

# PART III

## THE LARGER, “STRATEGIC” HISTORICAL MOMENT WITHIN WHICH THE PRESENT LARGER “TACTICAL” POLITICAL DEBATE ARISES:

### CHAPTER I

#### THE NEED TO IDENTIFY AND IMPLEMENT THE NON-“DIALECTICAL” NATURAL LAW IDEAL HISTORICALLY PROPOSED BY WESTERN CIVILIZATION

(A)

#### THE PROBLEM OF “DISCERNMENT” OF THE NATURAL LAW

(1)

#### THE PHILOSOPHER KINGS

Assuming, as we have noted above, that the “Natural Law” Worldview does, that there does exist an explicit “unifying phenomenon” (which is like the physical phenomena of "magnetism", “gravity”, “light”, or “sound”) which phenomenon physically “bonds together” every single integer of physical matter within our entire physical Universe into one single, unified, harmonious whole, acting, as it does, in effect “from *within*” the Universe, each unit acting directly upon each other unit, what, then, is the “dynamic” by means of which the best minds in Western Civilization have concluded that a given individual human being might be capable of detecting or “discerning” this physical phenomenon (just as he or she is considered capable of directly and experientially “discerning” the existence of light) – and what is the dynamic (if any) by means of which such an individual human being might be capable of “discerning” whether a specific act of human conduct (either individual or collective ) IS, or IS NOT, physically “harmonious” with or **dis**-harmonious to this specific unitive phenomenon?

The earliest writings pertaining to these two rather extraordinary questions were written by Parmenides, a scholar who was born in the southern Italian city of Velia in 540 B.C. shortly after his parents fled from Phocaea on the western coast of Turkey.

(Give details of his writings and ideas)

Parmenides' protégé was Epimenides who lived on the Greek island of Crete in the eastern Mediterranean Sea not far from the Western coast of Turkey between 550 B.C and 540 B.C

(Insert details of his writings and ideas)

The "School" of Western Philosophy which arose from the writings of Parmenides and Epimenides became known as the Ancient "Stoical" School of Greek Philosophy.

The later Greek Philosophers came to hold the belief that there existed certain, specially- "gifted" individuals (all of whom they believed to be Caucasian Greek males) who were capable of being trained by certain extremely intelligent and well-educated "Mentors" (who were also all presumed to be Greek Caucasian males) to become "Philosopher Kings": men who had been carefully educated in high-mathematics, physics, music, athletics, philosophy and "politics."

It was *these* specially-gifted and specially-trained young men of Greece whom the later Greek Philosophers believed to be uniquely "entitled" to "govern." However, even among these *later* Greek Philosophers, it was understood that the ability of these young "Philosopher Kings" to accurately "discern" and to enunciate the "correct" Laws was the end-result of these specially-trained young men combining the exercise of their educated intellects, their trained "artistic" faculties and their philosophical power of reflection and logical analysis with their practice of a unique physical exercise which was referred to as "Hybernation."

It was Parmenides and Epimenides (while recorded in Western History as the Fathers of Logic) who were, however, unique exponents of this extraordinary physical process which was referred to as "Hybernation." This process was assumed by Parmenides and Epimenides and their earlier associates to be a procedure which stimulated the functioning, within the human body, of a specific *latent* human biological faculty *by means of which* an individual human being was enabled to gain direct *experiential* "access" to this specific biological faculty which, in turn, enabled them to *directly physically experience* the "unitive physical phenomenon" which existed everywhere within our physical universe *in relationship to which* every specific proposed human action, either individual or collective, was either physically "harmonious" or **dis**-"harmonious"... thereby rendering each such act of human conduct either "harmonious" with or dis-"harmonious" to "The Natural Law Order of The Physical Universe" itself.

It was the conviction of Parmenides, Epimenides and their *early* “Stoic” associates that this “harmony” or dis-“harmony” was *directly physically experienced* by a “gifted” human being through the the “medium” this specific *latent biological “faculty”* which they believed to be possessed by each and every human being.

This *original* understanding... that it was this special biological human faculty which was the *primary* source of one’s direct ability to know what human conduct was either “harmonious” with or dis-“harmonious” to “the Natural Order of the physical Universe” became, however, gradually more and more distorted, placing a greater and greater degree of emphasis on the strictly *intellectual* “faculty” of such young men and a lesser and lesser degree of emphasis on this strictly *intuitive* “faculty”...until these two previously jointly-acting “faculties” became two separate and distinct “realms”...the *intellectual* and the *intuitive*... and the *intellectual* “realm” gradually became viewed to be the superior of the two.

This distorted conviction on the part of the later Philosophers of Ancient Greek Civilization was exported to Rome, with the second “wave” of the Greek Stoics. Indeed, before the fall of the Greco-Roman Empire in the Fifth Century A.D., two Roman Emperors themselves were said to have approached the capabilities of true “Philosopher Kings”. These two Roman Emperors were Julian and Marcus Aurelius. Later, Alexander The Great, the student of Aristotle, was asserted to have attained this stature.

However, after the fall of the Greco-Roman Empire, this earlier-believed capacity to *biologically* “intuit” the vibrational frequency of the physical unitive phenomenon which bonded together every ultimately irreducible integer of physical matter in the entire physical Universe into one physical “unitive harmony” became, within Western Culture, the exclusive “preserve” of members of an exclusive “Ecclesial Class” of Christian (Catholic) *priests* who were considered to be “adepts” in this unique undertaking of moral “discernment.”

Indeed, within Western Civilization, over the period of the two hundred years which followed the collapse of the Roman Empire (that is, between 400 A.D. and 600 A.D.), a highly-structured Institutional Church (The Holy Roman Catholic Church) was constructed to serve as the *exclusive* repository and arbiter of the “secret knowledge” pursuant to which a given potentially “gifted” young man was to be identified, recruited, trained and then entrusted with the “authority” to “discern” - and to then publicly enunciate – “The Law” (i.e. to declare publicly what specific human conduct was deemed to be either “harmonious” *with*, or **dis**-“harmonious” *to*, “The Natural Law.” The former category of human conduct was deemed, by The Holy Roman Catholic Christian Church, to be “Good”- or “Grace”-filled conduct. The latter category of human conduct was deemed by The Holy Roman Catholic Church to be “Bad” – or “sin-filled.”

However, such young men were not designated as “Philosopher Kings” by the Holy Roman Catholic Church, nor even as “Emperors. They were designated, instead, as “Priests” (Parish Priests, Monsignors; Bishops, Archbishops, Cardinals and then, eventually, “Popes” of The Holy Roman Catholic Church.) It was this “*Ecclesial* Class” within Western Civilization who were initially deemed to be *exclusively* authorized to “discern” the “Natural Laws” of our Universe - and who, derivatively, were deemed to be *exclusively* authorized to proclaim the local and regional “Laws” which were to “govern” the conduct of all the people within Western Civilization (both individual and collective.) This specific process of “Natural Law” “law-making (or, more accurately, of law “discerning”), therefore, constituted the very essence of the “Rule of Law” in Western Civilization for a full 1000 years (i.e. for the entire FIRST MILLENNIUM of Western Civilization.)

This was the operative Theory of Political Science in Western Civilization.

# CHAPTER II

## LAW “DISCERNING” AS A “THEOLOGICAL” UNDERTAKING

(A)

### Solely By The “Ecclesial” Class

It is essential, therefore, to any sound and accurate understanding of the historical “evolution” of the concept of the “law making process” in Western Civilization - and of the historical development of the Legal and Political Institutions of Western Civilization - to comprehend that “law making” (or, more appropriately, law “discerning”) in Western Civilization, for over 1000 full years, was understood by everyone to be an exclusively “*theological*” undertaking - allowed *exclusively* to Members of “The Ecclesial Class”, i.e. members of the Clergy of the Holy Roman Catholic Christian Church. To refuse to cognate this absolutely unquestioned fact is to remain functionally ignorant as to the historical source of the **political** power of the principles of “Natural Law” in Western Civilization.

The belief in the existence of an actual *physical* or *biological* “faculty” by means of which a given individual (Caucasian male...later Priest) was considered to be capable of directly *physically* “discerning” the physical “unitive phenomenon” which bonds every ultimately irreducible integer of physical matter in the entire physical Universe together with every other such integer into one unitive, internally-“harmonious” “unit” – and to then *experientially* determine whether a given form of human conduct was “harmonious” with or dis-“harmonious” to this unitive phenomena originated, then, during the early “Stoic Period” of Early Greece (in approximately 350 B.C.) – but *later evolved*, within the period of later Greek Civilization, into a later belief that there existed an essentially “*intellectual*”, “artistic” or “learned” ability that was *taught to* an especially intellectually “gifted” young man by an equally intellectually “gifted” and learned group of “Teachers.”)

However, the *original* understanding of this “faculty” as being an actual *physical* faculty *re-emerged* during the rise of The Holy Roman Catholic Church in Western Civilization.

