

AN INTERIM LPAC REPORT:

The U.S.A. 2008 Election

by Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.

April 20, 2008

This following, interim report by the LaRouche Political Action Committee (LPAC) on the current U.S. general elections, was drafted prior to the Pennsylvania Presidential Primary Election. The intention which has underlain this choice of timing, has been to present a perspective on matters as they would continue to be, whatever might have occurred as any particular short-term developments around that particular election as such.

This report has been prepared according to my responsibilities as a former U.S. Presidential candidate and leading economist. Thus, the report reflects the leading issues which will continue to plague the Democratic and Republican national campaigns through the entire Summer and into the November general election itself, and beyond that, too.

It is to be emphasized, that the unique importance of this report is embedded in my own unique competence as one who has repeatedly demonstrated himself, over decades, to be the most reliable long-term forecaster in those matters of outstanding importance in both international and national affairs, during decades in which most other forecasters have consistently failed, often utterly so. Therefore, that incompetence shown thus by my putative rivals in this field, is itself a crucial issue in these elections.

1. The Setting of this Campaign


Since the victory of a U.S. under President Abraham Lincoln, over the British Empire's Confederacy puppet, especially since the 1876 Philadelphia Centennial Exhibition, the leading intellectual influence in the world has been divided between two leading, English-speaking powers, the U.S. re-

public against the neo-Venetian, usurious power of the British empire, an empire otherwise known as the Anglo-Dutch Liberal form of international, political-social-financial system.

Later, in the aftermath of a wave of leading attempted and actual political assassinations, including the murder of our President John F. Kennedy, and especially since the international wave of dope-ridden and related anarchoid rioting and related expressions of the so-called "68ers," there was a dramatic shift in the constellation of power in the world at large, a shift once led by the President Nixon Administration, leading our republic away from the previous self-control by the U.S.A., into the control, increasingly, up to the present day, by that alien, neo-Venetian form of predatory financier usury which is centered in the British Commonwealth and its network of predatory, Anglo-Dutch Liberal, financier interests world-wide.

During the 1969-1981 interval, under U.S. Presidents Nixon, Ford, and Carter, the U.S.A. as we had known it from the Franklin Roosevelt administration, was systematically ruined, bankrupted, as if treasonously, from within, and ruined by anti-U.S.A. stunts such as the petroleum hoax tolerated by the Nixon Administration and its successors. Through that petroleum hoax, the power over the U.S. dollar was shifted from the control of the U.S. by itself, to control by the increasing power of the great swindle known as the Anglo-Dutch Liberal, "spot-market."

In this centuries-long pattern, since the assassination of President Abraham Lincoln by London-directed operations, the great strategic conflict on this planet has been between the implications of the establishment of the U.S.A. as a continental republic, as represented by the great Philadelphia Centennial Exhibition of 1876, and the threat to the British empire's maritime control over the world, a threat which was typified by the U.S. transcontinental railway system. Through the



EIRNS/Stuart Lewis

Lyndon LaRouche at a Washington webcast on April 27, 2006. His uniquely competent record as an economic forecaster, especially by contrast with his putative rivals, is a crucial factor in the current election. Who else knows how to salvage our bankrupt world financial system, and our collapsing physical economy?

1890 ouster of the implicit U.S. partner, Germany's Otto von Bismarck, through the influence of the Prince of Wales over his nephew Kaiser Wilhelm II, there was a succession of prolonged, monstrously debilitating, great imperialist, geopolitical wars. These wars have been orchestrated, chiefly, by the British Empire, a process continuing, with only occasional interruptions, through the numerous post-1890 wars to date, wars directed chiefly, at least implicitly so, against the modern constitutional, agro-industrial model of the post-1865 U.S.A.

The expression of that conflict is centered, today, in the issues of the current U.S. pre-Presidential campaign. No competent insight into the actual issues and conduct of that campaign were possible without taking these outstanding features of 1763-2008 European and world history into account, as follows.

The methods which the British empire has employed to subvert, ruin, and ultimately destroy our republic, most notably since the wave of high-level political assassinations of the 1962-1968 interval, have been those actions and methods typified within the trans-Atlantic community by, on the one hand, orchestrating global military and related conflicts, as during 1946-1989, and, later, under the influence of Britain's Tony Blair and the virtual British puppet government of Bush-Cheney abomination, through the moral and other intellectual corruption of the population of, especially, the U.S.A. and Europe. These subversions have featured the role of such exemplary elements of Apollonian-Dionysian subversion as those

of the existentialism spread by the London Tavistock Clinic, the existentialist cult of Theodor Adorno and Hannah Arendt, and the immorality of that subversive pestilence known as the Congress for Cultural Freedom (CCF).

The recent and continuing promotion of the neo-Malthusian cult of Britain's Prince Philip and such of his and his son's agents as former U.S. Vice-President Al Gore, is typical of the treasonous activities which London has promoted among influential levels within the U.S.A. and its Federal government.

The persistence of this British-led campaign of cultural perversion, has largely destroyed both the physical-economic and moral capacities of the populations and institutions of the Americas and Europe, such that the continued existence of anything resembling civilization, throughout this planet, is now immediately imperilled by the implications of the great monetary-financial and physical-economic

breakdown crisis which has explicitly threatened life on this planet, more and more, since the close of July 2007.

However, were the U.S.A. to adopt certain initiatives which I have defined, such as outreach to cooperation in global economic-monetary form among the U.S.A., Russia, China, and India, and other nations, the present threat of global doom could be halted, and a genuine recovery set immediately into motion.

My specific intention in this report, is the responsible representation of a PAC. That is, to intervene in the matter of the present U.S. election-campaigns, here. I am not blind to the implications of the argument I make here, but this report is not otherwise a commitment to the election of a particular choice of President. It is, rather, to encourage the formation of a quality of composition of an incoming government of the U.S.A., which would be capable of implementing the steps of ecumenical cooperation among both those four leading powers, and others, cooperation in the spirit of the 1648 Peace of Westphalia, which would be dedicated to, and capable of launching such an urgently needed reform on behalf of the nations of this planet as a whole. For my part, I am committed to doing whatever might be required, both to save my republic, and to move our own and other nations away from the criminal lunacy of "globalization," toward a form of international cooperation among perfectly sovereign nation-states which will, now, finally, realize the great objectives set forth as the principles of that 1648 Peace of Westphalia.

We must form this new Presidency for the U.S.A., as one freed of the sheer lunacy of the incumbent one, a new Presidency which will be morally and otherwise suited to contribute the initiative needed to free the planet from the grip of Anglo-Dutch Liberal imperialism, to form a planet, as Franklin Roosevelt, unlike President Harry Truman, had intended.

To apprehend the most crucial, global feature of the present world crisis, we must recognize, and emphasize that no part of this planet could escape a descent into a condition even far, far lower than merely barbarism, unless we join with others, including the saner conservative elements of the United Kingdom, to eradicate that intrinsically genocidal, and, frankly speaking, Satanic impulse associated with such modern Malthusian atrocities as the World Trade Organization (WTO) and the various leading measures currently promoted by former U.S. Vice-Presidents Al Gore and Dick Cheney.

The human species is not an animal species, although its members may have animal bodies. The distinction of our species from all other living species, is that we increase not only the potential relative population-density of the entirety of the human species, as no other living species can do this, and not only are able to do that, but also must do that through such modes of principled change which we associate with progress in truly Classical culture, and the application of ever higher energy-flux-densities represented by application of discoveries in the domain of physical science.

If we do not grow our population in that manner, we would now condemn humanity to live as beasts, and to suffer the extinction of vast masses of the human population and its culture, through descent to a lower level of technological-scientific practice, and lower level than Classical cultural practice, as we have already degenerated culturally, and morally, in the U.S.A. over the course of the 1960s, especially since 1968 and beyond. Not only do we represent that quality of the individual human mind lacking in the beasts, but it is our pursuit of endless improvement of ourselves and our practice in that way, that Nature itself would recognize us as a species still fit to survive.

2. The Leading Candidacies

For both leading political parties, the currently crucial issue in the ongoing U.S. election itself, is the way in which a party organization faced with the same type of national crisis faced by Franklin D. Roosevelt in 1932, had been taken over by the today's likes of Wall Street right-wing circles of John Raskob then, and, now, the alien circles of "Howard Scream," fascist Felix Rohatyn, and the alien influences radiated by London's George Soros, today. For example, the effect of a nomination, as the Democratic nominee, of what is currently to be seen from the current campaign, as conducted so far, as an "Elmer Gantry"-like, "faith-based, faith-in-money" quality of the campaign-image of Senator Barack Obama, would

tempt many Democrats of the FDR tradition, out of desperation, to support Senator John McCain as the proverbial "lesser evil," even despite Senator McCain's emotional and related problems.

Concerned Americans, unlike London-directed former Vice-President Al Gore, do not wish our republic turned over to control by that British empire against which our forefathers have struggled since February 1763, especially not by that foul breed known as Tony Blair's Fabians. For our concerned citizens in their right mind, McCain, for all his actual or imagined faults, is viewed as a patriot, that at a time the very continued existence of our depression-wracked republic is under the foulest kind of threat of its continued existence from the Tony Blair and kindred Fabians of London, Fabians who have taken increasing, top-down control of the mechanisms and cliques of the Democratic Party organization.

In any case, the principal problem facing any choice of the next U.S. President would compel the next President and Congress to re-craft the newly elected government along what would appear today to be organized along cross-party lines. The honest and also sane Democrats could not tolerate the current associated with the London-controlled, former Vice-President and rabid hoaxster Al Gore, and the honest Republicans want no more of the legacy left in the train of London-connected George Shultz's most notable recent miscreation, the Tony Blair-connected, Bush-Cheney regime.

The next President, unless he were a British stooge from the collection associated with hoaxster Al Gore, may carry a political-party label into the inauguration, but, unless our republic is very, very unlucky, he, or she will be an American patriot first, and a representative of a political party, second. Hopefully, he or she will walk in the footsteps of President Franklin Roosevelt.

