

A Biographic View of The West

By Ian Buckley

FEBRUARY 2020

Table of Contents

A BIOGRAPHIC VIEW OF THE WEST	2
War: Evil at the Top, Youth's Idealism Trapped.....	3
How Others Pay the Price	4
Relative Costs of WWII	6
Peace? Curious Origins of the 'Cold War'	6
Avoiding Economic Depression and Nuclear War	8
Militarism the Solution? Really!?!?	9
Origins of Europe's Mercantile Political Economy.....	12
Universal Justice: Democratic Fair-Trading Solutions.....	12
Background to Avoidable WW1	13
How Wars' Prevention Makes Sense.....	17
Mutual Survival: Base Materialism Out the Window.....	18
Ten Reforms to Restore Industrial Prosperity	20
SOURCES.....	21



Australian
National
University

Australian National University Emeritus Faculty

A BIOGRAPHIC VIEW OF THE WEST

“Consumption is the sole end and purpose of all production; and the interest of the producer ought to be attended to only so far as it may be necessary for promoting that of the consumer. The maxim is so perfectly self evident that it would be absurd to attempt to prove it. But in the mercantile system the interest of the consumer is almost constantly sacrificed to that of the producer; and it seems to consider production, and not consumption, as the ultimate end and object of all industry and commerce”.

Adam Smith AS_WN, IV.8.49, i.e., para 49, Wealth of Nations:

<https://www.econlib.org/library/Smith/smWN.html>

What with vast over-production, unequal distribution, domestic cum foreign exploitations, bizarrely idiotic wars and largely paralysed economies, one does not have to be an historian to recognise the current Western world’s state of unjust disarray. So, what can be done? Superficially it makes no sense, for it appears that long ago Western leaders trapped much of humanity into a dismally unbalanced socio-economic system. Favoured by its beneficiaries, a small minority, but for the vast majority it’s been one disaster after another. As you may surmise it did not have to be that way. However, looking back step by step, once recognised, its faulty features can be remedied. And by following this course one can look forward to a freshly constituted workable economic system which provides sustainable justice for all.(IBNF18) As you will see, this somewhat family-oriented historical essay shifts back and forth in space and time, yet I trust you will recognise its core concern is to overcome the enormous challenges facing our young and future generations.(IB5; MH1; DD1; JD)

Born, 1925, it’s been an extended process getting to understand the nature of the human-driven world of today. Given a ‘head start’, my brother Allan arrived some three years earlier, he soon best friend, minder and teacher. For long that search was limited to family and local history. Only gradually were we exposed to that of the First World war, initially hearsay on how Germany ‘started it.’ Then its hideous outcomes like the tragic wrecks wheeled through Melbourne’s streets on ANZAC Day. Also hearing how Melbourne’s Catholic Archbishop Daniel Mannix (knowing Ireland’s colonial history) rated WWI a ‘Trade War’. Should have been part of our Christian school education, - its causes, its outcomes explored. But such was kept in wraps, including the way that all WWI’s ‘Christian nations’ had claimed God ‘on their side’. Manifestly absurd, for even we knew Jesus of Nazareth would not support any ‘side’, indeed *any* war! (IB1, Appendices M & N; IBNF18, 11-14)

Also, we realised that whereas Jesus, seeking compassion and justice for all, was an absolutely wonderful person, yet much post-crucifixion Church doctrine was clearly made-up pseudo-Christian (Rome’s Constantine-derived) pretence. Hence the value of suspended judgement. It was the same with much taught at school, an Anglican school headed by our uncle the Reverend Sydney Buckley. One notable exception was WWI veteran ‘Tommy’ Lee, a teacher visibly distressed during morning Assembly when telling us boys how, standing by him in France his friend just dropped, - his head shattered by sniper fire. Only later would we learn other realities exposed by historians like Yale’s Paul Kennedy, for example, “...*the population losses and economic disruptions caused by four and a half years of ‘total’ war were immense. Around 8 million men were killed in actual*

fighting, with another 7 million permanently disabled and a further 15 million more or less seriously wounded – the vast majority of these being in the prime of their productive life..... the final casualty list for this extended period might have been as much as 60 million people, with nearly half of these losses occurring in Russia....” and that “... by the late 1920s the prevailing images of WWI were of death, destruction, horror, waste, and the futility of it all. The ‘Carthaginian peace’ of 1919, the lack of those benefits promised by wartime politicians in return for the people’s sacrifices, the millions of maimed veterans and of war widows, the economic troubles of the 1920s, the loss of faith and the breakdown in Victorian social and personal relationships, were all blamed upon the folly of the July 1914 decisions.” (PK, 359-60, 367; also WC4, 30, 31)

Australia, a small country (under 5 million) had fared badly. All volunteers sent to Gallipoli, then France, were under British command. Stuck in trenches and subject to machine-gun, mortar and shell fire, it was indeed a living hell, 62,000 lives lost, 156,000 wounded or gassed, countless survivors never re-gaining normality, - all in an insane ‘cause’. Under Prime Minister Billy Hughes two referenda sought to bring in ‘conscription’ but both lost. Neither civilians nor soldiers at the front agreed. (IB1, 5A(i))

War: Evil at the Top, Youth’s Idealism Trapped

Even though every nation suffered enormously (all worse off than before) the causes and mutually horrifying effects of the war were not revealed. Hence, its true origins never publicly debated. Moreover, only a few like J. M. Keynes reported on how the so-called ‘Peace Treaty’ betrayed all belligerent nations, Germany’s ‘sole guilt’ simply assumed, its population expected to pay “*the entire cost of the war*” and, with blockade still in place, continue to suffer. (JMK) Also, the effects of the war on Czarist Russia, such ending in a ‘communist’ revolution which led to a 22 nation intervention set on its ‘strangulation’. For, immersed still in their elite’s unstable (liable-to-collapse) mercantile political economies, Western nations shared a common fear that egalitarianism might ‘catch on’. Although Russia’s communism survived, fear and enmity remained.

Hence, when the extreme weakness of the mercantile political economy which Europe’s power brokers had concocted since 1500 A.D. finally transformed into the Great Depression of 1929, Britain’s Conservatives feared Russia’s ‘communist virus’ might induce *their* long-suffering people to revolt. Strong in Britain, such fear led Conservative government(s) to promote the re-armament of Hitler’s Germany (Germany by then disarmed). However, this 1933 turnaround was serious because, as all knew, Hitler’s Mein Kampf asserted Germany’s ‘right’ to expand into Russia. (AH) Addressing the Commons, Winston Churchill strongly disagreed, for he was certain such a war would be just Hitler’s first step to world dominion. Nevertheless, as Churchill describes in his history of World War II (Vol.1) *The Gathering Storm* (WC5i) throughout the 1930s Britain’s Conservative governments *continued* to support Hitler’s expansionary moves. Hence, the bi-lateral *Anglo-German Naval Agreement* of 1935 (submarines encouraged) and, on September 29, 1938 Neville Chamberlain signing with Hitler the joint Declaration which, betraying Czechoslovakia, cleared the way for Hitler’s invasion of Russia, as hereunder: -

"We the German Fuehrer and Chancellor and the British Prime Minister, have had a further meeting to-day, and are agreed in recognising that the question of Anglo-German relations is of the first importance for the two countries and for Europe.

"We regard the agreement signed last night, and the Anglo-German Naval Agreement, as symbolic of the desire of our two peoples never to go to war with one another again.

"We are resolved that the method of consultation shall be the method adopted to deal with any other questions that may concern our two countries, and we are determined to continue our efforts to remove possible sources of difference, and thus to contribute to assure the peace of Europe." (WC5i, 285)

So, as Churchill recounts, despite knowing that Germany's General Staff had planned to get rid of Hitler *before* he got Germany into another catastrophic war, British Conservatives continued to promote Hitler's plan. (WC5i, 279-283; 310-12) Shortly Hitler took over *all* of Czechoslovakia including its Skoda armaments works. Aware of all this, the USSR prepared for its inevitable invasion, but Britain held back, simply declaring it would defend Poland. Moreover, to the very end the British government rejected war's prevention via the 'Grand Alliance' (Britain, France, US, Czechoslovakia) advocated by Churchill. No wonder Churchill characterised WWII as "the Unnecessary War", he later (1948) recording, *"One day President Roosevelt told me that he was asking publicly for suggestions about what the war should be called. I said at once "the unnecessary war." There never was a war more easy to stop than that which has just wrecked what was left of the world from the previous struggle."* (WC5i, Preface xiv) And bear in mind that this war, the greatest of all time, was one that Britain's Conservatives could have saved us from, - but refused because they wanted Hitler's Germany to take over the USSR.