Indeed, between 400 A.D. and the year 1000 A.D., it came to be viewed as the single most important responsibility of The Holy Roman Catholic Church in Western Civilization to seek out and to identify the young male members of each new physical Generation in Western Civilization who manifested “the charisms” which were associated with one possessing this special biological “faculty of the spirit” to a degree which was superior to that of other children of his Generation –

to then physically remove such young men from the “temptations” and “distractions” of “The World” and to then train these young male members of each new physical Generation (as to special “meditative” techniques; special breathing exercises; special dietary habits; special practices of sexual abstinence and the practice of “prayer”) to physically strengthen this otherwise merely “*latent*” biological “faculty of discernment” to the point at which such a chosen young man could then take his place, within his Generation, as a Catholic Church-“authorized” “Discerner of The Natural Law.” This status, thereupon, “authorized” such a young man in Western Culture to review the various local customs and activities in various geographic regions which were under the supervision of The Holy Roman Catholic Church and to “pronounce”, within these regions, *which* of the local or regional human “customs” of that region were either “harmonious with” or **dis-**“harmonious to” the “Natural Law” of the Universe, and were, thus, to be deemed either “Good” or “Bad...(or “Grace”-filled or “Sin-filled.”)

### (B)

#### In Partnership With The “Royal” Class

However, between the year 1000 and the year 1215, The Holy Roman Catholic Church in Western Culture increasingly adopted the practice of “delegating” the theretofore *exclusive* “theological authority” of their Priestly Class to discern and to declare “law” to an entirely new set of “partners.” These were the **Papally-**appointed regional “Kings”... men “of The World” who were deemed, by “The Holy Father”(i.e. the Roman Catholic Pope), to possess a highly developed “faculty of discernment”, but who were still distinctly “Of The World.” These men were chosen to function as The *Secular* Designees of The Holy Roman Catholic Pontiff, in a given specific physical region of The Holy Roman Empire (the physical territory of which The Holy Roman Catholic Church had functionally “inherited” from the Roman Empire when The Roman Empire “fell” (in light of the “Universal” Catholic Church’s official capacity as “The Official State Religion” of The Empire of Rome... a status which had been bestowed upon The Holy Roman Catholic Church, in the year 306 A.D., by the nephew of the then-Roman Emperor Constantine, one Constantinian.

This new “Royalist” Mode of “law-making” prevailed, throughout Western Civilization, for two full centuries (for as long as the United States has existed as a nation), from 1066 A.D. to the Year 1215 A.D.

However, after this period of time - during which the Catholic Pontiffs made a number of arguably “insightful” such “appointments” - the hierarchy of The Holy Roman Catholic Church *mistakenly* undertook to relieve itself of the burden of having to repeatedly take the time and expend the effort necessary to locate and to identify a genuinely **new** “spiritually gifted” such “Man-of-The- World” to be

made the new “King” in each and every geographic region of The Roman Catholic Church's vast territories in Western Europe each and every time the previously Papally-appointed “King” died. The Roman Catholic Church chose to relieve itself of this inconvenient “administrative burden” by concluding (totally erroneously, as it turned out) that this *biologically*-rooted physical “faculty of spiritual discernment” was somehow *genetically* “**inherited**” exclusively by the eldest male child of the previously Papally-appointed King.

As a result of this gross error in judgment, The Holy Roman Catholic Church of the Second Millennium of Western Civilization mistakenly allowed the eldest male children of the previously Papally-appointed Kings to simply “inherit” the title – and the “authority” - of his deceased father (“The King”), allowing that son to “discern” the Natural Law and to declare the local “laws” in that physical jurisdiction of The Holy Roman Catholic Empire. This single decision proved to be one of the poorest historical judgments in the entire history of The Holy Roman Catholic Church (of which there have, indeed, been many.)

(C)  
**In Further Partnership With The “Landed Aristocracy”**

Due to this grievous error in judgment on the part of the hierarchy of The Holy Roman Catholic Church made in the Second Century of the Second Millennium of Western Civilization, these mere “inheritors” of the title of “King” in Western Civilization began (quite predictably) to engage in a protracted series of poorer and poorer political and social judgments as to which local “customs” they should endorse and which they should reject. Indeed, these “eldest sons” began to actively initiate and to decree blatantly self-serving and unjust “laws.”

As a direct result of the ever-increasing degree of “injustice” which began to spread throughout Western Civilization during this 200-year period ...as a direct result of this specific erroneous decision on the part of the hierarchy of The Holy Roman Catholic Church, a demand began to arise, from among “The Landed Aristocracy”, that they be granted the right to assert a “check” upon such transparently unjust actions on the part of the Roman Catholic Church-authorized regional “Kings.”

A growing demand for such a “Partnership” interest within “The Ruling Class” of Western Civilization (which, at that time, consisted *only* of The Ecclesial Class and The Royalist Class) had been outstanding on the part of The Landed Aristocracy of Western Civilization for many decades before the year 1215. However, it was in that year, at Runnymede, in Britannia, that The Landed Aristocracy finally discerned - and *publicly* declared - a “THEOLOGICAL” *rationale* for their previously strictly *political* and *economic* demand for “partnership” in The Ruling

Class of Western Civilization. This rational was set forth in THE MAGNA CHARTA in 1215.

In this, one of the most important historical documents in all of Western Civilization, the Landed Aristocracy of Western Civilization declared:

By the grace of God, to his Archbishops, Bishops, Abbots and Barons, John, by the grace of God, King of England, know ye, that We, in the presence of God, and for the salvation of our soul and of the souls of all of our ancestors and heirs, and unto the honor of God, the advancement of The Holy Church, and the amendment of our Realm, does grant, by this our present Charter that we grant to all Freemen of our Kingdom all of the underwritten liberties...for holding of The General Council of The kingdom concerning the assessment of aids and the assessing of scutages, we shall cause to be summoned the Archbishops, Bishops, Abbots, Earls and The Greater Barons of The Realm singly by our Letter...for a certain day, that is to say, forty days before their Meeting, to a certain place. Said Summons thus having been made, the business shall proceed on that day, according to the advice of those this head, let the matter be decided by the five-and-twenty Barons hereafter mentioned, for the preservation of the peace.

All unjust and illegal fines made by us, and all americiaments imposed unjustly and contrary to the law of the land, shall be entirely given up, or else left to the decision of the five-and-twenty Barons hereafter mentioned for the preservation of the peace.

Whereas, for the honor of God and the amendment of our Kingdom, and for the quieting of the discord that has arisen between Us and our Barons, we have granted all these things aforesaid and, willing to render them firm and lasting, we do hereby grant our subjects the underwritten security, namely, that The Barons may choose five-and-twenty Barons of The kingdom whom they think convenient, and cause to be observed, the peace and liberties we have granted herein by this our present Charter.

Given under Our hand, in the presence of God and the witnesses above named, in the meadow called Runnymede, between Windsor and Staines, this 15th day of June, in the 17th year of Our reign."

The new THREE-partner "partnership" in the enterprise of "law-'discerning' " which was established through this document (and the assertion of armed force at Runnymede) was "institutionalized" in Western Culture in the form of the House of Lords – an entirely new "Western" legal (and "theological") Institution which was granted the "authority" (by The Catholic Church and by King John) to act as

a “check” upon the otherwise arbitrary and capricious exercise of the “law-discerning” power on the part of the King (who, of course, depended upon the theological “authorization” of The Holy Father in Rome, i.e. The Roman Catholic Christian Church, as the ultimate source of his authority.)

**(D)**  
**In Final Partnership With The “Mercantile” Class**

Between 1215 and 1515, as the feudal estates of The Landed Aristocracy in Western Europe began to disintegrate, the former serfs on these estates who had developed especially valuable “craft” skills (such as the “blacksmiths”, the “carpenters”, the “wheelers”, the “carters”, the “bakers”, the “cooks” etc.) began to abandon The Estates of the Landed Aristocracy and to settle in independent communities which became “villages” and “towns.” These skilled craftsmen, as a group, soon acquired significant economic and social power. However, it was not until the members of this new “Mercantile *Class*” in Western Civilization came to the insight that a full “partnership” share in the “authority” to “govern” Western Civilization was NOT historically-acquired in Western Civilization merely by acquiring, or asserting, simple economic or social power - or even by the simple resort to force of arms *alone*. A new “Class” of citizens in Western Culture was able to successfully win a full “partnership” interest in “The Ruling Class” of Western Civilization *only* when that Class discerned that such a position could be secured ONLY through the process of identifying and then publicly articulating an explicitly “theological” rationale for the members of that new Class to participate in the essentially “theological” activity of “discerning” the “Natural Law” and “discerning” *which* local customs were either “harmonious” with this Natural Law or dis-“harmonious” to this Natural Law.

