

The Wells of Doom

by Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.

December 10, 1997

[Published in *Executive Intelligence Review*, Volume 24, Number 51, December 19, 1997.
[View PDF of original](#) at the LaRouche Library.]

Of “information society,” let it be said: Once more, this recent October, an “unsinkable *Titanic*” was fatally holed by its collision with the waiting, relevant species of iceberg. The impregnable post-1989, globalized financial system, is now settling into the watery abyss. Unfortunately, sanity being what it is, or is not, these days, even after the global events of October and November, most of the passengers, including former Citibank chief Walter Wriston, are still clinging to the sinking ship, clinging to a delusory faith in an “unsinkable utopia,” in an “eternal, neo-Malthusian, information society’s” economy.¹

“Yes, there seem to be some ups and downs on the markets,” is the gist of most U.S. adults’ reluctant acknowledgement of the recent several weeks of global financial storms; “but,” they add, “the economy is still basically sound. They would never let it happen here. Until I see it announced on television, I am not going to let myself believe, that that sort of crisis will ever come here.” Although the modern Manichean, that citizen, leaves unclear, who, or what these mysterious potencies, “they,” might be; the impression is, that they are awesomely Olympian.

Such popular superstition put to one side, given the catastrophes to the global financial system since late October through early December, no economist or political figure anywhere on this planet, could still be excused for believing a U.S. daily news media which promises that the current Asia crisis will *never* spread into the U.S. economy. After such events, no professional could still honestly deny the exceptional accuracy of my published, February 1997 forecast: an outbreak of a global, systemic financial crisis, beginning no later than October 1997.² The recent seismic shocks to the world’s financial system, have assumed the

¹ Walter Wriston, address to the Cato Institute, as broadcast on C-Span 2 on December 3, 1997. (See *Documentation* [in *EIR*, Vol. 24, No. 51, December 19, 1997, p. 30].)

² During February 1997, the present writer disseminated a series of warnings, in various published interviews, and otherwise, warning that 1997 would be a year of a grave international financial crisis. He indicated the 4th Quarter of 1997 as the outer limit for eruption of such a crisis, warning people to shift from speculative financial investments, such as futures and mutual funds into long-term U.S. Treasuries, and actual ownership of gold, even if nominal losses had to be expected in the short- to medium-term on such changes in investment holdings. (For example, in a radio interview with “EIR Talks,” February 5: “Sure, Treasuries don’t yield as

form of an eerie drum-beat; from Asia, through Europe, and into the Americas, the situation has become constantly worse. Until certain key governments end the presently ongoing attempts, to “bail out” a sinking financial Titanic, whose bottom has already been ripped out irreparably, the crisis will become worse, world-wide, that at an accelerating rate.

Meanwhile, as if to show us that matters were not already as bad as they might become, the policies demanded by both thuggish U.S. Federal Reserve Chairman Alan Greenspan and IMF Director Michel Camdessus, for example, have already begun what threatens to become, very quickly, a hyperinflationary spiral, like that which struck Weimar Germany during 1922–1923 [Figure 1 and 2]. The difference is, that, if this Weimar-1923-style policy of Greenspan and Camdessus were continued throughout Asia, and into the oncoming explosions in Russia, and South America, the result must be a Weimar-style hyperinflation, which might reach total breakdown, world-wide, not over months, as in 1922–1923, but, because of the added impact of a global, \$100 trillions-equivalent “derivatives” bubble, compressed into a period as short as weeks.

In such economics matters, mere statistical studies may inform us of such relevant considerations, such as the fact that the patient is dead, but they provide little help in defining the cures which might have saved the economy, if not its financial system. If we wish to cure the disease, we must go behind the mere symptoms, to identify the agency which those symptoms express. To discover the cure, we must discover the source of the sickness. To find the continuing source of this global civilization’s sickness, the presently onrushing, systemic, global financial crisis, we must focus upon the pattern of decisions which continue, even today, to shape economic practice: not the mere statistical effects of that practice. It is the substance of Genghis Khan, not his statistical shadow, which constitutes the mortal threat to our civilization. In short, to overcome the danger, the U.S. government must reverse the policy-trend of the recent thirty-odd years.

What must be introduced, would be considered by today’s commonplace, elected illiterates in the subject of economics history, such as Speaker Newt Gingrich, as very radical changes in policies. If precisely those policies are not soon introduced, to deal with an already hopelessly bankrupt set of international financial and monetary institutions, this is a bottomless crisis. In the case those policies are not introduced very soon, this planetary

much, but you’ve got one advantage with Treasuries: the government has agreed to back them up, and you’ve got something. Whereas, on these indexes, these futures, these options, when that market goes, you’ve got less than nothing.”) During the Spring months he updated that February warning, warning that a mild or severe shock could be expected by August, but that a heavy shock was virtually certain for October. (For example, to “EIR Talks,” June 17: “The talk is, the recognition now, is that this past crisis, the March–April and the upcoming one which will land here, expectedly, from Mars or something, between June, late June and October 31, the end of the third quarter kind of thing, that that will be a lollapalooza. Not necessarily the big one, but it forces us to look at the fact that the big one is coming.”)

civilization would be doomed, doomed by a lack of moral fitness to survive, doomed to plunge into the post-modernist barbarism of a prolonged “new dark age,” even before the 2000 U.S. election-campaigns begin. Unless, we can detect and eradicate those policies and supranational institutions, which have caused the past thirty-odd years’ decline in world economy, our culture is a dying culture, our nations, their populations, the casualties of a dying, global civilization.

Thus, modern European civilization, now somewhat more than six hundred years old, is, presently, dying. Nothing could save the present financial and monetary system itself. By the end of this century, perhaps sooner, it, in its present form, will be gone, either by responsible actions of key governments, or, lacking that remedy, by way of either hyperinflationary, or hyper-deflationary collapse, forever. As my own and other features in *EIR* have repeatedly warned, this financial-monetary system is like a doomed, sinking ship; the passengers, the nations, the peoples, and the physical economy living within this civilization, could be saved, but only if they are willing to abandon that doomed ship itself. They could survive, but only if they give up, suddenly, those post-1964, radical changes in culture, which have doomed the present world economic order.³

Unfortunately, the prevailing evidence warns us, that no more than a small minority of the populations and their doomed governments are yet willing, to support the policies needed to allow our nations to survive that global systemic financial crisis which has recently entered its terminal phase. For the moment, the boob-tubed majority of the pleasure-seeking populations of Europe and North America—most notably—seem to have lost the will to grasp for anything but the next fleeting instant of momentary—or, should we better say, monetary—pleasure.

We must view the majority of the people of most nations today, as like the pompous, doomed Akkadians of Biblical Belshazzar’s Babylonian empire; most of the leading

³ The repeated comparison of the present crisis to the sinking of the *Titanic* is no less irony than a true *metaphor*. It was not the design of Britain’s *Titanic* which was at fault; the ship was, in fact, better than most among those transatlantic passenger craft which were *not* sunk by icebergs that season. If the fault lay not in the design of the physical object, that ship, where, then, did the fault lie? Similarly, the present ruin of the world’s economy was not the result of any flaw inhering in the pre-1964 model of the U.S. physical economy. Thus, the relevant metaphor of 1997’s *Titanic* disaster is posed. Had not the owners, the captain, and induced British pride in the matter, not insisted upon the false assumption that the doomed ship was the fastest, most unsinkable extant, neither the Company nor the captain would have committed the fatal errors of policy and command which sent the ship at its relatively highest cruising speed into a fully expectable iceberg. The cause of the ship’s sinking was, thus, nothing other than that the owner’s, the captain’s, and the British public’s hysterical obsession with a set of purely ideological ruling assumptions. It was those perverse assumptions, the relevant mind-set shaping the decisions, which, decision by decision, defined the tragic sequence of decisions leading toward doom, in both cases. The root of tragedy, in these cases, as on the stage of Aeschylus, Shakespeare, and Schiller, is a debate over decisions as such, which refuses to take into account the underlying, axiomatic assumptions, which are the actual mother of the decision leading to doom.

institutions of this planet appear to have lost that essential quality, moral fitness to survive. So, as the artist portrayed a similar circumstance, Belshazzar's Feast:⁴ once again, the moving finger writes; the new message is now nearly completed.

How did our world get into such a mess? When and how did we start down the road to this catastrophe? What habits must we rip out of our institutions, and ourselves, if we, and our republic are to survive the ongoing, terminal disintegration of the entire world's present financial and monetary systems?⁵

To understand how all this occurred, how the most powerful civilization ever crafted, brought itself, like the fabled *Ozymandias*, to this present point of degradation and self-destruction, listen to a true story which begins with the September 6, 1901 assassination of patriotic U.S. President William McKinley, by an imported terrorist protégé of New York's Emma Goldman's Henry Street Settlement House, Leon Czolgosz. The mortal wounding effected by this assassin's attack, an attack steered by self-anointed "tyrannicide" Goldman herself, brought a nasty spawn of the Confederacy, Theodore Roosevelt, into the U.S. Presidency, on September 14, eight days later. About the same time, in England, a pathetic, perverse, but, subsequently, very influential British publicist, Herbert George Wells (1868–1946), escaped from what had been well-deserved obscurity. This Wells would later describe his personal acquaintance and ideological ally, Theodore Roosevelt, aptly, as "The Big Noise of America."⁶

That intersection of these two personalities, Wells and Theodore Roosevelt, with the accession of Prince Edward Albert as Britain's King Edward VII, typify a century gone wrong from the start, the century of 1) two World Wars, 2) a terrifying nuclear balance of power, which Wells was the first to propose publicly and widely, beginning 1914, and, 3) the recent thirty-odd years of worldwide reign of a global, neo-Malthusian nightmare, the latter another Wells dogma. These three factors, including the two dogmas, the one proposed, the other adopted by Wells, became, significantly through his contributing influence, the principal proximate cause of the presently ongoing worldwide economic-breakdown crisis.

⁴ Rembrandt van Rijn, *Belshazzar Sees the Handwriting on the Wall* (c. 1636). Belshazzar: *Bel-shar-ussur*, co-king of the doomed dynasty of Babylon, circa 555 B.C.