The issues which such a division in opinion reflects, are not merely passing issues of the moment. The very continued existence of our republic, now demands that we return to promotion of those principles which so many among our so-called "68ers" have foolishly sought to eradicate from the practice of nations. The great mission which must command the minds of political and other leaders fit to lead our nation, must be a return to the principles of scientific and Classical cultural progress on which our republic was founded, a commitment without which neither our republic, nor civilization at large could now conceivably survive.

The Present Candidates

When a citizen thinks seriously about the quality of the recent crop of pre-Presidential candidates generally, the citizen is left with slim pickings, with very few currently presented, or likely other candidates who might be made over into one actually fit for the job, that must be done before the next President might, otherwise, lead a U.S. sinking into the presently accelerating, great new world depression, that at an accelerating rate. If not Senator Clinton, after Hillary, presently,



John McCain 2008—www.JohnMcCain.com

The positive feature of Senator John McCain as a candidate, lies less in himself than in his family history in the U.S. Navy. Were he to be elected, a significantly bipartisan administration would be needed to guide him on economic and strategic matters.

the way leads down, very, very far down. If not Senator Clinton, then you must find another one of comparable quality, to be found among her putative replacements.

However, this does not mean that Senator Clinton's candidacy is the be-all and end-all of all serious options. Sometimes, as in the case of Washington, Lincoln, or Franklin Roosevelt, there is only one figure who is potentially qualified to lead the way out of mortal danger for our republic. However, although a U.S. President is a crucial figure in shaping our republic's mastery of a serious crisis of our nation, it is the team represented by a Presidency, hopefully working with the leadership of the U.S. Congress, which defines the potential located, as a team, within the offices of the person qualified to be the incumbent President.

Therefore, although I must consider individual candidates here, it is the function of the Presidency, not the particular choice of President, on which my attention is focussed here.

So far, the Presidential candidacy of Senator Barack Obama has been massively financed from Fabian-centered, London-controlled circles, such as those of notorious Lazard Frères creation and fascist Felix Rohatyn, and the London creation and drug-trafficking-friendly George Soros. This has been done, so far, by deploying a massive outpouring of money, that on an unprecedented scale, for the intention of eliminating the candidacy of Senator Hillary Clinton, after which the dumping of Senator Obama, through aid of already rampant scandals-in-progress, would be an easy matter for the same switch-prone circles temporarily backing his candidacy

now. Such a resulting demoralization of Obama supporters, combined with the elimination of Senator Clinton, would clear the way for a probable, London-steered, fascist takeover of the U.S.A., like that failed, but repeated attempt through Raskob and his accomplices, against Franklin Roosevelt, in 1932, and in coup and related attempts later.

In such circumstances, it is to be expected that a new, different roster of leading candidates for the Democratic nomination might appear by approximately June of this year. It should not be presumed that such newly surfaced candidates would not be fascists such as New York "corporatist," Mussolini echo Mayor Bloomberg, pachydermous British royal asset Al Gore, or comparable sorts of undesirables. Our republic is under attack, thus; the sovereignty of our nation is the issue, a nation whose very existence is now in peril.

Therefore, look briefly at the present mere handful of Party candidates with the foregoing qualifications in view.

Republican: Senator John McCain:

The most positive feature of candidate McCain lies less in himself than the implications of his family pedigree.

I mean the stream of tradition within the U.S. Navy professionals since John Paul Jones and James Fenimore Cooper, through the co-thinkers of General of the Armies Douglas MacArthur, as the latter is considered in the context of the greatest achievement of command in modern warfare in the Pacific war (the greatest victory, with the least avoidable combat, over the greatest area of the theater of conflict, with the relatively least loss of life, in modern warfare). I also mean that legacy of professional military and intelligence services which characterizes the inclusion of the difficulties of the kind faced in taking a suddenly recruited mass of previously untrained civilians to great warfare in World War II.

In my view, the best peace-makers are often those general and other high-ranking professional officers who would naturally tend to have been turned down for appointment by the Bush-Cheney administration. We must recall, that, under the Bush-Cheney administration, that administration, acting as a puppet of British Fabian pervert Tony Blair, misled the foolish U.S. Presidency and most of the U.S. Senate, through lies, into an unnecessary, bottomless, endless warfare, warfare now spreading, ever more widely, and hopelessly, the spreading and deepening quagmire of futility throughout Southwest Asia.

We must recall, that the last hope of evading a virtually perpetual war in that region was lost, when a former personal adversary of mine, George Shultz creature Paul Bremer, refused to assimilate the regular Iraq military forces as collaborators in organizing the peaceful reconstruction of their own nation, when it had been still possible to do so. The George W.

Bush administration's legacy will be, as of now, that it has been incapable of doing anything right, and that that is the very kindest thing that could be said about it.

On this account, Senator McCain's performance of late has been far less than impressive. Therefore, were he to be elected President, we would hope that his foolish "macho" impulses would be deterred by aid of military professionals who will reject absolutely current British initiatives and provocations in that Fabian government's lunatic lunge toward building an alliance of the U.S.A., the Commonwealth, and an accompanying, captive "Lisbon Treaty" Europe, to plunge into generalized irregular and other warfare against the presently already targetted combined forces of Russia, China, India, and the other nations which Fabian London has preselected for spread of global warfare now. It is the negotiation of implementation of common strategic interests, rather than concocted or even merely perceived strategic differences, which is the essential requirement of statecraft under the principle of the Peace of Westphalia, and especially so under the conditions of thermonuclear-armed asymmetric warfare which London's dupes are seeking to cause to be unleashed upon the planet as a whole today.

It must also be emphasized, that the vast destruction of the productive mental and physical powers of labor, which has occurred inside the U.S.A. and Europe since the tragedy of 1968, requires resort to a contemporary form of the measures associated with Harry Hopkins and the CCCs during the 1930s. We have a predominantly skill-less labor-force, through the combination of prevalent miseducation and the incompetence in agriculture and technologically modern industry, which has taken over the looted U.S. labor-force, especially that of management and of the lower eighty percentile of the labor-force in general, during the recent forty years. To assist in recovering from that economic-cultural catastrophe, we require a rebuilding of an engineering-oriented citizen's army in the form of the military services, reserves, and general population, as the lesson of Harry Hopkins' rule should remind us.

Were McCain to be elected, these matters would be a prime concern, now, as they were for a President Franklin Roosevelt who first entered his office knowing that World War II in some form, had been made inevitable by the London-sponsored award of power to both Mussolini and Hitler. Thus, were McCain chosen, the same kind of Republican we would wish to be very influential in a McCain administration, must be an integrated feature of any competent choice of Democratic President. To establish a credible and capable new administration, we would require a significantly bi-partisan next government. That requirement applies to forming the composition of either a Republican, or Democratic presidential administration.

It must be emphasized, as the cases of the ruinous record of the Howard Dean administration, and the fascist or otherwise alien influences represented by Felix Rohatyn and

George Soros, illustrate for the case of the Democratic Party, that neither party is presently capable of presenting a competent new Presidency from its own internal composition alone. On the Republican side, "neo-con" is, still today, like British "Fabian" in the time of H.G. Wells, another name for "fascist." In hard times, ordinary bread, rather than doomed Marie Antoinette's "cake," is much to be preferred.

Democratic: Senator Hillary Clinton:

The Senator Hillary Clinton who had been clearly seen earlier as a pre-determined victor for the Democratic Party's Presidential nomination, has been crippled by the Party leadership's use of Senator Barack Obama as a "sticky-bomb" candidate, a candidate designed and deployed along a trajectory intended to bring about the destruction of the candidacies of both Senator Clinton and himself. Only a most wishful worshiper of Senator Obama could imagine that the moment Senator Clinton were discouraged into withdrawing, that the relevant legal cases would not explode into prominence, and that massive scandals against Obama and his campaign, launched largely from the London which has created his candidacy, would not clear the decks for the insertion, perhaps as early as June, of a new Democratic pre-selection which would replace the largely self-discredited Obama. In such a case it were to be doubted that any Democratic candidate could succeed in November 2008.

To understand this aspect of the two present Democratic pre-candidacies, it were essential to look back to the Democratic Party nominating convention of 1932, when a somewhat Obama-like alternative was launched by the Wall Street-controlled Democratic Party leadership, then against clear front-runner and New York Governor Franklin D. Roosevelt. At the present moment, circumstances themselves have defined Senator Clinton's role as her attempt to play the part pioneered in 1932 by President Franklin D. Roosevelt. In fact, to the extent her campaign has enjoyed frank coverage by the news media, however rarely, that is the characteristic of the visible role she has continued to project since the New Hampshire primary.

There is nothing accidental in this present repetition of the pattern of the Democratic Party developments of 1932. The forces in play represent different generations, but their motives are essentially the same. This is no mere coincidence; it is the same historical forces from that past time, which have risen again to repeat the roles of the Democratic Party factions today. The campaign against both Senator Clinton, and, implicitly, President Bill Clinton, too, is motivated by exactly the same considerations motivating the Wall Street gang against Franklin Roosevelt in the Democratic convention of 1932. All serious patriots will remember, that had Roosevelt not prevailed at that convention, the fascism of Mussolini and Hitler, which had been crafted in and launched by London, would probably have ruled the world through most of the decades since that former time.



HillaryClinton.com

Senator Hillary Clinton (shown here with Rep. John Murtha, at a rally in Pennsylvania) is the only candidate who has addressed the economic and related welfare of the lower eighty percent of family income-brackets, in a meaningful way. Wall Street is trying to block her, just as it tried to do to Franklin D. Roosevelt in his 1932 campaign.