How Others Pay the Price

In the event, while the British Government finally came to see the reality of Churchill's case, it just 'looked on' as Germany invaded Poland, then Russia. Only then did Britain declare war on Germany, yet failed to go to Poland's defence. (WC5i, 310). It likewise continued inactive throughout the aptly-named Phony War. That is. until Germany's onslaughts on the British navy led to Churchill's rise to Cabinet (as Admiralty's First Lord) against the wishes of many Conservatives who still wanted a 'peace agreement' with Hitler. (DD2, 14-16; MG1: MG2, 325-) Before long Churchill, by then Prime Minister, defined Britain's prime war-time tasks as: (1) Defending its vital lifeline sea-lanes against submarine attack. (2) Defending Britain's Empire: Egypt, India, Burma, etc. and (3) Intense bombing of German cities, especially their factories and workers' homes. For these tasks, Churchill expected strong support from across the Empire.

Australia's Menzies government agreed, signing on to the 'Empire Air Training Scheme' (which gave Britain first call on aircrew) a commitment demanded throughout the war despite Japan's entry in December 1941, - its troops by then deeply into China, across the Pacific and literally on Australia's door step. Indeed, that urgent threat caused my brother Allan, a brilliant student two years through his Mechanical Engineering degree (and many others) to enlist. Intent on defending Australia, he trained as an RAAF navigator, yet was

sent to England to serve under the RAF's Coastal Command's 53 Squadron which patrolled the Atlantic aiming to sink German submarines. That too not a good idea because by 1944 these subs were thoroughly armed and protected. Having Naxos radar, shielded long-range cannon, and 4-6 machine-gun assemblies armed with tracer/incendiary bullets, they vastly outmatched the RAF's weakly-armed Liberators with their unprotected thinly-clad fuel tanks. As Jock Manson later told me, the all-too-frequent outcome was the plane on fire, out of control and none surviving the depth charge blast as their downed plane sank. From a squadron strength of 21 operational aircraft (each with crew of ten), 16 were lost between July, 1943 and November, 1944, - 13 within the year (July 1943 - July 1944), a loss rate near double that of many other Coastal Command squadrons.(personal communication, Jock Manson, 53 Squadron Historian; (JM); also John McCarthy's *A Last Call of Empire*. p.91, (JMcC)

<https://academic.oup.com/ahr/article-abstract/96/4/1200/66113?redirectedFrom=fulltext>

Similarly grim was the fate of Australian and other aircrew serving in Bomber Command. See (IB1, 9F (c33, e 37) - lucky if they survived 30 sorties over Germany. A full analysis on all this destruction, "*The Strategic Air Offensive Against Germany 1939-1945*" carried out by Britain's official historians, Sir Charles Webster and Noble Frankland (but not published until 1961) is altogether revealing. For example, "*The area attack of this period was deliberately aimed at the destruction of the principal cities of Germany. The object was, as has been seen, to destroy the entire centre of the cities, the housing, public utilities and communications to such an extent that their inhabitants would not be able to go on working. ... it was the destruction of the living quarters of the towns which was the main object of the attack. The worker was to be deprived of the means of working by the devastation of his environment.*" W&Fii, 235)

In 1943, for example, area bombing caused the deaths of some 200,000 people with far greater numbers injured, and the destruction of over 212,000 buildings. "*It was natural that those in Britain who surveyed this unprecedented destruction should think that German armaments production must have been sensibly reduced and the morale of the German people, perhaps, fatally undermined. In fact, however, armaments production was not only maintained but much increased during the first half of 1943. It remained at that level, with a slight fall at the end, during the second half and then rose steeply again in the first half of 1944, reaching its peak about the middle of that year.*" And, as to the effect on morale of the German and foreign (including coerced POW) workers, "*...the refusal to accept defeat through anguish and terror must command respect and admiration.*"(W&Fii, 224-5 and 235, (IB1: http://emeritus.anu.edu.au/members/ian_buckley at IB1, Ch.9F (c) p.33 & (e), p.37) Thus, although Churchill claimed it was Britain's major contribution to "*winning the war*", such bombing was a failure, simply destructive of cities and lives, including tens of thousands of young air crew.

Relative Costs of WWII

Moreover, when one considers the overall costs of WWII, we see how the above figures are dwarfed by the losses of just so many “lesser” nations caught up in this unnecessary war, US historian, David Kennedy (DK) revealing the figures:-

Country	Total War Dead	Civilian Deaths
United Kingdom	350,000	100,000
China	10,000,000	6,000,000
Yugoslavia	2,000,000	1-1.5,000,000
Japan	3,000,000	1,000,000
Poland	8,000,000	6,000,000
Germany	6,500,000	1,000,000
Soviet Union	24,000,000	16,000,000
United States	405,000	6

(figures not provided for France, Norway, Canada, New Zealand, Australia, etc.)

Speaking for themselves, you can appreciate the enormous disparity of the burdens of WWII on the nations caught up. Also the extreme differences the victors exhibited in dealing with these nations as they attempted to recover some semblance of ‘normality’. Against the sound advice of General Eisenhower, two Japanese cities were nuclear bombed (PDE1). Nevertheless, showing great promise of industrial development, Japan was led into close cooperation with the US and permitted a thriving economy. Similarly, Germany which had great industrial potential was before long relieved of its national debt, its West German industries thereafter greatly expanding. Needless to say, both of these defeated nations developed close political ties with the US.

Under international laws of 1945 (UNC) all signatories including the US were bound to honour national independence which was long over-due in both Indo-China, and Korea. Indo-China had been fighting against its occupation by France since the 1850s and Japan throughout WWII. Yet the US ‘allowed’ France to re-occupy Indo-China ; and when that failed following its defeat at Den Bien Phu, the US took over, thus launching *it’s* tragic Vietnam war. Similarly, Korea, a Japanese colony from 1931 through to 1945, the post-war South remaining under the control of its war-time Japanese ‘rulers’. Hence the ever-so-brutal War on Korea, more intensely bombed by the US than any other country. (BC) None of this a good start for a peaceful world, yet it soon became rapidly worse.

Peace? Curious Origins of the ‘Cold War’

Yes, curious because whereas Germany and Japan had been enemies, an ally, the USSR (it alone resisting Hitler’s invading armies and suffering the greatest losses of all as it fought Hitler’s forces back to Berlin) was re-cast as the West’s prime ‘enemy’. All very strange because at WWII’s Yalta meeting, the USSR had won the approval of Franklin Roosevelt and Winston Churchill to treat Eastern Europe (with Germany - it’s source of invasion) as it’s ‘Sphere of Influence’ protective buffer zone. Might sound OK, but this was turned on its head by claiming that the USSR was intent on dominating *Western* Europe, - all the way to the Atlantic! Absolutely absurd. With its war burden the greatest of all, the USSR was

intent on *recovery*, a simply enormous task. And, as for territory, it already had more than enough ‘Czarist lands’ to manage. Moreover, although US diplomat, George F. Kennan who served in Russia during the war was in favour of ‘containing’ the USSR, he soon came to understand the falsity of the US and British claims. (See below)

Strange also, for as Martin Gilbert (Churchill’s biographer) documented, within 3 days of Germany’s surrender (May 9, 1945) Churchill’s telegram to President Truman, described Russia’s extraordinary accomplishment of driving Hitler’s armies all the way back to Berlin, as, “...*this enormous Muscovite advance into the centre of Europe....*” he adding “...*Meanwhile the attention of our peoples will be occupied in inflicting severities upon Germany, which is ruined and prostrate, and it could be open to the Russians in a very short time to advance if they chose to the North Sea and the Atlantic.*”(MG2, 685-6) Further, in his March 1946 Fulton Missouri speech, Churchill claimed that his and Roosevelt’s agreement with Stalin to grant Russia an East European “sphere of influence” had (somehow?) divided the European continent with an “Iron Curtain”. Yet, as, Churchill stated, “*I do not believe that Soviet Russia desires war. What they desire is the fruits of war and the indefinite expansion of their power and doctrines.*” Nevertheless, as Truman soon made clear, the main instrument of American power to counter Russia’s efforts to produce a communist, socialist or egalitarian Europe, would be America’s atom bombs, they produced, further developed and by July 1946 tested over the Marshall Islands. Thus the ‘Cold War’ was confirmed, then stretched by further claims that Russia was intent on military advances around the world, including Western Europe. Never threatened, but since 1949 Western Europe has been ‘shielded’ by the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation (NATO) (GFK3)

