

Russia's Relation to Universal History

by Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.

November 14, 1996

[Published in *Executive Intelligence Review*, Volume 23, Number 48, November 29, 1996.
[View PDF of original](#) at the LaRouche Library.]

Letter to a Russian Friend

This is an urgent review of a crucial aspect within the continuing failure of U.S. policy toward post-1989 Russia.

A so-called "Reform" policy, was jointly imposed upon post-Soviet Russia, Ukraine, and Belarus, by Britain's Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher and the man she has described as her dupe, U.S. ex-President Sir George Bush.¹ That "Reform" policy, not reversed under U.S. President Clinton, has driven Russia presently to existential extremes, at which some sort of explosion is imminent. "Explosion" does not signify "global thermonuclear war," but the ignition, and spread of chaos, out from Russia, to engulf much of the planet. It appears, that official diplomatic Washington is more concerned with clinging to the appearance of defending a failed British-designed "Reform" policy, than replacing London's and the U.S. Republican Party's bankrupt policy with a sane American one.

This policy-issue can not be approached competently within the limits of the Russia questions themselves. The same economic situation in Russia which is the driving force of the explosive social crisis in the region of the former Soviet Union, is an integral feature of an ongoing, currently accelerating, global, finance-driven economic collapse, the greatest financial and economic crisis in the modern history of this planet. Not only is the dynamic of the Russia crisis, a product, and reflection of that presently accelerating global financial and economic collapse; the exhaustion of the past five years' London-centered looting of the former Warsaw Pact region, is an important, contributing feature of the timing and ferocity of the planetary financial collapse.

To complicate matters, the United States' government presently fails to comprehend the shock-front implication of the presently ongoing, chain-reaction financial collapse's impending cataclysm. Every leading financial center in the world, including IMF Managing Director Michel Camdessus, knows that an immediate disintegration of the existing world financial system is now fully under way, and that this, unprevented, would probably explode in time to be delivered to

¹ Margaret Thatcher, *The Downing Street Years* (New York: HarperCollins, 1993), pp. 782–83.

this year's Christmas celebrations. Most governments do realize that a financial collapse is onrushing, and will hit very soon; nonetheless, except for a handful of senior influentials, these exceptions almost entirely from the pre-“Baby Boomer” generation, virtually no government, especially the government of the U.S.A., presently has the least comprehension of the tornado-like fury and suddenness with which this crisis will strike, once it peaks. Like the Clinton administration, up to now, virtually all putative experts are gripped by a fantasy rooted in wishful denial, desperately deluding themselves that all can be kept under control, perhaps postponed yet another year or so, by means of a few shrewd agreements negotiated among the perennial “boys in the back room.”

*The present review addresses the hyperbolically soaring present crisis in Russia, with that larger context of global cyclonic financial crisis in view. Here, the crisis is examined, predominantly, with emphasis upon a decisive feature of Russia seen from the inside, a feature which most Western strategic policy-shapers not merely misjudge, but a facet which most of them have not yet gained the specific competence to recognize. It is intended that this report should contribute to their gaining comprehension of the pivotal issue of **scientific method** involved.*

During recent months, a significant ration of the writer's time has been occupied in discussions with Russian friends, on the matter of Russia's present place in world history. The pivot of this dialogue, is a little-known, but central issue of scientific method. As the writer has stressed repeatedly, for him, as for G. Leibniz, reality does not lie within the reductionist's notion of the object as such: but, rather, within the domain which Leibniz named “Analysis Situs.” By “Analysis Situs,” this writer signifies, as did Leibniz before him, and also Bernhard Riemann later, an efficient principle of the universe, but one which is axiomatically beyond the comprehension of today's generally accepted mathematics: the determining relations, as typified by the notion of universally efficient “not-entropy,” ruling over the domain within which the object is functionally situated.² The discussion so far has demonstrated, that that notion of Analysis Situs, is the “horseshoe nail” for want of which the proverbial “kingdom is lost.”

These discussions with Russians have centered around the problems generated by the fact, that, for well-known historical reasons, few of even today's ostensibly well-educated Russians, know the most crucial facts respecting the last three centuries of the history of their nation's relationship to Venice, the British Empire, western continental Europe, and the United States.

² For the purposes of this present paper, the writer's relatively most recent published presentation of “not-entropy” as an expression of *Analysis Situs*, is his treatment of the subject of human evolution: “The Descent to Bush from Man,” *EIR*, Nov. 15, 1996. For reasons to be made clear in the course of this present paper, the emphasis placed upon that November publication, is the reference to the late A.D. Sakharov's paper, “Cosmological Models of the Universe with Reversal of Time's Arrow,” as found in A.D. Sakharov, *Collected Scientific Works*, D. Ter Haar, D.V. Chudnovsky, C.V. Chudnovsky, eds., (New York: Marcel Dekker, 1982). See, also, relevant material bearing on *Analysis Situs*, in the writer's “While Monetarism Dies,” *EIR*, Oct. 25, 1996; “The Essential Role of ‘Time-Reversal’ in Mathematical Economics,” *EIR*, Oct. 11, 1996; and in “Leibniz from Riemann's Standpoint,” *Fidelio*, Fall 1996.

Today, outside Russia, in every situation in the Americas and Europe which the writer has examined, even the putatively best educated portion of the population of each nation, including today's U.S.A., is saturated with ideologically contrived, more or less popular political fictions, instead of honest accounts of history. So, it must also be said of Russia: respecting foreign relations in matters for which the facts are readily known to U.S. and western European scholars and others, even many putatively well-educated Russians met, are, with a few exceptions, to a large degree, victims of concocted fictional histories. The popular such fictions are chiefly of the "blood and soil," Romantic genre, typified in the extreme by authors such as that self-drawn literary caricature, World War II Moscow propagandist I.G. Ehrenburg.

In addition to recent years' discussions with friends in Russia, during the recent three decades, many of these fictional histories, from, and about Russia, have been examined, and discussed, intensively and extensively, by teams of the writer and his associates: from the standpoint of the relevant, known historical facts. Most of those examples examined, from the past, or by Russians today, have shown themselves to be largely, if not entirely fictions,³ varying as each was concocted either by apologists for Twentieth-Century Czarism, or for some pre-Stalin, Stalin, or post-Stalin phase-shift within the Bolshevik regime, or a recently acquired passion for some pathetic socio-economic dogmas of the virtual, post-1991 occupying powers, or, in the interest of some eclectic combination pasted together from among such options. The more the one of these varies from the other, the more the totality of them remains the same: a scattering of some facts, blended with fairy-tales which fill in those empty spaces from which vast acreages of relevant fact have been previously excised.⁴

³ As one may say of certain judges' Federal Rule 403 and other rulings *in limine*, such as Federal District Chief Judge Albert V. Bryan, Jr., and a certain crooked state judge of the Commonwealth of Virginia, the most dastardly lies are those which willfully superimpose a falsehood upon the evidence, by suppressing the most crucial of the relevant evidence. Similarly, in some of the worst historical myths circulating as "history" in Russia still today, the myth clings obsessively to the alleged importance of a few facts selected to fit the prejudice, hysterically denying all others.

⁴ Two examples suffice to illustrate the working point. In the first case: The war plan for the defeat of Napoleon Bonaparte's invasion of Russia, was devised by the Prussian reformers Wilhelm von Humboldt, Gerhard Scharnhorst, and Karl (Freiherr) vom und zum Stein, working directly with Czar Alexander I, according to a plan for destroying Napoleon devised on the basis of historian and playwright Friedrich Schiller's extensive study of the battle for the freedom of the Netherlands. The gist of the Prussians' war-plan for Russia, was not to permit the Russian army to be destroyed by its attempting, prematurely, and futilely, to defeat Napoleon in the initial battles [e.g., Smolensk, Borodino], but to conduct an orderly retreat, as a delaying action, conserving the integrity of Russia's military forces, while luring Napoleon, hopefully, to Moscow, which was thoroughly mined in advance, to the purpose of burning Moscow down around Napoleon's forces at the onset of winter (Sept. 15–20), after which the conserved Russian forces might then fall upon the vulnerable flanks of Napoleon's retreating Grand Army. With initial, sentimental reluctance, Czar Alexander accepted the Prussians' plan, over objections from among his Russian advisors. Clausewitz's successful wooing of the Prussian command under Yorck (Tauroggen, Dec. 30, 1812), to join in falling upon retreating Napoleon's forces, enabled the Russians, Prussians, and Austria's Karl (Fürst) von Schwarzenberg, to combine forces, to bring about the famous, decisive rout of Napoleon, at Leipzig (Oct. 16–19, 1813). In the second case, World War I, while planned and organized by the British-French *Entente Cordiale* of the Czar's uncle, King

Given, the fairy-tale character of those fictional fallacies of composition, which all too many educated Russians have come to defend as patriotic facts, we can not address the relevant problems of misunderstanding in U.S.A.-Russia relations, without also addressing, at the same time, the different, complementary form of ignorance based in widely accepted dogma, which pervades the policy-shaping circles within western Europe and North America. The problem is not only the substitution of sundry varieties of myths for history of Russia, on both sides; only a handful of leading policy-shapers and related advisors, on either the "eastern" or "western" side, possess the sense of universal history, without whose guidance the present world civilization will not survive.

Such experience has demonstrated, that wherever discussion of such matters arises, the discussion tends to become buried in impassioned defense of each among many, varied, disconnected, particular, popularized myths of pseudo-history. Worse, it is the world-outlook implicit in a combination of such disparate myths, which tends to misshape current policy, of, and toward Russia.

In particular: Unless, and until the discussion is focussed upon some crucial-experimental quality of fact, from which standpoint the most important issues fall into place in a more or less coherent way, no rational policy were likely to emerge from Russia, or the United States, in the matter of U.S.A.-Russia relations. In turn: That focus is not likely to succeed by itself. There will be no success, unless, and until those crucial facts are examined from the standpoint of the principles of that universal history, under which all particular histories must be subsumed, and by which they must be judged.

This is the form in which today's crucial strategic problem of relations between Russia and the U.S.A. must be approached. U.S., "Reform"-geared foreign policy toward Russia, is breeding an early strategic catastrophe, a global disaster for all concerned. A fresh, corrective, conceptual approach to the Twentieth-Century history of U.S.A.-Russia relations must be introduced. The author's referenced discussions with friends in Russia, affords the backdrop against which to present here what is crucial.

— * * * —

To understand Russia's situation today, we must begin by reference to the most crucial problems of Russia's Twentieth-Century history to date. To wit:

Edward VII, was actually launched when Czar Nicholas II approved the July 1914 general mobilization for the assault on Germany, to which Germany replied with its own general order for mobilization a few days later. The Russian Romantic versions of these events, omit all the leading facts, in order to parody thus propagandist Ilya Ehrenburg's fairy-tale propaganda-picture of consistent, virtually uninterrupted German racialist aggression against Russia, over centuries!

The London-orchestrated succession of the interrelated Sino-Japanese war of 1894–1895 and Russo-Japanese War of 1905,⁵ made possible the 1905 Revolution in Russia. The force which might have prevented Russia's collapse into its own suicidal folly, in joining World War I, the force within Russia typified by the statesmanship of Count Sergei Witte, was pushed from power. Lunacy fastened its grip upon the self-doomed institutions of Nicholas II's Czarist Russia. Hell was soon to follow. During 1917, the old order in Russia died of the sequelae of a self-inflicted disease called "pan-Slavism." The Bolsheviks buried the corpse. Then, under the Bolsheviks, came the 1920s locust-plague of N. Bukharin's NEP-men; Stalin's Bolsheviks buried the NEP-men, too. Then, decades later, the Bolshevik regime was toppled, in turn.

In history, change is inevitable, but some changes, and also lack of change, are mistakes. As in the Russia of 1993–1996, the kind of inaction which reflects submission to continuing established "policy-thinking," or what is called in the U.S.A. "mainstream opinion," has often proven itself, like a neglected cancer, the source for what usually prove to be the most disastrous changes.

The institutions of Nicholas II's Czarist Russia, had destroyed their own fitness to survive. So, as they had contracted the "French disease" in the embrace of the *Entente Cordiale*; so, they were administered the legendary French cure for that disease, the *coup de grâce*. Foolish Nicholas II's Russia hung out the sign for the ice-man: Who would bury the corrupt institutions which had combined their influence, to cause 1914–1917 Russia to destroy itself, by the folly of Russia's pan-Slav alliance with the Anglo-French war-makers? Lenin served as the undertaker.

The uprooting of the polluted institutions of the old regime was a necessary change; the question is, were the side-effects of the Bolshevik cure not a new disease? Now, decades later, the Bolshevik regime, too, has died. While the putative heirs squabble over the inheritance, the corpse of Bolshevism has yet to receive a decent burial. It appears to be a reasonable speculation, that until Bolshevism is buried in a decent way, and an honest elegy read over its entombment, that Russia will remain, not a nation-state, but a state of historical purgatory.

Russians, especially old Bolshevik patriots, might argue, that Lenin was necessary, to the degree that the corrupt Czarist institutions had virtually destroyed the possibility that anyone existed, apart from Lenin's Bolsheviks, who could govern in the chaotic conditions created by Russia's foolish western alliance for the war against Germany.⁶ They would argue, that

⁵ On the subject of the first Sino-Japanese war of 1894–1895, and the forces acting upon Japan which are relevant to British intelligence's deployment of Japan for the Russo-Japanese war of 1905, see the writer's report on Britain's ringing of China for intended destruction today: "Ring Around China: Britain Seeks War," *EIR*, Nov. 22, 1996.

Bolshevism, for all its faults, like Shakespeare's Othello, "had done the state some service," a fact, which in all honesty, honorable men, in Russia, or abroad, could not deny.

Such Russian patriots would wish it to be said, that, Russia, in its so-called "Marxist" incarnation, has also died. They would have it said, that Lenin's and Stalin's Russia died of the side-effects of the Bolshevik medicine which had saved it from dismemberment earlier. Those patriots would insist that the tale be told fairly, that it be granted, that there were certain achievements, some of heroic dimensions. These patriots would demand, that we tell them, "There must have been flaws, but certainly no worse than those of the rotten institutions of Nicholas II's time. Let us agree to settle these debts to history honorably; what were those flaws, that we might now proceed forward in history, without repeating the errors which brought about the self-destruction of regimes of the past?"

Such is the bare, descriptive form of the crucial facts. A compassionate regard for truthful facts, is the anteroom of wisdom in any matter. What is the essential truth which underlies those compassionately considered facts?

Like every history, Russia's history could never be understood efficiently, except from the standpoint of a truthful account of universal history. In the light of universal history, the apparent complexities of the 1905–1996 history of Russia, and all of the important features of the earlier history of Russia, fall into place with a beautiful truthfulness, including the central fallacy of Bolshevism.

As the circles of Russia's Nineteenth-Century cultural renaissance understood, the circles associated with the great A.S. Pushkin, with Czar Alexander II, with the great chemist and railroad-builder D.I. Mendeleev, and with the greatest of the Twentieth Century's statesmen of old Russia, Count Sergei (Y.) Witte, the problem of Russia lay in the fact that the old culture, of oligarchical, serfdom-ridden Russia, was in violent opposition to the essential requirements of the *universal* human nature of every individual human being on this planet. The oligarchical institutions which apologized for the continued, or past toleration of existence of serfdom within Russia, thus implicitly rejected the principle, that every man and woman, including Russian ones, is made in the image of God the Creator, individuals whose essential nature and self-interest, is that they are persons endowed with the power and need for development of those creative powers we associate with scientific, technological, and artistic progress. All of Russia's great statesmen, were men who devoted themselves to

⁶ In examining Lenin's writings, beginning those relating to his break with Plekhanov, the distinctive quality of his writings and executive actions, for which he was an awesome, if sometimes invidiously considered figure, even among the Bolsheviks, is the quality which Clausewitz associates with his special use of the German term *Entschlossenheit*: the reflection of the quality of the superior military commander, such as a Lazare Carnot, or the U.S. team of "anvil" Grant and "hammer" Sherman, in a political leader of a revolutionary insurrection. It is from this personal *voluntarist* quality of Lenin, more than anything else, that the Bolsheviks derived that capacity axiomatically lacking in the psychosexually impotent "objectivity" of Plekhanov's Mensheviks.

uplifting Russians from the rule of those institutions which were rooted in the evil, Babylonian, Diocletian, Justinian, oligarchical tradition of imperialism, as that evil heritage was expressed in those institutions of Russia which had rested for so long upon the aching shoulders of serfdom.

