

TRUTH! IN U.S. NATIONAL SECURITY POLICY

A Boldly Modest U.S. Global Mission

by Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.

This riposte to the Bush Administration's September 2002 pre-emptive war doctrine called "National Security Strategy of the United States of America," was released Sept. 27 by Presidential candidate Lyndon LaRouche's political committee, LaRouche in 2004.

A Preliminary Message To the Concerned Citizen

Contrary to that hysterical state of denial which now grips the White House, the present policies of the Presidency are impelling our already bankrupt nation into an Armageddon of avowed perpetual warfare, from which our Constitutional form of republic might never return. In such a circumstance, there are certain well-defined limits, at which point the critic's willingness to employ appropriately rude choices of language to describe such policies, become an obligatory test of that critic's usefulness, candor, and sound judgment.

As ignorance and brutishness are often intertwined, both the uttered present policies of the Bush "43" Administration, and their near-term inevitable consequences, are so awful, that it would be inexcusable not to emphasize the strategic significance of that pathetically banal, brutish prose style in sentimentalities, which permeates that President's current utterance under the title of national security. Serious statesmen around the world must recognize that the pathetic state of mind reflected in that document's literary style, is itself a source of insight into the gruesome folly of its intention.

To speak of both that document's clinically, and strategically significant literary qualities, President George W. "43" Bush's "The National Security Strategy of the United States," would have brought a lingering, deep-red blush of shame to the cheeks of both of two among Sinclair Lewis' epoch-marking characters, "Babbitt"



Special forces, forward bases, and bio-warfare gear do not make up national security. When someone says, “national security,” says LaRouche, find out what’s under the wrapping, the meat of the content of the policy which is supposed to produce real national security.

“and “Elmer Gantry.” Babbitt,” reading Bush’s prose, might have growled, “I think he is mocking me!” Similarly, to recognize the thuggish, “Elmer Gantry”-like literary qualities, and expressed mental state, of the proposed national security document’s style and content, should require no more demonstration than a relaxed reading of the piece itself.

The physical significance of that literary fact, is that “43” permitted such a preposterous piece of rubbish to be uttered as a program for “The National Security of the United States.” Such negligence by him attests to what most governments around today’s world have come to perceive to be, with horror, the ominous moral and intellectual shortfalls in what is, apparently, the President’s present state of mind. Hopefully, if the President were to review more self-consciously those words which had been stuffed into his ears and coaxed from his mouth by bad advisers, and also reassess them with a suitable psychological detachment, he might sense the accuracy of my present assessment of the current year’s spew of White House propaganda. Perhaps, then, he would have already cried out to me, for my help in extricating him from the looming, combined economic and strategic catastrophe he is digging for himself.

Since, our Constitution, wisely, does not allow that sudden dumping of a head of government which parliamentary constitutions promote, how do we keep the U.S. republic on course toward survival and economic recovery, during the slightly longer than two more years, under a President now perceived as defective by most among the world’s leading

circles? We are therefore obliged to focus on the question: How many of the President’s apparent, Faustian shortfalls, have been foisted upon him by the Brueghelesque rag-tag of Chicken-hawks and kindred Mephistophelean advisers gathered around Vice President Cheney? How do we, as the citizen-caretakers of our nation’s future, steer such a President, to adopt that new, successful role of national leadership appropriate for the avalanche of disasters now descending upon not only our nation, but the planet as a whole?

Therefore, before turning your attention to what I define as the actually appropriate, new National Security Strategy of our republic for this place in world history, I preface my present document with a condensed account of the informed, Constitutional approach to steering this President through the coming two years with a relative minimum risk of damage to, and suffering by, both our nation and the world at large.

Therefore, lest our citizens be plunged into despair by the deepening impact of “43’s” continued shortcomings, we should take comfort from the fact, that the office of President of the United States has been previously occupied, from time to time, by a wide range of talents: scoundrels—including thieves or worse, saddening failures of once-promising figures, honest statesmen, heroes such as James Monroe and Franklin Roosevelt, and at least a pair among them such memorably authentic and noble geniuses as John Quincy Adams and Abraham Lincoln. Our nation’s history thus shows, that, too often, our voters have been awesomely careless in the way in which they choose Presidents, even before the major



President Bush, shadowed by Vice President Cheney. The President must free himself from the grip of the awful lies being foisted upon him by Vice President Cheney's and George Shultz's Chickenhawks.

parties' altogether disgusting, Summer 2000 nominating conventions. As long as it appears the job is getting done, the negligent citizen sometimes breathes an irresponsible sigh of relief when a President has quit office, shrugging his shoulders, "We got by; but, I am sort of relieved that he is gone. Let us hope that the next one is no worse." Usually, then, he votes for the next, as foolishly as he did for the last. Nonetheless, all considered, our republic has survived, until now.

Unfortunately, despite that history, it is more than merely possible that, unless we act now, there might never be another President inaugurated under our Constitution, after this one. Given the ominous shortcomings of the incumbent's performance since January 2001, what does the history of our Constitution teach us about the possibility for getting safely through even such an exceptionally terrible time as ours, even under a fellow with "43's" conspicuous flaws?

How We Survived Until Now

Today, if the relevant facts are considered, our republic is gripped by the worst crisis since those of 1776-1789 and 1860-1865. The economic depression which now has the Americas, Europe, Japan, and others in its spin, is not merely worse than the 1929-1933 Crash that Coolidge and Andrew Mellon built; the available margin of idled productive potential for an economic recovery in the U.S. today, is, speaking relatively, vastly less than the potential which Franklin Roosevelt mobilized to bring us to that matchless gain in world power and prosperity which we achieved through the reconstruction

which he led during the 1933-1945 interval. In the course of these prefaced observations, I shall make passing reference to the factual basis for that comparison of the present situation with the crisis of 1929-1933, after I have first summarized the importance of taking up the implications of the atrocious defects in the referenced Presidential document.

The strength of the U.S.A. political system, on which we must now draw once again, could not be adequately understood without examining the role of leadership exerted by the true father of our republic, Benjamin Franklin, the Franklin who was the guiding hand behind the crafting of such Constitutional instruments as the 1776 U.S. Declaration of Independence and the 1789 draft of the U.S. Federal Constitution. This importance of Franklin's leadership was shown quickly by his absence, after his death. It was shown by the individual follies and general disarray among many of Franklin's former followers, such as the later Presidents Thomas Jefferson, James Madison, and John Adams. Each of these latter Presidents, in particular, had become disoriented, even sometimes foolish, under the acutely unfavorable strategic conditions which prevailed from the time of the July 14, 1789 siege of the Bastille, through to that, literally, massed sexual Congress of Vienna, which celebrated the close of the Napoleonic era.

So, from the retirement of Washington on, both the Adams Federalists and Jefferson's party degenerated into political quagmires. Happily, some first-rate, new leaders emerged from about 1812 on, typified by the American Whigs emerging around Franklin's publishing heir Mathew Carey, the



Two obstacles to a peaceful resolution of the U.S. current crisis: the President should take the resignation of Cheney (right), and must force the government of Ariel Sharon (left) not to blackmail the United States into war.

great Speaker of the House Henry Clay, President John Quincy Adams, economist Henry C. Carey, President Abraham Lincoln, and others. Such heroes are typified, more recently, by President Franklin Roosevelt. In this manner, through all our crises, those brought from without, and those spawned from within, our republic has survived, during two centuries in which no constitution of any nation of continental Europe has lasted more than a few generations.

This exemplary resilience of the U.S. Constitutional system, even in face of external enemies and even spates of treasonous corruption from within, has been expressed until now, by a resurgence of the controlling authority of three principles expressed in the Constitution's Preamble: the principle of perfect sovereignty, the overriding authority of the principle of the general welfare, and the obligation to define the general welfare as a continuing commitment to posterity. Under our Constitution, no interpretation of our Constitution, nor any enacted law, should be permitted to stand, if it is inconsistent with those three great principles inherited as wisdom from such precedents as that 1648 Treaty of Westphalia, crafted largely by Pope Urban VIII's and France's Jules Cardinal Mazarin, which has subsequently defined the dividing line between decency and bestiality within and among nations.

This uniqueness of our republic's creation, its role as an historical exception in modern times, is a continuing reflection of the fact, that from the beginning of the Eighteenth Century to its close, the only place around the planet, in which there existed the actually immediate possibility of launching

a true republic, was among the English colonies in North America. The greatest minds of Europe, as typified by the friends of our Benjamin Franklin, entrusted to our founders that most precious heritage of Europe's Greece-rooted Classical science, Classical art, and those historical reflections on the art of statecraft, which became embedded in the formation of our national culture through great intellectual leaders of ours, such as the Winthrops, the Mathers, Logan, and Franklin, of the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries. Under the strong-mindedness of Franklin, the secondary leaders of the American Revolution crafted a form of self-government based not on a catch-basin-full of so-called "basic laws," but on the overreaching authority of a systemically coherent set of interdependent principles, principles expressed, so concisely, as the essence of our Federal Constitution, in its Preamble.

Despite that excellent intention of our Constitution, our republic has suffered from the corrupting affliction of a continuing internal conflict which has persisted, to the present time, since the beginning of the British monarchy's open, 1763 break with the vital interests of the colonies. Since then, our nation has been always divided within, chiefly by a clash between two leading, absolutely irreconcilable political currents.

The first current, from Franklin to Franklin Roosevelt, and beyond, is what former Secretary of State, and Franklin Roosevelt detractor Henry Kissinger denounced, in 1982, as "the American intellectual tradition," which is also my tradition, as expressed by this, my present report.

Franklin Roosevelt's and my own opponents, have been



The true father of our republic, Benjamin Franklin, the Franklin who was the guiding hand behind the crafting of such Constitutional instruments as the 1776 U.S. Declaration of Independence and the 1789 draft of the U.S. Federal Constitution.

what was known, since 1763-1789, to the present day, as “The American Tories.” Those Tories are a faction rooted, historically, in chiefly foreign, chiefly Anglo-Dutch, Venetian-style financier interests. These Tories have been expressed as a faction often allied with the traditions of slaveholder interest, and, to the present day, with heritage of the British East India Company’s drug-trafficking interest.

Until now, in every national crisis of an existential severity, such as 1929-1933, the American intellectual tradition, as from Benjamin Franklin to Franklin Roosevelt, has intervened, repeatedly, in a timely way, to save our nation from the brink of self-inflicted ruin. Contrast the cumulative ruin piled up as the legacies of American Tories Theodore Roosevelt, Woodrow Wilson, and Calvin Coolidge, to Franklin Roosevelt’s invoking of the American intellectual tradition to rescue our republic from that accumulated Tory folly of those predecessors. By contrasting Franklin Roosevelt then, to the recklessly disordered state of mind exhibited by most among the principal advisers of the Bush Presidency today, we may recognize the deeply underlying, systemic, American Tory origin, of the present threat to the continued existence of our republic. It is an awful threat, which the promulgation



The Continental Congress votes up the Declaration of Independence, July 4, 1776.

of “43’s” “National Security” document typifies in the extreme.

For today’s crisis, we must recognize that Franklin Roosevelt’s extraordinarily successful Presidency had two leading features. First, that President provided to his recruited associates, an indispensable individual’s quality of personal leadership, a quality akin to that which was otherwise expressed by General of the Armies Douglas MacArthur’s leadership in the Pacific War. Second, the President was able to draw upon a depth of such mission-oriented, supporting leadership for such enterprises as those great projects of the 1930s, which enabled the U.S. to build up the depth of logistical capability which led to a secured victory during the period of the 1939-1945 war.

All relevant known history, including President Franklin Roosevelt’s role, shows, that installing an able leader for a time of crisis, depends upon bringing out the best in personalities he or she selects and assembles as a leadership team. The qualities those personalities bring to their assigned missions, are derived not merely from something which they had previously accomplished, but from the ability of a leader to evoke from his or her team, as Jeanne d’Arc did for France, powers of innovative accomplishment which those followers often appear, later, to have lost, as if they had been “playing way over their heads” during more glorious days.

In later times, we should be grateful to hear those memories of their accomplishment which still lingered on their tongues; but, most among them spoke to us, later, as one who retained only a fading memory of that prompting touch of genius which Roosevelt had exerted to inspire them; like Jefferson, Madison, and President John Adams, after the death of Benjamin Franklin, many veterans of the Roosevelt Presidency had lost track of that spark of leadership which had been supplied to them. This Roosevelt had been a true leader, with the fire of the anti-Tory, American System in his belly. The fire was not only passion; it was a deeply ingrained historical knowledge of and belief in Hamilton's anti-Adam Smith, American System of political-economy. This is the economic policy otherwise named our National System of Political-Economy, in contrast to both British East India Company "capitalism" and European socialism.

That is key for understanding that unifying, special spark of genius which Roosevelt's leading makers and shakers exhibited in their glorious times. It was a spark evoked from within them by a truly exceptional quality of national leader, the like of which we have not seen in high elected U.S. office since. The mission-orientation characteristic of the members of the FDR team, represents for us today, the image of an urgently needed rallying of human resources to play again the role of Roosevelt's team, resources rallied from the remaining vestiges of our American intellectual tradition, today as for the crucial, history-making mission of that time. Where shall we find the indispensable spark to make such recruitable talent perform, once again, such miracles of genius?

That view of the matter provides the key to a possible offsetting of the danger to civilization implied by the personal flaws of today's incumbent President. He must have, first of all, a freshened team, rid of any among the misleading persons now encumbering his judgment, a fresh team on which he must rely to bring his Administration to a truly successful outcome for our republic. Just as FDR relied on a team of both Democrats and Republicans for the post-1936 preparation for and conduct of U.S. action in the 1939-1945 war-time interval, the incumbent President must have an able team rooted in that American intellectual tradition hated by Henry Kissinger. The President must be induced to accept that quality of rearrangement, and must be provided adequate bipartisan support from the Congress for that specific mission.

To provide the leadership needed, to cause such a team to be rallied, some kindly guardian angel, or a reasonable approximation of such a personality, must be brought in to succor the imperilled Presidency. At this instant of writing, I am playing the part of that lurking guardian angel. I come, as did Dickens' Old Marley to Scrooge: the unwanted but familiar apparition, to tell the President what he needs to be told, the tough truth, for his own good, and for the good of the nation, too. With an appropriate team, he might succeed, if someone else supplies the spark which sets the team into creative motion.



Franklin Delano Roosevelt before his first Fireside Chat, March 12, 1933. Roosevelt was a true leader, with the fire of the anti-Tory American System in his belly, "a deeply ingrained historical knowledge of and belief in Hamilton's anti-Adam Smith, American System of political-economy."