Upon realizing this crucial fact, the leaders of this theretofore merely socially, culturally and economically powerful new “Mercantile Class” in Western Culture began to articulate and to publicly assert an explicitly “theological” rationale for its authority to participate as Governors of Western Civilization. They did this through the process of “The Protestant Reformation.”

This ultimately “political” campaign, which was waged through the ostensibly *spiritual* “Protestant Reformation” between 1515 and 1550 in Western Civilization, came to its full fruition in the public articulation of “The Protestant Ethic” pursuant to which members of this new “Mercantile Class” laid *public* claim to the “interior” gifts of the “spirit” while openly displaying the “external” qualities of being “clean”, “hard-working”, “parsimonious” and “industrious”, *thereby* publicly showing themselves to be capable of earning a productive living for themselves and their families independent of The Royalist Class, independent of The Landed Aristocracy...and, most importantly, independent of The Holy

Roman Catholic Church and its “Ecclesial” Class.) These unique “external signs” were declared, by “The Protestant Reformation”, to be the mere “external signs” of the “internal gift” of GRACE – the possession of which, in turn, rendered members of this new “Mercantile Class” capable of “spiritually discerning” what specific human actions were “harmonious” with or dis-harmonious to “Natural Law”.

Once this explicitly “theological” *rationale* was fully developed and publicly articulated within Western Civilization by members of this new Mercantile Class, this Class seized full “partnership” as a member of “The Ruling Classes” in Western Civilization...along with The Ecclesiastical Class, The Royalist Class and The Landed Aristocracy. This occurred in the middle of the Second Millennium of Western Civilization. This social and cultural reality was *politically* “institutionalized” in Western Civilization through the establishment of The Lower House of a Two-House “Parliament” which Lower house was called “The House of Commons.” However, The House of “Commons” never truly “represented” the interests of “The ‘Common’ People” of Western Civilization. It always “represented”, *instead*, the interests of The Mercantile Class, or the “Business” Class.

It was this Four-Member “Ruling Class” partnership with in Western Civilization of Western Europe which was “transferred”, in its entirety, to the north American Colonies in 1789...in the form of the “Bi-Cameral” Legislature of The United States Government which was established, by The United States Constitution, in 1789 creating: The United States Senate (i.e. The “Upper House” - made up of members of America’s “Landed Aristocracy” [the owners of “Mount Vernon”, “Monticello” and the other multi-acre Plantations of the North American Landed Aristocracy]) and The United States House of Representatives (i.e. the “Lower House” - made up of merchants and businessmen ...and their *business lawyers*) ...which two “Houses”, together, have historically directed 90% of their entire legislative endeavors to enacting legislation which is designed to expressly facilitate, to stimulate and to subsidize the “business” activities and interests of the Landed Aristocracy and The Mercantile Class here in the United States)... with the active support of the North American institution of the all-powerful “Office of The President” (the office...and person...of which is vested with many of the same “Royalist” powers which were wielded by the “Kings” of Europe.)

And above the “Representatives” of these three Classes, in the 18th Century American Colonies, stood “The Christian Church”, which - despite the formalisms of the “First Amendment” prohibition against the “Establishment” of any “State Religion” in the United States – has *continued* to function as the *de facto* “State Religion” of the American Government to this very day... as it has throughout all of “Western Civilization”... since the Fall of The Roman Empire.

Each of these four "Classes", then, based its historical claim to full political "partnership" in "The Ruling Class" of Western Civilization squarely upon an *expressly* "theological" rationale which was rooted squarely in an explicit assertion of the validity of "Natural Law" as the "Source" of "Right" and as the source of the "legitimization" of the "authority" of that Class to "govern" by means of "discerning" (NOT simply "declaring") "The Law."

The single historical event which *threatened* to "alter" – this previously-unquestioned state of affairs within Western Culture was... The French Revolution of 1789.

# CHAPTER III

## The Post-French Revolution Demand On The Part of “The Ruling Classes” For An "Alternative Theory of 'Right' "

There is no single event in the entire annals of the history of modern Western Civilization which struck greater fear into the hearts of the “partners” in The Ruling Class of Western Civilization than did The French Revolution of 1789.

The fury of the unlanded peasantry; the general nature of the unbridled destructive violence – but, most importantly of all perhaps - the horrific *ad hominum* violence which was directed *expressly* toward individual members of The Royalist Class and The Landed Aristocracy during the French Revolution – struck literal “terror” into the very hearts of the member-classes of The Ruling Class of 18<sup>th</sup> Century Western Civilization.

In light of the display of such a total disregard for the lives and property of The Ruling Classes displayed on the part of “the peasantry” during the infamous “Reign of Terror” of Robespierre and his revolutionary associates between 1789 and 1791, the intellectual leadership of The Ruling Classes in Western Europe, and throughout all of Western Civilization, were literally “terrorized” into undertaking the most radical step in the entire modern history of Western Civilization since the founding of Christianity itself... to seek to insure themselves that they would NEVER have to “share” political power with the *demonstrably* “irresponsible”, disrespectful and thoroughly untrustworthy “Masses” of “the unlanded” and “the unpropertied” Class in Western Civilization.

To achieve *this specific objective*, a decision was made on the part of the intellectual leadership of “The Ruling Classes” of Western Civilization between 1791 and 1795 to identify a means by which to sever - at its very “root” - any possibility whatsoever that the populous Unlanded Masses could *ever* gain “legitimate” (that is to say: a “Natural Law”-based) means of access to full “Partnership” status within The Ruling Classes of Western Civilization.

How was such a radical objective to be achieved?

The “permanent solution” to this problem lay in an understanding, on the part of the member-classes of The Ruling Classes of Western Civilization, that *de facto* and then *de jura* “access” to full “partnership” status within The Ruling Classes of Western Civilization lay, historically, in the ability of each newly-formed economic, cultural, social or political “Class” in Western Civilization which *sought such “membership in The Ruling Class”* to successfully discern, to then explicitly identify and to then finally publicly articulate, a fully-developed “Theological Rationale” for the entitlement of the members of that new Class to participate in the uniquely “Western” process of “Law-making” - which, as we have seen above, was, in practice, understood to be the “*Law discerning*” process (through the demonstrated exercise, on the part of the individual members of such a new potential Ruling Class Member, of the *physical* or *biologically*-based, “faculty of ‘spiritual’ discernment” - first: to *experientially* “discern” the extremely subtle, indeed “ethereal”, “unitive physical phenomenon” which was understood (by all other members of The Ruling Classes) to pervade the entire physical Cosmos, bonding together every ultimately- irreducible integer of matter in the entire Physical Cosmos into one unitive and harmonious physical “entity” and to, then, secondly: *experientially* “discern” (and identify) what specific acts of human conduct (both individual and collective ) were understood to be in physical “harmony” *with* this “Music of The Spheres” (which conduct was, therefore, to be deemed to be “Law”-full) and, on the other hand, which forms of human conduct were to be deemed to be **dis**“harmonious” *to* this Universal “Tone”, and, were, therefore, to be deemed to be UN-“Lawful”...or “Sin”-filled.

The availability of this entire “Protocol” of “Cosmic *authorization*” of the entrance of a *new* “Class” of citizens in Western Culture into “The Ruling Classes” of Western Civilization depended, of course, directly upon the maintenance of absolute culture-wide respect for... and the full public acceptance of... the validity of the underlying physical and biological presumptions of “THE NATURAL LAW THEORY”... which was the underlying philosophical, indeed, “metaphysical”, “Worldview” of the entire process by means of which “RIGHT” and “WRONG” were historically “discerned” within “responsible” society in Western Civilization.

If **the** very “SOURCE” itself of any potential *future* “authorization” of *any new* Class of citizens to a position of full Partnership within The Ruling Class of Western Civilization could be utterly destroyed, then the “door”, the very “gateway” itself *into* The Ruling Classes of Western Civilization, through which any such new member-Class might conceivably make its “entrance” into The Ruling Class, could be permanently “closed”... indeed, utterly eliminated ... forever.

THIS then, became “THE QUEST” on which the *intelligencia* within The Ruling Classes of Western Civilization were dispatched at the end of the dreaded French Revolution.

At the end of “The Reign of Terror” in Europe, members of the *intelligencia* within The Ruling Classes of Western Civilization turned their full intellectual attention to the task of resolving the “State of Emergency” which obtained throughout all of Europe at that time which, in their minds, absolutely mandated the *immediate* identifying of some new “Alternative Theory of ‘**Right**’” itself in order to effectively replace “The Natural Law Theory of Right” as the accepted and universally-recognized “SOURCE” of “Ultimate Truth” and, thereby, of “Right” itself.

# CHAPTER IV

## The Quest of The *Intelligencia* within Western Civilization's "Ruling Classes" To Identify An "Alternative Theory of 'Right' "

This "QUEST" on the part of the members of the *intelligencia* within The Ruling Classes of Western Civilization to identify an "**Alternative** Theory of Right" to replace "The Natural Law Theory of Right" as the fundamental "protocol" for the discerning of "Right" from "Wrong" within Western Civilization was initiated immediately upon the conclusion of "The Reign of Terror" of The French Revolution in 1791.