⁵ In other words, what was the "cultural paradigm-shift" involved? What was the change in underlying axiomatic principles of decision-making, which caused a previously upward-moving, increasingly collaborative international industrial society of the late Nineteenth Century, to change the effective direction of its decision, into becoming a Hobbesian collection of heteronomic gladiator-nations, plunged into two Great Wars, the age of nuclear balance of terror, and the suicidal insanity of the takeover of world decision-making by the sheer irrationalism of a neo-Malthusian, "post-industrial" utopianism?

⁶ H.G. Wells, *Experiment in Autobiography* (New York: MacMillan & Company, 1934), p. 646.

Wells' Nuclear Balance of Power

In these and other ways, among literate historians and other relevant authorities on the matter, H. G. Wells has notable importance for our understanding the strategic, political, economic, and moral crisis now enveloping this planet. An unlikely candidate for fame and influence? He was, admittedly, like fellow Fabian tribesman George Bernard Shaw, essentially a shallow *poseur*, in the literal sense of the Latin derivation of “vanity”: a miserable, invidious, misanthropic wretch, a picaresque eternal lout of immense vanity, of a personal character to be compared, and that not too favorably, with the popular image of a “mafia boss.” He was, in short, exactly the sort of lackey the British oligarchy would employ and cultivate to do a particularly nasty bit of thuggery.

From the time of this English *Sparafucile*'s rocketting out of obscurity, at the beginning of this century, he is to be compared with the notorious textbook case of Typhoid Mary; like her, incontestably a figure who has, in his time, radiated a certain unpleasant influence. To appreciate Wells' high-ranking, and generally rising importance in relevant world events, during the interval 1901–1939, think of him as, like Adolf Hitler, or his fellow-criminal Bertrand Russell, a carrier of what has proven to be an extremely virulent strain of cultural syphilis.⁷ Wells did not destroy our civilization by himself; but, he played a key, and exemplary part, as a tissue in which the relevant killer-strain of infection was cultured and disseminated.

Both Wells' depraved admirers and the populist's typically associative, Hobbesian view of a “world government conspiracy,” treat Wells, and other lackeys of his type, as either admirable, or despicable geniuses. Wells was no genius; his talent was, as he implicitly describes himself, a man with a pimp's insight into the susceptibility of a depraved clientele's not-so-hidden private sexual fantasies.⁸ In each case an influential idea is attributed to Wells, whether by devotees or detractors, we discover that no such originality ever existed. His role was never that of a discoverer of principles; indeed, there is nothing of principle in Wells' vocabulary. Wells was not an inventor, but, rather, a publicist, a man like Dick Morris, the recently notorious cousin of the late Roy M. Cohn, a pathetic creature who turned his pimp's instinct for the sexual perversities of a general public, into a public-relations career.

This is a crucial point, so we should add a few more relevant observations on the distinction we have just made.

⁷ Wells would acknowledge our choice of venereal disease, as an allusion to those utopian sexual fantasies, akin to those of degraded creatures such as Carl Jung, Wilhelm Reich, and former President George Bush's employer, the Moon cult, which, according to Wells' plausible, autobiographical statement of the case, shaped his thinking about all the subjects of his work which we address here. See Wells, *op. cit.*, pp. 392–409.

⁸ Wells, *op. cit.*, pp. 392–409.

For example, Wells' writes:

“The *New Machiavelli*⁹ is all the world away from overt eroticism. The theme ... stressed the harsh incompatibility of wide public interests with the high, swift rush of imaginative passion—with considerable sympathy for the passion.... I was not indulging myself and the world in artistic pornography or making an attack upon anything I considered moral.... I was releasing, in these books, a long accumulation of suppression. I was working out the collateral problems with an ingenuous completeness... In a world where pressure on the means of subsistence was a normal condition of life, it was necessary to compensate for the removal of traditional sexual restraints, and so my advocacy of simple and easy love-making had to be supplemented by an adhesion to the propaganda of the Neo-Malthusians. This I made in my *Anticipations* (1900)¹⁰ and continued to write plainly on that subject in a period when Neo-Malthusianism was by no means the respectable movement it has become.”¹¹

The political function for which a publicist such as Wells, is subjected to a competitive process of selection, is to transform the ideas which the prospective employers intend to promote, into the easy form in which the mere name of such ideas can acquire pleasurable associations within a large ration, if not yet the majority, of a targetted population and the institutions which that population regards as expressing its self-interest.

That is not the manner in which ideas *should* be given wider currency; the cognitive methods of Classical humanistic education, are the proper approach to all forms of education of a population, especially the population of a nation which wishes to escape the fall from republic to tyranny. Wells, like the Mephistopheles of Goethe's *Faust*, is a British empiricist, who avoids cognition; he targets the population's irrational susceptibilities, the target's non-cognitive, associative modes of fantasy-life: erotic imagery.

Wells, like the Dick Morris who did so much to sink the U.S. Democratic Party's 1996 campaign for the U.S. House of Representatives, typifies the use of the pimp as a publicist. “Run it up the flagpole, and see who salutes it!” “Throw it against the wall, and see if it sticks!” “Read the polls, and discover which of last night's political entertainments found their way into the polluted imageries of a relative majority of the targetted strata of the population.” Hence, the use of Wells' policy of sexually-oriented utopian propaganda, in the

⁹ 1911.

¹⁰ *Anticipations of the Reaction of Mechanical and Scientific Progress upon Human Life and Thought* (London: Chapman and Hall, 1901)

¹¹ *Experiment in Autobiography*, pp. 398–399.

case of the financially successful basing of the origins of the Promise Keepers' cult on the use of Jungian homoerotic imageries.¹²

That sort of pimp, like the mass-media generally, makes his living, and gains his political influence, through reliance upon appeal to the kind of underlying sexual perversity echoed in today's popular print and electronic mass-media of entertainment, and in the fictionalized fantasies presented in those media under the misleading rubric of "news."

This is a characteristic of degenerated cultures, such as that of the Roman Empire, or British popular culture today, in which the proposed size of the testicles of the sports arena's leading gladiators, or, such matters as the size of an actress's breasts, or the reported sexual peccadilloes of entertainment "celebrities," evoke far greater passion from the population, than those issues of policy upon which the lives of themselves and their posterity hang. As Wells expressed the same view, but from his vantage-point, "In a world where pressure on the means of subsistence was a normal condition of life, it was necessary to compensate for the removal of traditional sexual restraints, and so my advocacy of simple and easy love-making had to be supplemented by an adhesion to the propaganda of the Neo-Malthusians."

In general, whether for evil, as in the case of Wells, or for good, an idea gains currency through one or another kind of process of social ingestion. Properly, ingestion begins at the head, and is, next, transmitted from the cognitive process of one head, to replication of the same species and type of cognitive process in the head of another; but, in the lower reaches of society, types such as Wells, Dick Morris, and Richard Mellon-Scaife's circles, prefer to address the targetted populist audience's preference for fantasy, from the nether apertures of the publicist's body. In the case of the oligarchy which adopted Wells, it was his uncanny ability, like his Fabian fellow-tribesman George Bernard Shaw, to target and reach the most morally debased level of his chosen audience, whose relative successes showed the oligarchy how to shape its ideas in a form of expression which would capture what Wells recognized as the baser susceptibilities of the intended mass of dupes.

In sum: Wells did not invent sex; he merely sold it. Therein lay his talent, and the quality of his influence.

In the reports included in this issue's Strategic Study, our interest in Wells is focussed upon those features of his activity, which bear upon his crucial and continuing role in originating, beginning 1914, on the eve of World War I, a new variety of "balance of power" doctrine, premised upon chemist Frederick Soddy's assurances of the feasibility of a terrible new military power, nuclear-fission weaponry.¹³

¹² See Anton Chaitkin, "The Promise Keepers Cult and Homoerotic Brainwashing," *EIR*, November 14, 1997.

This is the now all-too-familiar doctrine, which features the development and use of nuclear weapons as a form of terror, by means of which nations might be forced to abandon national sovereignty, and to join a new, feudalist world order, which Wells, like his crony Bertrand Russell, advocated as “world government.”¹⁴ Within the setting of that topic, our more specific interest here, is the crucial role which the nuclear balance-of-power doctrine has had, in imposing those utopian, neo-Malthusian dogmas which have, increasingly, ruled, and ruined, and continue to menace the world’s economic decision-making, during the recent thirty-odd years.

On these accounts, H.G. Wells was not only the first publicist of the argument of “nuclear balance of power;” he was also among the key figures in misshaping what became that mass youth-counterculture which, like the mythological *Circe*, took over the minds and bodies of a majority of the 1964–1972 generation of university students. As such a mere lackey, he played a key role in bringing about the process of self-destruction, which, in turn, sent the entirety of modern European civilization to its presently ongoing financial disintegration.

To understand Wells, his selection by his aristocratic patrons, and the impact which he has had upon this century, one must begin at the year 1901, the year in which President McKinley was murdered by a London-centered international terrorist organization of that time, the year in which Wells’ utopian, and frankly, as he himself insisted on the term,

¹³ H.G. Wells, *The World Set Free* (London: Macmillan, 1914), dedicated to Frederick Soddy. Publicist Wells is the putative inventor of the term “atomic bomb.” Notably, although Wells had publicly acknowledged this debt to Soddy in his own 1914 *The World Set Free*, no suitable reference to a matter so important appears in his own 1934 autobiography. Soddy, whose most significant apprenticeship, in study of the disintegration of radioactive elements, occurred under Ernest Rutherford at Montreal’s McGill University, is among the first known, during 1908–1914, to have proposed the feasibility, and prospective power of fission weaponry. After Soddy had received his 1921 Nobel Prize in chemistry for related discoveries, his 1908 lectures, on which Wells had relied chiefly for his 1914 proposal of a nuclear balance of power, were published as a book. See, Frederick Soddy, *The Interpretation of Radium and the Structure of the Atom* (New York: G.P. Putnam’s Sons, 1922).

