

Die Euro Lüge: Capitalism & Its Law

by Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.

December 12, 2007

*[Published in **Executive Intelligence Review**, Volume 35, Number 1, January 4, 2008. View [PDF of original](#) at the LaRouche Library.]*

Germany's Professor Wilhelm Hankel is among a few of his nation's senior-ranking economists, and also other influentials, who led a rear-guard effort to prevent that disaster which was unleashed by Germany's consent to the replacement of its then sovereign currency, the Deutschemark. This attempted ruin of Germany was conducted by the instrument of a virtual post-modernist Tower of Babel, the strategic concoction known as the intrinsically very inflationary, presently collapsing Euro.¹

What the imposition of the Euro did, among its other leading, malicious effects for continental Europe, was to destroy the existing sovereign mechanisms by which Germany's national banking system, in particular, could defend itself against the rape which the introduction of the Euro has accomplished.

Partly as a consequence of the introduction of that Euro, a much, much greater crash than even notable opponents of the change to the Euro had justly feared back then, was delivered, on a global scale, beginning approximately the end of this past July. As I stated in my international webcast at that time, on or about the date of my July 25th, international webcast, the world had already entered a definitive form of general breakdown-crisis of the existing world monetary system. Since that date, that breakdown has already triggered a presently escalating, terrible acceleration of inflation, which, combined with catastrophic erasures of nominal banking and related capital, in

¹ The Euro as a single currency to replace the national currencies of the European Union member countries was decided with the signing of the Treaty of Maastricht in February 1992. The Euro plan was ratified a few years after, for example by Germany in Spring 1998. From January 2000 on, the Euro served as an interbank trading unit, and two years later became the daily currency of the European Union. Prof. Wilhelm Hankel and three other leading professors of economic theory and law (Nölling, Starbatty, and Schachtschneider) filed a complaint against the Euro to the Federal Constitutional Court of Germany in January 1998, to prevent its ratification by the German parliament, but the Court turned the complaint down. The ratification was hurried through shortly thereafter. Because of the inflationary pressure the new currency has generated since, the majority of Europeans to this day have not accepted it, and in Germany, almost two thirds of the population would prefer to have the old currency, the German Mark, back. In that sense, Hankel and his co-plaintiffs have been vindicated in their resistance against the Euro.

the order of more than \$1 trillions thus far, has unleashed a crisis of the type which should remind today's senior economists and other historians of the situation which existed during the late 1923 Weimar Germany.

The present breakdown is no longer merely a threat; the great crash of 2007, which is of orders of magnitude greater than the famous crash of October 1929, is, as I have just indicated, already an accomplished fact, as of approximately this past July 25th, 2007. The trans-Atlantic economies have already been hit, first and hardest, that since the immediate aftermath of this past July 25th; but, awful effects on the East and South Asian economies are now also threatened to come with early, and increasingly brutal blows.

The crucial fact, which must be emphasized here, is, that the present crash is not something which might happen. The crash has now already occurred; it happened, as I have just emphasized, during the last week of July; that crash now grips the crashing world monetary-financial system. The ensuing, widening waves of breakdown of the world's present monetary-financial system, are to be recognized as the reverberating after-shocks of the great, global earthquake which has already happened.

*That now just collapsed monetary system, can not be saved; it must be replaced. Without an urgently needed change in the monetary system itself, the entire world system would now have entered a terminal phase of sheer disintegration, or, perhaps, something worse, something out of the pages of the avowed English fascist H.G. Wells' early 1930s **The Shape of Things To Come**.*

Such are the reflections of some of the more notable among the sundry effects which the adoption of the Euro did not cause, but to whose eruption it has contributed significantly. Professor Hankel's new book has begun with a prefatory review of the kinds of political lies deployed in aid of bringing about a crucially significant, contributing factor in the presently ongoing general breakdown-crisis, the contributing role of the disastrous dumping of the Mark for the Euro.² He has concluded the book, appropriately, on a relevant positive theme, in the second of two, appended closing chapters, his epilogue, with a chapter titled "Capitalism & Its Law."

Certain selected matters, if only a few among those either treated, or implied by the content of the Professor's book, receive my special attention here. I choose my subjects with two leading concerns in view: to save Europe, even from itself, and to take the occasion of Professor Hankel's relevant concerns, to pound some sense into a presently disastrous, onrushing general election campaign inside the U.S.A. My concern is, principally, certain, selected, deeper implications of the matter which Professor Hankel addresses. Otherwise, the book speaks well enough for itself to the German readers who still have the means to purchase a copy.

² Wilhelm Hankel, **Die EURO Lüge: eine volkswirtschaftliche Märchen** (Wien: Signum, 2007).

For the benefit of the historian and of the leading political figures of today's world generally, the issue which Professor Hankel's new book poses, from its preface to its close, is the issue of some of those presently, extremely relevant social-political phenomena which have contributed to triggering not only the present crash of the Euro itself, but more. That issue which he poses, is, in point of historical fact: his identification of a pack of popularized lies which is to be recognized by Classical historians as the expression of a modern form of *Sophistry, a Sophistry*, whose effects, reaching far beyond the problem of the Euro itself, are now, already coming down upon today's modern, globally extended form of European civilization. The included result is a suffering which, unless prevented by drastic reforms, would soon be as bad, or perhaps soon worse, than that which felled the self-doomed Greece of the ancient Pericles.

To assist today's observer in grasping the import of that present, actually global crisis, we must draw upon the wisdom of Germany's greatest modern poet, dramatist, philosopher, and historian, Friedrich Schiller, who defined known European history as a single whole, as the unfolding of a great conflict, which must be traced as continuing across the intervening millennia since the conflict between the Delphic tradition of Lycurgus' Sparta and the spirit of the reforms led by Solon of Athens.

As Plato had emphasized, it was the influence of the Delphic cult of Sophistry on the Athens of Pericles and his followers, which not only induced the self-inflicted ruin of the Athens of that time, but, which is a Sophistry which, in the name of contemporary philosophical Liberalism, typifies, again, for us, today, the form of recurring, long-ranging corruption threatening the now globally extended reach of European civilization. Such is the relevant experience which is to be recalled now from that time under Pericles, then, to its effect on world-wide European civilization, its cultures, and its catastrophes, today.

As Professor Hankel's prefatory chapter illustrates the point for our contemporary historians, we are experiencing what he describes there, as, in fact, the effects of a political Sophistry like that, including the folly of the Peloponnesian War, which ruined Pericles' Athens, as this heritage is typified by the character of the existentialists' style of the lies used to promote Germany's ruinous acquiescence to the Euro. Such is the way in which a modern form of the same ancient tradition of Sophistry, has fostered the willful self-destruction of today's economies of western and central Europe, and also the Americas, that over the course of these recent decades. That threat to trans-Atlantic civilization, unless halted now, is now actually a pandemic threat of general physical-economic collapse to civilization world-wide.

Although Professor Hankel and I are in obvious agreement in much of our respective views of these matters of political-economy, it is a quality of agreement ironically typical of most

truthful accounts of the entire known history of crises of civilizations: that, the Professor and I share a certain relevant difference in our respective choices of standpoint used to shape the way we, respectively, but otherwise similarly, read the decades which span the temporary success of the original Bretton Woods, fixed-exchange-rate, monetary reforms, that over the interval between 1944–45 and the assassination of U.S. President John F. Kennedy.

So, on this account, Professor Hankel, for his part, takes John Maynard Keynes' 1944 proposal to the Bretton Woods conference as his choice for the genesis of the post-1944 world monetary system; I, for my part, take a different standpoint, rooted in those notions of physical economy traced from Gottfried Leibniz's concept of physical economy which informed President Franklin Roosevelt's approach, rather than monetary economy.

These latter notions, which I represent, most notably, today, are associated historically with the North American luminaries among the followers of Gottfried Leibniz's conception of a science of physical economy (or, credit system), rather than a monetary system. My views in respect to this matter have been those shared with such creators of the American System of political-economy as Cotton Mather, Benjamin Franklin, Treasury Secretary Alexander Hamilton, Mathew Carey, and the latter's celebrated son, Henry C. Carey. The gem of beauty in all this, is the deliciously ironical fact, for Professor Hankel's Germany, that, in Chancellor Otto von Bismarck's time, as for now, that it was Henry Carey who played a direct role, during his late 1870s visit to Germany, in the context of Germany's adoption of those brilliantly successful social and economic reforms, by Bismarck, which drove the uncle of the Kaiser, Britain's Prince of Wales, into the fits of rage which generated what is called World War I.³

To summarize the most relevant of the differences between the two systems as simply as possible: *the U.S. Federal Constitution treats money as a creation and subject of the state; whereas, the European parliamentary systems of government usually treat the state itself relatively as Keynes does (and the European Union does in the extreme today), as the mere hod-carrier of money, even merely fictitious money.*

³ Contrary to much rumor, both inside the U.S.A. and abroad, Franklin Roosevelt was a fully witting, and, essentially, a concurring descendant of his ancestor Isaac Roosevelt, the latter a New York banker personally allied with Alexander Hamilton, and against the Aaron Burr who was directly an agent of the British Foreign Office's spy master Jeremy Bentham. With the assassination of U.S. President McKinley, and Presidencies of such devotees of the Confederacy tradition as Theodore Roosevelt and Woodrow Wilson, the American System tradition underlying the U.S. Federal Constitution's economic and monetary policies, was both undermined and suppressed, in favor of London's dictates, until the election of Franklin Roosevelt. Few among Europeans living today have acquired personal knowledge of these issues which were of primary importance during the great struggles of the Eighteenth and Nineteenth centuries, and are still today.

As a practical matter, despite such differences between Professor Hankel's view of the matter and my own, there is a certain large degree of what should be recognized as a remarkable coincidence. That coincidence, as Professor Hankel makes the point plainly enough, lies in our shared moral view on achieving the desired human outcome for society of the management of the respective economic systems.

