

Reply to General Ivashov: A World System in Collapse!

by Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.

January 29, 2008

[Published in *Executive Intelligence Review*, Volume 35, Number 6, February 8, 2008. [View PDF of original](#) at the LaRouche Library.]

The following is addressed to a broad international audience, but is prompted by a statement by Colonel-General Leonid Ivashov, the President of Russia's Academy of Geopolitical Problems, uttered by him on January 26, 2008.

It must be emphasized, that the entire planet is presently gripped by a dynamic mode of general breakdown-crisis, a breakdown-crisis of the entirety of the world's financial-economic system. In brief: there are no national economies which, in the final analysis, are not *equally* threatened by the currently on-rushing, worst such catastrophe in all of that portion of the world's history since the so-called "New Dark Age" of Europe's 14th Century. If any major economy of the planet goes down, all of the world's economies go down in the same plunge. There are available choices of remedies for this situation, provided that they are both recognized and adopted within the immediate, short-term (and very short-tempered) period of opportunity ahead.

The most notable cause of the presently widespread loss of intellectual competence to judge this situation, by most of the world's governments, is the prevalent tendency to misrepresent the current crisis-phenomena from the standpoint of the previously adopted economic, and related social-political-cultural dogmas of nearly all present governments in all continents of the planet. If these currently prevalent, habituated mistakes of judgment are not corrected among at least some leading governments, the entire planet were now foredoomed to what is fairly estimated a new dark age, very, very soon, throughout every part of the planet.

The most interesting, and most important aspect of the failure of judgment of most of the world's leading governments and important institutions, is the prevalent tendency to analyze all crucial developments on a global scale, from the standpoint of a Cartesian mechanistic manifold, rather than employing the only competent mode for assessing such developments, the anti-Cartesian, *dynamic* mode of Gottfried Leibniz, as this latter modality was developed

more adequately by Bernhard Riemann.¹ The issue is not one of a kinematic interaction among nations; the issue is the need to consider the entire crisis in no other manner than as a subject of *Riemannian dynamics* of the planetary, physical-economic, rather than monetary system, as a whole. Any failure to grasp the importance of this distinction could be soon a fatal error for all nations which fail to master that conceptual correction.

1. The Crisis Defined

The world's present form of systemic crisis was first set into motion during 1865–1877, as the British imperial reaction, since that time, to the U.S. defeat, under the leadership of U.S. President Abraham Lincoln, of Lord Palmerston's role in the creation and use of the British imperial puppet known as the intentionally treasonous Confederate States of America (C.S.A.).² The emergence of the U.S.A., through such developments as an integrated transcontinental railway system, has shaped what has been the dominant, global-strategic, so-called “geopolitical” doctrine from that time to the present moment of world history.

The physical basis for London's hysterical reaction to Lincoln's victory, is to be recognized in the fact that the foundations upon which the global power of European cultures came to dominate the planet in modern times, had been rooted in the physical-economic and related strategic advantages of maritime cultures over landlocked regions of economy. This has been, until now, the advantage of European cultures which had been premised on the ancient, ocean-going maritime cultures from which the foundations of European advantages had been premised. The development of the U.S. economy as both a transcontinental railway and inland waterways system, like the earlier launching of development of Europe's inland waterways by Charlemagne, had been the crucial threat which the Lincoln heritage represented to the British imperial system.

A series of great wars, portended implicitly by the London-directed assassination of President Abraham Lincoln,³ and expressed by a series of great wars beginning with the British monarchy's deployment of Japan for the set of wars against China of 1895–1945, the Russia--Japan war which was an extension of those wars against China, the Balkan wars used

¹ The emphasis is on Riemann's 1854 habilitation dissertation, as this, and Kepler's principal discoveries came to be appreciated by Albert Einstein, and as this is reflected on a still higher level by Russia's Academician V.I. Vernadsky's treatment of the notions of Biosphere and Noösphere.

² U.S. President Abraham Lincoln distinguished between the traitors among the British Foreign Office's agents in the leadership of the Confederacy, and the dupes who were drawn into the conflict out of “loyalty” to their federal state.