The Case of Al Gore

From the vantage-point of this reporter, it is difficult to determine to what degree President Clinton or Senator Clinton has yet grasped the fullness of the historical ironies of their situation. William Jefferson Clinton had his Aaron Burr-like Vice-President Al Gore: the Aaron Burr, the actual traitor, controlled and deployed against the United States by the Jeremy Bentham whom Lord Shelburne had assigned to virtually create the British Foreign Office. That was the Bentham deployed to steer the British-created puppet, the “Bolivarian revolution,” which Bolivar himself later denounced, from Colombia, as the deployment of London’s dupes against Britain’s target, our young United States.

Gore is also controlled and deployed under the direct sponsorship and influence of both the current British Prince of Wales, and under the pro-genocidal, Malthusian policies, against Africa and other locations, of the Prince’s father, and of the British Empire’s veteran, once-Nazi asset, and Al Gore-backed current Dalai Lama.

Although President Clinton had, and has excellent, relatively superior qualifications in relevant features of the study of history, his administration’s public performance never showed, then, a full grasp of the practical implications of that history of British operations aimed to weaken and destroy our United States. His former reluctance to acknowledge the truth about his Vice-President, poses precisely that question. However, in that matter, it must be said that, excepting Benjamin

Franklin, the matured John Quincy Adams, President Abraham Lincoln, and Franklin D. Roosevelt, few of our Presidents have had an adequate grasp of the deeper, long-term strategic intentions, and implications of the British Empire’s origins and role since the February 1763 Peace of Paris. That was the Peace of Paris which actually launched our forebears in the struggle for independence of the then new-born imperialism of the British East India Company. Since that date, we have been cursed by the often treasonous role played by the interest of those agents of the British East India Company, such as Aaron Burr, who retained citizenship for their families and themselves within our borders.

Al Gore is an intellectual lightweight and mere charlatan in all relevant respects, relative to the skilled assassin and traitor Aaron Burr; comparatively, he is more like a stinking opossum than a predatory big cat. Nonetheless, the resemblance and smell of the opossum-like ethic are

both noteworthy. President Clinton thus kept his potential political assassin, Tennessee’s Africa-hating Al Gore, in his own Presidential closet. Generally, those, excepting Senator Kerry, who are situated to enter the race were Senator Clinton to bow out, are not much better, if much more honorable and intelligent in practice, while otherwise personally preferable to Gore.

What She Has Learned

In an earlier phase of her candidacy, Senator Clinton had projected a platform premised on stating policies she would implement beginning at the time of her January 2009 inauguration. Recently, especially since the New Hampshire primary, the projection of her policies has shifted; her focus has become sharper, more strategic. She has become the only leading pre-Presidential candidate who has addressed the immediate economic and related welfare of the lower eighty percentile of our population’s family income-brackets in meaningful, rather than circus-side-show terms.

That is good, but far from sufficient. However, we must show regard for the actual political circumstances of the moment. What is required immediately, if her candidacy is to be one of an effective prospective President, is the assembly of a platform and roster of key proposed associates in the Executive branch, an assembly which must give substance to meeting the specific, immediate tasks of our already profoundly imperilled national economy. She may be of the disposition to

do that; but, any serious candidate worth tolerating for election today must do precisely that, very soon. We are victims of a currently rotten U.S. Presidency (and Vice-Presidency), under the conditions of the worst, global economic and social crisis in all modern history. In this extraordinarily perilous set of circumstances we require a powerful Presidential candidacy which can outflank at least some of the worst follies represented by the present, imbecilic quacking of the incumbent, legacy-less, lame duck.

This matter of immediate programmatic prospective which must be already presented during the Spring and Summer of 2008, is a challenge of the greatest importance for the survival of the planet as a whole today. While our nation's legislative and related processes are crippled, and also menaced by the foreign influences of such factors as fascist Felix Rohatyn and by George Soros, we must take the stalemate, called Speaker Pelosi, out of the Congressional equation, and project an oncoming U.S. policy-imperative which will shape the perception of world powers generally. We can no longer wait and say, like the already fey Barack Obama: "When January comes, and our candidate is elected, we shall all feast on strawberries and cream."

Democratic: Senator Barack Obama:

The vast funding of the nomination campaign of Senator Barack Obama, has attracted many into the support of his campaign, an attraction not limited to those who had been formerly seduced, back in 2004, by Pied Piper Karl Rove's promise of "faith-based initiative" money. Vast floods of subsidy poured in at the behest of as many foreign agencies as what our more credulous voters could be deluded into considering as actually domestic contributors. All candidacies have been saturated with controlling influences of the same British empire which is gloating over our republic's prospective self-destruction, and virtually controlling all leading candidacies!

Although the British empire's present intention to dump the Rezko-Auchi-linked Barack Obama by June, might be altered by the fact that Senator Clinton has not been crushed, the net effect would be, in any case, that the swooned and swindled believers who put their errant faith in Obama, would tend to be transformed into a demoralized political mass. That would be the makings of a national catastrophe. These voters who have been lured into the mythical merits of Senator Obama must not be dumped by the outgoing political tide. Serious political leaders show care for all our citizens, whether we believe they were inclined to vote "the right way," or not.

The great danger posed by the Obama candidacy lies in its



BarackObama.com

The great danger posed by Senator Barack Obama's candidacy lies in its lack of any serious content. Instead, his babble about "change" reminds one of the revival meetings of the legendary Elmer Gantry.

lack of any serious content. Better a candidate who makes mistakes, than one who feeds and fools his dupes with his empty rhetoric, as Obama has done. Bad ideas can be corrected; braying inanities promote no such remedies. So, Obama's babble about change has much of the quality of the legendary account of Elmer Gantry, the quality of the celebrated revival meetings at which "more souls were made than saved." A serious search has found not one single programmatic commitment by candidate Obama which has actually positive relevance to the real world today's ongoing greatest, global financial crisis in all modern history. His sophistry has the hollow resonance of his uttered rhetoric; it is an echo of the style of the mythical demagogue, who promised the true believers the guarantee of infinite "strawberries and cream" forever. Populist candidates of that empty-headed style of campaigning, burn out duped citizens as voters, and thus leave a thus embittered section of the electorate ripe for the use of the next swindler to come along.

The battered Obama voter must be presented with the concrete options around which to rally, in the absence of a candidate in whom they had "believed."

3. Like the Citizens of Solon's Athens

When I returned to our U.S.A., in 1946, from war-time service in Asia, I experienced a feeling like that described by the famous Solon of Athens, when he had returned to the Athens which he had freed from slavery and like forms of oppression.

Back here, I experienced a sinking feeling, when I saw so many among those who returned from military service as once brave men, now dwelling at home in fear; in fear of such things as a wife's right-wing turn in opinions, away from President Franklin Roosevelt's true patriotism, to President Truman's corruption, like a true lackey of imperial London, which was, in fact, expressed as Truman's effort to wreck President Roosevelt's determination to uproot the evil of British and like colonialism from the post-war world. That curse upon us, that "mess of pottage," bequeathed by Truman and so many of the assorted political trade-styles of his neo-con and other present-day followers, is typified by the pro-genocidal policy of the U.S. Nixon Administration, and its present followers, toward Africa, as in the fraudulent British campaign against Mugabe's Zimbabwe, under such precedents as the middle 1970s NSSM-200.

That mid-1970s, Hitler-like legacy of the policy of genocide expressed by NSSM-200, is still the policy of our republic's British-boot-lickers, as toward Zimbabwe and other former British colonies of former Cecil Rhodes' Africa today, as found among the George Bush administration and its Democratic Party hangers-on today, such as fascist Felix Rohatyn's Speaker Nancy Pelosi. This pro-genocidal policy is, still today, an outcome of that legacy of moral corruption expressed in the anti-FDR policies of the "Wall Street" gang behind President Truman, the gang which took over immediately after President Roosevelt's death. Notably, Senator Barack Obama's wretched, pro-genocidal policy expressed, for example, toward Africa's Zimbabwe, as in his vile attack in support of British imperial racists' Fabian tradition and their intended rape of Zimbabwe, as in former Vice-President Gore's and Speaker Nancy Pelosi's attachment to Britain's former Nazi asset, the Dalai Lama, is typical of the spread of such moral corruption polluting much of the popular political opinion of today's U.S.A.

At this point, we turn your attention to a series of certain exemplary issues of political principle, issues each and all of some particular relevance to understanding of the present existential crisis.

To define the most essential problem which must be addressed in the circumstances of the presently onrushing, global breakdown-crisis of the world economy, we must define all leading issues of economic and social policy from the standpoint of the fact, that, in principle, the U.S.A. under the regrettable President Harry S Truman administration degenerated, into a prevalent state of Sophistry, especially since late 1946. The degeneracy associated with the Truman style in government, echoed, more than somewhat, the example of the degeneration of the Athens of Pericles, as that Athens had degenerated to similar effect in its own time. I am addressing that same kind of epidemic, as the mental-moral disease of Sophistry was defined, rigorously, by Plato.

Thus, we must proceed from the underlying cause of the

present economic and related social crises, from the fact that the already much-corrupted U.S.A., when left in the wake of the Truman administration, was wrecked almost absolutely in its long-term future prospects, by the later changes for the worse which were made possible through the assassination of President John F. Kennedy. So, our U.S.A. became easy prey for the asymmetric Malaysian monkey-trap-like Indo-China war. The entry into that foolish choice of war was, a folly which, like the atrocity which Athens perpetrated on the island of Melos, drove the aggressor, the U.S.A., as a society, downwards, economically and otherwise, into what has now become, in the wake of the 1968er upsurge, the ruined, current state of rotten-ripe financial and cultural bankruptcy of our U.S. economy of today.

It is the propensity of the U.S. system to commit such a tragic error, which must be featured as a starting-point for defining the policies needed to rescue the imperilled U.S.A. today. However, to understand that underlying aspect of the present crisis, we must look back to the origins of our nation as a sovereign republic, especially those developments associated with that February 1763 Treaty of Paris which defined the imperial British East India Company as a private empire, and which launched the provocation which sparked a direct and general struggle for national independence in English-speaking North America.

