

# The Roles of Church and State

by Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.

May 2, 2003

In his addresses to the United Nations Organization (UNO) on December 2, 1978 and October 5, 1995, Pope John Paul II presented the world with a set of concerns which the present world crisis now proves to be more urgent than at any time since the 1960s Cuba missiles crisis and assassination of U.S. President John F. Kennedy. In my reading of His Holiness' more recent statements, his policies and concerns presented to the UNO then, remain integral elements of his intentions respecting the role of the UNO under the gravely aggravated conditions in the world today.

Meanwhile, under those increasingly aggravated conditions which came to the surface of world affairs with the U.S.A.'s constitutional crisis of November-January 2000, I have become, for the moment, the leading candidate, in recorded popular support, for the 2004 U.S. Democratic Party's nomination for becoming the next President of the world's presently leading power, the U.S.A. How much of my growing influence is due to my talent, and how much to the often conspicuous failures of others, can be left to future assessments. The fact remains, that under such circumstances of presently accelerating world crisis, the responsibilities which I have assumed thus, oblige me to make clear what will, obviously, worry some governments and other onlookers from around the world, worry concerning the relationship of my policies to those of this Pope, worry about how I view the relationship of church and state.

My view should be clear from comparison of His Holiness' addresses to the UNO with a series of encyclicals issued during this Papacy, and with my own published utterances over the same period. Now, during the period of the build-up toward what threatens to become a new world war, as during the preceding decades, there is an obvious, and deeply rooted convergence of His Holiness' ecumenical views on such matters, with my own. However, the evidence of more than two decades is also clear, that whereas he is accountable for one of the world's religious bodies, I have been consistently accountable, as now, for the welfare of the republic which my candidacy, as a patriot, represents.

The questions of war and peace so posed to both state and church are neither merely coincidences, nor simple. As I shall

show here, they are profound, and also crucial for the continuation of civilization today.

On this matter of war and peace, I have just issued a major statement of my current foreign policy for the U.S.A., "A World of Sovereign Nation-States." At that moment I crafted that statement, it was my intention to accompany that policy-statement with a separate statement, on related matters of the ecumenical role of the Vatican in the effort to avoid war. Therefore, in that statement, I limited my reference to His Holiness' role in this present crisis, to a brisk, but precise acknowledgment of his unique quality of role in world affairs, as compared to the different quality of role which I now perform amid a virtual leadership vacuum created by the combined efforts of most ostensibly leading Presidential candidates, and many relevant others, of the U.S.A. today.

The purpose and function of that foreign-policy document, as stated within it, is clear, and precisely so. Although that document touched upon areas which were specifically addressed, below, in this document, I have thought it necessary that the relevant matters of church and state be treated separately, as I do now.

## The State and Ecumenicism

The presently rising danger of a new world war, a war which threatens to become more savage than those of the preceding century, has brought to the surface an old evil in a far more naked, more savage, more inhuman expression, than in earlier modern European history. In that foreign-policy statement, I did not exaggerate the threat in the slightest degree, in stating that the core of the war party in the U.S.A. today is a systemically pro-Satanic continuation of what U.S. and other intelligence specialists have recognized earlier, as the roots of a continuing fascist movement of two centuries, founded by Napoleon Bonaparte's tyranny. That movement, which is traced to the Emperor Napoleon Bonaparte, has been classified by official intelligence services as "synarchism/Nazi-Communist." It is also classified under the heading of "universal fascism," and, in that expression has a peculiar, systemic relationship to what is classified as the U.S. military utopians' "Revolution in Military Affairs (RMA)."

Since the early 1980s, I have been made familiar with that synarchist international, knowledge of which has included a fairly massive combination of U.S. military and French intelligence reports dating from the 1920-1945 interval. This documentation includes a long list of many notable figures, including France's Alexandre Kojève, Jacques Soustelle, Paul Rivet, and Houston, Texas's Jean de Menil. For example, I emphasized the importance of the synarchists in a half-hour network broadcast by my 1984 Presidential campaign.