³ The assassinations of Presidents McKinley and John F. Kennedy have kindred, global-strategic significance for our consideration in the reading of this present report.

as a lever for leading Europe generally into the great war of 1914–1917,⁴ the British putting of the fascist regimes of Mussolini and Hitler into power, the great war of 1939–1945, and Bertrand Russell’s personal design and launching of the state of nuclear weapons conflict of 1946–1989, are the prime examples of this still presently continued, global strategic conflict.

Inside the U.S.A. itself, the leading political-economic and related forces are divided essentially, as the continuing conflict between the U.S. patriotic faction typified by President Franklin Roosevelt, on the one side, and, on the opposing side, the stratum of Anglo-Dutch Liberal financier interest typified by such implicitly treasonous U.S. Presidents of the Twentieth Century as Theodore Roosevelt, Woodrow Wilson, Harry Truman, Richard Nixon, *et al.*

The present U.S. administration, which was created with a key role by the same George Shultz who earlier provided U.S. backing for the wrecking of the world monetary system in 1971–72, under President Nixon,⁵ has always been London-controlled, and is personally, and as Shultz’s puppets Mrs. Lynne Cheney and Vice-President Cheney were, in effect, puppets of the Fabian circles associated with Prime Minister Tony Blair. Even rehabilitation earlier did not provide current President George W. Bush, Jr., to be more than a pitiable tool of the London-centered circles which control the Bush-Cheney administration and the President Bloomberg administration presently intended by the London-steered Shultz cabal.

The central feature of this conflict is the role of the present Anglo-Dutch-Liberal financier offshoots of that British East India Company faction (as of Lord Shelburne) which gained imperial power for its financial interests with that February 1763 Peace of Paris ensuing from Britain’s steering of the leading powers of continental Europe into the mutual warfare of the so-called “Seven Years War.” Hence, the principal enemy of humanity at large, from February 1763 to the present instant, has been the same agency which created and unleashed Hitler, the Anglo-Dutch Liberal incarnation of neo-Venetian financier interest. The role of British Prince of Wales Edward Albert, is merely typical of the long continuing, globally extended process, extended from February 1763 to the present moment.

The object of London and its foolish U.S. and continental European sympathizers, in the present attempt to destroy the U.S. through economic-financial warfare, and related means,

⁴ Chancellor Bismarck’s secret agreement with Czar Nicholas II, not to permit Germany to be drawn into the silly old Austrian Kaiser’s efforts to draw Germany into support of Austria against Russia in a Balkans war, was a crucial element in the motives for the dumping of Bismarck by the British Prince of Wales’s foolish nephew Wilhelm II.

⁵ And also the establishment of the fascist Pinochet dictatorship in Chile, the Nazi-based Southern Cone massacres of the early 1970s, the long war in Southwest Asia (crafted under guidance of Britain’s Fabian Prime Minister Tony Blair), and the British-backed operation which placed the son of an Austrian Nazi, Arnold Schwarzenegger, in the California government, and has been working to turn Mayor Bloomberg of New York into a 2009 installation as a Mussolini-style President of the U.S.A.

is the intention to eliminate the role of the U.S.A. as a global factor altogether. Were that effort of the British and their tamed continental fools to succeed, the entire world would be plunged into a general (i.e., global) financial-economic breakdown-crisis, a financial-monetary crisis comparable to, but more severe in its effects than the crash of the Lombard banking house of Bardi.

The Roots of Empire

To understand this phenomenon, we must cultivate a corrected view of the history of the development of imperialism in Europe. By “Europe,” we must adopt the notion of European civilization as rooted in a maritime alliance, against Tyre, by Egypt (e.g., Cyrenaica), the Ionians, and the Etruscans dating, approximately, from the 7th Century B.C. The imperial forces, at one time centered in Tyre, against which this emerging current of European culture was developed, were premised from the start on what came to be known in the time of Demosthenes as the “Persian model” (also, the Babylonian model) or, more simply, generically, “the oligarchical model.” That oligarchical model is identified in essentials by Aeschylus’ Prometheus trilogy’s ***Prometheus Bound***.