¹⁴ Bertrand Russell, “The Atomic Bomb and the Prevention of War,” *The Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists*, Nos. 5 & 6, September 1, 1946. See also, H.G. Wells, *The Open Conspiracy: Blueprints for a World Revolution* (London: Victor Gollancz, 1928). This Wells manifesto became a blueprint for establishing the mystical, synthetic culture presently recognized by the terms “post-modernism” and “New Age.” Russell signed on publicly to this utopian scheme of Wells, and never departed from that pledge thereafter. During and following World War II, institutions inside and outside the U.S. establishment inundated the U.S. academic and strategic planning arenas with New Age dogmas. These, which included Norbert Wiener’s “information theory” cult, and the “systems analysis” of John von Neumann, were each and all dominated by the combined networks associated with earlier and continuing organizing on behalf of Wells’ *The Open Conspiracy* manifesto. The “mind wars” psycho-social kookinesses of the 1952–1972 period of the Cold War, became, like so-called “science fiction” publishing and “sci-fi” cults, a leading playground for such queer types. Through the 1970s and beyond, the dominant figures in New Age pseudo-science, new religions, and kindred projects, were closely associated with Russell and, or Wells, like the Josiah Macy, Jr. Foundation’s Gregory Bateson and his sometime spouse Margaret Mead, or, linked through the London Tavistock Clinic/Institute of Brigadier Dr. John Rawlings Rees and Dr. Eric Trist. It was through these channels of influence that that apparatus was developed for the mass-brainwashing of 1964–1972 university student populations, and others.

“neo-Malthusian” rant,¹⁵ *Anticipations*, was published.¹⁶ This book was then a leading part of the activity which brought Thomas Huxley admirer Wells into the Fabian Society, and into that eating-club, called the “Coefficients,” where he became a kind of early-on “Josef Goebbels” for Lord Alfred Milner’s imperial enterprises.¹⁷

On these matters, Wells’ writing is characterized by a vivid recollection of what he views as the central fact of his world: that he exists in it, surrounded by celebrities whose acquaintance he wears as his literary plumage. Even world figures, including such non-British figures as Theodore Roosevelt, V.I. Lenin, Josef Stalin, Franklin Roosevelt, and so on, appear in the writing of this irascible Rumpelstiltskin as if they might be merely his predicates. Thus, in his writings, the larger world in which he is situated, is mostly out of focus, a blur. In his own mind, this British *Steppenwolf* was less in the world, than prancing pompously on stage, before it.

Nonetheless, outside the virtual reality which he describes his erotic fantasy-life to be, there existed a very real world, and a very real situation, a world in which he exerted some very real influence. That real world was chiefly hatred against the British monarchy’s traditional adversary, the continued existence of Benjamin Franklin’s and Abraham Lincoln’s United States. This was a U.S. which he and his patrons feared, and hated, bitterly, even more than they hated the U.S.’s late-Nineteenth-Century allies, Japan, Germany, Russia, and, the France of Thiers, President Sadi Carnot, and historian-diplomat Gabriel Hanotaux. Without that essential situation dominating the world in which Wells lived, the Wells of the first half of the Twentieth Century could not have existed.

Follow lackey Sancho Panza (Wells) and aristocratic Don Quixote (Russell), from the starting-point of their journey, hatred against the United States, to their choice of weapons for our republic’s destruction. There are the three, interdependent, utopian working-notions thematically central to all of the 1901–1939 publicist activity of H.G. Wells, and of the Gernsback-Campbell U.S. school of radically positivist, pulp “science-fiction” which Wells inspired:¹⁸ 1.) nuclear weapons, 2.) world government, and 3.) masturbatory neo-Malthusianism. Find thus the bridge between the Wells of 1901–1928, and the 1964–1972 mass-brainwashing of university campus “Baby Boomers.” To grasp the thrust of their

¹⁵ Wells, *op. cit.* p. 399.

¹⁶ *Op. cit.* Wells refers pervasively to *Anticipations* as a “1900” book, rather than to the book’s date of publication.

¹⁷ Wells, *Experiment in Autobiography*, pp. 643–707.

¹⁸ Consider, for example, the formula underlying the design of the scripts for the “Star Trek” TV series. High priest “Spock,” ostensibly an “artificial intelligence” created by MIT’s mad Marvin Minsky, represents the Campbell cult’s logical positivism. “The Federation”: world government. A “Prime Directive” copied from the cabbala of Neo-Malthusianism. Religiosity: pure polymorphous perversity copied from the pages of William James’ *The Varieties of Religious Experience* and Sir James George Frazer’s *The Golden Bough*.

“Open Conspiracy,” consider that characteristic of the U.S.A. which was the focus of their fear and satanic quality of hatred.

The Abraham Lincoln Revolution

Since 1863, what the ruling British oligarchy, otherwise traditionally named “the Venetian Party,” has feared, and hated, more than anything else, was the relatively awesome power which the United States’s economy came to represent during the course of the years 1861–1876.¹⁹ The facts of this history have been richly documented in books and leading papers published by this writer and his associates over more than a quarter-century. For our purposes here, the relevant essentials of that matter, as this bears upon the roles of Wells and Russell, are fairly summarized as follows.

Until the 1862–1863 interventions of Russia’s Czar Alexander II, the British monarchy of Lord Palmerston and Bertrand Russell’s grandfather, Lord Russell, was fully committed to destroying the United States. As British agent August Belmont underscored this fact in his own admissions, London’s intent in launching its puppet, the Confederate States of America, was to force the Washington, D.C. government to accept the sovereignty of the British Confederacy puppet, thus creating the situation in which London could divide the North American continent among a Balkans-like collection of perpetually squabbling local tyrannies, this according to the same “balance of power” illogic which the dubious Zbigniew “Tweedledum” Brzezinski has proposed for Central Asia.²⁰

When, despite Belmont asset McClellan’s complicity, Britain’s Confederacy assets failed to bring the matter quickly to the conclusion London intended, Palmerston, Russell, and Palmerston’s French stooge, the Emperor Napoleon III, prepared to deploy the combined naval forces of Britain, France, and Spain against both Mexico and the U.S. blockade of the Confederate ports. When the Czar not only threatened to “make war throughout Europe,” should Britain deploy naval forces against those of the U.S., but dispatched two Russian naval fleets to aid the U.S. in the case of a British naval intervention in the Civil War, Palmerston’s and Napoleon III’s plan to destroy the U.S., had to be scrapped in favor of other, longer-term options.

During this period, the crucial feature of Lincoln’s strategy, was the rapid development of the basic economic infrastructure and agro-industrial potential of the region under his command. What Lincoln was fighting, from his side, was what Germany’s great Alfred von Schlieffen defined as “annihilation warfare,” in contrast to the predominantly Eighteenth-

¹⁹ On the usage of “Venetian Party,” see H. Graham Lowry, *How the Nation Was Won* (Washington, D.C.: Executive Intelligence Review, 1987). On the 1861–1876 Carey-Lincoln development of the U.S. economy, see Anton Chaitkin, “The ‘Land-Bridge’: Henry Carey’s Global Development Program,” *EIR*, May 2, 1997.

²⁰ Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr., “Tweedledum Goofs Again,” *EIR*, December 5, 1997.

Century model of “cabinet warfare” which generals such as Lee and McClellan proposed to fight instead. Victory in battles was necessary, but not decisive by itself. Decisive was the increase of the annihilation capability which one side was developing in depth, relative to the destruction of the core-capability of the opposing forces. In the end, it was the “anvil” Grant, the “hammer” Sherman, and Sheridan, who typified the expression of Lincoln’s strategic will on this account.

This mode of warfare, aimed to *annihilate* the adversary’s economic-military capability for continuing to deploy effective war-fighting capabilities, had been introduced to the United States, beginning approximately 1814, from the France circles of Lazare Carnot, the France’s celebrated 1792–1794 “Organizer of Victory,” and from Carnot’s former teacher and ally, Gaspard Monge of the *Ecole Polytechnique*. Carnot is the founder of modern warfare, a form of warfare which Carnot himself integrated with the introduction of machine-tool-design methods to the logistics and technology of war-fighting. This was adopted at the West Point of Commandant Sylvanus Thayer, whose production of a military Corps of Engineers became the germ of later U.S. military superiority, and represented an essential building-block for the Carey-Lincoln “economic miracle” of 1861–1876.

Under the guidance of economist Henry C. Carey, the 1861–1876 period saw the rapid development of the U.S. economy into not only the world’s most powerful, but the most technologically advanced, by far. This resulted in the successful adoption of the Carey-Lincoln model by Japan’s Meiji Restoration, and radical changes in the economic policies of Bismarck, making Germany the rising economy in Europe. Similar benefits of the U.S. revolution in industrial society, were extended to the Russia of U.S. ally Czar Alexander II, D.I. Mendeleev, and Count Sergei Witte. The aid to Russia’s technological progress came both directly from the U.S., and by way of U.S.-Russia-Germany cooperation.

Meanwhile, with the overthrow of British agent Napoleon III, France under Adolphe Thiers, Sadi Carnot, *et al.*, had ceased to be the number-two enemy of the U.S.A., and was engaged in cooperation in the great, railway-building and related land-bridge development projects in Eurasia. Until corrupt French creatures, agents of London, arranged a capitulation to Lord Kitchener’s London, in the Fashoda incident of 1898, France was effectively a partner of the great nation-building projects which Lincoln’s victorious U.S.A. had inspired and was fostering in Eurasia. Until British-directed, chiefly diplomatic countermeasures of the 1894–1901 interval, the combination of the U.S.A.’s links to Japan and to the nationalist forces of China, complemented U.S. patriots’ commitment to fostering Eurasia economic cooperation among France, Germany, Russia, China, and Japan.