As typified by the case of the great Vernadsky, the Bolsheviks adopted some of the tradition of the Russian intelligentsia's best statesmen and poets before them: they sought to erect a society, in imitation of that modern nation-state form first established by France's Louis XI, a society echoing that design wrought by the founders of the U.S. Federal Republic of 1789: premised upon universal citizenship, with leading emphasis upon establishing a quality of universal education essential to a society increasing its productive powers of labor through investment in scientific and technological progress.⁷ The case of geobiochemist and nuclear scientist V.I. Vernadsky, typifies the relevant point: No truly sentient observer could deny, that in the areas of physical science, including biology, Soviet Russia made durable contributions to mankind's history.

It is tragic, that today's foreign and other powers involved, have done almost as much as they might, in net effect, to destroy that nurture of the scientific progress, which was Soviet Russia's leading intellectual gift to itself, and also to mankind as a whole. It is tragic, that the government of the United States, and other guilty parties of the post-1989 "reform" policy, may have reaped the proverbial "whirlwind" from this seed of their venal folly, the which they have heaped upon a hapless former Soviet Russia. Low, immoral creatures, such as Baroness Margaret Thatcher and the Moon-cult-funded ex-President George Bush appear to be, do not grasp the point, that when civilized nations gain a victory, they do not celebrate by raping the wives, parents, and children, of the defeated forces, as the "Reform" of Thatcher and Bush has done.

Having situated our subject of inquiry so, we have circumscribed a domain of inquiry, in which this writer's personal authority as a physical economist is relatively unique today. For a most relevant, more recent antecedent, we shall refer, below, to the treatment of the subject of *Analysis Situs* within the writer's report on the subject of human evolution: "The descent to Bush from man." That reference supplied, focus upon a central common incompetence of both Karl Marx's economics, and the British Haileybury School dogmas⁸ from which Marx, much aided by his British intelligence patron, David Urquhart,⁹ and, thus, also influenced by

⁷ V.I. Lenin's repeated emphasis upon "American methods," rather than British, in economy, typifies this.

⁸ Note 2, above.

⁹ When Karl Marx first encountered David Urquhart in the London British Library, Urquhart had been a key British Foreign Service operative deployed into Transcaucasus and the Balkans (see *EIR*, April 12, 1996, "The British Monarchy Rapes Transcaucasus, Again"). Urquhart's connection to Marx came about through the former's function as an administrative figure in those British Foreign Service operations coordinating the Young Europe and Young America terrorists operating under the direction of Lord Palmerston's London-based agent,

the writings of the satanic, Physiocrat madman Dr. François Quesnay,¹⁰ constructed his own reductionist doctrine of economics. This is the same principle of radical-positivist irrationalism central to the economic-theoretical, brain-theory, and related systems-analysis dogmas of Bertrand Russell devotees Norbert Wiener (“information theory”) and John von Neumann (“mathematical economics”).¹¹ Discounting for external factors, such as pressures for war-economy, the issues posed thus, are key to understanding the axiomatic root, and post-Soviet relevance of the failures of Soviet economic doctrine and related philosophy of practice.

Many Russians, either who had been influential under the Soviet system, or became influential through post-1989 patronage by the U.S. National Endowment for Democracy's International Republican Institute, or, like foreign institutions, have rushed with more zeal than thought, to “new ideas” from the West. This creates an ugly spectacle, like hungry unemployed of a defeated nation gathering around the food wagons of an occupying army. In the desire to be “post-Soviet,” a certain blindness to the fact, that it was the moral rottenness of all the leading institutions of 1916–1917 Czarist Russia, which enabled Lenin's Bolsheviks to seize power. They should have mustered more energetic concern for discovering the actual, axiomatic roots of the Soviet collapse. Thus, many have rushed blindly into apologetics for the varieties of lunacy displayed by the wretched Baroness Margaret Thatcher's destruction of the economy of the United Kingdom, and the related fascist ideologies of the late Friedrich von Hayek's neo-feudalist Mont Pelerin Society.

Harvard University's celebrated George Santayana couched in academic aphorism: those who do not learn from history are condemned to repeat it. Thus, the rottenness of the 1905–1917 institutions of Nicholas II's Russia, and the mixed successes and failures, achievements and follies, of both old Russia and the Soviet system, must be addressed. Those follies common to

and control agent for Marx, Giuseppe Mazzini. Thus, Marx was drawn into playing the part of Urquhart's pawn in an intramural squabble between the latter and Lord Palmerston: Urquhart's duping Russia-hater Marx into composing a notorious, long-winded folly representing Palmerston as a “Russian agent.”

¹⁰ Quesnay, the political apologist for France's radically pro-feudal, treasonous Fronde tradition, upon whom Lord Lansdowne's (“Shelburne”) agent Adam Smith relied much for his own 1776 *Wealth of Nations*, was a key figure in a network of salons coordinated by Venice's spy-master Abbot Antonio Conti. The principle of relations upon which the Quesnay relied for his central, feudal-anarchist doctrine of *laissez-faire*, is that of satanist Bernard de Mandeville's *Fable of the Bees*: the literally satanic doctrine placed at the center of the late Friedrich von Hayek's neo-feudalist organization, the Mont Pelerin Society.

¹¹ Crediting von Neumann with the founding of generally accepted forms of “mathematical economics,” references today's widespread devotion, among Cambridge “systems analysts,” and others, to von Neumann's 1938 proclamation of his claim, that all economic propositions could be reduced to solutions for a simultaneous set of linear inequalities. The outcome of that proclamation is enshrined in one of the most pompous pieces of pseudoscientific quackery defecated upon the altar of mathematical formalism: John von Neuman and Oskar Morgenstern, *The Theory of Games and Economic Behavior*, 3rd edition (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1953).

the economic doctrine and practice, of the old Soviet system, to the Czarist regime before it, and also to Lady Thatcher's presently doomed dupes around the world, are the place at which to begin.

Commodities Do Not Produce Commodities

The most efficient proof of the principle defining the proper submission of all historiography to a principle of universal history,¹² is located in a unique quality of experimental fact adduced from the science of physical economy. This same principle is essential for understanding the inherent failure, and inevitable doom, of what British dogma misrepresents as "western civilization," and also key for defining the related, central, fatal flaw of economic and social policy embedded within the Soviet system.

The root of the formal incompetence of all reductionist forms of economic doctrine, commonplace accounting theory and Marx's economics included, is typified by the fallacy of the presently prevailing, implicit axiomatic presumption among economists, and others, that "commodities are produced by commodities."¹³ So, as in Karl Marx's thick *Capital*, or the thin, 1960 *Production of Commodities by Commodities* of Cambridge University's Piero Sraffa, such a mathematical economics, elaborated as a system of simultaneous linear inequalities after the style of Léon Walras, is implicitly premised upon the absurd, underlying, axiomatic presumption, that either linear "labor-time," or linearized "labor-power," is but another member of the array of bills of materials presented to the processes of production.

Construct the crucial experimental-physical proof in the following two, successive terms of reference. First, identify the general distinction of voluntary principle, which sets the human species absolutely apart from, and above all other living species, the latter absolutely inferior to man. Second, by aid of the evidence of physical economy, locate that distinction of

¹² Our use of the term "universal history," is intended to be read as following the outline of the case for use of this term by Friedrich Schiller, in his Jena lectures on the subject. Our view coincides with Schiller's, that the history, both of European civilization, and of that civilization's impact upon our planet as a whole, is to be traced from fundamental conflict between those two tendencies, typified in the history of ancient Greece, by the conflict between the principles of Solon of Athens, and the oligarchical tradition as typified by the Sparta slave-society of the Lycurgus tradition: the philosophy of freedom, Solon and Plato, against the heritage of slavery, the philosophy of oligarchical apologist Aristotle. That is precisely the conflict between the France of Louis XI and its adversaries, the conflict between the young United States in the footsteps of Solon, against the evil oligarchical oppressor, the British "Venetian Party's" Empire, the conflict within the United States, between President Abraham Lincoln's United States and the British puppet, the Confederate slave-owner conspiracy derived from the "Young America" organization set up by the organization of Palmerston's Giuseppe Mazzini. The difference is, that the present writer has supplied Schiller's conception its appropriate foundation in physical science.

¹³ Note 2.

individual human nature, the which is the primary location of that efficient, distinguishing physical principle.

The first array of evidence, is the combined archeological and historical evidence: of the increase in mankind's potential relative population-density, and of correlated advances in spectrum of life-expectancies,¹⁴ physical productivities, and standard of living. This evidence not only sets the human species outside the competence of ecology, but identifies the presence of a voluntary principle as responsible for this demographic self-evolution of human society.

The second array of evidence, enables us to focus upon the nature of that relevant, principled, voluntary distinction of the human individual, which accounts for man's qualitative superiority to all other species. Follow the argument as the writer has stated the core of the matter in his "The Descent to Bush from Man."¹⁵

"Consider the case for economics, first, and turn, then, directly, to identify the corresponding case for any deductive deterministic mathematics.

"Relative to any doctrine of ecology, the distinction which sets mankind outside the competence of so-called ecology, is the functional nature of the variability in the human species' potential relative population-density.¹⁶ This variability is of a type which might be treated as of that 'genetically' predetermined character which is experimentally tolerable (for purposes of pragmatic first approximations) in the comparative study of population-sets among species inferior to man. However, the ecological potential of mankind changes to the effect, that humanity appears to be an upward-evolving succession of species unto itself: that the impulse for constantly upward evolution, respecting its behavior and characteristic potential relative population-density, is the distinguishing characteristic of human nature: a distinction which places the human species beyond the reach of ecology.

"The cause for these advances in mankind's potential relative population-density, is found in mankind's realization, as practice, of certain validated, fundamental discoveries of natural principle. One thinks immediately of experimentally validated discoveries of physical principle, as those effects are encountered explicitly as advances in applied science and technology. These also include the principles underlying the Classical art-forms of poetry, drama, music, and plastic arts, from which mankind has derived advances in statecraft and related matters.

¹⁴ See, "While Monetarism Dies," *op. cit.* (Note 1), Figure 3, p. 18.

¹⁵ *Op. cit.* (Note 2).

¹⁶ Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr., ***So, You Wish to Learn All About Economics?*** 2nd edition (Washington, D.C.: EIR News Service Inc., 1995).

“Each of these validated discoveries, has the significance of an added “dimension,” in the process of progress from an n -fold Riemannian physical-space-time manifold, to an $(n+1)$ -fold manifold. These advances, in degree of *cardinality* of the higher degrees of physical-space-time manifold, correlate with an increase of mankind's (society's) potential power over nature, and with associated tendencies for increase of not only potential relative population-density, but also improved life-expectancies, and a quantitatively and qualitatively enhanced quality of family and individual life.

“The realization of these advances in technology and statecraft, requires absolute increases in the necessary physical and related consumption, per capita of labor force, per household, and per square kilometer of relevant land-area. However, in successful physical economies, those increases in the rations of ‘energy of the system,’ are more than offset by gains in physical productivity. The result is, that in a well-managed society, the ratio of relative ‘free energy’ to relative ‘energy of the system,’ does not fall. It tends, rather, to increase, despite the rising physical requirements of per-capita and per-square-kilometer market-baskets, for labor force, households, basic economic infrastructure, education, health care, science and technology services, production, and distribution. In sum, the transformation from input to output, is ‘not-entropic.’¹⁷ This gain in relative not-entropy, is the sole sustainable source of true profit in an economy.

“The agency underlying this not-entropic function, can not be located in a correlation between the array of inputs and subsequent array of outputs. The human mind is the relevant agency, the only source of this not-entropy.

“This ‘not-entropic,’ distinctive characteristic of the individual human mind's function, has the same implications for the notion of evolution, as it is crucial for distinguishing between scientific and non-scientific forms of political-economy. Contrary to the radically reductionist ‘brain’ dogmas of Bertrand Russell devotees Norbert Wiener and John von Neumann, it is impossible to define this not-entropic function of the human individual mind in terms of any generally accepted form of classroom mathematics. This axiomatic incompetence of today's taught mathematics, is the most devastating experimental-physics demonstration of Leibniz's warning of the need to develop a generalized *Analysis Situs*. In present-day mathematics, only along those frontiers pioneered by Riemann's celebrated habilitation dissertation, can this principle be expressed for purposes of mathematical comprehension.

¹⁷ We are obliged to resort to the relatively awkward term, “not-entropic,” because, over recent decades, a duped public has come to accept the mechanistic (and essentially absurd) significance of Professor Norbert Wiener's misuse of “negative entropy,” or “negentropy.”

“The array of physical inputs to an economic process, is a condition in the physical world; the array of physical outputs of that process, is also a condition in the physical world. Yet, from the standpoint of the philosophical materialist, or reductionists since Parmenides of Elea, what we identify as the ‘cause’ of the transformation linking those two successive conditions, is, for them, an alleged, philosophically impermissible, *metaphysical* intervention by the not-entropic cognitive processes of the individual human mind.

“Thus, it is the relationship of the governing ‘not-entropic’ intervention of the individual human mind, to the productive process, which defines the relationship between inputs and outputs of that process. This is the classical demonstration of the case for an *Analysis Situs*, [which exists only] outside and above a deductive deterministic form of mathematics.¹⁸

“Consider the predicament which this poses to the blockheaded variety of mathematical physicist. The methodological standpoint of experimental physics, as distinct from that of ivory-tower, mathematical formalism, presents us with the existence of efficient, cognitive not-entropy, as a phenomenon of *relationship*, a relationship for which there is no provision within existing mathematical physics. As we shall note, in the appropriate place below, the demonstration of the existence of this relationship as a physically efficient one, satisfies the most powerful standard of scientific truthfulness available in any part of science. It is a relationship nowhere permitted within the axiomatics of generally accepted classroom mathematics, a relationship banned by the dogmas of commonly taught mathematical physics. Yet, it exists!

“The formalist’s reaction to this paradoxical situation, ought to remind us of the spectacle created, if a biological instructor were to assure his students, that we do not yet have any statistical certainty that the evolutionary development of cognitive human life might be probable. So, in response to a proof of the existence of a type of relationship which his mathematics viciously excludes, the formalist proposes that we go to the blackboard, to demonstrate that this relationship might be derived from within the terms of that mathematics! The fraudulent mathematical definition of

¹⁸ Cf. B. Riemann, “Über die Hypothesen, welche der Geometrie zu Grunde liegen,” *Bernhard Riemann’s gesammelte mathematische Werke*, H. Weber, ed. (1902): (New York: Dover Publications [reprint], 1953), or (Vaduz, Liechtenstein: Sändig Reprint Verlag Hans R. Wohlend): “*Es führt dies hinüber in das Gebiet einer andern Wissenschaft, in das Gebiet der Physik, welches wohl die Natur der heutigen Veranlassung [mathematics] nicht zu betreten erlaubt,*” p. 286. Also, in the opening “Plan of the Investigation,” Riemann makes the same point: “*Hiervon aber ist eine nothwendige Folge, dass die Sätze der Geometrie sich nicht aus allgemeinen Grössenbegriffen ableiten lassen, sondern dass diejenigen Eigenschaften, durch welche sich der Raum von anderen denkbaren dreifach ausgedehnten Grössen unterscheidet, nur aus der Erfahrung entnommen werden können,*” pp. 272–273.

‘negative entropy,’ as famously supplied by the late Professor Norbert Wiener, is a celebrated example of such pathetic posturing by a reductionist.¹⁹

“The crucial point is, that not-entropy is not a special condition which might be constructed within the bounds of generally accepted classroom mathematics. In that latter domain, not-entropy presents itself only as a devastating paradox.²⁰ It is an efficiently existing principle, which, however, exists only outside the domain comprehended by such a mathematics. When such paradoxes confront mathematics, a scientific catastrophe is avoided by abandoning the confines of that mathematics; competence exhibits itself so, because it has recognized that the evidence obliges us to rise to that higher domain to which Leibniz assigned the name of *Analysis Situs*.

“This relationship, within the higher domain of an *Analysis Situs*, is the characteristic feature of that science of physical economy founded by Leibniz, as this is already exemplified by the subject-matter of his 1671 *Society and Economy*.²¹ The same kind of paradox confronts the mathematician, in addressing that efficient, not-entropic relationship known as life.