The most essential feature of this history, is the expression of the issue of the definition of man reaffirmed, as the principle of *agapē*, by the Christian Apostles John and Paul. On the one side, we have the human individual as the “man and woman” of ***Genesis*** 1, that defended by the mythic Prometheus; and, on the other side, the man degraded, as the helots of Lycurgan Sparta were degraded in a fashion demanded by the Delphic Apollo-Dionysos cult which was expressed as the Olympian Zeus of Aeschylus’ ***Prometheus Bound***.

The great enemy of European imperialism, in all of its relevant expressions since the Peloponnesian War, has been the notion of a sovereign nation-state, as this notion was expressed in modern form by Nicholas of Cusa’s ***Concordancia Catholica***, and expressed incarnate by the France of Louis XI and the England of Henry VII. This is a concept of the citizen which is to be traced for its agreement with the concept of man and woman in ***Genesis*** 1. This is also the notion of man and woman expressed in principle by the 1648 Peace of Westphalia, and is the specific character of U.S. constitutional law as expressed by the adoption of Gottfried Leibniz’s “the pursuit of happiness,” against the evil doctrine of John Locke, and as Leibniz’s principle is expressed as the underlying principle of all legitimate government in the Preamble of the U.S. Federal Constitution.

Why U.S. Enemies & Traitors Hate FDR

Those historic antecedents of the concept assumed a rigorously scientific form of appropriate universal law among nations for today, in what had been U.S. President Franklin Roosevelt’s expressed intention, that at the close of the war against Hitler’s forces, he would have rid the

world of the existence of colonies and semi-colonies, which should be brought to an end through aid of the conversion of the great war machine of the fight against Hitler into the building-up of a planetary system of sovereign nation-states, thus eliminating all imperialism, including, as Roosevelt stated plainly to Churchill, British imperialism.⁶ Under Roosevelt's successor, Churchill admirer Harry Truman, the interest of British imperialism was served by his administration, and has been the dominant political influence expressed by leading Anglo-American financier interests, even as expressed by powerful nominally U.S. financier interests working in defiance of the contrary inclination of some U.S. Presidents, such as Eisenhower.

Franklin Roosevelt understood, that to free the U.S.A. itself to adhere to its own Constitutional principle, the world's leading imperial force, the Anglo-Dutch Liberal financier interests which are the actual "British Empire," must be wrecked. To find an outright traitor, or one who is merely a fool among U.S. political figures, find one who regrets the role of President Franklin Roosevelt, or one who prefers the European model of parliamentary system, especially the British parliamentary model, to the American presidential system as it operated under President Franklin Roosevelt.

The widespread, somewhat idiotic, when not simply foolish opinion, that empires rise as expressions of the existence of nation-states, has been a prominent source of great tragedies in modern, as also medieval European history. The issue of who, or what actually controls what are presumed to be national governments, is very poorly grasped in even more leading circles of government, and academic opinion, in the world today.

Today, there is only one globally significant empire. That is the British empire, a term which may be properly used only on the condition that one recognizes that that "British Empire" is merely a garment worn by a higher-ranking, more powerful agency, a certain kind of virtual "slime mold" otherwise to be known as a global financier-oligarchical system. Today, the name for a single, one-world empire is the proposed new "Tower of Babel" called "globalization," otherwise known as "world government."

⁶ It must be recalled that with the death of Bertrand Russell's leading accomplice, the avowed fascist H.G. Wells, it was left to Russell to initiate the 1946 plan for launching a "preventive nuclear war" against the Soviet Union, as Russell himself published this claim to his responsibility in the September 1946 edition of the *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists*. Russell repeatedly acknowledged this policy during the late 1950s, and collaborated with certain dubious Soviet and other figures in orchestrating the so-called "missiles crisis" of 1962. The stated intent of Russell (and also Wells) in this policy was "globalization," which Russell termed "world government" at that time.

2. Globalization: The Brutish Empire

From the normal standpoint of a competent physical science, the distinguishing characteristic which sets the human species apart from all lower forms of life, is what is usefully identified as the inherent creative-mental potential of the individual human mind. The social interaction among persons sharing the social experience of creative contributions by the individual members of society, defines the culture of the human species (generally) and also each specific stage of development of a practiced language-culture, as something absolutely different than any characteristic of lower species or their subsumed varieties.