Curious also since it was Churchill who exposed the anti-communist origins of WW2 wrought by British Conservatives and widely supported by those of similar mind in Europe and across the world. In that, Vichy French stood out, but also many including American and English government and business people who traded aircraft, steel, etc. with Germany. As well, the London Times’ Geoffrey Dawson (see ‘History of the Times’) Lord Riverdale and Liberal ‘radicals’ like David Lloyd George who in 1934 appealed to the House of Commons with, “...*in a very short time, perhaps in a year, perhaps in two, the conservative elements in this country will be looking to Germany as the bulwark against Communism in Europe.....Do not let us be in a hurry to condemn Germany. We shall be welcoming Germany as our friend.*” (Commons, Nov, 28, 1934, Hansard V.295, 919-20; see also Lloyd George's 1936 meeting with Hitler’ (MG1, 203 ; IB1, 8B (c, d, e). Plus many who were deeply anti-semitic. Additionally, we need to keep in mind Churchill’s hopes of a significant post-WWII role in a world led by the United States.

But going back to judgements on Russia, Kennan outlined that history as, “*What I was then advocating for our Government was a policy of "containment" of Soviet expansionist pressures, a policy aimed at halting the expansion of Soviet power into Central and Western Europe. I viewed this as primarily a diplomatic and political task, though not wholly without military implications. I considered that if and when we had succeeded in persuading the Soviet leadership that the continuation of these expansionist pressures not only held out for them no hopes for success but would be, in many respects, to their disadvantage, then the moment would have come for serious talks with them about the future of Europe. But when, some three years later, this moment had arrived - when we had*

made our point with the Marshall Plan, with the successful resistance to the Berlin blockade and other measures - when the lesson I wanted to see us convey to Moscow had been successfully conveyed, then it was one of the great disappointments of my life to discover that neither our Government nor our Western European allies had any interest in entering into such discussions at all. What they and the others wanted from Moscow, with respect to the future of Europe, was essentially 'unconditional surrender.' They were prepared to wait for it. And this was the beginning of the 40 years of cold war." (GFK2)

Avoiding Economic Depression and Nuclear War

The above is most interesting because, having been fully engaged in the relevant issues during this historic period, Kennan was well aware of the US's full-on WW2 military-industrial production which had lifted it out of the Great Depression. And like the views of Albert Einstein, Dwight Eisenhower and John F. Kennedy, George Kennan's comments on the events of this so-called 'Cold War' are highly revealing of its precarious suicidal nature and world-destabilizing effects from the nuclear stand-off, - failure of which (whether by design or accident) would extinguish Western civilization.(GFK3 ; JFK ; PDE1 ; PDE2 ; IB9, 19-23) For as Kennan revealed in his Foreword to Norman Cousins' 1987 book, *The Pathology of Power*. he well understood how the US economy was designed to *remain* dependent on the continuation of high-output arms production throughout the post-WW2 era.

As a recently graduated medical student in the early 1950s I saw my father's monthly 'business letter' from share broker Ian Potter. Just imagine how I felt soon after the end of the most catastrophic World War in human history to find myself reading its message of 'August 1950' under the heading, "*Commodities Under Rearmament*". Beginning, "*It is hoped that the outbreak of hostilities in Korea will not spread and ultimately lead to a third world war.*" it went on to say, "*Whilst the impact of rearmament upon the world economy may not be as pronounced as may be considered likely in some circles, it is probable that a most important effect will be to sustain for a further period of years industrial activity in the U.S.A. and the British Empire at the very high level at which it has been maintained since the end of the last war. In America in particular there has been some doubt as to whether production could be held much longer at nearly one hundred percent above the 1938-39 figure. The expenditure of large additional sums by the Government for defence purposes now makes it practically certain that the heavy industries will be operating at full capacity for a long time to come even if this necessitates some reduction in the production of consumer goods.*" (IP1)

Then 15 months later, from the *Melbourne Herald* of September 21, 1953, the same highly-respected stock broker, Ian Potter, interviewed on his return from the US, indicated his conviction that America is 'psychologically, and well on the way' to being industrially, prepared for a Third World War'. As quoted, "*They are thinking of war in more realistic terms,*" he said today. "*There is a basic feeling that the situation between Soviet Russia and the Western democracies will never be cleared up without a conflict.*" "*My own feeling is that they don't expect Russia to start it. They feel that, in the end, their own exasperation might force some sort of terms on Russia which Russia could not accept, thus making war the only way out.*" he adding, "*They have a very strong national spirit, and quite apart*

from politics, they are very anxious to put an end to this battle of ideologies. They want to see this conflict finally solved.”, “My impression is that the US feels it will be ready to fight a world war, if necessary, in 1953. Then they might get tougher than they have so far.” “The need to prepare was ‘uppermost’ in American minds,” said Mr Potter. “Every big industrial concern was doing something to further the war production effort.” (IP2 ; c.f., PDE2)

Complementing this we know that already by 1951, with the Korean war under way, Australia was being groomed to expect a Third World War. To illustrate, I quote from an Australian Archives report of February 15, 1951, Cabinet papers prepared by Dr J. W. Knott, BA (LaTrobe), PhD (ANU), Head of History, School of Social Sciences, Australian National University, and an historical consultant to the National Archives of Australia:-

“Korea and the threat of world war (Para 5) Cabinet rarely discussed the day- to-day activities of the soldiers, ships or planes Australia had committed to Korea. What Cabinet did discuss in great detail, however, was the wider strategic implications of the conflict. Menzies had long been convinced that Korea was a prelude to a third world war. He had warned the Australian people of this in a radio broadcast on 22 September 1950. While in London, Menzies learnt of the probable timetable for this conflict: it would be three years before the Soviet Union was in a position to go to war. At the first Cabinet meeting following his return from London, Menzies once again gave voice to his belief that war with international communism was inevitable. He told Cabinet he was especially concerned that ‘there was no sense of urgency in the community’. He warned his colleagues that the nation ‘had only till ’53 Dec to prepare for [world] war’.[3] When announcing the government’s three-year defence program on 2 March 1951, Menzies said it was to enable Australia to be prepared for world war by the end of 1953. The belief that Australia only had three years to prepare for a third world war coloured most federal government policy making and planning throughout the rest of 1951.” (3) NAA: A11099, 1/11, 15 February 1951. (JWK)

Militarism the Solution? Really!?

On this key issue it is most important to quote George F. Kennan’s 1987 comment on the growing lock-down influence of the military-industrial complex on the US economy and society in general: *“Constituting as it now does the greatest single purchaser in the American market, with all the power that implies, anchored in long-term contractual obligations that defy the normal annual budgetary discretion of Congress, its tentacles now reaching into almost every congressional district and distorting the electoral situations wherever they reach, this military-industrial establishment has become a veritable addiction of American society - an addiction from which American society could no longer free itself without the most severe withdrawal pains. Were the Soviet Union to sink tomorrow under the waters of the ocean, the American military-industrial complex would have to go on, substantially unchanged, until some other adversary could be invented. Anything else would be an unacceptable shock to the American economy.” (GFK3; well-worth-reading full text IB9, 52-56, Appendix 2; likewise, PDE2)*

The above analysis of the origins of the insanely dangerous Cold War is stressed especially because of its threat of nuclear annihilation. For that not only made no sense, but it could well have led to mutual annihilation in which, as pointed out by Kennan, (and President John F. Kennedy in his wonderful speech of June 10, 1963), by far the greatest victims would of necessity have been its prime adversaries, the US and the USSR.(GFK2 ; GFK3; JFK; IB7, 59-61) So what could have led to such distorted suicidal ways of thinking? It is as if the proponents of the West's 'anything goes that's profitable' mercantile economy, invoke that system as 'sacrosanct', a 'religion' that cannot be altered. Indeed, in a professing Christian society that approach is so patently anti-Christian, so nihilistic, it all but denies belief!