(DISCUSSION OF THE DETAILS)

# CHAPTER V

## Friedrich Hegel's 1821 “Fundamental Critique of Natural Law” & His “Alternative Theory of Right”

The “Opening Salvo” in *that* intra-Ruling Class dialogue was fired, in 1791, by Immanuel Kant's immediate protégé, Professor Johann Fichte, the then-Chairman of the Department of Philosophy at Germany's University of Jena. This was done in the publication of his “Critique of All Revelation.”

In this ground-breaking theological work, Professor Johann Fichte initiated the task of “cutting the intellectual and metaphysical ground” from beneath the two most fundamental conceptual predicates of Natural Law Theory.

First, Fichte declared that:

There is NO single unifying physical phenomenon operating within the bounds of our physical Cosmos that bonds together every single ultimately-irreducible integer of matter into any single physically-united, internally-“harmonious” whole in which our human family finds ourselves contained;

Secondly, he declared that:

Even if there WERE such a single “unifying” physical phenomenon, members of our human species are simply NOT “endowed” with any demonstrable biological “faculty” (similar to “sight” or “hearing”) by means of which any single human being (or any specific “Class” of human beings) is capable of directly “experientially” *discerning* the existence of or the specific frequency of any such “unitive” physical phenomenon (in the same manner in which living beings were capable of developing the physical ability to directly, experientially “discern” the physical phenomenon of “light” or “sound”) - so as to, in turn, enable such an individual (or “Class” of individuals) to *experientially* “discern” what specific form(s) of human conduct (either individual or collective ) are either “harmonious with” this universal physical phenomenon or **dis-**“harmonious to” any such universal physical phenomenon that might, therefore, “authenticate” (or “authorize”) such an individual (or such a Class of individuals) to “declare”, with any

absolutely-“grounded” source of “authority”, that any specific form of human conduct is either ultimately “Right” or “Wrong”.

(\* Get Exact quotations and discuss)

Having laid this essential *negative* “ground work” for the **dis**-en“throning” of The Natural Law Theory as the valid (i.e. “validate-able) “Source” or “Referent” for all “Right” in Western Civilization, Professor Johann Fichte passed the task Of articulating the full-fledged *affirmative* “Alternative” Theory of Right to a younger Professor of Philosophy at Germany's University of Jena at that time, George Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel (1770-1831), to articulate The Western Ruling Classes’ *affirmative* “Alternative Theory” to Natural Law as the “Source” of “Right.”

Hegel did this, in 1821, after he has been appointed to be a Full professor of Philosophy at the University of Berlin, in his absolutely culture-altering work entitled: “**A Fundamental Critique of Natural Law: An Alternative Theory of Right**” (“Naturrecht und Staatswissenschaft im Grundrisse.”)

In this absolutely historic 1821 work of the intellect, George Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel repeated, and expressly affirmed, the two major *negative* premises of his mentor, Dr. Johann Fichte which were set forth in Fichte’s 1791 work entitled “A Critique of All Revelation”.

Then Dr. Hegel went on to set forth the specifics of an affirmative “Alternative” Mode of Ethical Reasoning for consideration, adoption - and then use - by The Ruling Classes of Western Civilization to replace Natural Law Theory as the “Source” and “Referent” of “Truth” and “Right” for all of Western Civilization.

This was his historic Theory of “The Dialectic”.

Pursuant to this new 1821 theory, George Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel declared:

First, that:

Any individual (or Class of individuals) who asserts that he (or they) possess some specific “faculty” by means of which he (or they) claim to be able to directly “discern” what specific form of human conduct is or is not directly “harmonious with”, or dis-“harmonious” to the Natural Law Order of The Universe (so as to purportedly deem such conduct to be absolutely, or “Universally” (i.e. "Cosmically") “Right” or “Wrong”) must, of necessity, be dismissed by all rational political, economic, intellectual and cultural leaders of Western Civilization - and by all of the citizens of Western Civilization.

## BECAUSE

granting Fichte's assertions that NO person has *any* direct experiential "access" to direct TRUTH (through an such *special* "faculty") but is, instead, totally confined and restricted in so far as his (or their) *means* of attempting to ascertain "reality" *strictly to* the direct experience of his or her own personal FIVE traditional physical "senses" (i.e. his or her: "sight"; "hearing"; "touch"; "taste" and "smell" – processed through his or her *intellect*

## MEANING

That each such person's judgment about "Reality" will be, *ipso facto* *strictly* "**RELATIVE**" to and "conditioned" by his or her own "relative" experience (rather than "Absolute")

(\* Get Exact Quotations and discuss)

SO:

We, in Western Civilization, must HENCEFORTH acknowledge that all that any individual human being (or Class of human beings) is capable of stating – with regard to identifying what is "TRUE" or "RIGHT" – is that person's own *individual* personal "Thesis" (or *relative* "hypothesis") as to what he (or they ) believe to be "true" or "right".

THEREFORE:

We, in Western Civilization, must, henceforth, actively encourage such persons to espouse their strictly "relative" THESIS as to what he or she believes to be "true" and "right" – *strictly as a relative* "THESIS" – in the course of his or her effort to persuade others in our culture as to the correctness of that specific "THESIS" pertaining to "reality";

HOWEVER,

We, in Western Culture, must remain perfectly clear that - because *whatever* THESIS is being expounded within Western Culture henceforth will be clearly understood, by all of us, to be strictly "relative" (i.e. NOT "absolute" - each such THESIS will, necessarily, "generate" a countervailing **ANTI** - 'Thesis' " (that will proclaim some different - also only "relative" - "truth" or "right");

SO:

We, in Western Culture, must adapt ourselves - indeed commit ourselves - AND OUR CULTURE – for our entire future to the inevitable (indeed affirmatively “desirable”) process of “DI-ALECTICAL” STRUGGLE that absolutely MUST go on between each new “THESIS” and its logical countervailing new “Anti-Thesis” - IF we are to “struggle” TOWARD “TRUTH” and TOWARD “RIGHT”. But we MUST fully realize that we shall NEVER achieve access to *full* knowledge...or *full* knowledge of what is actually fully “True” or “Right”.

(\* Get Exact Quotations and discuss)

This extraordinarily “revolutionary” idea was thereafter effectively *forced* upon all of European Civilization beginning at the mid-way point of the 19th Century by the intellectual community of The Ruling Classes and was *consciously* spread throughout all of Western Civilization with the *very* degree of intensity that the political, economic, intellectual and cultural leaders of Western Civilization’s Ruling Classes brought to their task of dis-enthroning “Natural Law” as the “Source” of “Right” in Western Civilization. This was all done to protect themselves against any emphatically **unwelcomed** eventual “partnership” with “The Great Unwashed” who had so terrorized the members of The Ruling Classes in the previous Generation.

# CHAPTER VI

**The “Grounding” of the Abstract “Hegelian Dialectic”**  
**in the CONCRETE Global “Dialectical” Struggle of**  
**Neitzsche’s “Uebermensch”**  
**Against**  
**“The Aboriginal Peoples” of the World**

It was yet a third German Philosopher (George Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel's name-sake) George Wilhelm Friedrich Nietzsche, the brilliant 24-year-old new Chairman of The Department of Philosophy at the University of Basil in Germany, who - after enthusiastically embracing both Fichte's and Hegel's 1791 and 1821 writings - raised, and then answered, the all-important “Practical Question” facing Western Civilization... the “answer” to which firmly enthroned Hegel's new “Alternative Theory of Right” explicitly in the stead of The Natural Law Theory of Right”, by the middle of the 19th Century, as the ultimate “Arbiter” of all “Right” and “Wrong” in Western Civilization for the next 150 years.

This practical question was:

How does this abstract idea of “The Dialectic” of Hegel's play itself out - in the concrete, practical, day-to- day life of our human family?

Or

HOW DOES THIS TOTALLY “IDEALISTIC” IDEA OF  
“THE DIALECTIC” ACTUALLY MANIFEST ITSELF,  
IN OUR REAL MATERIAL WORLD?

(\* Get Exact Quotations)

In effect, George Wilhelm Friedrich Nietzsche sought to “ground” Fichte's and Hegel's otherwise entirely “abstract” (or “idealistic”) ideas in the practical, day-to-day world of concrete material reality.

Nietzsche went on to answer this all-important “practical” question in his 19<sup>th</sup> Century works entitled: Beyond Good and Evil: Toward a Genealogy of Morals; Thus Spake Zarathustra and The Will To Power (this final work being Book I of Nietzsche’s intended “masterwork” which he had planned to entitle A Re-Evaluation of All Values.)