In the meantime, the persistence of that indicated difference in method of financial systems itself, is rooted essentially in the contrast between the presently continuing design of the parliamentary traditions of the principal governments of Europe, on his side, and the presidential form of the constitutional American system, on mine.

Notably, under U.S. constitutional law, the very existence of central banking institutions independent of supervisory control by elected government, has been an anathema to our actually thinking varieties of U.S. patriots. Under our patriots' reading of actual U.S. constitutional law, the national currency is under the direction and control of the Federal Executive, but only with the consent of the Congress, especially that of the House of Representatives. The crucial difference between the two systems is, that *the U.S. constitutional system (when not violated) is a Federal credit system, rather than a European monetarist style in globalist forms of implicitly finance-imperialist, neo-Venetian monetary systems.*

There have been hybrids, European hybrids, most notably, which combine elements of parliamentary and U.S.-style Presidential systems. A most notable example of this, is the founding of Germany's Kreditanstalt für Wiederaufbau [Reconstruction Finance Agency], an institution with which Professor Hankel has been associated. That Kreditanstalt has been a wonderfully successful innovation in its time, an institution whose design reflected the model based on study, by Hermann Abs, *et al.*, of experience of U.S. practice under President Franklin Roosevelt. Explicit German receptivity for that hybrid, is rooted as far back in the history of the two republics, as the trans-Atlantic role of the Marquis de Lafayette's German-American protégé Friedrich List.⁴ However, for obvious reasons, where parliamentary systems prevail, rather than the U.S. constitutional model, Keynes' doctrinal influence tends to prevail in shaping opinion today, as it does for Professor Hankel's inside view of the Bretton Woods proceedings.

⁴ The U.S. institution which sponsored Friedrich List's entry into the U.S.A. was the same Society of the Cincinnati which, as a private association of U.S. Revolutionary War officers and their primary heirs, conducted the most significant foreign intelligence, and counter-intelligence functions of that period of U.S. history. With the deaths of other original founders of the Society, such as the Alexander Hamilton shot by British agent and American traitor Aaron Burr, the Marquis de Lafayette performed a crucial function for the Society during the mid-1820s and slightly beyond. The curious circumstances of the death of List, following a visit with the English, are notable in this respect.

For the purposes implicit in the presently onrushing global monetary breakdown-crisis, proper attention to certain important matters presented in Professor Hankel's new book, should be focused on the way the two different systems, a U.S. style of constitutional credit system as contrasted with a monetary system rooted in a modern evolution of European parliamentary systems, once did, and still could cohabit efficiently within a single globally extended, political-economic domain among respectively sovereign nation-states.

It must be continually emphasized, again, that, at the present moment, the world is gripped by a global monetary-financial crisis with marked similarities, on a world scale, to the predicament which gripped a then relatively isolated Weimar Germany, during the latter half of 1923. It is therefore most notable, that there is no miraculously benevolent Dawes-Plan gold to supervise the looting of what had been the stalwart economic middle class of Germany of that time. Who shall pay the imposed war-debts, or their Maastricht equivalent, under the present conditions of a global monetary-financial breakdown-crisis, as now?

Under the particular conditions of the presently onrushing collapse of the world's monetary-financial systems, the crucially important issue associated with that distinction between a parliamentary and a true Presidential system akin to that of the U.S.A., is that the American System, provides an inherently available remedy for the presently onrushing collapse of the present world monetary-financial relationships. Whereas, present systems of western and central Europe do not. It is a remedy like that of the international monetary reform launched for a post-war world under President Franklin Roosevelt; whereas, the European parliamentary model, such as the Keynesian model as such, does not.

That, for us today, as for Germany's Hermann Abs in his post-war time, there is a remedy in the tradition of President Franklin Roosevelt's use of the 1944–1945 world-primacy of the U.S. credit system's dollar, to establish the fixed-exchange-rate system needed for the combined purposes which include the rescue of a chiefly self-ruined "Old Europe." That lesson from history was also, and remains, still today, the key for promoting the rise of modern, truly sovereign nation-states, in places where the past European reign over colonies or semi-colonies had ruled and ruined, as, once again, in the great crimes against the sovereignty of the nations of Africa today.

1. The Trans-Atlantic Legacy

To reach a competently systemic, global outlook on certain important matters of principles of economic policy which Professor Hankel references, it is essential to clear away some currently popular, simplistic opinion respecting the U.S.A. and its relations to Europe, a

body of erring opinion which pollutes currently prevalent expressions of influential opinion on both sides of the Atlantic, and beyond.

There could be no competent insight into the essential features of the way in which the present crisis came into being, without first recognizing the fact, that the policy of the Truman Administration, toward both the U.S.A. itself and to the world at large, especially toward the colonial and semi-colonial regions, expressed an intention which was directly the opposite to the war-time policies, and post-war intentions of President Franklin Roosevelt, including the intention embedded in President Roosevelt's sponsoring the Bretton Woods agreements. Roosevelt explicitly disagreed with the finance-imperialist outlook of Britain's Keynes on the design for the post-war world—although, manifestly, President Harry Truman, admittedly, did agree with Churchill's view on these matters.

Roosevelt's conception of the post-war world, was the elimination of the British Empire, to the advantage of a world system of national sovereignties, including the sovereign physical development of former colonies and semi-colonies; Truman's conception was, on the contrary, crafted to support the British Empire, a U.S. subordination, under Truman, to a commonality of interests of the U.S.A.'s financier oligarchy with that of the British Empire, in respect to the British system's organic character as an empire of the neo-Venetian style of imperial Anglo-Dutch financier Liberalism.

In short, President Truman's role as an opponent of President Franklin Roosevelt and Roosevelt's legacy, was to entrench a post-World War II dogma which became known as "Atlanticism." That role of Atlanticism has been, repeatedly, the Anglo-American curse which continental Europe has suffered since that time. On this account, it is essential to recall, and study the innovative approach by U.S. President Eisenhower to France's President de Gaulle, and a similar, exploratory thrust by Eisenhower and Kennedy toward both de Gaulle's France and the Adenauer factor in Germany; these outreaches were among virtually the last gasps of an effort from certain leading circles of the Americas and Europe, as typified by Presidents Eisenhower and Kennedy, to bring the noxious habit of "Atlanticism" to a close.

That must be recognized as the meaning of the repeated attempted assassinations of President Charles de Gaulle, the orchestrated "Profumo" scandal which brought down Britain's Macmillan government, the hastened retirement of Germany's Konrad Adenauer (as if by a knife thrust Liberally in his political back), Bertrand Russell's rotten role in the great missiles-crisis of 1962, and the assassination of President Kennedy in November 1963.

To understand the global turning-point of the interval from Sputnik through the onset of the U.S. war in Indo-China, we must recognize the fact, that Truman's "Atlanticist" policy

echoed the world view of the same, allied New York and London financier interests which had, even biologically, fully backed the earlier rise to power of both the Mussolini and Hitler dictatorships.

Under prodding by President Franklin Roosevelt, London finance had temporarily changed course, to come away from its original support for Mussolini and Hitler, and to oppose those dictators; but, once Hitler and Mussolini were gone, and President Franklin Roosevelt “safely out of the way,” the quarrelsome ties to London of American-Tory-infested Manhattan financier circles, resumed their formerly pro-fascist ties to and rivalries with the Fabian and relevant other playmates in the City of London. The continuation of “Atlanticism” was a product of this latter turn against the Franklin Roosevelt legacy.

Thus, nonetheless, the Bretton Woods system of the 1945–1970 aftermath of the death of President Franklin Roosevelt, had retained many important features of the original Bretton Woods design; but, with the assassination of President John F. Kennedy, that remaining element of the Roosevelt legacy was also virtually doomed. The long, wasting war in Indo-China, the rise of the wrecking-role of the crazed and violence-prone “68ers,” and the drive toward fascism expressed by the forces controlling the U.S. Richard Nixon Administration and the Trilateral Commission, have both wrecked both the U.S. and continental European economy from within, and put both on a course toward global Hell: unless action is taken now to reverse that post-1963 trend.

So, today, only the reawakening of the deeply embedded legacy of the American System of political-economy, as typified by the Presidency of Franklin Roosevelt, presents a credible strategic option for escaping a rather immediate plunge of our planet as a whole, escaping such horrors as becoming the virtual Hell of former Vice-President Al Gore’s version of both a crumbling, globalized, tumbling Tower of Babble, and a matching flight into the veritable Cities of the Plain.

So, to summarize this important point of qualification: although essential elements of the U.S.A. role in relations with western Europe, and many other places, continued, for a while, partially in the general direction which President Franklin Roosevelt had intended, until the aftermath of the assassination of U.S. President John F. Kennedy.

Therefore, on background: Roosevelt’s successor, President Harry S Truman, had introduced what was to prove, over time, as a great, and potentially fatal flaw in U.S. policymaking: the corrupting influence of Truman’s wicked Churchill fantasy. Under the influence of chiefly the financier interests of the United Kingdom and the Netherlands, the post-Franklin Roosevelt U.S.A. became, more and more, a promoter of the resuscitation of the inherently

corrupt intentions of the political and economic power of the leading European imperialist powers of the pre-war period.

Under the Truman legacy, the newly “independent” African states emerging over the course of post-war decades, for example, were permitted to (*almost!*) have their own governments, but not the freedom of those governments to rule—not to the present day! The monetary system, run as a joint enterprise centered in lower Manhattan and London, retained its imperial control by aid of the alternatives of corruption and brute force, including means adopted from the traditions of imperial Rome, such as assassinations, from about the moment of Truman’s inauguration, through the present day.

