

periment with Edison in a University of Pennsylvania classroom.

Dmitri Mendeleev, whose “Periodic Table” hypothesis was revolutionizing chemistry, was among the visitors at the 1876 exposition. That Russian scientist and economic nationalist was then in Pennsylvania investigating the petroleum industry—a field of work which the Pennsylvanians and allied patriotic industrialists had just invented, but which John D. Rockefeller was crookedly monopolizing.

Another European visitor at the Philadelphia Centennial was the German industrial and technological innovator, Emil Rathenau. Five years later, at the 1881 Paris electrical exposition, Rathenau would meet Edison’s representatives, namely Carey-circle operative Edward Johnson, Edison’s business manager, and George Barker, science director for the 1881 display of Edison’s new electric light. Since Rathenau had been in Philadelphia, Professor Barker had counseled and steered Edison to embark on the invention of electric lighting and public power.

Upon viewing the Edison light in Paris, Rathenau was moved with a vision of humanity uplifted with the aid of electrification, and he became the partner of Edison and the Careytes in that endeavor. Rathenau’s German Edison company was to be an essential component of the transformation of Germany following the late-1870s policy shift to national patronage of industry. (See box, p. 39.)

The ‘Kulturkampf’ trap

To proceed with their great economic and political objectives, the republican nationalists were required to solve dangerous social and religious problems in Germany.

We may look back from our vantage point of 120 years, and observe with calmed passions the dilemma of a Western nation that has been manipulated into a needless, destructive political-religious conflict. Unfortunately, what we observe seems horrifyingly like what the British oligarchy and its scribblers such as Samuel Huntington seek to incite today, a contrived “clash of civilizations” of the West against Islam.

The people and institutions of a major world religious faith, with a foreign center, are falsely defined as the “enemy,” as dangerous to the security and sovereignty of the state.

Thus was Germany’s Chancellor Bismarck, the wily East Prussian Junker aristocrat, squaring off in his *Kulturkampf* (or “struggle for civilization”) against the Roman Catholic Church, led by Pope Pius IX.

The May Laws and other measures against German Catholics were adopted by Prussia and the newly consolidated German Empire in the period 1871-73. This followed the July 18, 1870 decree of Pontifical Infallibility issued by the Council of the Vatican.

British Crown agents were playing a double game with

respect to the Church. Anglicans intrigued with north European Protestants, Jansenists, Old Catholics, and Orthodox Russians to whip up reaction to the “dangerous Papal infallibility doctrine.” The London-based stooge Giuseppe Mazzini had been thrown against Italy, his revolution and freemasonry terrifying and cornering the Vatican.

As pope from 1846 until his death on Feb. 7, 1878, Pius IX had, because of his fear of “revolutionary republicanism,” looked favorably upon the British-backed slaveowners’ rebellion against the American Union. Meanwhile, British Catholic “conservative” counsellors within the Church helped keep the Vatican confined to the false choice: protection of the Church by “black nobility” oligarchs, versus giving in to the atheist onslaught. Pius was rendered incapable of communicating with Germany’s leaders, who had made the Catholic Church their enemy.

Henry Carey had worked in many ways to outflank the British Mazziniite game in Europe. Carey met with Count

Carey and Pope Leo XIII vs. John Stuart Mill

Political strategy in the late-nineteenth-century world revolved around the opposition between the view of man typified by Henry C. Carey and by Pope Leo XIII, on the one side, as against that of British Empire propagandist and “classical economist” John Stuart Mill.

In his 1859 *Principles of Social Science* (Vol. 1, pp. 28-31), Carey quotes his adversary Mill, describing what Mill claims is economic science:

“Political economy considers mankind as occupied solely in acquiring and consuming wealth . . . except in the degree in which [desire for wealth] is checked by . . . aversion to labor and the desire of the present enjoyment of costly indulgences. . . . All [man’s economic acts], though many of them are really the result of a plurality of motives, are considered by political economy as flowing solely from a desire of wealth. . . . Not that any political economist was ever so absurd as to suppose that mankind are really thus constituted, but because this is the mode in which the science must necessarily be studied.

“. . . For the sake of practical utility, [the principle of population is to be] interpolated into the exposition.” (Mill, *System of Logic*, Book VI, Chapter 8)

Carey comments that here “we have the political-economical man, on the one hand influenced solely by the thirst for wealth, and on the other so entirely under the

Cavour—advocate of railroad-building modernization—in the late 1850s, and worked with Italian patriots to promote a unified Italian nation.