From the standpoint of a competent expression of modern physical science, this notion of a specifically human social form of evolving culture expresses a universal physical principle of the universe, akin in that sense to Johannes Kepler's uniquely original discovery of the universal principle of gravitation. However, in the case of the human species, as distinct from fixed modalities of universal lawfulness, the human species' natural potential is creative, in the sense that experimentally validated universal physical principles transform scientific practice, *anti-entropically*, to a higher physical state of being.

The aggregate expression of the effects of such physical-scientific, or like raising of culture to a higher physical, or cultural state, is expressed chiefly in the forms of evolution of the accumulated mass of cultural experience embodied within the legacy of the use of a language-culture.

In other words, it is worse than absurd, and also cruel, to assume that dictionaries of different language-cultures can be simply equated with one another in a mechanistic way of defining meanings of individual terms and common expressions. Thus, although the ideas which are generated by peoples of differing language-cultures may lead toward the same ideas in some ultimate effects, the process of forming ideas for expression within a specific language-culture, is not the same as in another language-culture. Among competent students of the use of language, it is the embedded history of the experience of the development and contexts of the use of language, which defines the way in which the ironical meanings of literate speech are to be uttered. People who "google" excessively, are verging nearer to animal states of mind than human ones.⁷

Hence, the included, essential feature of a civilized language-culture, in particular, is that it serves as a medium of interaction with other cultures. It is through the development of functional relations among the sets of users of differing specific languages, that the human species can be united in its effects to effect common goals. Without protection of the specific language-culture's sovereign role, this development of relations among cultures were not possible in a healthy form.

⁷ *Is the Devil in Your Laptop?*, Lyndon LaRouche Political Action Committee, 2007.

The remarks which I have just presented have a very significant scientific-functional significance.

The ability of the social organization in which the individual human mind is situated, to generate the equivalent of what may be designated as discoveries of valid universal principles, such as physical principles, which increase the human species' (or, a particular society's) ability to increase its potential relative population-density qualitatively, identifies a set of mental events which are intrinsically anti-entropic. This behavior which is not within the reach of the powers of what might pass for "animal intelligence," is the essential distinction of the human species. It is the generation of ideas whose effect is anti-entropic in that sense, which is the distinguishing characteristic of the human species from all other known species. It is the way in which languages evolve under the impact of this anti-entropic principle, which is the most crucial consideration in defining lawfully desirable relations among the respectively sovereign language-cultures of mankind.

The experience of the emergence of a specifically European culture in the setting of the alliance of Egypt, Ionia, and Etruria, circa the Seventh Century B.C., illustrates the point most conveniently.

The Relevant Origin of Europe

The principal human cultures emerging from about two hundred thousand years of glacial domination of large parts of the northern hemisphere of our planet, were ocean-based maritime cultures, which migrated by aid of a developing form of astro-navigation among oceans lying about 400 feet lower than today. The most important of the surviving or fragmentary calendars from more than, or significantly less than twenty thousand years ago, show the leading role of such maritime cultures. As the icecaps melted, the cultures of the peoples of the Sea moved into coastal regions, and near the mouths of principal rivers, as the culture of Egypt emerged from the seas in this way.

It was in this specific cultural setting, from the impact of maritime cultures on areas of the post-glacial melt, that the leading elements of what became a scientific culture emerged. It is from astro-navigational and related dependency upon insight into the ways in which the universe above behaved, that the concept of an absolutely universal system was possible. It is this concept, expressed, by aid of Egypt, in the tradition of Thales, Heraclitus, the Pythagoreans, and Plato, on which all of the notable achievements of known ancient, medieval, and modern civilization have depended. It was the related discovery, by Nicholas of Cusa, of the inherent great, ontological fallacy in not only the Sophistry of Euclid, but also Archimedes' quadrature of the circle, on which all of the successful development of modern physical science, through Leonardo da Vinci, Johannes Kepler, Fermat, Leibniz,

Riemann, *et al.*, has depended.⁸ Without a concept of *the universal* in this sense, an actual physical science could not have come into existence.

Unfortunately, much of that modern accomplishment has been misplaced, even within relevant institutions of scientific learning today.

