sotto voce, out of the corner of his mouth, to his acolyte, "Simple-minded. You know what I mean?"

The introduction of any principle, such as a principle of common interest, which is new to a population, requires the same type of circumstances as any scientist's valid discovery of universal physical principle. First, there must be a crisis of belief, a paradox which discredits preexisting belief. Second, there must be the kind of arousal of impassioned concern, and matching concentration, qualities which are otherwise associated with a scientist's or student's successful original, or replicated discovery of the principle which overcomes that crisis.

Take the case of the retired citizen, who has become habituated to what has appeared to be a high yield on mutual funds accounts. This citizen has come to rely upon those yields, even to meet the simple requirements of monthly life, plus, hopefully, a bit extra put aside for special vacations or emergencies. As long as that citizen can accept the delusion offered by the news media and the mutual-funds representative, the citizen will cling to habituated reliance on those mutual funds, come Hell or high water. He or she will rarely be rational on this subject, but, instead, will be seen, like Broadway's Willy Loman of ***The Death of a Salesman*** or Hickey from O'Neill's ***The Iceman Cometh,*** desperately grasping for straws of faith in a habituated belief, even when, for some time, there were no more straws to be grasped.[33] Those of us old enough to remember, recall a lot of such personal situations with the advent and following several years of the 1930s Great Depression.

Such is the type of personal crisis, hitting a large portion among numerous constituencies, more or less simultaneously, which announces those sudden and profound changes, that no ordinary political pollster will either desire to forecast, if he could, or is likely to discover, or be willing to discover, even for himself. History is made chiefly by the sudden arrival of what should have been foreseeable developments, but which seized most of the victims, including the so-called leading experts, by surprise.

Such crises, left to themselves, create despair and pessimism, very rapidly. So, Adolf Hitler's Nazis arose from obscurity to prominence in the 1923 Munich beer-hall *putsch,* when the Weimar hyperinflation had already wiped out the savings of most ordinary German households. So, at a point that Hitler and the Nazis were ebbing, in the late 1932 elections, the London-directed January 28, 1933 coup d'état against Germany's von Schleicher government, and the bringing of Hitler into power, on January 30, by London's Hjalmar Schacht, set off a sudden and deep pessimism in the German population, which took over Germany's political life by the time of the Reichstag fire a month after the coup d'état against von Schleicher.

It should be recognized as a general rule, that the attempt to evade a grave financial and economic crisis, by the kinds of "crisis management" tactics supported by the Clinton Administration since mid-September 1998, is precisely the kind of greatest folly, which tends to lead to those subsequent coups d'état against the same incumbent government which ushered in the crisis management tactics, making way for fascist or kindred types of repressive regimes instead. Thus, President Clinton's capitulation to financial "crisis management," in the wake of the September LTCM debacle and the subsequent October G-7 meeting, virtually ensured the renewed, post-November election, impeachment drive in both the House of Representatives and Senate.

It is in the relevant moments of perceived widespread crisis, of the type I have indicated here, that the population suddenly becomes receptive to radical changes in its opinion. Rarely before; later is usually too late for that entire round of modern political history. Any good change will occur in the form of a radically innovative discovery of principle, a discovery which musters from within the relevant strata of the population, the same kind of truth-seeking, creative change in outlook which we associate with a validatable form of discovery of new universal physical principle.

This must not be trying to "bridge differences in opinion," by the customary, disgusting, marathon tactics of arbitration sessions, or kindred, Tavistockian, Lewinite forms of social-case-work methods. No compromise should be attempted; the Democratic Party is already far, far too compromised, that in various ways. Only truth should be sought. Any perception of "common interest" which is not based on truthfulness and justice in Plato's and the Apostle Paul's sense of the Greek term *agapē,* is less than worthless.

Therefore, to this purpose, consider the technical details of the case of farmers and trade-unionists, as an example of the general principle underlying a truthful approach to defining the common interests of our core constituencies.

3.3 A matter of method

The first pure and simple fact to be settled, is the following ground-rule of the deliberations among farmers, trade-unionists, and other relevant core constituencies.