These three 19<sup>th</sup> Century works became the philosophical and metaphysical “grounding” for the theory of *material* “Dialectics” in Western Civilization. In these three works, all written between 1886 and 1891, Friedrich Nietzsche proclaimed that the way in which the “Dialectical Process” which was identified by Friedrich Hegel in his 1821 “Alternative Theory of Right” actually manifests itself on the practical day-to-day “material” plane is in the daily-observed “dialectical struggle” which he asserted was taking place on our planet at that very time between “DER UBERMENCH” (whom Nietzsche identified as those “super men” of the Caucasian Christian European Culture whom Nietzsche believed stood at the “apex of all biological evolution” (consistent with Charles Darwin's then-comparatively new 1859 “Theory of Natural Selection” or “Theory of The Survival of The Fittest” which had been published in 1859 and was, by 1886, “sweeping” the Western World.)

Nietzsche argued, in these works, that “Der Ubermensch” were struggling against the “Aboriginal People” of the world (whom Nietzsche perceived to be, basically, “evolutionary primitives.”)

Nietzsche understood the “Ubermensch” to be certain “heroic” members of the Caucasian European Culture who possessed and manifested a unique combination of those special human qualities which were understood (by the Caucasian society), at that time, to be the “special qualities” which were uniquely possessed by members of the Caucasian European Race (as distinct from “other” human qualities which were possessed by the “coloured”, or the “aboriginal” races on other continents.) These specific qualities were, Nietzsche asserted: INTELLECT; ENTREPRENEURIAL SKILL; EMOTIONAL AND SEXUAL SELF-CONTROL, and above all, **THE WILL POWER**, which is, the will to take the steps which are necessary to impose one's conceptual vision of reality out on to the world and to comport one's own personal conduct strictly in accordance with the physical, mental and emotional discipline which are necessary to be bring to one's tasks in order to “force” upon the world one's own personal view of “reality”.

The “Negroid” Race, native to Sub-Saharan Africa, certainly did not possess or display these specific qualities, according to Nietzsche.

The “Indigenous” Race, who were native to Mexico and North, South & Central America, certainly did not possess or display these specific qualities, according to Nietzsche.

Nor did the Hindu or Muslim Races, native to India and to The Indian Sub-Continent, possess or display these specific qualities, according to Nietzsche.

Certainly neither the Mongolian or Asian Race, who were native to Asia, possessed or displayed these specific qualities according to Nietzsche.

Indeed, it was Friedrich Nietzsche's *actual* position that it was NOT even ALL members of the Caucasian Race who possessed or displayed an adequate level of these “unique human qualities” to entitle them to the designation of “Uber Mench”. It was, for example, specifically noted by Nietzsche that “Slavic” and “Southern European” and “Eastern European” members of the Caucasian Race were explicitly deficient in these “special qualities.”

For Nietzsche, this “fact” resulted in there being only a decidedly “select” few even among the Caucasian Race (certain Caucasian men primarily from Northern Europe [i.e. from “The Caucasus Mountain Region” of Europe]) who possessed the special degree of the specific set of human qualities that placed them at the “apex” of all human biological evolution: - and who, therefore, found themselves in an organically-destined (i.e. materially-grounded) DIALECTICAL STRUGGLE against the biologically and culturally more “primitive” “ABORIGINAL” peoples of the planet... a “struggle” to determine which of these TWO fundamentally “**different**” categories of human beings were going to become the “Masters of History” and which was going to become its “Victims”.

This specific 1889 “THESIS” of George Wilhelm Friedrich Nietzsche became the new operative “Organizing Principle” of all of Western Civilization within a comparatively short period of time following the Post-French Revolutionary Period of Western Civilization in the 19th Century and ushered in “The Age of Manifest Destiny”; “The Age of The White Man's Burden”; in short “The Age of Western Imperialism.”

Indeed, a full-blown “Political Theory” was soon developed, during this very period, by the political, economic, intellectual and cultural leaders of Western Civilization that was rooted in Friedrich Hegel's and Friedrich Nietzsche's -materially-grounded “Dialectical” Mode of Ethical Reasoning of determining “Right” and “Wrong.”

The development of this “Political” Theory of The State, from Nietzsche’s more “philosophical” development of this idea, was undertaken by

Pursuant to this “Dialectical” Political Theory, the STATE was to be organized in a manner pursuant to which a President (selected, of course, from among the “Uber Mench”) was to be chosen to govern, in “partnership” with a Bi-Cameral Legislature consisting of an “Upper House” (made up of members of The Landed Aristocracy) and a “Lower House” (made up of representatives of The Mercantile Class and their business lawyers). Given a “range” of public policy “options” from amongst which to select the public policy “means” by which to address or to try to solve any specific “public policy” problem, these selected “Representatives” (of The Ruling Classes) would select, from among those public policy “options” tendered to them the specific public policy option that they believed most benefited The UBERMENCH.

Public Taxes would be gathered from all of the citizens - but these taxes would be placed, for their distribution and expenditure, into the hands of The UBERMENCH. The UBERMENCH could, of course, be trusted to make the (*most*) “correct” political, economic and social decisions that would, in turn, generate adequate “trickle down benefits” that would flow to the greatest possible number of people (even if the MAJOR benefits of the public policy decisions that they made flowed, in fact, to The Ubermensch, to their “Representatives” and their families...and to their Lawyers.)

The UBERMENCH would, of course, also own virtually ALL of the property, virtually ALL of the businesses, and virtually ALL of the means of production – and would, of course, hold virtually ALL of the highest-level political public offices and would, therefore, make virtually ALL of the public and private decisions on behalf of the community.

However, The Ubermensch would “take care” of the remainder of the population - because it was also in THEIR best interests to do so (because these “other” people constituted the “workers” who were needed to help make the products that were owned by The Ubermensch and these “other” people were also the potential “consumers” who had to be able to buy and to use the products that were owned and sold by the Ubermensch.

The STATE, in short, according to Nietzsche’s Thesis, was to be “organized” and “structured” for the benefit of The Ubermensch – with “enough” (i.e. “*just*” enough, and NO more) “benefits” being caused to “trickle down” to the “workers” to provide to them enough income with which to purchase and consume the products that were owned and being sold by The Ubermensch.

This was, of course, the political and economic theory of “Caucasian STATE Capitalism” which operated, un-abated – and unchallenged - throughout the later part of the 19th Century and into the first two decades of the 20<sup>th</sup> Century in Western Civilization as THE single un-challenged “Organizing Principle” of Western Civilization.

The values and intellectual and ethical processes espoused by “NATURAL LAW” were, therefore, simply pushed aside.

Material self-interest on the part of Der Ubermench reigned supreme as THE “Organizing Principle” of the leaders of Western Civilization. And this principle “drove” all of Western Civilization between 1890 and 1917.

Previous simple primitive White racial prejudice was *governmentally-enforced* through a system of racial segregation, that became an integral part of both the *de facto* AND the *de jura* legal systems of virtually ALL of the Western nation states of the Late 19<sup>th</sup> and Early 20<sup>th</sup> Century. Racial, cultural and economic “Imperialism” was “the order of the day” throughout the Leadership Class of Western Civilization.

And poverty reigned among the members of the non-Caucasian “aboriginal” peoples throughout the West – and throughout the newly-“colonized” non-Western World.

A gross disparity in access to the natural resources – and therefore in wealth - between the most wealthy 5% of the Caucasian population of Western Civilization (The Ubermench) and the remaining 95% of the population became a defining by-product of this ideology of “Western Civilization”.

# CHAPTER VII

## THE 19<sup>TH</sup> CENTURY WESTERN “GLOBAL ORGANIZING PRINCIPLE” OF “THE WHITE MAN’S BURDEN” AND “MANIFEST DESTINY”

**During the 70-year period between the year 1848** (the year in Western Civilization at which Friedrich Hegel’s *otherwise strictly theoretical* 1821 “mode of ethical reasoning” of “The Dialectic” actually functionally “replaced” the previous Western Civilization “mode of ethical reasoning” of “Natural Law” through its becoming *materially “grounded”* in Friedrich Nietzsche’s “organizing principle” of the real-*material* world “dialectical” struggle between “Der Uebermensch” of Western Civilization’s Caucasian Race and all members of the “Aboriginal” Race (found in Western Civilization in the person of the “Red Man” in both North America and South America; found in African Civilization in the person of the “Black Man”, found in Asian Civilization in the person of the “Yellow Man” and found in Southeast Asian Civilization in the person of the “Brown Man” ...because this “struggle” was finally “*scientifically* rationalized”, or “justified” by the adoption, in the West, of the doctrine of “Social Darwinism” which had been derived from Charles Darwin’s publication of his Theory of Natural Selection...pursuant to which “mode of ethical reasoning” the leaders of all of the Western Nation States actively and aggressively pursued the “Thesis” of “Caucasian State Capitalism” and ”International Imperialism”) **and the year 1917** (the year in Western Civilization at which Fredrick Engles succeeded in “grounding” Karl Marx’s *otherwise strictly theoretical* “**Anti-Thesis**” to **Caucasian State Capitalism and International Imperialism... of NON-Caucasian, NON State-Based (i.e. Worldwide or *trans-national*) Communism and Anti-Imperialism** in the concrete and *material* form of the October Bolshevik Revolution in Russia and the establishment of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)

Western Civilization experienced the unbridled – and often entirely unabashed – exercise of raw industrial corporate capitalism at home and the equally unbridled – and often equally unabashed – exercise of raw international economic exploitation and blatant imperialism abroad...on the part of ALL Western (Caucasian) Nation States including the United States.