Guardian angels are not like tooth-fairies, nor genies popped out of bottles. They do not tell a President what he wishes to hear, nor do they do his bidding by means of magic spells. They tell him what he needs to be told, counsel usually contrary to his strongly held prejudices. Now, therefore, hear me speak, as Old Marley did to Scrooge, of those terrible crises which should scare the President into entertaining a bit of precious wisdom, the wisdom to free himself from the grip of the awful lies being foisted upon him by Vice President Cheney's and George Shultz's nasty flock of Chicken-hawks.

The Strategic Threats Before Us

Scrap that rambling, "Red Queen"-style gobbledygook, which some swindling pranksters, like the tailors from Andersen's tale of "The Emperor's New Suit of Clothes," stitched together as that disgusting recent draft, The National Security Strategy of the United States. This is no time to tolerate such charlatans as those (mostly) draft-dodging hucksters of war have been. We need a policy designed, not for the fools who follow the popular opinion and tastes measured out by today's mass media, but a policy crafted for the guidance of the "forgotten man" of our time, that unusual citizen living on his block, who sees to where he is walking or driving, or investing, and who, similarly, actually thinks before voting. It is upon the "grass-roots" leadership role contributed by such citizens located in the pores of our nation's social and eco-

conomic life, such as true, anti-Wall Street entrepreneurs, that the needed mobilization of the nation can made possible.

We are presently confronted by, chiefly, three crises which, taken together, now threaten the continued existence of the republic.

The first, and most pervasive, near-term threat is internal. This threat to both the sovereignty and the bare existence of our republic, is the interconnection between the ongoing collapse of the present, infinitely crooked, world monetary-financial system, the system of the present IMF and World Bank, and the present, devastating, thirty-odd-year-long, continuing, self-induced, and economically suicidal collapse of the internal physical economy of the U.S.A. itself.

The second general near-term threat to our republic is worldwide. This presents us with the looming prospect of chaos, not only within our nation, but throughout the planet. We are thus confronted by an emerging chaos which, unless stopped, would become the inevitable, early effect of a continued effort to sustain the, presently bankrupt, increasingly globalized, and intrinsically predatory, "free trade" form of world monetary-financial system.

The third general strategic threat to the U.S.A. and planet alike, is the influence of the present, utopians' trend toward Roman imperial styles in perpetual warfare. This is the trend expressed by that utopian babbling of the present-day followers of the nuclear-terrorist madmen H.G. Wells and Bertrand Russell. This is the same Mephistophelean evil expressed by such followers of the satanic Russell as Vice President Cheney, and Cheney's unwholesome flock of Chicken-hawks.

Our strategy must pinpoint the origin of all three of those trends, which have culminated, now, in the presently existential crises of our republic's, and the world's situation. The approximate point of origin of these present trends is found during the Summer 1944 Democratic nominating convention, when a predominantly pro-Churchill, Anglo-American faction succeeded in replacing Vice President Wallace as the Vice-Presidential candidate for President Franklin Roosevelt's fourth term, by the nomination of Senator Harry Truman. The outgrowth of that shift of the nomination of Vice President to Truman, cleared the way for introducing what became a radical, post-Roosevelt change in post-World War II military policy, away from our military tradition, as Truman's Korean War entrapment of General MacArthur attests, a change to what became known, variously, during the first post-war decades as a utopian strategic doctrine, or "military-industrial complex."

The first step in this shift toward a utopian U.S. strategic policy, away from the traditional strategic policy of France's Lazare Carnot and Germany's Gerhard Scharnhorst,¹ came

1. Admittedly, there was a relevant defect included in the refreshed West Point program employed after 1815, typified by the emphasis upon the writings of Jomini. A pronounced influence of Napoleon, Murat, et al., was

immediately after President Roosevelt's death, by Truman's scrapping of crucial chunks of the President's anti-colonialist, post-war foreign policy, and Truman's support for the British, Dutch, French, and Portuguese empires' retaining, or even regaining many among their colonies by force of arms, as in Indonesia and Indo-China, for example.

That turn to a pro-imperial policy, under Truman, was complemented by the dropping of two nuclear bombs, needlessly, on the civilian populations of the cities of Nagasaki and Hiroshima. This matched pair of signal actions by the Truman Administration, adopting both pro-colonialist and nuclear-utopian strategies in foreign policy, represented the initial steps of reversal of the post-war policies of President Franklin Roosevelt, and laid the basis for the subsequent virtual takeover of our nation by the utopians' policy, most notably in the aftermath of the assassination of President John F. Kennedy.

The nuclear bombing of Japan was crucial in making that shift to a kind of utopian imperialism which echoed, variously, the common features of the fascism of ancient imperial Rome, of the fascist Emperor Napoleon Bonaparte, and of the imperial, universal-fascism doctrine of the circles of Vice President Cheney and his brood of Chicken-hawks today. Despite the popularized outright lie, that the nuclear bombing of Japan "saved a million American lives," that bombing occurred in defiance of General MacArthur's certainty that Japan was already a hopelessly defeated nation, and was done over the explicit objections of General Eisenhower. As one of the notable founders of modern military science, Machiavelli, had warned, in his commentaries on the *Ten Books of Livy*, no sane commander engages fresh war-fighting with an already-defeated, successfully blockaded adversary, such as the Japan of Summer 1945.

There was no World War II motive for that nuclear bombing. The motive was supplied by Bertrand Russell's influence in pushing the use of nuclear weapons as a utopian mode of "preventive nuclear warfare," nuclear warfare intended, as Russell and his accomplice H.G. Wells had insisted explicitly, and repeatedly, to terrorize nations into accepting the treasonous act of handing over their sovereignty to the form of world government set forth in H.G. Wells' 1928 *The Open Conspiracy*. That Wells-Russell imperial policy, is the guiding doctrine behind the utopians George Shultz and Vice President Cheney on Bush Administration strategic policy today.

The mechanics of "Cold War," and the interrelated role

introduced, in various ways, including some direct ones, into the military and related traditions of the future Confederacy conspiracy. Hence, there was a strong flavor of Napoleonic fascist ideology and methods of practice in the 1848-1861 preparations for the Confederacy's 1861-1865 insurrection. This pro-fascist influence, as typified by the original formation of the Ku Klux Klan, and its revival by sitting President Woodrow Wilson, typifies the fascist undertow reflected in the current utopian practices of "43's" Administration. Nonetheless, the mainstream of the U.S. military tradition was strongly influenced from France and Germany, by the work of Carnot and Scharnhorst.

of what became the RAND Corporation in defining the nuclear triad of utopian warfare, through addition of nuclear-armed air-power, set into motion the weeding-out of the U.S. military tradition of exemplars such as MacArthur and Eisenhower. However, it was not until the close of the Eisenhower Presidency, that the utopians were able to fully unleash their lunatic's wet dreams. Thus, the "Bay of Pigs" and 1962 missiles crisis were followed by kindred other developments, as by the 1964-1972 strategic insanity unleashed by the fraudulent Gulf of Tonkin resolution's plunge of the U.S. into the Roman imperial-style, no-win, perpetual war in Indo-China. That war never ended; after approximately eight years of fruitless brutality, the U.S. simply walked away from an uncompleted, ill-conceived project, as from a bad job better left undone.

The origins of all of those institutions which developed this utopian military dogma, are traced from such institutional configurations as: the role of Russell's Unification of the Sciences project; the exemplary part played by such inhuman creatures as Russell devotees Professor Norbert Wiener and John von Neumann; and, such locations as MIT's RLE and RAND Corporation. Wells and Russell personally are not merely the literary ideologues who fathered the military utopian doctrine expressed by Cheney's chickens. The relevant evidence on the public record, is overwhelming. It was the fanatical utopian Russell who actually coordinated, personally, the apparatus which ran the operations, including Henry A. Kissinger's sometime patron John J. McCloy, the operations behind the creation of what President Eisenhower denounced as "the military-industrial complex."

As a compliment to the Wells-Russell-inspired utopians' program of world government through nuclear-weapons terror, his utopian followers moved to uproot and destroy that principled commitment to scientific and technological economic progress whose destruction had been the crucial issue of the British monarchy's 1763-1789 campaign to crush technological progress within both the English colonies and our young republic.

So, from the middle of the 1960s, until the present date, the U.S. has been destroying itself internally by its continuing drift into becoming a "post-industrial society," as Rome of the civil wars and the Caesars rotted out the culture of Italy, in a process of transition, step by step, from a producers', to a consumers' society, during the period following the Second Punic War.²

2. It is to be emphasized, that the usages of terms such as "Kaiser" and "Czar" reflected the ultramontane doctrine associated with such referents as the fraudulent "Donation of Constantine." This doctrine, referencing the Roman Empire and the empires of Mesopotamia earlier, is the precedent upon which today's anti-nation-state notions of "free trade," "world government," and "globalization" are premised. Under this ultramontane dogma, which dominated Europe from the Roman Empire until the Fifteenth-Century, Italy-centered Renaissance, the power to create law was limited to an emperor, a title interchangeable with the ancient Roman religious notion of the superior

This trend toward domestic economic collapse of the U.S. role as a producers' society, first became conspicuous in the gutting of the space-oriented science program in the Federal budget of 1966-67. Although some manned Moon landings nonetheless did occur, beginning the close of the 1960s, later, by the end of the 1970s, the U.S. had not only terminated the effort, but had lost much of the technological base on which the success of the first Moon-shot had depended. The gutting of the nation's basic economic infrastructure, a gutting begun under President Nixon, and Nixon's lunatic monetary actions of August 15, 1971, consolidated a trend of decay in the U.S. physical economy, which has continued, at a generally accelerating rate, from that time to the present day.

Meanwhile, parallel utopian efforts had prompted the economic self-cannibalism which was launched within the United Kingdom under the first Harold Wilson government, the true predecessor of the ruinous London governments of Margaret Thatcher and Tony Blair. The floating-exchange-rate monetary system, set into motion by Nixon's August 15, 1971 acceptance of the advice of the utopian trio of Henry A. Kissinger, George Shultz, and Paul Volcker. That is the change in international institutions which, during the past thirty years, has ruined the nations of Central and South America, produced what became genocidal side-effects on sub-Saharan Africa, and dragged Europe and Japan into the same global swamp, where Federal Reserve Chairman Alan Greenspan's bubble-headed monetary-financial insanities as the "New Economy" hoax was spawned, and into more than three decades of generalized physical-economic ruin overall.

Then, just slightly less than two decades after American Tory utopian Henry A. Kissinger's installation as National Security Adviser, came a subsequent, crucial turn, with the collapse of the Warsaw Pact, at the close of the 1980s.

During 1988-1990, two directly opposite U.S. strategic policies were put on the table, my own, and the directly opposite policy which the first Bush Administration adopted in concert with both the silly but nasty British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher, and with France's President François Mitterrand. On account of this deep difference between me and such as those leading adversaries of mine, beginning 1986, I, personally, became targetted, repeatedly, for relatively immediate, attempted political, and also biological destruction, and was placed so, as both a declared target for official assassination or imprisonment, on the one side, and a leading, internationally influential policy-crafter, on the other side. So, I stood, then as now, on the stage of all post-1986 world history.

Now, my unique success, in forecasting the presently

authority of a Pontifex Maximus over the cults included in a pantheon of legally permitted religions. Thus, world government required the codification of a "world religion," and even monarchs were reduced to the authority of mere administrators, without that authority to define law which was limited to the personality of the emperor. Hence, the effort, as by the U.K.'s Prince Philip, to bring a "world religion" into being as a complementary feature of world government.

tragic outcome of the adoption of my opponents' economic and strategic policies, has put me, once again, near center-stage amid leading U.S. and global breaking developments, now in a larger role than ever before.

LaRouche and Bush, 1988-1990

The most crucial recent turn of events in recent world history began on October 12, 1988, when I delivered a crucial, subsequently historic, Presidential candidate's address, from what was then West Berlin. This address was recorded for a subsequent national U.S. TV broadcast which occurred later that same month. With today's turn in world economy and politics, my purpose in delivering this forecast, first, in Berlin, then, should become readily obvious.

I announced that the crucial issue of U.S. policy under the next U.S. Administration would be the impending collapse of the Warsaw Pact system. I stated then and there, that this would be a development leading toward the reunification of Germany and designation of Berlin as its future capital. In that address, I emphasized the appropriate U.S. policy-orientation for this impending seismic shift in world politics. My proposal, delivered then in my capacity as a Presidential candidate, was that the next President of the U.S.A. must foresee the impending of such a crisis of the Warsaw Pact, as the occasion to offer cooperation in a Eurasia reconstruction program which would be led by a U.S. initiative for a cooperative general revitalization of the obsolescence-wracked civilian economies of Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union.

This program, as I defined it thus in October 1988, should have been quickly successful under the forecast circumstances which erupted slightly more than a year after my Berlin press conference. In retrospect today, this program would have ensured a rapid and enduring long-range economic recovery and growth of the world as a whole. Today's U.S. and European depression-crisis would never have come to be the immediate, devastating threat it is today, had my policies been adopted. Instead of my policies, my opponents succeeded, to a significant degree, in pushing those lunatic utopian schemes demanded by such as the Bush "41" Administration's Cheney, back as early as 1990.

So, Thatcher, Mitterrand, and "41" succeeded in adopting a policy directly opposite to my own, a policy consistent with the influence of the rabid strategic utopians in "43's" own Administration today. That trio's response to the fall of the Berlin Wall, slightly more than a year after my 1988 Berlin conference, has therefore been a principal contributing cause for the accelerated rate of collapse of physical economy of the combined U.S. and European economies since that time.

That typifies the issues underlying the often embittered personal differences arising from the conflict between my policy and theirs, differences amplified by the issue underlying their extraordinary fear of superiority of my intellectual powers over theirs, in matters of economic and related policy-making. This same specific fear of my intellectual powers (I



Press conference in Berlin: The most crucial turn of events in recent world history began on Oct. 12, 1988, when LaRouche delivered a historic Presidential candidate's address on the impending collapse of the Warsaw Pact system, and the Eurasian reconstruction program that must necessarily follow.

command no other kind) had been that expressed by the U.S. utopian faction since 1982-1983 developments around what became known as the SDI.

It was my personal role in the crafting of the SDI, in collaboration with relevant officials of the Reagan Administration, and my personal role in related back-channel discussions with the Soviet government, which pre-qualified me as uniquely suited to the negotiations which should have occurred at the 1989-1990 point of the collapse of the Warsaw Pact system.