The losses from the heritage of the earlier cultural development of the notion of science, are chiefly due today to the frictional effects of the influence of that Anglo-Dutch Liberalism which has been installed as a special kind of imperialist cultural authority through the influence of Venice's Paolo Sarpi, who introduced the obscene practice known variously as Liberalism or Empiricism into the rise of Anglo-Dutch Liberalism and Cartesianism, during the course of the Seventeenth and Eighteenth centuries.

With the attempt to suppress the knowledge of those foundations of modern physical science, as associated with the exemplary work of Cusa, Leonardo, Kepler, Fermat, Leibniz, Gauss, and Riemann, from the beginning of the Seventeenth Century, onward, especially since the Napoleonic wars and the rise of the global power of British imperialism, the ratio of competent scientists among trained graduates and others has been decreased, this largely by the increasingly radical forms of modern Liberal Sophistry, as through the spread of positivism and the more radical mental decadence known as existentialism.

The aspect of what I have just described summarily in that manner, which is of crucial political-strategic force in response to the case as presented by General Ivashov, is that the problem of imperialism today can not be competently addressed without taking into account the absurdity which has crept into the work of strategic thinkers through failure to take into account the fact that the very idea of an efficiently existing universal physical principle, is not known as such among most of the relevant policy-shapers of today. Hence, the mythical, and functionally absurd notion of imperialism as a product of a specific national-language group has, in and of itself, created a circumstance among leading policy-shaping circles, in which the discussion of the relevant issues drifts into a deadly form of self-inflicted strategic folly.

How the Most Brutish Kill

As if to reveal the true identity and nature of the true British empire, it is to be emphasized that financier oligarchs do not usually make wars; they organize, and finance them. Usually, as in the Lombard bankers' wars of the Fourteenth Century, the bankers finance both sides, in order to loot the loser, and indebt the victor. So, it was London (chiefly) which put Mussolini and Hitler into power, and it was London which sought to prevent the U.S.A. from winning the war against Hitler "too soon" for Churchill's liking.

⁸ E.g., Nicholas of Cusa, *De Docta Ignorantia*.

Thus, as I have emphasized in locations published earlier, from the moment the Allied breakthrough was accomplished in Normandy, Churchill's instruments, such as Churchill's silly but brutish Montgomery postponed victory for months with his First Army prank, so there was a sharp right-wing, anti-Franklin Roosevelt move from the London-controlled right-wing financier and related gangs inside the U.S.A., a stunt which brought the scoundrel Truman into the U.S. Presidency.

So, the cult of Delphi destroyed Classical Greece with the Sophists' Peloponnesian War, as London prepared the way toward the destruction of the U.S.A. during the 1960s through the assassination of President John F. Kennedy, and the protracted 1964–1975 warfare in Indo-China. So, as I warned publicly at the beginning of 2001, days before the actual inauguration of President George W. Bush, Jr., that Bush would be utterly incompetent in dealing with the already erupting new economic crisis, and that we must expect an early major terrorist incident for a purpose like that of Göring's setting fire to the Reichstag (to make Hitler's appointment to dictatorship, by Carl Schmitt, possible). So, the Reichstag-Fire-like event of September 11, 2001 paved the way for new phases of permanent warfare in Southwest Asia, now reaching into Pakistan, just as the same Britain whose MI-5 staged the Mau-Mau hoax, is back at it in Kenya all over again.

When all such relevant details from recent history have been taken into account, we may, thus, turn our attention to the principle which such events reflect.

War as such is not the essential means by which the oligarchs reign. It is an auxiliary means. The essential goal of the oligarch is to manage the population's minds and their passions, by aid of inducing heated conflicts among forces which might otherwise unite against the oligarchy. Thus, as in the fraudulent war launched in Iraq through the *always-convert-able* leadership of Britain's Fabian Prime Minister Tony "sexed-up" Blair, managing "public opinion" among the sections of the general population put against one another's throat, and the easier management and looting of those populations thereby, is that essence of empire which has flowed through all pro-oligarchical-financier currents of European history since the old days of the Delphic financier activities of the Apollo-Dionysus cult.