From the success of France’s Paul Barras in ousting war-hero Lazare Carnot from all positions of political power in France, until the initial successes of President Lincoln’s naval

blockades, during the U.S. Civil War, London was assured, that the potential strategic danger from the continued existence of the U.S.A., was a manageable threat. The developments of 1861–1876 nearly obliterated British strategic self-confidence on this account. These events demonstrated to the nations of that time, the absolute, and vast superiority of the Leibniz-Franklin-Hamilton-Carey-List American System of political-economy, over the British intellectual export to its intended victims, the “free trade” model. The spread of Henry C. Carey’s American model into Japan, Germany, Russia, and nationalist China, transformed the threat to the British monarchy, from a grave potential one, into an immediate challenge to the continued existence of our republic’s traditional and continuing chief foreign adversary, since 1714 to the present day.

At the close of the century, when Wells first emerged from obscurity, the American System had shown great resiliency against even the worst treason and external afflictions it had suffered until that time. The election of a patriot in the Lincoln-Carey tradition, President William McKinley, threatened to undo the treachery accomplished under Confederacy spawn Grover Cleveland; the U.S.A. led by McKinley, was an active challenge to the continued existence of the British Empire. A new Japan emperor, friendlier to Britain, presided over the first, 1894 Japan-China war, a direct break of Japan with its former U.S. ally; the 1941–1945 U.S.-Japan war was a direct outgrowth of Japan’s prolonged, Twentieth-Century alliance with Britain against U.S. interests. The immediate grave danger to the British Empire was eliminated, for the ensuing two decades, by the assassination of President McKinley. King Edward VII’s successful use of treasonous French officials from the ranks of France’s assortments of revanchist scoundrels, enabled London to pit France and Russia against Germany, and to deploy combined French and British freemasonic agents to orchestrate the Balkan War used to detonate World War I.

Russell’s expressions of hatred against the United States, like his mass-homicidal threats against darker-skinned “more prolific races,”²¹ are already beyond the bounds of toleration;

²¹ Bertrand Russell, *The Prospects of Industrial Civilization* (London: George Allen & Unwin, 1923), p. 273: “Socialism, especially international socialism, is only possible as a stable system if the population is stationary or nearly so. A slow increase might be coped with by improvement in agricultural methods, but a rapid increase must in the end reduce the whole population to penury,... the white population of the world will soon cease to increase. The Asiatic races will be longer, and the negroes still longer, before their birth rate falls sufficiently to make their numbers stable without help of war and pestilence... Until that happens, the benefits aimed at by socialism can only be partially realized, and the less prolific races will have to defend themselves against the more prolific by methods which are disgusting even if they are necessary.” (As cited in Carol White, *The New Dark Ages Conspiracy* (New York: New Benjamin Franklin House, 1980), pp. 74–75. The latter book by Carol White, *et al.*, was based upon my 1978 outline of crucial features of a proposed text, debunking the mythical image of Bertrand Russell as a kindly old pacifist. This typifies extensive researches into Russell’s networks, beginning my own study of his mathematical and philosophical works, during the 1950s, and the work of my associates and myself, in Europe and North America, since the early 1970s. Selections from that research have been brought to bear here, as they bear on the subject as more narrowly defined in this *EIR* Strategic Study.

the man was a conscienceless beast. Yet, even Russell's anti-American rants do not approach the virulence and pervasiveness of Wells' expressed hatred against everything American. Only a low-life lackey could muster such public displays of obsessive hatred against his master's opponent as Wells does. Sometimes, as British whodunits instruct us, the household's Royal commissioner, the butler, often a fanatical British-Israelite thug, makes a readier assassin than the typical British version of *Oblomov*, the butler's Established-Church master.

After Wells' death, Russell summarized his own and Wells' common view in the following terms: "... bad times, you may say, are exceptional, and can be dealt with by exceptional methods. This has been more or less true during the honeymoon period of industrialism, but it will not remain true unless the increase of the population can be enormously diminished.... War, so far, as had no very great effect on this increase, which continued throughout each of the world wars.... War ... has hitherto been disappointing in this respect ... but perhaps bacteriological war may prove more effective. If a Black Death could spread throughout the world once in every generation, survivors could procreate freely without making the world too full.... The state of affairs might be somewhat unpleasant, but what of it? Really high-minded people are indifferent to happiness, especially other people's...."²²

The distinction, and convergence of implied master (Russell) and house-servant (Wells), are compactly represented by Russell's autobiographical outburst: "As for public life, when I first became politically conscious [William E.] Gladstone²³ and [Benjamin] Disraeli²⁴ still confronted each other amid Victorian solidities, the British Empire seemed eternal, a threat to British naval supremacy was unthinkable, the country was aristocratic, rich and growing richer.... For an old man,²⁵ with such a background, it is difficult to feel at home in world of ... American supremacy."²⁶ Russell was speaking in the context of Britain's continuing, Churchillian hatred against that U.S. President Franklin Roosevelt who, but for his untimely death, would have quickly rid this planet of all colonial empires and also of continued British

²² From Carol White. *op. cit.*, as quoted from Bertrand Russell, *The Impact of Science on Society* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1953), pp. 102–104.

²³ Former prominent British Conservative, turned leading Liberal Party figure, sometime Prime Minister, famous for his unsuccessful efforts on behalf of Irish Home Rule.

²⁴ British novelist and arch-imperialist conservative, who served as Prime Minister briefly in 1868, and again in 1874–1880. Notorious for his role in making the widowed, batty woman from the attic, Queen Victoria, Empress of India. During Gladstone's ministry, Disraeli was the most consistently savage spokesman for the opposition.

²⁵ Bertrand Russell, hereditary Third Earl, was born 1872, and died in 1970: hence, the reference to "old man."

²⁶ Carol White, *op. cit.*, p. 77.

export of its pernicious, theologically, implicitly satanic,²⁷ “free trade” swindle to the foreign nations its intended victims.

The Role of ‘The Venetian Party’

As previously stressed, in sundry relevant locations, since the 1439–1440 sessions of the great ecumenical Council of Florence, and since the subsequent establishment of Louis XI’s France as the first modern form of nation-state republic, the central issue underlying all the important wars and related political, social, and philosophical conflicts within extended modern European civilization, has been the conflict between the notion of the equality of all persons, as made in the *cognitive* image of God, against the contrary policy of those oligarchical classes then centered in Venice’s imperial role as the then-dominant maritime and financier power of the Mediterranean region and northern Europe.²⁸ The case of Russell, Wells, *et al.*, is no exception to this rule. The Civil War between the United States of President Abraham Lincoln and the British puppet-state known as the Confederacy, is a perfect expression of precisely this issue.

As stressed in earlier locations, the exceptional quality of superiority of the design presented in our 1776 Declaration of Independence and 1787–1789 Federal Constitution, is a reflection of the historic circumstance, that post-League of Cambrai Europe continues, to this day, to be characteristically a corrupted form of nation-state, in which one of the two ruling classes of feudal society, a financier-oligarchy of what has been known variously, since the Seventeenth Century, as the “Venetian Party,” “Anglo-Dutch” oligarchy, or, more recently, “Club of the Isles,” World Wildlife Fund, etc., has usually occupied the positions of top-most authority over government and economy. Although we were polluted with spores of such an oligarchical slime-mold, with our New England opium-traffickers, our New York bankers, and our southern slave-owners, our constitutional principle was of such excellent moral superiority over that of any other nation-state established in modern times, that we have managed, thus far, to emerge, sooner or later, afresh from every protracted period of corruption by the influence of our own domestic oligarchical classes.²⁹

²⁷ The proximate origins of the British “free trade” doctrines include Bernard Mandeville’s 1714 *The Fable of the Bees, or Private Vice, Public Benefits*. See H. Graham Lowry, *op. cit., passim*. On Mandeville’s notion of “free trade” as satanic in nature, see Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr., “Whose God Does Pat Robertson Serve?” *EIR*, November 14, 1997, *passim*. The single most significant ideological basis for both the *laissez-faire* of that heir of the feudal-reactionary *Fronde*, François Quesnay, and Quesnay’s plagiarizer, Lord Shelburne’s Adam Smith, is the neo-Manichean Bogomil cult, those inventors of the condom, more popularly known as “the buggers,” which rooted itself in two regions of France, the mountainous regions of the southwest and along the Rhône, from Lake Geneva to the Mediterranean. The standard argument for “free trade,” to the present-day representatives of the Mont Pelerin Society and the circles of Pat Robertson, Jerry Falwell, and Mark deMoss, is a direct copy of the Bogomil argument bearing upon the signs of selection of members of the cult’s “elect.”

²⁸ N.B., “Tweedledum Goofs Again.”

On this account, we were not an exception to the best currents within Italy, France, Germany, and so forth; the highest levels were reached by such German-speaking admirers of our republican struggles as Friedrich Schiller and Ludwig van Beethoven. Indeed, those best currents from precisely those countries, provided the majority of the founding kernel of our citizenry. The difference is, that we used our distance from Europe to constitutional advantage, thus becoming the only modern European form of nation-state which gained the freedom to be founded upon a consistent moral principle. That, and only that, is our *exceptional superiority* as a form of nation-state. This is the only reason for the stubborn persistence of the British monarchy's continuing role, since 1714, of being the principal, mortal adversary of our republic. The fact, as many foolish Americans demonstrate the point, that the British oligarchy regards us with an even greater, more consistent enmity than our U.S. patriots, such as the present writer, view the British monarchy.

This is not to suggest, that Klemens Prince von Metternich's Habsburg monarchy was any less fervent an enemy of the United States than Bentham's, Castlereagh's, Canning's, and Palmerston's Britain. Probably, putting aside a significant number of happier exceptions, such as the Marquis de Lafayette, the Emperor Joseph II, and Beethoven's student, the Archduke Rudolf, the continental European land-owning aristocracy, taken as a class, was more aptly represented by the secret police under such Austrian Chancellors as Wenzel von Kaunitz and, the official pimp, of the 1814 (sexual) Congress of Venice, Metternich.³⁰ That class, generally, was more brutish than the British. The difference is, that the landed aristocracy of the southern regions of Europe and the Americas, was a dying species, a great nuisance for the security of the United States during the first half of the Nineteenth Century, but with little potency for the longer term, even then.