My proposal for a system of strategic ballistic-missile defense based on new physical principles, which then-President Reagan adopted for his March 23, 1983, SDI proffer to Moscow, had been previously designed by me as the most effective means of outflanking both the Anglo-American and Soviet utopian factions' Bertrand Russell-led commitment to Mutual and Assured Destruction (MAD). I had forecast, in February 1982, that were President Reagan to make the proffer I recommended, and if the Soviet Union were to reject that proffer, we must expect a probable Soviet economic collapse to occur, approximately five years ahead. The collapse, as I had forecast it, occurred just slightly more than six years later. That forecast had been based on two included considerations. First, my attention to certain characteristic flaws in the Soviet

civilian economy. Second, evidence assembled during my 1977-1982 effort to define a mutual U.S.A.-Soviet escape from the “Kissingerian” trap of Mutual and Assured Destruction.

From Summer 1982 through 1989, the hate-filled utopians, such as the Heritage Foundation, their controlled mass-media, and their corrupt political-party henchmen, mobilized their forces, inside and outside government, against me, and, a bit later, also Dr. Edward Teller. My policy, as expressed by President Reagan’s March 23, 1983 and October 1986 Reykjavik proffer of cooperation to the Soviet government, was, like my early-1986 summary of a forty-year space-program, the long-range strategic planning basis for my October 12, 1988 announcement concerning the impending economic collapse of the Warsaw Pact. For my international influence on account of this nested set of policies, I was openly hated and feared by both the U.S. utopians and Soviet General Secretaries Yuri Andropov and Mikhail Gorbachev, more or less as much as by the U.S. utopians and their political supporters. However, with the collapse of the Warsaw Pact system, my thus-validated credibility for dealing with the Soviet government on the matters posed by the radically transformed global strategic situation was outstanding.

With me put temporarily out of the way, almost immediately following the January 1989 inauguration of Bush “41,” the utopian faction around Shultz and Cheney within the Bush Administration conducted its terrible blunders almost unchallenged. The utopians’ policy, adopted, if only in part, by “41” at that time, was to seize the opportunity presented by the collapse of Soviet power, to establish what was intended to be an “eternal” Roman-imperial-style rule of the entire world by the Anglo-American Tory concert of power. Later, as the utopians grew increasingly insane over the course of the 1990s, the largely “wise-guy-connected” Chicken-hawk brigade of utopians, showed their commitment to establishing an eternal U.S. imperial rule over the planet. These creatures tended, more and more, toward merely tolerating the still unavoidable burdens of partnership with the United Kingdom they had formerly viewed with awe; by their actions, they came to view London as a come-down Sancho Panza trailing after the lunatic, passionately homicidal, American Don Quixote. (Naturally, sane leading Britons are not at all pleased with such paranoid schemes of Vice President Cheney and his Chicken-hawks.)

An intelligent approach to the collapse of the Warsaw Pact system, would have been to integrate the massive potential for net economic growth bottled up within the system into both a reduction in the costs of operation of existing military systems, and a mobilization of new mechanisms of international credit for a coordinated, accelerated rate of increase of produced net physical output, per capita and per square kilometer, globally. We could have emerged from the physical-economic depression already fully under way inside the U.S. during the 1980s, into the greatest rate of increase of real

physical productivity in history, a planet-wide growth.

Instead, under the cover of agreements adopted by Thatcher, Mitterrand, and Bush, we did exactly the opposite. The policy conducted against Europe and the territory of the former Soviet Union since 1990, was to loot and destroy the greatest part of the productive potential existing in 1989-1990, in not only the former Warsaw Pact area, but within Europe as a whole as well. Worse, during the same time-frame, 1989-2002, the policies of the U.S.A., the IMF, and the World Bank, have accelerated the already ongoing, willful destruction of the basic economic infrastructure and physical production capacity of the Americas as a whole.

As a consequence of 1990-2002 U.S.A., IMF, World Bank, and related supranational agreements and practices, we have exhausted the recent dozen years in deliberately causing the relatively greatest collapse of productive potential in our planet’s history.

The outcome of these 1944 patterns of shift in U.S.A. and world policies and practice, has become today the complex of the three cited, leading threats to U.S. national security. If the U.S. soon dies, as it probably would if the present policies of Cheney et al. were allowed to continue, and if anyone survived to erect a tombstone for our poor, fallen nation, the appropriate inscription would be, as for the lost glory of Athens at the close of the foolish Peloponnesian War: “Died of Self-Inflicted Wounds.”

So far, the U.S. major-party nominating conventions of Summer 2000, rank prominently among those self-inflicted wounds.

The Doom of Our Reigning Economics Imbeciles

Modern European civilization was born within the Italy-centered, Fifteenth-Century, Platonic Renaissance. The modern nation-state republic, and the great increase in human productivity and well-being of modern times, were a continuing outcome of the republican, anti-oligarchical tradition set into motion by that Renaissance. The modern economic progress so set into motion, could have occurred, as it did, only through the force of scientific and technological progress typified by Nicholas of Cusa’s founding of modern experimental physical science, by the continuation of Cusa’s program by geniuses such as Leonardo da Vinci, and, later, the founding of a comprehensive, systemic form of mathematical physics, by the discoveries of that avowed follower of Cusa and Leonardo, Johannes Kepler.

Then and now, economic progress is essentially a product of the practice of the kind of anti-Romantic, Classical scientific and artistic culture traced, chiefly, from within the bounds of modern European culture’s intellectual debts to ancient Classical Greece. It is through the discovery and employment of experimentally validated universal physical principles, as discovered through the Socratic method, that the human will is able to increase society’s power in and over the universe,

as no other living species can do this.

Through those methods, we acquire the means to increase the ratio of the essential physical wealth of nature produced by us, in excess of the wealth we must consume to generate that production. The physical margin of such profit, is limited by the rate and relative scale of application of discovered universal physical principles. A “zero-technological growth” culture, is not a form of economy, but a commitment to endless attrition, an economic suicide-pact.

This notion of the discovery of universal physical principles, has been efficiently understood by the best minds of European civilization since ancient Classical Greece, as from Archytas and Plato through Archimedes and Eratosthenes. The explosive progress of modern physical science and productive powers of labor, during more than six recent centuries of modern European culture, has been chiefly the result of the Fifteenth Century’s revival of that ancient Greek Classical tradition in science and artistic composition radiating from the lantern of Brunelleschi’s catenoid cupola for the Cathedral of Florence.

In contrast to that knowledge, the problem is, that, for a parasitical financier or kindred oligarchy, poor, ignorant serfs and slaves are much preferred, politically, to a sturdy, intelligent citizenry of the sort unlikely to put up indefinitely with the rule by oligarchical parasites such as those associated politically with Cheney’s crew, and with the Enron and George Soros gang. To induce the submission of the human cattle of a past or new Roman Empire, one must stupefy the human subjects, as U.S. educational, “recreational” drugs, mass-media, investment, and employment policies have done, increasingly, with notable success, since the mid-1960s “Aquarian” cultural-paradigm shift.

In today’s post-1968 U.S., we have now replaced the relatively competent education under pre-1968 teachers, by a Ritalin-assisted proliferation of ignorant but fiercely opinionated teachers, who, often, themselves, would not have been qualified to graduate even from primary school, back during the mid-1960s. Such pervasive ignorance and superstition within an entertainment-stupefied population as a whole, like the imperial Rome of bread and circuses, or the modern equivalent in the U.S.A. today, are qualities of decadence in populations desired by those who would hope to maintain a Roman-style world empire.

A population employed in true scientific and technological progress, can not be a stupefied one, like most of those young victims coming out of our schools and even many university programs today. A population addicted to the quasi-psychotic pseudo-science of video-games, were better suited to the role of the Roman-imperial-style cannon-fodder of global perpetual warfare.

Thus, to realize the social-control objectives of the utopians, the U.S.A. and Europe had to be transformed from reliance upon technologically progressive forms of physical-goods production and professional health-care services, to the



The first Roman Emperor, Caesar Augustus. The danger that confronts us now, is that we will be trapped in a Roman imperial-style, no-win, perpetual war by the Cheney Chickenhawks’ utopian fantasies.

kind of decadent consumer society we have tended to become since approximately the time mad Zbigniew Brzezinski’s proposal for a post-industrial “technetronic” economy was presented, during the late 1960s.

Therefore, the immediately practicable solution to the immediate U.S. internal crisis, must appear to be something like a return to the days of the Eisenhower and Kennedy Administrations. The object is to reverse rapidly the damage done by the 1965-2002 cultural paradigm-shift. However, it would be insufficient to do no more than imitate, indifferently, both the follies and actual successes of the 1945-1964 interval. We must distinguish between the follies and successes of that time; and, we must use the successes as proven benchmarks, which show the way back toward that innovative highway of progress which the U.S.A. was created to become.

Today’s policy-shaping must take into account the following essential differences between the disaster of 1929-1933, and the far worse, onrushing disaster of today.

Despite the financial and economic crises of 1905-07, the first two decades of the Twentieth Century were a period of continued, energetic expansion and technological progress of the U.S. and European economies. Through the latter decades of the Nineteenth Century, into 1914, the world was mobilizing, both in technology and volume of output, for the war which the U.K.'s Prince of Wales (and later King Edward VII) was intent on unleashing on the continent of Europe. Edward was putting France, Germany, Italy, Russia, Austro-Hungary, the Ottoman Empire, and Japan, at one another's throats, all for the subsuming purpose of maintaining the British Empire's "geopolitical" rule of the world through maritime supremacy over both the U.S.A. and the interior of the Eurasian continent.

During the so-called "war to end war," and at the Versailles Treaty negotiations, the watchword was the expression of intent to proceed toward future "world government," a utopian goal sometimes identified as World Federalism. Then, and under the influence of the post-1944 utopians, "peace through disarmament" became a code-name for de-industrialization and halting scientific and technological progress, as much as might be deemed feasible. Thus, the combined, ruinous effect of "The Great War" was the destruction suffered by that war, and maliciously pre-calculated, and largely economic-cannibalistic destruction of existing, post-war wealth. The post-war Versailles and related policies were aimed at the further destruction of the kinds of maintenance and growth and technological progress which had characterized the period since the 1861-1876 emergence of the U.S.A. as the world's leading model of agro-industrial progress.

Thus, whereas less than a generation passed between the end of World War I and President Roosevelt's launching of the U.S. recovery from the 1929-1933 Great Depression, twice that interval of time has elapsed since the mid-1960s beginning of the willful destruction of the U.S. internal economy. Worse, has been the savagery of the rate of willful destruction of basic economic infrastructure, especially since, firstly, the tenures of American Tories Henry A. Kissinger and Zbigniew Brzezinski as U.S. National Security Advisers, and, secondly, the more accelerated rate of net destruction since 1990 up to the present time.

While the general principles of reconstruction for today remain broadly the same for today's crisis as they did for Franklin Roosevelt's first and second terms, the sheer magnitude of the U.S.A.'s present own economic disaster at home, as measured per capita and per square kilometer, is, speaking relatively, qualitatively greater than during the middle 1930s. We should have learned enough, collectively, from the 1933-1945 experience, and from other lessons acquired since, to overcome the difficulties before us, but we will fail unless we recognize those combined physical and ideological factors of destruction embedded within the present economy and its ideologies.

The greatest single internal danger to our republic today,

is not as much the admittedly terrible physical shortages in our infrastructure and productive capacity which have piled up over the recent thirty-five years. Our worst economic affliction is the set of habits which have been built into our popular culture and our economic thinking, under the recent three-and-a-half decades' shift from our former general consensus as a vigorous productive economy, down deep into the pit of a post-productive, decadent culture of an habituated "consumer society." Those habits which we have cultivated, in the prevalent zeal for a "post-industrial" utopia, have become the knee-jerk cultural reflexes which always tend to cause today's majority of popular opinion to prefer, repeatedly, the wrong, ultimately self-destructive choice of decision. To the degree that that cumulative cultural paradigm-shift is regarded as the wisdom of "democratic opinion," the U.S.A. today is a self-doomed nation. Without recognizing that this danger to our nation, and us all, comes from, largely, within ourselves, there could be nothing describable as a democratic possibility for a general economic recovery today; today, that recognition is what stands between us and our nation's self-extinction.

The utopian policy rat-race currently organized by Pied Piper Cheney's fanatics, is to be recognized as something which became possible today, only because of the broader accumulation of insanity which has taken increasing control of popular opinion, and also policy-shaping, since approximately 1964.

Such are the essential, predominantly internal features of the strategic threats to the U.S.A. today.

The U.S. Strategic Situation Today

One way to set off consternation in most discussions of "national security," is to ask, what each of those persons represented believes President George W. "43" Bush really means by the term "national security." It should be evident, beyond reasonable dispute, that, so far, the putative author, or authors, of the document entitled President George W. Bush's *The National Security of the United States of America*, may simply mean to take pleasure from seeing the effect of the sound of those words uttered there on others, as President Bush does, visibly, in many of those instances he is seen speaking on camera. Therefore, especially under today's conditions, our first step in any discussion of the leading crucial issues of "U.S. national security," now, must be to clarify what you and I ought to understand the term to mean. I am using the verb "to mean" in its physical-science meaning, as the intention, expressed by means of a universal principle, created by God or man, to produce, systemically, a specific type of result.³

Look around you. What do you read and hear on the subject of "national security?" Today, in circles of our govern-

3. For example, intention as employed by Johannes Kepler to indicate the universal principle of gravitation which he had been the first to discover.

Bush's Preposterous New Doctrine

From "The National Security Strategy of the United States of America," issued by the White House over the Presidential seal, September 2002.

From the Preface: "The United States will use this moment of opportunity to extend the benefits of freedom across the globe. We will actively work to bring the hope of democracy, development, free markets, and free trade to every corner of the world."

From the Over view: "The United States possesses unprecedented—and unequaled—strength and influence in the world. . . . America is now threatened less by conquering states than we are by failing ones. We are menaced less by fleets and armies than by catastrophic technologies in the hands of the embittered few."

From Section III—Presidential speech Sept. 14 in Washington, D.C.: "We will disrupt and destroy terrorist organizations by: . . . defending the United States, the American people, and our interests at home and abroad by identifying and destroying the threat before it reaches our borders. While the United States will constantly strive to enlist the support of the international community, we will never hesitate to act alone, if necessary, to exercise our right of self-defense by acting preemptively. . . .

[We will] compel states to accept their sovereign responsibilities."

From ((Section V—Presidential speech of June 1 at West Point: "We must be prepared to stop rogue states and

their terrorist clients before they are able to threaten or use weapons of mass destruction against the United States and our allies and friends. . . . [T]he United States has long maintained the option of preemptive actions to counter a sufficient threat to our national security. The greater the threat, the more compelling the case for taking anticipatory action to defend ourselves, even if uncertainty remains as to the time and place of the enemy's attack. To forestall or prevent such hostile acts by our adversaries, the United States will, if necessary, act preemptively."