3. A Dynamic Set of Nation-States

Those who have been fooled into believing in what are called "deductive" and "inductive" methods, mis-define universal principles as the implicit expression of mere mechanical demonstrations of "repeatability." As the case of Kepler's discovery of the principle of both gravitation as such shows; and, as his discovery of the harmonic organization which underlies the determination of a quantifiable notion of intra-planetary gravitation also shows: the principle of gravitation lies "outside" the mere measurement of the orbit as such. It lies in a

principle which drives the orbital pathway within the smallest interval which might ever be conceived.

In other words, the principle of gravitation is located as a principle of action, which occupies every smallest interval which might be conceived. The entirety of the original discovery of the calculus was premised, by Leibniz, on *this concept of the ontologically infinitesimal* by Kepler. Similarly, the characteristic of any valid universal physical principle is always of the same quality as a universal, ontologically infinitesimal, contrary to the notorious fraud on this subject by Leonhard Euler, *et al.* In Einstein's terms, a true, physically efficient universal principle bounds the universe of experience, such that we must think of the universe as anti-Euclidean, a universe everywhere finite, because it is self-bounded by an array of discoverable universal physical principles.

All approximately valid notions of universal principles (e.g., *universals*, or *types*) are of this same type of quality of efficient existence. Thus, as Einstein emphasizes, our universe is finite, because it is self-bounded by the universal principles which underlie its efficient existence.

The same principle appears in a special form in the concept of Biosphere and Noösphere by Academician V.I. Vernadsky. These are universal principles, as Vernadsky demonstrates this systemically for the chemistry of living processes, and for the Noösphere.

These same considerations from the domain of physical science, pertain also to the domain of *ideas of principle* in a still broader way. It is this quality of ideas which define the true meaning of a culture. It is only as we defend such ideas against being degraded from the analog mode in which they exist naturally, into the degeneracy of digital modes, that the aspect of the human mental processes associated with creativity is defended against brutalization. It is the precious, sensitive quality of the powers which are the specific difference between man and beasts, which must be defended through the promotion of analog functions, as distinct from digital, and as defending the former functions as the location of those processes which express the natural potential for creativity of the human individual's mind.

It is the preservation of the experience which has given birth, within a society's practiced culture, to the class of conceptions which inhabits only the analog-like, anti-entropic features of a language culture's artefacts, which must be defended.

A Unity of Apparent Opposites

The dynamic form of a society's cultural experience of itself is the proper center of emphasis for defining a national culture. It is that which must be defended, and its development promoted in integrating the varieties of cultural experience within an established, or becoming form of national culture. Ultimately, the ideas of all national cultures must be

reconciled as approaching the quality of a common cognitive experience, but this can occur only through the promotion of the common interest in such an outcome by what are respectively sovereign national-cultural entities.

Without this approach to the relations within and among cultures, there can be no effectively ecumenical community of interest among nations. Without such a community of interest, the creative powers of all parts of humanity are impaired, or, virtually nullified, as under the conditions of a “Tower of Babel” called “globalization.”

Therefore, in practice, we have the following:

The global breakdown-crisis currently in progress demands that we establish a global system of cooperation among an effective majority of nations which are either sovereign nation-states in the strict sense of the term, or are candidates to become sovereign.

The presently onrushing, general, planetary breakdown-crisis, requires an initiating role among four key sovereign nation-states: the U.S.A., Russia, China, and India, and, in addition to these, also others. The immediate purpose is to establish a system of treaty-agreements which, in effect, freeze, or approximately freeze, the ratios among national currencies to approximately their present levels.

This agreement must be buttressed and enhanced by certain other measures:

A new international fixed-exchange-rate system based on intentions congruent with the broad intentions of U.S. President Franklin Roosevelt for the post-war world.

The creation of a mass of international state-credit for specific major developmental projects within and among nations under provisions of nested sets of treaty agreements with life-expectancies of a quarter to half a century, or, in some cases, longer. The title for such a nested set of agreements must be “the common aims of mankind.”

Many of these projects are already implicitly in the process of discussion. We should start there, with emphasis on basic economic infrastructure.

Only an alliance of that sort, based on such common economic goals of progress and security, could enable us to reorganize the presently bankrupt world monetary-financial system in an orderly fashion. This approach is the only workable approach to international security under the conditions existing at this moment.

My fraternal regards,
Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.