The most significant of the forms of incompetence which have developed among our citizenry and institutions of government since the deaths of Presidents Franklin Roosevelt and John F. Kennedy, has assumed a specific kind of religious disorder. The tendency in politics has been to treat the idea of a non-denominational treatment of policy as a proposal for politics without actual principles. On the one hand, the atheist sees no further ahead than as if he were a dead dog, while the religious fanatic contemplates rewards in a garish fantasy-life which he mistakes for immortality. In both such extreme cases, the living mortal individual does not actually participate in that real future where the most essential consequences of individual mortal human life are to be experienced. By no means is the excellent set of verses 26-30 of *Genesis* 1 to be blamed for any of this.

Whereas those of us who view life competently, carry a few centuries or more of past human life in our conscience, and at least a century to come in estimating the moral consequences which our present decisions actually create for the future. Decisions premised on the exercise of very short memories, turn people into something less than dogs, and promote, thus, an existentialist of the type whose morality reaches little further into his future than instant gratification.

This is not so much a criticism of individual behavior, as such, as the way in which the presently hegemonic, existentialist form of culture, as it is promoted in places such as Europe and the Americas, has a dementing effect like that of video combat-games, in which the habitué is increasingly dehumanized into a synthesized psychotic-like state of mind.

So, as reported by Plato, the elders of Egypt praised the virtues of the people of Athens and related places, but warned the Greeks, that the defect in their culture was that they lacked “old men.” This referred not to the age of the particular Greek individuals, but to a lack of regard for the deeper, historical roots of their culture, expressed as the wisdom born of the experience of many preceding generations. Indeed, one of our leading problems today, is that the present generation of Americans have developed the memories better suited to grasshoppers than even competent citizenship, to say nothing of the ignorance of the actual historical roots of our nation’s development among even our leading political figures. Most of the terrible mistakes by which our nation inflicts great sufferings upon itself, are exactly of that nature.

For example: for as far back in the history of the internal development of cultures, as can be reached back with reasonable certainty presented through aid of today’s archeology, we may define, so, the conflict of 1763-1783 which had separated what became the U.S. constitutional republic and its economic policy from the relatively debased moral condition of the essentially predatory British imperial social, political, and economic system.

The essential difference between true republics and the oligarchical societies of Asia and Europe, as known during historical times, is the difference which I have identified earlier in this report, the difference between a society based on the principles of a true republic, and a society representing the opponents of the anti-imperialist, republican idea, as such opponents are typified by the oligarchical models of the Babylonian and Persian empires of near Asia, and, also, the succession of, principally, the essentially similar oligarchical models of the Roman, Byzantine, Norman-Venetian, and British empires based in Europe.

The essence of that quality of difference between Britain and actually civilized societies today, is what is appropriately associated with the morally depraved notion of promoting a “malthusian” policy, such as is inherent in the British empire, as that is opposed to a republic which is dedicated, on the constitutional principle of the promotion of the general welfare, to the promotion of the Classical qualities of scientific and Classical culture in the practice of the general population of the true republic. Such a republic is what is typified by our explicitly “Leibnizian” 1776 Declaration of Independence, and the Federal Constitution rooted in a Preamble which defines a universal principle of law as one consistent with the intention of the 1648 Peace of Westphalia. The difference is that associated with the playwright Aeschylus’ definition of the conflict between the Prometheus who defended the principle of Solon’s Athens, as that is contrasted with the universal oligarchical model’s principle associated with the Delphi Apollo-Dionysus cult’s god, the Olympian Zeus which Plato defines as the Atlantic maritime power against which Athens had fought.

So, civilization as a whole needed U.S. President Franklin

Roosevelt’s leadership during 1932-1945. Still today, it needs a Presidency molded in the FDR tradition. The U.S.A., as established by those who left Europe to create a special form of European culture thus freed from the grip of that oligarchical cultural pestilence which gripped Europe—still today, has remained, like a good, and also sometimes reliable insurance policy for Europe, when Europe, once again, must be rescued from the fruit of its oligarchical follies, by our U.S. republic.

Now, all western and central Europe is in a state of peril as grave as that which the predatory follies of the Anglo-Dutch Liberal financier oligarchy had created as what has been named “World War I,” and, then, “World War II.” So, for reason of the yawning grave our republic dug for itself under the mis-leadership of U.S. Presidents Theodore Roosevelt and Ku Klux Klan fanatic Woodrow Wilson, we were obliged, under President Franklin Roosevelt, to pay for the U.S. error in entering so-called World War I, by being obliged to free Europe, once more, from the threat to our nation from a new consequence of its habituated Anglo-Dutch Liberal kinds of imperialist follies spread from Europe itself.

On this and related accounts, civilization’s very continued existence presently depends, in its entirety, including our own, on choosing a relevant new Presidency of a specific quality of long-ranging historical outlook, which echoes the intention of that great mission performed, 1933-1945, under the leadership of President Franklin Roosevelt—that until his most untimely death. We must recognize that his death left our national mission in the hands of a most unsuitably very small-minded man. That pompous, morally shallow little man, was the moral mediocrity who had come to occupy the Vice-Presidency solely through the pressure exerted by the right-wing recidivists from the same Liberal financial establishment, such as the Morgans and Harrimans, which had joined the British Empire, earlier, in putting Mussolini and Hitler, and things of a similar ilk, into power on the continent of Europe during the course of the 1920s and early 1930s.

Seeing what was essentially very wrong about the President Truman Administration, can be a good choice of first step for uncovering the sources of what is wrong with the U.S.A. and its current government today.

How the Turn to Truman Occurred

Until the successful, 1944, Allied breakthrough on the beaches of Normandy, the same oligarchical circles of London and Manhattan had joined to defend their interests against the Hitler they themselves had created earlier. So, they, who had placed the species of Mussolini and Hitler into power in the first place, had come to support, if only temporarily, what they had come to consider as the momentarily unavoidable leadership of U.S. President Franklin Roosevelt. Once Roosevelt’s leadership had secured the inevitable near-future defeat of Hitler’s forces, on the beaches of Normandy, the recidivist Anglo-American Liberal oligarchy resumed its own, imperialist, colonialist, and pro-fascist ways. This produced



Franklin D. Roosevelt Library

The Allied breakthrough on the beaches of Normandy in 1944 brought about a shift among the oligarchical circles of London and Manhattan who had joined to defend their interests against the Hitler they themselves had created. After Normandy, they resumed their pro-fascist ways, and ushered in Harry Truman as their standard-bearer, after President Roosevelt's death.

the organization, by those financial interests, of the right-wing turn in the U.S.A., which forced Vice-President Harry Truman on President Franklin Roosevelt.

Roosevelt took the politically toxic Truman reluctantly, with the hope that he would outlive a Truman Vice-Presidency.

Thus, with the death of President Roosevelt, as it was said, softly to a colleague, by OSS chief General Donovan, coming from his last meeting with an obviously dying President Roosevelt: "It's over!" Mussolini was dead, and Hitler soon to be; but, the old Anglo-American-French gang, including Lazard Frères, the gang which had created Mussolini, Hitler, and their like, were back, although minus Mussolini and Hitler, playing the same evil kind of strategic imperial game which they had played in the aftermath of Versailles.

Today, there are many high-placed fools in the institutions of Europe, as our own U.S.A., fools who have refused to learn that lesson from history. Unless this is both understood, the lesson learned, and the needed changes in behavior made, we will, almost certainly, be soon visiting the backside of the existence of our republic, and of the collective fools of Europe as well.

The trouble is, that most of our political leaders, and many others, act as if they believed that living history itself were as ignorant as today's typical politician. For those of the precious few who not merely wish to be leaders, but also prefer

not to be foolish, the following advice on the subject of history is necessary.

So, I have lived, personally, through those years since Franklin Roosevelt's death, in a world usually without a living likeness of combined ability and authority represented by Franklin Roosevelt as President. In such a setting, unless the U.S.A. makes certain radical changes in the way it, and its people behave, our republic has been now more or less definitely doomed to the depravities our nation, and others, have suffered, as a result.

Look a short time back in history, to that time Mussolini turned up dead in the course of his racing, in the company of his mistress, to meet his old friend Churchill in Switzerland. It was a time when Hitler would be dead soon. Dead as both of them became back then, or would soon be, the gang which had placed them into power was in the process of resuming its old power. That is the principal source of the harvest of horror with which our planet as a whole is menaced presently. The financiers who had used the like of Mussolini and Hitler, had their game in play afresh, with a fresh cast of old dice. We are, now, therefore, as in the oligarchical aftermath of Versailles, living in the state of our

planet which those earlier Liberal predators, chiefly, have now created for us all.

Today, there are many high-placed fools in the institutions of Europe, as in our own U.S.A., fools who have refused to learn that lesson of history. Unless this specific kind of our present predicament is understood, the relevant lessons actually learned, and needed changes made, suddenly, now, at this terribly late date in our current affairs, we shall soon be greeted, if we live still at all, by seeing the backside of the existence our republic, and of the world outside it, too, as a whole.

So, in real politics all issues are seen from the standpoint, not of local issues, but of a monstrous current crisis in world civilization, which, while also an echo of recurring periods of great folly among modern nations, has, nonetheless, a distinct character of its own. It is far more deadly, far more awful in its menacing qualities than any we have experienced in all of modern history earlier. All such points taken into consideration, the fact of the situation remains, that, once more, civilization as a whole needs a U.S. Presidency like that which Franklin Roosevelt provided during 1932-1945. It needs a Presidency molded in the FDR tradition, again, today. The U.S.A. was established by those who left Europe to create a nation of a European culture thus freed from the grip of oligarchical cultural pestilence which gripped Europe. We are the U.S.A., still today, which has been, like a good insurance policy, hopefully, which might once more rescue the good which

European culture embodies, whenever the needed rescue of that errant civilization across the Atlantic requires this.