From Section IX—Presidential presentation to Congress, Sept. 20: "To contend with uncertainty and to meet the many security challenges we face, the United States will require bases and stations within and beyond Western Europe and Northeast Asia. . . . Our forces will be strong enough to dissuade potential adversaries from pursuing a military build-up in hopes of surpassing, or equaling, the power of the United States.

"In exercising our leadership, we will respect the values, judgment, and interests of our friends and partners. Still, we will be prepared to act apart when our interests and unique responsibilities require."

THE NATIONAL SECURITY STRATEGY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA



SEPTEMBER 2002

ment, there is great confusion, much pure and simple ignorance and, also, buncombe. Don't be so simplistic as to blame President Bush entirely; competent discussion of the subject of national security today, may require your getting into deeper waters than you probably even suspected until now. If you really care about the result of whatever is called your national security, you can and will make a successful effort to understand the subject in those terms which I identify and explain as follows.

To begin that discussion: Most of you, for example, probably define "national security," according to your desire to feel a certain way about your immediate physical and financial circumstances. Or, you may think, similarly, about your desire for a feeling of security about conditions in your family, your neighborhood, or the town's leading employer. In that degree, you are thinking as a consumer, not a producer of that product you desire.

I do not ridicule those concerns; but, at the same time, I, a person on the published record as our nation's leading practicing economist, and the only person qualified, so far, to stand for the 2004 Presidential elections, must think of myself as a "producer of national security," rather being merely a consumer. In every area of experience, the same object looks entirely different to the person who thinks of it only as an object of consumption, than to the person responsible for actually producing that condition of our nation's affairs. The distinction probably becomes clearer if you remember the time you were lured into the misfortune of relying on a product manufactured to fit the preconceived ideas of manufacturers who think only as consumers.

In other words, when President Bush speaks of "national security," he is not committed to delivering an actual product. Like many of today's sellers he—like the former management of Enron, or the stock broker you have come to despise—is

preying on the irrational suggestibilities of investors, governments, and others, all of whom are thinking only as consumers. President Bush is peddling the “sizzle, not the steak.” Like certain major accounting firms, he is not selling you the truth about Iraq, or the financial condition of U.S.A., Inc.; he is selling you—or, shall we say, “uttering”?—the “bottom line,” but without giving you relevant facts concerning the way that “bottom line” figure was fabricated. If you are a wide-awake citizen, your rebuke to the President is, “Forget the packaging! What’s inside? Who built it, and how? Does it come with a worthwhile warranty?”⁴

When I, unlike “43,” speak of national security, I am thinking of the conditions which must be produced to create that security. You, in your role as not merely a “consumer” of national security, but also a responsible citizen, should be demanding of me, and of the President, and our government generally: “How shall we, together, produce that product which will really be there when I open the package to discover the actual product on which you have pasted the label ‘national security?’”

That said, let us now rephrase the question accordingly.

Today, when the sovereignty of nation-states around the world is being corroded into virtual nothingness by the acids of “free trade,” “globalization,” and so-called “world rule of law,” why should any government which accepts such trends, ask us to believe the sincerity of its commitment to some nebulous thingamajig referred to by the name of “national security”? Throughout known history, prior to the Fifteenth-Century, Italy-centered Renaissance, sovereign nation-states, in the sense of our U.S. Declaration of Independence and Federal Constitution, did not exist. What, therefore, is national security, as something which could not exist, except within the context of modern society dominated chiefly by a system of sovereign nation-states?

I, for one, am committed to U.S. sovereignty and national security; but, does “43” really know what that term means? In practice, from the evidence on the public record, those words probably have a directly opposite meaning for President George W. Bush, than for serious thinkers. For example: Lately, especially since his January 2002 State of the Union address, he often appears to believe that “Cheney says that I own this government as my personal property, for the duration. Now, I’m asking you, do as I tell you, nicely; but, if you don’t do exactly as I say, I may have to kill you.” Before accepting anyone’s use of the words “national security,” you should settle what that term ought to mean in practice, rather than accepting some empty phrase-mongering which a teleprompter is telling that speaker to recite.

4. The joke is: Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld quit government to set up a fast-food hamburger chain. When the customers complained, “Where’s the beef?” Rumsfeld replied, taking a firm grip on his dentures with his upper lip, “I won’t tell you where the beef is hidden, but I have bullet-proof evidence that it exists.”

To begin with: if national security is a condition of a sovereign nation-state, what is a sovereign nation-state?

What Is a Modern Nation-State?

Before the Fifteenth-Century Renaissance, many varieties of governments existed, but certainly not “of the people, for the people, and by the people.” The customary pre-1400 A.D. society was some people hunting down flocks of other people, for herding, breeding, and culling. The people who had been targeted for killing or capture, were considered to be virtually wild varieties of human cattle, as people or nations otherwise described as “rogues.” Were existing sovereign governments to be liquidated by either total anarchy or a world government, such as the United States turned into “43’s” new, world-wide Roman Empire, the result would be a return to a similar state of affairs, in which most people would soon be in the process of being killed as rogues, or herded as human cattle, all in a world-wide perpetual war on the borders of the empire; hunted and slaughtered by a smaller number of other people.

Therefore, instead of chattering like excited squirrels about “national security,” demand that our present government make a credible effort to clarify the bloody state of perpetual warfare it is both advocating and generating. Our nation should ask itself, is it doing anything to ensure the creation of a present, or future state of affairs which is intrinsically peaceful. “Peaceful” should signify a state of affairs like that defined by U.S. President James Monroe’s great Secretary of State, John Quincy Adams, as a condition maintained by a community of common interest among sovereign nation-states. So far, “43” appears to have no conception of the meaning of the term “sovereign nation-state republic.” Since he appears not to know what such a state is, where it is, how to build it; nor could possibly know what it is, or is not; how could he know what constitutes its “national security?” Could a worm find security in a Robin’s crop, or a nut in a squirrel’s cheeks?

Therefore, the following should be explained to him, as to others who have, similarly, mistakenly viewed national security only from what could be described as a radically “consumerist point of view.” In fact, I am virtually certain, as perhaps you are, that “43” does not know many of the following essential facts.

The sovereign nation-state came into being during the Fifteenth-Century Renaissance, in Jeanne d’Arc’s France, under her political heir-in-fact, the superb statesman King Louis XI. The second such state, was brought into being by force of arms, as Henry VII’s England. The concept used to create these states, was derived, in significant degree, from the writings of Dante Alighieri, as from, most notably, his *De Monarchia*. The crucial design for establishing a community of principle among sovereign nation-state republics, was delivered in Nicholas of Cusa’s book, *Concordantia Catholica* (roughly: Universal Community of Principle). The develop-

ment which set the preconditions for the formation of the first sovereign nation-states—Louis XI's France and, subsequently, Henry VII's England—was the great ecumenical Council of Florence, out of which came Cardinal Nicholas of Cusa's initiative for those trans-Atlantic voyages, of which the included result was Columbus' inspiration, under the influence of Cusa's leadership, leading to rediscovery of the Americas.⁵

These new kinds of governments, which were the specific forerunners of our own republic, became known, during the course of the late Fifteenth through Seventeenth Centuries, as what English-language usage termed "commonwealths." This signified a form of society in which the ruling sovereign was not considered to be divinely selected as a shareholder in human cattle, but was held accountable for promoting a certain notion of the general welfare of all of the people, in all of that territory, and for the benefit of the future as well as the present. The Council of Florence and the subsequent first establishment of such nation-states premised on such a notion of the principle of the general welfare, mark the point of separation between modern European civilization and feudalism.

Now define that certain principle, under which people were no longer to be treated as human cattle: The state and its government were accountable for promoting the general welfare of all of the people, including posterity. Now, consider the origin of the set of ancient Greek and Christian, Classical principles from which the crafting of the principled character of the modern sovereign nation-state is premised. To simplify the tracing of the transition, put to one side the important role and influence of the Arab Renaissance, as typified by the Baghdad Abassid Caliphate of al-Mamoun, Haroun el-Rashid, et al., and the related matter, of important influence of the scientists al-Farabi and ibn-Sina. Conceding the existence of those important facts put to one side, the specifically Greek-Christian contribution to the foundations of modern European civilization is, summarily, the following.

In all European culture since the time of Solon of Athens, this emerging concept of just government was derived from a principle which is termed *agapē* in the Classical Greek of Plato's *Republic*. The relevant political-legal definition of that term, as referenced in that location, is defined in that dialogue, within the debate respecting mutually irreconcilable principles of government, among the figures Socrates,

Glaucon, and Thrasymachus. Socrates, there, expresses the relevant notion of the term *agapē*. This notion of *agapē* is the basis for defining that relevant, certain notion of the general welfare.

This same conception appears famously in the Christian Apostle Paul's famous *I Corinthians 13*, and is a notion which pervades the *Gospel of John*. This Christian adoption of Plato's notion of the term *agapē*, was later translated into Latin Christian usage as *caritas*, whence the English translation of *The New Testament* derives the original meaning of the term charity, rather than today's popular misuse of that term. Its meaning, as specified by Plato, and the Apostles John and Paul, appears as the special, religious, and natural-law connotation of *Liebe*, in the briefer, alternate German translation of *agapē* for Christian texts.

Under the natural law for society, the practical corollary of these usages is the principled conception of the promotion of the general welfare, or of the common good. Hence, we have Cotton Mather's and Benjamin Franklin's emphasis on the principle of doing good, as the Apostle Paul had done earlier, as an underlying standard, rather than crude lists of do's and don't's, for defining moral conduct. It is not the act in itself, but the consequences of either acting, or failing to act for the common good, which is the measure of moral conduct under natural law. It is not isolated deeds which measure true morality, but, rather an efficient intention expressed as a continuing mission, an intention akin to a universal law of nature. In other words, a good intention in its form as an ongoing, practiced mission, as *I Corinthians 13* specifies this. It may be fairly said, therefore, that the essence of wickedness is negligence of the general welfare; and, that the distinction of pure evil is a Bertrand Russell-like, existentialist indifference to its implications.

As I shall point out, below, the strict meaning of *agapē*, so used, for purposes of what is termed natural law, can not be separated from Plato's Classical definition of the meaning of the immortality of the individual soul of the mortal human being, as this underlies all of Plato's dialogues, either explicitly in some cases, or at least implicitly in all others. Plato's *Phaedo* and Moses Mendelssohn's *Phaedon* are of outstanding relevance on this account. All competent insight into the principles of modern statecraft, depends upon a deep insight, like that of Plato and Mendelssohn, into the strictly functional, rather than arbitrary ("ivory tower" logic's) definition of the immortality of the individual human soul.

The issue of the immortality of the soul, as I shall treat that as a scientific conception in the following pages, is not only a matter of any merely arbitrary theology; it has been a central theme of statecraft throughout the literate history of European civilization. I shall show here, that if a religious teaching did not properly define the meaning of that term, "the very stones would speak."

In this report on the subject of U.S. National Security, I proceed as if to educate a man such as our current President,

5. It was discovery, in Portugal, of a letter of Cusa's, which set Christopher Columbus on the track leading to the discovery of a map of the world crafted by Cusa's collaborator, the astronomer, Paolo del Pozzo Toscanelli. Note, that the great-circle circumference of the Earth was measured with a highly significant degree of precision by the famous Eratosthenes late during the Third Century B.C., and Cusa had already written that the Earth orbited the Sun. By relying on Toscanelli's map, Columbus assumed he was sailing to Asia. The error was almost certainly Toscanelli's misplaced confidence in Venetian sources, concerning the distance from Italy to the Pacific Coast of China!

who is bereft of valid knowledge of the principles of statecraft; to educate him in those rudiments of that matter he would require, were he to intend to extricate his mind from what are merely typified by his truly, Classically tragic blunders so far. In service of that model intention, I assort the essential components of the subject-matter, among four general classifications.

First, the strategy for peace. I shall emphasize the expected pitfalls along the pathway of attempting an ecumenical approach to securing a peace consistent with national security.

Second, I shall emphasize a cluster of certain interconnected, fundamental principles underlying the conception of the modern sovereign nation-state republic: the notion of the immortality of the sovereign individual human soul.

Third, the actual function of the so-called "great man" man in preserving national economic security, as President Franklin Roosevelt did, under conditions of systemic crises such as the present one.

Finally, I summarize the nature of the chief present threat to U.S. national security: the collective, pathological syndrome, which continues to control "43's" government, up to the present moment.

I now proceed so.

1. Two Concepts of Ecumenicism

In modern statecraft's reflections upon the horror of such religious warfare as the medieval Crusades, the bestial expulsion of the Jews and Moors from Spain, the horrors of the Inquisition, and the 1511-1648 period of Venice/Habsburg-directed religious warfare, the pivotal issue for defining what modern convention terms "peace," or "national security," is a key to understanding the challenge of preventing both religious warfare as such, and, also, defeating similar horrors in the form of ethnic warfare. All other important challenges to peace in the world today, can be best understood from that point of reference.

Presently, the governments of the U.S.A. and Israel are gripped by the intention to unleash the greatest proliferation of both ethnic and religious warfare since what British historian Trevor-Roper described as that "little new dark age" which actually dominated Europe during the interval 1511-1648. For example, the administration of President George W. Bush, Jr. is currently committed to an extended ethnic-religious war against Islam, with Iraq the immediate jumping-off point.

One of the leading examples of the present doctrine behind the launching of such racial warfare, is that crafted jointly by Bernard Lewis, formerly associated with the British Arab Bureau, and two former protégés, Samuel P. Huntington and Zbigniew Brzezinski, of the notorious, now deceased Nashville Agrarian and Harvard Professor, William Yandell Elliott. This overlaps the Israeli ethnic-religious war against

Arabs, which is currently being conducted by that Israeli political faction which was founded by the avowed fascist Vladimir Jabotinsky, with support from the faction associated with U.S. Vice-President Cheney.

Modern European civilization's most elegantly clear reflections on these matters of principle, are typified by Cardinal Nicholas of Cusa's *De Pace Fidei* and Lessing's drama *Nathan der Weise*, the latter composed in honor of his friend Moses Mendelssohn. The theme of both is the souls' appeal, as among Christian, Jew, and Muslim, to the Creator: "Since You created all of us to be Your worshippers, why do You permit us to kill one another in Your Name?"

Proceed from a glance at this worst form of warfare, known as religious and kindred forms of ethnic warfare, and go from there to wars among states which, unlike civil war, are more or less neatly defined by conflict among governments whose populations are separated from one another by more or less clearly defined national borders.