This nature of the immediate threat from that synarchist international to civilization as a whole, requires that the relevant defense of civilization, must find a unifying ecumenical approach for common moral, as much as physical defense of the imperilled planet. On that account, His Holiness' recent

Assisi initiative for the principle of ecumenicism, and his referenced declarations to the UNO, should be included as a pivotal point of reference for the presently urgent defense of mankind from that new, more ferocious expression of evil which imperils all mankind today.

Inevitably, in response to that fascist threat, the division of labor of defense between religious communities and political authorities, touches, once again, and perhaps more clearly and deeply than ever before, the relationship, and distinctly separate roles, of church and modern state.

The stated war policy of such so-called U.S. neo-conservatives as Vice-President Cheney and Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld, is the creation of a circle of synarchists developed by an earlier narrower circle featuring a long list of closely related, influential figures, such as Nazi legal specialist Carl Schmitt, Chicago University Professor Leo Strauss, and French official Alexandre Kojève.

The present U.S. "neo-conservative's" circles' central, Nietzschean doctrine, of an "End to History," like the rise to power of Benito Mussolini and Adolf Hitler, is a doctrine which is centered around the central quasi-religious, pro-dionysian worship of the beast-man, as the frankly pro-Satanic doctrine of this synarchist international, as expressed typically by the circles of the Nietzschean, neo-conservative followers of Professor Leo Strauss and Alexandre Kojève. The latter are among the leading neo-conservative circles in government of U.S. Vice-President Cheney and Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld today.

The present grip of the "synarchists/neo-conservatives" seemingly hypnotic influence on the mind of the current U.S. President, represents nothing less than an imminent, existential threat to the continuation of civilized life on this planet. The question posed to each nation, each citizen, is: How much would you have done to stop Hitler? How much would you do to free that President, and mankind, from the grip of an even greater threat to all humanity from the same synarchist tradition of Cheney et al., today? And then, "the cock crowed thrice."

What must we do, therefore? What is the root of synarchism, and how might mankind be freed from this threat? Those urgent issues focus our attention on modern civilization's still contested idea of the nature of mankind. It is on this point, that the modern state, science, and religious belief presently touch a common crucial issue of ecumenicism.

Since the Fifteenth-Century birth of modern civilization, out of the nightmare of Europe's preceding "New Dark Age," that civilization has been encumbered with three often epidemic cultural disorders which have played roles comparable to biological plagues in the political and moral dimensions. The first may be recognized as the continuing legacy of the system of serfdom, under which some people were herded by other people, and bred and culled as flocks of human cattle. The second, is the curse called empiricism, introduced by the tyrant of Venice Paolo Sarpi. The third, is the emergence of

modern existentialism, a doctrine which denies the existence of knowable truth. This existentialist doctrine of lying, is typified by as the doctrine taught by the intellectual grandmother of today's U.S. neo-conservatives, the late Professor Leo Strauss, and shared by Friedrich Nietzsche, Martin Heidegger, Karl Jaspers, Theodor Adorno, and Hannah Arendt. All three of those currents of influence share one most essential thing in common: the denial of any quality of difference between man and beast. The denial is expressed in varying guises, but the result is the same.

The common root of all three, is the denial of any principled distinction between man and beast, but, the most relevant case proving the hateful falseness of empiricism and of kindred forms of philosophical reductionism, such as Immanuel Kant, can be presented summarily as follows.

The pivotal issue of physical science so posed, can be pinpointed by asking: "What is the systemic difference between man and the higher apes?" Most simply, whereas the potential population of a living species of ape were in the order of several millions, mankind has increased by three decimal orders of magnitude beyond that today. The principal means by which that increase has been brought about, is the power of the individual mind to discover and employ universal physical principles which are fully efficient, but are not themselves objects of sense-perception.

The distinction between Biosphere and Noösphere, in the work of Russia's celebrated biogeochemist V.I. Vernadsky, typifies the relevant, experimental-scientific treatment of this distinction between man and all lower forms of life. Man discovers pre-existing universal physical principles which, made the subject of the human will, change the universe, to the included effect of increasing the specific potential population-density of humanity, while also making feasible higher levels of cultural development of the member of society. This specific distinction of the human individual from lower forms of life, is rightly termed "spiritual"; it is a power expressed by the individual human mind which does not appear in other expressions of life.