The trouble is, that most among our duly certified, incumbent political leaders, and many others, too, act as if they believed that living history itself were as ignorant as today's all-too-typical leading politicians. Such are the real political issues posed by the sheer intellectual emptiness of the Obama campaign organization, a threat to civilization by, not "Frick and Frack," but, Gore and Gere, today.

Where We Are, Today

For those precious very few who not merely wish to be leaders, but are also qualified by virtue of their rejecting the role of foolish officials who "go along to get along," the following advice on the subject of the principles of economic history is indispensable.

Now, all western and central Europe is presently in a state of peril as grave as that which the Anglo-Dutch Liberal oligarchy created as what we call "World War I" and then "World War II." So, for reason of the grave mistake we made under the mis-leadership of U.S. Presidents Theodore Roosevelt and Ku Klux Klan fanatic Woodrow Wilson, we were obliged, under Franklin Roosevelt, to fight a new war to free Europe, once again, from the consequence of its habituated Anglo-Dutch Liberal imperialist follies. We are threatened so, once more, now.

Now, it is essential to consider what went wrong for us on the day one of the greatest heroes of modern history, President Franklin Roosevelt, died.

On this and related accounts, civilization's very existence in its entirety, including our own, requires, immediately, a new U.S. Presidency of a relevant kind of specific quality which echoes the intention of that great mission performed, during 1933-1945, under the leadership of President Franklin Roosevelt—until his most untimely death, a death which left our mission in the hands of a most unsuitably very little man. That little man was the distasteful, moral mediocrity who had come to occupy the Vice-Presidency solely through the pressure of a right-wing turn in U.S. politics, a turn steered by those same financier-oligarchical circles of the U.S.A. and London, which had placed both Mussolini and Hitler into power in the first place.

Could Senator Hillary Clinton meet that challenge effectively? When we consider figures who might be both qualified in their talents, and also politically electable, there is no one in sight who is presently electable, who is much better, although some who might embody a comparable degree of personal competence. Therefore, the question should be re-framed: could a candidate of what we might estimate to be, for example, Senator Clinton's talents, succeed in governing



National Archives

Civilization today requires a U.S. Presidency like that which Franklin Roosevelt (left) provided during 1932-1945. Shown with him is Sir Winston Churchill, with whom he argued passionately during the war, over the breakup of the British and other colonial empires.

under these present circumstances?

Let us shift the meaning of the question slightly: could a successful Presidential team be crafted around the person of a comparable such candidate? To that latter formulation of the question, I offer two points in reply. First, we are not likely to find an electable candidate, for either leading political party, who is any better. Second, without emphasizing the concept of the Presidential team, rather than the President as an individual person, I doubt that a satisfactory result exists, in any case. These are decidedly not customary times; on this account I have placed the emphasis of this report on the need for crafting the needed quality of type, rather than considering the team as merely the appendage of any individual candidate or party.

I am not suggesting the "team" role as historians and others have discussed the troublesome composition of President Abraham Lincoln's Presidency.


President Lincoln's Challenge

During a February 2006 international webcast, I was challenged by a concluding question from Boston, Massachusetts. How would I respond to Presidential candidate Abraham Lincoln's stated policy in response to the question: had he the choice of defending the Union, or defeating slavery, which would he choose? He answered, correctly, as did I, the Union. The trick in the question is that had Lincoln answered, "Repeal of slavery," the southern region of what had been the United States would have remained slave territory to the present day; by defending the Union, Lincoln defeated slavery. Such was the crucial mission of his Presidency.

The Boston question, as presented on those two occasions, the one to Abraham Lincoln, the other to me, shows that the questioner had no competent understanding of the proper meaning of “principle” and “policy” of government in modern society. The small-minded individual wise guy, thinks in terms of specific issues affecting some part of society; the competent statesman thinks in terms of dynamics, as dynamics was defined as a scientific principle, in ancient times by the Pythagoreans and Plato, and for modern times by Gottfried Leibniz and Bernhard Riemann. In the real universe, competent remedies for important problems of policy are formulated in terms of the dynamics of universal principles, not particular, so-called “single” issues. Only fools or swindlers argue from the standpoint of lists of “single issues.”

In the case of the British orchestration of the spread of slavery in the United States, a spread effected, through leading efforts of the British Empire’s deploying the Nineteenth-Century Spanish monarchy for this purpose, as illustrated by the treatment of the *Amistad* case by John Quincy Adams. Then, the institution of slavery was upheld as supported by an assumed John Locke principle of law, as by the British empire and its southern slave-holding accomplices in crime. Only the Federal destruction of John Locke’s argument could eliminate slavery in the U.S.A. By attacking only slavery, without crushing the influence of Locke’s argument, the attempt to suppress slavery would have merely torn the nation apart, to the advantage of the British empire’s promotion of slavery in, particularly, the southern states of what had been our Federal Union.

For a comparable case. President William Clinton had been the most consistent advocate of minority rights for Americans of African descent. A few years ago, Karl Rove and company promoted a swindle called the “faith-based initiative.” Under this scheme, corrupt sources of money replaced the principle of civil rights. Like the characters of Stephen Vincent Benet’s celebrated short story, “The Devil and Daniel Webster,” many leading civil rights figures of the national political scene abandoned the standard of principle for the appeal of “Scratch.” That effectively killed much of the “stuff” of the U.S. Civil Rights movement, all to the great



EIRNS/Stuart Lewis

Abraham Lincoln's Presidency illustrates the meaning of the word "principle" in politics. Those who criticized (and criticize) him for insisting that the defense of the Union had priority over the abolition of slavery, fail to understand this fundamental issue.

amusement of the associates of Karl Rove and the Bush-Cheney administration generally. The dupes of this “faith-based initiative” scheme moved out of effective political actions. I watched this exhibition, this parade, in disgust!

Principles, Not ‘Issues’

Against the background defined by that just stated point respecting the essential role of the appropriate quality of selection of the composition of the team, I re-emphasize a relevant point introduced earlier here, Until the successful, 1944, Allied breakthrough at Normandy, the same oligarchical circles of London and Manhattan which had placed the species of Mussolini and Hitler into power in the first place, had come, rather briefly, into a time when they supported the indispensable wartime leadership by Franklin Roosevelt. However, once the breakthrough had been secured, the former Anglo-American oligarchies which had created the Mussolini and Hitler regimes, went back to their old, evil ways: one might say, “exposing their bare sterns.” Thus, Franklin Roosevelt had been induced, by the circumstances generated by such right-

wing pressures of 1944, to replace Vice-President Henry Wallace with the nomination of the right-wing scamp Truman, a concession made on the hopeful assumption that Roosevelt would then actually be reelected, and that he would, therefore, survive to control Truman.

However, having considered as much as that, we must look deeper into the origins of our modern European civilization.

The birth of modern European history occurred during the middle of Europe’s Fifteenth-Century Renaissance, a modern history whose birth is most compactly represented by two sets of the great works of Cardinal Nicholas of Cusa, his formulation for the founding of the modern sovereign nation-state, his *Concordancia Catholica*, and his founding of modern European science in a series of works begun with his *De Docta Ignorantia*. In principle, it is absolutely no exaggeration to report, that it was Nicholas of Cusa who organized the European discovery of America. It was the last will and testament of Cusa, as read in Portugal by an Italian sea-captain then in the Portugal service, Christopher Columbus, which presented the case for the project of exploration to which Columbus had

committed himself by 1480 A.D., and whose success was realized in 1492.

Indeed, Nicholas of Cusa has proven to have been one of the greatest geniuses in all modern history. It was he who launched a systemic conception of modern physical science; it was his intention which was echoed by the unique way in which the foundations of the U.S.A. were planted from Europe, and were echoed in the way in which the North American colonists crafted a United States in the tradition of the Winthrops and Mathers, that in reaction to the new mortal challenge to modern civilization by that February 1763 Peace of Paris. That was the treaty which established the evil embodied in the Anglo-Dutch British East India Company as the privately owned empire, an empire later intrusted, nominally, to the monarchy of aging Queen Victoria and her successors. It was the American constitutional break with the oligarchical traditions which are still gripping a continental Europe which remains, predominantly, a perennial captive of imperial London to the present day. This American break from British East India Company imperialism, was a break, top-down, which made possible the founding and continued existence of our constitutional system of government.

It is that specific principle which makes our constitutional system, when served, profoundly superior, in every way, to the parliamentary expression of the oligarchical systems which permeate Europe, and repeatedly corrupt even its noblest efforts, to the present moment.

Our United States, and its unique constitutional design of the principles of government and natural law, have been our advantage, both for the benefit of ourselves, and for the rescue of Europe from those recurring follies which have remained endemic in those places to the present day.¹

However, even to the present day, we have never freed our republic entirely from the over-reaching hand of that Anglo-Dutch Liberal form of financier succubus which formed the core of the so-called American Tory party of the 1763-1783 interval. The 1789 outbreak of that revolution in France which was orchestrated by the British Foreign Office under the direction of Aaron Burr controller Jeremy Bentham's Committee, established its control over the governments of France from the Fall of the Bastille, organized by British agent Philippe Egalité on behalf of Swiss British asset Jacques

Necker. The Jacobin Terror was conducted entirely by London agents, including the London-steered Martinist freemasonry of Count Joseph de Maistre, which was the key inside element behind London's use of the French Terror and Napoleon Bonaparte. The French monarchy's restoration, orchestrated by the Duke of Wellington, continued the control of France's governing forces by the British Foreign Office under Lord Shelburne's Bentham; Bentham's protégé and successor, Lord Palmerston, created Napoleon III, that out of some curious substance yet to be properly defined.

That aspect of the post-1783 history of France through the abdication of Napoleon III, is only most conspicuously typical of the fashion in which the European oligarchical tradition, whose control was centered in the neo-Venetian financier oligarchy of the Anglo-Dutch Liberal financial system, has been the chief source of every significant internal and external threat to our United States since the nativity of our independence in 1763.

That much said on background, focus on the crucially significant matter of Cusa's American legacy, the role of that legacy in shaping the essential, systemic distinction of the American System of political-economy from those of Europe.