The worst kind of warfare to fight is typified by conditions of homicide among adversaries living at close encounter, as wars fought either among the members of common neighborhoods, or in similar proximity to one another. In the age of such novel terminology as "weapons of mass destruction," bringing one's own troops, as invaders, to dwell for a time among neighborhoods populated by adversary general populations, as in the U.S.A.'s 1964-1972 folly in Indo-China, creates a related military problem. It was martyred Israeli Prime Minister Yitzhak Rabin's recognition of this danger, which prompted his part in that Oslo accord which each described as "a peace of the brave" between himself and Chairman Arafat. It was the intent to unleash religious warfare throughout the Middle East region, and beyond, which explicitly motivated such followers of the avowed fascist Jabotinsky as Prime Ministers Netanyahu and Sharon. Currently, the Bush "43" U.S. government is operating under the control of the utopian circles of Vice-President Cheney, with the intent to unleash religious and related forms of Roman-imperial-style, perpetual warfare throughout most, at least, of the Eurasian continent. There are no axiomatic differences between Cheney's commitments and those of the "Clash of Civilizations" doctrines of Bernard Lewis, Brzezinski, and Huntington.

The religious warfare in Europe, dominating the interval 1511-1648, the devolution of the U.S. war in Indo-China, the ultimately suicidal lunacy of continued Israeli "religious" warfare against the Palestinians, and the prospect of a U.S. land-invasion into the cities and other territories of the densely armed population of Iraq, are examples of wars in which your neighbor, indigenous or invading, kills you, and you him. This is only typical of the special quality, and "Armageddon Now"-like perils of warfare bogged down in this type of conflict.

Any protracted practice of even regular warfare, must tend, by the nature of the situation, to degenerate into such a



President Clinton with Prime Minister Yehud Barak and President Yasser Arafat, at Camp David, July 25, 2000. "By substituting a compromise of principles for a correction of principles, we produce, as in the case of the Clinton-Barak negotiations, compromises leading into a breakdown of the negotiations based upon what were essentially unprincipled, pragmatic designs."

fruitless form of an unjustified war, one which is inherently not worth fighting at such a price. In religious and ethnic wars, such as Ariel Sharon's war upon the Palestinian population, we see the worst variety of cases. By starting one's study of the issues of war and peace from that sort of warfare, as a point of reference, all of the issues of security of nations and peoples come together in a common point of reference. The name of the topical heading under which that study should proceed, is ecumenicism: How are the combatants of religious or ethnic warfare brought to desire to cease killing one another, especially in warfare where opposing general populations are engaged at close quarters, as in "land wars in Asia"? With what spiritual motive could one defeat the evil religious motives behind the present drive toward such warfare?

If you have adopted a principle which obliges you to engage in religious warfare, then the evidence that you are doing so proves something terribly wrong, morally and otherwise, in the way you have defined the religious or other interest which you purport to defend. That conflict between true spirituality and a religious doctrine riddled with evil motives, confronts us, now, with the same issued addressed so well by Cardinal Mazarin, in his role in bringing about that 1648 Treaty of Westphalia which ended thirty years of religious warfare in central Europe. We must take up the deepest question of all statecraft: Why should people not kill each over conflicting doctrines of religion? That question can not be answered competently, except by restating it; Does the individual human soul exist, and, if so, what does that mean in political, strategic practice?

The answer emerges in two successive steps.

First, when and why is an attempt at an ecumenical solu-

tion for a religious conflict foredoomed to fail?

Second, how and why does the proper notion of the meaning of the individual human soul, as provable from the standpoint of experimental physical science, lead to the discovery of that kind of ecumenicism which were most likely to halt, or prevent religious or ethnic warfare?

Now, I shall derive a corresponding conception of national security, from these considerations, showing it to be a provable notion of statecraft.

War, Religions, and Peace

In all significant instances, we must recognize that mortal, or potentially mortal conflicts between or among religious communities, encounter the difficulty, that a religious belief has what must be identified as its systemic characteristics.

A good first approximation, but only an approximation, of what is signified by systemic characteristics, is the case of a traditional classroom Euclidean geometry. That geometry is bounded by a set of definitions, axioms, and postulates, to such a degree that no proposition can be accepted as a theorem, if it is inconsistent with the governing array of definitions, axioms, and postulates. If arbitrary theorems are forced upon that geometry, then the systemic characteristic of that geometry as a whole disintegrates. In that case, the ecumenical intention will fail, leading toward a mental state of frustration which U.S. President Clinton experienced, repeatedly, in his failed attempts to bring about a durable implementation of a Middle East peace agreement. Such attempts as his, to reach agreements without actually addressing the deeper, controlling, practical issues of principle, then tend, as they did in those cases, to promote the very religious warfare which

the preceding, failed accord had claimed it would have averted.

What the U.S. utopian war-mongers, including Bernard Lewis, Zbigniew Brzezinski, and Samuel P. Huntington, are doing now, is a parody of the methods of imperial rule by ancient Rome, the methods which Napoleon Bonaparte adopted to launch the first among a series of fascist movements and states.

The Roman use of a pantheon, composed of various cults, officially certified as being “non-rogue” religions, used the systemic differences among variously approved and outlawed religious and ethnic groups, as a principal mechanism of “divide and conquer.”

This was the same method, including the Crusades, by which the financier oligarchy of a Venice which was tucked away at the North of the Adriatic, long maintained maritime power over Europe and most of the Mediterranean and Black seas, from about the time of the death of Charlemagne, until the last quarter of the Seventeenth Century. After that time, the same city of Venice continued to deploy its traditional stiletto of dirty diplomacy to continue control over the crucial issues of peace and war in Europe, until the occupation of Venice by Napoleon Bonaparte. Venice’s organization of, and control over the Crusades, beginning with the Norman Conquest, through most of the Thirteenth Century, is exemplary. Venice and the Habsburgs used their control over both the Spanish monarchy and the Princely Council of the Holy Roman Empire, as a controlling factor in religious and other warfare throughout Europe, during a period beyond its orchestration of the religious warfare during the 1511-1648 interval. The financier oligarchy controlling the Dutch and British India companies, from William of Orange on, were developed as imperial maritime powers in imitation of Venice’s financier-oligarchical tradition, and used the Venetians’ same Romantic methods of “divide and conquer,” to subjugate and loot many peoples more numerous than their own.

Only with the birth of the modern nation-state republic, in the Fifteenth-Century Renaissance, did warfare of this sort cease to be the characteristic expression of virtually all government. In its post-Renaissance efforts, such as those of the 1511-1548 interval, Venice used such assets as its Madrid and Vienna Habsburg tyrannies and other instruments, in the attempt to crush the modern institution of the sovereign nation-state out of existence. A part of that promotion of religious and other wars has been the characteristic impulse of pro-feudalistic relics, such as the puppet-role of our own American Tory hard core’s role in creating and deploying the London-Paris-Madrid-backed Confederacy.

Today’s often asserted claim, that it is the modern nation-state which is the cause of war, is a terrible lie; exactly the opposite is true. Faith in lying utopian recipes such as “free trade” and “world government,” as proposed today, is the poisonous gruel of those anti-nation-state delusions spread by the awful, such as the followers of H.G. Wells and Bertrand

Russell, to weaken and destroy those foolish enough to admire them.

As the referenced and other examples show, religious and related forms of ethnic warfare are the most effectively deadly strategies used to degrade nations morally and otherwise. The fellow who proposes policies aimed at such goals as a “Clash of Civilizations,” as Bernard Lewis, Samuel P. Huntington, and Zbigniew Brzezinski do, typifies the worst of all criminals the human species is capable of producing today. Such wretches not only make war; their influence, if permitted, pollutes and destroys all civilization. With this fact in mind, focus upon the distinction between flawed and effective forms of ecumenical strategies for peace among religions.

For the reason of the known danger which I have just pointed out, the emerging military policy of those of us attached to the cause of the sovereign nation-state republic, became the modern doctrine of strategic defense. Since, most notably, the policies of Cardinal Mazarin, of the great Jean-Baptiste Colbert, Vauban, Lazare Carnot, and Scharnhorst, the modern nation-state prepared itself, by aid of logistics and explicitly military means, either to greatly discourage an adversary in advance, or to win durable peace quickly against the onslaught of any possible aggressor. In such a contest for peace, the development of the strength of culture is the all-subsuming characteristic of competent modern strategy. Weapons defend, but it is culture which must bring the peace.

When Ecumenicism Must Fail

However, as I had warned publicly, and President Clinton’s failed efforts to bring about Middle East peace illustrate the point, merely pragmatic types of approaches to peace through ecumenical alternatives, must tend to fail, and usually will. The fault copied by Clinton lies in the substitution of a compromise of principles, for the task of correcting, and thus uprooting, the faulty axiomatic assumptions which will lead to war despite all efforts at merely pragmatic compromises.

Pragmatic compromises of principles must, necessarily, usually lead to a degenerative state of personal psychological and moral incoherence among the victims of such an illusory compromise. When unprincipled pragmatic “trade-offs” are used, instead of fruitful compromise rooted in agreed principle, as Israel’s brave Prime Minister Rabin proceeded; it is the moral sense of both parties which is compromised. As in the case of the failed, Clinton-sponsored peace negotiations between Palestinian and Israeli, when the compromise of opposing principles has failed in practice, as this must be expected, the parties are more likely to do evil after the inevitable failure of that compromise, than in times before the compromise had been adopted. Such is the outcome of the failed Camp David exercise today.

The reason for that historically recurring pattern should be obvious. In seeking an alternative to simplistic, merely pragmatic approaches to conciliation among representatives of differing ethnic-cultural strains, what shall we mean when



“The religious warfare in Europe . . . 1511-1648, the devolution of the U.S. war in Indo-China, the ultimately suicidal lunacy of continued Israeli “religious” warfare against the Palestinians, and the prospect of a U.S. land-invasion into the cities and other territories of the densely armed population of Iraq, are examples of wars in which your neighbor, indigenous or invading, kills you, and you him.” Here, Francisco Goya’s image of Napoleon’s disastrous invasion of Spain.

we say we are seeking “a compromise”? A careless approach to ecumenicism may obtain compromise at the price of compromising the integrity of the deep sense of personal identity among one or each of the participating parties. The principled, systemic issue here, is the essential part of the individual’s sense of personal moral-intellectual integrity within the framework of a specific culture. Remove that sense of personal integrity, and his next spate of rage will muster not a man at war, but a caricature of a man, a predatory beast gone mad.

In the case of Israeli-Palestinian relations, the failure of even the Labor Zionist current’s leadership, typified by David Ben-Gurion and Golda Meier, was not to come to the view of Nahum Goldmann, or the “peace of the brave” doctrine of Rabin, in a timely fashion. The natural impulse of European Jewry would have been the deeply embedded Socratic traditions of Moses Mendelssohn and the Eastern European Yiddish Renaissance. To the degree that concessions to the axiomatic moral depravity of avowed fascist Vladimir (Zeev) Jabotinsky were allowed to take over Israel’s political processes, no Middle East peace could ever be brought about except by the superior force exerted, as President Eisenhower did, by the U.S.A. and Europe.

To restate that point. Rather than compromising existing principles, discover, and remove the relevant fallacy in the set of principles, as is done in every case of a scientific discovery of principle which overturns, by correcting, a flawed set of principles. By substituting a compromise of principles for a correction of principles, we produce, as in the case of the Clinton-Barak negotiations, compromises leading into a

breakdown of the negotiations based upon what were essentially unprincipled, pragmatic designs. At the point that President Clinton, foolishly, publicly blamed Arafat for the failure of Clinton himself, the breakdown of the peace process was virtually assured, clearing the way for consequences such as the horrors produced by the Sharon government.

The pivot of that failure was President Clinton’s conceding publicly to Barak’s demanded violation of the well-defined, principled basis for any peace between Israelis and Arabs: that no political settlement shall violate the policy of maintaining the inviolability of the holy places in the region as presently, historically defined. By defending Barak’s demand for such a violation, President Clinton himself violated the implicit principle underlying the Oslo accords, thus unleashing the dogs of religious war, by demanding compromise on the very “peace of faiths” principle upon which a viable peace agreement depended axiomatically. Clinton’s error opened the door; Sharon charged through that door, with his feint against the site of the mosque. So, Clinton’s compromise of a principle unleashed the dogs of war. Had I been President, I could, and would have prevented that war.

In all cases, durable peace can be achieved only by premising it upon a complementarity of inner, principled agreements among the parties. To secure that peace, those principles must be discovered, and made the self-enforcing basis for the desired agreement.

For example, durable peace among religions, ethnic cultural currents, and even “white, Protestant, middle-class neighborhoods,” depends upon the efficient acceptance of a notion of truthfulness, rather than mere personal opinion.

Fascism, for example, depends, as in the case of Germany, upon the victim-believer's implicit adoption of a form of denial of the existence of knowable truth, a denial typified by the Nietzschean existentialism expressed in common by the pre-Hitler associates Martin Heidegger, Theodor Adorno, Hannah Arendt, the neo-Kantian Karl Jaspers, et al., as also by the Nazi philosopher Heidegger's pupil and admirer Jean-Paul Sartre.

In the case of the Nazi or other so-called "totalitarian" mental states, such as that of the leadership—among the followers of the self-avowed fascist, Vladimir Jabotinsky—of Israel's Likud party today, or the "universal fascism" propagated by Michael Ledeen, a substitute for the sane and moral person's function of truthfulness is found, in the inducing of a quasi-schizophrenic, elated state of "true belief" in some fantastic concoction modelled upon a scheme outside the knowable domain of space and time. This elation, clinically akin to that of the lynch mob or Nazis' Wagnerian "Nuremberg Rally," functions virtually as a "chemically" induced feeling of lunatic elation among the victims sharing that delusion. A similar problem, as portrayed clinically in Sinclair Lewis' *Elmer Gantry*, afflicts bodies among so-called "revealed religions," when a sexual-like quality of excitement (e.g., "ecstasy") infects those assembled in ecstatic entertainments of the Jonathan Edwards tradition, in which "more souls were born, than saved," or in more frankly Satanic mass "rock concerts" today.

The only systemic remedy and inoculation against such potentially homicidal, induced mental states, is the adherence of the individual to what serves, in effect, as an antidote to Kantian, empiricist, Cartesian, American pragmatist, and existentialist states of mind. That remedy is a systemic sense of truthfulness, the same sense of truthfulness which separates a great scientific mind like Leibniz's and Gauss's from the connect-the-dots irrationalism of the Eighteenth-Century "Enlightenment." It is the same sense of truthfulness which separates Classical musical composition and performance, such as that of J.S. Bach, Joseph Haydn, Mozart, Beethoven, Schubert, Schumann, and Brahms, from those Nineteenth-Century Romantics such as Czerny, List, and Berlioz, who sought to produce degraded caricatures of Classical composition and performance, for the sake of those more or less frankly "sexual," or quasi-sexual, sensual effects famously typified by the Liebestod duet from Wagner's *Tristan and Isolde*. Adolf Hitler's attachment to, and roots within the cult of Wagnerian Romanticism, typifies the coherence of existentialism, and of the tradition of Jonathan Edwards, with fascism.

