

5. A new foreign and economic policy

Since October 1997, the condition of this planet has passed into an extraordinary kind of increasing hyper-instability. Under this condition, ongoing world history is no longer shaped in the manner to which either governments or the ordinary citizen had been formerly accustomed. No longer can a reasonable view of current history be based upon the methods of deductive and inductive interpretation of some linear sequence of so-called leading events, events taken individually from the surface of day-to-day developments.

Instead, since October 1997, current history has been shaped, and reshaped, again and again, more and more, from month to month, or even week to week, not in response to individual events, or linear series of events as such, but, rather, in response to what a physicist would describe as a complex manifold of successive phase-changes, changes of a planet-wide, tectonic quality. The kind of difference, between ordinary times and now, is implied by saying, "It was not the traffic-jam which caused the accident; it was the earthquake."

These phase-changes in the world's political processes, which are now coming on like earthquake-shocks, are centered in relations among the three power-blocs. It is these phase-changes whose interaction is currently dominant in shaping of ongoing world history today: not so-called "current events," especially not what the major news media customarily chooses to misrepresent as "the issues."

In this concluding chapter of my candidate's statement, I focus upon three subjects of crucial importance for understanding, and addressing the kaleidoscopically changing patterns of developments now in progress. First, as briefly as possible, I define what I mean by successive phase-changes in the presently ongoing world situation. Next, I illustrate what that means, using some important, recent and ongoing developments to illustrate the point. Finally, I define the approach which both the incumbent and the next President of the United States must adopt, to meet the global challenges so defined.

5.1 What are phase-changes?

The simplest analogy for what I signify by "phase-changes," is the transition from ice to water, or water to steam, or steam to a plasma state. That is to emphasize, that although the chemical composition of the material remains ostensibly

unchanged, the physical behavior of the system, including its interaction with other systems, has been qualitatively altered.

Take a beaker of distilled water at ordinary room-pressure. Refrigerate it. The water's temperature becomes colder, but, otherwise, nothing seems to change. The temperature is dropped to about 32 degrees Fahrenheit (zero degrees centigrade). The water is colder; perhaps you notice some change in the volume of the water in the beaker, but the water is still water. Then, the change comes; ice forms on the surface of the water. Continue the cooling, and you have a block of ice—and perhaps a shattered beaker. Take another beaker of water. This time, heat it. Soon, it begins to boil, and the water is turned into vapor. Super-heat the same amount of steam sufficiently . . . and so on. With each change in physical state, there is a qualitative change in the kinematic and some other kinds of impact on the environment of that quantity of material. It behaves differently than in the preceding state.

An apparently somewhat different kind of phase-change occurs if you apply constant acceleration to an object shot through a volume of air in a tube of indefinite length. A change in physical state appears as the speed of the projectile approaches the relative speed of sound for that quality of air; a Riemann trans-sonic shock-front is generated. The relationship of the projectile to the air-medium is changed. Something similar occurs, when a mass of the proper mixing of hydrogen isotopes and lithium, for example, is compressed in a certain special way: a thermonuclear explosion, for example.

Nature is filled with many different species of examples of phase-changes within what are considered *physical systems*, producing effects which often surprise and mystify the on-looker first experiencing such changes. In the kinds of political, economic, social, and psychological shocks which most of you have already begun to experience in your immediate environment, we are dealing with a different quality of phase-changes than those identified by the series of examples I have referenced above. Despite that difference, the political changes we are addressing now, are still phase-changes, but operating under different rules than phase-changes in so-called physical systems. The difference is, that living systems have different characteristics than non-living systems, and human behavior has different characteristics than any other kind of living processes. No esoteric "forces" here; just something, new to most people, with which to become familiar.