“Once we situate man at the center of the functional relationship, in the study of evolution, we are confronted, once again, by the same problem of *Analysis Situs* which life represents, but on an ontologically higher level. The characteristic of a human nature which demonstrates itself through successive increases in mankind’s potential relative population-density, is precisely that same not-entropic principle, the distinctive principle of the individual human mind: a conception hidden behind the formalist’s [snide] paradox of ‘mind over matter.’ ”

This “artificial,” voluntary elevation of the human species’ potential relative population-density, accomplished in this way, renders the continued existence of mankind at that level subject to the exigencies of “technological attrition.” It might be a useful mnemonic ruse, to restate this to the reader as a slogan: The further man moves upwards from the bestiality of the apes, monkeys, and Bush-babies, the more man’s continued existence depends upon becoming ever more human. This requirement, satisfied in this way, is *human nature*, in opposition to the arbitrary dogmas of Thomas Hobbes, John Locke, Pierre-Louis

¹⁹ Norbert Wiener, *Cybernetics* (New York: John Wiley, 1948). Wiener degraded biological and other characteristically not-entropic processes to virtual statistical accidents within the type of mechanical domain associated with statistical gas theory: i.e., with Ludwig Boltzmann’s case for a highly improbable, local and temporary reversal of statistical entropy, according to the terms of Boltzmann’s construction of his famous H-theorem. See, Morris Levitt, “Linearity and Entropy: Ludwig Boltzmann and the Second Law of Thermodynamics,” *Fusion Energy Foundation Newsletter*, September 1976, pp. 3–18.

²⁰ Cf. A.D. Sakharov, *op. cit.* (Note 2).

²¹ *Society and Economy*, John Chambliss, trans., *Fidelio*, Fall 1992. Also, for an introduction to the science of physical-economy: Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr., *So, You Wish to Learn All About Economics?* *op. cit.*

Maupertuis, Giammaria Ortes, *et al.* This is the nature of the relationship between the human species, as a whole, and the universe as a whole. This characteristic of the human species is situated, within those developable creative powers which are located within the sovereign precincts of the human individual's cognitive processes.

This is, in G. Leibniz's lexicon, the *necessary and sufficient reason* for the continued existence of the human species. This is the voluntary principle, the which defines the meaning, and scope of authority of the concept of universal history. It is the adoption of this principle which distinguishes the historian from such tenured, tendentious gossips as Moscow's late Ilya Ehrenburg.

There is no "human nature," of any group within the human species, Russian, or other, which is subject to any different standard of historiography, any kind of standard contrary to what would be the case for mankind considered as a whole: the science of history is universal history, to which all peoples are equally subject, without exception. This is derived from the fact, that all persons have the same distinctive, human-species nature, which varies from one person, one culture, to another, only in respect of the degree, or imperfection of development of the voluntary principle.

There is a reciprocal relationship between each and all components of mankind and mankind as a whole. Development, in the sense of realization of scientific and technological progress as an increase of the potential relative population-density of both that society, and, by efficient implication, mankind as a whole, is what humanity as a whole requires of each culture, of each person within mankind as a whole. Thus, the primary need of the people of each culture, the need of every individual person, is the realization of a personal and cultural self-development which is consistent with the indicated reciprocal relationship between, on the one side, mankind as an historical whole, and, on the other side, the individual culture and personality within that entirety.

The pivot of all this, is the development of the sovereign cognitive processes, and the opportunities, of each individual person, to the effect, that, firstly, each person assimilates from the manifold of those discoveries of principle which represent human progress in efficient knowledge up to that time, and, that, secondly, each person is afforded the opportunity to participate in furthering such progress, of his or her society, of mankind, and of himself or herself, as an acting, voluntary participant in universal history.

This moral principle of our species does not vary, as our scrutiny passes from one culture, one nationality, to another. All persons have the same essential kinds of needs, which vary only as Leibniz suggests in his 1671 *Society and Economy*, as the relative degree of development, and locality of a society define the exact, functional meaning of those needs. There is no rational basis for tolerating policies of "zero technological growth," such as those

embedded in the notorious Code of Diocletian. The allowable variability in human needs, is bounded by the restriction, that there is no rational, or moral basis for tolerating the “cultural relativists’ ” defense of such degenerate cultures as those which feature the inclusion of cannibalism, head-hunting, ritual human sacrifice, or related abominations, as “traditions.” Nor, can we tolerate any “traditional” or other general practice, such as slavery, serfdom, or “anti-cognitive” qualities of education, practices which impair the functioning of those creative mental processes, by which the universal, voluntary nature of the human species is efficiently expressed.²²

The yardstick of performance of a culture, potential relative population-density, implicitly, defines, in that way, which cultures must be deemed relatively superior, and which either relatively inferior, and even evil. There is no rational basis for tolerating any contrary view.

The distinction of the human species is Reason, as we are implicitly defining Reason here. There is no whim, such as those of charismatic impulse, or presumed tradition, which can be permitted to place itself above the authority of Reason. There are no impulses attributable to the sensual appetites, such as traditions of devotion to notions of “blood and soil,” which a civilized society will permit to violate the domain of Reason as that natural law to which every society is properly, and equally subject.

Such are the most crucial considerations presented to the rational conscience, by the tragic follies which are presently leading the human species toward an immediate collapse into the worst “Dark Age” in the known existence of mankind. We return to this crucial matter, after, next, locating the notions of “*Analysis Situs*” and “not-entropy” with respect to what laymen, and some others, usually mistake for mathematical physics.

²² In former times, the U.S.’s treasonous slave-owner oligarchy, made it a capital offense, for a slave-owner to permit an African-American slave to acquire the ability to read and write. Today’s racists of Harvard University’s Education Department, where the Ku Klux Klan-like theology of Jensen and Shockley was taught, have devoted no fewer than three decades, to arguing that, for genetic reasons, the African-American is made uncomfortable by being required to develop his or her cognitive powers. They argue, that, genetically, the African-American is disposed toward emotional-associative, rather than cognitive behavior. The ensuing dogmas propose that the African-American should not be asked to form conceptions, but only to receive “information.” The obvious tradition of the eugenics cultist aside, the current popularity of this racist correlative of the eugenics cult, in Harvard’s “Black studies” programs, and elsewhere, can be traced to the utopian import of the Ford Foundation-funded, 1965 *Triple Revolution* dogma: that the African-American, and others, would be cut off from modern technology of production, to fill up the ranks of a burgeoning underclass, in ghettos on the outskirts of modern industrial society. Today, tens of millions of non-African-American U.S. citizens have been dumped into that same under-class. British Israelite ideologue, the London *Times* former chief editor, Lord William Rees-Mogg, goes “whole hog” with this: proposing that there should be virtually no industry in any part of a world which subsists upon “the production of information,” and that ninety-five percent of the population of each and all nations should not be educated at all.

Riemann's Notion of Hypothesis

The relationship between so-called mathematical physics and *Analysis Situs*, arises from the principle of *hypothesis*, as the latter principle was supplied by Plato, and his Academy at Athens, to give coherent order to, for example, the work of the original Euclid. The standpoint this writer is representing at this place in writing, is that of Bernhard Riemann's celebrated habilitation dissertation, a work we have already referenced here several times.

Riemann's notion of a successive ordering of physical-space-time manifolds, ordered in rank according to relative mathematical cardinality, defines what is termed a lattice of hypotheses. The notion of *Analysis Situs* is located, relative to a formal mathematical physics, in the ordering principle underlying the manifold represented by such a Riemannian lattice of successively ordered hypotheses, of manifolds of higher-order "curvature," of higher "cardinality." This underlying principle is that associated with the notion of "higher hypothesis" in the dialogues of Plato. This latter underlying principle, is the location of those functional notions of *Analysis Situs* referenced by G. Leibniz.

Consider these connections in terms of a series of definitions.

Each relatively viable strain in post-Fourteenth-Century science, begins with what the Golden Renaissance adopted as the central principle of experimental physical science: the validation, by crucial measurements, of natural principles whose discovery was contrary to pre-established, so-called "mainstream" belief.²³ In all viable strains of modern science, the development of a mathematics relevant to experimental physics, was not derived from blind faith in the so-called "counting numbers;" its origin was, as Riemann's standpoint emphasizes, in Classical-Greek geometry: the notion of a discoverable, perfectable, unified, coherent principle, governing measurement of extension in physical space-time.²⁴ Only in

²³ This notion of the role of measurement was set down by Cardinal Nicholas of Cusa, in his A.D. 1440 *De Docta Ignorantia*, and related writings on the subject of scientific knowledge. This principle of experimental physical science was adduced from study of Cusa's writings by such famed and influential successors as Luca Pacioli and Leonardo da Vinci. Cusa's method, explicitly referenced in those terms, was adopted for the founding of the first comprehensive modern mathematical physics, by Johannes Kepler, as stated at the outset of his "The Harmonies of the World" [*Harmonices Mundi* (1619). Published in German, the writer's textual reference here, is the extant standard translation from the Latin, *Weltharmonik*]. The scientific method of William Gilbert's *De Magnete* (1600), crucial for Kepler's original discovery of a principle of universal gravitation, is also the Renaissance standard of Cusa, Pacioli, and Leonardo. The same method is presented in Gaspard Desargues, Pierre Fermat, Blaise Pascal, Christiaan Huygens (with marginal qualifications), Gottfried Leibniz, Johann Bernoulli, Gaspard Monge, Carl Gauss, Wilhelm Weber, Bernhard Riemann, and Max Planck, but none of the empiricists and other reductionists. Here, we limit our focus on the principle of measurement, to crucial allusions to work of Leibniz and Riemann.

²⁴ The relevant, misguided belief implicitly addressed here, is the fostering of the fraudulent theme, "history begins at Sumer," promoted by the "British Israelite" fanatics who dominated Nineteenth-Century "Biblical archeology": those who virtually demolished a mountain of precious archeological evidence, in their wild-eyed, "Fundamentalist" zeal for being the first to discover the exact street-number of Abraham's residence in Ur.

terms of extension in physical space-time, is it possible to test whether the illiterate's blind faith in mere counting has not, yet once again, deceived us.

The defining topic of experimental physical science, is the subject of demonstrable anomalies: the measurable demonstration of cases in which a phenomenon stubbornly persists, as the universe's contemptuous, impenetrable defiance of the contemporary putative authorities. It is the explicit focus upon the underlying implications of such anomalies, which separates the science of Classical Greece—that which began with the work of Plato's Academy—from all earlier contributions to empirical science, most notably the empirical proto-science of ancient Egypt, prior to the degeneracy of Egypt under the influence of what came to be known later as the cult of Isis. The foundation of all modern science deserving of that name, is the method of hypothesis elaborated within Plato's dialogues, most notably what we recognize today as the later ones.²⁵

A related piece of nonsense, persisting to the present day, is the British Israelite doctrinaire's racist obsession with the delusion, that the original founders of the culture of Sumer were Semites [i.e., could not have been descendants of the Old Testament's Ham]: an arbitrary assertion, without basis in evidence, and contrary to the evidence that the Sumerians whom the Semites labelled the "black-headed people," represented those relative far-flung colonizing efforts (e.g., Horn of Africa) of a maritime culture based upon the then-contemporary, far more extensive culture of the nearby, western Asian subcontinent. [The fact, that the Semitic colonials adopted the cuneiform symbology of the Sumerian colonizers, has as much relevance for the supposition that the Sumerians were Semites, as the discovery of a German-Japan dictionary in Japanese proves that Germans are ancestors of the Japanese. From the same British-Israelite delusion, that history begins at a Semitic Sumer, comes the arbitrary assertion, that maritime cultures were off-shoots of riparian development, where the physical-economic evidence supports the notion of a directly contrary ordering.] In any case, the lunar astronomy of ancient Mesopotamia was absolutely inferior to the solar-astronomical astronomy of Central Asia, thousands of years earlier, and to that of the ancient Egypt contemporary to the Chaldeans. As the evidence of historical times attests, the degeneration of the self-doomed ancient cultures of the region of the belt from South Asia, through Asia Minor, into Europe, and down into the Horn of Africa, is associated with the introduction of Moon-centered worship of "supreme 'Great Mother' goddesses" of the Shakti-Ishtar-Athtar-Astarte-Cybele-Gaea-Isis pantheonic paradigm, which is also the paradigm for the Gaea-rooted, Delphi Apollo-cult, and Delphi's Lycurgus tradition at Sparta, etc. The extension of the numerology and cabalism of Isaac Newton, and of Nineteenth-Century Berlin's Professor Leopold Kronecker, into modern times, like the geocentric hoax concocted fraudulently by Claudius Ptolemy, is a product of the lunacy of the specific pagan tradition of the "mother-goddess" principle, which persists, still today, as a pollution of modern history.

²⁵ The discovery of very long solar-astronomical cycles by the ancient cultures of pre-aridization Central Asia (circa 6,000–4,000 B.C., or earlier) is a relevant illustration of the point. Consider, for example, those Central Asia cultures' discovery of the long equinoctial cycle, a discovery which were not possible unless the mind responsible for it thought in terms of what we know later as "Platonic ideas." The instance of the measurement of the Earth's meridian, by a member of Plato's Academy at Athens, Eratosthenes, who had been recruited to shape the education of Egypt's future Pharaoh, is paradigmatic for the earlier discovery of long cycles such as the equinoctial ones, and all such serve as precursors of the later advancement of astrophysics, geodesy, and study of the Earth's magnetic field, by Carl Gauss. Contrary to those modern "Babylonians" known as the empiricists, "Platonic ideas" are endemic to human nature; without them, human culture would never have advanced above subsisting chiefly upon a combination of berries and prehistoric forms of "road-kill." Classical Greece, as best represented by Plato, transformed the principle of "Platonic ideas" into the basis for a comprehensive scientific method.

Plato's Socratic method of hypothesis, serves as the origin of all modern science, as the first known, comprehensive effort to shift the question of knowledge securely into the domain of *Platonic ideas*. That frees man's mind from the bestial grip of emphasis upon sense-certainty, to examine the internal workings of those cognitive processes which regulate the generation of those conceptions which the utterer presents as propositions, and even as putative knowledge. The typical Socratic question may be stated: *What are the assumptions which underlie the adoption of certain propositions by the (sovereign) cognitive processes of the individual mind?* Now, consider the application of this Socratic method to geometry.

In short, the result of the application of the Socratic method to the propositions, and presumed proofs of geometry, is a set of definitions, axioms, and postulates, of the type we might exemplify by those of *Euclid's Elements*. That set of interacting, underlying assumptions constitutes an *hypothesis*. Hence, in all manifestations, Plato's Socratic method, in contrast to that of his adversary Aristotle, is the same *method of hypothesis* employed by G. Leibniz, the which is at the center of Riemann's habilitation dissertation.

Cusa's derivation of a distinct principle of experimental physical science, from the work of Plato, Archimedes, *et al.*, focuses upon the use of experimental methods of measurement, as the generalizable means for testing the relative truthfulness of two mutually exclusive hypotheses respecting the physical composition of our universe. Which hypothesis implicitly corresponds to a solution for a defiant experimental anomaly? Gauss's notion of a generalizable, experimental principle of curved surfaces, the masterful experimental method applied by Gauss's associate, Wilhelm Weber, and the fundamental discoveries of principle by Bernhard Riemann, represent the crowning fulfillment of Cusa's principle of experimental physical science, up to the onset of the present century.

Viewed from this advantageous standpoint of historical reference, scientific progress occurs, in each instance, as the mastery of one of two types of fallacies within generally accepted scientific opinion: either outright fallacies of judgment, or fallacies attributable to the limited scope of the existing hypothesis. In both types of cases, Cusa's method of measurement in experimental physical science applies. The essential principle of physical science, is the use of the principle of measurement to test which, if any, of the mutually irreconcilable hypotheses presented, corresponds, in a characteristic way, to the results of a relevant, crucial-experimental measurement. In Gauss's terms of reference, we measure the curvature of the physical-space-time manifold implicitly defined by a relevant hypothesis.²⁶

²⁶ In this paragraph, as earlier, the writer has employed the conventional term "crucial experiment," simply as a matter of literary convenience. For classroom use in training of science professionals, he prefers the term "unique experiment": i.e., a test which demonstrates the validity of a newly discovered principle of nature, rather than simply an experiment which tends to show the evidence to be in favor of one proposition, over another. The difference in use of "crucial" and "unique," here, pertains to the nature of the conceptual standards which might be brought into play for the design of experiments.

