

## Free Trade vs. National Interest: The Economics Debate About Russia

by Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.

June 12, 2008

[Published in *Executive Intelligence Review*, Volume 35, Number 26, July 4, 2008. [View PDF of original](#) at the LaRouche Library.]

*The pattern of cooperation among Russia, China, and India, is presently the pivot of any potential resistance to the present, London-led drive toward establishing the global fascism of a utopian, frankly imperial “New Tower of Babel.” This is a drive which is currently expressed as the former British Prime Minister Tony Blair’s proposed, imperialist, ideological, post-, anti-Westphalian hegemony in western and central continental Europe. This continuing, London-centered attempt to transform all of continental and central Europe into virtually a captive British colony, through such schemes as the proposed Lisbon Treaty, is complemented by the force of an implicitly treasonous hegemony of the mole-like, London-centered, financier influences behind current policy-shaping influences of leading elements of current U.S. national policy-shaping. This reflects a degree of British leading press and British control over the combined regular and irregular financing of U.S. Presidential election-campaigns, which is so large today that it would stun the many voters who actually confronted themselves with the evidence showing how much they have been manipulated in their voting by such foreign power, thus far.*

*In Russia, and among its principal Asian partners, the included reactions to this are to be recognized in a currently evolving, asymmetric strategy of self-defense against current British imperialism—and those nations’ governments do know that this is British imperialism. That current British imperial role will bring crucial reactions by Russia and its partners. These reactions prompt my increasing concern about the part which liberal elements still occupy in Russia’s own economic policy. My concern for all three—Russia, China, and India—among those nations, and also others, centers on currently menacing ambiguities posed by that influence of free-trade ideology inside Russia itself, which is, itself, an added threat to Russia’s own national interest—and therefore, also ours—still today, a threat which persists despite the intended victims’ concern to check such influence by alien interests.*

The matter which I put before this audience now, takes our attention to the heart of the urgently needed remedies for the gravest strategic crisis in all of modern world history: the presently onrushing, greatest economic crisis since Europe’s Fourteenth Century. This is that

present, global, hyperinflationary crisis which has now entered its succession of terminal phases.

This crisis itself could be overcome, but it could not be solved by any effort which was limited to merely reforming the present world monetary-financial system. In the very important matter which I present for discussion before this international audience in these pages, we shall consider the uniquely required remedy for the cause of this crisis.

This requires that we recognize the factor of widespread, crucial, strategic and historical illiteracy respecting real (i.e., physical) economy, even among high-ranking, ostensibly well-informed circles. This has been a kind of illiteracy which has been popularized as that reigning popular belief which has been planted among the relevant portion of that trans-Atlantic white-collar generation, the generation which was born during the 1945–1958 interval. This illiteracy is expressed in the form of a belief planted deep within them, as also younger generations, a belief expressed as a militant form of ignorance, ignorance of the axiomatic-like presumptions which lurk today, often unsuspected, as relics of influences deeply embedded in the psyches of the living, influences expressing the residues, transmitted within successive generations, of problematic experiences dating from centuries or more in the recent history of present cultures, even, sometimes, carried over from truly ancient times.

This situation confronts us with two categorical challenges. First, there is the fact that a powerful political force, the presently reigning international financial oligarchy, is so much opposed to the only existing choice of any actual remedy for this crisis, that those specific kinds of oligarchical interests would appear to prefer to see this planet (including their own nation) in Hell, rather than accept the only available option for remedying the currently onrushing, general, financial-monetary breakdown of the economy of the world as a whole. Second, there is also the complication contributed by the widespread honest ignorance of those principles of economy which must be considered for adoption, if the world is to escape the presently onrushing horrors of the present situation, horrors which reach far, far beyond the matter of those soaring gasoline and Winter heating-fuel prices to be expected, if the present policies of our own and other leading governments are allowed to continue as they are.

To save humanity from the presently onrushing threat of an early general breakdown-crisis which would ricochet throughout the planet, we must abandon currently popular opinions about certain relevant, current events. We must abandon both “information theory” and that recently acquired habit of mere “googling” which has become widely employed today as a proposed substitute for actually thinking. We must view all of now globally extended European civilization, with its intervals of increasingly convulsive, global internal developments, as gripped by a single, dynamical process; we must view this world-wide

process as a process among respectively sovereign nations with sovereign cultures; and, we must view that process among nations in the following, dynamical manner.

*What must occur soon, if a horror which would be worse than Europe's Fourteenth-Century so-called "New Dark Age" is to be averted, must be the formation of an initial organizing committee composed of the governments of the U.S.A., Russia, China, and India,<sup>1</sup> a committee whose agreement to what needs to be adopted as certain common principles of reform, principles which will serve as the needed catalyst for a general, more or less global agreement to a reform committed to certain principles of global cooperation among a majority of the world's nation-states. This reform must be essentially global, and must be crafted to serve as a process of reform to be continued during a coming half-century interval.<sup>2</sup>*

My recommendation is, that the U.S.A. must become prepared, soon, to volunteer its participation in this four-power initiative. This recommendation will astonish some; but, none the less, it is indispensable if civilization is to be preserved. At the present moment, what I propose does indeed appear to be an unlikely development for the near future. However, my advantage in this matter, is that I have clearly in view, as most other leading figures and circles do not, the kind of blows which the presently onrushing, global economic-breakdown-crisis is about to deliver to the U.S. economy and its political process. Current history affords the U.S.A. no real option for survival, but that which I propose here, if it wishes to survive the presently onrushing phase of the ongoing crisis.

In this report, I emphasize the specific kind of practical, problematic implications which the process of considering such an effort presents to the government of Russia, for example. However, what I write here also has a more general relevance for all parties, including many in addition to the four which I have proposed to serve as an initiating committee for this global economic-recovery effort.

Restate the general argument for this action by the four indicated leading nations, as follows.

We must examine this presently ongoing span of unfolding modern world history, as a single, unified process of coherent development among what should be regarded, nonetheless, paradoxically, as being properly viewed as, respectively, essentially sovereign nations.

For example: We must discover the efficient coherence which is curiously hidden by what the current great majority of educated and barely educated opinion, alike, regards as separate factors of development, and even separate concerns and developments. In contemplating the

---

<sup>1</sup> And, also, for strategic reasons, early during the continuing process, Japan, Korea, and Mongolia.

<sup>2</sup> A cycle of fifty years may be a long wait for some, if not for an old man of eighty-five. For the purposes of addressing a world crisis of the present type, the man of eighty-five has the right outlook.

proposed rescue mission for this planet, we must regard history as being like a complex, higher form of a living organization, whose organs interact with the built-in intent of an organic-like, common effect, an effect expressed as the unitary function of that organism as a whole. This is a function which is not homeostatic, but *dynamic* in Gottfried Leibniz's and Bernhard Riemann's sense of the term *dynamic*. Thus, we see modern history itself as a coherently lawful process of successive, alternating movements of rise and decline of civilization, as a process subsuming the process of relations among the world's present, seemingly contradictory set of respectively sovereign cultures as a whole.

To begin that investigation, consider the particular form of currently ongoing, "geopolitical" challenge this presents to Russia's policy-shaping.

Look now at the case of Russia. Take into account some essential features inherited from the experience of the Soviet Union.

### ***The Present Irony of Soviet Communism***

Ironically, the emergence of Soviet Russia as a state power under the leadership of V.I. Lenin, confronted that new government with the desire, then, to rebuild an avowedly Communist Russia's agro-industrial economy, by building it around the successful model of practice of what Russia had viewed then as "American capitalist methods." Praise of "American methods" from sources at that time, was emphasized, on various occasions, as during the first five years of that government, by such leaders of that moment as both of the restively cooperating rivals V.I. Lenin and L.D. Trotsky.<sup>3</sup> These were "the American methods" which Russia had witnessed in the great agro-industrial power shown by the World War I period of mobilization of the United States' economy, a reflection of what was also to be seen, since about 1876, by notable Russian leaders in the way in which Germany's agro-industrial power had leaped ahead through the adoption, at about the same time, of what had been a kernel of American-System-like reforms led by Chancellor Otto von Bismarck.

Throughout the entire sweep of Soviet history, from 1917 to 1989, all the critical issues of national-economic policy for that nation's patriots, were centered, in fact, on a debate of the issue of the systemic differences between the American nationalist and the British-Liberal-imperial models of the economy. What were the methods to which the young Soviet Union's otherwise avowed followers of Karl Marx might, then turn? Winston Churchill, like the avowed Luciferian Aleister Crowley, like the avowed fascist H.G. Wells, and the avowed

---

<sup>3</sup> The Soviet economist Preobrazhensky's notion of "primitive socialist accumulation," introduced during the early through later 1920s, was a product of the same provocative, historical irony. This time, Preobrazhensky reflected the economist Rosa Luxemburg's more insightful treatment of the concept of imperialism as a matter of a system of international loans, as the American scholar Herbert Feis was to support the same conclusion of Rosa Luxemburg with his own studies later.

radically Malthusian genocidalist and avowed nuclear and biological-warfare mass-murderer Bertrand Russell, in their time together, had shared motives, and tastes more or less peculiar to their own such circles; but, these sorts of ethics were scarcely what might be properly identified by decent people as moral scruples.<sup>4</sup>

It should have been obvious to modern historians, that, in general, Russian leading political and strategic thought, generally, has not yet resolved, even at this late date, what confronts it as the paradox of a Russia viewing the actuality of the relevant, presently continuing, historical conflict of its outlook on the English-speaking world, that between the U.S.A. constitutional tradition, as typified by President Franklin Roosevelt, and the British empire's system, still today. This confusion, often found among Russian circles of the past, is reenforced by the fact that the so-called "Wall Street" faction in the U.S.A. is the principal expression of the British imperial tradition of such as Aaron Burr, which is still operating prominently, today, from within the leading institutions of the U.S.A.

The included source of that specific kind of confusion, which is to be seen not only in Russia, but in European thought generally, has been, most notably, the long-standing failure by the socialist movements generally, as also by other observers, to recognize the relevant truth about Karl Marx's role as, implicitly, an intellectually confused pawn of the British Foreign Office of Jeremy Bentham's protégé; a Marx who, in his own time in London, was under the management of Bentham's heir and immediate successor, Lord Palmerston.<sup>5</sup>

The principal source of this confusion, has been the socialists', and others' stubborn refusal, whether as either avowed Marxists, or his customary, present-day and former opponents from leading political circles, to acknowledge Karl Marx's role as in a fully documented position as an agent-in-fact of Palmerston's own Young Europe organization of Palmerston agents Mazzini *et al.* This aspect of Marx's own (and relevant others') credulities has been largely responsible for the pathetic confusion, whether or not Marx himself was fully conscious of that arrangement. Such has been the state of confusion among both Marxists and anti-Marxists alike on this matter of the actual, persisting conflict between British and

---

<sup>4</sup> We must never be so silly as to suggest that Britain's Churchill and Bertrand Russell acted with moral "sincerity" in their argument for launching a "preventive nuclear attack" on the Soviet Union, as Russell presented his proposal publicly in September 1946. Russell's actual intent, as he confessed publicly later, was: "As for public life, when I first became politically conscious Gladstone and Disraeli 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, with such a background, it is difficult to feel at home in a world of ... American supremacy." Bertrand Russell, *The Impact of Science on Society*, 1953. Russell's intention, like Churchill's, was to outflank, and ultimately destroy the work of that U.S. Franklin Roosevelt Presidency seen by both as a threat to the British Empire.

<sup>5</sup> Marx once wrote a treatise in which he claimed to have exposed the man who was actually his master of that period of time, Lord Palmerston, as "a Russian spy." One might wonder, who, actually, put Marx up to that job!

American political-economy and history. This has been the root of much Russian confusion (and that of many others, too) on this point, even at high-ranking levels, even in the present day.

Since “the Fall of the Wall,” in 1989, which occurred during the term of U.S. President George H.W. Bush,<sup>6</sup> the insane, implicitly hyper-inflationary policies and practices which had already been imposed, as a trend, under U.S. Federal Reserve Chairman Alan Greenspan, have continued to prevail up to the present moment of writing, even under Greenspan’s pathetically confused successor, Ben Bernanke. Similarly, the Presidency of Russia’s President Yeltsin continued to be under the influence of this London-steered, ruinous, Anglo-American line of Greenspan and his successors, through, and beyond the time of the LTCM/Russian Bond scandal of August–September 1998.

However, since then, even with those very significant, later improvements in direction of Russia’s economic policy, under the Presidency of Vladimir Putin, the essential features of the conflict between Russia’s vital national physical-economic interests and the ruinous influence of predatory British monetarism, has not been fully resolved, conceptually, in Russia, to the present day—or, by most among those from western and central Europe who prefer Britain’s part to the constitutional tradition of the U.S.A., dupes who, when they are in leading positions, are usually pawns of British intelligence services.

After all, intelligent, well-informed U.S. nationals know that Britain’s royally beknighted former U.S. President George H.W. Bush is, like his father, that late Prescott Bush, who joined Britain’s Montagu Norman in backing Adolf Hitler’s cause, among those sympathizers of British imperialism, who, often, might as well be, then as now, tantamount to British agents in the practical implications of much of the practice of such sympathizers at sundry later times.

---

<sup>6</sup> In February 1983, I had warned of a threatened economic collapse of the Soviet Union, as likely to occur “within about five years,” should President Reagan propose, and the Soviet government reject cooperation of the type which I expected that President Reagan would proffer. Later in the Spring of that year, after the President had proffered the SDI and discussion of this had been summarily rejected, I repeated that forecast publicly. That remained a standing forecast, as repeatedly stated publicly by me, through my October 12, 1988 Berlin TV warning of an imminent chain-reaction collapse of the Comecon system, beginning in Poland, during early 1989. I had developed, and publicly circulated my first long-range forecast of this type in 1960–61, warning, that unless corrective measures were taken to deal with the trend established at the close of the 1950s, we must expect a series of monetary crises during the second half of the 1960s, with the threat of a breakdown of the then present monetary system about the end of the 1960s, or beginning of the 1970s, I have made several such forecasts, and have never erred in any among them. This success has been a matter of a method contrary to those intrinsically incompetent “race-track handicapping”-like methods used by the usual professional statistical forecasters. “Yes, or no?” forecasts of events by a specific date, are always products of intrinsically incompetent methods employed.

However, in the meantime, after the events of 1989, my insight into a needed new direction of Russian thinking in these matters, had been, already introduced by my wife and others among my own, and my associates' published work. These forecasts and related proposals were already introduced in part by relevant circles during the early through middle 1990s, post-Gorbachev, Yeltsin Russia. My own view was introduced by such notably influential intellectual figures as the brilliantly creative physicist Pobisk Kuznetsov, who was among the first prominent figures, then and there, to grasp certain leading implications of my teaching of the principles of physical economy, as opposed to any of the sundry, popularized forms of monetarism.

For example, by 1996, as illustrated by a meeting in which I participated as a member of the panel, in Moscow, there was a professionally and politically prestigious body of Russia's economists which met with me there and in other locations, prepared to approach the U.S.A. for the kind of reforms which would have been feasible at that time. The support for such reform collapsed, largely as a result of the corrupt influence of then-Vice-President Al Gore within the context of the U.S. re-election campaign of President Clinton, all of which coincided with the course of Gore-backed Yeltsin's campaign for his own re-election as President.

However, even with the beneficial shift under the Presidency of Vladimir Putin, the lingering influence of British, radically free-trade variety of monetarist dogmas, although diminished as a visible factor in Russia's policy-shaping, has persisted as an opposing, crippling factor of influence, despite now former President Putin's effort to establish the policies needed for a sustainable attempt at rebuilding not only Russia's economy, but to accept the goal, in practice, of creating the urgently needed, new, Bretton Woods-like reform of the world credit-system.

Admittedly, under the conditions in the U.S. government at the moment this report is written, the hope for such a reform of U.S. practice might appear to be far-fetched. I am not so pessimistic as to share that view. Shocking developments are already under way; these are times when many kinds of seemingly impossible changes will become probable.

Such is real history and its national and international complexities of policy-shaping up to the present time. Russia's freeing itself from the perilous ambiguities of efforts to balance Russia's national physical-economic interests against the residual, but still dangerous influence of Russia's own menacing monetarists, is a problem which must be addressed, if Russia's government is to be enabled to play its own crucial, unique role as a crucially needed partner among the four powers, the U.S.A., Russia, China, and India: the set of powers which must provide the core around which the majority of the human race rallies to rescue our immediately imperiled planet as a whole today.

I limit my discussion in this present publication, to reflect the conditions of what I can see and know with the authority of virtual certainty, as the principled nature of the problematic features in the publicly stated domestic policies of Russia accordingly.

I emphasize the importance of my taking up this specific issue now, under what are, presently, the actual circumstances of an accelerating global general breakdown-crisis of the present international monetary-financial system. The relevance of this can be demonstrated to best effect, by limiting the proposals presented here to the matter of considering the special role which potential cooperation between the U.S.A. on the one side, and Russia, China, and India, on the other, must play, if an actual recovery of our planet could emerge out of the presently onrushing, global breakdown-crisis of the present world monetary system.

That action is urgent, as I emphasize in the following chapters of this report.

## **I. A Unique Chance for Recovery**

The present world monetary-financial system in its present form, is in an absolutely hopeless, terminal condition. Contrary to popular mythologies, without a new system, the present world situation will be a hopeless one for all concerned. Since developments of the early 1970s, from August 15, 1971 on, the present global, monetarist system has no longer been controlled by the U.S.A., but, increasingly, since the mid-1970s, by a petrodollar-centered, Anglo-Dutch Liberal, floating-exchange-rate, financier-oligarchical system, a neo-Venetian-style system, whose control is presently, nominally centered, politically and financially, in London, Amsterdam, and Rotterdam.

As the case of British control of much of the current financing, and policy shaping of the pre-U.S. Presidential campaigns of the Democratic and Republican parties, illustrates the point, we must accept the fact, that all major policy-shaping by the U.S. government and major press policy today, is being currently shaped so far, predominantly, through the pivot and spigot of the petroleum “spot market” and its overlap with British intelligence’s currently infamous military-intelligence operations’ arm, known as BAE.

Take the particular case of London’s top-down control of the U.S. Democratic Party’s current Presidential campaign through such channels as the otherwise marginal figure of current Democratic Party Chairman Howard Dean’s putative owner, London’s George Soros. This case attests to the effects today of a subversive process of U.S. decline to London’s intended imperial advantage, an advantage which may be traced largely to the August 1971



breakup of the Bretton Woods system, and the subsequent launching of the 1970s oil-price hoax.<sup>7</sup>

This British subversion was continued through the systemic destruction of the U.S. physical economy by the 1977–1981 program of the destruction of the U.S. physical economy through the David Rockefeller-backed Trilateral Commission; and, continued, more recently, through the chain-reaction ruin of the economies of continental Europe through the chain-reaction effects of the Thatcher government’s thrusting the Maastricht Treaty down the throat of Germany and other nations of continental Europe. This bent is typified by the Rockefeller Foundation’s proposal, for Benito Mussolini-style fascism for the U.S.A. today, in the Foundation’s scheme featuring such figures New York Mayor Michael Bloomberg and California Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger. This is also a scheme echoing those practices of the medieval Fourteenth-Century “New Dark Age” which halved the number of existing parishes in Europe, and reduced the population of Europe, rapidly, by about one-third.