In all globally extended European civilization to date, from the times of Thales, Pythagoras, Archytas, and Plato, the Classical physical-scientific understanding of this specifically spiritual quality of the human individual, is of an experimentally demonstrable form, a form known as the principle of hypothesis.

The human senses are features of our biological organism. They are expected to respond to stimulus by the real universe, but do not know the universe whose footprint is those impressions. Thus, in the imagination of ancient astronomers, such as the school of Pythagoras, man's access to knowledge of the real universe, "out there," involved a branch of mathematical-physical inquiries called "spherics," a view reflected in what are known as the Tenth through Thirteenth Books of Euclid.

In effect, looking back toward Pythagoras et al., from the

modern discoveries of Johannes Kepler, Gottfried Leibniz, Carl Gauss, and Bernhard Riemann, we have the following view of the work of the ancient Greeks.

Think of the universe of sense-perceptions as if it were bounded by what appears to the imagination as a spherical surface. See the clear night's sky so. This is the standpoint of "spherics." Let us name it, for our purposes here, "The Sensorium." By a process identified as "normalization" of stellar and planetary observations, man discovers a certain regularity in the celestial proceedings. But, then, discover the distance from the Moon and Sun, or, discover the circumference of the Earth, as this attempt was made with greater or less success from Thales, through Aristarchus, to Eratosthenes. There are anomalies which force us to doubt simple regularity. There are anomalies, such as those which prompted Kepler to discover a principle of gravitation, and Gauss to discover the orbit of Ceres. There are paradoxes respecting the nature of the line, the doubling of the square and cube, the implications of the Platonic Solids.

These views of "spherics" and the associated ontological paradoxes of the kind of observations we associate with experimental physics, prompt us to hypothesize as Plato's dialogues define hypothesis. The discovery of those anomalies leads to those experimental hypotheses, which, if proven by means such as purely constructive geometry, are termed by Plato as "powers," the powers which the modern physical science of Leibniz, Gauss, Riemann, et al., recognizes as universal physical principles.

These hypotheses, if successful, are not merely proposed explanations. By appropriate experimental methods, methods typified by Plato's examples for constructive geometry, we are able to reach into a universe which exists beyond the spherical Sensorium, to know of the existence of a physical principle which is intrinsically invisible to the senses, and deploy that principle willfully to change the ordering of events in the Sensorium. Gauss, in explicit exposure, in 1799, of the systemic errors of the empiricists Leonhard Euler and J. Lagrange, identified that real universe as reflected by the complex domain.

This power, which is unique to the human mind, shows us, that we must treat the naive Sensorium as the successive work of Gauss and Riemann defined a new meaning for the notion of curvature in physical space-time. Think of events located as in the Sensorium, as singularities, as points of tangency of some real motion, as of relatively positive or negative curvature, or perhaps both, with the hypothetically spherical Sensorium. Gauss's discovery of the orbit of Ceres, thus proving crucially the correctness of Kepler's work, against all of Kepler's opponents, from three very limited data, illustrates this point.

The point so illustrated in summary, is also a demonstration of the specifically evil intent of Paolo Sarpi et al., in the launching of the empiricism of his household lackey Galileo, Galileo's pupil Thomas Hobbes, and related expressions of

reductionism. This is the essence of what is specifically evil, in Isaac Newton's "hypothesis is not necessary." So, actual knowledge was sliced away from the mind, like testicles from a eunuch, by Sarpi's use of Ockham's razor.

What happens, if we prompt mankind to reject the notion of the discoverable existence of those efficient objects of the human will which are to be known as such universal physical principles? Either mankind were then degraded to the likeness of a mere beast, or, in the alternative, a few are able to herd the duped many as if the latter were merely human cattle. Do men not slaughter cattle?

However, what happens, if we uproot empiricism and its relatives from modern society? What happens if men and women are not transformed into human cattle by reductionism? In Fourteenth-Century England, the point was put quaintly: When Adam delved and Eve span, who then was nobleman?