Since the Kennedy Assassination

The shock-effects produced, and probably also intended, by the assassination of President Kennedy, drove the U.S. political process into a madness reminiscent of what had been the worst impulses of the Harry S Truman Administration.⁵ The U.S. Senate vote for the fraudulent Gulf of Tonkin resolution—contrary to the policy of President Kennedy, and contrary to the counsel of no lesser rank than that of the leading veterans of World War II, Generals of the Armies Dwight Eisenhower and Douglas MacArthur—has sent the U.S., since, toward ruin, repeatedly, as if habitually, over the sweep of the 1964–2007 interval to date, that in ways reminiscent of the self-inflicted doom of Pericles’ Athens in the Peloponnesian War.

It must not be forgotten, that apart from the evils which have taken over leading U.S. policy since the assassination of President Kennedy, that the U.S. had previously undergone long waves of corruption under, mainly, among those of its earlier Presidents who were not assassinated or similarly removed from office, or election to that office, as during the bleak interval from the election of the always treacherous scoundrel Andrew Jackson, until President Abraham Lincoln, and, similarly, from the assassination of President William McKinley until the inauguration of President Franklin Roosevelt. Great U.S. Presidents have been the exceptions to our menaced republic’s otherwise apparently habitual practice of top-down rule by folly, as has been the similar pattern also among the crowned and other heads and also virtually headless alike, of Russian and other European states.

This pattern has not been accidental. Only those who have become sufficiently matured in their thinking, to the point of conceiving of the dynamically functional unity of full sweep of

⁵ The absolutely unwarranted nuclear bombing of two cities of an already defeated Japan, was the first major signal of Truman’s intention to be rid of General MacArthur, and of Truman’s obscene attachment to Winston Churchill and to the “world government through preventive nuclear war” doctrine of Britain’s Bertrand Russell.

the millennial history of European civilization since Thales, Solon of Athens, the Pythagoreans, and Plato, as in the terms specified by Friedrich Schiller, are truly qualified to understand the crisis which menaces the continued existence of European civilization, from within, as a whole today.

Men and women are not members of the animal species (the *Biosphere*); they are members of a higher order of existence, the *Noösphere*, that in the sense that the first Chapter of *Genesis* specifies. They are in the likeness of the Creator, as no animal could be, and are endowed with both creative-mental powers, and related missions in the universe, missions which no lower form of life could express.

Such men and women express the principle of the *Noösphere*, as this distinction, rigorously defined by Nicholas of Cusa in his *De Docta Ignorantia*, defined Cusa's launching of what became the modern European experimental science of such explicit followers of Cusa as Luca Pacioli, Leonardo da Vinci, the exploring sea-captain Christopher Columbus, and, as Albert Einstein was to emphasize later, the unique founder of modern universal physical science, Johannes Kepler. Creativity, as typified by the method of such successors of Cusa as Kepler, Fermat, Leibniz, Gauss, and Bernhard Riemann, and Einstein himself, defines the human individual as a potential representative of an immortal species, whose members' active role in the history of all mankind does not end with their death as mortal beings.

The only true histories are those of the struggles for the progress generated only by the creative powers of the individual representative of mankind, and of the universe as a whole. History is therefore *dynamic*, that, as Leibniz insisted, in the sense of the ancient Pythagoreans' and Plato's use of *dynamis*, and Leibniz's anti-Cartesian conception of *dynamics*. Thus, on this account, the history of European civilization, as known to us since Thales, Heraclitus, the Pythagoreans, and Plato, is a dynamic unity in that sense. We are, thus, interactive, within the terms of those dynamics, reflections of an indicated thousands of years span of the ebbs and flows of European civilization as a whole, as Friedrich Schiller made this concept of history explicit in such locations as his celebrated Jena lectures.

That essential element of chronic disposition for failure in modern European civilization thus far, is therefore expressed as the effects of those oligarchical forms of social and economic policies which insist on the populist forms of the suppression of that quality of man and women specified in the first Chapter of Genesis, a suppression undertaken by means of an imposed dumbing-down, as in the post-war Germany suppression of the revived Humboldt reforms of education, imposed upon the great majority of their own nations' populations.

Although this modern practice has rarely gone to the extremes of a cult of the Olympian Zeus, the fact of such a tendency toward evil persists throughout modern European

civilization, except where evil has achieved almost absolute control, as in the Spanish, Portuguese, Dutch, and British finance-capital's promotion of the international slave and opium trade.

Modernist trends in influential periodical literature, and related post-1945 trends such as those of Europe's Congress for Cultural Freedom (CCF), have promoted cultural trends aimed to affect the dumbing down of the intellects and morals of larger, and still larger rations of contemporary generations.

Instances such as what I have just referenced as the destruction of the Classical humanist education programs in post-1945 Germany by anti-rational cults such as the existentialists of the Heidegger, Adorno, Arendt, Brecht type, and the related promotion of intellectual and moral degeneracy by the already referenced Congress for Cultural Freedom (CCF) and the pollutions of morals and minds in Theodor Adorno and Hannah Arendt's *The Authoritarian Personality*, typify that systemic dumbing-down of popularized cultures, and, by implications, a corrosive dumbing-down of the U.S. and European populations at large, which has eroded the political competence, even the bare rationality of most of those populations.

The result of such brutishly corrupting policies of practice, has been the recurring pattern of moral and intellectual degradation of the majority of the political class of our populations. It is chiefly by that degradation, that nations have been controlled.

Until we develop the great majority of our citizenries to become the composition of our reigning moral and intellectual elite, as Germany's post-Hitler revival of the Humboldt program attempted to do this until the existentialist cult of the CCF *et al.* took over, the progress, now, even the existence of civilization itself continues to be an uncertain proposition.

The American System

From our founding as a constitutional republic which was opposed, constitutionally, to the oligarchical legacies still deeply rooted in Europe, there has been a factor of trans-Atlantic coincidence between the history of Europe and North America. That coincidence had persisted since Christopher Columbus' reading from the testament of Cardinal Nicholas of Cusa, had inspired Columbus to the effect of prompting him to cross the Atlantic as soon as he had the means to do so, about two decades later. This, the consequent legacy of what had been specified by Cusa, began to be built up in places such as the Seventeenth-Century New England of the Winthrops and Mathers.

The leading immigrants into what was to become the territory of the U.S.A., were not desperate refugees, but men and women of sturdy character and dedication, seeking to bring the best of the cultural heritage of Europe to a place, at a much needed, relative distance from oligarchy-ridden Europe, to a place in the Americas where the best of European culture might flourish, as did many who fled the evil of Spain of the Inquisition with similar intentions. This specifically American expression of the European heritage, rooted in the injunction by Cusa, not the spillovers of brutish, hate-filled religious cults from Europe, became the essentially positive distinction of the American character.

Unfortunately, a significant quotient of usurious interest and of Europe's export of religious fanatics, followed the founders of the new nations westward across the Atlantic, throughout the Americas. The products of this flood of the old corruption pouring out of Europe, included, most notably, the fostering of such assets of Jeremy Bentham's and Lord Palmerston's British Foreign Office as the family of the American traitor Aaron Burr, as also U.S. Presidents Andrew Jackson of "Trail of Tears" notoriety, as also Martin van Buren, Polk, Pierce, Buchanan, and such heirs of Lord Palmerston's Confederacy project as Theodore Roosevelt and Ku Klux Klan fanatic Woodrow Wilson.

The problem has not been limited to certain currents of immigration into the Americas. In all nations, it has been, usually, only in times of existential crisis, that truly great men and women of exceptional moral distinction rise to the relatively highest positions of leadership of nations. Such has also been the case with the U.S.A.'s great Presidents (and those among us who should have become Presidents), such as Washington himself, Monroe, John Quincy Adams, Lincoln, and Franklin Roosevelt. John F. Kennedy might have joined such a list, which is probably why he was assassinated and the truth of the assassination officially suppressed by John J. McCloy, *et al.*

Those among us who have risen to the rank of true statesmen, come, sooner or later, to understand this point. "The best man" rarely wins the post for which he, or she were best qualified for service to the nation's true interest. More often, when the potential of a suitable political or other leader is detected, that prospective candidate has been "snuffed in the political cradle." Nonetheless, win or lose, he, or she should do as I have done, to keep the torch of freedom alive. It were important to have good men in our Presidential residence; whether or not we have leaders who perform as persons who should have been in that office, is an even more significant, existential issue, as at this very moment of both U.S. national and world crisis.

Thus, the common punishment which a corrupted electorate brings upon itself, as during the U.S. experience of 2000–2007 to date, is that a corrupted majority of the participating

electorate inflicts itself with the opportunity to enjoy, shall we say, what it has brought down upon itself by its own choice, as in the U.S.A. over that 2000–2007 interval to date.⁶

This includes not only a U.S.A. afflicted with its current administration, but also the case of a Germany whose middle class had just been wrecked by the hyperinflation of mid-1923; this signaled the effects of that ruin in the emergence of the prospects for a future Hitler dictatorship. Even allowing for margins of fraud in general elections, the mere fact of the election, and then the re-election of an obviously mentally disturbed U.S. President, and a brutish, London-linked morals case as his Vice-President, speaks of something rotten in both the general population and the political class generally, something which already became visible on both sides of the Atlantic in the riotous ferment of 1968.⁷

Yet, at the same time, it takes a time of crisis of a certain quality, to awaken a people and their institutions to take the risk of committing themselves to a great enterprise launched on behalf of what must become the immortal heritage of the best traditions to be found among them. Such, hopefully, might become the situation in the U.S.A. entering the year 2008 general election campaigns.

2. Westphalia & the U.S. Advantage

It is that kind of systemic distinction rooted within the U.S. constitutional system expressed by President Franklin D. Roosevelt, which as Russia's President Putin appears to have understood in his persistently continuing search for U.S. cooperation, defines the indispensable role to be contributed by a U.S.A. which must now return to its Franklin Roosevelt legacy, for the sake of the world at large today.

