thomas Malthus, David Ricardo, *et al.*), and also the French-Swiss (Lausanne: Léon Walras) and later Austro-Hungarian (von Mises, Von Neumann, *et al.*) positivist schools of political-economy, are also direct outgrowths of the same work of Ortes and Maupertuis on which Bentham premised his “hedonistic calculus.” In fact, the principal axiomatic fallacy of all of today’s generally accepted classroom and textbook economics, all systems analysis and “information theory” included, is derived from this Maupertuis-Ortes root.

and Leibniz with the term *Analysis Situs*.<sup>38</sup> the necessity for increase of mankind's dominion over the universe in which our species is located, with which mankind interacts. This requires not only an inviolably axiomatic devotion to realizing scientific and technological progress, furthering thus the potential relative population-density of our species within the Solar System, and beyond; it requires the continued development of those forms of art which are known as Classical, in the sense of Classical Athens, art which celebrates and fosters the joyful excitation of *agapē* within the individual mind. Unless we submit to that underlying ordering-principle, our nation, perhaps even our species, will not survive.

The Enlightenment would have it otherwise. Its image of man is Hobbesian, Lockean, the disgusting image of man in Mandeville, Adam Smith, and Jeremy Bentham, the so-called materialist image. This is not an academic issue; it is a statement of axiomatic social policy of practice. In that image, the usurious lust of a Marquis de Sade, Voltaire, Wall Street speculator, or the social order inhering axiomatically in all empires modelled upon the paradigm of ancient Babylon and Rome, requires victims, many victims, thus to satisfy an order of society pleasing to devotees of Adam Smith and Speaker Newt Gingrich: in which, in effect, ninety-five percent of those who are permitted to live are milked, laden, harnessed, and culled, as cattle might be, as were, in fact, the African-American "property" under the perverse, Lockean constitution of the C.S.A.

The unfortunate thing, is that in every typical course and textbook provided in universities today, the method which is employed, whether in social studies, in political science so-called, in economics, in history, even in grammar, in mathematics, and so on, is the method premised on the false, underlying assumptions of the Enlightenment. One sees the ugly face of the Enlightenment worn, like gargoyle masks, by the talking heads on the Sunday morning TV "talk-shows." One sees the false-to-humanity scenarios of the Enlightenment, acted out, on stage, before camera, in all varieties of modern popular entertainments. The so-called "news media" purport to explain almost any incident according to the algebra of the Enlightenment view of man and nature.

Thus, we have come around to the opening clause of the U.S. *Declaration of Independence*: "When in the Course of human events, it becomes necessary..." In "the Course of human events," we have come again to such a time, as that of which Solon sought to warn the

---

<sup>38</sup> Given an anti-entropic, Riemann series of successive, experimentally validated, mutually inconsistent hypotheses (e.g., physical space-time curvatures), ordered respectively according to increased formal cardinality. The ordering principle corresponding to the anti-entropy of that series, lies outside, and above the domain of any deductive mathematical derivations, within the domain which Leibniz sometimes identified by the term *Analysis Situs*. In Plato's writings, *Analysis Situs* lies above the domain of hypotheses, such as that set of interdependent definitions, axioms, and postulates which underlies a Euclidean geometry, in the domain of higher ordering-principles governing sequences of hypotheses: *higher hypothesis*.

Athenians, by his writing of his constitutional poem. Our *Declaration of Independence* and *Constitution* were created out of the struggle to arouse the people of North America against the degradation which the British monarchy had deployed to corrupt the morals and economy of the colonies. Once we had won our Federal republic, the problem seen by our Solon, Benjamin Franklin, was “how to keep it.” Franklin, like Solon, foresaw the danger, that a time would come when the people of the United States might lapse into a form of moral decay such as that from which they had once freed themselves in a perilous struggle against their London oppressor. So, indeed, into such peril our nation was plunged by the moral degradation which gave birth to the C.S.A., a degradation from which we rescued ourselves at the price of a hideous Civil War. So, indeed, have we backslid again, today, into a far more perilous predicament than that of 1861–1865, not only for our republic, but, this time, for civilization as a whole.