Thus, Leibniz ridiculed the incompetence of the mathematical methods of René Descartes and Isaac Newton, demanding the introduction of the mathematics of the transcendental domain, instead.²⁷ Leibniz's introduction of the primacy of transcendental physics, and, together with Jean Bernoulli, of the first appreciation of a principle of physical relativity,²⁸ represented an accumulation of changes in hypothesis, away from that simplistic derivation of a merely algebraic mathematics which is derived from a naive reading of the hypothesis underlying Euclidean geometry. The principal next breakthrough, was that accomplished by Riemann, that chiefly on the basis of the preceding work of Gauss. The key implication of Riemann's. revolution in science, is that we are forced to think in a fresh, much more profound way, about what are termed "theorem-lattices."

Riemann's referenced discovery of principle presents us with the image of scientific progress, as a sequence of discontinuous transitions, from one hypothesis to a next, relatively superior one. For this purpose, the corrected view of the Euclidean hypothesis' notion of a fixed set of interactive definitions, axioms, and postulates, is employed. This sequence is commonly characterized, for purposes of experimental measurement, by a modified "Pythagorean," given the general form associated with Riemann's revolution in the notion of the hypothetical basis for geometry. This modified Pythagorean, is viewed from the vantage-point of Gauss's generalization of the notion of curved surfaces, and relevant references to

²⁷ For Leibniz, in his attacks on the incompetence of the "algebraic" mathematics of Descartes and Newton, "transcendental" and "non-algebraic" are interchangeable. The rumor, spread fraudulently, and maliciously by Professor Felix Klein, that the transcendental qualities of Eulerian logarithms and π were first demonstrated by Hermite (1873) and Lindemann (1882), is premised upon a myth popularized by Frederick II's Berlin branch of the network of salons of Newton-devotees set up by Venice's spy-master Abbot Antonio Conti (1677–1749). The Berlin node of this network, was coordinated with Venetian spy Giammaria Ortes (1713–1790): that of Newton devotees Voltaire (Berlin: 1750–53), Pierre-Louis Maupertuis (Berlin: 1741–53), Leonhard Euler (Berlin: 1741–66), Johann Lambert (Berlin: 1764–77), and Joseph Lagrange (Berlin: 1766–87). Frederick II's and Francesco Algarotti's Berlin introduced the Euler-Lagrange, anti-Leibnizian, fallacious theory of functions, which became standard authority for post-Vienna-Congress Europe. Although Newton and the London Royal Society had been object of fully justified ridicule by leading scientists throughout Europe, prior to the Klemens, pimp-Prince von Metternich's (sexual) Congress of Vienna, even in England itself [e.g., the Charles Babbage and John Herschel who introduced the calculus to Britain: *The Principle of Pure Deism, in Opposition to the Dotage of the University* (Cambridge: 1811)], after Britain's participation in the victory over France, the Euler-Lagrange version of Newtonian empiricism, aided by the Venetian controllers of Czar Alexander I's foreign policy, John Capodistrias and Carlo Pozzo di Borgo, "won on the fields of diplomacy what it had lost on the earlier battlefields of science." Hence, although the international networks of Alexander von Humboldt, such as Gauss and Riemann, continued the anti-empiricist, scientific tradition of France and Germany, the agents and "fellow travellers" of British imperial ideological interests, such as Laplace, Cauchy, Kelvin, Clausius, Grassmann, Helmholtz, Maxwell, Hermite, Lindemann, Klein, Mach, and the positivists generally, dominated the universities of the world, especially after that diplomatic triumph of empiricism represented by the post-World War I Treaty of Versailles.

²⁸ The coherence of the tautochronic (gravity) and brachystochronic (isochronic refraction of light) principles of physical-space-time curvature.

Gauss's development, for purposes of experimental measurements, of the notion of biquadratic residues, beyond the initial presentation in his *Disquisitiones arithmeticae*.²⁹

Thus, for Riemann, as for Plato, the presentation of an ordered series of successively more powerful hypotheses, presents us with the following imagery.

We begin with that enriched notion of the Euclidean hypothesis which Riemann's discovery provides. We then define a deductive form of Euclidean geometry as an ostensibly open-ended theorem-lattice, the relations among the theorems defined as their common lack of deductive inconsistency with each and all of the members of the set of definitions, axioms, and postulates, of the relevant hypothesis. Thereafter, in comparing a pair of differing hypotheses, we think in terms of comparing the cross-mappings of the sets of definitions, axioms, and postulates of which each of the two hypotheses is, respectively, composed.

Once we have understood ourselves in respect to the first comparison between pairs of hypotheses, we must then depart the confines of mathematical deductive formalism. We seek to discover what measurable physical difference in performance exists between the efficient performances of the physical systems corresponding respectively to the formal hypotheses compared. The relativistic view arising from the notions of isochronism/tautochronism, and the cohering brachystochrone experiment, as associated with the Huygens-Leibniz-Bernoulli work of the late Seventeenth Century, point out the direction we must follow, as Riemann goes so. The epistemological significance, and importance of "relative physical-space-time curvature," become clear to us; this directs us toward the appropriate notions and design of relevant experiments bearing directly upon the comparison of hypotheses respecting physical space-time.

At that nodal point of the investigation, we must return to the point of departure: the notion of ranking, and corresponding ordering, of deductively inconsistent theorem-lattices. We have thus defined a domain from which the 1741–1804 Euler-Lagrange axioms respecting continuity are banned. The discontinuities among the contrasted theorem-lattices (i.e., contrasted hypotheses), now become for us, as for the G. Leibniz of the so-called *Monadology*, the formal conception whose experimental-physical correlatives are sought out. We are rewarded, in significant part, by discovering that, in the *Monadology*, Leibniz's earlier sketched ideas respecting an *Analysis Situs* are assuming a definite form.

Apply to the Riemann sequence of hypotheses, the same requirement prompting the adducing of the hypothesis corresponding to a deductive theorem-lattice for geometry. In the

²⁹ These references to Gauss's work are made by Riemann in his habilitation dissertation. See Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr., "The Essential Role of 'Time-Reversal' in Mathematical Economics," *EIR*, Oct. 11, 1996, p. 19, Note 3. An 1889 German translation of *Disquisitiones arithmeticae* from the original Latin is available in a reprint edition: *Untersuchungen über höhere Arithmetik*, H. Maser, trans. (New York: Chelsea Publishing Co., 1981).

relevant terms of Plato's *Parmenides*: What is the "One" which corresponds to, subsumes, underlies the ordering of the "Many" terms of this hypothesis-lattice? The generic term for the answer to that question, is: Higher Hypothesis. What is the nature of the implied *content* of such a higher hypothesis? What corresponds, within higher hypothesis, to the role of interactive definitions, axioms, and postulates of the hypothesis for a deductive geometry? Broadly, the answer is, "*Analysis Situs*." In the instance before us, the individual human mind's cognitive potential: "not-entropy," as opposed to "entropy."

For clarity, add the following summary bit of exposition.

In other locations, the writer has defined the *Analysis Situs* of scientific knowledge in general, in the following terms of reference. The product of cognition which we term "knowledge," is composed of three distinct categories of observed processes, examined against three mutually exclusive domains. The three processes are "ostensibly not-living," "ostensibly living, but not cognitive," and "cognitive processes (of living beings)." The division of empirical evidence *of relations*, is: "astrophysics," "microphysics," and "macrophysics." This defines a table of nine cells, each distinct from all others. The map of the combinations and permutations of the relations among these nine cells, forms a lattice of relations; the relationship which subsumes the lattice of these combinations and permutations, subsumes Higher Hypothesis. The lattice so defined, is the *Analysis Situs* of higher hypothesis; the subsuming relationship, is what Plato recognizes as "hypothesizing the higher hypothesis."³⁰

In those locations, and otherwise, since 1948–1952, the writer has used the comparison between the cognitive processes of scientific and technological progress, in production, and the same creative processes in Classical forms of musical thorough-composition, both as related to the determining role of metaphor in Classical poetry and tragedy, as the key to "triangulating" the nature of the individual mind's sovereign creative processes. The substantial reference to be stressed, as by the celebrated medieval composer Ramon Lull's *Ars Magna*, is that the power of individual Reason is located within the active functions we associate with memory.

That is to say, we are conscious of perceptions by means of the agency of memory. Or, we should say, that human memory is not an analog for the "memory" of a digital computer. Human memory functions according to the principle of hypothesis; memory is the seat of individual cognitive judgment. Memory is governed by the functions ontologically associated with the usage of *Analysis Situs* as we have defined it here. Ramon Lull's *Ars Magna* displays a highly refined sense of something existing (ontologically) in that direction. The development of Classical methods of motivic thorough-composition, beginning with

³⁰ It should be noted, that this configuration is well known to all Platonists, such as G. Leibniz and B. Riemann.

W. Mozart's insight into J.S. Bach's *A Musical Offering*, through the last song of Johannes Brahms's *Vier ernste Gesänge* hymns,³¹ is the most convenient existing "model" for demonstrating how memory functions, to such an effect that all greatly accomplished musicians perform according to the principle which the great conductor Wilhelm Furtwängler identified famously as "performing between the notes."

That said, focus now upon the ordering principle implicit in a "not-entropic," Riemannian hypothesis-lattice, putting aside other notions of *Analysis Situs* than the principled relationship we have identified as "not-entropy."

What is the experimental-physical basis, which supplies a *unique* demonstration of this not-entropic principle of *Analysis Situs* in man's relationship to the universe? In summary, inasmuch as the Riemannian succession of hypotheses correlates with the increase of mankind's potential relative population-density, this correlation shows us that an increase of mathematical cardinality in the form of validated knowledge of physical principles, increases man's power over the universe. It is shown, thus, that the universe is so pre-designed, so to speak, that when mankind's will is expressed as a validated discovery of physical principle, the universe is obliged to bend, in that increased degree, to mankind's will. In brief: the law which the universe obeys, is this law. All human experience, when expressed in terms of this Riemannian series, thus forms a unique experiment, in which it is demonstrated that the universe as a whole is characteristically not-entropic.

Who could deny this efficiently? All knowledge is a product of the human mind, a mind which exists only in the form of sovereign cognitive processes of the individual person. The question of knowledge becomes, therefore: What are the characteristics of individual mental behavior by means of which society increases mankind's power in the universe, and by what means can we describe the directed mental processes by means of which that increase of power is generated?

In this setting, the most relevant and notable expression of the fallacy of formal deductive mathematics, is the folly of the attempt to define mathematically those distinguishing characteristics of living and cognitive processes, respectively, an experimentally well-defined relation (*Analysis Situs*), which, by the nature of mathematics, could not be described in terms of any previously adopted, reductionist form of deductive mathematics. The dishonest mathematician, or his lackey, would perhaps insist that we have created afresh the controversy between deductive rationality and blind "leaps of faith." On the contrary, the fact of the matter is, that deduction can not leap the successive chasms (mathematical discontinuities) of not-entropy, and that not-entropy nonetheless exists.

³¹ Opus 121.

The objector's problem is, that he would rather depart the universe than supersede an outdated mathematics which can no longer account for the experimental realities. The epistemological issue separating science from the formalist's reductionism, is simply a matter of acknowledging the evidence, and constructing a new mathematics which is in agreement with that experimental evidence.

In this issue, the "leap of blind faith," is entirely a product of the hysterical, charismatic delusion of the logician. So, it might be said: wherever there is a deductively obsessed Dr. Faustus, there is the lawful prey of a lurking Mephistopheles' charismatic charms.

How London Controls Moscow

Those indispensable preliminaries stated, we now turn to the crucial sub-topic of this strategic study. The examples we cite, appear to demonstrate, that neither the typical U.S. nor Russian academic knows what the international Communist movement was, or is, or how that affects, crucially, any prospect for U.S.-Russia relations today. However, we should also recognize, in certain achievements of Soviet society, how the inherent nobility of human nature as we define it here, often defies, and sometimes triumphs over the ideologies which otherwise seem to have gained hegemony over the leading institutions of nations such as the U.S.S.R., or today's U.S.A.

We begin this summary account of relevant features of Communist history, with reference to a document now in the possession of the writer's representatives, a relevant official document of the U.S. Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI), dated October 29, 1973. This document represents exchanges between the FBI's New York City office and the Washington Headquarters. Its subject is the FBI's utilization of its assets in the leadership of the Communist Party USA (CPUSA) for a plan to bring about this writer's "elimination."³² Although this FBI document itself was grudgingly released, piece-meal, much later, under the U.S.A. "Freedom of Information Act" procedures, the writer knew, already, beginning no later than early July 1973, that he was the target of a U.S.-British-East Germany "elimination" operation set into motion no later than February 1973. The role of the FBI, British MI-5, and the East Germany Interior Ministry (e.g., "Stasi"), was adequately confirmed by evidence already in hand by no later than January 1974, the time the *New York Times* deployed to run a massive, and fraudulent cover-up for the FBI.³³

³² See the video actuality of proceedings from an Aug. 31–Sept. 1, 1995 hearing, "The LaRouche Case," in which this and other documentation is featured within the testimony.

³³ Paul Montgomery, "How a Radical-Left Group Formed as an Alternative to Violence and Narcotics Degenerated into Savagery," *New York Times*, Jan. 20, 1974. It should not be really astonishing, that the same *New York Times*'s Paul Montgomery was caught on a Summer 1979 audio tape, to which he outlined a *Times* editors' plot to set this writer up for malicious, false prosecution by state and Federal agencies, together with U.S. Representative Elizabeth Holtzman (D-N.Y.). The public exposure of this tape, at New York City and

The relevant head of the 1973 FBI's CPUSA, Minnesota native Gus Hall, was described by the UNO Soviet Mission's representative at the time, as "a personal friend of Leonid Brezhnev"!

Take the case of Angela Davis, a protégé of "Frankfurt School"

Communist-turned-OSS/CIA operative Herbert Marcuse, who, in turn, played a key role for McGeorge Bundy's Ford Foundation, in creating what became the Weatherman LSD-and-terrorism group.³⁴ Ms. Davis had turned up to play a role in the CPUSA's youth group, the YWLL, prior to the time, beginning early March 1973, the YWLL was deployed to organize and conduct violence against this writer and his associates, months prior to the indicated official date of the FBI document.³⁵

Disgusting? Yes. Astonishing? Shocking? Not if one knows what the world is really like. As the great poet, and intimate of James Rothschild's Paris Salon, Heinrich Heine, attempted to warn his acquaintance Karl Marx and other dupes,³⁶ that the entire left-wing movement around Giuseppe Mazzini's "Young Europe," was an operation run by leading powerful

Washington, D.C. press conferences, impelled the *Times* to conduit its libel through a weekly rag controlled by the notorious Roy M. Cohn, who used a "Maoist" Progressive Labor Party cast-off, sleaze-scene hustler Dennis King, to carry the by-line on the libel published in Ed Kayatt's Cohn-controlled *Our Town*.

³⁴ Eyewitness testimony and official Foundation-grant records, show that Herbert Marcuse was key in the establishment and operation, on McGeorge Bundy's and Dr. Kenneth Clark's watches, of a Ford Foundation conduit to those self-styled "Crazies" at 1968 Columbia University who later formed the core of the Weathermen. Officially the conduit was named the "East Side Service Organization (ESSO)," and the Ford Foundation support was conduited by the Washington, D.C.-based Institute for Policy Studies, then represented by the Washington law firm of Arnold and Porter. This was part of the same Ford Foundation operation which organized, along the lines set forth in the Ford Foundation-funded *The Triple Revolution* of Robert Theobald, *et al.*, an anti-Semitic near-race-riot between recipients of Foundation grants and the United Federation of Teachers during the Summer and Autumn of 1968. The organization deployed, in Summer–Autumn 1968, to promote the cause of an anti-Semite race-riot against the teacher's union, was Gus Hall's Communist Party U.S.A. together with its retinue of "former CPers" and other "fellow travellers."