We must now recall, that the birth of the modern European nation-state republic, was a novel achievement, a product of a great movement whose concentrated expression was the A.D. 1439 great ecumenical Council of Florence. However, we must also recall, that,

⁶ The most pathetic sophistry which a candidate might adopt, is that "I must win this election if I am to do some good." What is not needed, as the pathetic state of present Presidential pre-candidacies attest, is a panel of rivals so concerned with winning, that they fail to rally the electorate for the policies on which the nation's continued existence may depend!

⁷ The crushing of the moderating force of Germany's productively oriented "middle class" (*Mittelstand*) under the Versailles occupation of the early 1920s, was the pre-cultivated condition for allowing the rise of a mass-based fascist movement of the ruined and enraged to power. Now, the combination of the Nixon Administration's wrecking of the Bretton Woods system, and the far worse effects of the reign of the Trilateral Commission, have brought the U.S. itself to the state in which a maddened literal "dictator," called, euphemistically a "decider," reigns over the growing fascist potential typified by the followers of former Vice-President Al Gore, like that of the Nazi party's base, rallied then around figures such as Hermann Göring, in the neo-malthusians of the 1920s, inside the U.S.A., as already in Europe, today.

immediately, even then, there was the massive attempt to destroy that great work, through such means as the Venice-centered financier oligarchy's attempt to destroy the work of the ecumenical Council, through the financier oligarchy's orchestration of the fall of Constantinople. Nonetheless, on the positive side, through the establishment of the first modern nation-states, in Louis XI's France and Henry VII's England, the Venice-led degeneracy in modern European culture was contested, and, in significant part, reversed.

From the fall of Constantinople on, the Renaissance was menaced in two interrelated ways: first, by a medieval, feudalist tradition, associated with the launching of religious warfare against the emerging nation-state forms, and, later, by a second faction, led by Paolo Sarpi, Sarpi's New Venetian Party. This New Venetian Party of Sarpi, *et al.* became the founder of modern forms of European irrationalism, forms rooted in the adopted model of the medieval irrationalist William of Ockham, forms which evolved, over the course of Europe's Seventeenth Century, into what is recognized today as Anglo-Dutch philosophical Liberalism.

The first wave of general religious warfare in modern, post-Renaissance Europe, was that associated with the rise of that ominous forerunner of Adolf Hitler, the Spanish Inquisitor Torquemada, with the latter's 1492 expulsion of the Jews from Spain. The second wave was reflected in the emergence to relative supremacy of the rival, new Venetian faction, that of Paolo Sarpi; this latter wave defined the subjects addressed with such brilliant strategic insight by Friedrich Schiller, the Netherlands wars and the subsequent, 1618–1648, Thirty Years War.

With the accession of William of Orange as the brutish tyrant-in-fact of England, the center of political and financial power of Sarpi's New Venetian faction was now expressed in an evolved form, as the rise of the imperial role and power of England: hence, the rise of Anglo-Dutch Liberalism's financier interest to become an imperial power.

This Anglo-Dutch Liberalism established itself as a *de facto* imperialist power through its management of the so-called Seven Years War on the continent of Europe. The Anglo-Dutch Liberals' playing the principal powers of continental Europe against one another, over seven years, resulted in the British East India Company's imperial triumph, in the 1763 Peace of Paris.

The Company's ruffian Lord Shelburne hewed the effects of that Peace of Paris into an empire-in-fact, and did much of this through the instruments, such as the Jeremy Bentham who virtually begat Lord Palmerston, to create the establishment and great power of the new institution known, from 1782 onward as the British Foreign Office, which then, in turn, pre-organized and directed what became, on July 14, 1789, the French Revolution steered

initially by British agents, and enemies of Benjamin Franklin and Lafayette, Philippe Egalité and Jacques Necker.⁸

Those European forces effectively opposing these successive expressions of New-Venetian and British imperialism, established the roots of what became known, during the late Eighteenth Century, as *The American System of political-economy*.

This *American System*, which is at the core of the U.S. Declaration of Independence and the Federal Constitution, expresses a central conception which is a reflection of the influence of the leading scientific mind of the late Sixteenth and early Seventeenth centuries, Kepler and Fermat follower, and, later, sometime (1672–1676) protege of Jean-Baptiste Colbert, Gottfried Leibniz. When the influence of Leibniz is taken into account in the shaping of those U.S. conceptions of constitutional law on which the U.S. republic was founded, we are suddenly enabled to view the trans-Atlantic development in the light needed to comprehend the profoundly existential issue confronting European civilization's hopes for continued existence today.

All modern European civilization worthy of that title, is rooted chiefly in two great religious reforms of that civilization's political and scientific foundations: 1.) The A.D. 1439 great ecumenical Council of Florence, and 2.) The A.D. 1648 Peace of Westphalia. The first of these two revolutions in the conception of the modern nation-state, is to be centered, for purposes of reference, in three most crucial designs presented by Cardinal Nicholas of Cusa's *Concordancia Catholica*, the modern sovereign nation-state, the founding of modern physical science, launched with his *De Docta Ignorantia*, and the ecumenical design which was to become the 1648 Treaty of Westphalia, Cusa's *De Pace Fidei*.

The actually first modern European nation-states were launched, during the later Fifteenth Century, under France's Louis XI, and England's Henry VII. Taking the important role of Cusa's follower Leonardo da Vinci into account, the founder of all competent modern European science was the Johannes Kepler who came to be esteemed by Albert Einstein as the originator of the principled organization of all that competent modern European science, as expressed by Einstein's acknowledged debt to such among his own outstanding predecessors as Kepler and Bernhard Riemann.

⁸ The announced purpose for which British asset Orleans ("Philippe Egalité") organized and armed the mob for the July 14, 1789 siege of the Bastille, was the appointment of British asset Jacques Necker, the father of the notorious Madame de Staël as Prime Minister of France. Necker was associated, through his wife, with the Edward Gibbon who was the author of the not exactly accurate, but influential myth-making known as *The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*. It was an important influence in shaping Shelburne's policies for the transformation of Britain into a world empire comparable to the Imperial Rome of the Caesars.

Leibniz's historical role in both science and statecraft is that, explicitly, of a follower of Kepler in physical science, and of the principles of modern ecumenicism specified by Cusa⁹ and the Jean-Baptiste Colbert, the latter of whom was the protege of that Cardinal Mazarin whose role in the 1648 Peace of Westphalia has been crucial for all civilized expressions in European statecraft and civilization since that time.

Westphalia As Such

The most essential feature of the 1648 Peace of Westphalia, is seldom acknowledged today, even in the highest-ranking circles of historians generally, or in the actual, current practice of statecraft. The crucial principle of that treaty, without which the peace would have been impossible, was the powerful, but little understood statement of all-subsuming principle, a single phrase which is, in English: "... the advantage of the other." This was directly an expression of the argument of Cusa's *De Pace Fidei*.

This Westphalian principle, which takes the theme of Cardinal Nicholas of Cusa's *De Pace Fidei* as its precedent, can not be properly understood without reference to the common meaning of the Classical principle of *agapē*, as that meaning of that Classical Greek term is located with one and the same intention in the use of that term by Plato, and, later, by such outstanding Jewish intellects, and intellectual associates of Philo, as the Christian Apostles John and Paul. In that view of the matter, the insertion of *agapē* as the premise of the entire 1648 Treaty, does not imply any degree of denial of the right of national sovereignty, but, quite the contrary. It adopts recognition of that higher, universal principle which unites, and binds all national sovereigns under the protection of a higher principle. That higher principle is the common quality of all humanity, the specifically *noëtic* quality of human mental life and of all valid physical science, the immortal agency of what Russia's great Academician Vernadsky identified as the *Noösphere*, called the human soul, which places the common interest of all mankind above the status of the beasts.

Each people travels by a different pathway of its own specific language-culture, to a common destiny of all mankind, such that that higher form of common destiny is the fundamental interest of each part of all mankind. Yet, if the people who should compose a nation of their own, were deprived of a specific sovereignty of their own, they would be stupefied as the Biblical image of a Tower of Babel emphasizes, and as present-day pursuit of "Globalization" intentionally "dumbs down" to a state of bestiality, and thus ruins civilization at large today.

Failure to grasp that set of distinctions which I have just uttered here, would, as much experience of modern diplomacy of late has shown us, degrade mankind as a whole to the

⁹ *De Pace Fidei*.

moral level of territorial peace-seeking negotiations among perpetually quarreling troops of baboons.

The essential issue so posed concerns the essential, axiomatic distinction of man from an hypothetical talking beast. The essential, functional form of principled distinction of man from beast, lies in the creative potential powers of each sovereign human individual mind, as the uniqueness of the discovery of universal gravitation by Johannes Kepler, or the earlier doubling of the cube by construction by the Pythagorean friend of Plato, Archytas, illustrate the distinction of creative mentation from mere learning.

It is the way the sharing of the experience of such qualities of discovery occurs, through the medium of a specific quality of development of higher qualities of a language-culture's potentials, that a people is enabled to progress from generation to generation, as no species of beast could do this by its own will. It is that aspect of specific language-cultures, which is of decisive importance in the functional considerations underlying the development and exercise of national sovereignty.

It is essential, that this progress within national cultures be efficiently interactive among them. Not only must such benefits of knowledge be made available to the benefit of others, but the progress of mankind as a whole depends upon promoting the raising of the level of competence *of the other* through promoting the sharing of these achievements in culture with one another, to the intended advantage of the other.

Humanity's nations are, as has often been said, all in one boat, and it is the primary sovereign interest of each, that that boat, of humanity as a whole, not sink. We must jointly bail, lest we all sink.

Let sundry horrifying, or merely disgusting performances of most of today's practice of foreign policy among nations warn us, that there is no morally excusable place for the carrying of the habits of competitive, bodily contact or related games of sports, into diplomatic relations among actually civilized nations. British agent Alexander Helphand's (and Samuel P. Huntington's, and Fabian asset Mrs. Lynne Cheney's husband's practice of) "permanent warfare, permanent revolution," is "permanent whore-fare," with diseases to match.