The passage, “When, in the Course of human events,...,” must be read, in such contexts as these, as having a Riemannian quality of scientific specificity. History is distinguished by breaking-points in culture and related institutions. These discontinuities are marked chiefly by the combination of some devastating paradox with either an appropriate solution, or the tragedy ensuing from the failure, or refusal to develop that available solution. Human knowledge is thus defined, in all respects, as the contemporary individual's cumulative replication of the paradoxes, and solutions, or want of employed solutions, which distinguish many such breaking-points in the discernible history of mankind and mankind's ideas to date. Solon's poem reflects upon that scientific principle, in its role as a constitutional principle of statecraft.

It is solely from that scientific vantage point, that a competent historical reading of constitutional intent might be situated and derived.

Today's popular and so-called learned opinions, alike, are imbued with an underlying misconception of the human individual, and mankind's relationship to nature, which is wicked; these opinions fall upon the ear, like passing footsteps of a culture marching toward its doom. It was against precisely that march toward doom, that a wiser generation of leading American patriots, like Solon before them, set forth the now-neglected *Constitution* on which this nation achieved great things, but now no more. Against such a perilous time, the founders of our Federal republic provided the *Constitution* for whose intent justices such as Rehnquist and Scalia have appointed themselves official grave-diggers.

### *The Soviet Comparison*

The crisis before us, is not merely a U.S. crisis, but a global one, which requires a global solution. The standpoint which this writer puts forward, as the premise for the solution, is

the standpoint of the U.S. *Constitution*, on the condition that the actual content of that Constitution's crucial features be accurately apprehended. There should be no doubt that the revival of those constitutional principles is indispensable for the U.S. itself. The same is easily shown, as the U.S.'s celebrated James G. Blaine would agree, for the other states of the Americas. For Germany, France, Italy, and so on, the same general observation would be more or less readily accepted by anyone who has recognized the profundity and onrush of the present global crisis. The exemplary question implicitly so posed, is: What of other regions of the world? The former Soviet Union, for example?

The passing of the institution of the neighborhood's backyard henhouses, has deprived our citizenry of a once valuable source of insights into certain forms of human behavior. So, today, silly people flutter, clutter, and squawk, as might chickens occupied by an hysterical wish not to see the shadow of a hawk over the henhouse. They were ecstatic when they saw that the Berlin Wall had fallen (and the Soviet system, too). Now, they wish to delude themselves, as fowl opinion is wont to do, that the collapse of the once-feared Soviet power means, that the system based upon "free trade," is thus vindicated, unchallenged by no credible, remaining danger. Contrary to chicken-witted certitudes, the recent collapse of the Soviet system is the mirror of the immediate future of this planet, the immediate future of the "free trade" system, most emphatically.

Meanwhile, recent years' experience has impressed upon a rapidly increasing ration of the populations of Russia and Ukraine, for example, the most devout wish that they had the Soviet economic system back. For a moment, they, as people of an implicitly defeated nation, had wished to find careers within the world order of the occupying power, the financier oligarchy behind the UNO's International Monetary Fund (IMF). They found that they had been truly admitted to the Western order of things, the crime-boss-run "informal economy" of the IMF's "Third World" slum-district.

The relevant point here, is that there is a common constitutional principle lodged in the ironical juxtaposition, during the past thirty years' "Course of human events," of the approximately simultaneous spiral of internal collapse within both of the interacting, and convergent, Western and Soviet economic systems. To adduce the solution to that apparent paradox, we must situate the trends of the recent thirty years within the larger, global context of the recent, 1946–1996 interval as a whole. Both systems have enjoyed comparable successes, at the same time they were preparing their commonly impending doom; rigorous attention to those ironical juxtapositions is indispensable, as a source of insight into the right constitutional choices of pathway toward economic recovery.