Aside from all the make-believe used to 'justify' naming the USSR as the 'new enemy', let me share additional detail on the background to the US's military-industrial policy. As David Kennedy's paper shows, from 1929 until it entered WW2 in late 1941 the US economy had been in deep depression with 14-25% unemployed plus 45% of white households (95% African-American) struggling beneath the poverty line. But once it began producing arms for itself and its allies it's economy took off, thriving throughout the war. (DK) In the mid 1930s Hitler had had a broadly similar experience, except that unlike Germany the US had survived WWII with its land and resources intact. However, in assuming the role of 'world leader', the US decided to base that on military might. An alarming idea but this is what happened. For that would depend on greatly enlarging its existing military establishment and making more armaments to sell across the world via its chain of military bases. It also meant that the search for military and other resources would involve plundering others' territories, illegal under binding U.N. Charter Law, the US a principal author. A very bad example to set by any aspiring 'world leader'. However, beginning early post-WWII, the Central Intelligence Agency chief, Allen Dulles, remodelled the CIA to include covert operations to engage in 'regime changes' and resource plundering under the guise of 'saving the world from communism' - or whatever. I say 'whatever' because, as William Blum's fine study *Rogue State*, shows, many deposed individuals and nations were anything but communist - or socialist, (WB, e.g., Noriega/Panama; Saddam Hussein/Iraq; Allende/ Chile). See also Robert Kennedy Jr's illuminating account. (RFK Jr. and GWC, plus <https://raymcgovern.com>)

Patently illegal, all this post-WWII wrong-headed terrorist-inducing plunder through war was thoroughly documented in 2018 by Professor Jeffrey D. Sachs Director of the Centre for Sustainable Development, Columbia University and Director of the United Nations Sustainable Development Solutions Network. Too much to detail, but briefly outlined in IBNF13, over-viewed by General Wesley Clark (GWC) and thoroughly detailed in Jeffrey Sachs article (JSa3), [here](#). A most important study because it draws together the US connection to the historical and still-current evolution of the unstable mercantile system, - especially the obsession with world domination via war. Thus, not wars of 'necessity', simply imperial wars of choice, e.g., over resources such as oil and gas. And, as earlier with England, France, etc., domination exerted both directly and indirectly, frequently with unintended consequences, - especially war between contending powers. Also, commonly, blow-back terrorism. In other words, the still-flawed mercantile system which has led so many nations into the West's catastrophic counter-productive wars. On that, Sachs stresses how it is vitally important for "*...the U.S. Congress to reestablish decisionmaking over war and peace. That is its constitutional role, indeed perhaps its most important constitutional*

role as a bulwark of democratic government. Yet Congress has almost completely abandoned this responsibility.” Altogether true, since unfortunately the dominating power of US high finance is by now so extreme that the finance sector has effective control over *both* major parties in Congress. Hence, it appears that in the US such critical ‘democratic decisions’ may have been effectively privatised. See Michael Hudson. (MH1, e.g., 274-323) However, people in Europe, Australia and other nations may still be able to effect remediation by pressuring their governments to engage in Quantitative *Investment*, - in public health, education, employment, social security, environmental protection and all other sorely-neglected key areas, - as now recommended by many including Percy Allan, <https://johnmenadue.com/percy-allan-how-to-avoid-a-recession-why-qi-should-replace-qe/> .

On this I believe Michael Hudson would agree, for as he has explained, “*Early attempts to align banking interests with those of industry have given way to a world in which the largest corporations are managed with financial strategy in mind. Today’s post-modern economic theory depicts Quantitative Easing – more borrowing – as a solution to today’s debt-strapped budgets.*” Yet, as you will see, all such machinations are designed to raise asset prices (property, land, stocks, etc.) plus great ‘rentier’ wealth to themselves *without* the real economy growing, - actual costs borne by the public via government and tax-payers. The same goes for international debts, (e.g., EU and IMF) As Hudson adds, “*I call this ideology post-modern because it rejects the Progressive Era’s program of taxing rentier wealth and subsidizing public investment in basic infrastructure with a view toward lowering the cost of living and doing business.*” (MH1, 275-7)

But returning to the evolving economies of the historic past, notwithstanding the unnecessary and thus unforgivable Second World War (a mere 20 years after the First!) it has been the West’s ‘standard practice’ to put all blame on the Axis Powers, (especially Germany) for bringing about both WWI and WWII. If that sounds bizarrely unreal (see Churchill, pp, 2, 3, above) just consider the proposition that *all* of Europe’s major wars have been unnecessary, a conclusion implicit in the title of Paul Kennedy’s fine book, *The Rise and Fall of the Great Powers: Economic Change and Military Conflict from 1500 to 2000.*(PK) Yes, there were many wars before, but 1500 A.D. marks the beginning of the mercantile political economic system originated by Europe’s powers as industrialism took off. Indeed, by the 1700’s, that system was in full swing, its aggressively competitive nature, masquerading as ‘trade’, fully exposed and condemned by moral philosopher cum economic historian Adam Smith. For Smith the stumbling block was the self-serving minority’s exploitation of the majority. Yet, as he counselled, honest *mutual-benefit* fair-trade backed by the resources of a responsibly-conserved World of Nature could readily support all the world’s people in comfort. Accordingly, wisely managed, industrialisation cum Nature’s conservation could reduce the work load while supporting all manner of mutually-beneficial creative enterprises. C.f. Gavin Kennedy’s ‘Comment’ on Fletcher’s views of “Mercantile political economy” for Saturday 26 February, 2011 at:- <http://adamsmithslostlegacy.blogspot.com/2011/02/>

Origins of Europe's Mercantile Political Economy

At this point, I want to say something about the origins of the 'Capitalist system' much of the world lives by today. Going back to the decline of Rome, Europe's power brokers engaged in endless battles as they grasped land and status, its narrow elite sector determined to maintain this feuding debt-strapped Empire's practices. So, unsurprisingly, the mercantile political economic system that grew out of Feudalism retained many of *its* traits, especially the forceful domination of land and people, both domestically and internationally. (AS_WN; MH1, 276-7) That meant the sector limiting peoples' every-day cooperation, plus strong civil and military coercion, including 'primogeniture' and usury to keep secure its unearned wealth. Similarly, when it came to trade, it was all about 'taking advantage' and 'winning'. In employment, to pay the minimum for workers' subsistence. In trading goods, to maximise any advantage, including monopolies, compound debt peonage and other scams. All aggressively competitive, especially international 'trade'. Thus both domestically and internationally such a system led to the loss of balance due to the maximisation of production in the face of the exploited sector's diminishing ability to provide the matching 'demand' essential for sustainability. Hence the ever-expanding problem of over-production and repeated depressions.

Early on, Europe's maritime nations compensated by plundering foreign ships across the high seas. As Sir Walter Raleigh put it, "*Whosoever commands the sea commands the trade; whosoever commands the trade of the world commands the riches of the world, and consequently the world itself*". (SR) Next, by invading, plundering and colonising the territories of 'lesser peoples': e.g., Spain and Portugal across the East and West Indies in the 1400s. And later by all maritime powers as they established a West African slave trade to channel enormous wealth from the Americas to Europe for over 300 years. (UNESCO) More than bad enough, but aggressive competition between the plundering powers over the spoils maintained their repeated wars *with one another*, a mercantile feature with us still today. Compare Adam Smith's and Jeffrey Sachs' findings (AS_WN, IV.8.49 : JSa1&3)

Universal Justice: Democratic Fair-Trading Solutions

Reading Adam Smith's *Wealth of Nations* one can appreciate how unnecessary was such aggressive 'trade' with its mutually destructive wars. Indeed, not only 'unnecessary' but, as Smith and others have long stressed, in human lives lost, health ruined and vast material loss via opportunity costs of 'preparedness', war itself, and ever-mounting indebtedness, it was and remains altogether counter-productive. That is, everybody loses. For, as Smith put it, "*...nations have been taught that their interest consisted in beggaring all their neighbours. Each nation has been made to look with an invidious eye upon the prosperity of all the nations with which it trades, and to consider their gain as its own loss. Commerce, which ought naturally to be, among nations, as among individuals, a bond of union and friendship, has become the most fertile source of discord and animosity. The capricious ambition of kings and ministers has not, during the present and the preceding century, been more fatal to the repose of Europe than the impertinent jealousy of merchants and manufacturers. The violence and injustice of the rulers of mankind is an ancient evil, for which, I am afraid, the nature of human affairs can scarce admit of a remedy. But the mean rapacity, the monopolizing spirit of merchants and manufacturers, who neither are, nor*

ought to be, the rulers of mankind, though it cannot perhaps be corrected may very easily be prevented from disturbing the tranquillity of anybody but themselves." (AS_WN, IV. 3. 38; JH; MH1).