### **The End of History?**

The doctrine of "the end of history," as taught by synarchist Alexandre Kojève to Francis Fukuyama and others, appeared in modern history as Romantic adulation of the tyrannical and beastly features of the Emperor Napoleon Bonaparte and his neo-Caesarian system. The case of G.W.F. Hegel, from among those Romantics who swooned, and oozed his fascist juices, over such spectacles as Napoleon's triumph at Jena-Auerstädt, is most notable. Hegel's doctrines of history and the state provided the fantastic rationalization of Napoleon and his regime from which the fascism and fascist state of such soggily Romantic figures as Benito Mussolini and Adolf Hitler were derived. The French and Austro-Hungarian positivists are relevant, pro-empiricist outgrowths of the Napoleonic mythos. Friedrich Nietzsche typifies the explicitly pro-Satanic expression of Hegel's end of history dogma.

As the case of the U.S. Banque Worms study of the wartime Vichy France regime reflects this, fascism has been an instrument of the repertoire employed by a certain type of rentier-financier interest. Just as the London-directed Jacobin Terror and the Caesarian role of the first modern fascist, Napoleon Bonaparte, were directed against the U.S.A. and the influence of its example, these rentier-financier types, who were outgrowths of the Fourteenth Century's Lombard bankers, were equally opposed to the existence of any form of state which threatened to impede their free flight of predatory usurious power.

However, just as the British East India Company's British Foreign Office and its Jeremy Bentham, used Philippe Egalité and Lord Shelburne's asset Jacques Necker in the July 14, 1789 Bastille affair, and in the guise of London-trained, ostensibly left-wing agents Danton and Marat, so the same genre of rentier-financier cabals adopted the Jacobin-turned-right-wing-fascist Napoleon Bonaparte, like Pierre Laval later, as the instruments of raw power, intended to

destroy whoever posed a threat to what they regarded as their system of doing business. Right fist and left fist are employed alternately to a single ultimate effect. The instrument derived from the 1789-1815 French experience was, therefore, the synarchist movement which combined a right and left fist from opposite sides of the same intended victim. Hence, "Synarchism: Nazi-Communist." Hence, Alexandre Kojève, Allan Bloom, Francis Fukuyama, and the French cronies of Richard Perle.

At first, it would appear that Napoleon was essentially a thuggish bandit, looting Europe for the enrichment of the financiers who discounted his stolen loot. We have men of similarly larcenous disposition in politically high places inside the U.S.A. today. Ah! But the Caesars were such bandits, upon whose precedent, Napoleon, like Napoleon III, and Mussolini and Hitler, relied for the design of his system. Organized thuggery as government is a system of government, with systemic characteristics. It is that system of government, once put in place, which then acts as an organization with an acquired organizational instinct.

Never allow it to come into place, or you or it will be destroyed. Destroy it while you can, before the holocaust of general warfare begins.

Such was the echo of Napoleon Bonaparte in Hitler's proclamation of a "Thousand-Year Reich." A Nietzsche-like beast, a Phrygian Dionysus, destroys massively, in such a

horrifying display that terrified peoples submit in slavery to his will, as Kojève's Hegel taught Fukuyama and other neo-conservatives. As Sorel taught Mussolini and Frantz Fanon. As Attorney-General John Ashcroft already prescribes. The processes of historical development are halted, it is to be hoped, by them, permanently.

Morally, intellectually, a people which lacks an efficient and institutionalized sense of the axiomatic distinction of man from beast, will accept slavery under sufficiently brutal application of synarchist-style terror. To protect the people from such folly of their own, a spiritual sense of self must be instilled and maintained. That is a matter of faith. To provide the commitment to the promotion of the general welfare for present and coming generations, is the responsibility of the states. That system of promotion of the general welfare, must be a system, contrary to the synarchists' concoctions, which must react as a system according to the missions of statecraft assigned to it.

To such sublime ends as those, the world and nations require leaders who stand firm for these principles, when weaker men and women cringe fearfully under the protection of those follies which they might hope would shield them from the monster's wrath. That principle of leadership we should have learned from Jesus Christ's Passion, and from those, like the Jeanne d'Arc, whose passion contributed greatly to the possibility of modern European civilization.