The present world economy's breakdown-crisis, presents the implied challenge of these, my foregoing observations, to us now, with great force.

3. The Continuing Tragedy of Karl Marx

It can, and it is important that it be said here and now, that Karl Marx was essentially a tragic figure of the kind who did not like God very much, and therefore preferred to believe in the existence of a silly universe, rather than the real one. Such is not peculiar to the unfortunate Marx; it is the essence of all true tragedy.

After all, if you decide to reject God, who will take over the office you have declared vacant—self-proclaimed dictator (i.e. “decider”) George W. Bush, Jr., perhaps? Or, in Marx’s own case, the chosen substitute for God was his true employer, of whose control over him Marx himself was curiously, hysterically unwitting: the ghastly British Foreign Office’s Lord Palmerston. Ah! One must ask: but who, or what (In Hell, perhaps?) controlled Palmerston!?

Like all Classical tragedy, as distinct from the silly opinions of the Romantic school and its progeny, whether we refer to the ancient Greek stage, or that of Shakespeare, or Schiller, there are no truly individual tragedies, but, as my wife, Helga, an expert in this matter, would show you, Schiller demonstrates the true secrets of modern history in his *Wallenstein* trilogy; but, rather, societies which imagine that the apparent universe is represented by the cultural cage in which they believe, as if blindly, do as did the actual Karl Marx.

So, the tragic society and its member lives, as presented on stage in such subjects as Shakespeare’s *Hamlet*, or *Julius Caesar*. Each dwells in a dream-world of his adopted culture, while knowing nothing of the real world within which he or she wanders. He wanders, believing blindly in his obligation to obey the rules of the game he is habituated to play. They are the “underlings” of Shakespeare’s tragedy of *Julius Caesar*.

In the history of European civilization, the type of tragic folly, the containment within which Karl Marx’s mind wandered, was a realm of Classical Sophistry, a realm typified by the arbitrary (i.e., “self-evident”) definitions, axioms, and postulates, like those shared by the Sophist Euclid and his follower Claudius Ptolemy. Karl Marx’s case, as referenced here, has special importance for insight into what Professor Hankel has, in fact, pointed out, already, in his book’s prefatory remarks, as the tragic elements in the heritage of Germany still today.

This kind of pathetic error, as only typified by the common features of the Sophistry of Euclid, Claudius Ptolemy, and their duped followers, creates belief in a universe which does not actually exist. The habits which the duped believers acquire through the practice of such delusory beliefs, will, sooner, or later, bring them to a tragic consequence. The source of the tragedy lies, thus, in the way their beliefs in a non-existent universe lead them, in effect, as in the cases of today’s typical U.S. Presidential pre-candidates, or western European leaders of today, leading both the principal, fantasy-ridden players and nations, as by the nose of their

personal fears and ambitions, toward a tragic collision with the reality of the universe in which they dwell.

That is the Classical principle of Tragedy, contrary to the sundry Romantic obsessions of such as the Nineteenth and Twentieth centuries' all-so-typical academic classrooms.

Karl Marx As Such

Thus, the documented tragic aspect of Karl Marx's role as an economist, was that he was caught up chiefly in the dream-world of Urquhart's British Library. There, in fact, he was a captive of a fantasy world which had been created for dupes like himself, an illusion which had been created prior to Marx's arrival there, by Lord Shelburne's Foreign Office tool, and Palmerston's personal un-godfather, Jeremy Bentham. In his Bonn, Berlin student years, and later, in a universe called "Young Europe," Marx's inner mental life was molded under the life-long direction, in fact, of the British Foreign Office of Bentham's successor, Lord Palmerston.

That was the core of Marx's tragedy. The tragedy of Marx was not, essentially, what he did, but what lay within what he believed the foundations of his belief to be. This fact is typified by considering the fact of his adopted substitute for a "religion," so to speak, in figures such as those of the Haileybury School, and the pair of virtually mated scoundrels, Metternich correspondent and anti-science fanatic G.W.F. Hegel and Carl Schmitt forerunner Savigny.

Many justifiable actions were taken by nominally, and avowed "Marxist" associations; these were not tragic in themselves; they were sometimes both necessary and even morally beautiful, as one who is not silly must act with the appropriate means available, as I can attest with force from my own experience of the span of more than sixty-five years of adult life.

Marxist doctrine served as a map for action for those caught up in such associations, a map with only symbolic relationship to the world of action. There were nominal Marxists who understood the irony of that fact, and used the map with an insight into its unrealities; and, there were those unfortunate "true believers" who did not understand this, and therefore remained foolishly blind believers, or turned with hatred against the map itself, when they awakened to the fact that its utility had been symbolic.

However, at core, Marxism as such was thus akin to the U.S. Democratic Party's belief in the alleged decency of scoundrels of the like of President Andrew Jackson. There is, after all a distinction between cooperating with the victim of a disease, and adopting the disease itself, especially when that is done in defiance of the relevant clinical evidence obtained. The tragedy prevalent among Marxists who deserve the discomfort of what I am saying about

them, especially the so-called “theoreticians,” was that they, at the relative best, submitted more or less blindly to the influence of denying the fact, that, in fact, Marx’s “creative, independent intellect” was only a myth.

The Myth of Marx: Interpolation

Since the rise of the Soviet Union, the issue of the myth of Karl Marx has been no joking matter. The Soviet Union and its reverberations throughout world history, can never be fully erased. Nor can we discard the principal, German predecessor in adoption of Marxist doctrine, the German Social-Democracy. However, we must not overlook the highly significant historical fact that Karl Marx himself was already doubly dead (as a mortal person and as a marginal political factor of his times) until the British Fabian Society asset, Frederick Engels of *Anti-Dühring* notoriety, recreated a synthetic Marx blown up to mythical size, a Marx who, in his real life, had already fallen out of the pages of modern history.

The influence of the still-living Karl Marx had died in the despondency of the aftermath of the Prussian military forces’ siege of Paris. In 1865, Lord Palmerston’s own personal legacy had been eviscerated by both President Abraham Lincoln’s victory over Palmerston’s created instrument, the Confederacy, and the ensuing further defeat of Palmerston by the effects of the U.S. intervention to expel the French and Austrian elements of Palmerston’s operation against the Mexico of President Benito Juárez. What was crucial in all this for Palmerston’s policies, was the fall of Britain’s puppet Napoleon III; but, with the fall of Palmerston, and with Palmerston’s agent Mazzini’s dumping his former protege Marx in favor of the anarchists, Marx’s influence over events collapsed in combined effects of the fall of British puppet Napoleon III and the desperation-driven failure of Marx’s adventure with the Paris Commune. Then, Karl Marx simply died in a pitiable state of retirement.

British heir of U.S. slave-produced cotton, and Palmerston agent, Frederick Engels, one of Marx’s most significant sometime controllers, set into motion a cosmeticized version of Marx’s political corpse, and marched him onto the stage of modern political mythologies.

The key to understanding what has underlain all those and related developments since the President Abraham Lincoln’s victory over Palmerston, is the implications of that sweeping change in the course of modern world history which occurred as a consequence of, or reactions to the victory, orchestrated by President Abraham Lincoln, over Palmerston’s Confederacy-gambit against the continued existence of the United States.¹⁰

¹⁰ Some people who are not thinking clearly, will contest this view of the role of Engels. On this account, note my reference to the Boston question to Lincoln. Palmerston’s intention in launching the Confederacy, was to divide the U.S.A., while, like Engels personally, enjoying the profit of slave-produced cotton.

The most crucial expression of John Quincy Adams follower Lincoln's strategic genius was expressed in an incident in Boston, Massachusetts during the campaign for the 1860 U.S. Presidential election. The incident, and its sequelae went as follows, an incident which is of the most crucial historical importance for understanding the mechanisms operating in the world crisis of the present moment, today.

Lincoln was presented, in Boston, with a trick question, the same trick question repeated to me during an international webcast in early 2006. Lincoln was challenged, would he prefer to preserve the Union, or abolish slavery. Lincoln responded wisely, as I echoed him in 2006: The Union. By saving the Union, Lincoln was able to abolish slavery. Had he been fool enough to say, "Abolish slavery," he would have ensured the immediate disintegration of the Union and the preservation and spread of black slavery, and import of African slaves into North America by Spain's monarchy, through the division of U.S. territory into perpetually quarreling tyrannies.

Lincoln's decision, as expressed in his reply to the Boston questioner, changed world history. The U.S. was consolidated as Secretary of State and President John Quincy Adams had prescribed earlier, consolidated as a continental republic, from Atlantic to Pacific oceans, and between Canadian and Mexican borders. This was affected through the development of today's equivalent of transcontinental magnetic-levitation systems, transcontinental railway systems, and inviting floods of farmers from Germany and elsewhere in Europe, to settle as citizens within the U.S.A.

The explosion of the success of the U.S.A. which had been launched under Lincoln's distinctive quality of leadership, produced a world-wide economic and cultural revolution, especially in both South and Central America and Eurasia, as typified by the late 1870s Bismarck reforms in Germany and related patterns to similar effect in Russia and other parts of Europe. Even years before 1877, the very existence of the U.S.A. as a continental republic, was regarded in the London of the Palmerston-trained Prince of Wales as the "geopolitical" enemy to be destroyed, by subversion in the U.S.A., and by war setting the continental European powers against one another's throats. Two so-called "World Wars" of the Twentieth Century, as also the London-directed Japan warfare against China during the 1894–1945 interval, and also the so-called "Cold War," were typical, leading results of that British imperial policy.