³⁵ During February 1973, foundation-funded groups deployed against the National Caucus of Labor Committees (NCLC). The issue was the NCLC's effort to halt the effort to use "workfare reforms" as a guise for deploying dragooned welfare recipients into breaking trade-union contracts. The relevant wealthy foundations were committed to using violence to halt the NCLC's organizing resistance to this "workfare" program. During early through middle March 1973, a group controlled by these foundations used the Philadelphia area news media, to announce a campaign to wreck a conference being held in Philadelphia, with NCLC co-sponsorship; the YWLL, which was an active part of that Institute for Policy Studies-steered pro-"workfare" coalition, attempted to deploy violence to break up the conference, and drew back only when YWLL goons saw an organized defense of the conference in place. After that, the national YWLL resolved to use goon-tactics, to sweep the NCLC off the streets of the U.S.A. The FBI's November 1973 deployment of its CPUSA assets for the proposed "elimination" of Lyndon LaRouche, was a continuation of the violence-prone, Winter–Spring operations in support of the "slave-labor" program defended by the YWLL. It was during the same period, February–December 1973, that the East Germany Interior Ministry, MI-5, and others, were deployed, in concert, in Britain and also continental western Europe, for the same violent cause.

³⁶ Heinrich Heine, *Ludwig Börne* (1840).

bankers known to Heine through associations such as the Paris Rothschild salon. As Heine's famous earlier writings, that exposing the Romantic school, and his denunciation of Immanuel Kant and others,³⁷ shows, this was not an accidental insight for Heine. Anyone who understands mankind's true nature, as every great poet does, more or less accurately, recognizes that we are essentially creatures of ideas, rather than the brutish, genetically-predetermined British instincts of a Baroness Margaret Thatcher or U.S. ex-President and "knuckle-dragger" Sir George Bush.

Nonetheless, once the layman is presented such evidence, he, or, she will tend to misinterpret it. Such naivety reaches to very high levels of government and other political and academic institutions. If, and when, and only when, one has at least the degree of grasp of this matter which Heine demonstrated, does one understand those underlying processes which control the fate of nations.

How, and when did the kinds of wealthy oligarchical families, such as those behind the funding of the 1968–1973 operations just identified, gain top-down control, as they did, over the leaderships of Communist parties and related organizations, in the Americas and in Europe? The answer is: Since a time long before the first Communist Party was born in any part of the world. Consider now, a relatively concise summary of the relevant facts; then, consider the degrees to which this control by wealthy international-financier families has, and *has not*, determined the character of Lenin's Bolsheviks and the post-1917 history of the Soviet society.

As Karl Marx, and the founders of Soviet Russia emphasized repeatedly, the pre-history of the present-day Communist parties, begins in France, during the 1780s, as Robespierre's Jacobin faction, prepared, in concert with Benjamin Franklin's personal enemy, the Duke of Orléans Philippe "*Egalité*," to take over France. What Karl Marx refused to face, was the fact which had already been publicly documented before Marx was born, and facts presented personally to Marx by Heinrich Heine, that Robespierre's Jacobins were, like the Duke of Orléans, agents of the British Foreign Service then commanded by the Jeremy Bentham, who had been appointed by Lord Lansdowne (the notorious "Shelburne") of the British East India Company's Barings bank, to head the British Foreign Service established during the brief period, 1782–1783, Shelburne was Prime Minister of Britain.

The British Foreign Service's asset, the Duke of Orléans, Philippe *Egalité*, and his Robespierre-led Jacobins, took over the 1789 French Revolution, through the elimination of

³⁷ During World War II, the British gave wide attention to an English translation of Heine's 1830s *The History of Religion and Philosophy in Germany*, in which Heine prophetically, and with accurate epistemological insight, emphasized the connection between the influence of Kantianism and future tyrannies arising in Germany.

the pro-U.S.A. figure Gilbert Marquis de Lafayette.³⁸ Orléans himself organized, and armed the famous seizure and burning of the Bastille (as an election stunt for the Orléans-backed candidacy, for the Prime Ministership of France, of Swiss banker Jacques Necker). He assembled, funded, and armed the mob which stormed a Bastille which contained no political prisoners! The same Orléans, the cousin of King Louis XVI, later organized, and armed the storming of Versailles, outflanking Lafayette politically, and thus virtually ending the power of Lafayette and his friends. Out of this came the London-directed Jacobin Terror in France.

As this was explained, officially and loudly, by Colombia's Simón Bolívar: Bentham employed the same methods he used in training Danton and Marat, in his control over those British Scottish Rite freemasonry's revolutionaries in South America and the Caribbean, which he deployed in the attempt to effect a British takeover of the Spanish colonies there.³⁹

This brings us to Heine's "case of Ludwig Börne." Bentham's protégé, Lord Palmerston, employed the same methods to create the British Foreign Service's insurrectionary "Young Europe" and "Young America" conspiracies, coordinated, in conjunction with Napoleon III and the London-based Giuseppe Mazzini, for the immediate purpose of toppling Britain's outlived Holy Alliance ally, Prince Metternich. Trier's young Karl Marx was picked up by Mazzini *et al.* during the late 1830s, as part of that British "zoological" collection of insurrectionary specimens. In miniature, the 1966–1969 developments around Columbia University, and parallel developments, against de Gaulle *et al.* in Europe, were replays of the "Young Europe" and (Massachusetts-South Carolina) "Young America" ferment of the 1830s through 1850s. The anarchist and socialist organizations which sprang up in Europe and the Americas after the outbreak of the U.S. Civil War of 1861–1865, were all products of the British Foreign Service's world-wide network of Mazzinian revolutionaries.

The pattern continues through the history of the Communist International, and the tentative, post-Stalin quasi-rehabilitation of the British Foreign Service's Bukharin-Thalheimer-Lovestone, "right wing" Communist International Opposition, under N.S. Khrushchev, Eugen Varga, Otto Kuusinen, and their successors. There is indelible

³⁸ The libretto of Ludwig van Beethoven's opera *Fidelio* was based upon the 1797 rescue of the real-life Florestan, Lafayette, from the dreaded Austria-Hungary prison at Olmütz, to which the real-life Lafayette had been relegated, after his flight to Austria in 1792, by the apparatus left behind by Wolfgang Mozart's deadly adversary, the then recently retired Austria Chancellor Wenzel Prince von Kaunitz. In real life, the imprisonment was done in the interest of the British Prime Minister William Pitt the Younger, the Opera's *Pizzaro*. The opera's Florestan was rescued by his wife, *Fidelio*; in real life, it was the persistent activity of Lafayette's wife, which secured his release from Olmütz.

³⁹ As Bentham's protégé Lord Palmerston, used British agent Giuseppe Mazzini (and members of the family of the deceased Emperor Napoleon Buonaparte) to seize Rome in a Freemasonic insurrection.

evidence that General Secretary Josef Stalin was on to the British game, at least to a degree beyond the comprehension, and desire of successors such as Khrushchev.

Who actually exerts such forms of control over the international Communist movement, and, also, many of its offshoots, and also others, still today? How is the control structured, and how does it function? To what purpose and effect? What part of Soviet history is real (i.e., actually Russian), and which, like the British Foreign Service's coordination of both the 1905 Russo-Japanese War and the so-called "1905 Revolution," merely a reflection of this Bentham-Palmerston-style of puppet-play?

The first step toward comprehension, is to get past the kind of popular idiocy which looks for a "CIA agent" under every bed. For example: Who actually exerted control over assets such as that former (Bukharin-Thalheimer-Lovestone) "International Right Opposition" of the Communist International, the one whose U.S. base was the industrial engineering section, formerly under William Gomberg, of David Dubinsky's International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union (ILGWU),⁴⁰ and which operated under such covers as the International Rescue Committee and its Freedom House offshoot?

How many of these "Right Opposition" agents were laundered into the U.S.A.'s war-time Office of Strategic Services and Office of War Information, and from such way-stations, into the post-war U.S., British, and Canadian intelligence services? The most widespread form of

⁴⁰ A thumb-nail sketch of Dr. William Gomberg, this based largely on his own autobiographical sketch and eyewitness supplements, is relevant. Gomberg's first known association with later, Kremlin-appointed CPUSA chief Jay Lovestone, relates to Lovestone's role in setting up and leading an "underground" student cell of the Louis Fraina-founded U.S. Communist Party, at New York City College (CCNY). (Fraina himself had been trained under the scoundrel known as Daniel De Leon, a Curaçao branch of the Dutch slave-owner oligarchy, an asset of the New York City bankers with a track-record as a rabid opponent of the Washington-Lincoln tradition, who took over the Socialist Labor Party out of which Fraina pulled one of the nuclei from which the U.S. Communist Party was formed.) Lovestone's later appointment as head of the CPUSA was made by Lovestone's *rebbe*, Soviet dictator N. Bukharin, over the objections of the CPUSA majority's support for William Z. Foster. In June 1949, Gomberg broadened his influence from ILGWU, into the arbitration panel, set up between the Ford Motor Company and the United Auto Workers. Together with Lovestone, who moved into a key relationship with both the FBI's J. Edgar Hoover and the AFL-CIO's Meany, Gomberg's boys moved into powerful positions within the AFL-CIO, especially the Industrial Union section. When last tracked directly in the author's counter-intelligence operations against the FBI-CPUSA assassination-plot of 1973, Dr. Gomberg was operating out of the Wharton School and the University of Pennsylvania, assisting British intelligence's Dr. Eric Trist, in working to destroy the West Virginia and Virginia segments of John L. and Denny Lewis's old United Mine Workers organization. In matters of counterintelligence, and related matters, never judge a book, or an agent, by its cover: rarely judge a person by their expressed opinions, and never by the opinions attributed to them by an almost inveterately lying mass media. Check their intellectual "genes," the underlying, axiomatic assumptions which most people have adopted prior to the age of twenty-five years, and which, only in certain exceptions, ever lose control of the relevant habitation thereafter. Opinions, like theorems, change, but, as in generally accepted forms of geometry or other mathematical belief, except as a tectonic crisis shakes them free from attachment to deeply ingrown underlying assumptions, people's axioms, like pallbearers of the mind, usually carry them into their graves.

political paranoia around the world today, is expressed by such delusions as the misguided assumption, that agents must be agents of governments, or government agencies, and that the character of national governments is an epiphenomenon of the national character of the government's relevant subject population. No historian, or counterintelligence officer "worth his salt" would support such delusions.

Take the British Empire, which still exists, under the rubric of "British Commonwealth." The blunder of John Q. Public on this matter, is not merely that he has been brainwashed into repeating the lying mantra: "Britain is our nearest, dearest, and oldest ally." His confusion is rooted in his deluded belief in popularized fairy-tales, that the British monarchy is merely a ceremonial appendage of "British parliamentary democracy," and his corollary delusion, that the British state is an epiphenomenon of the population of the United Kingdom.

The British state is headed by a hereditary monarchy, which was selected by the Act of Settlement of 1701, the Act which is about as much of a semblance of an actual Constitution as the United Kingdom has to the present day.⁴¹ The modern British state, and empire, came

⁴¹ According to the principle of international law at the center of, for example, Friedrich (Freiherr) von der Heydte's *Die Geburtsstunde des souveränen Staates* (Regensburg, Germany: Druck und Verlag Josef Habbel, 1952), the United Kingdom has never been a nation-state; rather, it fits all of the legal standards, under both western and Chinese political history, of an empire. An "empire," such as all of those of ancient Mesopotamia, is distinguished by the limiting of the original sovereign power of lawmaking to the assigned personality of an elected, or hereditary monarch, or other form of dictator (e.g., Oliver Cromwell). The power of such a dictatorship is that of a veritable Olympian Zeus: his whim may not be questioned, except as he may be impeached by a council of princely potentates, constituted in the form of a council with the power of an ancient Roman *pater familias*, to select and replace designated hereditary or other claimant to the sovereign power. Barring the pure whims within such a princely privy council, the grounds for impeachment of a sovereign, include offenses against the customs (e.g., official religion) of the realm in general, or excessive offenses against one or more among the special customs of ethnic or other groups whose status as subsidiary component of the realm commands toleration of relevant religious or other customary beliefs. Thus, the pagan Emperor Constantine's "legalization" of official Christianity by appointing it to membership in the Empire's Mithraic pantheon of the local Zeus, running under such aliases as Sol Invictus, afforded Christianity qualified protection from continued persecution, on condition that the Emperor be allowed to regulate Christian belief, as the gnostic Justinian did later, by appointment of the bishops to enforce the cult of the mortalist and reductionist Aristotle. Since no later than that Chaldean mother of evil known as the empire of ancient Babylon, three types of imperial power have been known: landed aristocracy, financier nobility, and dictatorships based upon the state bureaucracy itself. The old British imperial form of rule was based upon the power of the great landed aristocrats, such as those families which slaughtered one another in France as in England, during the Venice-coordinated "Hundred Years' War," and the "War of the Roses." The belief that the Magna Carta was a blow for freedom is a fairy-tale for credulous children: in reality, the Magna Carta was simply a matter of curbing the nationalist impulses of a King John who sought to free his kingdom from the overreaching tyranny of the great landed potentates. Beginning Venice's control over the mind of Henry VIII, through the manipulation of the Anne Boleyn affair by Venice agents including Francesco Zorzi, Cardinal Pole, and Thomas Cromwell, the 1517–1714 internal conflicts in Britain were orchestrated directly by Venice and its agents, to the purpose of defeating the English patriots among both the landed families and English intelligentsia, to bring to power a financier-oligarchical cabal, which has ruled the United Kingdom, virtually

into existence with the 1714 accession of a former protégé of the Netherlands' William of Orange, Hanover's Georg Ludwig, as the United Kingdom's King George I. The resulting design of the British state, was developed to make London, as a capital of international usury and maritime power in northern Europe, a clone of the old pre-Napoleonic Republic of Venice. This London, like old imperial Venice, its British Empire, and its so-called "British Commonwealth" of today, is an agency of an international financier oligarchy, an oligarchy, like that of its adoptive parent, *pater familias* old imperial Venice. That oligarchy is composed, both of some families which are immensely rich, or families and personalities, such as a Cardinal Gasparo Contarini or Paolo Sarpi, of other forms of extraordinary, traditional influence.

The crux of the matter is, that the British state, including its Commonwealth appendage, is a political "household lackey" of the several thousand powerful figures who represent the ruling families of the extended British financier oligarchy.

To the competent historian, this form of the British state is not a notably novel concoction.

As we have noted, above, until the establishment of the first nation-state, that of France's King Louis XI (1461–1483), the world was ruled by empires, not nations; the empires were ruled by an executive in whose person all property, all law (saving the countervailing weight of traditions) was concentrated: the emperor. All other power existed under franchises derived from the central imperial power. These empires were ruled by oligarchies of powerful families, an oligarchy whose presumed relationship to ordinary mortals mimicked the legendary oligarchy known as the gods of pantheonic Olympus. The dominant set of the oligarchical families composing these oligarchies were of three types: a landed aristocracy, a financier nobility, or a bureaucratic (e.g., state) nobility, or priesthood of the hegemonic pantheonic religious organization. All three types were represented in all cases since Babylon, or earlier; the distinction of one type of empire from the other lies in the selection of the dominant type, from among these three types. The constitutional state, a representative of the citizens and their posterity, did not exist (excepting some city-state approximations) until the modern nation-state first came into being, in France, through the work of Italy's sponsors of the Fifteenth-Century Golden Renaissance.⁴²

As we have noted, the British Empire (e.g., United Kingdom) is essentially an empire of the financier-oligarchical, as distinct from landed-aristocratic form. The British hereditary

unchallenged from within, since the 1714 accession. That political faction of financier-oligarchical interest, which came to power through the bloody succession of 1517–1714 conflicts, was known then, and into the Eighteenth Century, by the generic name of "Venetian Party." Consider the argument of the Scottish nationalists in this light: that they must be granted an actual constitution, rather than continuing to suffer the caprices of London-based, "Venetian Party" oligarchical "Princes."

⁴² I.e., the A.D. 1439–1440 sessions of the great ecumenical Council of Florence.

monarchy, is best appreciated by thinking of “the Windsors” as an hereditary version of the old Venice doge-ship. This British Venetian-style financier oligarchy, has supplemented the actual wars it has organized indirectly, as also directly, against the vital interest of the United States, with other forms of subversion. All have been conducted in the interest of the British expression of Venice-style imperial interest, in the interest, thus, of the “Venetian model.” Thus, as short-hand, we may reference these sundry attributes with the more economical utterance of “Venetian Party.” In other locations, the author and his associates have documented crucial highlights of the relevant methods of subversion.⁴³

In the United States, the Anglophile financier oligarchy of wealthy and powerful families, which tradition associates with J.P. Morgan's Wall Street finance, is a British-style imperial formation which has superimposed itself upon the U.S.A. institutions of state. For example, as the case of the flow of grants to Communist Party offshoots from foundations established by financier-oligarchical families, illustrates the point, the typical agent, is not primarily an agent of some U.S. government agency, but, rather of a faction of the wealthy families behind the proliferation of tax-exempted charitable foundations, such as the Ford Foundation under the guidance of families' representatives, such as Bertrand Russell's Robert M. Hutchins and McGeorge Bundy. Usually, the U.S. government agencies come into play as institutions which are under the de facto control, as through controlled “old boy” networks, of the wealthy oligarchical families.