And just consider how without war all could live comfortably via the benefits of mutually satisfying enterprises and trade, those benefits expanding year by year as cooperative inventiveness reduced hardship and improved the health and vitality needed to enrich the world's diverse cultures. Indeed, the present confusion is tragic because it is as if societies are still floundering in an ancient bog, having lost their capacity for imagination, even their will to insist on a truly *democratically* fair economy to replace our deliberately-skewed faulty version. For one can imagine how an enlightened public could attain that by insisting on its democratic right to direct their government's essential fiscal public finance needs. For example, a dinkum Chifley-style peoples bank (at last!), public-health, education, employment, essential infrastructure; plus environmental programs to protect Nature and all other key areas. In other words, to make good on making democracy play in the economy the central role it should always have had.

For a better understanding of what's needed it's well worth taking account of Adam Smith's *The Theory of Moral Sentiments* his powerful guide to understanding how human thought processes and feelings evolved. For here we see how concern for our own needs is balanced by concerns over how we treat others and how they regard us. Then, getting to understand the foundations of fair trade we can reconsider his *Wealth of Nations*. For it reveals how modern industrial economies can adequately serve all *without deliberate over-production* (AS_WN, IV.8.49.) and otherwise cheating. Although the term 'capitalism' was not used in his day, yet Smith knew how capital, (Natural, operating, fixed, etc.) was essential to support any equitable fair system. Critically, however, such a system hinges on just how these 'capital' assets are organised across the economy, whether fairly, - or skewed to favour a particular societal sector. Indeed, the mercantile system of his day was condemned by Smith precisely because it favoured the elite minority, e.g., those whose family had 'acquired' land in feudal times by military force. To rectify the resultant extreme maldistribution of 'wealth' Smith wisely counselled justice in all transactions, all exchanges involving land, goods and services. On services, his great concern was how their obsession to maximise production drove elites to minimise 'on-the-floor' factory pay to subsistence levels. Indeed, this made worse by various scams, especially monopolies and debt peonage which diverted wealth to the parasitic elite sector. Such 'comparative advantage' was bad enough domestically, but via Royal Charters it was applied to many territories across the world (e.g., India, Africa, Indies). Moreover, stemming from the resultant competition between rival powers themselves, it became the prime cause of recurrent intra-European wars with their mutually counter-productive catastrophic outcomes, including WWI and WWII.

Background to Avoidable WW1

John A. Hobson's highly-insightful *Imperialism A Study* (1902) wisely pointed to Europe's mounting levels of aggression in 'international trade', piled-up armaments and faulty Alliance traps which drew general war ever closer. For example, as US diplomat George F. Kennan explained, the *Franco-Russian Alliance of 1894*, coupled to the

Triple Alliance of Austria-Hungary, Germany and Italy, set Europe on the very brink. (GFK1) That should have cautioned Britain (already fearful of its own diminishing economic power) not to ally itself, Australia, etc., with those powers. Initially Britain entered into the *Anglo-Japanese Alliance of 1902*. Yet, it also approached its centuries-long enemy, France and, tragically, this led to the ‘deal’ Churchill described in *The World Crisis* (WC3Vi, 21-22; 31-33; IB1, 3B) whereby, providing France would recognise Britain’s claims and position in Egypt, Britain would support France’s colonial aspirations in Morocco, as agreed in their *Entente Cordiale of 1904*. Not an honest deal since neither power had moral or legal right to colonise any country. Moreover, the 1880 *Treaty of Madrid* bound Europe’s powers to both Moroccan independence and equal rights for outside traders. So, when in 1905 Germany insisted on its right to trade in Morocco, France, which by then regarded that country as its ‘Protectorate’ refused. (WC3Vi, 31)

In the Algeiras crisis meeting which followed, despite France's admittedly weak moral and legal position, Britain was determined to back France regardless of consequences. As Churchill put it, had the crisis come to war between France and Germany, "...*Great Britain could not have remained indifferent.*" And although war was for a time averted, secret "*military conversations*" between British and French General Staffs were begun, "...*with a view to concerted action in the event of war*". Hence, Algeiras was seen by Churchill as "...*a milestone on the road to Armageddon.*" (WC3Vi, 32-3; see also IB1, Appendix C, 6-11) Strange indeed, especially since Britain’s new Liberal government encompassed a vast majority of Liberal radicals who were utterly opposed to war, - Churchill one of them! As for the grave hazards of such a war, I quote from Churchill’s 1901 maiden speech to the Commons: "*We must not regard war with a modern Power as a kind of game in which we may take a hand, and with good luck may come safe home with our winnings. It is not that, and I rejoice that it cannot be that.*" "*A European war cannot be anything but a cruel, heartrending struggle, which, if we are ever to enjoy the fruits of victory, must demand, perhaps for several years, the whole manhood of the nation, the entire suspension of peaceful industries, and the concentrating to one end of every vital energy in the community...*" "*I have frequently been astonished since I have been in this House to hear with what composure and how glibly Members and even Ministers, talk of a European war...*" "*But now, when mighty populations are impelled on each other... when the resources of science and civilisation sweep away everything that might mitigate their fury, a European war can only end in the ruin of the vanquished and the scarcely less fatal commercial dislocation of the conquerors... We do not know what war is. We have had a glimpse of it in South Africa. Even in miniature it is hideous and appalling.*" <https://www.britishempire.co.uk/article/casehistory.htm> (IB2, p.1, para 5-)

Further, demonstrating that this was not just a one-off concern, his 1909 ‘*Spirit of the Budget*’ speech stressed justice for Britain’s underprivileged as the key to national security, as here, "*The social conditions of the British people in the early years of the twentieth century cannot be contemplated without deep anxiety. We are at the cross-ways. If we stand on in the old happy-go-lucky way, [362]the richer classes ever growing in wealth and in number, and ever declining in responsibility, the very poor remaining plunged or plunging even deeper into helpless, hopeless misery, then I think there is nothing before us but savage strife between class and class, with an increasing disorganisation, with an increasing destruction of human strength and human virtue—nothing, in fact, but that dual*

degeneration which comes from the simultaneous waste of extreme wealth and of extreme want.

Now we have had over here lately colonial editors from all the Colonies of the British Empire. The representatives of every Colony have expressed the opinion that the worst they saw here, was the extreme of poverty side by side with the extreme of luxury. Is it not impressive to find that they are all agreed, coming as they do from Australia, [363] or Canada, or South Africa, or New Zealand, that the greatest danger to the British Empire and to the British people is not to be found among the enormous fleets and armies of the European Continent, nor in any danger in the wide circuit of colonial and foreign affairs. No, it is here in our midst, close at home, close at hand in the vast growing cities of England and Scotland, and in the dwindling and cramped villages of our denuded countryside. It is there you will find the seeds of Imperial ruin and national decay—the unnatural gap between rich and poor, the divorce of the people from the land, the want of proper discipline and training in our youth, the exploitation of boy labour, the physical degeneration which seems to follow so swiftly on civilised poverty, the awful jumbles of an obsolete Poor Law, the horrid havoc of the liquor traffic, the constant insecurity in the means of subsistence and employment which breaks the heart of many a sober, hard-working man, the absence of any established minimum standard of life and comfort among the workers, and, at the other end, the swift increase of vulgar, joyless luxury—here are [364] the enemies of Britain. Beware lest they shatter the foundations of her power.”