The "Maastricht" agreements, with the poison pill of the Euro embedded in the package's design, inserted under malicious threats of warfare from Thatcher and Mitterrand, were also a continuation of the strategic acts of geopolitical hatred of London and its puppets against

the system of sovereign nation-states on the continent of Eurasia—from that time to the present day of former Prime Minister Tony Blair and present Gordon Brown.

The real-life Karl Marx of the period leading through the U.S. Civil War, and the other, cosmetic, London “wax-works museum” Karl Marx concocted in British interest through aid of Frederick Engels, were different entities, specific to entirely different periods of Nineteenth-Century world history.

The force of tragedy specific to the real Marx’s own case, is pin-pointed with exquisite precision by his silly rages against his actual master, Lord Palmerston.

Actually, Palmerston owned Marx’s very soul; Marx was one of the numerous pieces of ideological property collected by Bentham heir Palmerston under the rubrics of Palmerston’s agent Mazzini, for Palmerston’s “Young Europe” and for the “Young America” plot which led in producing the North American slave-owners’ Confederacy. Marx was a property of “Young Europe” from approximately the same moment he stepped into Savigny’s classroom in law, thus into what had been the partnership of Savigny and Metternich’s asset G.W.F. Hegel in control over the university in Berlin, until 1832, and Savigny until later. As such a piece of intellectual chattel of Palmerston’s ideological-strategic “zoo,” Marx, in due course, had come to report directly to Palmerston’s corresponding secretary for the “Young Europe” organization, Urquhart, based at the British Library where Haileybury School-trained economist Marx spent much of his time cultivating both his personal intellectual and bodily carbuncles.

Yet, the poor, real-life, silly Russia-hater Marx authored a book devoted to denouncing his actual master, Palmerston, as “a Russian spy”!¹¹ There you have the virtual essence of the tragic character of Karl Marx, that he was employed as the instrument of the same Palmerston he idolized as Satan, or, should we say that the figure of Palmerston was his chosen substitute for playing the part of the ghost of Hamlet’s father. For our purposes in this report, that is a useful illustration of the proper, Classical use of the term “Tragedy.”

Marx believed, essentially, that the world of political economy of his lifetime was a universe which has been designed by the British East India Company’s Haileybury School. So, when Marx considered a phenomenon which had actually occurred in the real world, he assumed that the laws which ruled “cause and effect” in that world were those forms of Liberal Sophistry taught by creatures such as Quesnay, Mandeville, Adam Smith, and David Ricardo. He was tragic in the same sense as were the poor fools who believed devoutly in the astronomical hoax concocted by Claudius Ptolemy.

¹¹ Aha! The property denounces its property-owner!

Marx as Economist

The popular view, that the economics of Karl Marx is an alternative to the British system of political-economy, is essentially a hoax which some who wish to believe play upon their own credulities. The British system, more fairly labeled the Haileybury School's Benthamite tradition, is the species from which Marxism differs only as a variety of that same species. Indeed, Karl Marx himself insisted, quite fairly, that his *Das Kapital*'s first volume was a faithful derivative of the axiomatic features of Jeremy Bentham's Haileybury school of Adam Smith, *et al.*, the one variety differing from the other, even in the case of Thomas Malthus, only in matters of detail.¹²

All of this same species, including the Physiocrats Quesnay and Turgot, from both of whom plagiarist Adam Smith derived much of the underlying assumptions of his *The Wealth of Nations*, are derived, as if axiomatically, from the axiomatic features of both the systemic irrationalism which Paolo Sarpi's Liberalism adopted from the medieval teachings of William of Ockham, and from the influence of the kind of irrationalism specific to Rene Descartes, Mandeville, and Voltaire, and to the neo-Cartesian dogma of de Moivre, d'Alembert, *et al.* These, in turn, subsume the later, still more wildly insane trends toward Twentieth-Century positivism, as expressed by the marginal utilitarians, and the wild-eyed extremes of the relevant social theory of such extremist followers of the scientifically dubious Bertrand Russell, Aleister Crowley, and H.G. Wells as Professor Norbert Wiener and John von Neumann.

Notably, virtually all academically certified and related social theory for economics, especially in the domain of the pseudo-science of radically positivist mathematical forecasting, such as those of the ill-fated Myron Scholes, represent offshoots of the same radically reductionist interventions into the domain of social theory. Also, we must include in this the case of the ruinous impact on the late phase of Soviet economic dogma by the influence of the radically positivist offshoot of the Cambridge Systems Analysis and Club of Rome current, as expressed as the Laxenburg, Austria, International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis (IIASA). Moscow under the reigns of Andropov and Gorbachev was no longer Marxist in any meaningful sense of its physical characteristics as an economy, but, via the Cambridge school of systems-analysis, a branch of the British system; it had not only lost the map, but

¹² On these matters, it is indispensable to compare a certain superiority in the method of Rosa Luxemburg (*The Accumulation of Capital*), relative to utter failures on the definition of imperialism by both V.I. Lenin and the German social-democrats of the pre-1914 interval. Luxemburg's case can be profitably assessed in light of the later work by a U.S. State Department specialist, Herbert Feis. Neither the relevant social-democrats nor Lenin grasped those essential features of either medieval or modern finance-capital which must be the point of reference for dealing with the presently ongoing global breakdown-crisis of the present monetary system.

would not have able, any longer, to read the once-familiar old map, even if it had remembered where it had been buried.

4. Physical Economy as Science

Focus attention for the moment, on the deeper implications of the shift in the essential character of the U.S. economy which occurred as a consequence of the 1929-like, October 1987 “crash” of the New York stock-exchange. Also consider the significance of the change of management in the U.S. Federal Reserve System, from Chairman Paul Volcker, to the hyper-inflationary loose-and-looney money practices of then incoming Chairman Alan Greenspan, whose role as notoriously an exponent of the right-wing cult of the deceased Ayn Rand, was neither rational nor humane.

Those facts are true, and are to be stated as such, and no more than that. There should be no temptation to exaggerate Greenspan’s role. He did not, specifically, cause today’s global economic problem by himself; but, the role he played suited the relevant New York’s and London’s financier interests, and, the factor which Greenspan came to represent on that account, became ultimately very bad news for the post-1987 U.S. and European economies, especially since the added factor of the introduction of those complementary Thatcher-Mitterrand Maastricht measures which have ruined western and central Europe itself since that time.

Before getting into the proverbial meat of the matter, the following relevant background, bearing on Greenspan’s specific role, should be considered.

By October 1987, over the sixteen years since President Richard Nixon’s August 1971 collapsing of the remains of the Bretton Woods, fixed-exchange-rate system, the U.S. economy had undergone what were to prove to have been two disastrous kinds of systemic changes in its character.

The first of these measures was taken largely under the guidance of President Nixon’s George Shultz, the principal U.S. bureaucrat figuring in the wrecking of the Bretton Woods system itself, and a key figure, together with such notable, continuing accomplices as Felix Rohatyn, in the U.S. Nixon Administration’s installation of the neo-Nazi dictator Pinochet in Chile.

That action in the matter of South America’s Southern Cone, an action in which Shultz played the leading role for that Administration, prepared the way for a second, even more catastrophic change, a change which was that injected under incoming President Carter’s National Security Advisor Zbigniew Brzezinski.

Prior to the selection of Carter as a Presidential pre-candidate, Brzezinski was already a principal figure in the launching of what was to become the disastrous program of the Trilateral Commission, which was already identified, prior to Carter's nomination and election, as a program of "controlled disintegration of the U.S. economy." That Trilateral Commission program featured the role assigned to Federal Reserve Chairman Volcker over the period of his tenure, from late 1979, through the time of the 1987 crash.

Briefly, Shultz & Company, operating under the Nixon Administration, had already wrecked the international monetary system. The Trilateral Commission, in its turn, operating under President Carter's National Security Advisor Brzezinski, *proceeded from the stated intention* of wrecking the physical economy of the U.S.A. The Commission's massive production of books of documentation of the Commission's avowed intentions, had shown no shame in declaring that specific intention, to anyone who cared to read published documents even prior to Carter's election.

Later, Federal Reserve Chairman Greenspan, operating under methods which were essentially copied from the model of Europe's Fourteenth-Century Lombard banking system, was the keystone player, together with the City of London, in carrying forward the ruinous 1977–1987 effects of the Trilateral Commission's wrecking operation, in injecting the radical monetarist practices which have brought the world economy to the brink of its presently hovering, threatened plunge into an abyss.

These combined changes represented two phases of a general commitment, steered, chiefly, from London, to destroy that leading role in the world's economy which the U.S.A. had accumulated during the span of the two so-called "world wars" of the 1914–1945 interval. The setting in which this lunatic, London-steered behavior took root, were the accumulated effects of a post-Kennedy, long U.S. war in Indo-China, as followed by the new direction in the economy introduced during 1969–1981 under Presidents Nixon, Ford, and Carter.

That latter series of developments, launched under President Nixon and the Trilateral Commission's measures, wrecked not only the economy of the U.S.A., but, in due course, the economies of both the Americas and western and central Europe. The result was not only a wrecking of the world's monetary system, but also steered the parallel, savage looting and wrecking of what became the former Soviet economy, under, most notably, the misguided leaderships of Andropov, Gorbachev and Yeltsin. This combination of 1989–2000 developments, has been a crucial, leading factor of axiomatic cultural change in transforming the principal trans-Atlantic economies of Europe, Africa, and the Americas, into the ruined state which was virtually completed at the moment of George W. Bush, Jr.'s entry into the U.S. Presidency.

Since then, the nearly two Presidential terms completed under a U.S. Bush-Cheney Administration, have transformed the economic disaster which existed at the point of the January 2001 Bush inauguration, into the existential catastrophe which grips the U.S.A. and western and central Europe, in particular, today. However, when all of that has been taken into account, the crucial feature in creating the setting which Wilhelm Hankel's book describes, the setting, for Europe, of the specifically U.S. element in this now global economic catastrophe, has been the role of the Federal Reserve since Paul Volcker left office, in the wake of the October 1987, 1929-style, stock-market crash.