For example, around Atlanta, Georgia, there is a cabal of agents of Communist Party backgrounds dating from the 1920s. The CPUSA's longstanding “Agrarian”-parody asset, “Mother Hen” Anne Braden, is a typical point of reference. To what degree are these Communist Party agents? The funding records show the control to be a network of oligarchical-family foundations closely intertwined with the World Wide Fund for Nature of Britain's Prince Philip. So, what else is new?

In short, the naive person has often looked for “government agents,” where most agents are, rather, agents of private interests representing a faction of the wealthy oligarchical families. There are some instances of straight-forward government agents, pure and simple police-agents, for example; for counter-intelligence purposes, these are to be viewed as like fleas on any dog which runs in the streets. Predominantly, the important expressions of agency are controlling links to oligarchical families.

⁴³ E.g., Nancy Spannaus and Christopher White, *The Political Economy of the American Revolution*, 1977, second edition (Washington, D.C.: EIR News Service, 1996); W. Allen Salisbury, *The Civil War and the American System: America's Battle with Britain*, 1860–1876, 2nd edition (Washington, D.C.: Executive Intelligence Review, 1992); Anton Chaitkin, *Treason in America* (New York: New Benjamin Franklin House, 1985); H. Graham Lowry, *How the Nation Was Won: America's Untold Story* (Washington, D.C.: Executive Intelligence Review, 1988); Anton Chaitkin and Webster G. Tarpley, *George Bush: The Unauthorized Biography* (Washington, D.C.: Executive Intelligence Review, 1992).

Focussing, for a moment, on “left-wing” movements in general. The pedigrees of these movements are all traced back to the Eighteenth-Century operations of the “Venetian Party” faction of oligarchs throughout Europe and North America. The formation of the Communist International, and also the original Communist Party of the Soviet Union, was no exception to this rule. This leads us to the question: To what degree were sundry Communists actually agents, or not agents of this international oligarchical interest; this includes Communist organizations outside the Soviet Union; it emphasizes the “international bankers’ ” control over such figures of the Communist International as Radek, Bukharin, Lovestone, *et al.*; it emphasizes the growing domestic and foreign influence of the residues of Bukharinite Communist Right Opposition, and to a lesser degree, of the Trotskyist Left Opposition, within Khrushchev’s and post-Khrushchev Warsaw Pact countries; it includes, above all, the massive influence of British intelligence within the pre-1991, and post-1991 Russia.

The kind of agency relevant to counterintelligence interest, in political movements, falls broadly into four types. First, to get his, or her case out of the way: The pure and simple “sent in” agent, or person recruited from a political organization to play such a part, such as a government agent. Second, the operative who functions among political organizations and movements as a “Leporello,” a lackey of some oligarchical-family interest, as Heine described the circumstances surrounding the case of Ludwig Börne. Third, the opportunist, who is the agent of the covert agenda supplied to him through the duct of his venality. Fourth, there is the unwitting dupe, whose behavior is controlled, as that of a puppet, by “jerking his political-sociological-psychological strings.” Most political organizations, notably the relevant left-wing ones, are controlled by agents of the fourth, “string-jerk” type.

We focus here on the functional significance of foreign-controlled, “jerkable-string” agents—e.g., unwitting puppets—of the fourth type. The matter of “psychological strings” is crucial for understanding the political characteristics of Russia’s situation today. This returns our attention to the issues of *Analysis Situs* referenced above; now, we view the same issues from the standpoint of what many would wish to identify as the realm of “social theory.”

The Labor-Movement Paradigm

There are three qualities of “jerkable psychological strings” to be considered, to attain a functional, e.g., counterintelligence, comprehension, respecting the most important internal political problems threatening Russia today. The relevant defect which defines each of the three qualities may be identified, respectively, in ascending order of intellectual cardinality, as “populist,” intellectual, and moral.

It is important to proceed from what the socialist organizations, including the Soviet state, considered the related counterintelligence problem. One could drive a herd of cattle through

the doors which those counterintelligence services left open: hence, the frequent, hysterical, bloody-handed resort to slaughtering the poor cattle, innocents included, because of the inability of the relevant security services, then, as in Russia today, to discover, and close the relevant "doors."

As the socialist movements attracted increasing aversive attention from police and related political agencies of governments, these movements accreted a variety of "rules of thumb" governing matters of internal security against problems of agents in their ranks. Among those "rules of thumb," one of the two most interesting, for purposes of this strategic study, is the extensive array of liturgies on the subject of the conflict between the role of loyalty to the nitty-gritty impulses of the "masses," as against the "sophisticated," and therefore inherently "alien" tendencies in thought endemic to all so-called "intellectuals." This doctrine was carried to its lunatic extreme in those currents which were, not accidentally, the most useful sort of relatively long-term assets of the very police-agents from which that populist's mantra was presumed to inoculate the socialist or related organizations.

Yet, there was a misplaced germ of truth buried under the pro-"nitty-gritty" irrationalism of the anarcho-syndicalist types.

The fact that the socialist movements are usually creations of powerful financier-oligarchy or analogous interests, and that they also often function in aversive environments, makes the issue of loyalty of attachments and commitments of primary importance, both within those organizations, and as matters of concern to strata of the population to which these organizations orient for their adopted constituencies. The dominant issue in the pre-1966–1969 socialist and related movements, especially the professedly Marxist ones, was loyalty to the interest of productive labor, and to the rightful interests of nations and nationalities. It was therefore elementary, until the global change from progress, to "post-industrial" utopianism, that the rough and simple counter-intelligence yardstick of such organizations was: "Where does a person's loyalty lie? To whom, is one attached; to what, is one committed?"

Without doubt, the difference between the proverbial careerist "hack," and the person of moral commitment in those socialist organizations, was the matter of shared, deep commitment to the interest of society and its posterity, such as commitment to the purpose of freeing slaves, fostering improvement in the conditions of life through investment in scientific and technological progress, uplifting those who suffer from imposed ignorance, and so on. The hack might defend such goals, but, as if with a French existentialist's shrug of the shoulders; the hack was the "business-like pragmatist," a spiritual cousin of that legendary used-car dealer who focuses upon selling what a prospect might be induced to believe about a vehicle, rather than providing the customer with something which works. Not being good,

but being a “success in one’s political career,” was the mark of the socialist hack, in the same sense as the morally unwholesome sort of bureaucratic hack in anyone’s politics, in any profession, in any business enterprise.

Thus, in his occasional, relatively more considerate moments, the hack would muster a patronizing smile at the story of “the good Samaritan.” From the hack’s cynical seed of personal, suppurating moral corruption, all kinds of evil Reeds and Bushes, including the socialist variety, will sprout. The issue of security, is primarily a moral one: *to what principle is one committed axiomatically?*

We should not simply ridicule the socialist who argues, that a person’s degree of axiomatic dedication to the benefit of humanity, of a nation, of the sick, and so on, is the relevant question of security. Nonetheless, however well-intentioned in that degree, the socialist organizations were axiomatically incapable of addressing that moral issue efficiently. These qualities of commitment are matters of the person’s sovereign, individual cognitive processes; therefore, these are matters located within that same intellectual domain which those radical reductionists known as anarcho-syndicalists, for example, viewed with categorical abhorrence, and the Marxists viewed as suspected deviations from that solid materialism of the scientific discovery set down by a wealthy British processer of slave-produced cotton, Frederick Engels: that human intelligence is an epiphenomenon of the “opposable thumb.”

None of the relevant literature, nor other spokesmanship of the relevant subject strata, competently addresses that question of attachment and commitment. This was virtually inevitable: the crucial problem of internal political security confronting the Communists, in particular, was that the Communist and related movements were virtually all products of the so-called Enlightenment, as the case of Marx and the Communist movements is paradigmatic. Thus, their conception of human nature, and therefore of human and national interest, was of the genre of empiricists and other reductionists such as Bacon, Hobbes, Locke, and the Eighteenth-Century British and French materialists. In this respect, the ultimate internal security threat to the socialist movements, and the Soviet state, lay within themselves.

It may have been their opponents who exploited the “string-jerk” variety of dupes within the Soviet society, but it was the implications of the materialism hegemonic within that society which fostered the proliferation of such dupes. As Shakespeare has written, often, the crucial fault lies within ourselves.

Putting to one side the anarcho-syndicalist and materialist aberrations with which the self-styled Marxist organizations tended to pollute their attachment to a labor-movement constituency, the attachment itself was real, and, hacks aside, did provide a moral mooring for those organizations. The point we are stressing, is the relationship of this tradition to the

way in which Lenin's Bolsheviks attached themselves, by moral commitment, to the defense and improvement of the well-being of the people of Soviet society.

The corruption of a commendable social commitment to the benefit of the families of society's working people, by infection with such aberrations as anarcho-syndicalist "anti-intellectualism," typifies the lowest form of "string-jerk" agency: crude social, or ethnic prejudices. The influence of a doctrine, such as the reductionism of Aristotle, of Immanuel Kant, or frank empiricism, attacks the functioning of the intellectual powers of mind, and is not only more a sophisticated and complex mental and moral disorder than simple social prejudice; on this account, it is potentially more deadly, and evil. The right to name the third, most sophisticated of "jerkable strings," ought to be given to the Christian Apostle Paul, whose *I Corinthians* 13 summarizes Paul's Christian view of a principle, identified as *agapē*, developed by Plato earlier. In military science, the fault would be identified as want of the quality which the famous Clausewitz's posthumously published *Vom Kriege* identifies by Clausewitz's use of the German term *Entschlossenheit*. it is not sufficient to have formal knowledge; one must have that peculiar quality of corresponding, commanding passion for truth and justice, which Plato contrasts to vulgar erotic passions, *agapē*. Truth, in the absence of the specific quality of passion which compels one to act in the interest of truth and justice, is a dead thing, which on that account, ceases to be truth by virtue of inaction.

In summary, the three types of "jerkable strings," which transform socialist organizations, or members within them, into perhaps unwitting, but nonetheless effective agents of oligarchical influence, are: 1) *crude social prejudices*, for some ethnic, or other stratum, or against others; 2) the *intellectual* defect, represented as degrading hypotheses, such as Aristotelianism or other forms of reductionism, which prompt the believer to act, as a virtual puppet, viciously against human nature, even contrary to what the relevant virtual puppet otherwise believes his intention to be; 3) that want of the quality of passion which compels one to act for knowable truth and justice.

Then, Came Post-Industrial Utopianism

The relevant issue for today is, what must happen at the point Soviet society began to abandon the commitment to improvement of the productive powers of labor through investment in scientific and technological progress?

As the shards of the former Soviet society lie eroding on the battlefield of a lost historical battle, the poet muses: This wretched scene is the tragedy of those Communists who were committed to the moral idea of being servants of humanity. How do we account for the manifest virtual loss of that moral commitment in the policy-making of Russia today?

The immediate cause of the Grand Guignol of crisis-ridden Russia today, is the "Reform" dictated to post-Soviet Russia, by Britain and Thatcher's dupe, U.S. President George Bush. That external factor contains no riddle. The crucial thing to be considered, is the pell-mell flight of so many prominent representatives of the Soviet system, into the embrace of those brands of outright fascism peddled by the U.S. National Endowment for Democracy and its U.S. Republican Party affiliate, the International Republican Institute. The seed of Moscow's susceptibility to this destruction, was planted much earlier, beginning what is most fairly described as the neo-Bukharinist restoration which can be traced to the time of Khrushchev's reign.

The axiomatic quality of autochthonous contribution of Russians themselves to this disgusting condition of Russia today, is a disorder of the second, intellectual type. The potential for this disorder is rooted, epistemologically, in the "materialist method" theory. The Russian contribution to the present, post-1989 degradation of Russia is not simply a direct result of that "materialist method" as such, but, rather in the cumulatively corrosive effect of that adherence, under the special historical conditions set into motion during the so-called "Khrushchev period." Let us summarize those conditions here, as the writer has presented this dominant aspect of post-World War II world history in earlier locations.

We must trace the leading features of today's world history, including the present situation in Russia, to the fact that the death of U.S. President Franklin Roosevelt was most untimely. The removal of President Roosevelt from the leadership of the world's dominant power at that time, brought to power a President who was a willing dupe of the British imperial interest represented by outgoing Prime Minister Winston S. Churchill. Of most crucial significance, British control over President Harry S Truman captured the world's leading power, the U.S.A., for support of the utopian nuclear-weapons policy of the Twentieth Century's most savagely racist and rabid war-monger, Britain's Bertrand Russell. Russell's summary of British nuclear-weapons policy, in the September 1946 edition of *The Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists*, is the key to the main course of all leading features of world history from the death of Franklin Roosevelt to the present day. That Churchill-Russell nuclear-weapons policy has never been reversed; among other implications, that policy is key to any non-foolish understanding of the foreign relations, and internal conditions, of Russia today.

The underlying feature of that Churchill-Russell blend of mass-murderous racism and nuclear-weapons policy, is Churchill's and Russell's consistency with the entire sweep of British long-range strategic goals and policy since the days of that disgusting ancestor on whom Winston Churchill, throughout his entire adult life, sought to model himself: that man who, like Britain's George I, was a protégé and tool of the evil William of Orange, the first Duke of Marlborough.

The underlying feature of the role of the Venetian Party in the history of England since 1517, has been the misshaping of England into an instrument of Venice's commitment to wipe the existence of the modern sovereign nation-state from the face of our planet. Since Venice's narrow escape from imminent crushing defeat by France and her League of Cambrai allies, all of the history of European civilization has been governed by the conflict between the ancient oligarchical, imperial tradition, against the insurgency of the upstart modern nation-state republic, as first typified by Louis XI's France, and as best typified later by the U.S. Federal constitutional republic shaped by G. Leibniz's anti-Locke conceptions of natural law, and that that principle was best served under such Presidents as Washington and Lincoln.⁴⁴

Since 1789, the center of world history has been, the struggle between the empires and imperial traditions of Europe against the influence of the constitutional and economic model represented by the intent and achievements of the Federal Constitution of the U.S.A. Through the entire period since 1763, when the creation of the future U.S.A. was only a considerable threat on London's horizon, the central commitment of the British ruling oligarchy, has been to subvert and destroy the United States and the influence of the American System as a model throughout the world. Who does not recognize that fact, knows nothing of importance about modern history.

As Russell stated with shameless clarity, in his September 1946 proposal for a "preventive" assault with nuclear weapons upon the Soviet Union, the purpose of Britain's nuclear-weapons policy, was to eliminate the continued existence of the sovereign nation-state from the surface of this planet: to establish actual world government. The refusal of the Stalin government to submit to Russell's nuclear threat, prompted the British and their U.S. political dupes to resort to a temporary alternative: to divide the world, as Churchill's notorious Fulton, Iowa address stated, between two military blocs, the Anglo-American against the Soviet. Thus, Russell *et al.* introduced the 1946–1989 age of a British-designed geopolitical balance of power, premised upon mutual, global nuclear terror between the two blocs.

To those who were paying attention to business at those times, about ten years before the 1989–1991 break-up of the Comecon, visible signs already posed the question: What would happen if the Soviet economy were to begin to collapse?

This writer posed that issue during the late 1970s and early 1980s, as during the 1982–1983 exploratory back-channel discussions he conducted with Soviet representatives, on the

⁴⁴ As Friedrich Schiller traces the history of European civilization as the elaboration of the continuing mortal conflict between the traditions of Solon of Athens and that of Sparta's slave-society under the influence of Lycurgus' code. The distinction to be made is, that a form of European state consistent with the principle of Solon did not come into existence until France's Louis XI.

Reagan administration's behalf. He assumed, in 1983, that the Comecon economy had about five years remaining before it began to disintegrate, under trends existing during 1982–1983. In October 1988, he forecast publicly, in a Berlin press conference, and in a nationwide U.S. television broadcast, the immediate imminence of onset of such a collapse, beginning in eastern Europe. In both periods, 1982–1983, and 1988, he proposed alternatives. There were others, such as Deutsche Bank's Alfred Herrhausen, who plainly thought in directions similar to this writer.