As this reporter has stressed early and often, the difference between U.S. patriots in the tradition of Franklin and Lincoln, and the British ruling classes and their lackeys, is not other than, nothing less than, an uncompromisable difference respecting the concepts of

²⁹ This thesis, respecting the post-League of Cambrai (i.e., post-A.D.1610) Europe, is developed in numerous locations, including the "Tweedledum Goofs Again," referenced above.

³⁰ The Austro-Hungarian secret police (*Geheimpolizei*), who conducted political operations against such figures as both Wolfgang Mozart and Ludwig van Beethoven, were notoriously closer to the Venice-dominated council of princes of the Holy Roman Empire, than to the Habsburg royal household. Generally, the Chancellor was closer to that body of princes than his Emperor. Thus, the targets of political assassination under von Kaunitz tended to be the circles associated with the former Emperor, Joseph II, such as Mozart and his friends. The scandal around Anton Schindler and the conversation books, exposed the fact that Beethoven, despite his close association with the imperial family, was also targetted by the *Geheimpolizei* under Metternich. The ascription of "pimp" to Metternich, is historically precise. Metternich and his *Geheimpolizei* managed the Congress of Vienna chiefly in the bedrooms, where the entertainment of the distracted celebrities by assigned countesses and peasant-girls was arranged by Metternich, and the quality of entertainment provided, closely supervised and documented by the secret police.

God, man, and nature.³¹ Russell's, Hitler-like, sordid racialism, expressed in proposals for genocide, to be accomplished by aid of means which he himself acknowledged to be "disgusting" Malthusian methods, including bacteriological warfare, expresses this unbridgeable moral gulf between our respective forms of government.

To make the needed summary of our argument on this point, as short as possible, the reader is referred to the charming stories of Jonathan Swift's 1726 *Gulliver's Travels*. One must get past the misapprehension, that these are merely children's stories. They are, chiefly, political satires on the condition of the British Isles under King George I. The most relevant among these, is the tale of the fictional Lemuel Gulliver's visit to the kingdom of the Houyhnhnms, in which lordly horses' posteriors reigned over rutting humanoid creatures, called Yahoos, which latter were devoid of morals or speech:³² an apt picture of the British Isles' aristocrats and lower classes at that time. It is relevant to emphasize here, that that is also a fair satire on the Eighteenth-Century depravity to which the British population has been returned, since the onset of those pestilences known as the Harold Wilson and Margaret Thatcher governments.

The chief practical expression of the issue which underlies the incurable hostility between all U.S. patriots and the present British oligarchy, is the interrelated issues of popular education, popular employment, and popular physical standard of household incomes. Summarily: If each man and woman is made, equally, in the image of God, by virtue of those sovereign cognitive potentials of the individual mind, by means of which man increases our species' power over nature through such means as new, validated discoveries of physical principle, then the education, employment, and conditions of family and community life of each and all persons must be ordered accordingly.

In such a society, which our Leibnizian 1776 Declaration of Independence, and the Preamble of our 1789 Federal Constitution, define this republic of ours to be, there can be no superior social classes, nor any institution by means of which any form of usury—financier usury or slavery—is allowed as means by which one group of persons can subjugate, or otherwise loot another. Each newborn personality must be cultivated to the utmost degree possible, in the development of those powers of cognition which define each as made in the image of God. Each must be afforded, to the degree possible, the opportunities of useful employment which are consistent with such developed cognitive powers. Each household, and community within society must be afforded the opportunities which are consistent with these other requirements.

³¹ E.g., Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr., "What Economics Must Measure," *EIR*, November 28, 1997.

³² In the U.S.A. today, "Yahoo" is more readily recognized as the mating-call of that Confederate tradition cherished by Nashville, Tennessee's Agrarians.

Not only must we desire this naturally lawful state of affairs for our nation itself. We can not be happy unless we are working to ensure the same rights for all humanity, for all nations.

Here, on these two points, we part company with our foremost traditional enemy, the British Venetian-style financier oligarchy and its representative instrument, the imperial monarchy.

The question is then often posed, “Can we not persuade such wretches as poor lackey H.G. Wells, that our desire is in their best interest as human individuals?” “Can the British not be brought to understand, that we wish nothing so much for them, as that they might enjoy the same preconditions of happiness we defend for our own nation?” Why not? Perhaps a miserable wretch like Bertrand Russell, belongs to the criminal class his title and outlook define his loyalties to be? But, what of the ordinary, poor Brit, or simply one of unpretentious circumstances: Why should he or she not see the wisdom of abandoning his nation’s long-established policy of destroying the liberties of one’s own people?

With such questions, one touches upon the existence of a principle of evil, like that which gripped the poor Confederate soldier, almost in a condition of slavery, and illiteracy, like the African-American slaves, himself. Why should he fight for the cause of his actual oppressor? How can a miserable wretch such as lackey H.G. Wells exist? Wells would recognize the answer to that question: “Eros!” Will Shakespeare’s friend, Christopher Marlowe wrote elegantly of this in his *Doctor Faustus*. John Milton’s Satan, like Bertrand Russell, would rather reign in Hell, than serve in Heaven. Wells, like Adolf Hitler, another of the same pedigree, would rather be Satan’s lackey in Hell, than a citizen in Heaven; on both counts, both Russell and Wells succeeded. You will not bring them back, nor, likely, any of their kind. They have been destroyed by the culture of which they are a part.

That should be warning to those who are reluctant to give up the acquired traits of the 1964–1972 youth-counterculture. History is so composed, that bad cultures tend to eliminate, or, at least, greatly weaken themselves. Although several thousand years were required to crush the degraded Semitic culture which grew up in Mesopotamia, when the crucial blow was finally struck, by Alexander the Great, the way was cleared for the role which Christianity began to play just over three centuries later. Archeology and related studies warn us, that it is by the weakening of a bad culture, which would otherwise be an impediment to human improvement, that mankind has progressed. Thus, if we do not willingly purge ourselves of a bad culture, one which, like that 1964–1972 youth-counterculture, has brought this civilization to the presently ongoing systemic collapse, this generation now in topmost positions of power, and its children and grandchildren, will pay the horrid price suffered by any culture, whose virtual extermination is a prerequisite to further human progress. Similarly, if we allow the British cause, as represented by Wells, Russell, and their like, to

continue to dominate the course of current history, we and our posterity shall be in large degree, soon obliterated, as the levels of global population are reduced, through the “Four Horsemen of the Apocalypse,” to the range of not more than the several hundred millions world population which Europe’s Fifteenth Century encountered.

The central issue of all known human existence to date, and the essential issue which prompts all U.S. patriots to recognize the British oligarchical system as our republic’s first, continuing, and principal mortal adversary, is this issue of establishing a form of society consistent with the inborn, cognitive potential of each and all human individuals. The issue is to eliminate all expressions of multi-tier society, in which those beneath serve as virtual human cattle to landlord or financier above.

What moves a Russell, is not the desire to exploit, as much as it is to have the status of an exploiter. What moves a Wells, or a Henry A. Kissinger, is, similarly, the passion to be a lackey, rather than live in a world where lackeys do not enjoy the privileges accompanying patronage by an oligarchy. There is, as the cases of the public sexual advocacies of both Russell and Wells attest, something Freudian, or similarly debased, in the proximate motivations of these despicable types of Englishman—and others like them. Indeed, the entirety of empiricism’s history, is a history of degraded eroticism. Not merely strange sexual appetites, although those abounded; but, erotic in the more inclusive sense of placing the sense-perceptual experience of intense pleasure-pain at the highest rank of motivating passion. Exemplary, is the smell of homosexual rape in the slave’s subjection by the master. It is not by our objective interests, but, by our motives, our passions, that we are ruled.³³

Russell’s referenced expostulation, “... it is difficult to feel at home in a world of ... American supremacy,” sums up the point adequately. The kind of republican society represented by the U.S. in its best moments, is a kind of society in which a Russell loses his desire to live. Thus, he must destroy that kind of society. It is that simple a motive. Wells wishes to be a butler to a Russell; a world without Russells, Milners, and so on, is a world which gives a Wells no pleasure, a world in which he would not care to live. He, too, must destroy that kind of society.

³³ See Helga Zepp-LaRouche, “How Aesthetical Education Determines the Moral Character,” *The New Federalist*, September 15, 1997, address to Autumn 1997 Schiller Institute conference, in Reston, Virginia. Friedrich Schiller, in motivating, in 1793, what became the philosophy of the German Classical Humanist educational reforms of his friend and follower Wilhelm von Humboldt, emphasized that the degeneration of the French revolution of 1789 into the Jacobin Terror, reflected a moral defect in the French population. This danger, he warned, must be remedied by recognizing the vital role of Classical forms of artistic composition in the moral education of the population’s passions. Thus, today, the near obliteration of Classical artistic culture from the U.S. population, and its replacement by the most debased expressions of dionysiac revels, is the major internal security threat to the continued existence of our republic.

The British oligarchy's horrid fascination with the persistence of the American Revolution, impelled that oligarchy to look at this phenomenon more deeply. Rather than simply attempting to crush the existing United States, it reckoned that it must uproot the seedling, destroy the seed, and salt the fields, such that this planet might be secured against new growth of such an undesirable plant, at last, and forever. To accomplish that, Britain must eliminate the existence of the institutions upon which the existence of modern European civilization depends. It must turn back the clock of history, accordingly. It must eliminate the nation-state, to return to a kind of global *Pax Romana*, or a world government approximating that. It must eradicate forms of economy which depend upon the development of the cognitive processes of the general population. It must create a world ruled by the horses' posteriors depicted by Swift's satire, a world in which the illiterate masses are kept amused, as Wells proposed,³⁴ and as Newt Gingrich admirer Lord William Rees-Mogg has implicitly proposed, by rutting with one another in bushes and ditches, when they are not fully occupied with menial chores of a sort which a virtual beast might accomplish.³⁵

So, the one-time partners of Lincoln's legacy, France, Germany, Russia, Japan, and so on, were put against one another's throats, in World War I. Not sufficient. Some nations, among the victors, survived! Worst of all, the hated U.S.! Try again, put Hitler into power in Germany, and soon, we shall have another wonderful war on the continent! Not good enough; the victor nations still exist. Try nuclear-fission weapons; and pit the biggest victors, the U.S.A. and U.S.S.R., against one another, "With we Brits managing both sides in the middle." Stalin is a bother; as Russell said, during that period, that is a medical problem, which can be solved accordingly, that we might deal on better terms with those successors whom we think we have waiting in the wings. Russell's discussion-partner Khrushchev will cooperate. We shall bring the powers to their knees, in sheer terror of going to the brink of total nuclear warfare! Then, they will beg for world government. Then, we shall win.³⁶

³⁴ Towards the end of the 1939–1940 academic year, Bertrand Earl Russell was invited to become a professor at the College of the City of New York. A woman whose daughter attended the college, brought suit against the Municipality of New York, claiming that the employment of Russell would be dangerous for her daughter's virtue. The lawyer for the plaintiff pronounced Russell's works to be "lecherous, libidinous, venerous, erotomaniac, aphrodisiac, irreverent, narrow-minded, untruthful, and bereft of moral fiber." A New York City judge found for the plaintiff, against further employment of Bertrand Earl Russell at City College.