Money is not a material interest. It is not physical, like food and other physical commodities. Nor does it represent a service, like medical care, or education in science and engi-

33. There is a line from ***The Iceman Cometh,*** which is particularly appropriate for capturing the essence of the kind of real-life situation I am referencing here. After Hickey has dropped the mask, to reveal what has actually been transpiring, one of the bar's alcoholic habitués sits staring at the glass of whisky he has not yet touched during the preceding passage of time. The habitué replies to the query as to why he is not drinking: "Hickey, you took the life out of the booze." Something like that will hit those caught suddenly by the collapse of mutual funds accounts; for them, the life will have been taken out of the Wall Street booze.

neering subjects, performed to a beneficial physical effect delivered; these are thus like the consumption of physical commodities in this respect. *Money is a fiction.* It is created by printing a piece of paper, or issuing metal or other coin, which is called "money." Money acquires the quality of being money, by being issued as a form of credit against the issuing agency, which is usually a government, or a private bank such as the Federal Reserve System or other private bank, for example. It continues to enjoy the curiously blessed status of being money, only as long as people appear to believe that it is money. That is why creditors are named "creditors." Sometimes, as in 1923 Weimar Germany, that belief, and the status of "creditor," evaporates suddenly and quickly.

Then, like near-beer, there is also near-money, so called because its content is based on weaker foundations than so-called real money. Generally, in the U.S.A. today, we refer to M-3 as constituting those combined varieties of money and near-money, which are considered forms of credit so regarded by important, relevant sorts of responsible officials, and also statistical agencies, as respectable currency.

The importance of recognizing that money is a fiction, rather than intrinsic economic value, is the fact that the relative money-price assigned to products and services bought and sold, often has little or no correlation with the intrinsic value of the unit market-basket, measured per-capita or per-square-kilometer, of product or services purchased and sold. Indeed, money is often paid, or received, for products or services which are non-existent, or have either no intrinsic economic value, or even a negative such value. The fairy-tale, told by fairies such as Bernard de Mandeville and the British East India Company's Haileybury School economists, that a process of "free competition" converges, as rabid ideologue Al Gore babbles, "democratically"—e.g., "statistically"—upon "the right price," is an esoteric form of delusion, when not simply an outright lie. As Gottfried Leibniz laid down the first principles of economic science, in 1671, intrinsic economic value is measured in market-baskets, which are judged both by the mode in which they are produced and delivered, and by the relative physical effect they have upon the intermediate and final consumer.

Effects of real market-baskets, include relative changes in life-expectancy and other demographic characteristics of persons and populations, and upon the relative changes in the productive powers of labor. The idea that some mysterious, irrational agency, such as a financial market, determines the true money-price of a commodity in some esoteric, statistical way, is pure political fiction in the mind of the superstitious believer, when not also a fraud in the intention of the person who peddles such superstitions.

For example, how does one construct a so-called "level (competitive) playing-field" between a farmer operating 200-400 acres and an international food cartel with the resources to buy and sell entire sections of the ruling financial and political establishment? An actual "levelling of the playing-field" is known, in fact, as a farm-parity-price regulation, a protective tariff, regulation of public transportation, regulation of public utilities dealing in power supplies, and so forth. Similarly, the leveller of the playing-field between a 250-pound thug and a 140-pound stripling, is sometimes known as a shotgun, or, in the alternative, a reliable police-force. The next time you hear some crooked would-be privateer on the high seas of world commerce advertising his version of "globalization" as a levelling of the playing-field, remember that 140-pound guy with the shotgun; more and more nations ruined by such predators of "globalization" as Al Gore crony George Soros, are thinking about protectionist "shotguns."

Apart from so-called levelling of the competitive playing-field, there are things a sensible government does to rig the markets in the favor of the interests of both government and the general population. Useful investments, such as those which increase the nation's physical productivity in capital-intensive, power-intensive uses of scientific and technological progress, which create employment in these areas, and so on, should be taxed at much lower rates than purely financial capital gains. Those charities and other purveyors of the public good, which shoulder some of the burdens otherwise falling upon governments, should be afforded special treatment in the tax codes. Tariffs should protect and promote industries of types which are in the national interest. Tax-rates—such as so-called "flat tax" swindles—which assign burdens at equal rates to those lower levels of income corresponding to what a proud and sensible nation should consider the acceptable minimal standard for its households, are morally and economically wrongful.

In summary of this point. It is the function of the sovereign nation-state to rig financial markets in such ways as to build into markets those differentials of explicit regulations and implied rules of the game, which encourage the markets to behave in ways corresponding to the sovereign interest of the nation, its people, and their posterity: corresponding to the general welfare, as the U.S. Constitution requires. If you don't like that, you are free to emigrate to the United Kingdom (if the monarchy will have you), where you, like our forefathers of 1776, 1789, 1812, and 1861-1865, can then make a better informed comparison of the differences between the American System of Alexander Hamilton and the British East India Company system of Adam Smith et al.

Look at the apparent conflict between farmers and trade-unionists in such a frame of reference.