In summary, the monetary and financial practices which those developments represented, have wrecked the physical economy of Europe and the Americas, that through methods of monetary and financial practices which, in essential features, echoed those Lombard banking practices which plunged mid-Fourteenth-Century Europe into what has become known in the pages of modern history as a Fourteenth-Century "New Dark Age."

A Matter of Checks & Balances

Briefly, it has become the lately conventional Sophistry of the leading monetary and financial institutions of the U.S.A. and of western and central European practice, to presume that actions of a form of practice which gratify currently prevalent monetarist dogmas, are the best option for the economy over the medium to long term (if we were able to live long enough, under these conditions, to discover how these practices "worked out in that end which is now very nigh").

In that monetarists' ideological view of matters, the effect of current monetary and related policies of practice, is not to be subjected, in the interim, to any standards of actual physical-economic evidence which are displeasing to those reigning monetarist ideologues. In short, leading governments and most declared economists of today have become the victim of the same sort of swindle associated with the propaganda of the true believers in the early Eighteenth-Century John Law and related financial bubbles.

This fact is illustrated in the simplest of truthful ways, by a pedagogical illustration which I have named my "Triple Curve" (**Figure 1**). Although my Triple-Curve illustration is a *pro forma*, conceptual summation of the detailed evidence, evidence over more than a decade to date has shown, that there is no error, nor exaggeration in that which it purports to illustrate.

The hypothesis which needs to be considered, if we are to understand the present strategic situation accurately, is the following:

Are the minds behind this currently reigning monetarist dogma as completely stupid as some innocent, but duped observers of the actual performance of the world economy might believe the data to seem to show? Or, is it the case, that the ruinous state of the world economy currently, has been the kind of effect, like the comparable effects of the Maastricht agreements, which the authors of these policies had actually intended to bring about? If the latter, who (looking beyond the well-documented predatory actions of Thatcher and Mitterrand themselves¹³), or, what is that somebody of relevant great influence who has intended to reap what he, or she considers to be such a desired harvest of ruin?

European and related history since about 4,000 B.C., shows two ways in which to build, or maintain an empire. One approach is to seek to build up great physical wealth, and share the benefit so produced with those whose willing submission one wishes to cultivate. That is what the U.S. has often been accused of doing during times prior to the effects of the U.S.A.'s long, wasting war in Indo-China. That is an implication of the need for remedies modeled on the Peace of Westphalia.

The alternative approach to winning global influence, is the British alternative: simply to ruin everyone else, even by setting fire to one's own house as part of the scheme for burning down the town. We should be familiar with that British imperial strategy from the experience of both two so-called "world wars" of the last century, and also the long "cold war" which followed. That has been the intended effect of the Anglo-American Peloponnesian War-style periods of long warfare in both Indo-China and Southwest Asia.

The effect of the latter course, is, of course, precisely the clear intention and effect of the policies thrust down the throats of the victims of the Maastricht agreements. It is precisely the effect on the entire U.S. economy, in particular, of what the Trilateral Commission stated as its motive, "controlled disintegration of the economy" of the U.S.A., which was precisely the intention, the practice, and the effect of the implementation of the Trilateral Commission's policies under President Carter and over the course of the 1980s.

That, for example, has been the stated intention in the implementation of the Maastricht agreements, and in shoving of the intentionally ruinous Euro, in particular, down the throats of Germany's citizens.

The simplest way to identify such policies of practice as these is "rule through ruin." This was the explicit intention and practice of those ancient empires organized according to what is known as "the oligarchical principle," as in the Middle East today, as by the Delphic policies of Lycurgan Sparta, by the Roman Empire, and by the Venetian masters of the process of

¹³ As by former Germany Chancellor Helmut Kohl's published memoir.

Norman military rule, rape, and ruin, up through the Fourteenth Century Lombard system of usury which produced the Fourteenth-Century New Dark Age in Europe. This has been the intention behind the launching of the infamous policy of Thomas Malthus under Jeremy Bentham, and is the policy of former U.S. Vice-President Al Gore and, his crony, the Prince of Wales, today.

Blood & Gore

This present, neo-Malthusian policy of virtual genocide by the hoaxster Al “No Belle” Gore, has its proximate origins in the influence of the infamous Venetian economist, Giammaria Ortes, from whose London work, originally published in 1790, Thomas Malthus plagiarized the English translation of that work by Ortes in Malthus’s own mass-murderous policy of ***On Population***. The utter fraud of the “Global Warming” propaganda associated with the fraud by hoaxster Al Gore today, is a copy of the intention expressed by the “machine stormers” of early 19th-Century England. It was, then, and remains, today, a policy which had been originally intended to keep the English labor-force stupid, if often sullenly rambunctious, through aid of promoting technological and scientific backwardness, as Gore does today, thus making the victimized general population resistant to the impulse of scientific and technological progress supplied, then, from the continent.

Today’s revival of that currently ongoing, mass-murderous, Malthusian policy which I have just summarily described as traceable to the Venetian Ortes, or to the 1588 work of Venetian agent Giovanni Botero’s doctrine for the state, is to be traced back to the post-World War II policies of Winston Churchill and the U.S. Harry Truman Administration, from the moment of the death of President Franklin Roosevelt.

The first expression of the policy which Al Gore touts today, came at a time, at the close of the war, when President Roosevelt’s avowed intention had been to bring the existence of the British Empire to an end, and to use the to-be-converted great industrial war-machine of the U.S.A., at the end of that war, to promote both the freedom and economic progress of conditions of life of the peoples subjected to colonial, or semi-colonial forms of European exploitation. The policies of Churchill’s and the British Empire were to waste those U.S. economic means, and to prevent that development, which would have been a clear, and Roosevelt-intended threat to the continued existence of that empire. That is the clearly implied, genocidal intention, expressed as the import of the Nobel award to hoaxster Al Gore now.

That is the policy of those who share the policy-outlook of the London-Truman alliance to the present day. Scientific and physical-economic progress of the people of our planet, is a deadly adversary of that oligarchical principle which Anglo-Dutch Liberalism and kindred

sentiments represent. That is key to the pivotal lie which lurks within the entirety of Al Gore's Nobel prize-winning fraud. The question is, why did so many manifestly silly, hysterical people from among the ranks of the white-collar tribes of the "Baby Boomer" generation, seize so passionately on what was to be seen so readily as false by any competent scientist: the utterly decadent Al Gore's spreading of one more of those kinds of lies to which Professor Hankel has referred in the prefatory chapter of his current book?¹⁴

Look back to 1944. Once the breakthrough on the Western Front by Allied forces had occurred, it was clear, as the actions of the relevant leading German generals recognized, that the Nuremberg fantasy called the Hitler regime, was doomed to fall in Hitler's own, adopted Wagnerian fashion, and a revolt by the generals could have rescued a Germany otherwise foredoomed to a crushing kind of defeat, which would, and did occur, if the war were continued. Such was the relevant impulse of all sane German military commanders, and others. However, Winston Churchill and his gang were determined to prevent that attempted surrender from occurring "prematurely." Churchill's gang took active measures to assure that the surrender would be prevented at that time, as the "Market Garden" swindle of Churchill's Montgomery attests.

With the breakthrough on the European western front, the danger, as viewed from the British side top-down, was no longer Hitler; the target was now Roosevelt, as it is, still, for George Shultz's long-standing crony, pro-fascist Felix Rohatyn today.¹⁵ The case of the creation of the so-called "Baby Boomer" generation recruited from the ranks of those born to "white collar" social orientations between 1945 and 1958, typifies the methods employed by the Churchill gang and its U.S. fellow-travelers, to the purpose of ruining what had been President Franklin Roosevelt's intentions for the post-war world.

Two principal elements of strategy for wrecking the FDR legacy, were emphasized by the Churchill-Truman faction. First, what later became known as "the Cold War" strategy of the post-Truman period; second, to pit the new-born "white collar" generation, born between 1945 and 1958, the so-called "Baby Boomer" generation of both the U.S.A. and Europe, as a future striking force against the inherently pro-American, and what were culturally, if not

¹⁴ It were useful to look back to Gore's radically right-wing associations, as with Newt Gingrich, in Georgia, back during the 1970s, and to see the direct link to Vice-President Gore's savage apology for Gingrich's right-wing policies, which set up President Clinton's Administration for such effects as the right-wing Gore-Lieberman efforts to dump Clinton in 1999. Whatever actually happened in Florida in counting the Presidential votes in 2000, Gore had already blown the election, in favor of George W. Bush's candidacy during that year's campaign.

¹⁵ As Rohatyn has openly, and repeatedly attacked me, since Spring 2005, as the threat of a potential "new Franklin Roosevelt" today, and through his puppet Nancy Pelosi today.

always politically, largely pro-Roosevelt scientists, industrial and agricultural social strata of my own generation.

The ideology of the “Cold War” had the function of preventing the powerful agro-industrial-scientific machine built up for the conduct of the 1939–1945 war, from being used for the peacetime mission for which Roosevelt had declared his intention openly, including to Churchill and others. The further intention was, that by the time those progeny of a generation born between 1945 and 1958, from households with the “white collar” orientation we associate, retrospectively, today, with the 1950s ideology of “White Collar” and “Organization Man,” had reached into adolescence and young adulthood, that new generation, which might be called “The Al Gore Generation” exemplified by the cases of the U.S.A. and Britain today, would be used as a weapon of social hatred against both genuine science and the “blue collar” tradition of American progressive industry and modern family-farm agriculture.