The comparable successes are those which were developed within the interaction of a relatively universalized scientific education with the "military, scientific-industrial complex"

of both of the principal adversarial alliances. In other words, the combined economic and military successes achieved within that “complex,” through the forced-draft mobilization of the relevant strategic machine-tool-design sector. Relative to the pre-1976 U.S. economy, the Soviet failures lay in the resistance, from within the bureaucracies of the large state civilian-sector enterprises, to assimilating the spill-over of advanced technologies into the general practice of basic economic infrastructure, agriculture, and manufacturing.<sup>39</sup> The relevant, commonly shared, potentially fatal delusion, respecting the private capitalist corporation, on both sides of the pre-1989–1991 East-West divide, was the shared acceptance of the Hobbes-Locke-Smith-Bentham view, the British Mont Pelerin Society’s fanatical delusion, that the secret of success in private capitalist enterprise, is the miracles which might be wrought by random walks through the trackless jungles of individual human greed.

The secret of the successful U.S., privately owned, capitalist enterprise, was always the proper relationship between the leadership of the closely held middle-industry enterprise, and the impetus of scientific and technological progress supplied to such enterprises through the mediation of the strategic machine-tool-design sector.<sup>40</sup> The problem for the Soviet system was that aspect of Soviet ideology’s anti-voluntarist, “objective,” “materialist” conception of individual human nature, which Marx and other relevant influences adopted as followers of the English-French Enlightenment.<sup>41</sup> For that reason, in the Soviet system, as in the Twentieth-Century U.S.A. (for example), all significant investment in scientific and technological progress tends to be suppressed, except as otherwise dictated by the imperatives of preparation for, and conduct of general annihilation-warfare among principal powers.<sup>42</sup>

Unless, and until Russia, Ukraine, and relevant other nations dump the anti-Christian, Enlightenment dogma respecting individual human nature, which is the common coin of Bentham, Plekhanov, the Mont Pelerin Society, Justice Scalia, and Michael Novak, and

---

<sup>39</sup> Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr., “Return to the Machine-Tool Principle,” *loc. cit.*

<sup>40</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>41</sup> The most singular irony of Soviet history is, that as the defeated Mensheviks insisted, V.I. Lenin had won by “cheating,” by acting on a *voluntarist* principle, thus violating the rule of so-called “orthodox Marxist” “historical objectivity” required by the solemn, Hegelian hesychasts George Plekhanov and Karl Kautsky. So, the principal strategic-economic successes of the Soviet system, in the strategic machine-tool-design sector of the Soviet military scientific-industrial military complex, and in the very establishment of the Soviet state (by Lenin), depended upon the Soviet system’s sly overlooking of its own Benthamite, Enlightenment principle of “objective historical determinism.”

<sup>42</sup> The term “annihilation,” as indicating a category of military policy, is employed here in the sense stipulated by Alfred (Graf) von Schlieffen, *Cannae*. It signifies, as General Douglas MacArthur’s brilliant execution of 1942–1945 exemplifies this, not the annihilation of people, but, rather, the annihilation of an adversary power’s war-fighting capability. The term “wars of annihilation” is to be read as the antonym for “Eighteenth-Century cabinet warfare.” The distinction between the two kinds of warfare applies to both “regular warfare,” and such forms of “irregular warfare” as revolutions.

accept what we have identified as that alternative, Renaissance, “voluntarist” conception of individual human nature, commonly expressed in the achievements associated with the military-centered, strategic machine-tool-design sector of both the pre-Malthusian U.S.A. and former Soviet Union, there could be no sustainable economic recovery, either in the U.S.A., for example, or the territory of the former Soviet Union and its former Comecon partners.

The characteristic motivation of the successfully developed individual human personality, is not greed, nor any other expression of Hobbes’ and Locke’s Seven (and more) Deadly Sins. The characteristic motivation is that associated with validated revolutionary discoveries of principle (and student’s reenactment of such discoveries) in science, in Classical forms of art, and in the employment of the same motive, and the same cognitive faculties for the practice of statecraft. On that account, the U.S. Federal *Constitution*, was then, and remains today, the model instrument for constructing those global, ecumenical agreements among sovereign nation-states, the which are urgently wanted now, to rescue this planet from an otherwise inevitable, early plunge into a prolonged, planet-wide “New Dark Age.”