Ask the trade-unionist: "Do you believe in minimum-wage protection? Do you believe in the rights of trade-unions to bargain for fair wage-rates? Do you believe in unemployment insurance and other social security protection? Do you believe in workman's compensation? Do you believe in health-insurance protection? Do you believe in work-place safety standards? Do you not realize the barbarism which deregulation of transportation introduced to the trucking industry and its drivers? Do you not realize the economic ruin of many localities in the U.S., which could no longer compete for industries and job-places under the inequities wrought in both service and freight-rates by deregulation? Do you believe that everyone deserves the kind of justice which these kinds of regulatory and protectionist measures are indispensable to provide?" Let us call such measures labor-price, and entrepreneurial parity-price protection. Why should the farmer not enjoy the same kinds of protection?

Do you not believe that constituencies such as African-Americans and Latin-Americans have rights to the same kinds of regulatory and related protection and regulation? What, then, is all this chatter about rights to a lower price of food, at the farmer's expense? Why, then, should our constituencies be degraded to squabbling like barnyard livestock among themselves, over scraps tossed into the kennel floor or trough? What is the principle involved here? Think . . . think . . . think! What is the universal principle involved here, a principle equally beneficial and necessary for each and all of the core constituencies?

The solution to the apparent conflicts of interest among core constituencies, lies in tabling for later consideration, for brief review at the end of the agenda, all of the apparent conflicts in immediate self-interest which devilish charlatans use to set one such constituency against another. The solution lies in defining, as the main business at the top of the agenda, the principle of common interest, and then define each constituency's special rights as defined by that principle of common interest. The notion of common interest, is another way of stating what the leading founders of our republic's independence and Constitution recognized as *the general welfare*. That is the *method* which will be used for this campaign by each and all among the *useful* varieties of Democratic Party leaders.

To restate the principle of general welfare in an up-to-date frame of reference, let us begin with the matter of the standard forty-hour work-week established during the course of the 1930s.[34]

Admittedly, the forty-hour week, and its approximations, plus or minus, are, today, relics of a long-gone past. We gave it up during World War II, which was morally the right thing to do, temporarily, as long as such special circumstances persisted. We should have returned to it at the close of that war, which we did not do exactly, for reasons of conditions wrongly introduced by the post-Roosevelt regime in national and world affairs. The forty-hour week was honored in the breach during the Eisenhower 1950s, and into the middle of the 1960s. Since the increasing savage cut-backs in the U.S. space program and other highly economically stimulative programs, beginning 1966-1967, the forty-hour week vanished into a different kind of space, from which it has not returned since.

The economic principle expressed by the forty-hour week standard, is that to ensure a labor-force capable of achieving a certain standard of physical-economic net productivity, two general requirements must be defined and satisfied in performance:

1. That the population *as a whole* must have the standard physical, including demographic, conditions of household and related existence required to generate and sustain a population whose active labor-force has both those *physical* and *cognitive* potentials associated with such potential levels of technological skills and productivities.

2. That a minimum of approximately sixty percent of the active labor-force, must be employed as operatives, technicians, or professionals, that either in agro-industrial modes of production, or in developing and maintaining the hard and soft forms of basic economic infrastructure upon which the needed preconditions of both production and that labor-force's households depend for their productive potentials. If this amount is reduced by large-scale unemployment, or by encroachments for sales or other forms of services or administrative employments, the productivity of the labor-force as a whole will be dangerously eroded, as has been the case during the recent thirty-odd years of degenerative drift into the bamboozled world of a so-called "post-industrial" or "information" economy.

The productive potential of that labor-force depends upon

34. My personal standard, until a recent period of convalescence, was a seventy- to eighty-hour work-week: twelve to fourteen hours, six days a week, plus four to five hours or more on Sundays. I believe that I shall soon be back to either that kind of schedule, or one close to it, minus a couple therapeutic hours a day for special exercise and brief rest-periods. The nature of my work, like that of any serious scientist, is mission-oriented, which demands long periods of uninterrupted concentration-spans; but, it is also the quality of intellectual work which includes virtually all of the benefits which other citizens should seek through forms of recreation. It is fortunate—in a sense, the best of all possible worlds, that my wife and I share the same areas of work, chiefly collaborative in nature. Most others, and their children, require a routine of leisure which affords them the opportunity of the same sorts of intellectual and related benefits which I derive from my work itself. My associates work in circumstances either like, or similar to my own. Hence, for us, who have chosen to work and live so, for the moral purpose we have adopted as a profession, the work-week is defined differently, by our free choice, than should be the case for most others. For others, under the customary economic and social circumstances of life in today's U.S.A., the forty-hour work-week, without second or third jobs on the side, is the normal yardstick which should be recognized as a right under the requirements of education and leisure for life under conditions of modern technology and required demographic characteristics.