Now, the design of the contested Lisbon Treaty, although rejected by a popular majority’s vote in Ireland, still threatens us all with both the threat of the early, fascist-like extinction of virtually all sovereign government by any nation of western and central continental Europe, and by the use of a London-controlled residue of that Treaty, as a military force aimed for the subjugation of all Asia and Russia, too. This brings the world to the verge of the reign of an Anglo-Dutch Liberal financier-oligarchical tyranny over the world, a tyranny which, if established, would be an echo, indeed, of Europe’s Fourteenth-Century plunge into a new dark age. Such a descent into a dark age which would be accompanied by a spread and escalation of the pattern of warfare, including emphasis on “shock and awe” raining from the stratosphere, a scheme into which Britain’s Tony Blair *et al.* levered the U.S. under President George W. “Patsy” Bush, that on the pretext of “9-11.”

This new quality of present threat to all civilization arises now, when the outstanding financial claims of what is, presently, a London-directed world imperial system, have reached a point of decadence beyond all calculation, that by its intrinsic nature, that far beyond any amounts of explicit financial claims involved.

This present monetary-financial system is so structured, that its menacing state of presently accelerating hyper-inflation, with its increasing rates and amounts of financial collapse, could

---

<sup>7</sup> The control of the Democratic Party’s National Committee, and of the Presidential nomination campaign of Senator Barack Obama by funds channeled largely by London’s George Soros, is typical of London’s large degree of control over all such campaigns, and of a large part of the U.S. financial system otherwise. This change actually began with the assassination of President John F. Kennedy, and the Autumn 1967 British Sterling crisis followed by its echoes in the changes introduced under U.S. President Lyndon Johnson, on March 1, 1968.

be terminated in only one of two probable outcomes: either by, 1.), a complete, hyperinflationary breakdown of the present system, or, 2.), by the intervention of a powerful combination among governments, to put the system into receivership for a fundamental redesign as echoing a Bretton Woods system of the type which President Franklin Roosevelt (but not that of Britain's John Maynard Keynes) had actually intended at the Bretton Woods conference of 1944.

The consequences of a general breakdown are such that no truly sane and intelligent government could refuse to consider the action which I am proposing. However, not all those governments are truly sane, or even intelligent, in respect to these economic matters, and few presently incumbent governments are truly competent in today's real state of world affairs, respecting what are now, most immediately, crucially essential matters of economic policies of practice.

Parenthetically, imagine for a moment, that the world would not continue its present plunge into an early breakdown of its financial systems, a collapse which would now occur, were there no reorganization of the world's credit system of the kind which I prescribe: what is currently proposed would echo, if in a manner reflecting the change in capabilities of modern weaponry, the Fourteenth-Century imperial tyranny of a Venetian financier oligarchy. Such an echo of that Fourteenth-Century horror, would be launched through newly reigning mechanisms, of city-based banking like that proposed by the U.S. Rockefeller Foundation behind the Mussolini-style schemes of New York's Mayor Bloomberg, a scheme echoing the monstrous, medieval folly of the Venice-created, Fourteenth-Century, Lombard banking-system.

That will not occur. The crash is in process. Only a general outbreak of what would become planet-wide, even nuclear warfare, would produce a different "scenario" than our intention is focused upon in the mainstream of this present report.

The urgently needed re-design of the world's monetary system, includes the requirement of what would turn out to have been, simply, cancelling what is presently the greatest, intrinsically speculative, unproductive portion of the present, nominally outstanding, financial debt (as typified by the case of so-called "hedge funds," or, in Germany, "locusts"), and replacing the present world monetary system with a new one, one modeled upon President Franklin Roosevelt's 1944 design for the Bretton Woods system (not the crucially flawed, Keynesian substitute for Roosevelt's system). Such a new system requires concerted, cooperative action by nations which, in efforts combined for common action, represent the

most vital interests of not only a majority of the human population today, but the future of virtually all of humanity for generations yet to come.<sup>8</sup>

As indicated at the outset of this report, such a timely, needed reform would be impossible without the initiative of cooperation among four, selected, keystone nations: the U.S.A., Russia, China, and India. An appropriate initiative by those four, would assuredly draw many other nations into membership in the same cooperating body for the needed, concerted, immediate action, and for agreements on long-term reform of the international credit-system. Such cooperation would represent sufficient, forceful political and related power, to bring about the presently, urgently needed reforms for economic recovery of the world system.

For the purpose of bringing about that urgently needed reform, we must recognize that the U.S.A. represents an economy of European culture, Russia one of Eurasian cultural history, and China and India, chiefly Asian cultures of, respectively, significantly different cultural characteristics. A similar challenge is presented by the sovereign characteristics of other prospective partners. This must be a system of agreements among nation-states, echoing the 1648 Peace of Westphalia, not the imperialist scheme of Anglo-Dutch-Liberal-dominated “free trade” and “globalization,” which latter has been intended by such plotters as the government of either Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher’s authorship of the Maastricht atrocity, or those of Prime Minister Tony Blair’s government.

Contrary to such silly utopians as the current dupes of “globalist” and related “Malthusian” propaganda, these cultures must not be put under the law of a single supranational government. The nations can be, and must be united in purpose and common endeavor among sovereigns, but it must be among sovereigns. That must be done through adoption of certain common aims of mankind; but, the perfect sovereignty of the sovereign nation-state in its law and cultural characteristics, is the most essential among those common aims. Without that factor of sovereignty, the remainder of the effort would ultimately fail to reach any acceptable quality of common economic goals.

No new Tower of Babel wanted, *please! Nor a new, presumably Fabian league of Cities of the Plain.*

---

<sup>8</sup> What President Franklin Roosevelt had intended, during the 1944 Bretton Woods conference, was to have been a nested set of treaty agreements with the U.S. constitutional credit-system. What was changed, by President Truman’s agreement with the Winston Churchill he admired so much, was an agreement among monetary systems of a type adapted to a Keynes proposal which President Roosevelt had rejected at Bretton Woods. The special importance of the U.S.A.’s reaching an agreement with Russia, China, and India, as keystone partners now, is to create a “New Bretton Woods” agreement on the Franklin Roosevelt, 1944, not the Truman model.

Efficient institutions of defense remain needed, as a precaution, but, contrary to Prime Minister Blair's government's role in the launching of the presently continuing warfare in Southwest Asia (and other places), not preemption, and never the infantile folly of high-flying "shock and awe." Proper defense in the true sense of the terms, including strategic defense, remains necessary for as far forward as we might foresee in practical terms today. But, with the quality of weaponry, and its warfare already existing, and advancing still today, we must emphasize again that the practice of preventive warfare, or, of conducting, or planning long wars like that which a lying Prime Minister Tony Blair promoted in Southwest Asia, contrary the warnings of Dr. David Kelley, is criminal, and should be treated as such.

Under such an urgently needed reform, the military policy of today's world must be a predicate of the principle of the 1648 Peace of Westphalia. Those of contrary persuasion occupying positions of great power, are to be considered criminals by virtue of the inherent effect of their intention. The worst such are those who associate such military policies with the imitation of a "Tower of Babel" called "Globalization," or the reduction of the human population by half or more, as such genocide vastly beyond the ambitions of Hitler, as proposed, still now, by Britain's Prince Philip and his batty World Wildlife Fund, and are to be treated as lunatics, or criminals.

### *The American System Itself*

The specific and indispensable role of the U.S.A.'s acceptance of such a reform as that which I affirm here, is not merely a matter of choosing the precedent set by President Franklin Roosevelt. The crucial fact of the matter is, the fact that the United Kingdom, and most of the principal nations of western and central continental Europe, are either parliamentary, or quasi-parliamentary systems based upon, and inherently subject to Liberal monetary systems. It is, as I have indicated above, the specific, distinctive, constitutional characteristic of the U.S. constitutional ("Hamiltonian") definition of a sovereign currency-credit system, rather than a Western European-style monetary system, which is crucial for the success of the now urgently needed, prosperous, physical-economic recovery of the planet as a whole.

Therefore, in short, the objective must be to have the four proposed initiators (the U.S.A., Russia, China, and India) form the core of the larger set of nations which undertakes the initiating obligations for a treaty-agreement pivoted on the conception of a credit-system, instead of a monetary system. This shall be a treaty agreement, echoing the principle of the 1648 Peace of Westphalia, among a set of nations of differing internal cultural and other characteristics. This will serve, thus, as the initiating of the new, multi-cultural international credit-system, during the time the world's present monetary-financial system is being reorganized in bankruptcy.

The fact that the U.S. Constitutional system was created as a credit-system, rather than a monetary system, is a matter of crucial importance for any nation which wishes a feasible solution to the catastrophe now already descending upon it. The needed new system of world credit, required to stabilize prices, could be readily established, according to U.S. Constitutional law, by the device of a U.S. return to its Constitutional principle respecting the nature of its uttered currency and credit.

The *Constitutional U.S. system* is a credit-system, not a monetary system. Credit, and the uttering of currency based upon the lawful credit of nation-states, is the only possible, systematic form of escape from the current effects of the 1970s superseding of the Franklin Roosevelt-designed U.S. fixed-exchange-rate system, and going to that Anglo-Dutch Liberal floating-exchange-rate system which has brought about the world's presently onrushing storm of a general, intrinsically hyper-inflationary break-down crisis.

There are two relevant, exemplary ways in which Constitutional money and related Federal credit can be generated by the U.S.A. The first, by consent of Congress (e.g., the House of Representatives) to authorize the U.S. Presidency (e.g., the Secretary of the Treasury) to utter credit which can be legally monetized. The second way, is through the Congressional affirmation of draft treaties of the U.S. government. A set of leading nations which would enter into relevant treaty-agreements with the U.S. government, would *therefore* constitute the form of the needed fundamental change needed to bring the world rapidly out of the presently onrushing, global breakdown-crisis. The establishing of a network of such treaty-agreements with the U.S., would challenge, and eliminate the present, hyperinflationary, floating-exchange-rate system. A group of nations including the U.S.A., Russia, China, and India, would enable other nations to join as full partners of the new system. That would be sufficient to establish a functioning form of new Bretton Woods monetary system, not in the likeness of the monetarist scheme associated, through policies of the U.S. Truman Administration, with Keynes, but the original 1944 intention of President Franklin Roosevelt.

This would have the moral force of being in service of the Creator's law, and echoes the great 1648 Peace of Westphalia, at a time when the existing, monetarist practice and the promotion of an echo of the Tower of Babel called "Globalization," serves no one as much as the cause of Old Satan.

This poses a series of crucial issues. On that account, we must consider some very relevant history.

### ***The Root of the U.S. Republic***

In order to understand anything crucial about modern European history, it is essential that we emphasize, that what became our United States was a product of the direct impact of the stated policy of Cardinal Nicholas of Cusa upon the celebrated Genoese sea-captain in the Portuguese service, Christopher Columbus. Columbus had, since about A.D. 1480, adopted Cusa's mission of reaching across the oceans, as part of a strategy for rescuing European civilization through reaching across the seas to other parts of the planet. Columbus, who committed himself to this mission, approximately A.D. 1480, later, in A.D. 1492, gained the means needed to put that intention, implicit in Cusa's argument, into effect through the support of Spain's Queen Isabella.

On this account, it is to be emphasized, that this same Cardinal Nicholas of Cusa who had prescribed the modern sovereign nation-state system,<sup>9</sup> and also modern science-driven economy,<sup>10</sup> had also set forth the policy of reaching across oceans to outflank the new peril created by the Venetian oligarchy, a policy introduced by Cusa, which inspired sea-captain Christopher Columbus to cross the Atlantic with preceding scientific certainty of the available success of such an enterprise, as aided by scientific knowledge which Columbus had gained by aid of such Cusa associates as Toscanelli.

It is also to be emphasized, that the purpose, and in net effect, the distinction of the process of colonization which led to the creation of the U.S. republic, was to carry the best of European culture to a place which was a useful distance from the chronic, pro-oligarchical, cultural corruption of "Old Europe," and, thus, to hope, as Cusa had specified, to help bring about the redemption of a corrupted Europe to purposes such as the intentions of the great ecumenical Council of Florence.

Since the time of Columbus' voyages, the leading purpose of the volunteers for trans-Atlantic colonization, was that of taking the best of European culture to a relatively secure distance from the oligarchical forms of corruption which had polluted what were otherwise the best contributions of European culture's science and Classical artistic achievements. All that is good in the U.S.A. since, is chiefly an echo of that sense of a special mission for the settling of what became our United States.

The development of the most successful among the sovereign nation-state republics of the Americas, the United States, has been the leading approximation of Cusa's intention for such a mission. It is this view of the roots of the creation of the U.S. republic, which leads to competent conclusions about the unique accomplishments of the U.S. Constitution; but, it is also the continued reach of the European oligarchy, especially that of the Anglo-Dutch

---

<sup>9</sup> *Concordancia Catholica* (1433).

<sup>10</sup> *De Docta Ignorantia* (1440).

Liberal financier-imperialist interest, which has been the chief cause of every contemptible feature of U.S. history since the rise of the British East India Company's founding of what became the first expression of the imperialism which has been represented by the Anglo-Dutch Liberalism established by Venice's Paolo Sarpi, through to the present day.<sup>11</sup>

The crucial fact in this present world crisis is, that the resulting, specific characteristics of the existing U.S. Federal Constitution, provide for a state-controlled system of credit, rather than an inherently usurious, Liberal form of monetary system. This feature of our Constitutional law, makes the U.S.A. the indispensable keystone for the creation of a system of treaty-agreements among sovereigns united for practice by a treaty with a U.S. whose Constitution and past experience, is as under President Franklin Roosevelt. That feature of the U.S. Constitution is uniquely suited, rather than merely expedient, for the work of quickly recreating the needed new, fixed--exchange-rate, international system of credit, which is required for the organization of a global and durable recovery and progress among the physical economies of nations generally.

Here, in these just-stated historical considerations, lies the demonstrably principled authority underlying the intention of both the U.S. 1776 Declaration of Independence and the authority of natural law expressed by the Preamble of the U.S. Federal Constitution,

### ***Founding a New Credit-System***

Here so far, I have repeated my emphasis on the distinction between the constitutional credit system of the U.S.A. and the dominant role of monetarist systems in modern Europe thus far. At this point, I carry the discussion of that subject a step further.

As I have already emphasized, earlier here, there are two ways, under U.S. law, for regulating currencies and related international economic treaties.

One, which I have described above, is action of the U.S. Treasury Department's uttering of currency/public credit, by authority of the consent of the U.S. Congress.

---

<sup>11</sup> The most common folly of most laymen and even professionals today, is the mechanistic presumption that history is the outcome of percussive-like, Cartesian-like, contemporary transactions among individuals. It is the nature of mankind, as distinct from the beasts, that mankind changes its culture, and transmits the impact of those changes down the line of history into relevant future generations. There are few developments in modern European history which do not reflect the powerfully corrupting influence of the "New Venetian" policy and program of the Paolo Sarpi who deliberately created a new center of European imperial power in the northern Atlantic and Baltic regions of rising maritime power, as the way was cleared for this by the disastrous end of the venture of the Spanish Armada. The very idea of Liberalism is a personal creation of Sarpi, who based this policy on the writings of the medieval irrationalist William of Ockham. The way Europeans infected with Liberalism (e.g., empiricism, positivism, etc.) think and act today, especially in the highest ranks of power, is the work of the hand of Sarpi controlling their minds from the inside still today. All really important thinking today, attacks Liberalism at its actual historical root in the work of Paolo Sarpi.

The other route, as I have also specified above, is through the consent of the U.S. Congress, to relevant international treaty agreements on international uttering of credit.

Thus, the agreement among a group of responsible nations to a nested set of treaties on credit, tariffs, and trade which involve the U.S.A. as a systemic partner with each and all, is sufficient to create something efficiently tantamount to a “New Bretton Woods.” This is the most crucial of the actions expressed as the indispensable role of the U.S.A.’s constitutional system in bringing about an escape from the present brink of a global new dark age.

It must also be recalled that I have emphasized above, that especially under present world conditions, there remains a fundamental difference between the Bretton Woods system prescribed by authority of President Franklin Roosevelt, and the seemingly similar language of the policies of a fixed-exchange-rate system under President Harry S Truman.

President Roosevelt’s intention was the use of the physical economic power, for promotion and expansion of that great mass of productive potential which had been assembled for war, for the post-war freeing of the captive peoples of the British and other empires to become truly developing and sovereign nation-states. Roosevelt’s foreign economic policy was thus directly opposite to that of both the British Empire and that of President Truman.

The deeply regrettable change, was away from the credit system of Roosevelt’s Bretton Woods, to President Truman’s support for a virtually Keynesian monetary system. This change, reflected Truman’s alliance with Winston Churchill’s determination to save the British Empire’s colonial and quasi-colonial privileges, privileges which, despite some alteration in forms, persist, essentially, in substantive effect, as intentionally mass-murderously pro-genocidal policies, against most of Africa, for example, especially since such U.S. policy doctrines of the mid-1970s, to the present day. It was U.S. President Truman’s adoption of British doctrines directly antagonistic to the constitutional intentions of the U.S.A. which can be regarded, soundly, as the opening for all of the new great catastrophes which have afflicted civilization globally since 1945–46.

The return to the affirmation of our historical mission as a nation, as a renewal of the natural intention of law on which our republic was founded, and as this return was the intention of President Franklin Roosevelt, thus, has, for today, the most extraordinary quality of historical importance at this juncture. Truman rode the train in his 1948 campaign for the Presidency, but pulled up the tracks; we must bring back the railroads and restore the tracks, not just inside the Americas, but world-wide.

The most notable illustration of the need for immediate action to this effect, is that the presently accelerating, implicitly hyper-inflationary rate of monetary inflation, is carrying the world as a whole to such a state of chaotic extremity, that reorganization of existing



monetary systems as such, would no longer be feasible. In other words, the action which is now urgent, is the chance that we might avoid the already onrushing risk of a chaotic form of a general breakdown-crisis of all of this planet's present monetary systems. Orderly recovery as I am insisting must be done now, as distinct from reconstructing out of chaos, requires that something simply negotiable remains in the existence of a temporarily shrunken, but essential monetary pot of still-viable credit and currency. In this process, we must transform the world's present monetary systems into credit systems. For that, now, time is rapidly running out.

This proposal for action is not to be seen as a utopian's pipedream; the world's vital interests now depend upon it, and for now, not some distant point ahead. Its effectiveness depends for its practical success on the included recognition and influence of certain universal physical principles which are virtually unknown to the customary practice and teaching of economics among the governments and economists of today. These are principles which are consistent with what President Franklin Roosevelt did, and are most conveniently approximated from existing records, as the design of the American System of political-economy associated with the United States' first Secretary of the Treasury, Alexander Hamilton, and also with the virtually miraculous application of those principles of the American System under the leadership of President Franklin Roosevelt.

For example, to be extremely practical strategically, if a suitable, viable choice of U.S. Presidential nominee were to come clearly in sight by approximately the beginning of September 2008,<sup>12</sup> when the relevant pre-election nominations had, presumably been settled, the required prefatory arrangements for the needed form of cooperation among the U.S.A., Russia, China, India, *et al.*, could be put into motion immediately. In that respect, "sooner" could not be "worse." The choice of the next leading U.S. Presidential candidate must be delimited by this strategically crucial consideration; either find and commit ourselves to election of a candidate of those characteristics, or accept the doom of our republic and its people which failure to make such a selection would now virtually assure.

In the meantime during the Summer months, the U.S.A. in particular, and the world in general, will already be, assuredly, plunging ever more deeply into a worsening a state of ruin, a state of ruin which will be far beyond anything imagined by most leading circles of the world as recently as the close of this past May. The sooner the subjective factor of *a promise of a new credit-system's being organized*, the sooner the present dive into a pool of chaos can be prevented psychologically, and, therefore, the better the chances of avoiding a collapse of even the world at large, a collapse into most extremely calamitous chaos of the

---

<sup>12</sup> Although there is no current evidence that assures us, yet, that one such is about to be chosen. However, we are, indeed, in a time of great, and sudden changes, of one sort or another.

planet as a whole.<sup>13</sup> Considering the nature of the onrushing global and other crises of today, we must remind ourselves that qualified leaders of nations must never, as the proponents of the Lisbon Treaty have done, subject a nation to a sense of hopelessness about its own continued existence, especially a very large, and, therefore, very dangerous nation, or its elites, gone mad.