In the United States, this period witnessed the unfolding of the following events:

(FILL IN THIS HISTORY: THE ROBBER BARONS  
&  
MARK HANNA)  
(HANNA: A HISTORY FROM LINCOLN TO McKINLEY)  
&  
Wm. McKinley & His Times

These events reached their peak during the so-called “Gilded Era” of American history. The archetypal character of this period was Mark Hanna, the behind-the-scenes “Advisor” to the Administration of William McKinley and the “political architect” of McKinley’s defeat of William Jennings Bryan in 1896 and 1900. He was also the Chairman of the Republican National Committee in 1896 and was elected to the United States Senate in 1888. When McKinley was assassinated in 1901 and Theodore Roosevelt (McKinley’s Vice President in 1900) ascended to the presidency, Hanna prepared to challenge Theodore Roosevelt when Roosevelt ran for the American presidency in 1904. But Hanna died in early 1904. Hanna was quoted as asserting that: “The greatest single possible achievement in a human lifetime would be to make as much money as possible.” It was in pursuit of the principles and policies advocated by Mark Hanna that the National Republican Party in the United States, between 1880 and 1917 pursued the policies of:

The pursuit of these openly economically selfish domestic policies and these openly economically imperialistic and exploitive international policies on the part of the National Republican Party between 1890 and 1917 generated the following response on the part of the leaders of the National Democratic Party in the United States.

Because of this “tepid” moral response on the part of the leaders of the National Democratic Party to these blatantly immoral domestic and international policies on the part of Mark Hanna and the other leaders of the National Republican Party between 1890 and 1917, a major Third Party political movement grew up in the United States in the form of The Progressive Party and, of course, in the form of The Bull Moose Party of Theodore Roosevelt.

These two Third Party movements generated the following Principles, Policies and proposed Public Programs:

The famous “Bull Moose” Party was, of course, a narrow single-candidate Political Party created to serve as nothing more than the one-time political vehicle for Theodore Roosevelt, the “maverick” Republican who had left office after only one prior Term as President under the Republican banner but who, grievously

distressed by the blatantly pro-Big Business principles, policies and programs of the National Republican Party under William McKinley and Mark Hanna, decided to come out of “political retirement” to run for the American Presidency in 1898. This decision on the part of Theodore Roosevelt “split” the disgruntled *non*-Republican and non-Democratic vote between his Bull Moose Party candidacy and the Progressive Party candidate..... while depriving the lack-luster and rudderless Democratic Party of a substantial plurality of the national electorate...thereby allowing the National Republican Party to hold political power *beyond* their possession of any majority mandate to govern pursuant to their unpopular “Robber Baron” policies. Because of this turn of events at the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> Century, the National Republican Party remained in political power from ...to ....(with the sole interim exception of Democratic President Woodrow Wilson who was chosen by the American people to get the United States out of World War I and to redesign the world order to prevent another World War among the competing arms merchants, petroleum companies, mining corporations, international bankers and investment houses, land speculators and their respective “broker” Capitalist Nation States.

These Republican Party principles, policies and programs *continued*, however, with the 19--- election of Republican Wm. Howard Taft in 19--, ushering in a set of national American domestic and foreign policy decisions which led directly to the Great Stock Market Crash of 1929, the resulting Worldwide Economic Depression between 1930 and 1940 and, of course, the rise to power in Europe of Adolph Hitler and the German Nation State-based attempt to implement the *pure* “Thesis” of Caucasian State-based (and State-Subsidized) Capitalism and International Imperialism...with its many highly-placed and politically and economically powerful American families and their leaders.

This “hidden American history” and these “hidden American players” will be discussed in further detail in Part \_\_\_ below.

However, the Progressive Party, during this critical period between 1898 and 1940 (over influenced by the Russian self-consciously *atheist* “Communist” Movement and the theologically simply *self-conscious* European “Socialist” Movement) failed to seize and thoroughly integrate into its Principles, Policies and Proposed Programs the principles, policies and programs being advocated by the “theologically”-driven American Chautauqua Movement and, thereby, effectively “abandoned the field” of progressive social change to the self-consciously atheistic Marxist Movement.

A brief review of the history of this unique American Chautauqua Movement will reveal the extraordinary potential which failed to be effectively supported by the “secular” Third Party supporters of social change in America.

# CHAPTER VIII

**THE 19<sup>TH</sup> CENTURY RESPONSE OF THE SPIRITUAL COMMUNITY**  
**TO**  
**THE “GLOBAL ORGANIZING PRINCIPLE” OF**  
**CAUCASIAN STATE CAPITALISM & WESTERN IMPERIALISM**

# CHAPTER IX

## The Rise of The “ANTI “-THESIS of International World Communism

Even the critics of the doctrine of Caucasian State Capitalism were, however, conceptually wedded to Friedrich Hegel's premise that “Natural Law” was forever dead - and that *any* “alternative” to this new Western “organizing principle” in Western Culture would have to “make its way” into existence – and acceptance - *only* through the process of the materially-grounded "Dialectic".<sup>1</sup>

For this reason, the “Dialectical” opposition to the THESIS of Caucasian State Capitalism that developed through this “dialectical” process was the woodenly “dialectical” “ANTI-thesis” of International World Communism that was ultimately directed primarily toward the NON- “Caucasian” peoples of the NON “Western” world (that is, toward the people of Russia, China, Latin America, Africa, Southeast Asia, India and the “Ethnic”[i.e. NON-Caucasian ] Provinces of The Soviet Union.

This *materialist* “Anti –Thesis”, therefore, *as an absolute matter of principle* had NO “grounding” whatsoever in any metaphysical source. It was, instead, an entirely “materialistic” anthem promising the distribution of an egalitarian physical “fair share” of the world's *material* resources to those “workers” who “blended”, or co-mingled, their *material* physical units of human labor with the *material* raw natural resources of the earth to produce the *material* “products” that were sold by the “Capitalists”.

The Russian exponents of this new Anti-THESIS of International Non-Caucasian Communism were, therefore, engaged in an essentially “metaphysically-*bankrupt*” activity of a merely *materialist* “dialectical struggle” to overcome their “opponent” – the Caucasian State Capitalists. They, therefore, “lost their way.” (Indeed, they never *had* any real “WAY” at all, from their very start, that was defined by any metaphysically-discernable guideline beyond that of simply attempting to stimulate a more intense (and, therefore, hopefully more effective) degree of personal *material* self-interest on the part of the individual and collective members of the “Working Class” to pit *their strictly material self-interest* (as a Class) against the raw *materialist* motivation of the members of the “Ownership” Class.

---

<sup>1</sup> The only “exception” to this rule was “The Chautauqua Movement” that was initiated by The National Board of Homeland Ministry of The United Methodist Church in the United States in 1890. This movement will be discussed in detail in Part \_\_\_ below.

# CHAPTER X

## The Failure of The "Flawed" "Relative" ANTI-Thesis of International NON-Caucasian World Communism

From its very inception, therefore, the underlying philosophy of the International World Communist Movement of the early 20<sup>th</sup> Century was, uniquely, a direct “function” of the Hegelian “World View”, rooted, as it was, in the dual *false* “Hegelian” premises that: (A) there functioned within the physical Cosmos NO truly “Unitive Physical Phenomenon” at all that bonded each of the finite number of ultimately-irreducible physical integers of matter in the Cosmos to each other into a “unitive”, internally-“harmonious” physical entity that, in turn, lent any intrinsically “real” unitive “meaning” to reality... as a whole ) and (B) that - even if there WERE any such “Unitive Phenomenon” (thus, even if there WERE some intrinsically “real” unitive “Referent” for a “meaning” to reality as a whole) that there was NO human “faculty” by means of which any single individual (or any Class of individuals ) could possibly ever directly experientially “discern” such a “Unitive Phenomenon” (and, thereby, “discern” what this ultimately “real” unitive “meaning” of reality actually was) so as to be enable a person to be able to declare “authoritatively” what human conduct (either individual or collective ) was “harmonious” *with* this “referent”, and thus “Right”... or dis-“harmonious” to this “referent”, and , thus, “:Wrong”.

