

# Foreword

---

These essays were composed at a time when the United States of America appeared to be plunging toward its self-destruction. The Bush administration appeared to be as mad as the Biblical King Nebuchadnezzar, and this for similar causes. Such madness is the characteristic feature of a "Thornburgh Doctrine," which elevates the mere whim of a U.S. President above all international law, even higher than the natural law of Almighty God.

Since the spring of 1989, it has become increasingly obvious that, using the imagery of the ancient Chinese philosopher Mencius, "the Mandate of Heaven" has fallen away from each and all of the three empires lately dominating our planet: the Anglo-American ("Animal-Saxon"), Moscow's, and the Communist Chinese dynasty. As all three are visibly doomed, so, "whom the gods would destroy, they first make mad."



*Raphael painted "Socrates teaching" in this detail from the "School of Athens," Rome, Vatican, ca. 1510. St. Augustine, whom the artist follows here, adopted a Christian Socrates in scientific method in arts and science, while rejecting the flaw in a merely pagan Socrates.*

The ongoing economic and moral breakdown of those three empires may suggest, that the dreary object-lesson of this waning century is the common worthlessness, and consequential folly of those ideas associated, respectively, with the names of Adam Smith and Karl Marx. If we examine the same contemporary facts from a more appropriate standpoint, the preceding twenty-five centuries of European history as a whole, we are led to those deeper truths which are the subject of the essays in view here.

All European history, including European civilization's unfolding in the Americas, is characterized by a single principle of conflict, a conflict between *republicanism*, on the one side, and *oligarchism*, on the other. Such was the conflict between the young United States of America and the oligarchical regimes of King George III and the Holy Alliance powers. Since the Achaemenid empire of oligarchical aggression against the Ionian Greek city-state republics, the only real issue within European history as a whole, has been the conflict between the *republican* followers of Solon, Socrates, and Christ, on the one side, and the opposing, usury-ridden heritage of Babylon, Canaan, and pagan Rome.<sup>1</sup>

This pertains not merely to political history, but to every important development in the arts and sciences for as far back in the existence of mankind as our knowledge can reach.

Most simply, *oligarchism* signifies a division of the families of which every society is composed, a division between a relative few, powerful, ruling families, and a relatively great mass of the oppressed families which are the mere objects of rule by the ruling families. The apotheosis of oligarchism is the Greek pagan, olympian pantheon of Zeus and other immortals, playing with merely "mortal" men and women in the fashion a cruel, bullying, capricious child plays with, and breaks his dolls.

The distinction between *oligarchism* and *republicanism* arose in literary history with the defense of the Greek city-state republics against the oligarchical enemies from Babylon and Canaan. The idea of *republicanism* grew up and evolved during many successive battles for freedom. Thus, when a truthful historian speaks of the history of republicanism, he offers two primary sets of distinctions. He refers to the succession of struggles, beginning with the constitutions of the ancient Ionian city-state republics, continuing through the work of Solon of Athens, Aeschylus' Prometheus, Socrates, and Plato. The historian concurs with St. Augustine's relevant letter, on the point that Christianity adopts a *Christian Socrates* as to scientific method in arts and science, but sees a crucial single flaw in a merely pagan Socrates. So, we have the history of republicanism, and the crucial distinctions emerging in the course of that history.

1. See Friedrich Schiller's "The Legislation of Lycurgus and Solon," for an exposition on the differences in the law-giving of Lycurgus and Solon, in *Friedrich Schiller, Poet of Freedom*, Vol. II, The Schiller Institute: Washington, D.C., 1988.

The essays before us peer into the deepest features of the historical conflict. The mind of the oligarch sees "God," "man," and "nature," in an entirely different way than does the mind of the republican. It is the axiomatic quality of those deep epistemological differences which the essays address, thus continuing the work of the 1989 book *In Defense of Common Sense*. The object of the present essays, and the indicated predecessor, is to demonstrate the possibility of *intelligible representation* of an entire class of conceptions. These conceptions share the common quality of showing that the choice between an oligarchic or republican political-philosophical world-outlook leads, as a consequence, toward a congruent set of ideas in every field of rational thinking and discourse, including both art and physical science.

What the author has done, in connection with the two sets of philosophical essays referenced, is to revive the Socratic method by recasting it, as it were, *de novo*, and doing this from the standpoint of the best knowledge available in the present century. Thus, *In Defense of Common Sense* was written in the form of such a commentary upon the topics of Plato's *Thaetetus*, and also, implicitly, the *Sophist* and the *Parmenides*. The purpose was to illuminate the potential intelligibility of Plato's method and conceptions, by presenting a more advanced, twentieth-century vision of the same topical areas.

Relative to *In Defense of Common Sense*, the objectives of Project A are more specialized ones. In the latter, we address directly, chiefly, certain crucial problems of modern mathematical physics, and also the underlying principles to be employed for effective conduct of winning republican "cultural warfare." Different as those two topics might appear to be, the text of the essays shows that they are, in reality, the same topic.