A sense of ecumenical peace premised on a surge of ecstasy over the amorphous feeling of peace (e.g., "Schwärmeri," in formerly standard international usages among Freudian and related psychological doctrinaires), is not an ecumenical solution. It is a call to a dictatorial imposition of an arbitrary scheme, such as "world government," through

the fascist-like, Jonathan Edwards-like emotional elation of the devotees. (e.g., "Since I have agreed to love you, I have to kill you if you don't agree with my peace-plan.")

Vernadsky's Immortal Soul

To restate and develop that argument in broader terms, include the following considerations.

Thus, for reason of precisely that importance of reaching peaceful compromises which do not impair the individual's sense of personal-moral integrity, a likely agreement to durable peace is the work of Classical philosophers; that, in the sense of Classical Greek philosophy, not lawyers. That remedy is provided only by a rigorously defensible sense of a principle of discovery of knowable truth. The referenced cases of Plato, Cusa, and Moses Mendelssohn, serve to typify such work of such Classical philosophers. The key to the possible success of this work, is the issue of those proofs of the sovereign existence of the immortal individual soul, which are to be found, as I shall show a bit later here, in Classical practice of natural law.

This principle is applicable to all cases; that form of the problem, common to all cases, is only more frankly expressed in the cases of what are explicitly, religious and ethnic conflicts.

Therefore, at least in part, the implied solution must come from outside what is classed as "revealed religion." By that, I mean a body of religious belief which relies on arbitrary assumptions of definitions, axioms, and postulates, as a classroom Euclidean geometry, or today's "new math," is not truly science, but a form of revealed religion. By definition, any arbitrary assumption, such as one of those commonly taught in classroom geometry, is a controlling belief adopted under a purely arbitrary, unproven authority. If that were the case, then it is the axiomatic fact of the situation, that the believer does not actually know that the assumption is true. Therefore, the belief, being arbitrary in that degree, does not rise to the standard for truthfulness, even when it seeks to discover truth otherwise.⁶

For example, inside the U.S.A. today, the most likely political base of support for a policy of religious warfare, is to be found, ironically, in a combination including chiefly traditional anti-Semitic "white, Protestant" sects of the

6. This argument is identical with the premises of Carl Gauss's exposure of the follies of "Enlightenment" empiricists D'Alembert, Euler, and Lagrange, as presented in Gauss's 1799, original announcement of his discovery of the fundamental theorem of algebra, which proved the existence, and implications of that (physical) complex domain existing outside the arbitrary definitions, axioms, and postulates of a reductionist form of arithmetic and geometry. Notably, Gauss's copy of Plato's notion of physical powers, as in the *Theaetetus* dialogue, reflects the knowledge of the existence of an anti-Euclidean notion of a physical geometry, known among such as Archytas, Plato, and Eratosthenes, and probably among the Pythagoreans earlier. Riemannian physical geometry today, is the form of anti-Euclidean physical geometry which expresses the currently known form of outgrowth of that Classical tradition in mathematical physics.

glazed-over-wild-eyeball variety; kindred sorts of Pope-hating, pro-feudalist, pro-anti-Semitic nominal Catholics, such as the Carlists and their like; together with the temporary allies of both among pro-fascist, Likud-allied religious and secular Zionist cults. All in all, a heteronomous accretion of single issues, a coalition with no coherent, single, unifying principle among them. A phenomenon akin to playwright Peter Weiss's portrait of the mental asylum at Charenton. The result is not a religious body, but a pestilence, like the locust-like epidemic of roaming hordes of Flagellants during Europe's mid-Fourteenth-Century "New Dark Age." Thus combined, this constitutes a minestrone of eternal bad taste, whose very existence is both an intended insult to God and a horror for mankind. A living caricature of misguided ecumenicism at its worst.

That case is admittedly extreme, but nonetheless undeniable, rampant evil. It points to the importance of locating ecumenical solutions in the constitutional functions of perfectly sovereign nation-state republics, such as our own. The danger to be averted by such a policy, is fairly described as the menace of pantheism, as the case of imperial Rome only illustrates the point. This tradition of pantheism did not originate with Rome; it has been the recurring form of the same type of affliction in all known cultural tendencies toward imperialism, from Babylon and Delphi, to the coalition rallied in support of Vice-President Cheney's present Bush Administration.

This immediately raises a related crucial problem. There exists the delusion of some of today's U.S. Federal judges and others, that the intention to separate church from state, as prescribed in that addendum called the "Bill of Rights," compels government to play atheist. If, as must be done, the reading of all parts of the U.S. Federal Constitution, and all enacted laws and judicial rulings, are to be interpreted always and solely from the standpoint of the historically-defined authority of the Constitution's Preamble, this exclusion of God from the classroom is precisely the sort of atheists' variety of religious fanaticism which does need to be outlawed, that because it is being forcibly imposed, wrongly in fact, and by unjust means.

Under the United States' obligation to outlaw ancient imperial Rome's law and practices, two things are implicitly banned. First, in the simpler case, an established state Church. Second, in the matter before us here, the introduction of either any pantheon, or any approximation of a principle of Pontifex Maximus or Delphi cult; and also any other kind of effort to impose a pantheistic principle of law on society.

The state's obligation is to recognize no other legal authority by, or over religious bodies, or belief, but the principle of truthfulness in the proper functions of the state itself.

For example, consider some of the evidence showing reasons why such a standard of truthfulness poses an enormous, perhaps insuperable mental challenge to "43."

The case of the slaughter conducted under Texas Governor George W. Bush, is a relatively simple illustration of the

presently imperilled status of truthfulness in law. Governor Bush's galloping irresponsibility in respect to executions of convicts, illustrates, in the most disgusting way, the often mutually exclusive meanings of a conviction adopted as a matter of a legal fiction, on the one side, and a truthful determination of justice, on the opposing side. The rejection of probable cause-in-fact for reexamination of a conviction and death-sentence, on the pretense of a doctrine of "finality," typifies a judicial practice now fostered by the worst of the wild-eyed fanatics on the Supreme Court; a practice which kills for the sake of a fictitious assumption, instead of truthful one.

James Baker III, acting as legal representative for the Republican Presidential nomination of Governor George W. Bush, explicitly invoked the fiction of "finality" as a substitute for truth, in his public pleading on the matter of the troubled Florida election-result. The truthful, and reasonably expeditious procedure for such a contested Electoral College vote-total, was variously prescribed and otherwise implicit; that procedure was not followed, because of the intervention of Justice Antonin Scalia's crafting of a special legal fiction of "finality" which prevented a truthful process of law from taking its proper course. The Constitution itself was seriously damaged by that use of a hastily concocted administrative fiction.

The proclivity for adoption of hastily composed, and often blatantly anti-constitutional fictions of administrative law, in the abused name of national security, has been an increasing characteristic of the Bush Administration throughout the course of 2002 to date. Presently, an increasingly exuberant excess of legal fiction, thus transforms us into what threatens to become, in truth, a lawless nation.

This problem tends to erupt most readily when the state applies its sanctions to the area of the sundry fictions of religious belief—as in support for Sharon's racist religious warfare; and sliding into a war on Iraq with no honest evidence presented, with no license for military action under understood rules of engagement; and preemptively launching a general war intended to be of extended magnitude, against a series of targetted nations, without waiting for the mere constitutional technicality of the prescribed Declaration of War authorized by the Congress.⁷

The point is, that there are certain matters of religious belief which either do, or do not coincide with an extant, truthful determination of universal principle. It is possible, nonetheless, to cut through this Gordian Knot. My intention here, is focussed on the matters of war and peace; so, I touch on other matters only as far as those are of important bearing on the war-peace matters.

To go as directly as possible to the core of the way in which separation of church from state affects the design of a

7. Testy impatience with the UNO's or Congress's processes of deliberation is the premise for an impeachment of a President, not a justification for ordering a war to proceed. Iraq is much more important than Monica Lewinsky.

national-security doctrine, I shall now summarize the implicit definition of the immortal human soul which is central to scientist Vladimir Vernadsky's definition of what he named The Noösphere. I summarize his crucial point, and then restate the same set of issues in the setting of my own original discoveries in the field of the science of physical economy.

2. The Human Soul, a Scientific View

At St. Petersburg, Vladimir I. Vernadsky had been among the students of that Dmitri I. Mendeleev famous to all physical chemists today, as the discoverer of the periodic table of elements. Vernadsky, himself the founder of the branch of physical chemistry known as biogeochemistry, was the first to develop a rigorous conception of what he named the Biosphere. He proceeded from that success, to present his discovery of what he named the Noösphere. All scientifically competent environmental studies in the world today, are referenced to Vernadsky's development of the interrelated, but also respectively distinct concepts of Biosphere and Noösphere. My own original discoveries in the field of physical economy, lead me to accept those features of Vernadsky's work which overlap my own principal specialty. However, more than a half-century ago, I had added what is recognized here as a relevant, distinct point of difference between my conception of the Noösphere and that presented by Vernadsky.

From the standpoint of constitutional law in general, his experimentally based, proof of principle argument for the distinct existence of the Noösphere, supplies natural law with a physical basis for the application of the principle of the immortal soul, a proof which stands without need for any appeal to axiomatic assumptions of so-called revealed religion. So, "the stones may speak," without violating the separation of church from state.

Although Vernadsky's definition of the Noösphere provides a specific, conclusive physical-scientific proof for the existence of the human soul, his definition lacks the addition of my proof of that soul's efficient immortality. This latter proof has contributed an indispensable element to my unrivalled thirty-odd-year, published record of consistent success, as, cumulatively, the world's presently most successful long-range economic forecaster. I am therefore empowered, by reference to the relevant physical evidence, to speak with truthful confidence on the subjects of both the efficient immortality of the soul, and the essential role that knowledge must play as a controlling factor in political leadership of nations.

Here, I now summarize the relevant aspects of the argument and proof I have given in earlier published locations. I summarize the crucially relevant points of Vernadsky's discovery, and then restate the matter from the vantage-point of

my own work. In the first instance, I define the physical-scientific knowledge of the existence of the soul. In the second instance, I use the economic significance of physical science to demonstrate the immortality of the soul within society.

The political importance of such knowledge, lies in the fact, as I shall indicate, that the leaders of society, so informed, will tend to act appropriately in the policy-shaping of nations, whereas those who are ignorant of these principles would almost certainly not. One should emphasize, that one who has not mastered those most essential features of Vernadsky's work which I reference immediately below, is not yet qualified to formulate conclusions for official action bearing on the policies of nations respecting the environment.

To go directly to those points, I first summarize my own defense of the physical argument made by Vernadsky, and, after that, my own relevant standpoint within the science of physical economy. Some of the language I use here is unavoidably technical; but, it is necessary in any competent argument on a matter of science such as this one.

Vernadsky's Noösphere

From my standpoint, what Vernadsky defines as the Noösphere, is describable in mathematical-physics terms, as a Riemannian manifold composed of three distinct, but multiply-connected phase-spaces. Vernadsky, without employing Riemann's concept of physical geometries, defines it to the following effect.⁸

In the history of experimental physics since Johannes Kepler's 1609 publication of his epoch-making *New Astronomy*, universal physical principles are competently defined mathematically only as experimentally demonstrated, universal effects which are discovered as solutions to evidence of problems which can not be comprehended within the framework of a preestablished physical-mathematical system. Thus, the fact that the orbit of Mars was, in fact, not only elliptical, but also not of uniform motion, presented that paradox which discredited all of both Aristotelean and empiricist schemes. This evidence led Kepler to discover a universal physical principle, gravitation, by recognizing a built-in intention of the universe as operating "from outside" the comprehension of the ivory-tower mathematical schemes of Claudius Ptolemy, Copernicus, and Tycho Brahe. Since Vernadsky's later experimental definition of the Noösphere, such effects are divided among three general classes: abiotic (non-living), the Biosphere, and the Noösphere.

Vernadsky's discovery of the Biosphere was not strictly new. Since ancient Classical Greece, pre-modern physical science had already recognized that the physical universe is composed of two interacting phase-spaces, one of systemically non-living processes, the other living. The foundations of modern scientific thinking were provided by the adoption of the Classical Greek heritage along these lines.

8. Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr., *The Economics of the Noösphere* (Washington, D.C.: EIR News Service, 2001).

It was already recognized, even prior to Plato's crucial work in this area, that non-living and living processes reflected different, but interacting classes of principles, such that living processes were dominant, if only in the long run. This defined the universe as hylozoic (e.g., "living matter"). For Classical Greece, as documented since the collaboration between Archytas and Plato, the mathematical proof of the hylozoic principle, was supplied chiefly by three great, crucial anomalies in physical geometry. These three were the problem of doubling the square and the cube by construction, and the anomalous implications of the proof of the construction of the five Platonic solids. In other words, that the mind of man could change the world by the methods associated with those mathematically paradoxical challenges, showed human nature as expressing a universal principle beyond both non-living, and merely-living processes.

Thus, on the one side, non-living processes seemed describable within the bounds of what has been passed down as the first nine books of Euclid's *Elements*, but only up to a point of crisis typified by the challenge of doubling the square and cube by construction. The construction of the Platonic solids introduced a qualitatively new paradox, reflected in approximation in the last three books of Euclid's *Elements*. This paradox was a central feature of Plato's contributions to physical science, and would occupy the central place in Kepler's founding of the first approximately comprehensive form of modern mathematical physics.

The point, so far, is that an axiomatically different system is required for dealing with the behavior of living processes and their effects, than with processes which are, ostensibly, intrinsically non-living in origin. This distinction has one crucial qualification, that, as the case of doubling the square and cube, by construction, illustrates, a standard classroom form of today's instruction in arithmetic and geometry is not capable of representing the real universe of even originally non-living processes. The left-over problems from Classical Greek accomplishments were solved in an essential way, during modern times, by certain among the most crucial, successive discoveries, by, most notably, Kepler, Leibniz, Leibniz-Bernouilli on a principle of universal least-action, Gauss, and Riemann.

The cause of the hylozoic principle was reinvigorated by the work of Louis Pasteur and his followers, including Vernadsky's relatively youthful studies within that milieu. Gauss's development of the notion of the complex domain, had solved many of the left-over questions from the work of Archytas and Plato through Eratosthenes and Archimedes. This included Gauss's notion of a general principle of physical-space-time curvature, and Riemann's generalization of that. Through the advances in crystallography and mathematical physics sparked by the Classical currents of Alexander von Humboldt's collaborators in French and German science, the conceptual apparatus needed was developed, to deal experimentally with the geometrical side of the mathematical-physics of living processes and their fossil residues.