### *The U.S. Presidency*

Consider the uniqueness of what President Franklin Roosevelt accomplished, in breaking the U.S.A. away from London's, Wall Street-pivoted, political control over that control of the U.S. Federal government which had persisted since the assassination of President William McKinley. What Franklin Roosevelt's election accomplished, was a seeming miracle at that time, but it was no accident.

The birth of what became the American System of political-economy, had begun within the pre-1688 Massachusetts Bay Colony under the leadership of, most notably, the families of the Winthrops and Mathers. It was this "model," typified by the pre-1688 development of the Saugus Iron Works, which was the kernel of inspiration of the young genius Benjamin Franklin himself, his personal development which he contributed to his crucial, personal role in the launching of the so-called "industrial revolution" in England, not the other way around.

Similarly, every regrettable feature of U.S. history has been a reflection of the over-reaching hand of European oligarchism, chiefly that of the Anglo-Dutch Liberal forces of financier oligarchy. The number of U.S. political figures who have accepted honors of British nobility from an imperialist foe of our system, only typifies the hand of corruption reaching into the U.S. political system still today.<sup>14</sup>

---

<sup>13</sup> As history shows, the possibility of a virtual mass-suicide by the will of the dominant classes, as classes, of an entire nation, or even its reigning elites, is not an impossible event under conditions of extreme crisis. The continuation of the war by the Adolf Hitler regime after the successful allied breakthrough in Normandy, is but one example of this. A large portion of the financier-centered castes of the United Kingdom and the U.S.A. has a clear potential for the "shock and awe" against oneself as the people of a nation, which the Hitler regime was enabled to accomplish temporarily, as it did, through the threat of "unconditional surrender" in the concluding months of that war. So, the fraudulent Versailles charge of "sole war guilt" enabled the British and French governments to create the potential and the threat of the Hitler regime in Germany, and so the "Versailles-like" criminality of the provisions imposed upon Germany under the Maastricht Treaty, imposed with the consent of the U.S. President George H.W. Bush whose father, Prescott, had acted, financially, to bring Hitler into power in Germany.

<sup>14</sup> Relations with a United Kingdom as a republic, would be a different matter than the stench created by the active role of former U.S. Vice-President Al Gore, that of a shameless lackey of the imperial British Royal Household, especially that of a Prince Philip whose avowed intention is to bring about a reduction of the world population to less than one-third the present number of persons, a direction of both intention and deeds done, as shared by Al Gore.

So, the intention expressed by the word and practice of President Franklin Roosevelt, as by such as the brave, wise, and good President Abraham Lincoln before his time,<sup>15</sup> is the fact to which relevant leaders in Russia, China, and India, and other nations, should turn their attention in the matter treated in this present report of mine. The point to be stressed, is not that President Roosevelt did extraordinarily good deeds in his time in office; but that what he did to this effect was nothing different than the intention expressed, in opposition to European oligarchism, in the creation of the U.S. republic.

Particular U.S. Presidents, such as the present incumbent, may have been disgusting, as we have been reminded all too often; but, the intention of the U.S. Constitution itself is a different matter. Admittedly, this leads to certain principled questions, questions which carry our discussion into the heart of the matter of the specific subject of this present report: What is principle, that we might place our faith in its efficacy? What is the principle of such relevant quality in the U.S. Federal Constitution? What, actually, is “economic value”?

## II. What Is Economic Value?

In any serious discussion of the history behind the economic policy in Russia today, one must deal with topics expressed in a “special language” which, once spread from Europe into North American settlements, has been customarily used for discussion of the related subject-matters of economic experience and its effects on economic policy-shaping.

This is a “language” which has come to be called “economics,” which was originally codified in its present form, by the British Empire, during the course of both the post-1763 decades of the Eighteenth Century and much of the first half of the Nineteenth Century. It is also the language employed by such disciples of the British East India Company’s Haileybury School as London-trained Karl Marx. In that respect, the practice of most of what was taught as economics in Britain, as that has been echoed in today’s U.S.A., and in the former Soviet Union, was, principally, both an outgrowth of, and, as the case of Marx typifies this, sometimes a reaction against the British East India Company’s late-Eighteenth and Nineteenth centuries’ Haileybury School.

Even people such as Alexander Hamilton warned, on this account, of the need to take into consideration the language of economy employed by the Anglo-Dutch establishment.<sup>16</sup>

---

<sup>15</sup> Compare the dates of the births of President Franklin Roosevelt and General Douglas MacArthur with the cultural impact upon them of the experience of their parents’ and grandparents’ generations, especially the effect of the Civil War.

<sup>16</sup> The history of the development of the systemically usurious, British school of political-economy is essentially Venetian, starting with the role of Francesco Zorzi (*De Harmonia Mundi*, 1525) in the marriage affairs of England’s Henry VIII, through the takeover of the control over the English monarchy of James I by the Venice faction of Paolo Sarpi and such Sarpi agents as Galileo Galilei, as by the school of Rene Descartes and the Paris-

The only significant exception to that program of teaching under the rubric of “economics,” in the known history of mankind, has been what is called “The American System of political-economy,” as that system is commonly identified with what was uttered by the first Treasury Secretary of the United States, the Alexander Hamilton who was murdered, for related reasons, by the British agent, one-time Vice-President of the U.S.A., and practiced duelist, Aaron Burr.<sup>17</sup>

Such arguments as those put forward in the interest of British imperialism, arguments made in the much-soiled name of economics in our relevant university departments, and other places, today, are based, unfortunately, upon monetarist assumptions, derived from the methods of usury developed by modern Venice on the foundations of medieval banking practices of the mid-Fourteenth Century.

The habits associated with those assumptions and practice, “hedge-fund-like” stealing aside, *have no functional correspondence to any useful, physical-economic function*. However, because of the broad influence of the use of the special language of “economics” used as a rationale for the widespread practices and influence of the British empire, they have supplied many otherwise mutually differing bodies of opinion about economy, with what became a common special language of accounting for discussion among representatives of various proposed theories respecting human economic footprints. The consequent discussion proceeded without discovering the physical principle expressed by the actually walking man. Ordinary economists’ practice tells one of certain measurements and certain reportable conditions and events, but tells one virtually nothing of intrinsically physical-scientific interest about *why* an economy behaves as it does over the medium to short-term intervals, and, with some historical limitations, also long-term ones.

---

based Abbé Antonio Conti. Most notable for the British school of the 1790s and beyond, is the case of Giammaria Ortes, whose 1790 work was plagiarized by the Haileybury School’s Thomas Malthus, and who was the actual founder of the modern Malthusianism of such figures as England’s Prince Philip and his virtual lackey and former U.S. Vice-President Al Gore. Ortes had a significant influence on Karl Marx’s own work in economics, despite Marx’s attacks on Malthus otherwise.

<sup>17</sup> See Anton Chaitkin, *Treason in America: From Aaron Burr to Averell Harriman* (New York: New Benjamin Franklin House, 1985), for extensive coverage of the role of Burr. It must be added, that Burr was under the direction of the head of the secret committee of the British Foreign Office, Jeremy Bentham, an utterly depraved creature, as so described by his own published writings; the Bentham who ran key elements of the French Revolution, was also the controller of the Bolivar movement, which was later exposed as a Bentham-directed operation, by Bolivar himself. He was the author of what became known under his personally trained, Foreign Office successor, Lord Palmerston, as the Young Europe organization of Mazzini, and the Young America organization deployed to organize what became the pro-slavery cult known as the London-directed Confederate States of America. Accomplices of Burr included the Andrew Jackson associated both with a treasonous Burr conspiracy and Jackson’s position, as an agent of New York banker, author of the Land Panic of 1837 and U.S. President, Martin Van Buren.

Consequently, as a result of the coopting of Karl Marx by the British Foreign Office, so-called Marxist economics is not only a variety of *British Liberal* economics, as Marx himself often emphasized in describing the fraudulent British utterances of Adam Smith *et al.* as “the only scientific” economic teaching. This development of that British hoax, in the form this experience impacted the further development of Marx’s own political, and general cultural world-outlook, is a teaching which was based, explicitly, on the productions of the British East India Company’s Haileybury School.<sup>18</sup>

Although Karl Marx was pulled back by Frederick Engels, in both of these instances, from both what Engels apparently suspected might be Marx’s attraction to the influence of the American System economists Friedrich List and, later, Henry C. Carey, Marx caved in to Engels’ insistence on a posture of either simply contempt, or hatred toward the American System of political-economy. This is illustrated by study of the case of Engels’s frankly silly, so-called *Anti-Dühring* tract against both Henry C. Carey and Chancellor Bismarck’s reforms.<sup>19</sup>

A comparison of sources in British economics, including those which impacted both Marx, directly, and also most of the certifiable Marxist varieties, shows that a common special language is in use for composing descriptions, not only within each variety of brand-label, but among adversarial views of the sort illustrated by both so-called capitalist and Marxian-

---

<sup>18</sup> Marx’s recruitment involved his assignment to the British Museum under Foreign Office specialist David Urquhart, whose intelligence functions there included his executive role in supervising correspondence among the agents of Palmerston’s agent Mazzini. The same foolish Karl Marx who wrote a book “exposing” Lord Palmerston as an alleged “Russian spy,” nonetheless knew that he, himself, was an agent of the same Mazzini who would, later, promote Marx, publicly, to head what Mazzini had founded as “The First International.” During the period following Palmerston’s downfall at the hand of U.S. President Abraham Lincoln, Marx was essentially dumped by the Foreign Office’s promotion of anarchism, anarcho-syndicalism, and the French disease known as synarchism (also later known as fascism), and died in relative obscurity as a neglected figure from former times. Marx was later resurrected, in a manner of speaking, by his former associate, Frederick Engels. Engels was to play a significant role on behalf of the Fabian Society, in such projects as the recruitment of the Alexander Helphand, a.k.a. “Parvus.” This was the Helphand who served as a life-long agent of the Fabian Society in sundry arms-trafficking and other crafts suited to the promotion of what sometime British arms-trafficker and peddler of revolutions, Helphand, would promote as a doctrine of “permanent warfare, permanent revolution:” the fundamental strategic policy of the British Empire’s Fabian Society crew of former Prime Minister Tony Blair’s time, still today.

<sup>19</sup> During the last years of his life, Carey steered two most notable foreign projects, one in support of the Meiji Restoration’s American System-style economic reforms in Japan, and the other in assisting Chancellor Bismarck in crafting American System-style reforms for Germany. Eugen Dühring was a key intellectual figure among those assembled for the promotion of those Bismarck reforms. In that case, as in Engels’ affinity to the conceptions associated with the Thomas Huxley who virtually created H.G. Wells in a laboratory project, Engels’ polemics were, essentially, scientifically silly, late-empiricist stuff. During the same period, the great Russian scientist D.I. Mendeleev was inspired by the Philadelphia Centennial celebration to persuade the Czar to unleash the great new scientific-industrial revolution in Russia of that time.

socialist advocates. This was continued, with some notable exceptions, into approximately the close of World War II, and beyond.<sup>20</sup>

A full break with the early Nineteenth-Century formalities of that special language of economic argument, began with the establishment of the radical-positivist mathematics cults, rooted, inclusively, on the “Malthusian” principle of the Giammaria Ortes admired by Karl Marx. The present-day mathematics cult, was built up, especially since the rise of so-called “systems analysis” during and following the Second World War, around the kernel taken from Bertrand Russell’s *Principia Mathematica* and typified by the work of such Russell devotees as Professor Norbert Wiener and John von Neumann.<sup>21</sup>

Therefore, when our attention is focused on the formalities of Russian economics thinking today, we must proceed with the awareness that we are dealing with the combined effect of the same tradition of the Haileybury School’s economic categories employed by Marx and, as this has provided the context within which the decadent faction of Bertrand Russell followers have introduced their von Neumann-style, radical departure from any literate notion of economy. We witness that intrinsically chaotic departure reflected among those Soviet, or ex-Marxist economists found among the devotees of the cult of Cambridge Systems Analysis, as met in Laxenburg, Austria.

So, when discussion turns to post-Soviet Russia today, these diverging traditions, their affinities, their incongruities, and their mutual hostilities, must all be taken into account.

### *Geometry & Economics*

That much said as a matter of defining the context of the subject to be clarified in this chapter. The pivotal point to be considered next, is that there is no scientifically valid,

---

<sup>20</sup> The fact that some economists sometimes produce brilliant insights into physical-economic developments, does not contradict my warnings against generally accepted forms of taught academic and comparable doctrines. The power of insight of creative powers of the individual mind, sometimes leads professional economists to insights which their acceptance of some generally accepted economics doctrines would have never generated. One might wish to say, sometimes: “Yes, he is a brilliant economist, but that is only because he violates the accepted rules for which he gained his status as a trained professional.” The case of the late Pobisk Kuznetsov is an appropriate illustration of this point. As an accomplished physicist, he recognized a principle of physical economy, which violated the errant principle of thermodynamics which he defended against the very discovery for which he praised me in economics.

<sup>21</sup> The change in conception of economics can be compared usefully with the shift from the positivist view of mechanics, that of Ernst Mach, to Russell’s categorical shift, during the same decade, from mechanics, to the standpoint of *Principia Mathematica*. It is worthwhile to take into consideration the brutish attacks on the work of Max Planck, by the Berlin and Vienna followers of Ernst Mach, during the period of World War I, and the shift to the more radical attack, led by the followers of Bertrand Russell, during the Solvay Conferences of the 1920s.

principled notion of a conception of “value” in the economics of either Marx or the Haileybury School.<sup>22</sup>

I mean this in the same sense that there is no true notion of intrinsic physical value in the Sophistry of Aristotle or his follower Euclid, or that of their follower, the hoaxster Claudius Ptolemy. A post-Soviet “ideological” debate on economic matters among these varieties, assumes more the form of a debate among advocates of brand-labels, or parodies on the board-game called “Monopoly,” than concern for the substance to which those labels have been sometimes attached by most among today’s sundry varieties of economists. Without a credible and powerful adversary to check their power, the London-led international monetarist interest, as echoed by the followers of former U.S. Federal Reserve Chairman Alan Greenspan, had gone utterly, recklessly mad.

For an example of this type of problem in earlier European history: Aristotle follower Euclid’s *Elements* is premised upon a set of *a-priori* assumptions, assumptions which are demonstrated, in fact, to have no actual physical-scientific basis.<sup>23</sup> Virtually all of the useful geometry prior to the time of Euclid, had been chiefly derived from astronomy, as this is typified by the case of the *Sphaerics* of the Pythagoreans and Plato. For example: the most crucially systemic demonstration of the difference between the method of science and the method of *a-prioristic* description, is the celebrated physical construction of the doubling of the cube, as a matter of an actually physical principle of action, by the strategist Archytas, the celebrated Pythagorean of Tarentum, Italy.

In today’s world, for example, it is commonplace that students, as in secondary schools and universities, or even as full professors in later life, treat matters of scientific principle as they compose their impromptu opinions concerning works of art. They detach issues of scientific principle from customs of conventional opinions about subject-matters in which they have no systematic involvement emotionally. For them, like Sophists generally, what they wish to be caught believing, praising, or deprecating, is the extent of their emotional engagement in the subject on which they express their “hand-waving” opinions. Like all Sophists, for them, truth is not the issue; being “accepted” by whatever circles by whom one wishes to be accepted, is everything. “MySpace mass-psychosis” is only an extreme expression of that misuse of emotions intended to evade the realities of either physical science, or almost anything else real in life’s experience.

---

<sup>22</sup> That distinction is expressed as a principled extension of the actuality that there is no actually physical principle to be found in Euclidean geometry, or the practice of financial accounting.

<sup>23</sup> For example, as I have reported this in earlier locations, my own rejection of Euclidean geometry first occurred on the occasion of my first encounter of this in my secondary school education, when I rejected Euclid on the basis of my observation of the relationship of the physical geometry which optimizes the physical-geometric, dynamic objective of minimum weight and maximal strength of support, which I had previously recognized in my observations made at the Charlestown Navy Yard.

What Archytas' constructive form of action, demonstrates, rather than attempts at deductive duplication of the cube, is the same rejection of quadrature of the circle by the principal founder of the modern form of physical science, the Nicholas of Cusa, who pointed out the fallacy of Archimedes' construction of the circle and parabola. Cusa's is the same principle demonstrated for astronomy by Johannes Kepler, and the principle implicit in Pierre de Fermat's principle of least action (against René Descartes, *et al.*), the unique discovery of what is called properly the "ontologically infinitesimal" of Leibniz's discovery of the calculus, or, by Carl F. Gauss' refutation, as in his doctoral dissertation, of the fallacy of the anti-Leibniz hoax of Leonhard Euler, *et al.*, respecting the Fundamental Theorem of Algebra. This is the same principle which underlies the entirety of the work of Riemann, and of the later work of Albert Einstein: all to be considered afresh, as we are obliged to do so in the aftermath of Riemann's presenting of his 1854 habilitation dissertation.<sup>24</sup>

The useful aspect of some of the content of Euclid's work, is located among those principal theorems of his which represent what he had copied from the already established work of predecessors, theorems thus copied and classified as a compendium in the form they are included, with certain bald sophistries added, as features of the *Elements*. The *a-priori* assumptions presented as definitions, have been demonstrated to have been merely arbitrary by their expression of the essential nature of *a-priori* presumptions, and, when they are presumed to be conceptions underlying actual physical principles, are also wrong in the extreme, as the case of the willful hoaxster Claudius Ptolemy illustrates this point.<sup>25</sup>

Much the same is to be said in speaking about what is generally accepted academically as economics today.

A similar folly is demonstrated by the case of the fellow who, when challenged to identify a physical principle, or related conception, goes to the blackboard, or kindred medium, writes out a set of formulations, and then ends his argument with a gesture to which the credulous

---

<sup>24</sup> Kepler's determination of "equal time, equal area" demonstrates the absence of anything but an ontologically, not spatially, infinitesimal, as a reflection of a universal physical principle of action underlying the phenomenon of gravitation. This notion, as presented by Kepler, was among the two notable challenges by Kepler to "future mathematicians:" the calculus of the infinitesimal (not "infinite series") by Leibniz, and the generalization of the physical notion of elliptical functions by the leading contemporaries of Carl F. Gauss. This same consideration underlies Albert Einstein's view of the work of Kepler, and Einstein's contempt for the systemic fallacy of method expressed by the influence of the followers of Ernst Mach, Bertrand Russell, and Russell's dupes among the representatives of the Cambridge system analysts.

<sup>25</sup> For example: all that Kepler says about Aristotle, in the course of his denouncing the hoax by Claudius Ptolemy, must also be said of Euclid's *Elements*. The implications are made clear by the theological attack on Aristotle by the friend of the Christian Apostle Peter, Philo of Alexandria. Contrary to the doctrinal implications of Aristotle, to the theology embedded in Euclid's *Elements*, and to Claudius Ptolemy's fraud, the Creator did not render Himself impotent through the act of Creation. As one dear friend, a celebrated rabbi of our time, insisted: the Messiah will not return according to something like a train-schedule, but when God chooses.



observers of this performance are intended to respond by uttering “Amen,” or: “Q.E.D.” The alert member of the audience will then be tempted to respond this ritual by rudely pointing out the obvious: “You did not present an actually crucial *physical* experiment!”

Now, that much said in preparation, what does this mean for the student of economics?