For this reason, the advocates and practitioners of this ultimately “Hegelian” Philosophy acknowledged no ultimately-“referenced” absolute standard for “Right” or “Wrong” - other than whatever specific conduct ostensibly fostered or promoted to its highest possible degree the strictly self-serving *material* interests of “The Working Class” over-and-against the self-serving *material* interests of “The Capitalist Class”.

Meanwhile, The Capitalist Class (defining itself, in equally “Hegelian” terms, as “Der Ubermensch”) also acknowledged no ultimately-“referenced” standard for “Right” or “Wrong” other than that specific conduct which best promoted the self-serving *material* interests of “Der Ubermensch” viz-a-viz “The Aboriginal Peoples” of the world.

It is little wonder that two such completely “antipodal” (indeed, absolutely “Dialectically” opposed) philosophies would “clash” as planet-wide “adversaries”, in each and every “venue” where there was any conceivable *material* “grist” for the political and economic mill of conflict between these two “adversaries”, throughout the entire 20<sup>th</sup> Century. For such a “conflict” was the only “means” that

**BOTH** of these two “sides” (to this “dialectical” conflict) *explicitly* recognized to be the “proper” manner by means of which *either* of these “adversaries” could tell which of the two theories was “right”.

Thus, in South America, previously-“landed” peasants who sought simply to retain their meager piece of land on which their ancestors had been eeking out a bare-bones subsistence existence for literally hundreds of years became “Communists” - in the eyes of The Capitalist Class - IF these peasants questioned in any way a decision made by a military government (“backed” by – indeed often actively placed in power by and *kept* in power by *direct* U.S. military and/or para-military [i.e. C.I.A.] power) declaring that all such small parcels of land previously owned by thousands of peasants was to be seized by The State and to be “transferred” into the hands of a mere 14 families who would “consolidate” this “Resource” of the nation to be put to the more-“efficient” (i.e. more *private profit-generating* [i.e. “Capitalist profit-generating]) use as cattle-grazing land for the corporation that owns Burger King or McDonalds Hamburger stands or for the growing of sugar cane or sugar beets owned by a major sugar corporation that produces sugar for the coffee and soft drinks of Americans and Europeans. And such “Communists” were, of course dealt with accordingly - as “Enemies of The State” (in this case, the pro-“Capitalist” State.)

Conversely, in Russia, or Poland, or Hungary (or other “Eastern Bloc”, i.e. “Communist” nations) any previously-landed peasant who sought simply to retain for his family some of the food produced by his own labor on the land that his family had owned for hundreds of years for the private benefit of his children became a “Traitor to the Working Class” and was dealt with accordingly - as an “Enemy of The State” (in this case, the “Communist” State.)

Such examples of “black and white” (“You are either *with us* or you are *against us*”) “mirror-reflections” of one's “Enemy” abounded, across our planet, during the 80-year dialectical “struggle” that raged between the “Western” THESIS of Caucasian State Capitalism and the “Eastern” ANTI-THESIS of International Third-World (i.e. NON- Caucasian ) Communism. Advocates of each “alternate” ideology therefore engaged in unspeakable horrors undertaken in complete transgression against any and all “Natural Laws” of human decency – on both sides alike - all in the name of suppressing “The Ultimate Other.”

Advocates of both of these “alternate” ideologies emotionally publicized such transgressions committed by advocates of THE OTHER ideology, as proof of the “evil” of “The Other” - but actively “forgave” (indeed, actively concealed or, worse yet, positively “rationalized”) the *exact same* inhuman transgressions undertaken by advocates of “their” ideology as having been “necessary and proper” in order to protect The Homeland *against* “The Ultimate Other.”

Indeed, by the night of October 26<sup>th</sup> of 1962, this condition of “ultimate alienation” of one-half of our human family from the other half had grown so intense that each such “camp” within our human family expended vast portions of its respective human talents, creativity and natural resources probing into the very mysteries of the relationship between “mass” and “energy” itself for no other purpose than to draw out, for use as a weapon of mass destruction against "The Ultimate OTHER", the very power of creation itself - in the form of thermonuclear explosives - and confronted our human family with the self-conscious choice on the part of The Joint Chiefs of Staff of The United States Pentagon to actually *initiate* a massive “First Strike” nuclear attack against The Soviet Union (that would have axiomatically resulted in an absolutely certain immediate full-scale thermonuclear retaliation against the United States) that would have totally destroyed every single human being in our species.)

While *both* “Hegelian” ideologies suffered from the same essential fundamental flaw, the advocates of International World Communism consciously embraced the sub-tenet of Conscious Atheism and had undertaken an active campaign of steps to actively stamp out all vestiges of religious practice inside the “Communist” States. However, they never identified *any* truly effective “substitute” for “religion’s” motivational system.

In short, the 80-year experiment of Russian Communism dramatically demonstrated that the abstract motive of sacrificing one's (and one's family's ) short-term economic, material (and even spiritual) interests on behalf of the mere *economically-determined* “Class” to which one belonged – defined entirely conceptually (even if economically in the form of “The Working Class” or to “The Proletariat” ) DID NOT – AND COULD NOT - WORK as an adequately effective “motivation” for human conduct – when confronted by the PURE ECONOMIC SELF-INTEREST of the Capitalist Class OR a RACIALLY-based system of *racial* Class-identification or motivation.

Thus, in a straight-up, head-to-head, “competition” directly between the “abstract” self-identification and motivation system of one's loyalty to an economically-defined “Class” versus one's *experienced* loyalty to the base human motive of direct personal material self-interest (or one’s loyalty to the direct material interests of one's “RACE”) – the latter will ultimately WIN OUT, because the latter “loyalties” are, in fact and in practice, MORE FUNDAMENTAL, more "BASIC" and more highly-“motivating ” within our “human nature” than is an abstract loyalty merely to one's “Class” defined simply in more abstract “economic” terms.

Thus “Class Warfare” waged on behalf of “The Working Class” was simply a “Bad Bet” on the part of Karl Marx, Friedrich Engels and Vladimir Lenin - and millions of other people. It was a “bet” which they therefore ultimately lost.

(\* Insert greater details in this section to answer expected Marxist criticism)

# PART IV

## CHAPTER I

**THE FACT THAT THE MATERIALIST “ANTI-THESIS” OF INTERNATIONAL WORLD COMMUNISM “LOST” IN ITS “DIALECTICAL STRUGGLE” WITH THE “THESIS” OF CAUCASIAN STATE CAPITALISM DOES NOT MEAN THAT THE “THESIS” OF CAUCASIAN STATE CAPITALISM HAS THEREFORE “WON” A FINAL VICTORY OVER ALL OTHER ORGANIZING PRINCIPLES – AND THAT WESTERN CIVILIZATION HAS, THEREFORE, ARRIVED AT “THE END OF HISTORY”**

**(INSERT HERE A DISCUSSION OF “THE VULCAN’S” PROPOSAL TO SIMPLY “RETURN” TO THE LATE 19<sup>TH</sup> CENTURY “THESIS” OF IMPERIALIST CAUCASIAN STATE CAPITALISM – NOW THAT THE “ANTI-THESIS” OF NON-CAUCASIAN, INTERNATIONAL COMMUNISM HAS BEEN “DEFEATED”)**

The underlying major premise of both Zbigniew Brzezinski's and Samuel P. Huntington's interpretation of Dr. Francis Fukuyama's contention that Western Civilization has reached "The End of History" here at the conclusion of "The Cold War" between The Soviet Union and The United States and its Western Allies is that the operative period of "History" about which Dr. Fukuyama was speaking is only the period of history between the birth of the idea of "Capitalism" (in one form or an other) and its potential "Opponents" - thus designating the "ideal" of "Capitalism" as now effectively “occupying the field” within Western History as its “Ideal” Organizing Principle... now entirely un-opposed and authorized by history to express itself in whichever “better” form its might choose (either in its "Liberal" and "Universal" Ideal Form, as is recommended by Dr. Brzezinski, or in It's "Triumphalist" and only a Quasi-"Global" Ideal, as is proposed by Professor Huntington.)

However, as was discussed immediately above, this "idea" of "Capitalism" (more specifically, this perverse idea of *Caucasian State Capitalism*) has been the dominant Organizing Principle "Idea" in Western Civilization only since the single-lifetime period of one Generation, thinking and writing between the years 1821 and 1886.