Meanwhile the work of Kepler on the almost Bachian, harmonically internal ordering of the Solar system as a whole—as reflected in Kepler's ironical little masterpiece on the subject of the snowflake—supplied important, experimentally based indications of the general way in which two distinct phase-spaces, the non-living and living, interacted, to the ultimate advantage of the living, within the universe at large.

Through his work in establishing the branch of physical chemistry called biogeochemistry, Vernadsky was able to put together the evidence needed to show a general case for the existence of the Biosphere.

The Noösphere

Just as the concept of the Biosphere depended upon showing physical effects which could not have been generated by non-living processes, so the concept of the Noösphere depended upon showing of physical effects within the Biosphere which could not have been generated by either abiotic or living processes in general. To make the argument as short as possible, these effects are each and all generated by a form of human action of which no other form of life is capable. That form of action is most simply illustrated by the experimentally validated discovery of a universal physical principle by the same general standard displayed by Kepler's original discovery of universal gravitation, as that application of Plato's principle of hypothesis is presented in exemplary, psychologically intimate detail, in his *New Astronomy*. This is the same principle of discovery exhibited by Archytas, Plato, Eratosthenes, et al., in the solution to the paradoxical problem of construction of the doubling of the square and the cube, otherwise expressed as the so-called Cardan problem, and Gauss's uniquely original (1799) report of his discovery of the fundamental theorem of algebra.

The study of the way in which such hypotheses, so generated, transform the biosphere, to the effect of increasing the potential relative population-density and life-expectancy of mankind, defines a specific phase-space, thus defining the superceding of the Biosphere by the Noösphere.

This capacity of the sovereign powers of successful hypothesizing by the individual human mind, sets mankind categorically apart from, and above all other living species. Thus, whereas the potential relative population-density of lower species is limited in range by its ostensibly genetic heritage, the human species' cognitive powers for hypothesizing, enable mankind to increase that potential by a relevant type of act of will.

Plato, like Gauss after him, defines those physical discoveries of experimentally validated universal principles as powers, as the transformation from line to surface, and surface to solid, is a physical act which reflects the power of the action which that transformation expresses. Leibniz, the original founder of scientific economics—the science of physical economy—emphasized this same notion of powers defined by Plato, as echoed by Gauss's 1799 paper. Herein lies the

special, central role of Gauss's discovery of his fundamental theorem for all physical science after that.

These physically efficient creative powers of the individual human mind, define the existence of the individual soul as an efficient physical existence.

That far, in that direction, Vernadsky's work will carry us. However, respecting the search for answers to those problems of statecraft being addressed in this report as a whole, Vernadsky does not go far enough.

LaRouche Against Russell

I shift from Vernadsky's definition of the Noösphere, to my own work. I begin this phase of this discussion of the Noösphere, with a brief summary of the relevant points of personal background.

My own relevant discoveries date from the setting of my adolescent defense of Leibniz's so-called "monadology" against Kant's *Critique of Pure Reason*. Early during the immediate post-war period, I recognized the fatal moral and intellectual defects in Bertrand Russell devotee Professor Norbert Wiener's fraudulent "information theory" dogma. I set out to show the nature and importance of Wiener's fraud from the standpoint of the way in which the discovery of new physical principles transforms the average productive powers of labor in manufacturing, in an anti-entropic way; a transformation thus increasing the anti-entropy of the relevant "universe" — of the relevant phase-space — in which such transformations are generalized. That far, my commitment was a bit unusual for that time, but not revolutionary in quality.

As a result of work then centered on my acquisition and study of William Empson's delightful book *Seven Types of Ambiguity*, during the period prior to my early-1948 peek at an advance copy of Wiener's book, I adopted my own modifications of Empson's consummately excellent work as a clue, from literature, as the basis for studying the whole, broader process of the way in which language must be used for the transmission of physical-scientific ideas and other concepts of principle within a general social culture: ideas beyond the scope of propositions such as "Who ate my cat?"

The initial phase of these explorations led me into a general encounter with the utopian school of systems analysis, as that was then centered on the work and promoted influence of Russell devotee John von Neumann. This defined me as an adversary of Russell and his kindergarten, and also led to my early adoption of the model provided by Bernhard Riemann as the appropriate way for representing the fruits of my discoveries and related labors. My early ventures into national-economic forecasting during the second half of the 1960s, came largely as a result of maturing reflection on the implications of the sundry adoptions and original discoveries which, while somewhat entwined with my activities as a management consultant, had been the happiest hours of my intellectual life during the post-war period up to that point.

The creative aspects of the individual's mental processes do not occur in the form of arithmetical thinking, but in the

same kind of activity expressed as the roles of paradoxical forms of irony — or, more emphatically, metaphor — and the role of the subjunctive mood in good Classical poetry. The connection of that function of Classical poetry to mathematical physics, is typified by such exemplary cases as the Classical Greek geometry paradoxes to which I have already referred. The notion of powers as employed by Plato's dialogues — as, for example, the *Theatetus* — and by Gauss's fundamental theorem, points to the way in which the hypothesizing powers unique to the individual mind generate and represent the discovery of an experimentally validated universal physical principle.

Thus, powers, as Plato and Gauss typify that notion, are another name for that class of ideas which are congruent with a demonstration of the validity of an act of discovery of a universal physical principle. This is also the notion of power which Leibniz introduced to his founding of physical economy as a branch of science.

The significance of the points just listed, becomes apparent when we shift attention to the transmission of such ideas (i.e., powers) from one mind to another. The picture becomes richer and clearer, as we study the functional role of irony, in general, and metaphor, in particular, in Classical forms of composition and performance of both plastic and non-plastic art. An example is the best Greek Classical sculpture, in which an instantaneous moment of a body in motion is the idea expressed. This conception is demonstrated by Brunelleschi's crafting of the cupola of the famous Cathedral of Florence, in which the principle of constructing the cupola is the catenary ("hanging chain" curve), the curve which is the Leibniz-Bernoulli epitome of a universal principle of least action — the epitome of frozen motion in action, and the secret underlying such closely related other residents of the complex domain as hyperbolic and natural-logarithmic functions.

The transmission of ideas of that class of universals, such as universal physical principles, is the crucial, functional connection which defines a viable form of social processes. We use measurement, and mathematical formulations, but the essence of the matter is a form of cooperation premised on the process of transmitting ideas of the class belonging to the category of powers. It is in art, rather than mathematics, especially Classical art forms, that the standards for the social process of transmitting such ideas are cultivated.

Therefore, we must think of a valid type of physical-mathematical conceptions as a branch of Classical art, and of Classical art as a branch of physical science. It is a physical science, because it generates a palpable physical effect, a measurable increase in the human species' ability to exist, and to increase its power, as a species, in and over the universe it inhabits. Such transmitted ideas, as long as they exist as ideas within society, are immortal. So is the moment of thought, which later generations replicate within their own individual minds, through re-creating the act of discovery by an Archytas, Plato, Kepler, Leibniz, or Gauss, within their own minds.

Such ideas may be compared with “improved genes,” which have the kind of effect on society’s power to exist, which only a genetic improvement would accomplish in a lower form of life. The progress of society as a living process, in that way, keeps the original individual’s discovery of such a “gene” alive as long as that process of self-development of society is either continued, or revived.

It is such a human individual, as an immortal soul within an ongoing historical social process, which is the standard for defining the meaning of *agapē*; of the general welfare, the common good.

That is, in brief, the gist of the matter. That is the standard of truthfulness by which all society should rule itself in all matters.

3. The Great Man in History

The essential principle of peace depends upon the existence of individuals who are exceptional, morally and intellectually, even relative to the class of those who are otherwise deserving of being classed as needed leaders in society. The cross-over from the ordinary leader, even some outstanding ones, to such exceptional individuals, is defined by the way in which only today’s historically exceptional person, such as Pope John Paul II, for example, is efficiently self-ruled by a sense of the true meaning of the living person’s ruling self-interest immortality of the human soul.

The ordinary person today, locates his or her so-called self-interest within the perceived interests of the mortal self, or, similarly, within the bounds of pains and pleasures which are the common experience of mortal life. The person of a higher degree of moral development, thinks primarily of what his or her life will mean after his or her own death, both for past and future mankind considered as a whole. All truly great statesmen, such as Solon of Athens, think so. Jesus Christ taught—and was a living expression of such wisdom in his Passion and Crucifixion—so.

The distinction does not end there. An adequate definition must shift emphasis from the simple choice of deed, to that which is specifically a uniquely human act—an act exemplified by the discovery of a universal physical principle, such as Kepler’s uniquely original discovery of universal gravitation; Leibniz’s uniquely original discovery of many things, including the calculus and the related principle of universal least action; Gauss’s 1799 presentation of the original discovery of the fundamental theorem of algebra; and Riemann’s revolutionary 1854 habilitation dissertation. On that account, we honor the past and future with our momentary mortal existence, and will not permit ourselves to do anything, or perform any act of omission, respecting principle, which would rightly be considered shameful in the vision of us by the always-watching past and future generations of mankind. Those who achieve that superior conception of personal self-interest, are

the truly great men and women of their time and place.

To what degree, I have not determined; but, on balance, President Franklin Roosevelt was a great man for his time. In every great crisis of mankind, the production and selection of leaders partaking of that exceptional quality, has usually been relatively decisive in the outcome of that crisis, for that period, and that situation. So, it is for the U.S.A. today.

One would hope, that the future of mankind would not be gambled on the rarity of great men and women of such exceptional qualifications. A better result would not be achieved by greater emphasis on democracy, but only by cultivating so many qualified to be leaders for times of crisis, that a happy outcome were always a more likely prospect than we have before us in the U.S.A. today. Today, our nation’s survival as a republic hangs by a thread or two. I, fortunately and unfortunately, am one of the few such threads available.

Until now, the most pervasive problem in known history of cultures, has been the role of the exceptional quality of the leading individual personality in inducing a society to master a systemic crisis intrinsic to its existing culture and general population—such as the imperilled U.S.A. today—or, in the alternative, the great suffering which such a society brings upon itself if it either lacks such a person to assume that leading role, or if it refuses to accept that leadership when it were available. Thus, in all great Classical drama, the principal two subject-matters are The Tragic and The Sublime. Hamlet’s Denmark is a Classically Tragic society, whereas Jeanne d’Arc epitomizes The Sublime in a most poignant way. Jeanne d’Arc spent her mortal life wisely; not only for France, but for all civilization; she is a blessed immortal soul.

Where Hamlet, given the opportunity to spend his life to save his nation, succumbed for fear of offending the custom carrying that nation, and led himself, toward doom, Jeanne was what Friedrich Schiller defined as a beautiful soul; she knew her life was mortal, and chose to spend her talent well. That quality of the Sublime which is crucial for a nation, or a world wracked by an existential quality of systemic crisis, requires an individual who is dedicated not to “my interests,” but, rather, to ensuring that the totality of a mortal life’s opportunity was not wasted by spending that talent on things which would be worth nothing to a man once he were already dead. If that person’s choice is truthfully useful to human progress, he or she has achieved the effect of the Sublime.

That notion of the Sublime defines what should be classed as “the great man” in society, the man who expresses the Sublime in that way.

The conflict between the great personality and the “little me,” is just that. The little people, just because of their littleness, often tend to destroy their great personalities, and their nation, in two ways. On the one side, they seek to drag the person of higher dedication down to the common level, saying, perhaps, “We will trust you if you are humble, because, then, you are no better than we are.” Or, they express their hatred of leaders, by putting clowns from among themselves



Citizens gather around a LaRouche organizing table near Washington College in Chicago, where they are challenged on their responsibility for “national security,” and for acting with an exceptional leader to change history.

on the throne. This conflict is a variable degree of problem. Where the influence of Classical culture and scientific progress are relatively more influential, popular opinion prizes accomplished and dedicated leading personalities, and Classical art. When a society is relatively depraved, it esteems the worst strata of exemplars, in leading personalities and art, to represent the little-mindedness of that nation as a whole.

When the crucial point is reached, as now, when a generation or more of habituated folly brings a society to the brink of general collapse, the population in general, and also leading institutions and personalities are confronted with a choice. End your foolishness, or go under! The U.S.A., among other nations, is at that critical threshold today. In such a circumstance, no individual, not even a Jeanne d’Arc, for example, can determine the outcome. Nonetheless, if those persons who are blessed with the developed potential for a higher, Sublime quality of personal commitment, do not act, the worst for all of that society becomes more or less inevitable.

Those are simply the basic facts of the problem described in a general way. There is another aspect to the significance of the great man under conditions of grave systemic crisis, such as that of the present moment. There are several crucial topics to be considered under that heading, but the economic aspect is the most crucial.

Capital Formation and Recovery

The trend in reports is, that the U.S. domestic product may be in the order of \$10-11 trillions per year, and the aggregate

for the world as a whole in the order of something more than \$40 trillions. The total debt exceeds some hundreds of trillions of dollars, much of it off-market, and much relatively short term, such as financial derivatives. The presently outstanding debt could never be paid in a timely fashion within the framework of the existing world monetary-financial system and economic policies of nations. Therefore, the attempt to collect on that mass of debts would plunge the world into a genocidal crisis comparable to Europe’s Fourteenth-Century, genocidal New Dark Age.

At the same time, the principal nations of the Americas, and Europe and Africa, are operating at levels below a physical-economic break-even point. There must be a rapid expansion of employment, with emphasis upon a shift from financial and other dispensable types of services, to large increases in employment in production of a mix of essential and high-technology capital goods, and a surge in employment in long-term basic economic infrastructure, such as transportation, power, water management, land reclamation, education and health-care systems. These imperative changes will require a relatively vast and growing infusion of long-term credit for capital improvements in the private and public sectors.

Such a challenge can be managed. However, by the nature of the situation, there must be a profound shift in policy-thinking, from today’s shrinking of forward thinking to the microscopic time-span of today’s financial trader, to long-term thinking focussed largely on one to two generations of build-up of physical capital factors. Short- to medium-term



China tests the world's first operating maglev railroad, at Shanghai. In the U.S., "there must be a profound shift in policy-thinking, from today's shrinking of forward thinking to the microscopic time-span of today's financial trader, to long-term thinking focussed largely on one to two generations of build-up of physical capital factors."

thinking will continue, but will emphasize the task of managing stability of the long-term process over the span of the bumps and gullies in the relatively shorter term.

The management of that balance between shorter-term and long-term capital formations, will require a return of the United States to the kinds of strict regulation, and fixed exchange-rates which prevailed in national and world affairs during the immediate two post-war decades.