Indeed, truly sobering words to be acted upon while there was time, for the Liberals had the commanding majority able to stop Britain's engagement in such a war. Moreover, we know just how generally Europeans feared the ever-looming war with its growing piles of hideous weapons. In [*The Proud Tower: A Portrait of the World Before the War 1890-1914*](#) (1970) Barbara Tuchman includes *The Steady Drummer* (Chapter 5) which stresses the European public's ever-rising concerns. (BT1) See the *Hague Conferences* of 1899 and 1907. (IB11) <http://www.britishempire.co.uk/article/australiaswarsb.htm>. Likewise, their detestation of the inequalities imposed via Imperialism through the 'mercantile' system responsible, the very system Adam Smith condemned; see also John Hobson's *Imperialism, A Study*, 1901) <https://www.econlib.org/library/YPDBooks/Hobson/hbsnImp.html>

So, could WWI have occurred without Britain's key intervention?! I ask that since, according to Churchill, Europe was then in a state of calm. As he put it, "*The spring and summer of 1914 were marked in Europe by an exceptional tranquillity. Ever since Agadir the policy of Germany towards Great Britain had not only been correct, but considerate. British and German diplomacy laboured in harmony. Germany seemed, with us, to be set on peace. There seemed also to be a prospect that the personal goodwill and mutual respect which had grown up between the principal people on both sides might play a useful part in the future; and some there were who looked forward to a wider combination in which Great Britain and Germany, might together bring the two opposing European systems into harmony and give to all the anxious nations solid assurances of safety and fair-play.*" (WC3Vi, 178) And as Churchill went on, even naval rivalry had ceased to be a 'cause of friction' because (Germany, having made no further increases in naval power since early 1912) it was certain that "...we could not be overtaken as far as capital ships were concerned." (WC3Vi, 179, 244-7) Not only that but it would have been clear to all of

Europe's nations that such a war's outcomes would be truly catastrophic, including ballooning post-war international debt.

Hence, had Churchill chosen to lead the Liberal radical majority's opposition to WW1, its outcomes would have given Europe's nations a *very* different option for the future. For he could have called a crisis meeting, favoured arbitration and convinced Europe of the total counter-productivity of launching into the long-planned industrialised war, such saving tens of millions of lives, avoiding all its ongoing material costs, including post-war deep indebtedness. Also, having recognised the utter wrongness of making competitive economic growth subject to *military* contest as the final arbiter, logically he would have called for open debate on the root causes of Europe's international wars, including the plunder and colonial exploitation of 'lesser peoples' across the world, the very basis of ever-more costly wars over 'the spoils'. After all, treated with moderation, Mother Nature could instead provide sufficient resources for all nations to engage in peaceful, mutually-supportive fair trade.(see below)

Indeed, by avoiding WW1, Germany's economy could have continued to grow as before; and possibly there need not have been a revolution in Russia. Or if there was one, like those of Britain, America and France, instead of attempting military intervention, it could have been monitored to see what emerged. And then, once fair rules of domestic and international trade (say, along the lines of Adam Smith and John Hobson) had been agreed, Europe could at last have been freed of its long-lasting mercantile political economic system with all its injustices, precipitating Alliances, and wars that the mercantile system generated. Thus, it would have prevented the loss of tens of millions of young lives and the immense physical and mental wounding of survivors across Europe and beyond. And Churchill, who would have escaped 'his' catastrophic Gallipoli Campaign could instead have been given great credit for creating such an improved world! For him, a far better outcome also, since he would not have had to admit to Gallipoli's 'last minute' faulty planning with its inevitable failure, as outlined here:

<https://www.britishempire.co.uk/maproom/australiagallipoli.htm> (IB3)

Yes, I know it didn't happen that way, but I chose Churchill because of the rare insights he revealed yet failed to act on, I wishing to see what similarly enlightened 'others' might have imagined and implemented so that all future generations could be saved. Here I return to what actually happened. Unfortunately, Churchill was misled by the prospect of his growing status via his selection into the 1911 Liberal Cabinet dominated by just four ministers: Prime Minister Herbert Asquith, Foreign Minister Sir Edward Grey, Chancellor of the Exchequer David Lloyd George and First Lord of the Admiralty Winston Churchill, - the exclusive four *covertly determined* that Britain *must* support France any time France was at war with *Germany*.

What is extraordinarily revealing about Churchill's account of the resulting military arrangements between Britain and France is that they were kept secret not only from the British public but from their parliamentary representatives, even from most members of Cabinet! (WC3Vi, 46, 203-5) But, as you may well ask, why covert? Well, simply because such an alliance had no chance whatever of getting parliamentary or even Cabinet approval. Nevertheless, this patently illegal device was chosen as the way to side-step British

democracy (its parliament), betray the country's wishes (likewise unaware Dominions), - and promote war on Germany aimed at preventing its future economic growth. (JMK)

Remember, the supposed basis for war was the assassination of Austria's Archduke Ferdinand by Serbian separatists on June 28, 1914. Only then did Foreign Minister Grey, backed by Asquith, Lloyd George and Churchill, instruct the rest of Cabinet and Parliament concerning their supposed "*binding moral commitment*" to France. (in fact Britain opposed any *legal* commitment). Referring to the resulting crisis, Churchill wrote: "*The Cabinet was overwhelmingly pacific. At least three quarters of its members were determined not to be drawn into a European quarrel, unless Great Britain were herself attacked, which was not likely.*" (WC3Vi, 199; see also IB1, Appendix C, 7-13) So, the issue for Britain became, should it go to war over an 'incident' in the Balkans which did not involve its national interests. (BT2, 139-162) Yet, the real issue concerning the British Cabinet's inner four was the competition from Germany's faster-growing economy. This was made clear in Foreign Secretary Grey's plea to members of the House to give their backing to the hitherto secret commitment to support France militarily should she go to war with Germany, - a 'last minute' appeal made on August 3, 1914, just one day before World War I began! Grey's words included, "*I ask the House from the point of view of British interests to consider what may be at stake. If France is beaten to her kneesI do not believe for a moment that, at the end of this war,.....we should be able to undo what had happened,.....to prevent the whole of the West of Europe opposite us from falling under the domination of a single power....and we should.... not escape the most serious and grave economic consequences.*" (BT2,121-2) Thus, given war's final costs in human and economic terms, Grey's statement reveals the evil effects of Britain's long-held short-sighted response.

How Wars' Prevention Makes Sense

Indeed, the universally calamitous outcomes of their wars with one another should long since have stimulated the major powers to investigate, debate, and remedy Europe's socio/economic system which induced aggressive trading and wars, the very system Smith had long condemned. For, clearly such practices are totally opposed to what Adam Smith, Jesus of Nazareth, Jeffrey Sachs (JSa1&3) and all sane people regarded as an appropriate, just, or even sane response to the periodic economic ascendancy of other nations.(PK) Obviously, the outcomes are counter-productive all round: overall human costs in tens of millions of lives, shattered bodies and minds making no sense whatever. For, their talents are an enormous loss to their countries, a tragic loss to their families, indeed a terrible loss to the world, especially for what they would have contributed to future generations. And all on the vastest of scales, requiring extensive restoration, - yet with the extraordinary ever-growing accumulation of each nation's war debts. (see IB5, p.22-25 for Smith's data) Moreover, that other constant feature of mercantile political economies, periodic economic depression due to massive over-production, such still applying to all industrialised nations today. In short, a world already struggling with the mounting environmental crises due to that obsessive production maximisation (toxic pollution, climate change, etc.) which continues to accentuate those crises via further wars of uncapped magnitude. Clearly, such a course is totally inconsistent with future life on Earth.

Recognising the possibility of such a far better outcome for Europe and the world had WWI been avoided, I suggest a similar approach to our confused mess-ups of today. That is, to re-examine the fateful steps taken (or not taken) which made each disaster inevitable. For example, the failure to analyse the deep faults in Europe's mercantile system which led to societies' inequalities and wars (as revealed by Smith, Hobson, etc.). Recognise these shortcomings as the basis of their undemocratic behaviour: aggressive trade and wars between the powers, including those fought over the spoils gained by colonising and enslaving 'lesser peoples'. Freely admit that all this was common practice and the core reason for what misled major powers into larger counter-productive wars between themselves. That is most important for all to keep in mind as we analyse the basis of all previous wars because, never properly considered and openly debated, the underlying mercantile system has been allowed to continue on (in all its catastrophic ways) unquestioned, and thus simply accepted 'as normal'.