### ***Marxian Economics as Such***

*You say that you understand Marxist economics. Then, pray tell me what is wrong with it. Why did the Marxists fail? Why did the chosen replacement fail even more badly?*

To gain insight into the effect of Marxism on the Russian of today, you must understand the peculiarities of the mind of the present-day American, or the western European, who presumes that he, or she is studying the mental life of today’s Russian, when he is actually supplying evidence needed for some crucial, clinical insights into some of the pathologies of his own mental life. Often, amateur and other psychologists, afford us unintended, more and better insight into their own mental disorders than of the mentality of the subjects they pretend to analyze.

Take the illustrative, experimental case of Johannes Kepler’s uniquely original discovery of a universal physical principle of gravitation. First, Kepler proves the existence of the Earth orbit as being generated, physically, according to a principle of equal areas, equal times. Since such an actual orbital pathway can not be actually generated by the method of quadrature which had been mistakenly adopted for the circle and parabola by Archimedes, the cause for the orbit can not be located within the confines of the pathway, but the pathway must be regarded as the adumbrated product of the course determined by some universal physical principle which is not directly perceived by the senses, as this fact is qualified in Kepler’s development of a general principle of Solar gravitation in his *Harmonies*.<sup>26</sup>

That kind of challenge in the field of physical science, is the same to be recognized in the field of human psychology. It is the principle which adumbrates manifest human behavior which is the truth about human behavior, in the same sense that the planetary orbit is the shadow of the principle of gravitation. This view of psychology is of essential importance in treating mass behavior as culturally directed behavior, as in the mass economic behavior which is our underlying subject of discussion here. The fellow who says, “This is my tradition,” or menaces with the assertion, “This is my culture!” or, “This is our culture!” is

---

<sup>26</sup> As Kepler knew, and warned “future mathematicians,” and as mathematicians of Gauss’s time showed, there is a qualitative distinction between the ironies of quadrature posed by the generation of the circle, and the higher order associated with elliptical functions.

revealing more about himself, more about the moral defects in his mind-set, than he would wish to recognize.<sup>27</sup>

The fuller meaning of this was shown by Gottfried Leibniz's uniquely original discovery of the calculus, which was done by a unique method derived from close examination of Kepler's work, and, at a later phase of Leibniz's work, by also considering the relevant implications of the principle of least action traced to Pierre de Fermat: the principle of universal physical least action which Leibniz presented in accord with his collaborator Jean Bernoulli.

The fuller comprehension of this subject-matter was supplied by Albert Einstein's reference to the work of Bernhard Riemann, as showing the relevant deeper implications of Kepler's work for physical science generally, as defining a self-bounded universe, a self-expanding (i.e., *anti-entropic*) universe, which is self-bounded by efficient universal principles akin to Kepler's discovered principle of universal gravitation.

It is the principle which, thus, defines the formula, rather than the merely stated formula defining the efficiently acting substance, the principle. It is the concept, so defined, which points to the efficiently substantive principle.

There is nothing inherently wrong, in and of itself, in employing a method of description, even if the description as such is not actually sound scientifically. It is by discovering proof of what is wrong about hypothetical assumptions based on such descriptions, that an approach to a scientific treatment of the subject has begun. It is when that distinction of substance from shadow is overlooked, that foolish behavior proceeds.

Therefore, if we treat Marxist economics as a system of description used for a customary, coded practice of financial accounting, without believing it is really a science, it can be used as a convenient way of discussing most of the kinds of matters which, formerly, occupied the attention of most of those university graduates in economics who were serious about using their minds, rather than merely passing grades, or awarding of degrees and titles, who used to be able to understand this point, if only in a Kantian or similar fashion.<sup>28</sup> However, although the Marxist competently trained to behave as a Marxist economist (a rare creature in the world of today) may present an honest and useful description of his intention, yet, he does not know actually why the phenomenon he identifies comes into existence. Where knowledge of principle is lacking, desiring to believe fills the vacuum.<sup>29</sup>

---

<sup>27</sup> Typical is the "human nature" can't (or, Kant) of the typical middle- to upper-caste Briton. A Classic illustration of this is the argument of de Moivre, d'Alembert, *et al.*, on which they, and others premised the pathological notion of "imaginary numbers."

<sup>28</sup> It should be recognized, that with the present world crisis, such leniency is no longer tolerable.

<sup>29</sup> What is often proffered as criticism of Karl Marx's work today, especially since developments of 1989, boils down to the simple observation that, since the fall of Soviet power, Marx ceased to be fashionable.

So, in earlier and saner times, before Alan Greenspan, so to speak, the difference between what might be called a theory of Marxist economics and that of any late-Eighteenth-Century or early- through middle-Nineteenth-Century so-called “Classical economist,” could be broadly described as a practical difference in meanings between dialects of a common language. (As we used to say that Americans and Britons are separated from one another by the barrier of a common language.) Thus, an economist working for General Electric in the days, prior to the assassination of U.S. President John F. Kennedy, when “fair trade,” rather than “free trade,” reigned, could conduct exchanges with a Soviet representative, or a German Social-Democrat of the *Kanalarbeiter* school, with no particular, systemic form of difficulty in understanding the subject-matter which they happened to have under their common discussion.<sup>30</sup>

Usually, in fact, all three discussion-partners would have been mistaken, if in differing ways; but, nonetheless, the discussion could be, and often would have been useful, even, perhaps, productive.

Take my own case as a matter of illustrating this point.

Although I was attached to the standpoint of Leibniz from middle to late adolescence, and was, if only implicitly, on the way to what would lead to my adopting Riemann in 1953, the fact is, that during the course of the post-war interval 1946–1953, as in my professional work as a management consultant, my never wavering outlook was that of a loyal admirer of Franklin Roosevelt, and as, therefore, implicitly allied, for patriotic reasons, with the American socialist opponents of President Truman, as against the notorious Senator Joseph McCarthy, and the Senator and later President Richard Nixon. My differences as one among those who could agree with that viewpoint, never prevented me from understanding, or being understood by any of these varieties of professionals with whom I had to deal in the course of my practice. Yet, my own views, especially beginning 1953, were not consistent in any substantive respect, with any among those other types. Yet, in a certain degree, on practical matters of economic analysis and proposals, in those past times we each tended to express an efficiently practical understanding respecting the subject under discussion.

Such is life among sensible professional people of differing persuasions under tolerable circumstances. Today’s circumstances are not tolerable ones. There comes a time and place when and where such comfortable arrangements break down, as now. The prevalent economic practice by the government of the U.S.A. today is no longer even tolerably sane, and, in fact, has not been since the 1970s. Look now at certain among today’s Americans

---

<sup>30</sup> The published collaboration between the late John Kenneth Galbraith and Professor Stanislav Menshikov is a principled example of this.

who might imagine themselves to be looking at today's Russian, while I am actually conducting a clinical assessment of their own behavior and expressed beliefs.

***'For the Want of the Nail...'***

There is a children's rhyme of some pedagogical merit, in the poem which traces the loss of a nail in the horse's shoe, to the loss of that shoe, to the loss of the horse, and, ultimately, "The Kingdom was lost," all for the want of a horseshoe nail. The paradox which I have been outlining here, thus far, partakes of a similar track; but, this is no children's rhyme. It is the reality of the situation which confronts the world in economics today.

What is customarily lacking among relevant officials and professionals today, on this account, is the notion of a physical, rather than financial economy. That is our "horseshoe nail" in this present discussion.

This lack assumes the form of mass-insanity when nations consent to the defense of what is termed "a principle of free trade," since advisors of President Richard Nixon, such as the Chicago School's George Shultz, (that same which was to give us the neo-Hitlerian Pinochet dictatorship in Chile), who had prompted silly Nixon to scrap the Bretton Woods system which had been introduced by President Franklin Roosevelt in 1944. The loss of the essential nail of sanity, a post-1968 loss of cultural sanity, which *a-prioristic* belief in "free trade" has promoted, is "the loss of that little thing," the thing taken from us by the same gang, a loss of an essential principle of competent policy-shaping, a loss which has been the crucial element of mass-insanity ruling more and more of the world, increasingly, since that time. This is the trend which has ruled the international economy of the world, increasingly, producing thus, that step-by-step downward process, since August 1971, leading into the terminal cancer of the world-market system today.

To speak of "little things" here, is to say that as long as money buys what is needed for a person's customary physical quality of life, the difference between the idea of a determining physical factor of value, rather than a value of a monetary process, seems relatively small. Then, as Russians became acutely aware of a collapse in a physical standard of life, more than a monetary one, as under Russia's President Yeltsin, the difference between *physical*, as distinct from money-economy became no small thing.

For example, in the U.S. until very recently, it was virtually impossible to convince a typical American that the U.S. economy had been collapsing physically since a time no later than 1971–1973 (actually since about 1966–67), when, in fact, that economy had been collapsing at a generally accelerating rate over the entire 1971–2008 interval, and now at a rapidly accelerated rate. The wish to believe the popularized myth, was stronger for the typical individual, than even the increasing painfulness of his, or her own experience of reality.

The crucial factor in this, is the systematic, ideological rejection of that concept of physical economy, the concept on which the brilliant and fertile mind of physicist Pobjin Kuznetsov concurred (largely, at least) with me during the course of our association during much of the 1990s. Comparing this with the trans-Atlantic post-1945 experience, the most destructive factor in the potentially fatal loosening of the nail of physical sanity in economy there, had been the factor of existentialism spread by circles such as those of the followers of Theodor Adorno, Hannah Arendt, *et al.*, under the auspices of the essentially pro-fascist, post-World War II Congress for Cultural Freedom. It is a loss of the sense of the physical production of the means for satisfying physical needs, which is the leading factor in fostering the typical insanity about money met in North America and Europe, an insanity of today which emerged gradually, but then faster, since the aftermath of the 1939–1945 war.

I explain.

The principal immediate victims of the brainwashing of the targets of this cultural warfare, which was directed chiefly against the image of U.S. President Franklin Roosevelt, were chiefly typical members of a so-called “white collar” stratum from among World War II military veterans and their wives, especially those whose careers and aspirations to improved welfare made them extremely sensitive to eligibility for security clearances by the U.S. Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) and comparable agencies in the U.S.A. and abroad.

These households were an included target, but the principal target intended was their children, the children of the fear-driven young adults (often the housewife who had not been in military service during the war) of the 1945–1958 interval. It was those children, born to those households, to which the jargon of the 1950s came to refer to as members of families in the social category of “White Collar” and “Organization Man,” children born, chiefly, between 1945 and the time of the 1958 depth of a relatively deep U.S. recession. It is those children born during the 1945–1958 interval, who require special attention when we are assessing the most critical of those moral disorders whose influence on a significant portion of their class, made possible the aftermaths of Spring 1968 in, most emphatically, the Americas and Europe.

### ***The Baby-Boomer Epidemic***

The key to the present, middle-aged “Baby Boomer’s” mental behavior, is the factor of cultural and also moral depravity embedded, as Sophistry, in the victims of such targeted sons and daughters of the returning veterans from their own childhood in the worlds of the 1930s Depression, the 1939–1945 war, and, then, as the victims of the U.S. Truman Presidency with its threat of nuclear and thermonuclear war, which the Truman administration had launched on London’s behalf. It was that experience, which generated

what became the hard core of the depravity to be met among a certain sociological nucleus from among those who expressed the special propensity for “purgative violence” in the Americas and Europe, most notably, beginning the Spring of 1968.<sup>31</sup>

There was no significant element of accident in the timing of that 1968er development. Up to a certain point in the course of the mid-1960s U.S. war in Indo-China, educational deferments from induction into active military service had produced a certain indifference to the reality of the ongoing war among those who regarded themselves as the “intellectually privileged,” as “draft exempt” representatives of their Baby-Boomer generation.<sup>32</sup> These young people, from among those who saw themselves as privileged, saw the others, of the “lower,” “blue collar” social class as those to be considered as suited to serve as cannon-fodder in Southeast Asia, or -wherever events might take them.

However, when the call-ups to military service hit the university strata which had enjoyed a self-esteeming privileged class’s snickering escape from the threat of overseas military service, as later Vice-President Al Gore had done, fear and hatred of the perceived loss of elitist privilege, combined with the triggers of the March 1, 1968 crisis of the U.S. dollar and “Tet Offensive,” became the special detonators of all that was really necessary to detonate the riotous reactions of 1968 and beyond.

If we look more deeply into the minds of those types of 1968er rioters, it was the loss of the credibility of the U.S. dollar, on March 1, 1968 and the effects typified by the “Tet Offensive,” which were the crucial detonators, as I saw them during the Spring 1968 developments and beyond. It was not injustice to them which provoked them; what I witnessed was the “existential” fear prompted among those who regarded themselves as representing a privileged idle class, in their flight from their real, existential fear of actually being dumped into the same pot with the types of the combined, “blue collar” industrial and farmer majority whom they came, more and more, to hate.

The spectacle of President Charles de Gaulle, the greatest French hero of the post-war period, being virtually spat upon on the streets of Paris, is a manifestation of the same process

---

<sup>31</sup> It is this historical fact which I recognized from studies of subjects such as the early 1930s violent Berlin trolley-car general strike, in my writing and publishing my Summer 1968 report on *The New Left, Local Control, and Fascism*. I emphasized the back-and-forth swapping of memberships from the Communist and Nazi parties during that strike as what I recognized as the crucial bit of clinical evidence of the specifically synarchist feature inherent in the “social chemistry” of the relevant portion of the 1968er generation. This was not, however, spontaneous. The visit of Herbert Marcuse to Columbia University campus during relevant events there, is merely typical of the intellectual manipulation which created the echoes of the Berlin trolley-car strike.

<sup>32</sup> Take the illustrative case of current U.S. President George W. Bush, Jr., who escaped combat service during the period of the Vietnam War by the class privilege of assignment to the Texas Air Guard, or, the case of later U.S. Vice-President Al Gore, who avoided military service in a comparable fashion.

expressed in slightly different circumstances. Europe has never recovered culturally, to the present day, from the damage done over the period from the repeatedly attempted assassinations of such as President de Gaulle, the crimes of the assassination of U.S. President John F. Kennedy, and the 1968 assassinations of the Reverend Martin Luther King and Senator Robert Kennedy.

This sociological development of 1968–1971 did not produce the continuing effects which have gripped the U.S.A. and other nations since those times. The kinds of systemic destruction of such pillars of economic and social progress and stability, as that wrecking of the economy and social fabric of our republic continued since President Nixon's folly of 1971 and under the virtual treason of what can be fairly described as the intended, rabid "deconstruction" expressed by the Trilateral Commission during and following the 1977–1981 Carter Administration, have been the drivers of continuing decadence. Such was the intended process of personal and moral deconstruction of selected types of individual figures, chiefly from among the 68ers, who came to embody that synarchist-like immorality of cultural pessimism which has motivated them to destroy every pillar of economic and cultural progress which had been built up in the trans-Atlantic community, and beyond, built up since that 1939–1945 war to defend humanity against what Adolf Hitler had represented.

Any such person who wished to get ahead "in this establishment journalists' world of things as they are," was likely to have become either a founding member of the 68er phenomenon, or has been, or wished to be recruited to its ranks out of sheer, utterly immoral opportunism, or "for the pleasure of the ride." For many among them, a ride on a share in British agent George Soros's ill-gotten gains, will do, for lack of anything else. Under the reign of Obama and Howard Dean funder Soros, the privileged get the dollars; the others get the "change."

The name of the menace to all civilization today, is thus "the Baby Boomer syndrome," as I have summarily outlined its origins and characteristics here.

It is the hysterical denial of this 1945–2008 history of the "Baby Boomer" syndrome, especially by those of this type now dominating the positions of power in government and the private sector, which is key to understanding the way in which the official U.S.A. mass media, and western and central Europe's Liberal mass media view Russia and Russia's history still today. To understand the motive which makes use of the "Baby Boomer" outlook, we must look to the centers of the power of Anglo-Dutch Liberalism, and participation of those U.S. financier interests in the tradition of the British East India Company's traditional "party of treason" inside the U.S. financier-dominated "Establishment."

Therefore, once we have thus discounted the Baby Boomer factor and the London influence over it, we must ask ourselves: what, really, is economic value? What is the reality of the matter?

### III. The Science of Physical Economy

To situate the crucial role of Russia within a “New Bretton Woods” type of agreement under the present, global crisis-conditions, we must look back, most emphatically, to the post-Lord Palmerston characteristics of the setting marked by the combination of the Philadelphia Centennial under U.S. President Grant and the converging U.S.A. relations with Germany, Russia, and Japan (most emphatically). The British monarchy, as an instrument of the neo-Venetian, Anglo-Dutch financier-oligarchical heirs of Paolo Sarpi’s legacy, reacted to these relations of the U.S.A. with rage against what these London-centered circles came to label as a grave, “geopolitical” threat.

The most crucial feature of what the British empire regarded as this threat, was the role of U.S. cooperation in, most emphatically, Germany and Russia, in the development of what were intended to become a system of transcontinental railway systems linking the greater part of the continental territory of Europe and Russia in a manner echoing the U.S. development of its transcontinental railway system. Today, that same perceived threat is revived and extended by, most crucially, the scheduled completion of a Bering Straits railway link of the continent of Eurasia with that of the Americas.<sup>33</sup>

Then, the most notable feature of that relationship between the United States and Russia was epitomized by the role of the great D.I. Mendeleev, who was a crucially important participant in the 1876 Philadelphia Centennial, and the most crucial instrument in forging that scientific-technological development of Russia which was highlighted by, but not restricted to the development of the Trans-Siberian railway.

Through the folly of the Prussian monarchy, over the objections of Chancellor Otto Bismarck, Prussia had continued the war with France after what should have been the primary objective, and conclusion of that war, once the ouster of the British puppet-emperor of France, Napoleon III, by France itself, had been achieved. Thus, through a protected warfare after the proper mission had been accomplished, the Romantically foolish Hohenzollern tribe *et al.*, created an enraged France which would become a British instrument of the *Entente Cordiale*.

---

<sup>33</sup> See *EIR*, May 4, 2007, for proceedings of the April 24, 2007, conference in Moscow on the Bering Strait project.



Thus, Europe fell into the trap of two so-called World Wars, and such evils as the London-crafted Mussolini and Hitler dictatorships. Thus, in such a manner, Britain, echoing its orchestration of the Seven Years' War and the 1763 Peace of Paris, had created the British East India Company's financier-oligarchical empire. Thus, through the foolish Wilhelm II's folly of dumping Bismarck in 1890, Wilhelm embraced the even sillier Habsburg Kaiser in support for that Balkan war which produced the objective, the alliance of Russia against Germany, sought by Wilhelm's uncle, the British Crown Prince Edward Albert (and, later King Edward VII), a development which has kept continental Europe in a state of recurrent destruction since the aftermath of both the dumping of Bismarck and the synarchist style of assassination of France's President Sadi Carnot.

*The British imperial intention* then, in the immediate aftermath of the consolidation of the U.S. victory over Lord Palmerston's Confederacy puppet and the freeing of Mexico from the brutish tyrant Maximilian, was, and remains today, *Britain's geopolitical commitment to the elimination of the threat of a system of truly sovereign, cooperating nations on the continent of Eurasia.*

Today, since 1989, the British imperial objective has included, in addition to attempted financial and political destruction of the U.S.A., the wrecking of the economies of Germany and Russia, and most of continental Europe besides. The included motive is the same: use subversion to ruin the U.S.A. from within, as has been in progress, most notably, since the repeatedly attempted assassinations of France's President Charles de Gaulle, and the actual assassination of President John F. Kennedy: the ruin the already existing and emerging independently sovereign nations of continental Eurasia.

The relevant, contrary, long-ranging, continued strategic interest of our United States, is, as for President Franklin Roosevelt during the course of his life and Presidency during 1939–1945, and remains the promotion of a global system of truly sovereign nation-states, without colonies or semi--colonies, as typified by the U.S. commitment to Germany and Russia from Presidents such as Lincoln and Grant, in the tradition of Secretary of State and President John Quincy Adams. For special reasons, Germany and Russia had special importance for the U.S.A., then, and still, if in a somewhat different form, today.