This project of discovery launched by Cusa was developed by him in response to the new decline of European civilization set into motion by the succession of the Fall of Constantinople and also the subsequent Balkan wars which have continued to be the accursed folly of European continental civilization ever since, to the present time. Cusa emphasized the significance of the cultural failings of European culture in permitting this decline to occur. Such was the testament, by Cusa, which informed Christopher Columbus' decision to cross the Atlantic. This was the germ of the policy of intention to take the best of modern European civilization across the sea, to plant that seed of European culture at a relatively safe distance from the close reach of the corrupting feature of European oligarchical traditions.

Until we have taken into account this specific role implicitly assigned by Nicholas of Cusa, a great intellectual leader in the birth of modern European civilization, for making possible what became the U.S. republic, we must fail more or less inevitably to grasp the very special kind of global significance which the design of our Federal republic has for the world in crisis still today. If we correct our failure on that account, we can then understand the historical fact, that the chief issue of all modern history since developments such as Columbus' voyage; the American resistance to British imperialism in 1763-1783; and the consolidation of our nation as a continental republic, centered around the figure of Abraham Lincoln, during 1861-1876, has been the focus of the obsession shown over this entire period of time, by the obsession of the Anglo-Dutch Liberals who have been gripped by the intent to either obliterate our republic's existence, or, as now, simply gobble it up.

This nation needs, desperately, a growing portion of a cit-

1. Take the presently extremely important case of the conflict between the two contrasting philosophies of law, that of President Franklin Roosevelt versus John Maynard Keynes, which collided in the 1944 Bretton Woods conference. It was only the betrayal of the U.S.A., by President Harry Truman, which led to the abandoning of President Roosevelt's design for a decolonized post-war world, which allowed the influence of Keynes' monetarist dogma to be inserted as a factor of systemic corruption into Bretton Woods policy after President Roosevelt's death. The fundamental difference between the U.S. economic system and the monetarist systems of Britain and its European victims today, is lodged in the constitutional monopoly of the U.S. Federal Constitution over the creation, control, and defense of U.S. currency, as contrasted with the opposite policies of the Anglo-Dutch Liberal central-banking and related practices of Europe.

izenry which has resumed the earlier custom of actually thinking. There is no form of government which can be of much good to itself or its people, if the mass of the population is sinking into something like the gin-soaked, or pot-headed condition of a rutting mass of an English population infected with Eighteenth- and Nineteenth-Century Anglo-Dutch Liberalism. Such a nation soon comes to what it has brought upon itself, by its purported enjoyment of a kind of national life which it may not have deserved, but which it has, unquestionably, earned.


4. Our American System of Political-Economy

U.S. leading citizens who are not only patriotic, but actually competent in matters of economics and forecasting, have always been enemies of that swindle of British Liberalism called “free trade.” To understand the presently vital important significance of that fact better, focus attention on the widely circulated fraud on the subject of the principles of the Bretton Woods system. Focus attention on the role of President Franklin Roosevelt’s unfaithful successor, President Harry Truman, who created the conditions under which that fraud was imposed upon credulous leading economists, and other relevant figures of the world, still to the present day. Focus on the practical effects which that fraud has had, world wide, to the present day.

First of all, take into account the fact, that President Franklin Roosevelt was not merely a witting and faithful descendant of the New York banker Isaac Roosevelt who had been an intimate ally of U.S. Treasury Secretary Alexander Hamilton. Franklin Roosevelt showed his adherence to that commitment, in his successive roles as a brilliantly successful New York State governor, and President of the U.S.A.—which is why the British circles of the House of Morgan were implicated in the treasonous schemes against him. If we put the cases of U.S. Presidents George Washington and Abraham Lincoln to one side for a moment, then, without any margin for reasonable doubt, Franklin Roosevelt should be seen clearly as relatively the greatest among all other Presidents of the U.S.A.

The practical and urgent point here, is, that had Franklin Roosevelt not been elected U.S. President in 1932, Hitler and his crew would have remained allied with London, and would have ruled the world for a very long time. This is the historically crucial fact which both British Fabians and many foolish American citizens have never accepted. That fact is the true nature of the role of the economist John Maynard Keynes at the 1944 Bretton Woods conference. This fact is key for understanding the way in which the fraudulent belief has been swallowed, and made popular among most of today’s leading economists around the world still today.

That is to say, that the fraud about Keynes’ role at Bretton



British Liberal economist John Maynard Keynes (right) was not, as is commonly believed, an ally of Franklin Roosevelt in formulating the Bretton Woods system. Here, he is shown at the Bretton Woods conference in 1944 with Harry Dexter White, the senior U.S. Treasury Department official on the scene.

Woods, is a fraud which has been foisted, after President Roosevelt’s death, upon most of the credulous world economists, up to the present day. More significant than the mere fact of that fraud itself, is the way which belief in that swindle has affected lives throughout the world, up through the present day.

That fraud is, the foisted belief, that President Franklin Roosevelt had adopted the doctrine of John Maynard Keynes at the famous 1944 Bretton Woods monetary conference. In fact, President Roosevelt had deployed his special representatives to the conference to prevent the adoption of the fraudulent doctrine which Keynes presented at that conference. Being a born New Hampshire man myself, with a certain affection for Mount Washington and its vicinity, and having slept one night at that location, I demand, on behalf of that honorable President Roosevelt, that the truth in this matter be told.

The origin of my relatively unique authority in what I am about to present in this concluding section of this report, lies essentially in three bench-mark features of my development as a physical economist, especially during the interval from secondary school through my attention to the relevant implications of Bernhard Riemann for a science of physical economy, during the early 1950s.

Since what I am about to summarize here, is of exceptional importance for the policy-shaping of our own and other governments dealing with the presently ongoing, global breakdown-crisis of the world’s present monetary-financial systems, the emphasis in what I have to present on that account, is to be treated as science, not mere opinion, of which latter our suffering world economy has endured all too much

during recent decades. Therefore, on that account, I am obliged to present this material in relevant terms.

The Purpose of the Truman Lie

The crucially important feature of that lie about Keynes' role, still today, is the fact that this lie was accepted only under President Harry Truman and his accomplices, only after President Roosevelt was dead. More significant than that lie itself, is the practical reason for Truman's adoption of the lie.

As any actually literate person should know, the hallmark of the post-war economic policy repeatedly stated by President Franklin Roosevelt during the war, was that President's broadly, and repeatedly circulated statement of his intention to bring about the liquidation of all colonial and semi-colonial arrangements, once the war had been won.

This was the open conflict in the monstrously difficult, strictly temporary, war-time alliance of the U.S.A. with Churchill's British imperialist system. Once Hitler were dead, the U.S. policy was to break up, world wide, both the British empire and all similar imperial arrangements, which were to be regarded as enemies of the true freedoms which the world should adopt and cherish in seeking to tear up and destroy the long-standing roots of the kinds of great evils which the Hitler regime had also represented.

Behind the actual calling of the Bretton Woods conference, was President Roosevelt's intention for the U.S. role in the post-war world. That intention was to convert the mightiest war-machine the world had ever seen, our own war-time agro-industrial war machine, into becoming an engine of global economic reconstruction and development. This meant, as President Roosevelt had told Churchill directly, that U.S. policy was to break up the British and all other empires, by aiding what had been the victims of British and other colonialism and semi-colonialism, through mobilizing the great scientific and agro-industrial war-machine for the peaceful development of the standard of living of the inhabitants of the planet as a whole.

In contrast to that, the British imperialist intention of Churchill and his cronies, including our own skunk President Harry S Truman, was to restore the pre-war imperialist and related colonial systems of the British and other imperialists, and to prevent, actively, what the British Empire saw as the mortal threat to its imperial system in Roosevelt's intended conversion of the U.S. war-machine to peaceful post-war purposes. That contemptible ingrate, the British system, sought to ruin Roosevelt's intention by promoting a great nuclear-warfare confrontation between the misguided Anglo-American partnership and the Soviet Union.

Thus, the most evil single figure of the Twentieth Century, the Bertrand Russell, who was closely allied with avowedly fascist Fabian H.G. Wells, would propose, publicly, in September 1946, in the *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists*, that the purpose of such a preemptive nuclear attack on the Soviet Union (at a time it had no such weapons), would be to estab-

lish global submission of the planet to "world government," a form of British imperialism approximated by the current, London-crafted Lisbon Treaty, which is called, euphemistically, "globalization" today. Russell stated this repeatedly, through to the end of the Truman Presidency, and stated, years later, that he, the great pacifist he professed to be, had "never regretted" his effort to mobilize governments for launching preemptive nuclear warfare. Nevil Shute wrote on "the Beach"; Russell was the true-life "Son of that Beach."

Such is the threat of a global nuclear holocaust which the London architects of the Lisbon Treaty have crafted for such an intent, again, today. There lies the crucial issue of coincidence between the economic and military features of the absolute opposition of the policies of President Franklin Roosevelt to the hideous schemes of Winston Churchill, and to what would become Churchill's crony, President Harry S Truman. Such was the breed of the monstrous, late Bertrand Russell, and such Fabian followers of the legacy of H.G. Wells as former Prime Minister Tony Blair today.

The difference between President Franklin Roosevelt, on the one side, and Truman and Churchill on the other, lies in the intrinsically anti-imperialist characteristics of the American System of political-economy, which is Hamilton's, Lincoln's, Franklin Roosevelt's, and my own system of thought. This distinction lies with the conflict of our republic's system, from the start, with the policy of "free trade," or "monetarist" system of the present British continuation of the so-called "Liberal" dogma of the followers of Venice's Paolo Sarpi.