Call discontinuous phase-changes of a character analo-

gous to the examples just supplied, “changes in state.” Imagine a number of large-scale social systems, which are, individually, each undergoing changes in its own state, but in which each system is also reacting not so much to another nearby system, but rather to changes in the state of that other, different, but proximate system. This has happened in earlier periods of history. These process are always present, in all periods of history, whether their effects are noticed, or not. The effects usually become obvious to ordinary observers, as now, only in those periods of turbulent transition, which mark the passage of human affairs from one state of society in general, through a turbulent time of birth-pangs, leading to the birth, or the still-birth, of a qualitatively new state of affairs in general. There are no “normal times” in real history, no periods in which the laws of history are different than during times of societies’ tectonic turbulences; there are only those quieter times of unsuspected pregnancies, when most of the population is dozing, and dreaming simple dreams, between birth-storms.

The time for simple dreams is past. Tectonic upheavals are now the normal state of affairs. Such are now, speaking roughly, the kinds of ongoing changes in the state of the world as a whole, a pattern of changes of state, within and among systems, which has emerged during the past fifteen months. It is this fundamental change in the character of the way the world works, which now determines the changing shape of world events.

These changes are currently being expressed, primarily, as phase-changes within the framework of the set of relations among the three multi-national blocs. This new state of global affairs, now works to such effect that the interaction among those three regions’ phase-changes as such, has become a kind of “triple point.” That “triple point,” in and of itself, rather than any of the systems interacting, as if “kinematically,” at that point, is now the determinant of change of state for this planet as a whole. This fact and its crucial implications, are illustrated in many ways.

The simplest and perhaps most shocking single example of this fact, is the inertness of the consciences of the government of the United States, and also of western European governments, to the ongoing genocide against black Africans. This is a Holocaust which continues to rage, spreading from bloody tyrant Yoweri Museveni’s Uganda, throughout more and more of sub-Saharan Africa. This genocide is proceeding chiefly by the continuing instigation of the British monarchy, but with important participation of Israel’s deep-rooted operations in Africa, and the fully witting complicity of Secretary Madeleine Albright’s and the Principals Committee’s U.S. Department of State. These governmental agencies are responsible for a continuing toll of *more than six millions black Africans*, to date, in a Holocaust which is not only still ongoing, but is currently being accelerated by those agencies I have named. What happened to “Never again!”

Such shocking events no longer trouble the consciences

of the relevant mass media or governments. How many tens of millions of black Africans must be murdered by this ongoing genocide, before Madeleine Albright’s State Department will dump Susan Rice and the policy which Rice continues to serve as guidon?

Where are Vice-President Al Gore’s hypocritical expressions of passion for “human rights”? “What’s your problem, Al? Is it that they happen to be *black* Africans, whom you view as you viewed former U.S. Senator from Illinois, and African-American fighter for justice in Africa, Carol Moseley-Braun, during the time of the 1996 Democratic Party convention? How does this reflect upon your attitude toward Mexican-Americans, Al? Does your indifference to State Department support for genocide in Africa, imply that we must read your NAFTA policy, as showing, that you view Latin-Americans as essentially fodder for the slave-labor ovens of the *maquiladoras*?”

Such are these, our present times, and their customs.

So, presently, the fate of this planet is dominated by the interactions among a recently emerging array of three power-blocs.

- The first is the so-called “Anglo-American” bloc, the vastly self-hyperinflated putatively-rich-if-bankrupt bankers’ club—“Why shouldn’t they be rich; they print their own money at hyperinflationary speeds?”—an enlarged BAC actually centered, not in a unity of the U.S.A. and the British monarchy’s Commonwealth, but in the increasingly tight integration of Wall Street’s elite circles of lawyers and bankers (and their attached lickies and lackies) within the British monarchy’s empire, the so-called Commonwealth.
- The second, is what is fairly described, relatively speaking, as *the poor man’s club*, the continental Euro-land group of increasingly tawdry, and increasingly desperate relics of the formerly proud and sovereign states of that region, today’s victims of the Thatcher-Mitterrand-Bush Maastricht swindle of 1989-1990.⁶⁷
- The third, which began to come into existence, as a bloc, in this form, after October 1997, is a “post-Gore” Eurasian bloc, most fairly described as “the survivors bloc,” a triangle whose corners are China, Russia, and India, and which includes those sections of the former Soviet Union, and of East and South Asia, which are attracted to one another by the relative weight of the three largest of the powers of that Eurasian region,

67. Naturally, Prime Minister Thatcher did not lead the United Kingdom in joining the Euro. When the herdsman sends the cattle into the slaughterhouse, he, discreetly, remains outside. Thatcher may be dumb, but her handlers were not quite that dumb.