The fulfilment of that U.S. interest now, requires a shift in the dominant economic policy of the planet, to an alliance among perfectly sovereign credit-systems, away from the kind of monetarist systems which have been deployed from London to cause us to ruin ourselves as we have done so successfully since 1968, and, actually, since the assassination of President John F. Kennedy. The target must include the establishment of a transcontinental railway system which is being upgraded, step by step, from friction-rail to magnetic-levitation systems operating at speeds in the range of propeller-driven aircraft.

These developments in transportation, which depend largely upon rapid development of nuclear-power systems, are essential to enable nations to develop the extraction and reprocessing of raw materials over extended territories, such as northern Russian Eurasia and Africa, sufficient to support what should be adopted as the common aims of a mankind assembled as a body of respectively sovereign nation-states. For this purpose, Russia represents an extraordinary scientific and cultural potential, both in its territory, and its ability as a scientific power, to develop its territory in ways beyond the present capacity of other nations of Eurasia generally. This development, by Russia, is of crucial strategic importance for all its Eurasian neighbors.

Thus, it is fairly said, from quarters within Asia, that the specific quality of Russia's essential role within Eurasia, and Asia most emphatically, is Russia's role in science. This specific quality of Russia's potential is to be seen as inseparable from the fact that its relevance for today, lies, significantly, in the fact that Russian culture is essentially a Eurasian culture. The practical significance of this for today, points to Soviet Russia's contribution to China's development, prior to the break brought about under the Khrushchev who made a crucial shift not only toward London, but, toward Bertrand Russell. Some of the damage that must have been caused in relations between Russia and China has been repaired. Russia's relations with India are well known. Under present crisis-conditions of the world economy, the prospective relations of China, India, and Russia (and other nations) will be indispensable, not only for all of the nations of East and South Asia, but for organizing a recovery of the economy of the world as a whole.<sup>34</sup>

### ***V.I. Vernadsky and His Age***

Long before the work of Russia's Academician V.I. Vernadsky, civilization had already recognized that mankind has experienced three interacting categories of existence: the *pre-biotic*, the *living processes generally*, and *those living processes specific to mankind* which are susceptible of discovery of physical principles, by individual persons, by means of a process through which mankind is enabled to increase the potential relative population-density of our human species, per capita and per square kilometer of the sovereign nation or the planet, as no other known form of life can duplicate this effect. However, there was a lack of the concept of the specific scientific principle on which realization of this potential now depends.

---

<sup>34</sup> Take, for example, the keystone role of cooperation among China, Russia, Mongolia, Korea, and Japan. Note, first, the vital strategic-economic interest of Japan and Korea, in their cooperation as a developmental fulcrum of the region as a whole. Thus, it must not be permitted that anything prevent affirmative cooperation among these nations in their common long-term interests, including the importance of frankly protectionist measures for promoting the general development of the entirety of China's territory, that in ways which are prevented by the typically British, imperialist "free trade" policies dominating international trade today.

With the work of Vernadsky, modern, Twentieth-Century physical chemistry, for the first time, identified the crucially determining distinctions of physical principle among these three categories. Although the development of the exposition needed on this subject is still only a partial one, a mere beginning, some indispensable, preliminary features of those functional distinctions in principle have been settled. Science has been able to show, thus, two fundamental differences of principle which divide existence among three categories: the *abiotic-in-principle*, *Biosphere-in-principle*, and the *Noösphere*.

Although the mere term “Noösphere” was not, itself, original to the work of Vernadsky; the concept of the *Noösphere* as he defined it, was his uniquely original discovery: it is a demonstrable universal physical principle of modern physical chemistry. A competent physical science of economics, is, therefore, a subject-matter specific to his definition of the *Noösphere*. In the modern history of physical science, that principle is a unique type among the domain of those principles defined, equally, as *both universal, and as the universal’s complementary expression as the ontologically infinitesimal*: as this subject was treated, in fact, by those such as Archytas, Plato, Eratosthenes, Nicholas of Cusa, Johannes Kepler, Pierre de Fermat, Gottfried Leibniz, and in Riemannian physical geometry.

The creative principle which defines the uniqueness of the *Noösphere* so defined, is also that principle of the human mind which separates Classical artistic composition and performance from other so-called expressions of art.

Thus, from the vantage-point of this knowledge, the Earth is to be viewed, in functional terms, as composed of these three categorical features, defined such that the mass represented by the Biosphere is increasing relative (anti-entropically) to the mass of the Earth as a whole, while the physical mass represented by that higher order of the *Noösphere* (products which are specific to the effect of the processes of the human mind) is increasing (also anti-entropically), relative to that of the *Biosphere*.

### ***Science Is Essentially Personal***

Fools propose that science must be “objective.” That is a commonplace, but very destructive view of that subject. Science, like Classical artistic composition, is essentially personal, since it is premised upon the creative powers unique to the individual personality. The practice of science in its social expression, must be the interaction among the sovereign creative powers of respective individual, sovereign minds. This social relationship is expressed in the form of one thinker to another: “How did you discover that?”

There are those who argue against this. Their view of so-called “scientific objectivity,” belongs more to the department of autopsy than those qualities of mind which distinguish the human creative individual from the beasts, or bestialized individual men and women.

In matters of science and Classical artistic composition, I can not trust anyone, personally, who thinks differently about such matters.

So, for me, my coming to share in this discovery of the Noösphere, was the outcome of my following a decades-long trail, from my adolescent adoption of Leibniz as my principal mentor in study of science then, through my later recognition of Riemannian *dynamics* as being in no way an expression of today's customary use of the term "thermodynamics" by the modern empiricists and positivists; but, rather, as being the outcome of Leibniz's modern contribution to the revival of the science of the ancient Pythagorean and Platonic notions of *dynamis*.

So, for present-day purposes, *dynamics* has come to be defined implicitly among competent authorities, by the implications of the discoveries by Riemann. This modern view of *dynamics*, as that had been defined by Leibniz, and is to be viewed now from a Riemannian standpoint, has defined my notion of a certain universal physical principle as it is to be expressed in contemporary practice as *a function of potential relative population-density per capita and per square kilometer*.<sup>35</sup>

From the considerations just listed, the notion of a *physical science of economy* is definable for modern civilized practice in broad, but, nonetheless reliable, general terms.

So, for me, it is much better than merely convenient, to examine what I have just written here from the vantage point of what Albert Einstein came to say respecting the combined work of Kepler and Riemann. I must include a repetition of my frequently stated view of modern science, as being what Cardinal Nicholas of Cusa founded, largely by aid from ancient sources, as the modern method now to be traced, as to founding epistemological principles of practice, from Cusa, through Luca Pacioli, Leonardo da Vinci, through their follower Johannes Kepler, and through such as Pierre de Fermat and Gottfried Leibniz.

I have presented the core of this argument itself, in numerous locations published during some previous decades; but, it is essential that it be restated, yet once again, here, as mandatory background, and warning for the reading of what I have to say in this report on urgent issues of economic policy, here and now.

---

<sup>35</sup> This has nothing to do with those notions of "thermodynamics" which are associated with the empiricist presumptions of the reductionists Clausius, Grassmann, Kelvin, *et al.*, or the kindred, Machian conceits of Ludwig Boltzmann, *et al.* The savage attack on Max Planck and his work by the followers of the mystical Ernst Mach during the World War I period in Germany and Austria, and the continuation of this by the followers of Bertrand Russell during the period of the 1920s Solvay conferences, are typical expressions of the sheer nastiness, as much as the epistemological folly of those modern followers of the ancient Olympian Zeus (of Aeschylus' *Prometheus Bound*) who have devoted their professional careers to denying the role of the anti-entropic principle (of "fire") in the discoverable composition of the processes of which the universe is composed.

Competent science, such as a competent knowledge and practice of the science of physical economy, and also what is worthy of the name of Classical artistic composition, are like that.

Human knowledge worthy of the names of what are actually the closely related subject-matters of physical science and Classical artistic composition, can not be competently presented as having begun with certain stated, or implied statements of *a-prioristically* “self-evident” presumptions, such as those of the followers of Aristotle and Euclid, or their follower, Claudius Ptolemy. The categorical, systemic distinction of man from beast, and also the related distinction of perception from knowledge, must be our rule.

*Mankind is distinguished from all beasts, by our species’ manifestation of its unique potential for willfully increasing its own potential relative population-density, as no other living species known to us has been able to manifest this power.* Therefore, no competent science, nor truly Classical mode in artistic composition, could be accessed as to principle, except as we refuse to trace the origins of those specific distinctions of human behavior from either the attributable characteristics of beasts, or, as some radical positivists, such as Bertrand Russell devotee John von Neumann, have done: in the worst extreme, from inanimate processes.

Such issues are properly so treated as I do here. Anyone who thinks differently, is lacking something which is essential to the competent practice of a science of economy. The essence of economy is the quality of creativity through which humanity raises the potential relative population-density of the human species, as no lower form of life can do this. That makes the practice of economy truly a very, very, personal responsibility of the individual for his or her contribution to, hopefully, the present and future of all mankind.

### ***Reason versus Sense-Certainty***

For a short time, it may appear to some that I am now diverging from the previously stated mission of this report as a whole. Not so. It should be understood that what we are doing at this immediate point, is focusing on identifying a specific conception on which any competent science of economy, *and of the application of that science*, depends absolutely. Like many important discoveries of physical principles of nature, a competent grasp of the way in which economies either actually function over the long span, or do not, often depends upon efficient principles which have been usually ignored, as if they did not exist. Sometimes, as in this case at hand, the matter which has been generally overlooked among professional economists and related scholars, might appear to be a tiny matter in the world at large, but, over the longer term, ignoring it would spell broad and enduring disaster, as the world is experiencing just such an onrushing, truly global disaster, now.

Therefore, at this point in this report, I place the emphasis on warning my readers of this matter now, at this moment of crisis in human history. I do this since many among them are

about to become acquainted, from today's global experience, with consequences which reflect, in a unique and indispensable way, the practical significance of my use of the technical term *ontologically infinitesimal*.

I explain this term with the benefit of an extremely relevant reference to a concept which was introduced by Albert Einstein, concerning the highly personal work of both Johannes Kepler and Bernhard Riemann. Einstein's contribution here, was a concept which he termed that of "a finite, but unbounded" universe, a concept which I prefer to identify as that of "finite and self-bounded" universe, that for reasons which I shall soon make clear here. Einstein's effort was that of one striving to sense the viewpoint of the acting Creator of the universe, with great humility, but with a sense that it was his urgent duty not to misunderstand, not to misrepresent the Creator's viewpoint.

The concept, to which I refer, as Einstein did, is the concept of what Gottfried Leibniz presented as the *infinitesimal* of his calculus. On the latter point, respecting that work of Leibniz, I have already, in various published writings, identified the absurdity of Leonhard Euler's simply fraudulent misrepresentation of Leibniz's use of the term "infinitesimal," a fraud which typifies Euler's part in the mid-Eighteenth-Century attacks on Leibniz's calculus, a fraud which had been introduced by the circles of the Paris-based, Venetian Abbé Antonio Conti, such as Voltaire, Abraham de Moivre, d'Alembert, Euler, *et al.*

The most appropriate proof in this matter proceeds from the two famous, successive accomplishments by Johannes Kepler in the course of his uniquely original discovery of the universal physical principle of gravitation. I refer to those, again, here: this time for a fresh purpose. The first, the discovery of the characteristic of the Earth's orbiting of the Sun, as in his *The New Astronomy*, and the second, the development of the general principal of gravitation within the Solar system, in his *Harmonies*.<sup>36</sup> I limit my account here to the essentials of the matter bearing on the subject-matter of a science of physical economy. I frequently repeat myself in the following summary, that for reasons which should require no explanation.

The unique quality of beauty of his mind in those and related works, is that he grasps the essence of the point I have just emphasized above: competent science, when its subject is the role of human creativity within it, is intensely personal. This is outstanding in Kepler's work, pronounced in Leibniz, concealed, but resonant, in the work of Gauss, opens up again with Bernhard Riemann, and gains loving expression again in the reflections of Albert Einstein during the last four decades of his life.

---

<sup>36</sup> See the LaRouche Youth Movement (LYM) website documentation of its team's reliving of the process of these discoveries by Kepler ([*link to come—ed.*]).

After all, anything which bears upon the uniqueness of the aroused creative powers of the individual human mind, promotes the soul to shout “Eureka!” in one way or another, and is expressed with an intensified moment of playfulness of a certain free-spirited kind, or it is not creative at all. Science and art are not for grim gravediggers.

Thus, in the first instance, once Kepler had gone through the successive steps by which he crafted his work showing the Earth’s elliptical orbiting of the Sun, in *The New Astronomy*, his measurements showed that this orbit was ordered by a principle of action whose effect he described as “equal areas, equal times.” *This evidence already demonstrated, in itself, the absurdity of the presumption that the orbit could have been determined by an ordering of that elliptical pathway which is congruent with Archimedes’ mistaken quadrature of the circle.*<sup>37</sup> This, by itself, exposed the virtually childish absurdity of Euler’s joining the previously stated, silly argument (for the “imaginary”) copied from de Moivre’s and d’Alembert’s specious attack on the infinitesimal of the Leibniz calculus (as “imaginary”).

This set of considerations leads, in the second instance, from that point, through the development of the general measurement for gravitation within the Solar System, to the notion which Leibniz was to define later, as the role of *the ontologically infinitesimal*, rather than *a simply geometrical infinitesimal*, a notion which Leibniz crafted in accord with the prompting from the work of Kepler. The measurement of the crucial phenomena, in this matter, requires two measurements, one according to the principle of *the sense of sight*, the second according to what Max Planck implicitly emphasized, contrary to the apostles of Ernst Mach, and contrary to the devotees of Bertrand Russell later, as the systemically contrary notion of dynamics expressed by the function of hearing, rather than mechanics.<sup>38</sup>

The two measurements, combined, created an image in the mind of Kepler and other scientists, like the argument by Fermat and by Leibniz, both of whom followed Kepler in this method: an image-like conception entirely outside the domain of naive sense-perception as such. In this way, Kepler, as a follower of Nicholas of Cusa, took any competent science after him entirely out of the domain of Euclidean *a-prioristic* presumptions, rightly downgrading sense-perception to the status of instrument-readings, rather than naive sense-certainties. By adopting the systemically, mutually contradictory “instrument-readings” of sight and musical sound, a reading of the evidence, by Kepler, which made ridiculous the later effort by many to substitute Titius-Bode for Kepler’s own work on the organization of the planetary orbits.

---

<sup>37</sup> The discovery of the calculus and the exploration of physical functions of an elliptical form, were two tasks which Kepler had referred to the work of future mathematicians. The first was solved by Leibniz; the second, among Gauss and his relevant contemporaries.

<sup>38</sup> See Bernhard Riemann, “Mechanik des Ohres,” *Werke*, pp. 339–359.

The still deeper implications were made clearer by Einstein's presentation of the argument, such that when we introduce the relevance of Bernhard Riemann's work for its bearing on the work of Kepler and Kepler's legacy, it becomes clear that, in terms of demonstrable universal physical principles, our universe is intrinsically *finite and self-bounded* by principles such as the uniquely original discovery, by Kepler, of the role of gravitation in the organization of the Solar System.

*How could that which is universal become "visible" to the senses, except as it changes? Did the Creator render Himself impotent by Creation of a universe? If the change is not anti-entropic, then it may be made visible, if only to memory, in terms of the change to becoming less than before; but, otherwise, it can be made visible only if the change was to something which never was before, as if the universe were ordered anti-entropically, as a finite, self-developing universe, an expanding process of continuing, universal creation.*

The latter quality of change to a higher order of existence, is a definition of creativity (i.e., anti-entropy), such as human scientific creativity in discovery of universal physical principles, and their applications, an action of discovery on which increase of the potential relative population-density of a culture depends in practice.

The fact is, that a discovery, such as Kepler's uniquely original discovery of universal gravitation, could be made only by a sovereign individual mind, an experience which can be made known by others in no way but as the replication of the process of an experimentally demonstrable discovery by another individual mind. This notion of an individual human person's creativity, is the key for unlocking the door to the apparent mystery of the Leibniz *ontological infinitesimal*. This leads us to unlocking the apparent mysteries of the Biosphere and Noösphere. This leads us to what some might otherwise regard as the mystery of the science of physical economy.

### ***How Man Sees His Universe***

What, then, is the required design of an experiment, which shows the way in which human creativity can be demonstrated, not only as an efficient source of increase of human potential relative population-density, per capita and per square kilometer of the Earth's surface, but as creativity has just been defined in our progress in this report thus far?

For this purpose, let us, first, take the case of qualitative steps of incremental process sometimes named an increase of what has been termed, since the closing decades of our preceding century, as "energy-flux density," as stepwise progress from burning of wood, charcoal, coal, coke, nuclear fission, and thermonuclear fusion, typifies a case of a prompting of qualitative leaps in potential human productivity, as per capita and per square centimeter cross-section of the ongoing energetic process.



The problem which this conception presents for some scientifically trained specialists, lies in their conditioned adherence to a reductionist, virtually Cartesian misconception of physical scientific principles: the misconception associated with the notion of particles which happen to be in motion, for what should be the obvious reality, that nothing exists except as if it were in motion.

The general principle of progress, is that a discovery of a valid universal principle, leads to applications which increase the productivity of mankind by *a significantly greater amount of net gain* than the cost incurred by the discovery and investment in its application. This leads to a relevant increase in capital-intensity, both of the investment itself, and in the course of its use; but, the gain realized, when these investments are properly applied, is, and must be, rather soon, greater than the sum total of the combined direct, and indirect costs of the investment itself.

This is *a physical concept* of an act of creativity, a concept which, for reasons just stated, could not be competently represented functionally in terms of ordinary financial accounting, nor by any Cartesian, or kindred methods, nor stated in terms of existing financial systems or prevalent economic dogma.

In the first approximation, but only first approximation, we should consider only the increase in energy-flux density of the source of power supplied to the process, for, in this case, in first approximation, the assumption that the process is not changed otherwise.

To express this quality of effect in another way: as “any increase in productivity obtained at a physical cost which is, after the fact, in principle, less, in net effects, than the physical cost of making and maintaining that change.”

Let us now combine the two notions just presented under the rubric of “cases of benefits derived from increases in capital intensity.”

Now, combine the two, as combined increases in energy-flux density with the margins of benefit derived, in the same case, from general increases in capital intensity.

Let us add another qualifying consideration. So far, we have considered benefits expressed in the form of inputs to the productive, or comparable process. Now, let us include all margins of quantifiable benefit afforded to the consumer by means which require increasing the capital-intensity of the productive, or related process.

Now, gather these and related kinds of parameters within the dynamic process of an appropriate Riemannian manifold. Consider the following, “rule of thumb” form of descriptions.

Then, map the process so outlined for those aspects which are products of changes which had been made, from some earlier dynamic state, an outcome which were affected through applied discoveries of universal physical principle.

Now, consider another track. Consider some relatively simple illustrations.

Normalize the rate of solar radiation impinging on the planet; employ a normalized spectrum. Do this for the purpose of defining a standard scale of physical-economic reference for human life on Earth.