Economic Crimes Against Humanity

As the present-day promotion of the predatory scheme called "globalization" shows, monetarism, especially in its radical "free trade" expression, is, like the dogma of the British imperial World Wildlife Fund, a frankly genocidal scheme which must be outlawed as an avowed commitment to crimes against humanity. Similarly, the World Trade Organization (WTO) has now proven itself to be another genocidal scheme falling within the same general class of criminality as Adolf Hitler's schemes. Apart from being crimes against humanity, these expressions of criminality are, not accidentally, in mortal conflict with the general welfare of the lower eighty percentile, and a clear and present danger to more than a calculable, ultimately eighty percent of our own population today.

In the standard "free trade" monetarist system, the control of money is assigned to what are often termed "central banking," or kindred systems. These systems operate to such effect that various explicitly, or implicitly imperialist systems function as creations of consortia called "central banking systems." These are systems whose prescribed degree of "free trader's" independence from restraints by sovereign governments, defines what is to be recognized in today's world systems as a global tyranny, of world rule under the direction of consortia of intrinsically predatory, and essentially parasitical financier cartels. The result of this arrangement, is a system

akin to both the Lombard banking system which caused the Fourteenth-Century “New Dark Age,” and would be, unless terminated, the source of an early crash into a new, global dark age, unless we break up the present control over the world’s financial economy represented by that London-Amsterdam financier cartel, pivoted on the “spot market,” which is the functional core of the British world empire-in-fact today.

That was already the real issue lurking within the conflict between President Franklin Roosevelt and John Maynard Keynes in 1944, and is the root-motive of the fraudulent attribution of the Bretton Woods System to the policies of Keynes. The actually original Bretton Woods system, like the matching Franklin Roosevelt design for the United Nations Organization (UNO), was an anti-free-trade system, a system based upon the model of the Constitutional limitation of all uttering of U.S. currency, or related stated credit, to the authority of the Federal Presidency acting with the consent of the U.S. Congress.

The Bretton Woods agreements, crafted under President Franklin Roosevelt’s 1944 direction, were an anti-imperialist (e.g., anti-colonialist) design, premised upon the extension of the great principle of the U.S. Federal Constitution’s Preamble, extended by Roosevelt as a protection for the people of the world. The contrary proposal of Keynes was designed to re-establish the so-called Liberal monetary system of the British Empire as the implicit ruler of the world. Thus, the proposal of Keynes was defined as the implied imperial ruler of the world, designed to obtain that power through its status as the first among equals among the ostensibly “equal” empires of the world as a whole. That is not a British Empire of the past; it is what has become the state of affairs generated by the combination of President Nixon’s floating the dollar, and the monstrous oil-price hoax which made the Amsterdam “spot market” the implied master of the price of the dollar for the world.

This is key for grasping the fact, that the British interest is, still today, the butcher of “Black Africa,” and the top-down controller over the campaign of Senator Barack Obama, a control which has been deployed, in significant degree, through London-centered international organized-crime networks. It is the imperial control exerted on the Democratic Party organization and Speaker of the House Nancy Pelosi, through traditionally Lazard Frères, pro-fascist channels such as Felix Rohatyn, as by, otherwise, the London-created financier George Soros and the British Empire’s Rupert Murdoch.

In contrast to such Liberal swindlers, to understand modern economy, we must go back to both the founding of modern economy, and of the 1776 Declaration of Independence, on the promise of the great principle of Gottfried Leibniz: “the pursuit of happiness,”

How To Forecast

I have been engaged in economic forecasting since my first, successful venture, undertaken in my executive function as a management consultant at that time, in Summer of 1956,

in foreseeing the virtual certainty of a major U.S. recession to erupt about February 1957. That recession occurred precisely on time, and was unique among known forecasts circulated, to my knowledge, at that time.

My success in this forecast, encouraged me to expand my practice. I crafted the base-line of a long-range forecast during 1958-59, in which I anticipated that, unless certain changes in U.S. policy intervened, a serious recession-process would dominate the second half of the 1960s, leading toward the threat of a breakdown of the existing monetary system by approximately the beginning of the 1970s. When that breakdown actually occurred, in mid August 1971, this forecast of mine had been the only case known to me of a publicized forecast of such a dated event. This led to a celebrated debate, at New York’s Queens College campus, between me and an internationally prominent Keynesian economist, Professor Abba Lerner.

I won the debate, but thus made a host of influential enemies, such as the circles of Professor Sidney Hook, as a result of what they stated they considered the embarrassment I had heaped on their friend Abba Lerner, by prompting him to defeat himself. Since that time, all but two of my principal economic forecasts, have been long-range, of a span of about a decade or more; all have been successful so far. One of the two short-term forecasts was a June 1987 forecast of the outbreak of a major recession, a virtual 1929 depression-shock, to occur approximately the first week of the coming October. The second was my forecast of a “mudslide” recession to occur about the close of 1992.

The significance of those forecasts for the purposes of this report, is that the uniqueness of my pattern of success as a forecaster is essentially a reflection of the superiority of the method which I have employed. I do not accept the contrary method, which I regard as intrinsically incompetent scientifically, the incompetent method which is expressed in the usual sort of statistical methods, such as those of LTCM, common to academic and most professional forecasting.

All of the forecasts which I have presented were addressed to the fact of a serious flaw in the physical-economic assumptions governing the human direction of the process on which my attention was focused. My first, relatively short-term forecast of an approximately February 1957 break in the credit-system of the post-1952 automobile marketing and related industries, was premised on the dependency of that and related markets on marketing assumptions which attributed financial lives to credit-extensions which exceeded the “healthy” physical life-span of the credit uttered. This also involved, significantly, the automobile industries’ promotion of new-car sales and net revenues by what amounted to a fraudulent over-valuation, and useful remaining “life,” of used-car trade-ins on new-car dealers’ lots.

The included controlling factor in this forecast of mine, was focused on the folly of the U.S. post-war policy of shifting investment in transportation from rails to roads, which

created the railway-crisis of the period of the negotiation of the proposed merger of the New York Central and Pennsylvania railway systems. There was never an actually rational reason for that geopolitically-motivated policy of destroying the more efficient U.S. transcontinental railway system for the inherently less efficient shift in replacing rail systems with long-distance highway transport of trucking and commuter auto traffic. An integrated system of modular truck-train transport should have, and could have been developed.


In all of the crucial factors in the creation of the relative decay of what had been, still, until the assassination of President John F. Kennedy, the greatest, most productive economy of the world, our U.S. economy as expressed by our World War II achievements, I have been what some might consider the apparent intellectual beneficiary, in my function as a forecaster, of recognizing that relevant major shifts in top-down shaping of U.S. economy policy, have had the character of a deliberate ruin of the U.S. economy by those financier and related circles which hate not only the memory of President Franklin Roosevelt, but all of those successful policy features of the U.S. economy's traditional superiority of performance, which were viewed as unpleasant by our British and certain other rivals, and also by the rabidly anglophile financier interests centered traditionally in Manhattan and Chicago.

It is also to be emphasized, that the most commonly efficient way to ruin an economy of a nation one hates, is to lure it into the folly of long wars, such as the Peloponnesian war, as we were lured into the long, useless war in Indo-China, as the Soviet Union was lured into the asymmetric warfare in Afghanistan, and British Prime Minister Tony Blair lured poor foolish President Bush into the presently continuing and spreading long war of Bush-Cheney in Southwest Asia.

The History of Economy

What can be recognized as economy from the standpoint of modern European civilization, first appeared under the reign of Charlemagne. Although monetary functions existed then and there, the function of economy there was that of a physical economy, rather than a monetary one, and was coordinated, with the aid of a great census of population and production by the government of the domain. The development of the great network of inland waterways, which was the forerunner of what became the transcontinental U.S. railway system of the middle through late Nineteenth Century, was a characteristic of Charlemagne's domain as a whole. That system of inland waterways was completed only recently, as the link between the Rhine and Danube was finally completed.

During that time, the relevant enemy of Charlemagne's society was Byzantium, in which the dominant force was the power of usury, rather than production. With the decline of



UNICEF/Giles Vauclair

The hideous practice of "globalization"—transferring production from areas of higher living standards and productivity, to countries where labor is cheaper and productivity lower—has been the driving factor in bringing on the current economic breakdown crisis. Here, child labor for the export market, in Honduras.

Byzantium, about the turn of the millennium, especially with the rise of Hildebrand's power within the Papacy, there was the rise of a combination of the Norman chivalry consolidated by the takeover of England, and the Venetian usurers, who emerged as the real, controlling agency of power throughout most of the European system as a whole.

Despite the rising impulse of nationalism already expressed by the development under Charlemagne, and expressed otherwise by Dante Alighieri's revival of the Italian language and his *De Monarchia*, the establishment of the modern nation-state was set into motion by the influence of Nicholas of Cusa's revolutionary *Concordancia Catholica* within the proceedings of the great councils, which resuscitated the Christian church from the ruinous effects of the Fourteenth-Century "New Dark Age." This work of the Councils converged in effect upon the great

ecumenical Council of Florence, within which Nicholas of Cusa contributed a crucial role. It was Cusa's development of the principles of modern European science, beginning with his *De Docta Ignorantia*, which established the correct foundations, in physical science, for the emergence of modern European civilization's practice of physical economy and of modern physical science in general. Christopher Columbus was inspired by Cusa's program for trans-Atlantic exploration and settlement, a program carried forth by Columbus to the effect of establishing the principal outlines of modern planetary civilization and its political economy since.

At that point in history, the notion of economy was divided among conceptions of mutually contradictory meanings. On the one side, the prevalent notion was established, first in Louis XI's France and then Henry VII's England, of essentially physical, rather than essentially monetary national economies. On the opposing side, were the Venetian factions, which included both the old Venetian usury faction, and, later the new Venetian party, which became the so-called Liberal faction, centered on the founder of modern irrationalist Liberalism, Paolo Sarpi.