This is made very clear in Adam Smith's writings where he condemns the very nature of the mercantile political economy of his day, its unfairness, exploitation of home and international citizens by monopolies and other ways of cheating: wars, plunder, slavery etc. However, those who have benefitted from the mercantile system have not accepted Smith's judgement. Instead, it has been either 'overlooked' or systematically misrepresented as supporting the idea that in 'free' markets, 'greed is good' because wealth, maximised at the top, is allowed to trickle down. However, as clearly evident, none of this has improved the plight of those disadvantaged. Instead, as industrialism expanded (benefits below remaining minimal) profits at the top have continued to grow enormously. Moreover, as Adam Smith historian Gavin Kennedy made clear, all evil features of evolving Western economies (low wages, monopolies, colonisations, plunder, slavery, wars, etc.) remained ascribable to the ever greater excesses of the mercantile political economy. (see Gavin Kennedy's 'Adam Smith's Lost Legacy' for Feb. 26, 2011

<http://adamsmithslostlegacy.blogspot.com/2011/02/> (i.e., his response 'Comment') For more on mercantilism and Adam Smith, see Gavin's reviews of '*Learning From Adam Smith*', https://emeritus.anu.edu.au/members/ian_buckley/pages/Adam_Smith_Essay.pdf

Readers may also find this essay useful; the validity of its content having been vouched-for by the (the late) Gavin Kennedy, the highly-esteemed Adam Smith historian, Professor at the Edinburgh Business School, Heriot-Watt University and Managing Director of Negotiate Limited). For these essay reviews, see

(1) <https://adamsmithslostlegacy.blogspot.com/2010/12/australian-accurate-on-adam-smith.html> and (2) <http://adamsmithslostlegacy.blogspot.com/2014/01/>

Mutual Survival: Base Materialism Out the Window

Thus viewed, the background histories of both World Wars opens the way for a fresh start on abolishing war by instituting just and fair economies, a 'package deal' which could solve these two vitally important problems, such clearly essential for the survival of species. Hence, before it is too late, now is the time for all to begin afresh, to constitute a parallel, universally-fair, workable economic system that can deal with the mess today's

world is in from centuries of over-production, wars, wastage, pollution of air, land and sea. Moreover, we must all seriously assess one's own needs in relation to the needs of others, most especially those of future generations. Just think of the predicament all are in, as long foreseen by scientists like David Attenborough, David Suzuki and many other insightful people including Pope Francis Bishop of Rome in his wonderful *Laudato Si, On Care For Our Common Home*.(PFBR) Likewise, the suffering and enormous economic wastage from ever-recurring conflicts, - as the extraordinarily insightful Pope John XXIII related in his *Pacem in Terris* on the universal catastrophe of nuclear and other war.(PJXXIII) Put together, these losses make future life not just unstable but totally untenable. Accordingly, the urgency of transforming our chaotic economy into one that is sustainably just, one fair for all. On this, Smith recognised the primacy of natural capital as the source of all real 'wealth' which supports the world's living species (what we must think of as 'Common Wealth'). Hence, humans must think of Nature as part of the Commons with themselves as *Nature's custodians* (as do Australian Aboriginals). For, it is vitally important that true democracy becomes a central feature of economies the world over. Moreover, to support today's and future generations of all the world's living species, it is essential they be conserved for their own sake.

Of course, due to impending widespread environmental catastrophes, everyone wants healthy survival for their families throughout life. Logically that makes urgent strong lobbying across all electorates to attain fairly-based remedial government programs, something not in evidence to date. For, without such fiscal stimuli the alarming increase in today's environmental crises will cut short the lives of both our's and future generations. That is common sense since all such crises stem from *centuries* of over-production, since 'too much' was never enough to satisfy the West's elite sectors. Consequently, the build-up of toxic cancer-causing chemicals and oil-derived plastics, etc., which are contaminating the biosphere (human and other) everywhere: throughout the air we breathe, the land, cities, crops, forests, waterways and oceans. Obviously, a gigantic task, but it must get started. Here two major problems stand out. Overwhelming in so many regions, climate change must be stopped short, all sources blocked. Likewise, since all are self-destructive, wasteful, tragic and in every sense grossly contaminating, the world's numerous wars must promptly cease. To ignore this is to hasten world-wide catastrophe.

Indeed, industrial production must be limited to peoples' essential needs. Since all superfluous production will exaggerate both toxic contamination and climate change, we must choose security above all, - i.e., world-wide comfortable survival for selves and offspring. As Pope Francis recognises, excessive production and wealth diversion at the high finance level, has brought the world to its near-paralysed state. For these, together with blood-soaked armaments and wars, continue to undermine the natural world we live by. Ongoing habitat loss and species extinction are far advanced. Indeed, unless we act our species will be included. So let's not go beyond the point of no return. (Keep in mind, The Doomsday Clock now reads **100 seconds to midnight**, a decision made by The Bulletin of Atomic Scientists, January 23, 2020.)

Accordingly, efforts must focus on establishing *continuity of appropriate* life-supporting sectors of today's largely paralysed economies across the world. For this, economist **Professor Michael Hudson** gives enormous help through his quite remarkable book,

Killing the Host and How Financial Parasites, and Debt Bondage Destroy the Global Economy, a ‘must-read’ work now freely available online at:

http://store.counterpunch.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/08/Killing-The-Host_PDF_V7.pdf (MH1), Complementing the book, see also his two 30-min. YouTube interviews with Chris Hedges:

1. *Days of Revolt: How We Got to Junk Economics – YouTube*
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=m4ylSG54i-A> and,
2. *Days of Revolt: Junk Economics and the Future - YouTube*
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=cMuIoIdVWI>

These sources are highly revealing of the problem’s background as well as ways for humankind to establish sustainability for future generations by blocking the top-heavy financial parasites that currently dominate Western economies, It is indeed an extraordinarily well-thought-out work, beginning with an extremely-informative Introduction outlining Hudson’s realisations gained from the world of international finance (over time, he exposing one wealth-grabbing scheme after another); - and concluding with **Chapter 29. The Fight for the 21st Century** (p. 306-323) which indicates what can be done to stimulate key functions of today’s near-paralysed economies, - brief excerpt (MH1, p. 308) hereunder which lists, then expands on:

Ten Reforms to Restore Industrial Prosperity

1. Write down debts with a Clean Slate, or at least in keeping with the ability to pay
2. Tax economic rent to save it from being capitalized into interest payments
3. Revoke the tax deductibility of interest, to stop subsidizing debt leveraging
4. Create a public banking option
5. Fund government deficits by central banks, not by taxes to pay bondholders
6. Pay Social Security and Medicare out of the general budget
7. Keep natural monopolies in the public domain to prevent rent extraction
8. Tax capital gains at the higher rates levied on earned income
9. Deter irresponsible lending with a Fraudulent Conveyance principle
10. Revive classical value and rent theory (and its statistical categories)

Finally, let me encourage all concerned about our present world’s fast-failing flawed economies to take on the remarkable wisdom contained in Michael Hudson’s extraordinary unexcelled work: His exposition of the extreme threat to life on earth which sectors of homo sapiens have brought upon the biosphere; And, given the will, the ways this very real threat may be overcome to sustain the lives of the young and future generations.

SOURCES

- Allan, Percy. How to Avoid a Recession – why QI should replace QE
<https://johnmenadue.com/percy-allan-how-to-avoid-a-recession-why-qi-should-replace-qe/> August 2018 (PA)
- Blum, William. Rogue State: A Guide to the World's Only Superpower, Zed Books, London,; Spearhead, South Africa, 2001.
<http://kalamullah.com/Books/RogueState2002updeditionWilliamBlums.pdf> (WB)
- Buckley, Ian. Australia's Foreign Wars: Origins, Costs, Future?! 2002
http://emeritus.anu.edu.au/members/ian_buckley/pages (IB1)*
- Buckley, Ian. A Case History: Britain, Empire Decline, and the Origins of WW1: Or, Might the Lessons of the Boer War have 'Saved the Day'.
<http://www.britishempire.co.uk/article/casehistory.htm> (IB2)*
- Buckley, Ian. The WW1 Gallipoli Campaign: Aims, Options, Outcomes
<https://www.britishempire.co.uk/maproom/australiagallipoli.htm> (IB3)
- Buckley, Ian. Learning from Adam Smith - Help at Hand Today, Online essay, 2009
http://emeritus.anu.edu.au/members/ian_buckley/pages/Adam_Smith_Essay.pdf (IB5)
- Buckley, Ian. From Adam Smith to the Present Mess via Depressions and Two World Wars: A Short History of Economic and Christian Corruption Across the West, 2014
http://emeritus.anu.edu.au/members/ian_buckley/pages/From_Adam_Smith_to_the_Present_Mess_via_Depressions_and_Two_World_Wars.pdf (IB7)
- Buckley, Ian. Mercantile Origins of the Western World's Current Moral, Economic, Military, Political and Environmental Crises: A Short History of Humankind's Militarized Over-Expansion.
http://emeritus.anu.edu.au/members/ian_buckley/pages/Mercantile_Origins_of_the_Western_World's_Current_Crises.pdf 2016 (IB9)
- Buckley, Ian. The 1899 & 1907 Hague Peace Conferences to Prevent War & Weapons of Mass Destruction, IB1 Appendix B
<https://www.britishempire.co.uk/article/australiaswarsb.htm> (IB11)
- Buckley, Ian and Fominas, Nikolaus The West's Long-failed Economic System Where to From Here? July 2017,
https://emeritus.anu.edu.au/members/ian_buckley/pages/The_West's_Long-failed_Economic_System_-_Where_to_from_Here.pdf (IBNF13)
- Buckley, Ian and Fominas, Nikolaus, Reconstitution of The World's Self-Induced Failing Civilisations, June 2019)
https://emeritus.anu.edu.au/members/ian_buckley/pages/Reconstitution_of_The_World's_Self-Induced_Failing_Civilisations.pdf (IBNF18)
- Churchill, Winston S. The Spirit of the Budget, In Liberalism and the Social Problem, p.362-3, Hodder & Stoughton, London 1909. Also online:
<http://www.gutenberg.org/ebooks/18419> (esp. RHS Numbered Paras 362-365) (WC2)