Consider solar radiation and water. How is the relationship between the two to be enhanced? Now consider moving large masses of water about, to increase the “green cover” of the planet’s surface, thus increasing the biomass of regions of the planet per capita and per square kilometer, and producing a moderating effect on weather-patterns, and increasing the relevant biomass, rather than merely heating up the atmosphere by not taking such measures. Combine this with the increased development of supply and development of sources of controlled power of generally increased energy-flux density. *(Never commit the wicked prank of degrading a product of living processes, generally, as by reliance on so-called “bio-fuels,” into the contrary direction of transforming living processes into dead ones. The goals of economy in our Noösphere, must be the triumph of life, especially human life, over non-life, and of the creative powers of the human being, over the bestial.)*

Now, consider combining the benefits of increase of energy-flux density, with the adjustment of the relationship between use of impinging Solar radiation and water resources, to enhance green cover.<sup>39</sup>

In all of these illustrative images which I have just presented, there is a commonly underlying coherence with the same principle of discovery of universal physical principles which is illustrated by the referenced case of Kepler’s discoveries. Moreover, all competent discovery is, in its net effect, coherent with that principle of (for example) modern European science introduced by Nicholas of Cusa and reflected in what I have described as typical of the discoveries of Kepler. All of the illustrations I have just written here converge on a Riemannian quality of manifold, not a Euclidean, nor Cartesian, nor any other reductionist method.

The immediately preceding points of illustration bring us to the matter of the relevant systemic errors, over about a century and a half, of the so-called “orthodox” Marxist economists. The problem to be considered is lodged in the intrinsically reductionist fallacy of the so-called “labor theory of value,” a fallacy which Karl Marx derived, chiefly, from the

---

<sup>39</sup> Including margins of quantifiable benefit afforded the consumer by means which require increasing the capital-intensity of the productive, or related process.

British environment in which his systematic views on modern economic processes were shaped by Urquhart and the circles of the Haileybury School tradition, that during about two decades of Marx's life there.

It was this same flaw, which Marx came to share with the Haileybury School whose works he studied, which was employed by the marginal utilitarians as a pretext for the utter nonsense which they produced. It was a relatively short step from the marginal utilitarians, to the Romantic follies of the positivist Ernst Mach, and, then, to the utter lunacy of the followers of Bertrand Russell, such as Norbert Wiener, John von Neumann, and their devotees of today, such as the forecasters in the likeness of the LTCM of 1998 notoriety.

*It is the creative powers of the individual human mind which generate all the true increase in wealth produced by mankind, that in mankind's essential physical expression as the Noösphere.* These are the same creative powers, expressed by the work of such as Kepler and Leibniz, expressed by physical science in that tradition. These are also expressed in what may be identified as the "social theory" which is the implicitly governing principle of strictly Classical modes of artistic creativity, as the latter influence was identified by Percy B. Shelley in his *A Defence of Poetry*: the increase of "the power of imparting profound and impassioned conceptions of man and nature." There is no true science, nor true Classical art without such artistic passion.

So much as a matter of broadly stated introduction to what we must now address as the kernel of the matter.

### ***The Noëtic Principle***

The considerations which I have sought to illustrate roughly by aid of the preceding illustrations of a point about the principles of physical economy, all converge on two interdependent facts about the individual member of the human species, facts which each bear implicitly upon V.I. Vernadsky's Riemannian, physical-chemical definition of the Noösphere. First, that no animal species known, is capable of that function of creativity which is typical of the distinction of the human species from all others. Second, although creativity can be echoed, as if broadcast, from one human mind to another, all acts of creativity occur only within the sovereign powers of the relevant individual mind. We can, and must stimulate the creative activity of the other's mind; but, there are no available, "wired connections."

Both considerations force attention to the fact that, contrary to modern Sophists such as Clausius, Grassmann, Kelvin, Boltzmann, *et al.*, entropy is not a law of the universe; the universe is *intrinsically anti-entropic*: e.g., *creative*.

Yet, paradoxically, the manifest human creative function is located as an activity associated with the individual human brain, although no known animal brain has been discovered to be capable of species-anti-entropic creative powers. Yet, the development of the Solar System from an isolated “young Sun,” is a reflection of a creative process. The suggested implication is, that the universe as a whole is creative, but many of its products are not creative when the relevant experiment is designed, by use of a fallacy of composition, as in and of itself, in a reductionist mode, rather than a truly dynamic one. The increase of the relative mass of the Earth’s Noösphere, relative to the Biosphere, and the Biosphere relative to the abiotic portion of the matter, calls our attention to such matters.

This is a matter which I have addressed, sometimes at significant length, earlier.<sup>40</sup>

I recapitulate some relevant essentials here. Science is history, and history is also science. For an example of this we have the following.

### ***A History of Imperialism***

We know, that the currently prevalent dogma of taught thermodynamics, is a reflection of the same ancient oligarchical principle portrayed in the famous *Prometheus Bound* of Aeschylus.

What Aeschylus portrayed, thus, is otherwise known in ancient through modern European and West Asian tradition as *the oligarchical principle*. The known origin of that tradition is traced back to as far as ancient Babylon and its priesthood. It was continued beyond the fall of the power of Babylon by the Babylonian priesthood’s role in other Asian dynastic systems, and was the proposal for a two-empire, Asian and European system, during the period following the collapse of Athens in the aftermath of the Peloponnesian War. The essential distinction between the two, was that the Asian version was derived, at least proximately, from what had become a land-based culture, whereas the western part, such as that of ancient Egypt,<sup>41</sup> was based, directly, on a Mediterranean-centered maritime culture. The British empire, for example, is an offshoot of successive evolutions of the western mode in empire, beginning with the Roman Empire established by that pact, struck on the Isle of Capri, between Augustus Caesar and the priests of the cult of Mithra.

The imperial model, otherwise best identified as the oligarchical model, is premised on the intention of preventing the natural creative powers of the human individual from coming to fruit in such a fashion that what might be termed “the lower classes of society” might not

---

<sup>40</sup> Cf. Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr., “Vernadsky & Dirichlet’s Principle,” *EIR*, June 3, 2005.

<sup>41</sup> Contrary to the foolish fad of an “hydraulic” society, civilization, as in the case of Egypt, moved upstream, from the oceans, not down-stream. Astronomy as a product of transoceanic navigation and related developments, attests to this.

continue to submit to the overlordship of a ruling class. In other words, the Olympian model of oligarchy which is presented as the principle of evil in Aeschylus' *Prometheus Bound*.

In the oligarchical model, as from the founding of the Roman Empire through the Anglo-Dutch Liberal financier oligarchy of today, the general population of society, and of the societies ruled by an imperial tradition (e.g., the Olympus of *Prometheus Bound*), is "managed" *through maintaining pro-genocidal limits on the growth of the general population*, opposing scientific and technological progress, by vulgarizing popular culture, and by preventing knowledge of the actual universal principles on which mankind's rule over nature depends: in short, the evil, pro-genocidal, neo-malthusian policies of the Hitler regime and of the World Wildlife Fund of Britain's Prince Philip and his lackey, former U.S. Vice-President Al Gore.

In modern European society, this legacy of the mythical Olympian Zeus, means a policy of limiting knowledge of scientific principles to a small, tightly controlled scientific elite, which is usually of the intellectually castrated variety, thus incapable of expressing genuine, carnal knowledge of the role of universal principles in science, but, chiefly, only mathematical formulas as substitutes for reality.

The most significant modern expression of that kind of oligarchical rule, is what is most accurately identified as the Anglo-Dutch Liberalism institutionalized through the "New Venice" faction of Paolo Sarpi. The distinction of Sarpi may be fairly summed up by stating that the most essential of the keys to Sarpi's reforms, is that he dumped the Aristotle whose barren doctrines had been the principal method of oligarchical "brain-washing" of European culture in earlier times, as replaced by the new form of oligarchical brain-washing, called Anglo-Dutch Liberalism, the so-called Liberal philosophy launched by Sarpi, and based on the medieval irrationalism of the William of Ockham whose lunacy is the central feature of modern logical-positivist dogmas.

The new form of empire which emerged from the leadership of Paolo Sarpi, is what is called the Anglo-Dutch Liberal model. This Anglo-Dutch Liberal model is based on the ruling authority of an otherwise anarchic class of financiers in the tradition of Venetian usury, neo-Venetian usurers following the Liberal traditions of Sarpi. Sarpi launched that swarm of financiers who constitute the essential core of the imperial power of the present Anglo-Dutch Liberal imperialism nominally centered in London, as expressed typically in the imperial power of the post-1973 petroleum "spot market."

The leading opponent of that form of Anglo-Dutch Liberal imperialism which assumed the form of an imperial power of the then British East India Company, with the 1763 Peace of Paris, was the American faction generated, chiefly, by such leaders of the Seventeenth-

Century, English American colonies as the Massachusetts Bay Colony of the Winthrops, Mathers, and their principal intellectual heir, Benjamin Franklin.

Through that relative isolation of the young United States constitutional republic from its former European friends and sympathizers, which began with the British Foreign Office's orchestration of the siege of the Bastille by "Philippe Égalité," the Jacobin Terror, and tyranny of Napoleon Bonaparte, the U.S. emerged from the effects of the 1814–1815 Congress of Vienna as largely an isolated and embattled republic. This relative isolation was continued until it was broken by the victory of the U.S. over the combined British, French and Spanish forces deployed against the U.S.A. and Mexico by Lord Palmerston's British Empire, together with London's creature the treasonous Confederate States of America, against both the U.S.A. and Mexico.

Since the U.S. victory over Palmerston's efforts, world history has centered around the continued conflict between two leading English-speaking powers, the United States against the British Empire of Anglo-Dutch Liberal interests in the cultural and political, imperial "free trade" tradition of the financier-oligarchical Liberalism of Paolo Sarpi.

Since then, all other politics of the world since the occasion of the February 1763 Peace of Paris, have pivoted upon a dependency on the issues separating the two leading groups of English-speaking powers, the U.S.A. versus Anglo-Dutch financier-imperial Liberalism. This balance of power between the two leading, English-speaking powers, has been not only a conflict between two territories in the world; it has also been a conflict between the patriots and Liberal Tories within the United States. An Anglo-Dutch Liberal hatred of the kind of prosperity ensured by the global influence of the American System of political-economy.

However, do not forget, that the actual happiness of the British Isles' "normal people" was not a pleasing prospect for a royal financier oligarchy in the tradition of Venice's Paolo Sarpi and his northern European maritime region's ambitious followers of Sarpi's "New Venice" policy.

### *Truman, Unfortunately*

This depraved, pro-oligarchical intention by President Truman to which I referred above, was spoiled by the Soviet Union's unexpectedly early development of a nuclear-weapons capability, a development which spoiled the publicly declared intention by British imperialism's Bertrand Russell to launch a so-called "preventive" nuclear assault on the Soviet Union, on the assumption the Soviet Union would not possess a military-nuclear capability at that time.<sup>42</sup> This cleared the way for the election of the immensely popular

---

<sup>42</sup> The significance of this Soviet development of nuclear weapons, is not properly recognized until it is noted that the Soviet development of an Anglo-American mode in such weaponry was, reportedly, the result of

General Dwight Eisenhower, who delivered significant set-backs to the British war-hawks and their U.S. likenesses.

However, after Stalin's death, his successor, Nikita Khrushchev, entered into an arrangement with the British circles of the same Bertrand Russell who had echoed the policies of Russell's deceased political confederate, "futurologist" H.G. Wells, with Russell's own, earlier nuclear saber-rattling.<sup>43</sup> Khrushchev's launching of the "Cuba missiles-crisis" was an integral feature of the same operation which launched repeated assassination-attempts against France's President Charles de Gaulle and others during the span of the 1961–1968 interval, including that of President John F. Kennedy. The launching of the U.S. fraudulently launched war in Indo-China and the 1967–1968 monetary crisis triggered by Britain's Prime Minister at that time, ended the continued influence of the policies of real physical-economic growth which had still been U.S. policy over the post-Franklin Roosevelt, 1945–1967 interval.

The emblematic, strategic features of this time were the continuation of the Indo-China war, the economically counter-revolutionary rampage of the "anti-blue collar" 68ers, and the break-up of the Bretton Woods agreements by the administration of pro-fascist President Richard Nixon. The British-Saudi orchestration of the oil-shortage hoax of the 1970s, which established the Anglo-Dutch "spot market" as a virtual replacement for the earlier pace-setting role of the U.S. dollar, when combined with the Trilateral Commission-steered destruction of the essential features of the U.S. physical economy, wrecked the U.S.A., and cleared the way for what has become the post-1987, inflationary destruction of the U.S. dollar and, later of its associated physical economy under the incumbency of U.S. Federal Reserve Chairman Alan Greenspan.

The result of this trend in the rise of Anglo-Dutch Liberal power, at the expense of, most notably, an increasingly ruined U.S. economy, has been a resurgence of nothing other than the old British Empire in unwashed, but newly pressed old rags of a past imperial glory. This is a development better described as resurgence of the power of Anglo-Dutch Liberal financier interests, that now in a form echoing the Fourteenth-Century conditions and trends leading into the "New Dark Age" of Europe's Fourteenth Century.

---

Stalin's decision to test a U.S.-like type, rather than the already developed Soviet type, so that a failure of the test could be blamed on a flaw in the copying of the U.S. type, rather than the Soviet type.

<sup>43</sup> The sometime avowed fascist, H.G. Wells of *The Open Conspiracy* and *Things To Come*, and of the H.G. Wells Society loose inside today's U.S.A., was originally a youthful protege of the nasty Thomas Huxley of sundry Nineteenth-Century notorieties and later a leader of the followers of Cecil Rhodes in preparing the way for launching of what became known as World War I. It was the death of Wells which bequeathed to Russell the authorship of the fascist, post-World War II scheme for a "preventive" nuclear-weapons attack on the Soviet Union, that for the purpose of establishing "world government." Russell gave up the advocacy of such a nuclear assault on the U.S.S.R., when it was discovered that the Soviet Union had also developed a nuclear-weapons capability of its own.

Sometimes, even sophisticated people are astonished by my insistence, that the only true empire of the world today is the Anglo-Dutch Liberal empire set into motion, as the new model of Venetian empire, by Paolo Sarpi. That astonishment reflects a lack of sufficient attention to the true distinction of human beings from the beasts. I explain this extraordinarily important point.

### ***The Effects of Cultural Stagnation***

The crucial point is the distinction of the Noösphere from the Biosphere. The aspect of this distinction on which to focus at this point in the report, is the fact that lower species of life have relatively fixed levels of potential relative population-density, relative to their environment and its current condition; whereas, the cognitive powers unique to the human species, are the source of a voluntary power of the human species, a power to change its potential relative population-density, upward, as no other species can do this. This reflects a specific power of the human mind which does not exist in the animal brain.

Thus, speaking strictly, although mankind can attribute a history to the existence of an animal species, no animal species can attribute such a voluntary history to itself. Man is thus fairly described as a distinctly historical species.

Thus, patterns of principled kinds of policies transmitted over successive generations, act like the *a-priori* forms of axioms and postulates attributed to a formal geometry, to such effect that seeming traditions of a certain society during a certain time impose what are effectively ideas generated in the past, acting upon several of more, successive, later generations. In that specific sense, the very wicked Mr. Paolo Sarpi is very much alive, as a willful agency today; only his human body is dead.

This fact of historical man, as distinct from animal species, has been the principal source of my uniquely successful history as a long-range forecaster over more than four decades. That is to say, that day to day decisions, even innovations, have only a very limited influence over history in the longer term, for as long as certain relevant, principled types of policies, policies of a type which characterize a cultural mind-set, remain in effect. Other kinds of decisions have only a relatively minor, temporary effect in shaping the direction of a society's movement into its future. The principal, axiomatic-like assumptions of belief associated with the existing social system prevail, until some breakdown or equivalent change in the course of history intervenes to change the course of history.

Thus, to understand the Anglo-Dutch Liberal system of imperial tyranny which menaces world civilization today, you must understand that the legacy of Paolo Sarpi still reigns. Think of adopted "axioms," such as the arbitrary axiom of "free trade," as akin, in its functional effect on human behavior, to genetics in the design of an animal species. The



imperialist Liberals of today are, as a social class, a species with the “genetic” characteristics transmitted from Paolo Sarpi. To understand them, you must first study the case of their “genetic” ancestor, one like the Grand Inquisitor of Dostoyevsky’s novel, the evil, virtually Satanic, Paolo Sarpi.

### ***The Choice Before Nations***

Thus, the only competent economic policy of any nation, or for the world as a whole, is what is loosely described as a “science-driver” policy for both sovereign nations and the world community at large. All of the principal evils known as the cause for failure of nations and peoples, are expressions of either a neglect of that policy, or, worse, commitment to uproot it, such as that of modern Malthusians from Malthus through genocidalists such as Adolf Hitler’s regime, or today’s former Vice-President Al Gore today.

Thus, the efforts to defend humanity from brutish systems of government and conventions, during the interval from the accession of William of Orange to power in England, as the virus which was the cultural legacy of Paolo Sarpi’s neo-Venetian Liberalism, settled upon its new geographical, Anglo-Dutch nesting-places, and consolidated the outcome of this as the habit more or less securely established in most of Europe by the post-Seven Years’ War, February 1763 Peace of Paris.

There had been several qualitative steps leading into this and ensuing results since the cultural disaster of the expulsion of the Jews from Spain by the Grand Inquisitor, Tomas de Torquemada, acting in concert with the takeover of the Spanish monarchy by the Habsburg interest. The impact of a subsequent, parallel change from the reign of Henry VII to Henry VIII in England, engineered by leading Venetian intelligence official and impromptu marriage-counsellor to Henry VIII Francesco Zorzi, had been a keystone for a plague of religious warfare in Europe which persisted as a trend from 1492 until those actions of Cardinal Mazarin which triggered the 1648 Peace of Westphalia.<sup>44</sup>

In the midst of this 1492–1648 interval, Paolo Sarpi had risen to prominence as the leader of a faction of reform for a significant portion of the Venetian oligarchy. This did not mean that Sarpi was devoted to a peace of faiths; the best evidence is that he sought what became, in effect, the Thirty Years’ War of 1618–1648. Sarpi was not motivated by desire for peace; his concern was the inability of Venice, under its pre-existing social policies, to suppress the political-economic legacy of such as Nicholas of Cusa, Louis XI’s France, and England’s Henry VII. The economic, scientific, and social reforms unleashed by Cusa *et al.* in the great ecumenical Council of Florence, had produced a science-oriented, urban, city-centered

---

<sup>44</sup> Mazarin had been the Papacy’s chief agent in the efforts to bring about peace between France and Spain. He continued that assigned function with his movement into France, where he succeeded the authority held by Cardinal Richelieu.

culture, which the massed forces of the Habsburg interests could not suppress as long as they clung to radically Olympian, Aristotelean dogma respecting social-technological practice.<sup>45</sup>

Sarpi's policy was one of seeking to maintain Venice's power as a finance-imperialist interest, by adapting to, and working to corrupt the scientific-technical changes in European culture, rather than fighting against them. Therefore, the keystone of Sarpi's policy had been what is known today as Anglo-Dutch Liberalism. For this, Sarpi needed an ideological lever, which he found in his revival of the irrationalist ideology of a notorious medieval figure, William of Ockham. This substitution of Ockham for Aristotle, by Sarpi and Sarpi's lackey Galileo, and Sarpi follower Thomas Hobbes, became the core of the Anglo-Dutch Liberal dogma adopted and spread by the emerging Anglo-Dutch imperialism of the Netherlands and Britain. The case of the virtual "stuffed dummy," of the circles of Antonio Conti and Robert Hooke, Isaac Newton, is the typification of the philosophical world-outlook of a modern British culture embodying the living spirit which had occupied the former mortal figure of Sarpi.<sup>46</sup>

### *What Was Isaac Newton?*

The origin of what became the cult of Isaac Newton, is traced chiefly to Sarpi's lackey Galileo, who used his access to some of Kepler's work through Kepler's correspondence on music with Galileo's father. Galileo, in his other role as Sarpi's ideological lackey, produced a series of hoaxes which became his alleged accomplishments in science. Later, Galileo's model was employed by his English followers to copy and reify relevant published writings by Kepler, to fabricate a mangled and fraudulent attribution of the discovery of gravitation to a science-incompetent figurehead, Isaac "Open the Window" Newton.<sup>47</sup>

---

<sup>45</sup> Consider the opinion of a close friend of the martyred Christian Apostle Peter, the Jewish rabbi Philo of Alexandria, against the doctrine attributed to Aristotle. Aristotle had defined a God rendered impotent by the attributed "perfection" of his Creation, thus leaving Satan free to roam. The point is, that what was created was an anti-entropic, inherently creative universe. The argument against which Philo, among Christians and others, complained is to be recognized as that of the evil Olympian Zeus of Aeschylus' *Prometheus Bound*, the satanic Zeus on whom the worship of Malthus and Prince Philip's batty World Wildlife Fund is premised.