³⁵ See Lord William Rees-Mogg, London *Times*, January 4, 1995: "It's the elite who matter; in the future, Britain must concentrate on educating the top 5%, on whose success we shall all depend."

³⁶ By the early part of 1950, through his advocacy of "preventive war" against the Soviet Union and the creation of "world government," Russell states in his autobiography that "... I had become so respectable in the eyes of the Establishment that it was felt that I should be given the O.M. [the highest military award, the Order of Merit]. This made me very happy, for, though I daresay it would surprise many Englishmen and most of the English Establishment, I am passionately English, and I treasure an honour bestowed on me by the Head of my country. I had to go to Buckingham Palace for the official bestowal of it." Earl Russell notes that during the investiture, King George VI remarked favorably upon his cousin, Lord Portal, who was the only holder of both the Knight of the Garter and the O.M.

So, beginning 1964, young university students of increasingly doubtful literacy, began to imitate the rutting Yahoos of Swift's fable, in the corridors, basements, and bushes of the campuses. Some challenged then, "What about reality?" The voices from bushes retorted, "We don't go there!" One might have imagined that he heard Wells giggling from his grave: "In a world where pressure on the means of subsistence was a normal condition of life, it was necessary to compensate for the removal of traditional sexual restraints, and so my advocacy of simple and easy love-making had to be supplemented by an adhesion to the propaganda of the Neo-Malthusians."

Nuclei & Geopolitics

To understand how the images associated with the 1901–1928 writings of the lackey publicist H.G. Wells, could have become, as they did, the prevalent characteristics of belief among the university student population of the 1964–1972 interval, we must understand how modern European civilization works. In other words, we must identify the mechanisms by means of which a chiefly unsuspecting population is so subtly encumbered, even suddenly, with a new mind-set, that it is, afterward, scarcely aware of the fact, and might even deny vehemently that its mind-set has undergone an induced change to such effect. To understand that, we must discover how to discover how modern European civilization works. In other words, we are obliged to examine history in the same way we ought to study any branch of physical science.

Decades ago, the present writer, then engaged in consulting to various branches of industry, was struck by the implications of something which most relevant business managers and their consultants appeared, to him, at that time, simply to take for granted as a cruel fact of business life. In a time when the rudiments of successful industrial society were rather widely known, one of the most interesting, and important facts respecting production, was the fact that it was possible to foresee, even years in advance, a general change in popular taste for products and product-designs. We, whose treatment of the productive processes themselves must take into account the fact of changing consumer tastes, must ask ourselves, how was it possible, that the business executives who planned the new designs of products to emerge even a specific number of years later, could effectively foresee what public tastes would be. During the writer's early adulthood, this was the characteristic problem of manufacturing garments; the distinctive feature of the rise of power of Wall Street's General Motors over the industrial philosophies of Henry Ford and Walter Chrysler, was General Motors' emulation of the New York garment center. How, for example, did we foresee, what typical women, in identified social strata, would prefer, as a style change, not only months, but even years ahead. What does this phenomenon say about the human mind, the opinion-making of those customers? What does this tell us about the manipulability of public opinion generally?

This same question bears upon the ability of the British to foresee the induced changes in cultural-paradigm which they, and their confederates brought about with the hegemonic trends among the university student populations of 1964–1972. It was not quite as simple a matter as shortening skirt-lengths almost to the hips; but, as H.G. Wells would have been greatly pleased to observe, there was a connection.

As one might recognize, from study of my writings on the function of time-reversal in physical-economic processes, this question, which I have just summarized, touches upon the most profound and important philosophical questions respecting mankind's efficient relationship to nature.³⁷ The question thus posed by industrial experience, is simply a reflection of a much larger domain: *What is history?* Not "history" as chronology, or chronology enhanced by mere academic commentary upon commentary, but living, real history, as history makes itself. To render comprehensible a valid representation of the connection between Wells of 1901–1928 and the university Baby-Boomer population of 1964–1972, the following summarized considerations are indispensable.

When some among us were children and adolescents, the raw idea of history made its impact on our awareness in chiefly two ways: the living genealogy in which our own existence is situated, and the antiquity of the process of emergence and development of the language we use.³⁸ In the present writer's time, and for earlier generations, these two impressions converged upon one another to relatively strongest effect about the time we approached adolescence, and were exposed, in that time to not only foreign languages, but to the importance then attached to the study of both Latin and Classical Greek. The timing of the appearance of that effect upon our young selves, had to do with our developing sense of the evolution of modern mathematics and physical science out of origins more than two thousand years earlier. The attempt to put together, in some coherent way, these three considerations: genealogy, language, and the transmission of a developing body of scientific ideas, is the rudimentary basis for a modern study of human history.

The point of this, is the urgency of freeing mankind from our species', unfortunately, commonly displayed habit, of blindly following current changes in public opinion, a habit of viewing opinions impressed upon us, in our role as victims, as unchallengeable, sacred gifts of

³⁷ See, for example, *Executive Intelligence Review* entries: "The Essential Role of 'Time-Reversal' in Mathematical Economics," October 11, 1996; "What Economics Must Measure," November 28, 1997. See, also, "The Classical Principle in Art and Science," *Fidelio*, Winter 1997.

³⁸ For example, the present writer's grandparents were born in the 1860s. One great-grandparent was known directly, during the writer's 1920s childhood. The most celebrated maternal ancestor, Quaker abolitionist and "Underground Railroad" station-manager Daniel Wood of Delaware County, Ohio, was a contemporary of Abraham Lincoln. It is now nearly the close of this century, and Daniel Wood was born early in the previous century. Thus, a span of nearly two centuries was represented in the dinner-table conversation of the maternal grandparents' household. This same principle is extended to the families of our acquaintances. Thus, we gain an intimation of filling some necessary place in a "simultaneity of eternity."

pagan gods, of some Hegelian or Savigny *Weltgeist*, *Zeitgeist*, or, for the case of the most pitiable class of dupe, the populist, the *Volksgeist*.³⁹ Is there some comprehensible principle of Reason, which we might observe as the underlying metric of a science of history? Is there a comprehensible ordering-principle underlying what a Socratically self-critical, well-informed mind might wish to identify as “history”?

Of course there is; that is the subject-matter to which the present writer has devoted the principal amount of his adolescent and adult life: the nature of human progress as measurable in the human species’ often successful efforts at increasing power over the universe. In other words: measurable in the sense of those subjective processes of valid discovery of new principle, by means of which mankind increases our species’ per-capita power over the universe. This led this writer, relatively early in adult life, to focus his life’s efforts on enhancement of an admired Leibniz’s discoveries in the science of physical economy. However, economy is only a facet and reflection of the more general process of practice of ideas, a practice of mankind’s total relationship to the universe, a total relationship which the realities of physical economy best typify. From this vantage-point, one may identify what ought to appear to be rather obvious clues to those mechanisms, by means of which the influence of a 1901–1928 publicist might have become the prevailing ideology among a university student population of 1964–1972.

As most of the present writer’s published work on physical economy and related matters, emphasizes this, mankind’s relationship to the universe, and to our species itself, bears no similarity to that of any other living species. The distinctive—“ecological,” if you will—relationship of man to the universe, is man’s increasing power, as a species, over that universe. This power is located in the manner in which the properly developed, sovereign, innate cognitive potentials of the individual human mind, discover new, valid principles of the universe, both physical principles, and the principles which govern this remarkable subjective potential of the individual human cognitive processes themselves. In short, history is a history of orderable sequences of discovery and practice of ideas, in Plato’s specific, anti-empiricist sense of *idea*.⁴⁰

³⁹ These three, closely interrelated types of formally Romantic irrationalisms, are chiefly the donation of such neo-Aristotelian madmen as Immanuel Kant, G.W.F. Hegel, and Metternich asset, and official Prussian state philosopher Hegel’s post-Vienna Congress accomplice at the university in Berlin, F. Carl von Savigny. Like the axiomatically irrationalist dogma of libertarianism-*cum*-free trade, these Romantic ideas sprung from the pages of Kant’s famous three *Critiques*, impute to history some incomprehensible principle of action, a mystical principle impervious to reason, which must be simply, blindly obeyed as “current trends in public opinion.” This, of course, was the essential assumption underlying fascism generally, and Nazism in particular. It is otherwise known today, in such locations as University of Pennsylvania, as “political correctness.”

⁴⁰ See references given in the preceding footnote.

For us, as members of European culture, we must first master the history of our own culture, as from the inside. Only after we have applied the Socratic method to smoke out the hidden, usually perverse assumptions underlying our own, naive beliefs, have we established the intellectual foundations for examining the process of history in a more general way, the competence to pass judgment upon cultures not our own, that competence which is typical of a true science, capable of judging everything. The beginning of that initial subject-matter, European civilization, is the emergence of Classical Greek culture, as typified by the passage from Homeric epics through Solon, through the great Classical tragedians, and through the foundations for modern civilization supplied by Plato and the following century or two of his Academy after him. The essence of this process of initial internal development of European civilization, is the Greek image of *Prometheus*, as that image is typified by the work of Aeschylus.