Margaret Thatcher and her prize dupe, President George Bush, thought differently: witness the "Reform" which has brought Russia, among other parts of the former Comecon, to the desperate verge of an explosion. The intent of the British oligarchy, and such among its assets as the U.S. financial oligarchs behind Bush, was to use the combination, of the collapse of Soviet power and their control over the U.S.A., to set immediately into motion, the eradication of the institutions of the nation-state from this planet, to replace the existing sovereign states of the world by regional supranational governmental agencies, all under the supreme power of a world government, centered in the United Nations Security Council: a one-world empire, under which regional supranational agencies would be satrapies, and the whole mass administered by unelected Non-Governmental Organizations certified as agents of the United Nations Organization as a supreme world government.

The correlative feature of this Russell scheme was the destruction of modern agro-industrial society. In short, the termination of the policy of increase of the productive powers of labor through fostering investment in infrastructure and scientific and technological progress, by means of introducing what we know today as a "neo-Malthusian post-industrial" utopianism enforced by supranational agencies under UNO world-government authority. Since, such a neo-Malthusian zero-technological-growth policy meant the planet could no longer support the presently existing level of population, Russell and his like have campaigned, since the end of World War I (!), for racialist policies of depopulation, targetting especially the "non-Caucasian" populations of the world for sharp reductions in numbers, even, in Russell's own 1923 written word, "by means which are disgusting even if they are necessary."

The practical question today, is, how did so many people in leading positions for shaping Russia's relations with other states, in Russia, as outside, become *de facto* agents of a policy of mass-murder through economic and related policy-means, which is even more mass-murderous in its implications than the practices for which Nazis were indicated and convicted at Nuremberg?

There are two visible, relevant preparatory phases of political degeneration of influential strata within the Soviet Union which paved the way for the situation inside Russia today. It began under Khrushchev, coinciding with Khrushchev's extending his hand toward

accepting Russell's nuclear-weapons policy. The so-called Pugwash Conference arrangements, notably the Quebec conference of 1958, are exemplary. After the missile-crisis of 1962, agreements were reached, along the lines of Russell's Dr. Leo Szilard's and other Pugwash designs, among the principal nuclear powers. Russell himself played a featured public role in those negotiations.

The gist of the matter is, that the combination of the missile crisis and the new agreements persuaded relevant parties that an actual general war between the two blocs were now unlikely, excepting diplomatically managed conflicts conducted, chiefly as surrogate warfare, "below the threshold of nuclear conflict." Thus, during the second half of the 1960s, a sharp phase-change emerged in the thinking of relevant leading policy-shaping circles of both the NATO and Warsaw Pact countries. On the Soviet side, this turn fostered an accelerating intellectual corruption; witting neo-Bukharinites aside, more and more other Soviet figures were transformed into unwitting agents of the second, intellectual type.

The orientation accelerated, beginning under Khrushchev, toward modifying Soviet policy-making with increasingly generous doses of the forms of empiricist thought which might be fairly characterized as "generally accepted academic thought" internationally. The Soviet government's credulous relationship to the Cambridge (England) systems-analysis group of Lord Kaldor *et al.*, via such channels as the Laxenburg, Austria International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis (IIASA), is exemplary of infection of some of the highest levels of the Soviet apparatus by that latter kind of corruption. Once the authority of the Soviet organization was cracked, beginning Gorbachev's London-blessed 1985 accession to the position of General Secretary of the CPSU, the impact of the cumulative corruption typified by the IIASA channel, ran rampant, like a locked-up wild beast in a zoo, whose cage-door had been suddenly left open.

Instead of a learning of the lesson of mistakes made earlier, there was a rush of more and more former Soviet figures into the arms of a U.S. Republican Party turning rapidly fascistic, under increasing influence of the Mont Pelerin Society and of the variety of "neo-conservatives" (fascists) whose political pedigrees trace back to the U.S. Bukharinites of the 1930s!

There are many professionally qualified figures in Russia still, who could contribute to effective leadership of Russia's economic renaissance and stability, if the United States would show the good sense to abandon its own, much-hyperventilated, mantra-like policy of "democracy and reform," to allow Russia to free itself from the present grip of the ruinous "Reform," and the kind of "democracy," at the point of IMF "economic bayonets," as might be achieved by artillery-fire upon an elected parliamentary body. In a nation whose centuries-old tradition tends to settle pent-up internal political differences with bullets, and with an

unfulfilled want of that kind of *Entschlossenheit* we have associated with the principle of *agapē*, it would be immoral of outsiders, in the U.S.A, for example, to adopt a self-righteous posture of blaming Russians for neglecting to overturn that mass-murderous "Reform" which we have continued to impose upon them.

That aside, it is urgent that influential Russians cease to be unwitting agents of that which is destroying Russia. Russians must become aware of the social, intellectual, and moral "strings" which turn them into virtual Shakespeare's Hamlets, bringing their own destruction upon themselves. The writer hopes that what is written here, will contribute to provoking the much-needed discussion of those matters. First, before bringing the foregoing elements of this discussion into identification of their underlying unity, we must take note of what is fairly identified as the best side of the Soviet legacy, and of the Czarist Russia which preceded it.

The Human Side of Russia

Consider a much underappreciated, but extremely relevant feature of life in the former Soviet Union.

At this point, the reader should reflect for a moment, on our earlier indictment of the academic and other economists. Recall the fundamental fallacy common to sundry varieties of all generally accepted academic economics, and accounting practice, in every nation, today: the fallacy of the either stated, or functionally implicit presumption, that "commodities produce commodities." The same incompetence pervades all that commonplace opinion and analysis, which has presumed, up to now, to compare the so-called "democracies" of the "West" with a so-called "communist system."

The same pathological state of mind which guides miseducated economists and accountants to leave out the "human cognitive equation" from the study of economic processes, has governed the polemics, on both sides, of the "communism versus capitalism" debate. A similar incompetence affects what silly U.S. Republican spokesmen are saying about China today. In all these cases, as in all generally accepted sociology, anthropology, and psychology taught in universities, or as offshoots of Freudian psychoanalysis today, the identical axiomatic incompetence pervades: a bestial misapprehension of the nature of human beings.

In the case of the Soviet Union, and Czarist Russia before it, it is indispensable to recognize that the people of Russia are neither communists, nor Czarists, nor even Russians; they are human beings. Whatever "system" one superimposes upon a population of human beings, in some fashion, in the final analysis, the actual characteristics which human nature imposes upon society will shine forth, to manifest its functional supremacy as the determining feature of history. This reality is most prominently featured in the phenomenon of revolutionary

changes from one technology, to a more advanced one, in devastating wars and kindred crises, or in revolutionary changes in political systems.

In referring to “human nature” here, the writer references what has been said on this matter, above.

In face of any evidence of such change, all generally accepted academic forms of so-called comparison of “systems,” inasmuch as they ignore, or misapprehend actual human nature, as the empiricists and materialists do, will collapse into intellectual bankruptcy, on this account. In the study of any specific case, such as a comparison of behavior of Russia's society under various phases of Czarist rule, under Bolshevism, and today, competence focuses upon the anomalous contrasts between the so-called “system,” and expressions of human nature which slyly, or otherwise assert their presence.

The characteristic achievements of the Soviet Union were exemplified by the work of V.I. Vernadsky. The very name of “geobiochemistry” points attention in the relevant direction. The image so implied is brought into focus by noting Vernadsky's seemingly prophetic view of the possibilities of nuclear energy, as expressed by him publicly, in his official Soviet capacity, approximately seventy years ago. Relevant persons from among leading scientists in the “West” have attested to the excellence of Soviet science's work within these fields; more notably, for our purposes here, there are aspects of that Soviet practice to whose quality this writer can attest from the standpoint of his own special expertise.⁴⁵

In the fine arts, the intellectual results have been relatively less impressive. Respecting musical performers, before and after 1917, Russia has produced some prodigious muscular and related capabilities, but, excepting the product of Romantic composers, where such refinements are of marginal moral significance, the product has generally suffered a profound crisis of interpretation. In the fine arts generally, Soviet standards tended to be permeated with a post-Classical decadence, analogous to the degeneration which gripped numbers of

⁴⁵ A case in point: In 1978, representatives of the Fusion Energy Foundation were invited to participate in a Soviet-sponsored international conference, on the subject of inertial-confinement (e.g., “laser”) fusion. The participants met with this writer to learn what his requests might be. In light of the quarrel between the FEF and places such as Lawrence Livermore Laboratories (LLL), this writer suggested that the Soviets might have declassified aspects of their reliance upon B. Riemann's conception of isentropic compression for the development of the Soviet “hydrogen bomb.” Papers representing such declassification would be most useful in the writer's and FEF's efforts to challenge the competence of virtual-reality devices, such as LLL's Lasnex. The FEF representatives were successful in filling this request. It was on this basis, that the writer proposed to proceed with *EIR*'s computer-based quarterly economic forecast for the U.S. economy, which, during the 1979–1983 interval it was operational, was the only successful such forecast available in the public domain. This forecasting endeavor was prompted by the desire to demonstrate the Riemannian principle of isentropic compression by a useful application in some domain. This case is exemplary of those past generations of Russia's scientists, and who were, thus, rooted in the Classical scientific method of western Europe, especially the Germany scientific tradition of Gauss, Humboldt, Riemann. These are exceptionally qualified persons, of a quality which will not be easily replicated today.

leading Vienna musical figures during the last gasp of the attacks on Brahms by the Wagner cult. Much of this, in Vienna and elsewhere, was as frankly satanic as the British theosophists' Vienna-based *Lucifer* magazine, in which anthroposoph Rudolf Steiner played a hand. Similarly, this veered toward the outright Satanism which Maxim Gorky preached to doting Bolshevik leaders, and others, in the notorious Grotto of the Emperor Tiberius's and Axel Munthe's pre-World War I Isle of Capri.⁴⁶

Those considerations frame the portrait, so to speak. On the one side, we have undeniable effort of a great outburst of genuine scientific creativity, as we have defined creativity above. At the same time, the evidence is, that the methods of "blackboard mathematical physics" employed to present the results of such creativity, have been predominantly of that doctrinaire, formalist variety, which stifles creative scientific productivity. An inconsistency? Yes. A paradox? Yes: a delightful one, in fact. The true human nature of mankind, the developable, sovereign creative powers of the individual's cognitive processes, will seek to find self-expression, even in a Gulag, and even through the cracks in the prison-grillwork of the Euler-Lagrange pandemic of mathematical formalism.

The blame for this paradox does not lie with Soviet Russia, or with Marxism as such. It is inherent in that sodomic misconception of human nature intrinsic to the oligarchical tradition characteristic of societies whose cultural practice is molded by the "zero-technological-progress" inhering in the Diocletian Code, as in all pro-slavery, pro-serfdom societies, including the old Czarist empire. Under the Bolsheviks, of course, the official epistemological standpoint was the reductionist tradition of Aristotle and Paolo Sarpi, in British reductionism's so-called "materialist" costuming.

The fault in some of the best work on economics in Soviet Russia was that it was in the intellectual prison called "derivable mathematically at the blackboard by means consistent with the extant notion of generally accepted classroom mathematics": in short, the fallacy of "production of commodities by commodities," in this guise. In short, the related susceptibility to the corrupting influence of Laxenburg-conducted, British "systems analysis."

⁴⁶ The two facts, that the Roman Empire was born on the Isle of Capri, during negotiations of an anti-Cleopatra alliance between Octavian, the future Emperor Augustus, and the priests of Mithra, and that the Emperor Tiberius directed the execution of Jesus Christ by his niece's husband, Pontius Pilate, from his palace on this place, gave the island a compelling symbolic importance for Satanists such as Axel Munthe, Rudolf Steiner, Benito Mussolini, Nietzsche followers such as Adolf Hitler, Maxim Gorky, and numerous others. This is a brand of Satanism otherwise expressed by the notorious György Lukács, the spiritual founder of the Frankfurt School of Horkheimer, Adorno, Marcuse, Korsch, *et al.* In music and other art, late-Nineteenth-Century Romanticism and Twentieth-Century modernism, strongly reflect the influence of the kinds of Satan-cults which for a time adopted Capri as their professed international shrine. Freudian psychoanalysis, the Frankfurt School of Adorno, Hannah Arendt, *et al.*, and the satanic perversity of Dostoevsky, Gorky, Radek, Lukács, and Bertolt Brecht, are, like the related pedophile cult-rings of today, typical of the increasing influence of this "New Age" form of deconstructionist vogues of modernism in art world-wide.

However, beyond the prison walls of that academic parlor charade called “mathematical physics,” experimental physics exists. The bold discovering mind, once it leaves the protection of its natural habit, in that creative domain of cognition typified by the metaphors of experimental physics, must disguise itself as what it is not. It assumes the academic prison-house costume of mathematical formalism, goes to the lecture hall blackboard, and lies, mathematically of course, respecting the manner in which the reported discoveries were actually derived. In hearing the accomplished science of Russia, listening between the seams, so to speak, of its mathematical-physics’ academic-prison-house uniforms, one hears reverberations of that same quality of genius which virtually all official histories of modern science seek to purge from the revolutionary work of D.I. Mendeleyev, or Wilhelm Weber, B. Riemann, C. Gauss, and so on.

Thus, the importance of the Leibniz-Gauss-Riemann tradition in science for those scientists of Russia who laid the foundations of Soviet science prior to the 1966–1972, worldwide cultural-paradigm shift to the “New Age” lunacy of “post-industrial” utopianism.⁴⁷

The immediately relevant Russia case is rightly situated if we consider the same phenomenon much more broadly. However terrible conditions in modern European political systems have been, until the cultural downturn which began approximately thirty years ago, the worst conditions in Europe and the Americas were paradisiacal compared with cultural conditions of a prehistoric man, living as a virtual Yahoo, whose potential relative population-density was not in excess of several millions for our planet as a whole.⁴⁸ For expression of individual

⁴⁷ As this issue of *EIR* goes to the printer, reporter Rene Sanchez’s headlined article, on page 1 of the Thursday, November 21, 1996 edition of the *Washington Post* screams: “Math-Science Study Faults U.S. Teaching, Curricula.” Under that headline one is told, that a just-released report of the U.S. Department of Education, representing “the largest international study ever undertaken of how American students perform in math and science,” shows, that “core problems with the teaching style and the courses that many American schools rely on to instruct students in math and science” produce a catastrophic failure, relative, for example, to compared nations such as Japan and Germany. The *Post* fairly sums up the facts of the report, as it reports those facts later in the article, by stating that the root of the failure in U.S. education, is that “most teachers only state concepts without fully developing them.” This may be summarily restated as reflecting three facts: 1) that the U.S. has rejected the principle of the Humboldt humanist education program, which Alexander Dallas Bache introduced in Philadelphia, in creating the U.S. system of secondary schools, and has moved much further from the humanist method of inducing the students to replicate the mental experience of the original discovery, but, also, that 2) the U.S. teaching of mathematics and physical-science topics has fallen prey to the same long-term “deconstructionist” degeneration of education conduited into the same schools, and universities, through the Modern Language Association (MLA); 3) U.S. adults and students are far more advanced than most otherwise comparable nations in becoming a virtually decorticated “information society,” the television-centered catalyst for a general degeneration in the cognitive potentials of both students and adults in the U.S.A. today. The contrast between the reality of experimental physics, and the shadowy “virtual reality” of mathematical physics constructed axiomatically on the basis of the Euler-Lagrange presumptions of continuity, is merely a less degenerate expression of the same principles responsible for the case which the *Post* attributes to the U.S. Department of Education.

⁴⁸ See, Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr., “While Monetarism Dies,” *EIR*, Oct. 25, 1996: chart, page 18.

human nature's characteristic creative-cognitive impulse, any form of modern civilization, until about twenty-five years ago, even Nazi Germany, was a relative paradise. Indeed, relative to the rabidly irrationalist, existentialist, and hysterically mass-murderous "zero-growth" mentality, which has become rampant during the course of the recent thirty years of global "cultural-paradigm" downshift, conditions under Stalin were often less unfavorable, specifically, to expression of creative scientific impulses, than Russia, or the United States today!