Those conditions and requirements require a change in the character of the functions of government, back toward those of the Franklin Roosevelt era and immediate post-war decades. The habits of deregulation, privatization, free trade, and shareholder value, must be uprooted. The emphasis must be on crafting a system of checks and balances aimed to ensure the stable upward flow of physical capital formation, technological progress, and rebuilt standard of infrastructure and of living over the course of more than a generation.

A recovery program of the required scale and central missions must be integrated by aid of what used to be termed "Critical Pathway" scheduling. The principal source of danger to the success of a recovery program of that type, is that the effort will be nibbled to death as if by an invasion of mice; mice disguised as members of Congress, lobbyists, populist demands for those kinds of shifts in priorities which would fritter the recovery away in such fashion. The allotted funds for fixing a crucial bottleneck are diverted to some worthy cause, and the bottleneck is left uncorrected. The effect might remind us of the old gag: "A camel is a horse designed by a committee." Only a strong President, with energetically capable key aides, can prevent those sorts of corrosive attrition, by going directly to the people whenever a popular political mobilization for frictional corrosion

threatens the integrity of a long-term reconstruction.

For this set of conditions and tasks, personalities which find their identity in the long-term effects of their present actions, are the indispensable leaders of society. The quality of such persons is expressed by their dedication to progress in knowledge and use of universal principles, as typified by progress in the accumulation and employment of universal physical principles. Their motives are located within the bounds of the long-term, universal view, thus touching the Sublime.

When a culture is in self-inflicted collapse, as the U.S.A. today; when the economy has collapsed to a level of physical output which is not at least self-sufficient; getting successfully into the future, that as soon as possible, is indispensable. To march into that future, demands that leaders "see" both that future and the choice of pathway by which it may be reached. The ability to meet those requirements of foresight and decision-making, touches upon the Sublime. In such times, it is national leadership so selected which leads the nation to its national security, as President Franklin Roosevelt did.

4. The Present World Situation

At the present time the U.S.A. has no capable strategic adversary, or combination of adversaries on this planet, unless "43" creates such adversary forces by a continuation of his presently accelerating, reckless capitulation to the current utopian policies of Vice-President Cheney et al.

Should we put the presently depression-ridden world through the necessary measures of constructive economic re-organization in bankruptcy, the preconditions exist for sus-

tainable and gradually accelerating improvements in the world economic conditions, using methods and objectives akin in spirit to the decolonized world of sovereign nation-states which President Franklin Roosevelt had intended for the post-war world.

Admittedly, there could be dangers of a violent type, but, were we engaged in a general economic recovery—that, in partnership with most of the nations of the Americas and Eurasia, for example—we could readily develop and maintain a depth of strategic defense capabilities which would be awesome against any likely eruptions by a foolish government elsewhere.

The Administration's presently hysterical lunge toward war is not prompted by any desire to overcome some actual strategic threat extant today. It lunges toward war, because it wishes war, and is disposed to adopt any pretext it can concoct to have that war. There are no actual facts, no evidence, no cause of action under rules of engagement, no basis for a declaration of war. The lack of production of any actual evidence of probable cause tells us that the Administration wants war for no other reason than that it, like Roman Emperors Tiberius, Caligula, Nero, et al., passionately desires war as an intemperate child might be prepared to kill for the sake of getting a lollipop.

The other key factor aiding the war drive, is the fact of those leading forces who would prefer to risk sending the world into the likely prospect of global Hell, rather than resist the war. Cowardly "world-historical" figures, in sundry nations, would rather go to Hell than risk the severe displeasure of a government of the U.S.A. which has currently no net base of support among its allies, or the majority of its own population. The shortage of great leaders of nations, at a time we need them most, might, unfortunately, be noted on the tombstone of this global civilization.

The Common Tasks of Mankind

On the other side of the ledger, the immediate need for a global network of great infrastructure projects, is the marker of the practical basis for bringing at least most of the nations of the world into this complex of transportation, power, water-management projects. These projects, typified by what my associates and I have defined as the Eurasian Landbridge project, would become, within a generation or less, the most powerful economy-driver ever. Although the national components of these projects would be installed on and by the relevant sovereign governments, the cooperation and coordination in matters of technology and credit must be facilitated by new international monetary-financial systems through which the needed long-term credit and settling of accounts would be well-ordered.

These great infrastructure programs would provide part of the market for expanding industries and agriculture, and would serve as the basis for development of new industry and new urban centers in new areas. The long-term objective of

such infrastructure development in Eurasia, is the opening of areas where large natural resources exist, resources which could not be developed without the new infrastructure.

For this mission, the world must have a prevalent standard set of rates for debt-service which do not rise to the level of the rates of physical growth, per capita and per square kilometer, associated with the capital improvements for which the credit is extended.

The secure passage of our U.S.A., will be predetermined, not by any mere interpretation of the existing, imperilled world order, but, rather, by our choice of that intention, that mission, which predetermines our planet's successful orbital trajectory, its escape from the grip of the past and present, into the future. This ability to discover and adopt creative physical-scientific and kindred choices of our republic's intentional orbit, is a power which exists only for the human species, and not for any other type of abiotic or living species within the Creator's universe.

With the world's present monetary-financial system now disintegrating, and the economies of all of the nations of the Americas and Europe presently in a powerdive, it should be clear that the generally accepted slogans, explanations, and recipes of the leaderships of our political parties, major news media, and popular opinion, represent, combined, nothing but a highway to a global catastrophe for our nation and its people.

Clearly, the time has come when the possibility of the survival of our republic depends on the willingness of a majority among our people to abandon their habitual mind-slavery to so-called popular opinion. If our republic is to outlive the present crisis, we must not only abandon the war policies of Vice-President Cheney and his Chicken-hawks. Despite the monstrous mental decay in our schools, universities, and financier-controlled mass media, our survival as a nation now requires a majority among us to turn to actually thinking, as Britain's Percy Shelley wrote in his "In Defence of Poetry:" we require a reawakening of mental life of our citizens, away from mind-dulling populism and its fads, to the practice of "imparting and receiving profound and impassioned conceptions respecting man and nature."

There exist no simple-minded answers for the problems of survival or collapse of our nation today.

It is now a time when we shall either think and discuss in rigorous and profound terms, or we shall not continue to survive as a nation for very much longer. Widespread numb-headedness and opportunistic resort to populist rhetoric, instead of actually thinking, is presently the greatest single threat to our republic's security today. Demanding that politics be brought down to the level of, for example, outgoing Senator Phil Gramm's simple-minded populist slogans, would ensure the continued stupefaction of our political processes and their leading institutions, causing the probable early disintegration of our republic. "Politics for Dummies" may appear to be the popular standard for political discussion today. The fact remains that such standards are likely to pro-

duce results in the same direction as manuals in “Brain Surgery for Dummies.” Confining political dialogue to the level of content preferred by self-avowed dummies may turn out to be the most important of, even perhaps the only great threat to our national security under today’s national and worldwide crisis conditions.

The successful struggle for true freedom—to gain it, to regain it, to preserve it—always began within the human mind. All the great movements for freedom depended upon a core of future leadership rooted in a Classical-humanist approach to education, such as that of the famous Brothers of the Common Life who, like the writings of Dante Alighieri and his followers, had great influence on the generation which brought forth the Fifteenth-Century Renaissance.

Therefore the deepest fault of the imperilled United States today, is that its present policies are dominated by foolish conceits of those disciples of Thomas Huxley who have crafted the lunatic utopian doctrine of such Bertrand Russell followers as Vice-President Cheney and his unsavory flock of Chicken-hawks. These dupes of the utopian rant of Russell et al., have, manifestly, like Russell himself before them, refused to recognize the existence of a principled distinction between mankind and British Lord Solly Zuckermann’s baobons gathering nuts from the baobab trees.

National Mental Security

At this moment, the greatest danger to U.S. national security, comes from internal, not external threats. The threat is essentially a psychological one, or, better said, a psychopathological problem. The current epicenter of that problem is the White House itself. The evidence needed to prove that fact, is in plain sight, like the “purloined letter” of one of Edgar Allan Poe’s famous detective-stories. More importantly, so is the obvious cure.

In the beginning of this report, I emphasized the fact that the current President is a man living, mentally, not in the real world, but in a controlled, “other world” environment, like the all too familiar case of a mature woman who has retreated into a “soap opera”-like world of playing “doll house.” As long as the victim of her flight from reality is able to avoid subject-matters which do not threaten her obsessive clinging to her need to believe that the real world is a shadow of her “doll house”-like world, she may appear to be quite normal. The same “doll house”-like syndrome also appears in the behavior of “controlled groups,” which hide from fearful realities, by building a mental wall as a kind of self-imposed, controlled psychological environment, such as that which the current White House crew has erected as an attempted hysterical denial of the reality, that the delusion which they share, “our economic way of life,” is disintegrating. To defend that “doll house” fantasy, to make economic reality “go away,” they are prepared to launch a new World War, this time “A War to End the World,” the war currently demanded by an hysterical President George W. Bush, Jr.

The nature of psychopathologies such as “43’s,” states of mind comparable to the image of “Hitler in the Bunker,” is rather well known among able psychopathologists, and relevant other specialists. Playwright Tennessee Williams’ *Glass Menagerie*, is a reflection of such a psychopathological pattern rotting out the life of an individual family.

The essential difference between the typical, individual case of the “doll house” syndrome, that which controls the life of a family household, and the same shared delusionary condition in a “tight group,” such as the current Bush Administration, is to be found in the notion of the controlled group, such as a religious group modelled upon what Sinclair Lewis saw so insightfully in his portrait of “Elmer Gantry.” We witness the same mass psychology in the current behavior of the government of Israel, and the controlling influence of Cheney’s Chicken-hawks within the “doll house”-like qualities of the overall behavior of “43’s” Administration.

The fact that that Administration is presently controlled by a severe case of the “doll house” syndrome, is made clear by the Administration’s refusal to face up to the exploding reality of a present global, as well as U.S. internal economic and monetary-financial collapse. This is made clear by the explosive eruption of sanity among our people, in their hitherto suppressed, now growing perception of the reality of the economic collapse, and their horror of “43’s” mad flight forward, from the unbearable fear of economic collapse, into the consoling, suicidal euphoria of a mad dash toward the hoped-for killing fields of Armageddon.

Many people, including most of the professional psychologists whose work I have studied, may be able to describe the form of the “doll house” syndrome rather convincingly, up to the point their interpretation falls into the same pathological trap which they describe in their relevant mental patients. “Doll house” syndromes in the behavior of adults can not be competently diagnosed without showing the existence of a corresponding difference between the controlling belief of the proverbial woman holding family tea-parties in the attic, and the actual nature of the reality from which the participants in that common delusion are fleeing so hysterically.

The “doll house” syndrome (“Step on a crack; break your mother’s back!”) in a larger-than-family grouping, usually, perhaps always, emerges with the associated feature of pathological control over the group of victims as a whole. There must be one or more leading personalities, within the ostensible leadership of the grouping, who—like a wife-beating, bipolar head of a household—enforces the control; who mobilizes the group in pack-rat formation to rally against those dissidents who insist on bringing realities, such as the doom of the present world monetary-financial system, into conjunction with the real-life personal experience of the group itself.

It is those kinds of mechanisms, expressed, so obviously, in the extreme, by the current Bush Administration, which are the chief real-life source of threats to the national security of the U.S.A. today.



als who privately agree with you; but do not carry your dissent to the point of challenging the axiomatic errors of the population, as axiomatic errors." This latter syndrome has been typical, even in earlier generations, of certain otherwise gifted scientists, even some leading ones, who out of fear would seek to prostitute themselves to what they knew to be false, even disgusting, for the sake of their academic honors, their careers.

The pivot of the currently increased spread of that type of psychopathology today, is the degree to which ideas are not considered a matter of truthfulness, but of mere opinion.

The fact is that "43," like economic advisors such as Paul O'Neill and Larry Lindsey, is in an insane flight from today's economic reality. That fact merely symptomizes, rather than defines, the specific psychopathological mechanism controlling the increasing collective insanity of the Administration.

The axiomatic root of the hysteria shared among the leaders of the Administration, is shown by the fact that they typify, in the extreme, that majority among that generation of "Baby Boomers" whose adult experience, in Europe as in North America, has been a delusion. This has been the delusion associated with the 1964-1972 cultural paradigm shift, also in Europe, including many of the Soviet elite's privileged youth, now turned financial predators, from that same generation. It is the delusion associated with such included characteristic symptoms as "post-industrial society," "information theory," and "consumerism."

These changes in axiomatic assumptions of combined conscious and unwitting belief, typified by the widespread psychopathology known as "consumerism," constitute a pathological belief-system of the relevant members of that generation. Even those of that generation who have principled rational objections to the tenets of that cultural paradigm-shift, fall prey to the social pressures of "you have to go along, to get along," and adapt to those pressures in the hope of being accepted by the controlling forces now dominated by the characteristic ideology of that generation. In other words, the fearful sense that "we must be realistic; we must adapt to the presently ruling authority of that opinion," becomes the psychopathological mechanism by which even the more rational members of that generation tended to be controlled, either directly or indirectly, by the ideologies shared among what appear to be the presently empowered representatives of that "Baby Boomer" ideology, today.

One form of adaptation among dissenters, is a kind of psychological encystment: "Share your dissent with individu-

The hope of freeing our people from the pathological syndromes which have controlled the adults of the Baby Boomer generation, from the aftermath of the 1964-1972 cultural paradigm-shift, until now, is that reality itself has intervened into the consciousness of society, with a general economic depression, whose existence has become undeniable to all but psychopathological cases such as the current White House, and the continuing crescendo among the numbers of people, influentials and others, around the today's world, who are now saying of me: "Obviously, he has been right all along, while we were wrong."

For this reason, I have always cautioned my associates and other collaborators of the importance of practicing Socratic dialogue in their outreach into the street and other marketplaces of ideas. There are several reasons for this; one is maintenance of one's own sanity. The majority of the public may be wrong, and, in fact, usually is; but we must always know the realities of our society, and must deal with the errors of sundry varieties of wrong-headed popular opinion, by engaging it in a Socratic dialogue, as Plato's Socrates did. We must discover the realities of the experience to which various strata of the population are being exposed, and play back those realities to them. It is by means of that outreach, into the streets and other relevant places, which I have always insisted my associates apply, that my associates protect their own sanity from the risk of the "doll-house syndrome," and also the larger population to whose welfare we are devoted.

Only groups afflicted with the kind of "doll house" psychopathologies which I have summarily identified here, could deny the physical reality of my definition of the strategic practical issues of humanity.

That potentially fatal denial presently persists. Fight to change that, in yourself and others. Fight so, as if the life of you and your friends and family might depend upon the outcome. It does.