The crucial *formal* issue addressed in the essays, is the definition of the *ontologically elementary* in physics. The following comments conclude these preliminary, summary observations as a whole.

Modern classroom physics begins only after it has successfully ignored those topics upon which the very idea of a rigorous physical science might be premised. That is, mathematical physics begins from the starting-point of certain naively conceived, and provably false ontological assumptions taken as axiomatic.

At the center of those such popular, ignorant follies upon which so much of modern classroom physics is premised *mathematically*, is the popular delusion, the axiomatic assumption, that the elementary form of "matter" must be *simple substance*. The essays identify the readily accessible, conclusive proof that such a popular assumption is false. The nearer to the very small we reach, the more that substance in the very small partakes of all of the complexity inherent in a *negentropic* form of *universe as a whole*.

This view, just expressed here, was already implicit in the Socratic work of Plato, and in the work of Nicolaus of

Cusa and Gottfried Leibniz—among others—in the founding and elementary elaboration of modern physical science. For them, as for Professor Bernhard Riemann, the universe as a whole is “axiomatically” *negentropic* (mathematically), and substance in the very small reflects this negentropic quality, this “nonlinearity” of the universe as a whole.

These essays’ approach to the most crucial among the problems of present-day physics, brings us back, directly, to the political issues as such, and does this in a most interesting and profitable way.

The proper basis for a physical science is found by means of an adequately rigorous reflection upon the question, “What is it possible for the mind of the human individual to know, and that by means solely of the individual’s sovereign potential for creative reason, the sovereign potential which sets mankind apart from, and above the beasts?”

This required demonstration is immediately at hand, as *In Defense of Common Sense* and these essays combine to show. The showing of the central role between, on the one side, a sovereign individual potential for (anti-Kantian) creative reason, and, on the other side, a *negentropic* form of existence of the universe taken immediately in its indivisible entirety of unitary existence, is the key.

By means of developed (individual) creative reason, we are each capable of making our own conscious thought a process rendered an intelligible subject of the same quality of conscious thought. In the language of the mathematician Georg Cantor, we are able, on a higher level of consciousness, to adduce the ordering-principle characteristic of a relatively inferior, observed aspect of our same conscious process. In mathematical physics, this is the “hierarchical ordering” of *transfinite* orderings. In this same way, we are enabled to become efficiently conscious of a *transfinite ordering* of a direct relationship between our conscious, sovereign powers of creative reason, and an undivided universe as a *negentropic* form of *elementary existence*.

The exploration of that conscious appreciation of that transfinite connection between “monad” and universality, shows us that this transfinite process is the only form in which a true physical science is possible.

Then, by exploring the higher, “nonlinear” forms of transfinite ordering associated with this “maximum minimum” connection, we are enabled to find in this transfinite

realm the higher correspondent to the formal “hereditary principle” in the deductive modes. On that basis, we have begun to practice a truer physical science; on the same basis, we have established, at last, a true *political science*.

Finally, now, the following observations.

The map of the universe just identified, is peculiar to the deepest epistemological implications of the Christian form of Socratic thinking, of the Christian form of republican world-outlook. It is the physical science of a Cardinal Nicolaus of Cusa, a Gottfried Leibniz.

This fact is key to understanding modern physical science properly, as the complicated reflection of a four hundred years’ war within the ranks of science, between the opposing republican and oligarchical factions within science: the republicans Brunelleschi, Cusa, Leonardo, Kepler, Pascal, Leibniz, Carnot, Monge, Gauss, and Riemann, against the oligarchists Descartes, Locke, Newton, Cauchy, Kelvin, Clausius, Maxwell, Rayleigh, Boltzmann, and so on.

First, the oligarchical world-outlook is incapable of understanding the nature of creative reason, and could never understand the most crucial conceptions of a Plato, Augustine, Cusa, Leonardo, Kepler, or Leibniz. The closest approximation to a science of which the oligarchical mind is capable, is the pseudo-rational, deductive formalism of an Aristotle, Descartes, or Kant. (Otherwise, oligarchism is mere, arbitrary irrationalism, akin to that of a David Hume or a Friedrich Nietzsche.)

Second, the present form of mathematical physics is chiefly the result of the political power of the oligarchical faction over the monied institutions of science and education. It is the past hundred-odd years’ rise to superior political power by the usury-practicing, “New Age,” oligarchical faction, which has caused the classroom triumph of arithmetic-algebraic formalism over the more natural mathematics of non-euclidean constructive geometries.

Third, the scientific inferiority of the oligarchical world-map, is a crucial, potentially fatal tactical vulnerability of the oligarchical political-philosophical faction as a whole. The included purpose of Project A, is to foster among republicans the knowledge needed to exploit that feature of the oligarchists’ “genetically” determined tactical inferiority.

Finally, the time has come, when the oligarchical faction’s corrupting influence can be tolerated not much longer.