Against that long-wave historical background, one may say, that the human creative spirit of the individual will seek out cracks in the prison-wall of any social system, to discover an avenue of escape, through which true human nature can be given some relatively appropriate expression. The seam in the wall has often been the metaphor which is the characteristic feature of all great Classical forms of plastic and non-plastic art. The same creative function of metaphor, which we find in Aeschylus, Plato, Leonardo da Vinci, Raphael Sanzio, Rembrandt, Shakespeare, and Friedrich Schiller, is the characteristic feature of physical scientific progress, as Riemann's notion of a progressive manifold of manifolds exemplifies this. As Haydn, Beethoven, and Brahms, most notably, found imperfected musical expressions of this embedded in the domain of folk-song, so, following Brahms's rule for this,⁴⁹ his protégé Antonín Dvořák demonstrated, with help from Harry Burleigh, the same spark of creative genius imparted by generations of African-American slaves, into the Negro Spiritual.

Putting aside such commonly recognized sorts of aversive factors, the key internal problem of the Soviet political-economy was what some Soviet officials used to describe as the "peasant problem." Soviet economics literature was well-populated with references to the disastrous "bottlenecks" which might be fairly laid, chiefly, to this "peasant problem."

Although Russia had taken the first steps toward the freeing of its serfs, on the recommendation of G. Leibniz to Czar Peter I, this was reversed later during the Eighteenth Century; the conditions of life worsened under the great feudalistic reaction introduced by a maddened, guilt-ridden Czar Alexander I, returned from Metternich's (sexual) Congress of Vienna, where emperors, kings, and other celebrities had contracted venereal diseases provided by Metternich's "swallows," in sexual acts closely supervised, and meticulously documented, by the watchful eye of Chancellor Metternich's secret police. Only when Britain's so-called "Crimean War" afforded Czar Alexander II the latitude to arouse Russia's patriotic spirit against the brutalized feudalist reaction imposed by Alexander's British-allied

⁴⁹ Gustav Jenner, *Johannes Brahms als Mensch, Lehrer und Künstler: Studien und Erlebnisse* (Marburg an der Lahn, Germany: N.G. Elwert'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1930). As referenced in *A Manual on the Rudiments of Tuning and Registration*, John Sigerson and Kathy Wolfe, eds. (Washington, D.C.: Schiller Institute, 1992): Chapter 11, "Artistic Beauty: Schiller Versus Goethe," pp. 199–228.

predecessors, and when Alexander, once again found Russia an ally in the United States, were the institutions of serfdom reversed, and a great industrialization of Russia begun under patriots such as D.I. Mendeleev and Count Sergei Witte. The greatest numbers of Russia's population affected by Stolypin's parody of Witte's re-industrialization program, were recruited from aching centuries of a terrible feudal backwardness in what Karl Marx, for once, aptly named "the idiocy of rural life," a long crushing of the human nature of Russia's peasants according to the evil tradition of Diocletian's imperial Code.

Like all societies emerging from prolonged dark ages of that sort, Russia stumbled into the modern world, haltingly at first, as a "two-tier" society. It came out of an habituated cultural tradition, in which the institutions integrated with feudalism had worked, systematically, to structure all of the institutions of Russia's feudal order to keep each section of the population in its assigned place, as Diocletian had prescribed, and as Byzantium had destroyed itself by following that imperial tradition. V.I. Vernadsky's political difficulties, under Czarism and also during significant parts of Soviet history, typify this. He was not so much a dissident within the Soviet system, as a dissident within all expressions of modern Russia's inherited cultural backwardness. He is typical, thus, of that moral quality which distinguishes a true creative-scientific mentality: he hates that which crushes the creative potential of the individual human personalities.

To make the point clear to U.S. readers, and clearer to Russian ones: Had this writer, for example, been born in Soviet Russia in 1922, instead of a small city in the United States, and had he survived there for long enough to make that choice, the only option for him, with his hatred of the cruelty of that which was analogous to Russia's "peasant problem" inside the 1920s and 1930s U.S.A., would have been to seek out a place of honorable personal refuge in a scientific profession.

The writer can locate relevant, approximately comparable experience, in presenting such a supposition. During the writer's childhood and youth, nearly all those of his parents' generation, his teachers, and his peers, lied most of the time, on virtually every subject mentioned. What they said in public and related settings, was totally at odds with what they expressed as arguable beliefs, in private; in public, and in analogous social settings, they did not say what they believed, rather, they spoke *diplomatically*, sometimes as diplomatically even as a Talleyrand or Kissinger: they said what they considered it prudent, or otherwise advantageous, to be overhead saying. That problem has not suffered significant moral improvement during recent years.

In this writer's studies of some of the work of Soviet scientists in earlier times, he sensed he could "smell out" in such Russians precisely the same quality of "dissidence" which the writer himself had developed, initially, out of a childhood experience with the generally

accepted form of, habitual, “company manners” lying of his parents, their peers, his teachers, and his own peers.

This quality of dissidence, in this writer, or in the treasured acquaintance with Russia's biological scientist Pobisk Kuznetsov, does not assume the virtually satanic form of asocial, dionysiac fury which one finds in rabidly irrational anarchists such as today's U.S. Libertarian Party leaders. One senses that the society of which one is a part is suffering a great cultural evil, a moral and intellectual sickness, and that the best way one can help one's society, is by refusing to submit oneself to that same sickness. Riesman *et al.* might say that this writer was an “inner directed” personality, horrified by the Orwellian specter of “other-directedness” which continues to corrupt, and threatens to destroy the United States, still today.

There is no more ridiculous, pathetic folly, than the voter who wishes to have elected officials who are courageous enough to be trustworthy and honest, but who insists that such candidates must be part of the “mainstream” of popular belief in, at least, most of those popular lies which are supplied, at popular prices, to all credulous “other-directed” folk, by the relevant mass media and the polls. Usually, that voter is delivered exactly what he has bought; most eligible voters, have yet to draw the obvious lesson of this experience: that, perhaps the problem lies not in quality of the candidates, as much as in the voter's own execrably bad taste!

One meets the appropriate address to this problem of society, in Plato's writings, as in the Apostle Paul's celebrated *I Corinthians* 13: one must be ruled by what Plato and Paul identify as *agapē*, which Plato introduces, as a type, as “passion for justice,” and for truth. One must be willing to become, a “good Samaritan” of the mind and soul, first, and of the needs of the suffering body, second. If one succeeds in addressing the first challenge, the appropriate means for addressing the second will be found.

Such dissidents within society are the tissue of the social organism in which progress is generated. The art of statesmanship, in the last analysis, lies in fostering a greater ration of such dissidents, and in facilitating their suitable employment. The Soviet system channelled those such dissidents which it did not crush into the domain of physical science and its immediate environs. It was V.I. Lenin himself, who set the pattern for this policy in his statement clarifying the matter of policy underlying his award of special rations to the experimental neurologist I.P. Pavlov; bringing back leading Russian scientists such as V.I. Vernadsky, were a better paradigm than the case of Pavlov. For all the faults of the Soviet science community, in which they were no worse than their “western” contemporaries, and sometimes better, this is the leading edge of cultural achievement bequeathed from Soviet society, and Russia before it, to Russia and the world today.

This role of Soviet science, in absorbing such dissidence to its advantage, is the presently living experience within the culture of Russia today, to which the people of Russia can turn for a comprehensible “model” of how a presently bankrupted economy of Russia may be rebuilt. Here, in this facet of Soviet experience, the people of Russia can find that heritage, within their society, which best expresses that within them which is truly human, that which must be fostered, if human nature is to be summoned efficiently to rescue Russia from its present nightmare. However, for this to succeed, we must, without deprecating the useful role of mathematics, shift the emphasis from the virtual reality of a mere mathematical physics, to that standpoint in experimental physics stressed by B. Riemann. The result of this search must be, that, in effect, the idea of science must be freed from the mind-deadening, soul-killing shackles of the Aristotelian tradition, to rediscover the true foundations of modern science, in the method of Plato.

The Need for a Literate Policy

We come thus to the concluding proposition: How might a literate policy toward Russia today, be crafted by today's, predominantly, functionally illiterate U.S. statesmen? Such a warning points toward the kind of men and women in public life, who, with guidance of pollsters, might have learned to identify the relatively more fashionable opinions of today, but who are either incapable of formulating actual conceptions, or, if they were capable of doing so, do not permit such capabilities to interfere with the opportunism of their overriding devotion to expressing strong support for those received opinions deemed fashionable.

To that point, and with emphasis on the matter of defining the underlying basis for U.S.A. relations to Russia today, we conclude this study with identification and explication of this following one point: *The means by which the condition of humanity is advanced, is the fostering of the development of the creative potential of the individual person's sovereign cognitive powers, combined with the ordering of society to such effect, as to foster the employment of the developed individual in those expressions of that developed creativity which are appropriate to the fostering of the increased potential relative population-density of humanity as a whole. In sum: to increase mankind's dominion in the universe, through Classical forms of artistic and scientific progress.*

Will the cobbler's children wear shoes? Can we supply to U.S.A.-Russia relations, that product which the U.S.A. appears to have lost the art of manufacturing? Today, the educational system of the U.S.A. is destroying the minds of successive generations, by methods of “deconstruction” which are aptly represented by the racist prescriptions for systematic “downsizing” of African-Americans' cognitive development, coming out of Harvard University's Department of Education. Does the United States itself have any future existence, which it must thus relate to a future existence of Russia, if we continue to tolerate

at Stanford University and elsewhere, bestializing, actually racist, “politically correct” policies, such as the elimination of students’ obligation to master the contributions of “Dead White European Males?” (“Keep them dumb, down, and short-lived, but make them think it was all their own idea.”)

This returns us to the standpoint of *Analysis Situs*.

As we have accounted for this above, earlier, the not-entropic actuality of human nature can not be adduced on any lower level of conception than higher hypothesizing. What is said on the subject of “human nature,” on any lesser level of reference than that, is only foolish babbling by functionally illiterate gossips, such as empiricist strains among sociologists, anthropologists, ecologists, and psychologists. As we demonstrated the case, the characteristic feature of human nature is its “not-entropy,” an entropy analogous to a series of Riemannian manifolds, in the order n to $n+1$, corresponding to increase of mankind’s potential relative population-density. This universal ordering of the relations of change, from one hypothesis to its successor, is the general principle of *Analysis Situs*, under which all human existence, all scientific qualities of knowledge, are subsumed.

We have also indicated how all human knowledge is ordered under this rule: the set of all permutations of relations, subsumed under this not-entropic characteristic, adduced for the nine-cell configuration we identified earlier, above.

The last feature of this matter to be considered in this report, is the form this not-entropic ordering assumes within the sovereign precincts of the individual cognitive processes.

The essential practical, historical consideration of statecraft, on this point, here, is, that mankind’s progress from the Yahoo-like condition described by the archeologists for Africa, an estimated one millions and more years ago, is that this development represents an accretion of successive, valid discoveries of physical and related principle, as passed from the person who discovered each, to those individuals of that and later generations who have replicated the mental experience of the original discovery within the sovereign creative-cognitive processes wholly internal to the private mental processes of the individual qua individual: not explicitly communicable to others by means of language, or other modes of symbolic argument. It is that determining characteristic event, the which defines the functionally literate meaning of the term “history.” It is the mental experience associated with the “non-informational,” implicit transmission of the indicated type of personal creative-cognitive experience, which is the empirical location of all properly conceived law, whether in the domain of physical science, or of the constitutional law of political society.

The crux of the matter is metaphor, in the sense that Thomas Hobbes sought to ban metaphor from the English language, and that Dryden and, Hobbes’ dog, Alexander Pope,

succeeded to the point of driving it away from their parodies of actual poetry. The metaphor of Classical strophic poetry, including ancient such poetry, was the original and continuing language of science. No alternative were possible.

The contemptible illiteracy of that so-called "information theory," devised by hoaxster Norbert Wiener, so popular among today's credulous dupes, is that any person who understood the rudiments of scientific method, knows, that the essential distinction of an original discovery of principle, is, that there exists no prior term, no previously possible grammatical construction in the language, no symbolic means, by means of which that principle might be explicitly signified.⁵⁰ Metaphor arises in poetry, music, and physical science, as the conjoining of two or more allusions ("ironies") within the same utterance, to such effect that the juxtaposition evokes a sense of an ontological paradox within the sentient mental processes of poet and hearer alike: this is of the form of the *One/Many* ontological paradox characteristic of Plato's *Parmenides*. Thus, the sentient mind of the hearer is made aware of the poet's intent to present the hearer's mind with a kind of puzzle, for the solution of which, no explicit clues, no symbolic clue, is to be found in a literal reading of the utterance itself.

If the hearer's mind constructs the solution for that puzzle (that metaphor), it becomes possible to verify the accuracy of the solution, not by "looking it up in the back of the textbook or in an encyclopedia, or on the "Internet," but, rather, by the kind of practice we associate with experimental physics. The solution to such a puzzle must, therefore, be expressible in the form of experimental practice which tests, in the real world, a principle for which no term, no possible theorem, previously existed.

In other words, the communication of an original, validatable discovery of physical principle, from one mind to another, can occur in the kind of process which Riemann's referenced habilitation dissertation presents. That Riemann would have thought of the matter in this way, is clear, if one reads his own other writings from that general period against the background in Classical epistemology to which he repeatedly refers, or clearly alludes.

This understanding of the educative process of communication, is the underlying principle of a Classical Christian humanism of the sort practiced by the Brothers of the Common Life, as prescribed by Friedrich Schiller and his follower Wilhelm von Humboldt, in opposition to the travesty which has become, increasingly, U.S. educational dogma since the apotheosis of that Fabian/fascist/socialist scoundrel, and Rockefeller lackey, John Dewey.

To the degree that each society develops reasonably good approximations of such a Christian humanist-education principle for replication of crucial discoveries of principle from past

⁵⁰ On the subject of Norbert Wiener's proclivities as a highly neurotic hoaxster, the celebrated Richard Courant and David Hilbert are already on record.

generations of mankind, into the coming generations, the mind of the pupil so benefitted is populated with the names, even, sometimes, the facial images, of those discoverers who live in the pupil's mind today, in the degree that the pupil has replicated in his, or her own mind, a living moment of creative cognition, which sprang first into life in the sovereign mental processes of one among the great human beings of earlier generations. This comprehension will reach as far back as even until thousands of years ago, among today's "dead white European males" of Plato's Academy at Athens, for example, or Archimedes. It should reach, also, to some unknown, early astrophysicist of Central Asia, six to eight thousand years ago, who first calculated, with impressive accuracy of approximation, the long equinoctial cycle of pre-Mesopotamian solar-sidereal astronomy.

The function of the nation-state, is to ensure that that standpoint in universal history is the basis for education and for the development of the culture of all humanity, and, also to ensure, by those *dirigistic*, anti-"free trade," anti-*laissez faire* means rightly recognized for this purpose by France's Louis XI, and by the framers of the 1789 U.S. Federal Constitution, that society must focus its development, upon both emphasizing investment in scientific, technological, and related progress in the productive powers of labor, and in fostering the opportunities for developed young citizens, of "dissident" disposition, or otherwise, to find available niches in society where they may occupy themselves as world-historical personalities of universal history. Their function in such niches, is simply that of doing some not-entropic sort of good for the human species, pleasing the past generations who made their own existence possible, and blessing generations to come with the fruit of their labor.

That required condition of man in society, and of relations among nations, is what Leibniz signified by "happiness." This is the intent of the plainly anti-Locke emphasis upon Leibniz's doctrine of "happiness" in the 1776 U.S. Declaration of Independence, and the embedded principle, including the celebrated "general welfare clause" of the 1789 U.S. Federal Constitution.

Respecting Russia, the United States must recognize two things. First of all, without a "crash-program project" approach to technology-driven revival of the presently wrecked, post-1989 physical economy of Russia, no rational recovery is possible. Unless we in the U.S.A. foster such a recovery, Russia is given no option for survival, except to play the part of a feral, enraged beast throughout, more immediately, the continent of Eurasia. It must be added, both to U.S. policymakers, and to thinkers in Russia, that it should be clear, that, for historical reasons, the genius of the people of Russia as a whole, has no significant, presently articulated expression, but in those traditions of experimental physical science, including biophysics, which are now to be found in the scientific cadres who must be assembled quickly, under the provenance of such great projects of reconstruction and progress as are urgently wanted for the benefit of both Russia itself and Eurasia more generally.