*Prior to that single 65-year period of Western History, the IDEAL ORGANIZING PRINCIPLE OF WESTERN CIVILIZATION was entirely DIFFERENT FROM the idea of Caucasian State Capitalism.*

Only if one entirely arbitrarily – and incorrectly - identifies "The History of Western Civilization" as beginning during that single one-human-lifetime period and continuing for the 170-year period that has transpired in Western Civilization between 1821 to the end of "The Cold War" in 1991(a period no longer than two single human life-spans) can one fail to recognize that both Zbigniew Brzezinski and Samuel P. Huntington (and Dr. Fukuyama as well) are being entirely "myopic" in their vision of "History" when they insist that the principle "identifying factor" that we must recognize as THE manifestation of the "Ideal" of Western Civilization is the idea of Caucasian State Capitalism (whether it be in its "Liberal" form of Capitalism that self-consciously agrees to recognize some "secondary" values that "ought" to be allowed to "caveat" the public policy choices that would otherwise be imposed upon on nation and planet by the operation of the otherwise "wooden" adherence to the purely mechanical consequences of *raw* "market forces"(requiring nothing more than the entirely "voluntarily" *choosing* to grant "at least *some* benefit to the least well-off" while we, otherwise, organize our New (Post Cold War) Global Society pursuant to the "primary" "Organizing Principle" of allowing Free-Market Forces to define all of our planetary public policies here in the Third Millennium (as is recommended by Zibigniew Brzezinski) or whether this "Ideal" to be adopted be recognized as being the "religiously endorsed" "Conservative" form of Capitalism that allows for a more "rigid" adoption of raw Capitalist Market Forces" as the all-defining Capitalistic Organizing Principle of Western Culture (as is proposed by Professor Huntington.)

However, if one refrains from engaging in this transparently incorrect and myopic way of identifying "History" – then one is immediately faced with a distinctly different question that is posed by The End of The Cold War than the question that is recognized by either Zbigniew Brzezinski or Samuel Huntington.

Instead of asking:

What are the potentially "Universal Values" which Western Leaders - especially the political, economic, intellectual and cultural leaders of the United States - must identify and voluntarily comport their individual and collective conduct in accordance with (as mere "caveats" to their otherwise allowing Free-Market Forces to *primarily* define the policies and programs of the New World Order) in order to earn the status of "The Moral Leaders of The New Global Community" (solely in order to RETAIN their right and authority "to shape a world so that we are in control of its destiny" ? )

OR

What are the separate and distinctively “Western Core Values” to which we will have to return and that we will have to self-consciously embrace and more effectively enforce within our culture that are directly associated with private property; individualism; the Christian work ethic; the separation of "spiritual" values from secular Public Policy; and the “Free Market” mechanism in order to adequately strengthen our separate and distinct Western Civilization from that of The Asian Culture and The Islamic Culture - so we can successfully “stave off” being "overwhelmed" by the huge and powerful “Asian Empire” that will be evolving over the next 50-year period of The Post Cold War Era ?

We should be asking, instead:

Exactly WHAT ARE THE **ACTUAL IDEALS** OF WESTERN CIVILIZATION THAT HAVE BEEN DEVELOPED OVER THE ENTIRE 3000-YEAR HISTORY OF WESTERN CIVILIZATION(as distinct from simply over the most recent 170-year period) that our Western Leaders are now finally free to identify and to implement as a concrete "model" for the world to observe and to either choose or reject that we, in Western Civilization, should now identify and "model" to the world - so as to “model" these "ideals" in the real work-a-day world of practical economics, politics and human frailties? -

and

What role (either "primary" or "secondary" - or, perhaps even "tertiary") should "Capitalism", racial identity, private property, national or cultural identity or “Western” Catholic Christian values play in this (these ) "model(s)" ?

Professor Samuel P. Huntington suggests - indeed declares - that there remains... and *should* remain... a fundamentally "dialectical" struggle yet to be waged between the set of "Core Values" that are uniquely distinctive to "Western Civilization" and those that are uniquely distinctive to “The Asian Empire”. He suggests that we simply (and “tactically”) temporarily *postpone* entering directly into this seeming inevitable "struggle" with The New Asian Empire - while we, in The West, adequately undertake to "renew" our historical commitment to, and our actual practice of, those "Core Values" that he deems to be the essential "Source" of our uniquely purely "dialectical" strength - and that we, *thereinafter* consciously engage this “New Asian Empire” (perhaps even to the point of engaging in a thermonuclear war against China), *once* we have been

adequately "renewed" and strengthened - when China (inevitably, he suggests ) undertakes to try to "overwhelm" Western Civilization, either economically or militarily.

Dr. Brzezinski, on the other hand, suggests that we simply "blink" the differences between Western "cultural values" and the different "cultural values" of Asia Culture and that we simply attempt to "sell" our "Capitalistic" and "representative democratic" values to the entire Post Cold War world (including to China and to The Asian Culture) by *consciously* "tempering" these values by "caveating" them by voluntarily "conditioning" our free-wheeling application of these decidedly "Capitalistic" and "materialistic" values by voluntarily adhering to a specifically-identified set of "Universal values" (essentially *moral* in their nature) that would require The West to *voluntarily* forego certain of the consequences of a purely unrestrained logical application of their Capitalist values in a way that would consciously provide "at least some minimal guarantee of individual well being " to "the least well-off" within our human family as a concrete demonstration that our "free market system leads to a demonstrable improvement in social conditions" - thereby enabling the Leaders of the United States to remain "The Masters of History in the 21st Century".

If we, however, choose to reject both of these 19th Century objectives as the ultimate purpose of Western Civilization, what "unconditioned" IDEAL is revealed to reside at the base of Western History ?

Would it be practically possible to implement this Ideal in our present world ?

Will it be possible to undertake a self-conscious campaign to effectively implement such a "Western IDEAL" in our Post Cold war Era...now that "911" has occurred?

And

Will it be possible for such a Western "Ideal" to make its way in the real world without advocates of this true Ideal being forced, within our Western Culture, to engage in a "dialectical struggle" against the Organizing Principle of Western Caucasian State Capitalism and/or, internationally, against the "Core Values" of The Asian Empire - whatever they might be determined to be ?

# CHAPTER II

## WESTERN CIVILIZATION'S LONG-ASSERTED "IDEAL": A "NATURAL LAW"- BASED GLOBAL CIVILIZATION

The true task, then, implied by Dr. Francis Fukuyama's 1989 article "The End of History" is *similar to* the tasks that were identified by Zbigniew Brzezinski and Samuel Huntington. However, at the same time, the true task is radically "different."

The political, economic, intellectual and cultural leaders – and the civilian population – of "Western Civilization" must engage in an intense internal dialogue among ourselves – and, then, engage in an "external" dialogue with the political, economic, intellectual and cultural leaders of "other", non-"Western" cultures – to discern, identify, raise up and then publicly articulate a set of "values" that has been discerned within the writings and thinking of great minds within Western Civilization over the past 3000 years that constitute the very highest aspirations of our human family... as these aspirations have come to be recognized within our Western Culture. However, there should be no "primacy" placed on any set of values just because they are *distinctly* or *uniquely* "Western" (as Professor Huntington would insist.) NOR should we insist that the specific set of "values" that are so identified as "Western" values be *instantaneously* adopted by every other culture or other "civilization" as being "Universal values" as a condition-precedent to our including such values among the "ideals" of Western Civilization (as Dr. Brzezinski seems to demand.)

In the work that follows, we argue that such a set "Core Values" *does* exist and that this set of values possesses the characteristic of being DECIDEDLY "OTHER THAN" exclusively SELF-INTERESTED on behalf of the persons who identify them.

This set of values also possesses the characteristic of *being perceived by other cultures* as being NON-Self-Interested on the part of those in The West who identify them.

Thirdly, such a set of values must also be more-or-less "self-evident" - and, thus, not require some complex or extensive linguistic explication or argumentation on their behalf before they can be expected to be accepted and endorsed by others who are not previously familiar with these values.

Finally, such a set of values must be “concrete” and “practical” in the real world, thereby capable of being translated into concrete, practical public policies and programs that will generate adequately-rapid and conspicuous positive “changes” for the betterment in the lives of average real people.

We argue, in the work that follows, that the concrete “set” of ethical “Values” which are recognized in Western Culture that share *these* specific concrete characteristics are those values that are generated by the “Natural Law Philosophy” of Western Civilization – so long as one “up-dates” these values to take into account the most recent discoveries in the fields of Quantum Physics, Human Biology and Cosmology.

What, then, is the process by means of which *these* specific concrete “Values” were “discerned” in Western Culture?

Exactly what ARE these specific concrete Values?

And

How can we best go about “implementing” these specific values by translating them into specific *concrete* Public Policy Principles, then into operational “Middle Axioms” and, then, into a set of “alternative” concrete public policy *programs* that will translate these abstract general Principles into concrete legislative choices that can be tendered to the people of the world for their genuinely free democratic “choice” in free and fair public elections as distinguished from the Principles and Programs that are offered by different value systems (such as those offered by Zbigniew Brzezinski's “Liberal” Democratic Capitalist Model; Samuel Huntington's “Conservative” Western Christian Capitalist Model – and the Principles and Programs that are being offered by the Models generated by China's “New Asian Empire” that are based upon the “Core Values” of the Asian Culture, by Persia's (Iran's) “Islamic Civilization” based upon its “Core Values or by The “Orthodox Culture” of a potential re-vitalized Russia-centered Civilization?