<sup>46</sup> Whereas, the actual and unique establishment of the calculus had been published by Gottfried Leibniz, before his leaving Paris, in 1676, the later claims of Isaac Newton's keepers rested upon the claim that Newton had already made the discovery, but had neglected to publish it. The explanation proffered by the keepers of the Newton cult, was that the original discovery was to be found in Newton's chest of scientific papers, which, it was explained, had been mysteriously misplaced. Said chest finally appeared in the Twentieth Century. The celebrated John Maynard Keynes was entrusted with examining the contents. A Keynes horrified by the mass of black magic and similar materials contained within the chest, proposed publicly that it be shut tight, and never opened again. In fact, no actual calculus was ever produced by Newton, or in Newton's name, during his lifetime; what was produced was a treatment of "infinite series," probably done by, or in collaboration with Hooke.

<sup>47</sup> The lack of any recorded actually orally uttered statement on science from the mouth of Isaac Newton, is typified by Newton's long-standing position as a member of Parliament. The only oral utterance on record from there, is Newton's "Will someone open a window." There is, curiously, no evidence that former Vice-President Gore was visiting the premises on that occasion.

In short, belief in Newton is a matter of pagan religious belief, not science. The god of that particular pagan religious cult, was not God, but something tantamount to the Olympian Zeus of Aeschylus' *Prometheus Bound*, a pagan god whose traditional priesthood came to include the plagiarist and hoaxster Thomas Malthus. The rest of the matter is simply the issue of who does, and who does not attend that particular pagan church called Anglo-Dutch Liberalism.

The scientific issue posed by Sarpi's Liberalism, is that Sarpi and his followers, such as Rene Descartes, crafted a system among mathematicians, in which mathematical formulations are employed as substitutes for physical principles. Since the modern notion of a physical principle in science has rested chiefly on the affirmation of the method of Cusa's *De Docta Ignorantia*, as that method was realized by Kepler's uniquely original discovery of universal gravitation, there should be no mystery as to why Sarpi, with his avowed mission of employing Ockham as a substitute for Claudius Ptolemy's Aristotle, should have required the invention of the irrationalist myth of empiricism, and why the invention of a virtually mythical Isaac Newton-the-scientist should have been concocted by Paris-based Antonio Conti, *et al.*, to serve, like a stuffed shop-window dummy, as an English-speaking substitute for a nominally French Descartes.

### *Art & Science*

It were sufficient to look back to the historical origins and persistence of the Liberal (i.e., Ockhamite) Venetian reforms introduced by Paolo Sarpi, including the shift of Venetian maritime power from its former Adriatic base, to the northern European maritime provinces, to recognize the consistency of the principled determination of the nature and practices of the Anglo-Dutch Liberal financier-oligarchical imperial interest, to its present-day expression in the current 2008 U.S. Presidential election-campaign.

Most of the leading actors on that present stage, are to be seen as, to a very large degree, virtual puppets of Paolo Sarpi.

It is therefore of some practical, political importance today, to express decent disgust for the staging of Classical Greek, or modern Shakespearean, Lessing, or Schiller drama in costumes of times which do not correspond to the historical setting in which the original staging of the drama by the author was located. Staging *Macbeth* or *Lear* in times other than those which Shakespeare chose, or, the same for *Hamlet* or *Julius Caesar*, or the same for the great master of the drama, the thorough historian Friedrich Schiller, as above all, his *Wallenstein* trilogy, is already a fraud perpetrated on the audience. History, in each of its phases of time and place, has a cultural specificity which, as such a specificity, is the essential feature of the drama.

It is the culture which is speaking, and speaking to the actual audience across the intervening actuality of the span of time and place. No decent play is simply the interaction among some actors placed on some stage. The most important feature of any drama is its historically actual place in the cultural history of mankind. The great Classical dramatists put actual history as they knew it, on stage, and put the passions of what they perceived as those times to play out on stage as intended expression of the historical times to which the performance referred. Classical drama must not entertain the audience, but grip the audience to such effect, that, as Friedrich Schiller prescribed, the member of the audience must leave the theater a better citizen than he had entered. To change the historical setting from the actual setting of events, to some other time and place, is an immoral act in and of itself.<sup>48</sup>

That is to repeat a preceding point, respecting such historically specific phenomena as the proposed Lisbon Treaty, that that treaty can not be understood except as the imprint of Paolo Sarpi, as a continuing matrix of culture principle intrinsic to the establishment of what was to become, and has remained the legacy of Paolo Sarpi.

The most significant implication of that same point of historical fact, is that any world-shaking crisis, such as that descending upon all humanity today, can have come into existence only as the overlong persistence of some set of misguided paradigms of a quality simulating axiomatic features of a culture. Thus, as the fate of the world today is largely in the grip of a paradigm established by Sarpi's influence for Europe today, especially Anglo-Dutch Liberal imperial power, so it is against our enemy Paolo Sarpi that the force of our defense of civilization must be focused.

The world has changed in many ways since the death of Sarpi, but the conflict within the body of the English-speaking institutions, those of the Anglo-Dutch Liberal system and our United States, remains as an essential conflict between what are, virtually, two opposing, relatively immortal systems of society.

It is the axiomatic-like principles which characterize the response-patterns typical of a culture, which remain the determining characteristics of the pattern of developments within, and among cultures as long as those axiomatic-like patterns persist. It is only a seemingly radical change in those axiomatic-like patterns, often, in history, spanning centuries, which determine the history of, and among the relevant nations and cultures.

What remains constant among these patterns shifting in that way, is the essential nature of man, and the actuality of the relative level of development of cultures. The principal changes

<sup>48</sup> For example, Giuseppe Verdi's transfer of times and places from Sweden, to Boston, Massachusetts was not the intention of Verdi, but of the Italian censor of that time. Shakespeare was exacting in this respect, and Friedrich Schiller a true genius. Eugene O'Neill's *The Iceman Cometh*, passes the test nicely as a case which belongs in my time and nation. Orson Welles' Mercury Theater productions were often the clever machinations of a highly talented and pompous ass.

in the long-wave trends of behavior among cultures, are to be located in the axiomatic-like features. Hence, Paolo Sarpi, although long-dead, typifies the forces which have persisted in Europe since his time, that until we are rid of what he, in principle, represents from our current history's past, as he does, efficiently, still today. The most essential feature of this conflict, centers on that between the legacy of Sarpi and of the *noëtic* principle. Thus, the conflict portrayed by Aeschylus' Prometheus Bound, remains the principal pivot of historic conflict within the world today.

So, the crucial objective for the future of mankind must be to free mankind and its nations from the grip of institutionalized ideologies such as the slavery of tradition typified by the brutish ideologies attributed to the mythical Olympian Zeus or Paolo Sarpi, and to bring the actual power of human creative reason into play, instead.

#### **IV. The Program of Development**

The objective of what is discussed today as "A New Bretton Woods," may be fairly described as an expression of the wish to return to the original Bretton Woods intention of U.S. President Franklin Roosevelt, as if he had not died early during his fourth term in office.

To refresh the reader's memory from the preceding chapters of this report: the regrettable intention expressed by deceased President Roosevelt's successor, President Harry S Truman, was to overturn several among President Roosevelt's essential intentions for the post-war time, especially Roosevelt's intention to uproot pro-colonialist aspects of imperialism from the planet. These Truman actions which were aimed to wreck much of President Roosevelt's achievements, were expressed in chiefly two ways. First, as Truman's intentions to destroy features of those policies which were displeasing to Winston Churchill's anti-U.S.A., British imperialist intentions for the post-war period. Second, to bring that about by aid of forcing a threatened nuclear confrontation with the Soviet Union.

Had President Roosevelt lived to carry out his avowed mission for the post-war period, the entire colonialist and quasi-colonialist systems of European powers would have been liquidated, and Britain itself freed to enjoy a normal national sovereignty under a system of a world composed, exclusively, of an intended system of sovereign nation-state republics.

If we wish to survive the presently onrushing, global economic-breakdown crisis, we, of the United States, must insist on returning to Roosevelt's intentions now. First, we must re-establish the principle of national sovereignty. Then, each presently deprived nation, must be assisted to fulfil its desire to develop into the desired form of the sovereign nation-state. Not all objectives will be reached immediately, even though they are proper choices; therefore, our policy must be establishing an intended, working system of *developing* sovereign nation-

state republics, a goal which must be reached, or else nothing much will have been reached, after all.

As a matter of practice which we are implicitly required to adopt under the present conditions of an onrushing general breakdown-crisis of the world's present monetary system, the policy of the U.S.A. must become that of replacing the present monetary system by establishing a new Bretton Woods system, as such a design was implicit in President Franklin Roosevelt's efforts through the Bretton Woods conference, instead of the error introduced under President Harry S Truman, of adopting John Maynard Keynes' misinterpretation of President Roosevelt's intention.

The significance of this requirement, is best argued from the standpoint of examining the inherent insanity (and immorality) of the present system of so-called "globalization," as that was the present policy of the Anglo-Dutch Liberal imperialists which was installed during the 1970s. That radical change in direction of the planet's evolution, toward "globalization," away from the U.S. policies of the 1950s and early 1960s, was brought about not only by the August 1971 scrapping of the Bretton Woods system, but by the petroleum-price hoax of the Anglo-Dutch-Saudi operation of 1973 onward, and by the systematic wrecking of the U.S. economy as a whole through the globally radiated impact of the installation of the ruinous program of the Trilateral Commission under the hapless Presidency of Jimmy Carter, and into the 1980s and beyond.

What we of our U.S.A. permitted to happen to our republic, during the interval of the term of Britain's Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher, was tantamount to the influence of treason among us.<sup>49</sup>

### *The Evil of Out-Sourcing*

Back during the 1950s, the bellwether of future disaster was the phenomenon which began to be described, then, as the effects of "run-away shops." What has, subsequently, become a global policy, began to be seen within the United States itself, with the transfer of employment. still within the same corporate structure, from places where higher skills, and relatively higher wages, of a relatively higher-paid quality of labor-force had existed during the World War II times, to areas where significantly cheaper wage-rates and lower local tax-

---

<sup>49</sup> Notable was the policy of the U.S. under Secretary of Defense and George Shultz crony Caspar Weinberger, as in the instances of the Malvinas War of Britain against Argentina and the wrecking of the economy of Mexico during the related State Department operations during Summer-Autumn 1982. The "good side" of President Ronald Reagan showed in Reagan's avowed hatred of a U.S. defense policy based on what Reagan had denounced as "revenge weapons." However, with George H.W. Bush as Vice-President, with Shultz and Weinberger in Reagan's Administration, with Henry A. Kissinger deployed on special missions, and the same Trilateral Commission which had reigned under Carter all over the Reagan Administration, that Administration, in the end, was, overall, a shambles in performance from 1982-1984 on.

rates (and poorer infrastructure) prevailed. Later, qualitative changes became the prevailing trend, and the export of employment opportunities from the U.S.A. and western and central Europe, to nations with dramatically lowered standards of living.

The more radical change in the U.S.A. came during, and following the 1970s: with the U.S. Nixon Administration's August 1971 wrecking of the Bretton Woods system, the oil-shortage hoax of 1973, and, especially, the 1977–1981 wrecking of the U.S. economy under the Carter Presidency, a wrecking done according to the guidelines adopted by David Rockefeller's Trilateral Commission, led by Zbigniew Brzezinski. The physical-economic conditions of life for the lower eighty percentile of family-income brackets in the U.S.A., have become persistently worse, at a generally accelerating rate, ever since those and related developments of that decade.

To see the result on a global scale, take the case of China.

That U.S. reopening to China which occurred during the Administration of U.S. President Richard Nixon, was not an error in itself; to that degree, it was not only correct, but overdue. However, what should have happened, instead of the lunatic 1971–1972 wrecking of the Bretton Woods fixed exchange-rate system, was the use of the opening of constructive relations with China through negotiating a long-term system of credit under a fixed-exchange-rate system. By that means, we should have acted to emphasize the development of the agro-industrial infrastructure of a developing China economy, that to such effect that a commitment to the full development of the entirety of China's territory and population, should have been the primary objective from the start.

The bad effect of neglecting the latter approach should be clearly evident to competently skilled observers today. The extent of the internal problems in the relatively poorer regions of China today, reflect that fact. The wrong approach taken by the U.S.A. was basing the new relations with China on a "free trade" premise, the policy of inducing China to fulfill U.S. internal consumption requirements at prices far below those which could be matched by production within the U.S.A. itself.<sup>50</sup> Under that misguided premise, especially since 1989–1990, China, like nearly all nations which have experienced expansion of their export industries under "free trade" arrangements since the collapse of the Soviet Union, find that the gain in national income of the developing economy from exports, is not sufficient to sustain more than a minority of the exporting nation's total population and territory. In other words, the exporting nation is losing money on the costs of production represented by the failure to cover the true costs of that national production as a whole. The chief reason for this shortfall is the relevant practice of "free trade," under which China, for example,

---

<sup>50</sup> In significant part, the longer-range purpose of this sort was to shut down the internal market of nations, to make each dependent for a crucial part of its consumption needs on international trade controlled by oligarchical forms of international speculation.

produces for export at *an incurred true national physical cost* which is marginally greater than the relevant income from export earnings.

This is complicated by the ironical balance of U.S. dollar holdings by China, under the present trend of both the collapse of value of the U.S. dollar on international markets, and the related depreciation of China's current income from exports to the U.S.A. The ugly, medium- to long-term reality of the matter now comes to the fore in this and other ways. A more equitable arrangement between the U.S.A. and China is now needed at a time when the stability and strengthening of relations among the "Big Four" of the U.S.A., Russia, China, and India, is crucial for all mankind.

In the case of China, for example, the problem of underdevelopment of the greater parts of the territory and population is, in itself, a rough measure that China is not paid sufficiently for its exported products to cover the physical costs actually incurred by China as a whole, in producing what represents the net export of China's total production. This is an affliction which infects virtually all of the national economies which have absorbed the production of what was formerly produced in North America or western and central Europe, for sale to, largely, the North American or western and central European nations which had formerly exported the production of these goods to developing nations.

We should have adopted a "fair trade" policy for prices of goods produced outside the U.S.A., instead. It is our failure to continue the U.S. "fair trade," so-called "protectionist" policies of the 1950s which has ruined the U.S.A. in favor of Anglo-Dutch Liberal imperialism, and has created the pattern of crisis and also economic and social disasters among nations exporting cheap products to such places as North America and Europe.

Similarly, since 1989, the former Comecon states, including Russia, have undergone a similar heavy loss on account of the true costs of exports, and of labor, that to the present day. In other words, the apparent "market value" of exports has fallen far below the true costs of production, not only costs of goods, but costs of human life.

In general, the process of globalization, especially as it evolved, since the U.S. stock-market crash of October 1987, during the reign of Alan Greenspan as Chairman of the U.S. Federal Reserve System, has brought about a "globalization-driven" collapse in the real economy of the world as a whole.

The effect of the relevant, prevalent official delusion, on nearly all sides of decision-making, has been that the determined "market price" of goods has been driven far below the true *physical* cost of production by the relevant nation: a policy corresponding to what Soviet economist Evgeny Preobrazhensky of the 1920s called his proposed Soviet policy of "primitive socialist accumulation." Preobrazhensky, during his part in the Preobrazhensky-



Bukharin debate of that time, was echoing the rather uniquely competent insight by economist Rosa Luxemburg, and also, later, former U.S. State Department official and historian Herbert Feis, on the specific subject of international loans under finance-imperialist conditions.<sup>51</sup> Otherwise, V.I. Lenin and the German Social-Democrats, like others, had been essentially mistaken in their relevant economic doctrines on the subject of modern imperialism.

These and related facts might seem to be unclear to many commentators, until several points of clarification have been introduced to show the incompetence of most leading, mostly wrong popular opinion about this matter. For this reason, we must return to subject-matters referenced in some of the preceding chapters of this report.

See how and why the post-1970 policies of the U.S.A. have become such a disastrous, presently global, and terrible failure. Begin with this specific kind of failure in the policies, and the beliefs of the Marxists.

### ***When Rosa Luxemburg Was Right***

The mistake of the so-called “orthodox Marxists,” V.I. Lenin, and others, who failed where the brilliant daughter of a *Bund* figure, Rosa Luxemburg,<sup>52</sup> had succeeded, has a little-recognized significance for today on precisely this account.

She was not a “Marxist” in the sense of the impact of Marx’s doctrines bearing on such matters of economy as I have just emphasized immediately above. That is to emphasize, that there is no necessarily “rational” relationship between what the so-called “orthodox” Marxists distinguished as “price” and “value.” *There is no basis for the assumption that, in a so-called “market economy,” there is an underlying, long-term, asymptotic convergence of a so-called “free market,” monetary price upon relative physical value. In the entire sweep of U.S. experience since 1968, for example, exactly the opposite has been consistently true for the U.S. economy as a whole.*

*The problem with the minds of so many deluded U.S. citizens, is their tendency to prefer to believe, even devoutly, what their masters frighten them into pretending to believe, even when the bitter evidence of experience should have convinced them of the opposite.*

---

<sup>51</sup> Rosa Luxemburg, *The Accumulation of Capital*, Agnes Schwarzchild, trans. (New York: Monthly Review Press, 1951); Herbert Feis, *Europe, the World’s Banker 1870–1914* (Harvard University Press, 1964).

<sup>52</sup> The “*Bund*” refers to a labor association known in its U.S. extension as “The Workman’s Circle.” Rosa Luxemburg was the daughter of a notable figure of the association, from Poland, whose career in the Socialist movement was strongly influenced by the French Jean Jaurès whose assassination on July 21, 1914 virtually destroyed what became popularly known as the Zimmerwald movement, so named for a peace conference scheduled to be convened in Zimmerwald in 1915, which was the leading opposition to the unleashing of what was to become known as the impending World War I. Her association with the role of Jaurès was among the most important formative influences of her development as a political figure.

The real subject of a policy of “free trade,” is not the cheapness of goods, but the cheapness of expendable people, even to the extent of the currently rising, virtually genocidal rise of rates of mass starvation globally, which nothing so much as present, “World Trade Organization” (WTO) policies has done. Such have been among the means for implementing those pro-genocidal policies of Britain’s Prince Philip and his World Wildlife Fund, which express his avowed intention to reduce the world’s population from more than six and a half billion persons, to no more than two, that in relatively short order of historical time. Worse, that is not only Prince Philip’s policy, but had been that of his now deceased accomplice, the Prince Bernhard of the Netherlands who had once signed his letter of resignation from Hitler’s SS in the manner he did on the occasion of the date of his marriage to the Netherlands princess. Such is Prince Philip’s policy and practice; it is his actual practice, and that of the fraudulent “Malthusian” schemes of such among his lackeys as former U.S. Vice-President Al Gore.

It was thus, also, precisely that, from the inauguration of President Harry Truman, on, in the first instance, and from the relatively much more radical measures of de-construction of the U.S. economy since 1968, which has made the U.S. economy of the 1968–2008 interval the “terminal case” which is expressed by the general breakdown-process of the world economy confronting us all today.