Classical Greek culture, thus viewed, is a process of freeing the Greeks from submission to the assumed power of pagan gods, a process of freeing mankind, as an idea of mankind, from any notion that the human species is anything but the noblest, most beautiful existence within all known Creation. There is a connection, of this sort, between the Ulysses of the *Odyssey* and the Prometheus of Aeschylus' *Prometheus Bound*. Aeschylus' Prometheus is prepared to endure immortal torment, for the sake of keeping secret the forecastable, self-induced doom of Zeus and his fellow-gods of Olympus, a secret which Prometheus keeps, so that the noble human species might at last be freed from the rule over their minds by those evil pagan gods.

So, as it is written in *Acts* 17:22–23, the Apostle Paul comes to the place in Athens dedicated to the “Unknown God.” Paul speaks: “... I found an altar with this inscription: ‘To The Unknown God.’ Whom ye therefore ignorantly worship, him I declare unto you.”⁴¹ Thus, Jesus Christ’s mission was expressed, as the establishment, in practice, for the first time in all known human existence, of a universal equality and oneness of all mankind, an equality rooted in no lesser consideration, than the fact each man and woman is made the noblest creature in the universe, because made in the *cognitive* image of God, a creature, by nature, beloved of God, to exert dominion in this universe. The Christian Apostles’ takeover of the richest contributions of Classical Greek culture, as Christianity’s most suitable garment for its continuing mission in this world, and the fight of Christianity against that Rome which the Apostles knew as variously “Babylon” and “Whore of Babylon,” is the central feature of

⁴¹ Compare: Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr., “Whose God Does Pat Robertson Serve?” *op. cit.* Not by accident, the hill on which the Apostle chose to speak, the Areopagus, was always famously associated with the reforms of Solon, which had rescued Athens from its own self-destruction in 594 B.C., and with the Solon-Aeschylus-Plato tradition since. In classical tragedy, Athena created the Court of Areopagus to untie the bloody knot of murder and revenge at the culmination of Aeschylus’ *Oresteia* trilogy, saying, “I shall establish this law for all time.” [*Eumenides*, line 484].

European civilization's unfolding history since the day the Apostle Paul stood upon the Athens hill.

However, until the Fifteenth-Century aftermath of the 1439–1440 sessions of the great ecumenical Council of Florence, there existed no form of society consistent with such a Christian principle. Over ninety percent of the population of each nation lived in the estate of human cattle, or in the debased, oligarchical status of brutish human-cattle-herders. Man in the image of God had no recognized rights under Diocletian or his followers of Byzantium or feudal western Europe. The principle which, to date, the Leibnizian Preamble of the U.S. Constitution represents with an *exceptionally* good approximation, exemplifies what the founders of the Council of Florence intended by their sponsorship of the first approximation of a Christian form of society, the France reconstructed under Louis XI.

That is to say, a form of society in which the accountability of the state for the promotion of the natural rights of all persons, as persons, was, for the first time in feudal history, placed above, and in opposition to the feudal rights of the land-owning and financier oligarchs and their lackeys. Since Louis XI lacked the power to eliminate the oligarchs, he placed himself as representative of the sovereign-state, above them, and thus, by virtue of the sovereign state's accountability for principle, made the sovereign state under his reign an efficient agency for that Christian principle, in opposition to the pagan principle intrinsic to feudal forms of society.

That is to imply the corollary point, a point which we may be certain France's Louis XI would have acknowledged as a measure of his reign's uncompleted work. The essential problem of modern European civilization, is that it has yet to free itself from the institutional heritage of what the Christian Apostles rightly named "Whore of Babylon," the Latin imperial, bureaucratic Rome of Augustus Caesar: from the pagan form of state bureaucracy. Here lies the key to the transmission of Wells' fantasies of 1901–1928 into the behavioral code of university students of the 1964–1972 period of "cultural paradigm-shift."

This, as codified by Diocletian, persisted as the evil inherent in Byzantium. This Roman imperial bureaucratization is expressed, by intent, as the permanent civil-service bureaucracy of the British Crown. It is a tradition of imperial corruption by bureaucracy, which an Anglophile spawn of the Confederacy, President Grover Cleveland, fostered, in the abused name of "reform," for the United States. It is the rot within our republican institutions, an imitation of the British permanent, civil-service bureaucracy, which has degenerated into the ruling U.S. Federal bureaucracy and judiciary of today.⁴²

⁴² As has been noted and argued in several published locations, U.S. Associate Supreme Court Justice Antonin Scalia epitomizes, by his pattern of decisions, precisely that sort of Romantic law of Savigny, Carl Schmitt, *et al.*, which harks back to the worst features of Rome. Cf. Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr., "Michael Novak, Calvinist?—'Not by Marketplace Alone!'" *EIR*, July 4, 1997.

This continuing role of bureaucracies, and bureaucratized judiciaries, in imitation of the principle of Augustus Caesar's Roman imperial bureaucracy, is a crucial, pervasive flaw in the existing institutions of modern European civilization, world-wide. The kernel of the problem of administrative practice so ordered, is the existence of systems of rules which acknowledge no principle, but have, rather, the nature of the terms of a commercial contract, or what some terribly misguided theologians and others identify as a "covenant."

This, of course, is directly opposed to all Christian principle, as Paul's celebrated *I Corinthians* 13 exemplifies the working point. The quality which identifies the person as in the image of God, is identified by Plato, and by the Apostle Paul as *agapē*. *Agapē* is expressed, in Plato, as the passion for truth and justice, as the governing cognitive principle, the informed quality of passion which guides one's cognitive processes and will for action. So it is with the Apostle Paul and the Gospel of John.

When a body of law is informed by this passion, we may speak of "natural law." By "natural law" we should signify the impact of an efficiently served agapic passion for man, as a sacred life of a being made in the cognitive image of God, a view of man's nature which must inform the cognitive processes of administration of society, especially those functions associated with justice. It is that conception of man, which is to served in all legislative and other conflicts respecting positive law: "Does this decision coincide with those requirements which an agapic notion of the individual person implicitly imposes upon the society as a whole."

This was Abraham Lincoln's conception of the law, as expressed in his Presidency, in all leading matters. No such conception is to be found in representatives of the philosophy of government among his oligarchical adversaries of that time: none among the followers of John Locke, such as the southern slave-owners; none among those New York bankers in the spirit of the Bank of Manhattan's treasonous Aaron Burr, Martin Van Buren, or treasonous August Belmont; none, among the New England families of the British East India Company's opium-trafficking tradition. Lincoln's central point of concern was to ensure the existence and durability of those qualities of institution, especially of sovereign nationhood, without which human freedom, and natural human rights can not exist. This notion of essential institutions was governed by the Christian notion of natural law, of *agapē*. Among his oligarchical opponents and rivals, there was no principle, only cognitively sterile commercial contracts, mere covenants.

The characteristic of a positivist notion of "contract law," is an indifference to the existence of such principle of natural law. For the merely positive law, or the Romantic law, a stated, or at least implied, narrow putative, absolute or relative, intent, is attributed to the literal text, a text read as akin to a Babylonian commercial contract. Today, the prevailing practice,

under U.S. Associate Justice Antonin Scalia, as under the Romantic school of law of the Nazis, is that what the bureaucracy, or justice chooses to perceive as contemporary trends in opinion—e.g., *Volksgeist*, provides the interpretation of the text of the law, and thus becomes a depraved, erotic substitute for all principle of law. Under the sway of such combined bureaucratic and judicial travesties, there is no provision for the existence of actual rights of the individual person, under law.

It is the quibble of some misguided souls, including perhaps even most of that ignorant popular opinion which reigns, on the highest judicial benches, and elsewhere, inside the U.S.A. today, that the merely positive law is only “objectively” indifferent to the issues implied by *agapē*. Indifferent? Yes, precisely as much as the despicable William of Ockham was indifferent, as Adam Smith’s empiricist employers, the British East India Company of slave- and opium-traders, were indifferent to principle, as Mandeville was indifferent to principle, as François Quesnay’s *laissez-faire* expressed his Frondist’s absolute hostility to morality. Is such indifference not to “close out,” to “exclude,” to “deny,” those considerations which are the victim of indifference? Can we not speak of the murderer as a person whose actions were indifferent to the principle of individual human right to life? What would we say of a man who professed, archly: “I simply do not choose to breathe”? Indifference means, in this case, exclusion, means denial, means *lawless law*, like Roman law, like the mob rule of Savigny’s, Carl Schmitt’s, and Nazi Justice Roland Freisler’s *Volksgeist* law, like the popular law of Nero’s Roman arena.

By reestablishing such a bureaucratic tradition in the administration of public affairs in the United States, we surrounded the individual citizen with denial of his, or her humanity. The positive law, and related infantile bureaucratic rules of the game, were axiomatically blind to the essential quality of the individual person; they denied each such person his, or her most essential right, the right to be human in the sense Christianity recognizes each person’s sovereign cognitive potential as that of a being made in the image of God.

In a correlated matter, by destroying the practice of those forms of Classical culture which express *agapē*, and replacing them with entertainments premised on erotic, even overtly satanic principles, we transformed many of the noblest creature in creation into those forms of degenerates we call “existentialists,” degenerates in the sense of Nazi philosopher Martin Heidegger and such degraded cronies of his as Jean-Paul Sartre, Theodor Adorno, and Hannah Arendt, all moral and intellectual degenerates in the sense of Hermann Hesse’s *Steppenwolf*.

For the ordinary person, caged within such bureaucratic and judicial indifference to principle, what this has done, is to instruct that victim, again, and again, and again, that the principle associated with *agapē* has no efficient command over the society within whose

bureaucratized rules that victim is trapped. The result of such a prolonged condition, as the U.S. population has been more or less continuously subjected to this since the untimely death of President Franklin Roosevelt, is a corrosive process, of descent into what is called “cultural pessimism.” When this same corrosive process is aggravated by a reversal of a previous commitment to fostering the benefits of scientific and technological progress, as usually accompanies deep and prolonged economic depressions, such as in post-Versailles Weimar Germany, the result is an upsurge of the erotic impulse in its worst expressions, as Wells and Russell epitomize that correlation between debased rampant eroticism and cultural depravity in all other dimensions.