During the late Sixteenth and early Seventeenth centuries, the New Venice faction of Sarpi shifted its base northward, as in Sarpi's virtual takeover of the England of James I, the launching of what became the Thirty Years War of 1618-1648, and the creation of a powerful New-Venice financier-oligarchical faction planted in the Netherlands, England, and other North Sea and Baltic regions. This financier-oligarchical faction based itself ideologically on Sarpi's adoption of the specific irrationalism of a lunatic medieval ideologue, William of Ockham (Latin: Occam), as the weapon adopted for ideological defense of Sarpi's system against the specific form of Classical scientific rationalism which had been revived by Cusa and Cusa's followers, such as Leonardo da Vinci and Johannes Kepler in physical science.

Today, the medieval viewpoint in political philosophy and science has been relegated to the living troglodytes of dead history. With the rise of the British Empire as the highest among equals of the imperialist, Venetian Liberal tradition, there are only two leading, mutually opposed conceptions of the meaning of economy: the one typified by the system of Anglo-Dutch Liberalism, and sundry opposing currents best typified by what U.S. Treasury Secretary Alexander Hamilton defined as the American System of political-economy based upon our own Federal Constitution's fundamental law, as expressed summarily in the anti-Lockean Preamble. It is the distinction between these two mutually opposing conceptions of economy, the American System versus the intrinsically imperialist, loan-sharking, Anglo-Dutch Liberal system of the Bentham-led Haileybury School, which defines the essential lines of global conflict throughout the planet today.²

2. The system which Karl Marx presented in his *Capital*, was premised on the dogmas taught to Marx in London, through the medium of what was then named The British Museum.

Thus, the question facing the entire world today, is which of these two systems shall prevail as the leading choice for a system of cooperation among the peoples of the world at the juncture of the presently onrushing, global economic breakdown-crisis of the planet as a whole. By whatever choice of "brand names" a sovereign nation might choose, the only possible system of international economic functioning, globally, today, is one of these two. The choice of the Anglo-Dutch Liberal system means the rapid reduction of population of the planet, from the level of approximately six-and-a-half billions living individuals, to about half a billion, or less, soon.

My Three Factors of Science

However, as significant as those considerations have been in my success as a forecaster, the more general, principled feature of my heretofore relatively unique success as a long-range forecaster, has been rooted in more fundamental matters of physical science.³ Three such developments in my experience have been relatively most significant. First, was my well-founded categorical rejection of Euclidean geometry, as Sophistry, on my first encounter with Euclid in secondary education; the correct choice of premises on which I based that objection, has proven to be the greatest single source of intellectual benefits I have enjoyed in adolescent and adult life since that time.⁴ I insisted on a science of physical economy, free of all a-prioristic presumptions, a science of economy rooted in the same issue of method which I came to know later as the method of Archytas in the duplication of the cube. Second, was my related, 1940s recognition of the intrinsic incompetence of the attempts to apply the radically reductionist methods of such as Norbert Wiener and John von Neumann to economics. The third was my delighted embrace of Bernhard Riemann's 1854 habilitation dissertation, a view which I adopted from the vantage of my earlier rejection of the method of Sophistry intrinsic to, and typified by the a-prioristic meth-

3. My intention has never been to patent my work, but to promote the adoption of my successes in method by coming generations.

4. The relevant feature here, is that, the most essential features of *Euclid's Elements* are parodies of theorems and related conceptions developed by sources such as Thales, Heracleitus, the Pythagoreans, and Plato, in which geometry is treated inclusively as a subject of physical science, rather than as a system superimposed upon physical science. There is, thus, nothing important, and also original to Euclid, included in the *Elements* as such. Actually, Euclid's own work is, like the hoaxes of the Roman Claudius Ptolemy, a product of the specific school of Sophistry traced to Aristotle. Although the opening statements of Bernhard Riemann's habilitation dissertation are crucial, as an original contribution to modern science, the idea of a physical geometry free of the encumbrance of a-prioristic assumptions is already expressed in ancient sources including the Pythagoreans and Plato. This point becomes clearer in modern science, when we trace the development of modern physical science from Brunelleschi and Nicholas of Cusa, through Leonardo da Vinci, Kepler, Fermat, Leibniz, Jean Bernoulli, and Gauss. This point becomes transparent when we trace the legacy of these modern scientists from the work of ancient forebears such as Thales, Heracleitus, the Pythagoreans, and Plato.

ods of Euclid and of Bertrand Russell's devotees Norbert Wiener and John von Neumann.

From the standpoint which I have identified in this chapter of the report thus far, the idea of a monetary system as the equivalent of a branch of physical science, is baldly absurd. No general economic forecast for the development of a real economy, which is premised upon the methods of financial accounting and related statistics, could possibly be anything but absurd. The use of financial accounting is not absurd in itself; but, the systemic misuse of financial-accounting methods to forecast the development of physical processes is tantamount to the action of either the charlatan or, simply, the lunatic. That is essentially the gist of the reason that I have always been correct relative to my putative rivals among the usual suspects of financial forecasting.

Broadly, my discoveries, either acquired or developed by me, bearing upon a science of economy, were originally crafted by me on the three benchmark considerations I have pointed out above. However, it was merely consistent with my long-standing emphasis on the qualitative distinction of the creative functions of the individual human from the capacities of even domesticated members of animal species, that I cautiously adopted Academician V.I. Vernadsky's notions of the principled nature of the Biosphere and Noösphere as functionally distinct universal physical phase-spaces. This change did not contradict my earlier views, as based on rejection of the systemic follies of Bertrand Russell's Wiener and von Neumann; rather, my work was greatly enriched by these added considerations.

The Key Was Leibniz

This brings me back to the role of Gottfried Leibniz in defining what became known as that American System of political-economy, and the essential incompatibility of the American System of political-economy with all Anglo-Dutch Liberal ideology. This is the American System which underlies that gracious goodness and superior accomplishment of our United States, whenever we free ourselves from the ideological grip of the Liberal system.

The characteristic of a competent economics, as distinct from the intrinsic incompetence of the use of financial accounting and related methods for such purposes as forecasting, is a characteristic feature of economy which does not exist within forms of life lower than the human being. To summarize that point: the essential feature of competent studies of economy is its essentially human quality, that quality of discovery of universal physical principles which does not exist among forms of life lower than the human individual. This distinction is expressed statistically in the variable function of what is most conveniently described as *the increase of relative potential population-density*.

The most readily accessible illustration of the meaning of that term is the increase of both the potential density of population and physical standard of living of the typical human

member of society, through both advances in physical science's practice and an increase of the relative density of functionally related basic economic infrastructure, as that increase of density is illustrated by the progress in use of fuels, upwards, from burning of wood, of charcoal, of coal and coke, of petrochemical stocks, of nuclear fission generation of power at increasing levels of "energy flux density," by thermonuclear fusion, and so on up the ladder.

By contrast, all animal life has a characteristic potential relative population-density which is fixed, for any environment, by its inherent limitations as a species. Mankind, through the effects of scientific and Classical cultural modes of progress, willfully increases society's potential relative population-density indefinitely, as no lower form of life can do this.

Thus, only very debased forms of human life, comparable functionally with collections of baboons and chimpanzees, could tolerate "Malthusian" caps on population-growth of societies.

Therefore, all competent studies of human behavior, as distinct from the behavior of lower forms of life, are focussed on that specific factor in human behavior which accounts for mankind's power to increase the potential relative population-density of our species *willfully*.

That factor of efficient human-species willfulness can be expressed in mathematical-physical terms only in one characteristic way. The key to that expression is found in the *Sphaerics* of the ancient Egyptians and Pythagoreans, as in the work of Plato, and in the great principle rediscovered by Cardinal Nicholas of Cusa, the principle upon which all competent method in modern science has depended categorically. This was expressed by Cusa as his discovery of the systemic error permeating Archimedes' attempts to define the quadrature of the circle or parabola. That discovered principle is what I have preferred to identify as the ontologically infinitesimal, as that is typified in modern science by Kepler's discovery of the principle of universal gravitation, and Leibniz's uniquely original discovery of the calculus on the basis of Cusa's and Kepler's notion of the ontologically efficient infinitesimal.

In common practice of culturally literate modern individuals, this notion of the ontologically infinitesimal is the only existing key to understanding the basic principle on which the intentional advancement of the productive powers of human labor may be induced.

In the case of society, mankind's power to use up so-called natural resources of some type, as a means for maintaining a growing population, requires constant progress in making scientific breakthroughs which provide us with the means for more than offsetting the relative depletion of some needed resources, by superseding the use, or the manner of use of those resources through fundamental scientific progress in the productive powers of the human labor of the individual members of the society as a whole.

The study of the physically functional interdependencies

of modes of human action needed to account for the problems and their solutions so defined, compels us to consign ordinary financial accounting to the trash bin, or simply lock the economists outside the hall where serious economic-policy-shaping is occurring, when dealing with the physical realities of the rise and fall of actual economies. In a competently managed national or world economy, categorically Riemannian *dynamics* must prevail at the cost of Cartesian and related reductionist methods. What the United States did, in past times when the national government and the economists were relatively sane, as this is typified by the Franklin Roosevelt legacy, was to regulate prices in a mode we used to identify as “fair trade” practices of regulation; these “fair trade” practices were crafted, partly by government, and partly on private initiative, to such effect that managed relative price-levels so determined corresponded with reasonably good approximation to the physical effects we desired that our national economy would secure.

The crazed drive for “deregulation” which seized an in-

sane U.S. government, and many others, during the 1969-1983 interval, has been the chief factor in causing the accelerating physical collapse of the U.S. economy over that interval, and beyond.

The worst expression of the type of “free trade” lunacy to which I have referred, is the obscenely stupid notion, that it is an advantage to the human species to transfer production from places where the physical standard of living and per-capita productivity is higher, to locations where the standard of living and physical productivity of the population as a whole is cheaper and actually lower. It has been the closing down of capital-intensive investment in technological progress in North America and northern Eurasia, for the sake of cheaper prices of labor, which has been the driving factor in bringing about the presently onrushing general economic, chain-reaction process of a breakdown crisis for the planet as a whole.

Gentlemen tycoons! The problem with the world economy today, is that you are not only filthy-rich predators, but also insane!