Carey and his German allies confronted the *Kulturkampf* as a British-induced suicidal trap, blocking Germany's national development and its vital global role.

The problem was solved only with aid from the outside, with the Carey-led movement for dirigist nationalism, and with a new pope, Leo XIII, who understood British perfidy.

The German Catholic Center Party was of no help. Ludwig Windthorst (1812-91) led the Center Party, which he had co-founded in the 1860s. We have observed Windthorst's name, above, as a participant with the protectionists in the Reichstag. Indeed, the Catholic Center Party's support for the protective tariff was a decisive factor in making a majority for that policy. The Center Party organization itself, however, did not initiate the policy shift, although Catholic industrialists in western Germany played a crucial role. As

their depression-wracked constituency demanded change, the party accepted the inducement to make a deal with Bismarck under the emerging nationalist policy.

Ludwig Windthorst himself was a rather weak-principled individual; perhaps his greatest distinction was that under the *Kulturkampf*, he had become Bismarck's personal nemesis (Bismarck said that his life revolved around his wife and Windthorst, the one to love and the other to hate).

Windthorst wrote that Britain was "the country of hereditary wisdom" in politics, and in general he followed Britain's free-trade doctrine. He was a fervent devotee of John Stuart Mill. This is an excellent political litmus test for that era: Henry Carey was known to "swear like a trooper" when Mill's name came up. Mill had been intelligence director for the British East India Company, and in the 1870s headed up British Empire political intelligence operations in America and Europe.

Leo XIII was elected pope in February 1878, after he

control of the sexual passion as to be at all times ready to indulge it, however greatly such indulgence may tend to prevent the growth of wealth."

"[British] political economy," writes Carey, "presents for our consideration a mere brute animal, to find a name for which it desecrates the word 'man', [otherwise previously] recognized . . . as expressing the idea of a being made in the likeness of its Creator.

"It was well asked by Goethe—'What is all intercourse with nature, if by the analytical method, we merely occupy ourselves with individual material parts, and do not feel the breath of the spirit which prescribes to every part its direction, and orders or sanctions every deviation by means of an inherent law?' And what, we may ask, is the value of an analytical process that selects only the 'material parts' of man—those which are common to himself and the beast—and excludes those which are common to the angels and himself?

"Such is the course of modern political economy, which not only 'does not feel the breath of the spirit,' but even ignores the existence of the spirit itself, and is therefore found defining what it is pleased to call the natural rate of wages, as being 'that price which it is necessary to enable the laborers, one with another, to subsist and perpetuate their race, without either increase or diminution'—that is to say, such price as will enable some to grow rich and increase their race, while others perish of hunger, thirst, and exposure."

Carey sharply contrasted the purpose of his own global infrastructure program: "To the highly organized community . . . every new road brings with it increase of power

over nature, with increase of life," and the practice of Mill's British Empire: "Railroads are now being made *for*, but not *by*, the people of India, but their effects must, inevitably, be the same with those observed in Ireland. [Their] object . . . is the further promotion of the export of the raw produce of the soil, and the further extension of the centralizing power of trade; to be followed by increased exhaustion of the land . . . and more rapid decay of commerce."

As for Pope Leo XIII, he wrote, in his 1891 encyclical, *Rerum Novarum: On the Condition of the Working Classes*, that "animal nature . . . is far from embracing human nature, but rather is much lower than human nature, having been created to serve and obey it. What stands out and excels in us, what makes man man and distinguishes him generically from the brute, is the mind or reason. . . . Workers are not to be treated as slaves; justice demands that the dignity of the human personality be respected in them. . . .

"[I]t is incontestable that the wealth of nations originates from no other source than the labor of workers. Equity therefore commands that public authority show proper concern for the worker so that from what he contributes to the common good he may receive what will enable him, housed, clothed, and secure, to live his life without hardship. . . . [I]t is of absolute interest to the State that those citizens should not be miserable . . . from whom such necessary goods proceed. . . . Workers' associations ought to be so constituted and so governed . . . as to attain the object . . . that . . . the members secure, so far as possible, an increase in the goods of body, of soul, and of prosperity."