This “white collar” social strategy of the anti-FDR currents, has gained its most hate-filled harvest in Germany today. For both the “traditional” reasons expressed by both Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher and the Mitterrand whom Britain of the 1970s and 1980s considered its crucial French asset, Germany has been, as has Russia, one of the principal nations most feared, for its cultural-scientific potential, by the relevant, anti-FDR Anglo-American Liberal factions of today. Germany’s “1968er” generation was subjected to the most savagely administered dose of ideological targeting by the enemies of the Franklin Roosevelt legacy. The Congress for Cultural Freedom and the sheer evil of the lies propagated by authors Theodor Adorno and Hannah Arendt of *The Authoritarian Personality*, are examples of the root of the new, more wildly irrationalist, existentialist mode in fascism which menaces trans-Atlantic civilization globally today.

Al Gore, a present-day caricature of the Malthusian machine-breakers of the early Nineteenth Century, and with a certain frankly fascist character of his own, is a prime example of that specific moral degeneration.

British imperialism has two most notable cultural characteristics. First, destroy its own people, culturally, and spread the infection of the decadence so fostered, like an infestation of the creepy-crawly cultural Beatles, to other shores. Second, to induce the destruction of every part of the world, including East Asia, from which the seeds of a future Renaissance might be sown. *These are Fabian intentions; they are Fabian methods, as the stench of the recent Tony Blair war regime attests.*

5. Beyond the Delusions of Fabianism

As I have just emphasized, the essence of Fabian methods, as the image of the Roman strategy for weakening of Hannibal's forces, illustrates the concept, is to win wars or kindred conflicts by sado-masochistic methods of inducing the targeted party to destroy himself, in greater or lesser degree, as by "scorched earth" tactics, even by aid of sacrificing significant elements of one's own forces to aid in inducing this intended effect. Strangely, or, perhaps, not, the British Empire's intended victims, including those members of its own population, seem seldom capable of actually understanding this point, even though they tend to come around to practice that same, induced policy upon one another.

The ever-loving, half-drunken lout lumbers in to abuse the wife, and give the kiddoes a salutary whack or two, up to the day she is waiting by the door to whack him with a heavy iron skillet, or a smiling dose of arsenic in his tea. To develop one's own population as a source of the corruption one intends to spread against civilization more broadly, one must induce one's own people to degrade themselves, as British influences have led in the corruption of the political-cultural processes spread, through our own mass-media, and, as by the witchy British agent Mrs. Lynne Cheney's influence on our educational institutions, into our U.S.A. itself.

The point which it is essential to grasp, on this account, is that it is childishly absurd to believe that, since the reign of William of Orange's trained puppet, George I, the British Empire was ever really a charitable association. There may have been worthy exceptions, even sometimes numerous ones from within the ranks of the British population, but the system under which they were ruled as an empire, made certain that the rotten element of the Venetian Liberal tradition of Sarpi, Galileo, and Hobbes, ruled from the top.

The empire does not intend to enrich those over which it intends to rule, but to make them more fearful, and more dependent, by becoming less capable of sustaining themselves, or of mustering the will to defend themselves. The British system pursues that course by keeping most of its subjects about as sex-crazed as minks, fearful, and hungry, and by use of kindred aversive methods, much as they employ the same approaches to the victimized populations of their current and intended colonies, alike. A life without meaning, suicide, or killing one's own children, or both, is the ultimate weapon into which the coward flees ("game ending"!) all in expressing a perverted impulse to punish his, or her imagined foe.

In a pinch, the doctors of the monetarist persuasion, especially the British persuasion, would rather defend the market-price of the afterbirth, rather than the life of the child.

Uproot the Monetarist Delusion!

The essential difference between the economic policies underlying the intrinsic superiority of the U.S. economy, when it follows its own Federal Constitution, over its European rivals, as it did under President Franklin Roosevelt, is that the crafters of the U.S. system premised their constitutional design upon the notion of physical economy associated with Gottfried Leibniz, as opposed to the inherently usurious, Venetian monetarist cults predominant still in western and central Europe today. It must be fairly said, that the problem with European economic doctrines is that they are essentially symbol-minded. A mere symbol, a conception of money rooted in the history of usury, has been substituted by today's continuing European customs for the physical reality of actual wealth.

In a certain manner of speaking, Europe came by its monetarist delusions fairly.

We can trace the calculable history of Eurasian monetarism from the decline of the bow-tenure systems of ancient southern Mesopotamia, when the practice of usury was introduced, repeatedly, into Sumer and its successors. Similarly, descending from the hills where the site of the ancient cult of Delphi was situated, to the port from which Delphi usury spread its reign, as a rival of Tyre, around the targets of the Mediterranean coasts, we encounter, again and again, the substitution of usury, as a standard of economic value, for the concept of the physical-productive powers of labor which a civilized current in modern Europe and North America adopted as, largely, the product of a science of physical economy developed by and around the influence of Gottfried Leibniz.

As I have said, Europe came by its present, delusory conception of monetary systems fairly. Tyre, Rome, Byzantium, the Venetian-Norman medieval system, and the new Venetian model expressed as the practice of modern Liberalism, all locate the presumed notion of economic value in the symbol-mindedness of an essentially fetishistic delusion known as the belief in some intrinsic value of money as such: *usury*.

It is precisely here, in one very simple, elementary notion, that my definitive intellectual advantage over my putative contemporary rivals among putative economics specialists has lain; that I do not share their usurious, monetarist delusions.

For me, as for any scientist examining the matter competently, monetary systems can be simply replaced, as by organ transplants, whenever the continued health of the patient requires. The means for bringing off such a translation, is the proper understanding of a law of bankruptcy: it is sufficient to know how to replace a bankrupt monetary-financial system, through rational proceedings in bankruptcy: as if to save the child at the expense of the

afterbirth—contrary to the presently incumbent U.S. Treasury Secretary, who clings up to the present date, to a contrary, extremely foolish conception.

The essential problem inside the U.S.A. today, is that we have been habituated to the experience of destroying real wealth, that of agriculture, industry, infrastructure, and the development of the creative powers of the individual human mind; we have allowed this to occur for the benefit of the nominal valuation attributed to property-titles as such. We have wiped out our independent, productive farms and industries, and looted our essential basic economic infrastructure, for the purpose of defending the nominal riches of a shrinking class of nominally super-rich financial parasites, as typified by a predatory class of virtual criminals, known as “hedge funds.” This class of parasites has concentrated both financial and political power, top down, in the purely speculative financial holdings of a class of locusts, a class which has no kinship with what was formerly considered the productive physical capital of agriculture, industry, skilled crafts, and infrastructure. This class of parasites, merely typified by cases such as that of Felix Rohatyn, becomes the yardstick for the kind of political power which has become a replacement for what had been formerly considered our nation’s interest.

We have come, thus, to a point in modern history which mimics the time, during Europe’s mid-Fourteenth Century, when the world political system of that time virtually disintegrated in the aftermath of the bankruptcy of the Lombard banking house of Bardi. If we do not rid ourselves, our nations of these usurious “locusts,” the political system which fails to make that purge of the present system will disintegrate, plunging the planet as a whole, very soon, into a kind of chain-reaction collapse marking the onset of a prolonged new dark age.

You can not say that this is impossible. It has happened before, and it is now in the process of happening again.

The 2008 phase of the U.S. election-campaign will be the test which determines whether or not the U.S.A. itself is capable of returning to a former, protectionist tradition which would enable our republic to survive.

The Science of Physical Economy

The essential incompetence of the doctrines called “economics” taught in university today, lies, hereditarily, in the delusions expressed as the beliefs associated with the teaching and practice of financial accounting as a substitute for an actual science of economy. It is not that orderly financial accounting is not necessary. The point is, that it has nothing to do, intrinsically, with the physical principles of real economy.

By real economy, we should signify the essential difference between apes and people. In the simplest terms of reference, that difference is located, functionally, in what Academician V.I. Vernadsky identified as the distinction of the *Noösphere* from the *Biosphere*. The root of this distinction is located, functionally, in those creative mental powers of the human individual which are not to be found in any form of ordinary animal life. The possibility of any science of physical economy depends upon the function of those creative powers of the individual human mind whose expression is typified, for modern physical science, by Johannes Kepler's uniquely original discovery of that universal physical principle of gravitation which regulates the internal organization of the Solar system. That is the same principle expressed by Gottfried Leibniz's unique translation of Kepler's discovery of the universal principle of gravitation into a general principle of the infinitesimal calculus. The science of economy depends upon those conceptions.

Over the course of the development of modern physical science, since Nicholas of Cusa's *De Docta Ignorantia*, through Bernhard Riemann's elimination of the last rotting vestige of the reductionist's Sophist tradition of Euclidean geometry, and through the related, consequent discoveries of such as Vernadsky and Einstein, it should have become clear to us, that the typical action of mankind, by means of which the potential relative population-density of the human species is increased per capita and per square kilometer of territory, is the transformation of the applied practice of physical science to the effect of increasing man's power to live through the combined effects of man's development of himself, as human, conjoined with mankind's transformation of the planet in which we live.

Hence, the only true economic value, is a physical-economic value of that nature. The American System of political-economy expressed that Leibnizian view in the terms of Treasury Secretary Alexander Hamilton's definitions for the American System. Our American tradition of protectionism was premised on the knowledge that prices must be regulated according to the considerations of national interest. Free trade, or globalization, was always virtually a policy of treason. It is the physical effect of production and circulation upon the creative economic powers of a people, as expressed per capita and per square kilometer of total territory, which is the basis for defining a notion of true economic relative value. It is the development of the individual in society, and of the relations among those individuals, which is the active principle of economic value.

The practice of the American System of political-economy, as President Franklin Roosevelt worked to revive this, was, in effect, a system of experimental approximations which took the notions of value to which I have just pointed into account.

In contrast, all attempts to define a notion of a function of economic value which is premised on monetarist assumptions, are insane, and, ultimately, murderously so. As for globalization, it is a form of treason, not only against some particular nation, but as the Biblical account of a Tower of Babel implies, against the human species.