The U.S. veteran of World War II, returned to his, or her United States, which had accomplished economic and related miracles, in emulation of the Carey-Lincoln economic miracle of 1861–1876. By mid-1946, it seemed to that veteran, that the U.S. had resumed the Great Depression of the pre-war 1930s. The sudden introduction of the theme of a nuclear war with the Soviet Union, introduced by Bertrand Russell and his crew, as much as Winston Churchill, by mid-1946, and the explosion, that same year, of a “political witch hunt,” plunged the overwhelming majority of these veterans into deep, erotically nasty cultural pessimism. Excepting the quickening of the optimism and reawakened morality, by the veterans’ generation’s President John F. Kennedy, by the role of the Rev. Martin Luther King, leading into President Johnson’s actions on two civil-rights bills, and the inspiring accomplishments of the 1960s space-program in progress, there was no point during the 1946–1966 interval, at which the notion of truth and justice had principled authority in government, or in customary social relations within the society in general. The 1950s flight from truth, became the generation of the “Organization Man,” who could say of his marriage, as almost anything else, “Nothing personal; I’m just doing my job.”

The nature and effects of this process, are illustrated by the explosion of degeneration within such diverse institutions as the Christian churches and the military officer corps, during the course of the 1960s. A summary of the clinical case for each helps to clarify the way in which Wells’ 1901–1928 propaganda erupted in the university student population undergoing the 1964–1972 cultural paradigm-shift.

The 1946–1960 takeover of society by a banning of commitment to truth and justice, had a monstrous effect within those Christian churches, whose viability depends entirely upon precisely those commitments. The degree to which the churches made themselves an accomplice, in the name of “anti-communism,” and the related degree to which the churches retreated from the real world into shibboleths respecting social relations in the small, emptied the churches of actually practicing Christians, during the 1950s, an opportunistic soiling of sanctity during the 1950s, with the result the pews also began to emptied during the 1960s.

Then, strange, new paganist cults, as “new religions,” not accidentally “from below,” took over the field.

The assassination of President Kennedy, followed by the folly of McGeorge Bundy’s and Robert McNamara’s Vietnam Grand Guignol, destroyed the morals of the military officer-corps much as the abandonment of *agapē* had rotted out so much of the clergy and laity from the Christian denominations. The way in which a process of detente was imposed by effects of the 1962 missile-crisis, and the disgusting hoax of military policy under McNamara at Defense, all compounded by the protracted, mass-murderous farce of post-modernist “cabinet warfare” in Indo-China, were reflected in the accelerated rates of break-up of marriages among members of the officer corps, and by the spread of deep cultural pessimism and moral corruption among the professionals. To their wives, their children, and themselves, these professionals were longer heroes, but prospective, or even actual mercenaries.

The words often, from among these two strata, were, increasingly, “I no longer believe.” They no longer believed in themselves, in even the possibility of the efficient existence of truth and justice. They had lost the passion for such things, and, thereby, lost their own souls.

In such an environment, the so-called “Baby Boomer” generation, those born during, or during the decade following the war, was conditioned during the span 1946–1962. For the overwhelming majority among those family households of that interval, neither truth nor justice existed as efficiently controlling principles of either government or private life. So, those “Baby Boomers” received the shock of, first, the 1962 Cuba missiles crisis—standing at the brink of total thermonuclear war, and, just over a year later, the assassination of President Kennedy. As a result, from 1964 onward, the morale, and morals of a generation went to Hell. The self-drugged Yahoos rutting on the university campuses of 1964–1972, warned any sensible person that our civilization had reached the outskirts of something which would pass for those doomed, Biblical cities of the Plain, Sodom and Gomorrah.

The essence of the moral and intellectual degeneration of the generation of World War II veterans and their families, during the 1946–1966 interval, was Roman-imperial-style bureaucratization of every imaginable facet of life. There were few nooks and crannies of even private life which were not invaded, and permeated by a quality of bureaucratization which one-time H. G. Wells protégé George Orwell depicted in his novel *1984*. Orwell used “1984” as a symbolic reference to 1948, when the spirit of what he described in that novel was already rampant. In that sense, the world of 1946–1960 was already pretty much a fascist world in Orwell’s sense of the matter. The popular morality expressed even in the minutiae of interpersonal relations was predominantly disgusting; “hypocrisy” was the gentlest among those terms which could be honestly employed to describe the personal

morality pervading life during that time. For personal life, and political reality, too, a substitute was being provided in the flourishing role of the television entertainment medium. Thus, the Eisenhower 1950s became the age of the Organization Man.

Put the same point another way. Look at this matter again, this time from the standpoint of what should have become my familiar explications of the significance of linearization in the small, with respect to the notions of entropic versus not-entropic orderings of social as well as non-living and living processes. Let us summarize the argument, and then its implication, as follows.

It has been repeatedly documented, that all generally accepted teachings of economics in textbooks, university classrooms, and correlated occasions, shares in common, a single, fatal, axiomatic flaw. These teachings share in common, the delusion that we might account for the appearance of net physical-economic profit in a society considered as a whole, without considering the role of the creative cognitive processes of the mind of the individual operative in agriculture, industry, and so on. In effect, these teachings, from Adam Smith, through Karl Marx, and John von Neumann, make no functional distinction between a society whose processes employ human beings, and those which might employ monkeys.⁴³

It is demonstrated, in practice, that the physical-economic profitability of modern industrial macroeconomies, must satisfy the following restriction. The argument, in summary, is as follows. A certain level of per-capita consumption, by infrastructure, by agriculture, by manufacturing, and so on, is a precondition for maintaining a constant or improved rate of per-capita physical productivity of the society as a whole. This required rate of increase of such consumption levels, corresponds to “energy of the system” of that economic process. Any gain in output, in excess of replenishing the required increased amount of energy of the system, is relative “free energy.” The precondition for profitability, is that the ratio of “free energy” to “energy of the system,” must either increase, or not decline, despite the requirement that the per-capita value of “energy of the system” must increase.

It is shown, in these relevant locations, that the origin of what appears as the anti-entropic generation of net physical-economic profitability, lies within the capacity of the individual human mind to generate validated discoveries of new principle, and to transmit those discoveries to other minds by methods of cognitive replication. This is effected through the generation and dissemination for practice of valid discoveries of principle, discoveries which are originally generated, and replicated, within the sovereign cognitive processes of the individual mind. This social process of scientific, technological, and related progress has, as indicated in these locations, a Riemannian characteristic. This latter characteristic correlates with anti-entropy.

⁴³ Cf. Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr., “What Economics Must Measure,” *EIR*, November 28, 1997, *passim*.

Thus, the sole source of sustainable physical-economic profitability of economies in their entirety is this anti-entropy, as generated by the characteristic features of cognition by individual minds.

More profoundly, it is this same cognitive anti-entropy which defines the anti-entropic relationship of the human species to the universe at large.

As indicated in those earlier locations, the characteristic emotion of this anti-entropic, cognitive process, is the passion identified as *agapē*, the same passion which Plato associates with the motive for truth and justice. This is the same quality associated with those forms of ideas unique to Classical forms of art.

The suppression of *agapē*, as by eliminating the factor of Classical art, at the same time we suppress emphasis upon scientific and technological progress, while allowing negative physical-economic decline, tends to produce a degenerative process in the morals and intellectual qualities of the affected population. The result, as Wells, in his own way, points toward this, is a form of escapism into synthetic “virtual realities,” converging on erotically motivated forms of moral and intellectual degeneracy, such as so-called “rock music,” or increases in membership of a Nazi party, and so on. If this cultural depression persists, the general result may be that society’s temporary, or even permanent loss of the moral fitness of that society to survive.

A typical example of a morally degenerate form of culture is the world-outlook of Seventeenth-Century English empiricism, that of Ockhamite Paolo Sarpi and such of his assets as Francis Bacon, Thomas Hobbes, and, by derivation, John Locke, Bernard Mandeville, David Hume, and Adam Smith. These cultures, are characteristically linear, thus excluding all consideration of those qualities, all non-linear, which set mankind apart from both mechanical contrivances and lower beasts. For example, in the present time, notions associated with the cults of “information theory” and “systems analysis,” or positivist forms of so-called psychology and sociology, are examples of such degenerate, linearized cultural traits.

As indicated in an earlier source,⁴⁴ the very notion of “geopolitics” is an example of such linear pathologies. Generally, all of these pathologies are associated with pathological qualities of erotic states. The fact that both Russell and Wells were erotic degenerates, is no coincidence; although not all degenerates of this culturally depressed type necessarily exhibit such flagrant expressions of erotic pathologies as these two unfortunates. Each such pathology expresses a degenerate conception of God, man, and nature. By denying, or simply excluding by means of disinterest, concern for those “non-linear” (i.e., anti-entropic) qualities of individual cognition which define actual human nature, the relations among

⁴⁴ Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr., “Tweedledum Goofs Again,” *op. cit.*

persons and nations are bestialized, as the very notion of a geopolitics, or related “balance of power” doctrine expresses such bestiality.

Curiously, it was Oscar Wilde who gave the show away, with his “The Picture of Dorian Grey.” By fostering Dorian’s increasing depravity, he was self-destroyed. That was essentially what the British monarchy has done to those nations, the United States included, which threatened to overwhelm the London-centered international financier oligarchy. We were set up, and, then, through our own folly of seeking pleasure instead of happiness, we permitted London to orchestrate the 1962 shock of going to the brink of general thermonuclear war; then, out of terror, we capitulated to that shock. Our promising children, entering universities then, the children on track to assuming future positions of leadership in society, were almost destroyed. Now, we are running out of chances. Perhaps, only if the Baby Boomers themselves will face the reality of the way in which they were “brainwashed,” will the new shocks of a disintegrating global financial system, prompt them to throw away the shackles they put upon their own minds, approximately thirty-odd years ago.