Therefore, it is that miscreant’s economic policy-of--practice of Prince Philip and former U.S. Vice-President Al Gore, which is the most important of the globally decisive issues of policy menacing the economy of the entire world, which must be addressed at this point in our ongoing account here. The most relevant way in which to address this issue, is to reference the contrast between the evolution of U.S. economic policy of practice up to the time of the death of President Franklin Roosevelt, in contrast to the lunacy of policy-trends since the assassination of President John F. Kennedy, and, most emphatically, the systemic insanity of political trends in economic policy-shaping which have taken over, more and more, the shaping of U.S. social and economic policy since the end of Winter 1968, and since the approximately coinciding effects, internationally, of the end of the Konrad Adenauer and Ludwig Erhard governments of West Germany, and the virtual ouster of France’s President Charles de Gaulle in the same 1963–1968 time-frame.

### ***What Is a ‘Fair Price’?***

The practice of empire, as illustrated for Europe since Augustus Caesar established that pact, on Capri, with the oriental cult of Mithra, has been the enforcing of the status of what were relatively human cattle, a status which had been imposed upon the great mass of the population of that empire. This policy of practice has been continued by all empires since: by the Roman Empire, Byzantium, by the medieval system dominated by Venetian usurers and

Norman chivalry, by the Habsburg-dominated region, and the modern system of Anglo-Dutch Liberal tyranny whose hegemony was defined by the succession of London's orchestration of the so-called "Seven Years' War" and the outcome of that war as the British East India Company's imperial triumph in the February 1763 Peace of Paris.

The essential characteristic of the imperialism of these forms, and of kindred oriental forms earlier, has been the denial of the existence of actually creative powers of the individual human mind, as by the legendary Olympian Zeus of Aeschylus' *Prometheus Bound*. This policy of practice, as it is exemplified by the practice of imperialism, is premised, as by the law of that Olympian Zeus, on forbidding the ordinary human beings to be given knowledge of "fire,"—signifying "fire" as symbolic of those creative powers of progress in knowledge of fundamental physical principles on which the increase of the power of the individual member of society depends, as measurable per capita and per square kilometer of relevant territory.

The practice of empire and its likeness, has demanded the suppression of the actual knowledge of such "fire," and the limiting of access to its use where it is known. In this way, the empire's reign over its subjects, denies them those powers of mental development by means of which they might become willfully independent of imperial and kindred forms of oppressive rule.

Hence, since the maintenance of a certain potential relative population-density must overcome depletion of currently standard resources through scientific and technological progress, the consequent, stupefying—e.g., "Malthusian"—quality of rule by any imperial or kindred system of society is, ultimately, as world-wide now, the perennial source of the doom of empires, such as today's form of the British empire, which have run out of available space to expand. Thus, all empires and kindred systems are doomed by their very continuation in that mode, as the present existence of Prince Philip's pro-Malthusian notion of a British Empire-in-practice, would doom a planet which continues to tolerate such British imperial rule today.

When we consider this prospect from the vantage-point of V.I. Vernadsky's conception of the Noösphere, this cyclical aspect of imperial systems of rule is to be seen as clearly unnatural. Mankind is naturally an anti-entropic species operating within an anti-entropic universe. Thus, the matter of useful price must be considered in these terms of reference.

Consequently, a competent government is impelled to create a "fair price" system, a system designed to conform to the requirement of an increase of potential relative population-density, per capita and per square kilometer of total territory. The solution for the problems this entails was accomplished in the U.S.A. under President Franklin Roosevelt, and was the implied intention of searches in this direction by governments operating in the tradition of

what the U.S.A.'s first Treasury Secretary, Alexander Hamilton defined as "The American System of political-economy."

The most significant experience with such an approach to pricing was the U.S. experience with the mobilization for warfare, for which the way was prepared by President Franklin Roosevelt from the first day he entered his first term of office in March 1933, at a time when World War II had been made virtually inevitable by the award of dictatorial powers to Adolf Hitler on the day following Hermann Göring's orchestration of the burning of Germany's Reichstag—a fire which was Germany's historic, London-orchestrated predecessor for our experience of "9-11."<sup>53</sup> Roosevelt's Administration was aware of the virtual inevitability, if certainly not in every detail, of a U.S. involvement in such a war. The amount of sheer physical-economic might which the U.S. marshaled and maintained to enable the allies to win that war, is a demonstration of the great economic principle of all modern history, a lesson which the United States appears to have forgotten since the assassination of President John F. Kennedy, and, especially, the death of most citizens of my own generation.

### ***Price: From the Top, Down***

To understand the matter of pricing, it is essential to work one's way from the top, down, rather than the bottom, up. It is essential to examine a national economy as a whole, and, then, to examine how that economy does, or should appear, if we were looking from the bottom, up, as we do in looking at the local transaction, rather than the top-down process as a whole.

The first thing to examine is the national productive infrastructure as a whole, from the top down. Then, to examine the process of production of agricultural, industrial, and comparable goods produced. Then, to take into account services such as education, healthcare, and sanitation. Always looking at the economy as a whole—from the top, down, rather than in local detail.

In this view of the matter, our attention must be focused upon the way in which a net increase in productivity per capita and per square kilometer of total territory is affected.

The functional view to be adopted in such a study, is that of attention to the fact that there is an indispensable combination of these, and related component categories, which will determine the net productivity of the entire economy, per capita and per square kilometer. Since there is always attrition, in the forms of attrition of sundry kinds of essential resources, there can be no stability in the economy without a continuing process of scientific and

---

<sup>53</sup> Adolf Hitler was brought to power by the intention of a complex of financier interests centered on Hjalmar Schacht's sponsor, the Bank of England's Montagu Norman. These were forces including Averell Harriman's Brown Brothers Harriman, and the grandfather, Prescott Bush, of the current President of the U.S.A.

technological progress in the degree required to offset the forces of attrition intrinsic to any fixed mode of technology.

The intellectual function of sundry aspects of public and private policy-shaping is that of what is often termed an “allocation” function. This function, which shapes policy and practice respecting details of activity within the economy as a whole, leads to such included results as the proper roles of taxation, credit, and price. Those roles must be subordinated to the mission-orientation assigned to the economy as a whole, from the top down. Local initiative, as if from the bottom up, smooths out the general policy which evolves from the top down.

“From the top, down” signifies longer capital cycles of investment and consumption, which are largely matters of the functions of international treaty institutions, national governments, local governments, large private enterprises, learned professions, and so on, down the list, from top to bottom.

In all of these functions, the crucial, needed element of change, is the practice of science and related innovation by individuals and small groups. In general, this requires a predominant role of physical science and Classical forms of artistic culture.

The result of this process of such interactions in the large, includes the matter of local price, and of transactions among individuals and small organizations.

When we inspect a real economy in those terms of references and comparisons, we discover that all of this detail, from the top down, and bottom up, results in a net gain or net loss in the rate of relative physical productivity of the national economy, and world economy, considered as wholes.

The connection among such decisions, at all levels, and in all aspects, results in a measurable estimate of historic values of progress, stagnation, or retrogression. The only competent measurement of performance of an economy then becomes what I have defined as *a potential relative population-density per capita and per square kilometer* of the whole territory and population of a nation, or group of nations. *This is the true measure of economic value.*

Statistical methods congruent with the axiomatic presumptions of Cartesian and related statistical methods are intrinsically incompetent attempted substitutes. People who think in Cartesian-like statistical terms, are therefore intrinsically incompetent as general forecasters. Riemannian dynamics, as a further development of what Gottfried Leibniz introduced as the principled notion of dynamics of modern science, in rejecting the intrinsic incompetence of Cartesian and related statistical methods, points to the foundations of the required methods.

The set of systemic relations I have outlined in the preceding paragraphs can not be competently represented in any formal way not consistent with the concept of a relevant Riemannian manifold. In practice, a good estimate is an acceptable approximation.

### ***Global Fair Pricing***

The internationalization of production expressed, in an increasingly significant degree, by “globalization,” means that we are approaching a manifest state of world affairs in which the total production by the world is on the way to be less than the costs incurred by the production, in all nations, of the world’s consumed product. The horror which this presently intended state of affairs portends, is typified by the collapse of the supply of foodstuffs, a collapse which is an implicit expression of failure of the world to meet the true costs of what it produces—the true physical cost of what it produces and consumes.

To the same effect, there has been a general net collapse in basic economic infrastructure in North America and Europe, among other locations, a trend of net collapse of combined wasted and newly built infrastructure since about 1967–68. A collapse of the number of serving physicians, and of hospital and related facilities, in North America and Europe, is an expression of this.

This is to be compared with the monstrously large incomes of a small percentile of the population, who, in net effect, are, like the hedge funds, engaged more in looting, than in even marginal production of useful physical goods and high-quality forms of essential services.

There are many factors of folly which have contributed to this general decline of the practice of physical economy in formerly leading industrialized nations, since about the 1967–68 turn downward in the U.S.A. and Europe, among other places. However, in large part, this decadence of the economies of North America and Europe, for example, has been the cultural effect of the rise into adulthood of the “white collar” portion of the generation born between the close of World War II and the 1958 depth of the 1957–58 U.S. recession. The “anti-blue collar,” “anti-industrial,” “anti-nuclear power,” and “green” traits of that increasingly influential, “white-collar baby-boomer” portion of the population, have exerted an extraordinary influence of the type associated with the lunatic traditions of the Malthusian “machine-stormers” of early Nineteenth-Century Europe, on the political institutions, and other critical aspects of culture, politics, and production of wealth.

The most deadly factor in this complex of ruin which has dominated North America and Europe, most notably, since the riotous days of 1968, has been the influence of the form of mass-insanity typified by the influence, in Europe, of a virtual witches’ coven represented by the 1920s and 1930s launching of what was incarnated, after 1945, as a combination of

substituting the cult of “information theory” for science, and the operations and influence of the virtually Satanic Congress for Cultural Freedom and the related influence of the British trio of witchcraft’s Aleister Crowley, H.G. Wells, and Bertrand Russell.

These forms of economic cultural warfare against modern civilization, combined with the Malthusian campaign, by Britain’s Prince Philip, *et al.*, for reducing the world’s population from over six to two billion living human individuals, or worse—a much greater genocide than Adolf Hitler’s, has been, in combined direct and indirect ways, the greatest single motivating force for the spread of economic and cultural depravity which has gripped the world increasingly since the late 1960s.

Thus, through economic policies of those who promote today’s policies of “globalization,” and through the cultural policies, such as those of the former Congress for Cultural Freedom, we have driven the net price of production below a less than zero-growth economic standard of living for a great portion of the world’s population at large, and, even worse, have been using these means for driving down the per-capita physical productivity of the existing world population (of more than six and a half billions persons) toward what Britain’s Prince Philip insists must become no more than two billions.

The true physical cost of production, contrary to those evils of currently intended practice, is the cost of maintaining the entire human race in a rising standard of physical productivity per capita and per square kilometer. The true value of goods and services produced is therefore to be determined as the standard of living and productive culture, required for the planet as a whole, per capita and per square kilometer.

### ***The Role of Language-Culture***

The present goal of what is advocated as “Globalization,” is the transformation of global civilization into a gigantic, new “Tower of Babel,”—i.e., tower of babble.

As the experience of our U.S.A. “melting-pot” nation illustrate the point, the efficient definition of culture is not a specific language, but, rather, a language-culture: a group of languages in use, assembled around a principal national language. That means, as the best aspects of U.S. culture illustrate the point, that there is a national language of record for legal and related functions, but the language is a kind of benchmark for the set of secondary, family tongues of which the population is composed; that legal language serves as the pivot for unifying, rather than “ghettoizing,” a language-culture of the population as a whole. The multiplicity of languages associated with a central language-culture, is not a drain on the language-culture of the people, but, rather, tends to force the raising of the cultural level of the population as a whole.

The principal source of unprofitable quarrels about the matter of a national language-culture, so defined, is the kind of ignorance which is spread through attempts to standardize speaking and writing in such a way as to limit the meaning of words, sentences, and paragraphs to a strict, dictionary codifying of meanings, as by aid of a rigid stylebook. The *New York Times* Style Book is case in point.

The characteristic of the mental development of the individual human being is associated with the principle of Classical irony, as the case of William Shakespeare, Percy B. Shelley, and John Keats, typifies this for the use of the English language by intelligent speakers. It is through irony, and only through Classical conceptions of irony, that the creative powers of the mind generate and impart creative expressions among literate users of the same language, or language--culture.

This significance of Classical literacy in art, is ultimately the same as the distinction of the crippled mind of the literal worshipper of mathematical formulas, from the competent scientific thinker. The crippled mind locates the idea in terms of the equation; the intelligent citizen sees the formula as a mere shadow of a universal physical principle, as the work of Bernhard Riemann illustrates that point.<sup>54</sup>

The literally deductive mode of thinking, whether in physical science, or in practice of grammar, is not only the mark of a self-damaged mind, but is a practice which damages the human mind by crippling the individual's native potential for true creativity.

We already see the ongoing process of "globalization" as crippling the potential of the individual subjected to the effects of a tendency toward a "Tower of Babel" as a substitute for a literate language-culture. It is the enriching of the use of the creative powers of the individual mind, through the promotion of the powers of creativity associated with irony, on which the progress, and the morality of society depend.

## V. Phaedo: What Is Immortality?

The time has come, in the writing of this report, at which I should speak for myself.

The greatest of all of the commonplace failures of societies thus far, has been the failure to grasp the actual implication of the common theme of ancient Plato's *Phaedo* and the writing on the subject of that great work by modern Moses Mendelssohn: the true implication of the immortality of the mortal individual's human soul. Unfortunately, most among even those

---

<sup>54</sup> ". . . Es führt dies hinüber in das Gebiet einer andern Wissenschaft, in das Gebiet der Physik, welches wohl die Natur der heutigen Veranlassung nicht zu betreten erlaubt." From Riemann's 1854 habilitation dissertation, *Über die Hypothesen, welche der Geometrie zu Grunde liegen*, in *Bernhard Riemann's gesammelte mathematische Werke*, H. Weber, ed. (New York: Dover Publications reprint, 1953).



who profess to seek immortality, do not see it as a continuation of something uniquely specific to human life, but, rather, with the prefatory remark, on the anticipated brink of death, “And, then?”

For the rest of mankind, they are so gripped by their own fearful prescience of human mortality, that they do not even suspect the purpose in mortal life which they should be seeking. The best part of them, is the fearful sense that it is something like that which they should be seeking.

Simply, the animal aspect of the individual denies itself such knowledge; but, what is called the soul remains as it was, always there, as I have spoken and written on past occasions, as if continued life of the soul might suggest the assembly of souls, from assorted past times, portrayed by Raphael Sanzio’s *The School of Athens*.

The problem has been, that most people, still today, (empiricists, for example) do not believe that they actually possess a “soul,” except as a Sunday-go-to-meeting dress which they have borrowed for the occasion. There is a reason for this phenomenon; that is, that the victims of such an induced outlook treat themselves as loyal subjects of what Aeschylus portrayed as the Olympian Zeus of the *Prometheus Bound*. They accept the obligation to deny the actual principle of human individual creativity which is the difference of man from beasts, as a quality which does not lie within the bounds of the mortality assigned to the beasts. They accept the status of virtual cattle, which British empiricism, such as that of slave-trader John Locke, assigns to people. They accept the view of that willing slave, who does not create, but, rather, like the believer in the swindle called “faith-based initiative,” hopes for good things—especially money, or what it might buy—to be caused to descend upon him.

So, where truth is known, great accomplishments in national economies, when they occur, often have a “life” in the order of a century or more. Important developments in development of power-systems and essential investments in productive facilities, have economic life-spans equal to those of a contemporary human generation, or longer. The development of the technologies required for progress, requires the dedication to producing such effects over several successive generations. The mission of society on these accounts is immortal, as one generation produces a successor, and another successor generation after that. We teach our young, if we are sane and moral, the premises of the accomplishments which will be realized by our children and grandchildren.

Yet, those discoveries of universal physical principle which have generated all of the great improvements, live on, eternally, as the goodness from which relatively long-lived man-made benefits, as of a generation or more, live on temporarily for our advantage.

Thus, on those premises of experience, alone, we should suspect that the human individual, as distinguished from the functions performed by the member of the animal species, is immortal.

### ***A Hellish Fact, or Two***

I have explained this earlier in this report, in emphasizing the specific legacy of Paolo Sarpi as the central feature of the Anglo-Dutch Liberal characteristics of British Liberalism today. In the case of the history of British Liberalism since its emergence around Sarpi during the last decades of the Sixteenth Century, we are confronted with a form of mental-moral disease typified by moral-intellectual stagnation, as in the shift from Marlowe and Shakespeare to the depraved circles of Bacon and Hobbes. In the happier variety of cases, we would expect a high rate of conceptual progress from generation to generation.

When we consider the poverty which reigns in most of entire continents, such as in Africa and Asia today, and when we also consider the types of known remedies which are required to overcome these conditions, a moral society is to be defined in terms of centuries of its commitment to foreseeable goals of general development of the quality of not only the productive powers of labor as such, but the creative powers of the individual human mind. Thus, our departed ancestors live in us, as we should live in the improvements, as changes, which we have transmitted to our descendants.

When we define the term productivity within those terms of reference, we experience a qualitatively different definition of individual and general morality than when we think of the narrow interest of individual life between the bookends of birth and death.

We may come close to the truth of this matter, when we speak of “immortal” works of art, such as the crafting of that cupola of Florence’s Santa Maria del Fiore by Filippo Brunelleschi, which was the first modern definition of the use of the catenary as a principle of physical design, later defined by Leibniz’s demonstration of the universal principle of physical least action.<sup>55</sup> A true demonstration of a universal principle is Johannes Kepler’s discovery of the universal principle of gravitation as such, in his *Harmonies*, as being a true universal physical principle; the argument of Albert Einstein on the uniquely valid universality of Kepler’s discovery, as the prototype of a truly universal physical principle, is relevant.

Immortality is not “a thing,” but a principle of the universe, for which certain objects are predicates. Immortal principles of the sort which typify the human soul as a being distinct from all forms of merely animal life, lie in the progress of accumulated knowledge of the

---

<sup>55</sup> Paolo Sarpi’s hoaxster Galileo Galilei, for example, never actually knew what a catenary (the funicular curve) is, although he claimed to know.

human mind, powers accumulated through transmission of those living conceptions, that by aid of re-experienced acts of such discoveries. The great concrete works of physical science and Classical artistic composition, are footprints of the passage of those principles. It is through the replication of such acts of discovery of universal principles, that the immortality of the human soul is efficiently expressed. The footprints of that movement of the creative human soul, are what is more famously recognized as key to locating the works produced by the immortality of the human soul.

The common difficulty, even among elegant individual minds, is the fearful seizing upon the mortal act which expresses a footprint of immortality, for the actual foot which leaves that print behind.

The true statesman, of the special type we require for conquering the great challenge now before us, recognizes, and acts upon that specific distinction of the spirit which moves the true hero, by the current effect which the spirit has expressed. A long life, of men and women who have contributed great acts, is good; but, immortality is all that is truly enduring. Such men and women are the true immortals from among our species.

Those of us who are so persuaded, adopt as their life's immortal mission, service to the future of mankind. It is that self-interest which we defend. It is that self-interest which we refuse to betray.

There is a great mission presented as a challenge to present-day mankind. That is a mission to accept the distinct sovereignties of the people of respective nations, with no attempted "Tower of Babel" permitted. The function of the existence of each sovereign people, is all future mankind.

The signs are clear. These terrible times now immediately before us, warn us to unite, as respectively sovereigns, to defend the proper common aims of mankind.