The three main power blocs



The British-American-Canadian bloc, typified by Queen Elizabeth II and George Bush.

The Euroland group of increasingly desperate relics of formerly proud and sovereign nations, such as German Chancellor Gerhard Schröder.



The “survivors’ bloc,” including China, Russia, India, and other Eurasian powers. Shown here is Chinese President Jiang Zemin in Novosibirsk, Russia, November 1998, where he underlined Russia’s enormous potential for contributing to Eurasian scientific and technological progress.

powers now tending to consolidate around the shared role, as Russia’s Prime Minister Yevgeni Primakov recently described this, of the strategic corners of such a *survivors’ club*.

All other parts of the planet are in orbit in the strategic space-time dominated by those, the largest planets of the system, the indicated three principal, strategic “clubs.”

Before proceeding to the discussion of those matters of the blocs, let us write a brief aside here.

In what I have to report, except other locations in which I reference this explicitly, the rest of the planet, including the real citizens of the U.S.A., are recognized by me, as more or less as much outsiders to Wall Street’s and Al Gore’s make-believe U.S.A., as the nations and people of Central and South America. You, the people, are presently kept out of influence on any among the three leading blocs. This is typified by the case of the approximately eighty percent who are counted as expressing support for President Clinton against the impeachment gang, citizens whose rights and opinions do not register with the London-Wall-Street impeachment gang. The American people, the real United States, are, thus, not currently in any among the three blocs.

Lest there be any doubt that the American people are

outsiders to the first bloc, let it be emphasized, that such architects of the attempted impeachment as the Reverend Jerry Falwell might say, “religiously,” as Al Gore says, “democratically”: ignore the existence of that estimated eighty percent of popular opinion. The rush to impeachment reflects, precisely, the fear that, under the conditions of a now looming Wall Street collapse, the American people might be provoked to do what the people of Central and South America can not, to get back in the political game inside the U.S. itself, a development which might be, even probably, the end of the power of the first “club,” Al Gore’s cronies of the Wall Street lawyers and bankers club. That is motive for the rush to get Wall Street’s current choice of a temporary stand-in, Vice-President Al Gore, into the Presidency.

It is notable, here, that there are only two ways in which Al Gore’s promotion is possible: not by election, but by impeachment of the sitting President, or, as was done with getting Vice-President Theodore Roosevelt into what Teddy named “the White House,” by assassination.

That said, look at the three blocs which I have identified. How do they interact, differentially, with the ongoing, kaleidoscopic process of global phase-change?

The first bloc, the “bankers’ club,” is a pack of lunatics commanding much more power than is good for them, or

anyone else. They, like utopian fanatic Vice-President Al Gore, are gripped by the same type of insanity which gripped the dupes of the Seventeenth-Century “tulip craze,” or the English and French John-Law-style financial bubbles which popped into oblivion during the early Eighteenth Century. These Wall Street and like “free trade” fanatics, are thus virtually insane, lunatics, like doomed Adolf Hitler in the bunker, or the theosophical Elizabeth II’s Windsor clan, of the “after-us-the-apocalypse” variety. This is the type which would rather send the entire planet to Hell, than give up Al Gore backer D.E. Shaw’s doubtful claims to Russian money, or whatever Al means by his “Alice-in-Wonderland” style in satanically perverse misuse of words such as “freedom,” “democracy,” and “human rights.” Look at these members and hangers-on of the bankers club! There they are, with their big fat mouths — and that is not all — hanging out, fully aware that they are pumping out the greatest mass of worthless, purely hyperinflationary money and debt in history. They know, as Alan Greenspan occasionally suggests, that they are pushing the world, with irrational exuberance, to the edge of the worst crash in all known history. Yet, they keep on doing it, all in their desperate, lunatic, Adolf-Hitler-in-the-bunker-like passion for “the only way to defend our system.”

The second bloc, is the China-Russia-India triangle, a triangle which is coming to include a number of other nations. This bloc is not of homogeneous composition, but the members recognize that they are mutually dependent on the conditions for survival which they must build and maintain in concert. This is the bloc which Vice-President Al Gore built, quite unintentionally, by his shameless display of the most monstrous form of financial corruption, toward Russia’s internal political life, and by his succession of rabid outbursts of undisguised anti-Asia racism which he exhibited at Kyoto, Kuala Lumpur, and elsewhere recently. This Eurasia bloc is fully rational, and is a natural partner of the real U.S.A. which you, the citizens, represent. They are rational, by the standard of what we in the U.S. used to consider rationality, in a time when our governments were still more or less rational, whereas Al Gore and today’s Wall Street are not.

The third bloc, the Euroland poor man’s club, is of curiously mixed emotions. Centered around France and Germany, this club represents nations whose recent economic and other leading policies have been mostly bad to terrible, but their national consciences constantly remind them of their economic and other interests in mutually beneficial relations with Russia and with Russia’s current and prospective partners in Asia. They are nations whose vital interests are being dumped by what the Blair-Gore pestilence represents currently.

The Blair-Gore war against Iraq, for example, gives them the horrors; it shakes them deeply, because all of the leading military and other experts of Europe recognize that the Principals Committee is neither competent in military affairs, nor

exactly sane, and, that if these maniacs of the Principals Committee continue their present policy, an early strategic catastrophe is in the making.

In these and other ways, Euroland represents, at the moment, a domain of mixed emotions, and mixed and confused policies, but with an anguished sense that Euroland’s vital interests definitely do not lie in the directions which Wall Street and Blairdom are jointly taking. Euroland is still with Washington almost, but not exactly; but, not for long, if things continue to run in the directions Blair and Gore are indicating.

Interesting is the interaction between the United Kingdom and the nations of Euroland. Within the United Kingdom, an increasing ration from both so-called “right” and so-called “left,” are tending to think like some in Euroland, about the follies associated with the cronies of Blair and Gore — or, is it Burke and Hare?

The naked theosophical lunacies of the pack of Elizabeth II and her “Addams Family”-like litter,⁶⁸ spiced with the repeated, tasteless exhibiting of the unfortunate Camilla Parker-Bowles, keeps the issue of the wrongful death of Lady Diana the prominently unsaid reality which defines all of today’s politics of the United Kingdom. The image of Lady Diana’s eyes will never cease to haunt that fey house. The spectre of those eyes will continue to appear, to haunt Queen Elizabeth II and her house as Shakespeare’s Lady Macbeth was haunted, as the death of Jeanne d’Arc haunted the father of Louis XI. This is no mere scandal; there is a growing, nagging sense afoot, based more in political-economy than sometimes bloody and other royal scandals, that the United Kingdom might be more likely to survive without the Windsors, than with them. After all, looking from London, at what is about to strike Wall Street, the thought might occur, that the universe was not created in A.D. 1714.

There are related, centrifugal stirrings within the Commonwealth, too.

At the present moment, there is no visible, durable prospect for adoption of a common basis for action among these three clubs, and there is much, and growing, perhaps even fatal dissent within the first.

The governments of Russia and China have shown, in sundry ways, that they are clearly aware that there is no common ground, ever, with what Gore and the IMF system represent today. Wall Street and Gore will never give up their present, lunatic ways willingly, this side of Hell, or in it. Continental Europe, perhaps even some in the United Kingdom, might prefer closer ties to the Eurasia survivors’ club, but that is yet to be seen as likely. For the present moment, no part of Europe, continental or United Kingdom, could survive as habitable territories, under the conditions implicit in continuation of the economic and related policies of the G-7 group.

68. Featuring the Duke of Edinburgh cast in the TV role of “Lurch.”