- Churchill, Winston S. *The World Crisis*, Vi, 1911-14; Vii, 1915, Thornton Butterworth, London, 1927. (WC3)
- Churchill, Winston S. *The Aftermath - being a sequel to The World Crisis*. Macmillan, London, 1944. (WC4)
- Churchill, Winston S. *The Gathering Storm*, In, *The Second World War*, Vol.1, Penguin, London, 1985. (WC5i)
- Clark, (General) Wesley. *America's Foreign Policy Coup*, Speech at Commonwealth Club, California, San Francisco, October 3, 2007
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=TY2DKzastu8> (GWC)
- Cummings, Bruce, *Americans once carpet-bombed North Korea. It's time to remember that past*, <https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2017/aug/13/america-carpet-bombed-north-korea-remember-that-past> (BC3)
- Day, David. *Conquest A New History of the Modern World*, Harper Collins, Sydney 2005. (DD1)
- Day, David. *The Great Betrayal: Britain, Australia and the Onset of the Pacific War 1939-42*, W. W. Norton, New York, 1988 (DD2)
- Diamond, Jared. *Guns, Germs and Steel, A Short History of Everybody for the Last 13,000 Years*, Vintage, Sydney, 1998. (JD)
- Edwardes, Michael. *The West in Asia 1850-1914*, Batsford, London, 1967. (ME)
- Eisenhower, President Dwight D. *Mandate For Change 1953-1956: The White House Years*, Doubleday, 1963, p.3 (PDE1)
<https://nsarchive2.gwu.edu/nukevault/ebb525-The-Atomic-Bomb-and-the-End-of-World-War-II/>
- Eisenhower, President Dwight D. *Farewell Speech*, January 17, 1961
https://www.eisenhowerlibrary.gov/sites/default/files/file/farewell_address.pdf (PDE2)
- Gilbert, Martin. *The Roots of Appeasement*, Weidenfeld and Nicolson, London, 1966. - (MG1)
- Gilbert, Martin. *A History of the Twentieth Century Vol. 1, 1900-1933*, Harper Collins, London, 1997. (MG2)
- Gowrie, Lord Alexander, Governor-General of Australia, *Address opening the Australian War Memorial* November 11, 1941. (Canberra Times, 11/11/1941)
http://emeritus.anu.edu.au/members/ian_buckley/pages/appendix_1.pdf (LG)
- Hamilton, Sir Ian. *A Staff Officer's Scrap-Book*, Edward Arnold, London, 1905 (IH2)
- Hitler, Adolph. *Mein Kampf*, Pimlico, London, 1992
<http://gutenberg.net.au/ebooks02/0200601.txt> (AH)
- Hobson, John A. *Imperialism: A Study*, James Pott, New York, 1902.
http://files.libertyfund.org/files/127/0052_Bk.pdf (JH)

- Hudson, Michael. Killing the Host: How financial parasites and debt bondage destroy the global economy. Electronic edition, 2015, http://store.counterpunch.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/08/Killing-The-Host_PDF_V7.pdf (MH1)
- Hudson, Michael. On Contact: The history of debt forgiveness <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=AdPukQ96vEA> (MH2)
- Hudson, Michael. Days of Revolt: How We Got to Junk Economics <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=m4yISG54i-A> (MH3)
- Hudson, Michael. Days of Revolt: Junk Economics and the Future <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=cMuIolidVWI> (MH4)
- Kennan, George F. The Fateful Alliance: France, Russia, and the Coming of the First World War, Manchester University Press, 1984. (GFK1)
- Kennan, George F. The Failure of Our Success, talk, Council on Foreign Relations meeting New York, as published (NYT Archives), New York Times, March 14, 1994. <http://www.nytimes.com/1994/03/14/opinion/the-failure-in-our-success.html?pagewanted=all> (GFK 2)
- Kennan, George F. Foreword to Norman Cousins' The Pathology of Power, Penguin Books Canada, Ontario, 1987 (see IB9, Appendix 2) (GFK 3)
- Kennedy, David, Rise to Power: Professor David Kennedy on American History, of Militarism, ABC RN, Background Briefing, October 21, 2001 <http://www.abc.net.au/radionational/programs/backgroundbriefing/rise-to-power-professor-david-kennedy-on-american/3500516> (DK)
- Kennedy, Gavin. What Is Wrong With Mercantile Political Economy? In Adam Smith's Lost Legacy, Sat. February 26, 2011. See Gavin's 'Comment' on Ian Fletcher, under, <http://adamsmithslostlegacy.blogspot.com/2011/02/> (GK)
- Kennedy, Paul, The Rise and Fall of the Great Powers: Economic Change and Military Conflict from 1500 to 2000, Fontana Press, London, 1989 (PK)
- Kennedy, President John F. On the great significance of world peace Commencement Address at American University, June 10, 1963 <https://www.jfklibrary.org/archives/other-resources/john-f-kennedy-speeches/american-university-19630610> (JFK)
- Kennedy, Robert F. Jr. Why the Arabs Don't Want Us in Syria: They don't hate 'our freedoms.' They hate that we've betrayed our ideals in their own countries –for oil. POLITICOMAGAZINE, February 22, 2016. <http://www.politico.com/magazine/story/2016/02/rfk-jr-why-arabs-dont-trust-america-213601?o=0> (RFKJr.)
- Keynes, John Maynard. The Economic Consequences of the Peace, Macmillan, London, 1920. <http://www.gwpda.org/1918p/keynespeace.htm> (JMK)
- Knott, J.W. Korea and the threat of world war NAA: A11099, 1/11, 15 February 1951 <http://www.adri.govt.nz/collection/explore/cabinet/notebooks/events-issues-1951.aspx> see, p. 40, para. 5. (JWK)

- McCarthy, John. A Last Call of Empire Australian Aircrew, Britain and the Empire Air Training Scheme. Australian War Memorial, 1988. (JMCC)
- Manson, Jock. Personal Communication, 53 Squadron RAF historian 1990 (JM)
- Pope Francis, Laudato Si', ON CARE OF OUR COMMON HOME, Papal Encyclical http://w2.vatican.va/content/francesco/en/encyclicals/documents/papa-francesco_20150524_enciclica-laudato-si.html (PFBR)
- Pope John XXIII Pacem in Terris ON ESTABLISHING UNIVERSAL PEACE IN TRUTH, JUSTICE, CHARITY, AND LIBERTY APRIL 11, 1963 http://w2.vatican.va/content/john-xxiii/en/encyclicals/documents/hf_j-xxiii_enc_11041963_pacem.html (PJXXIII)
- Potter, Ian. "Commodities Under Rearmament" Business Letter, August, 1950. (IP1)
- Potter, Ian. America well on the way for a Third World War, Melbourne Herald September 21, 1953 (IP2)
- Ronald, Susan. The Pirate Queen, Elizabeth I, her Pirate Adventurers and the Dawn of Empire, Sutton Publishing, 2007 (SR)
- Sachs, Jeffrey. Bursting at the Seams, Reith Lectures, (L1 – 5) BBC, 2007. <http://www.bbc.co.uk/radio4/reith2007/lecture1.shtml> (All, L 1-5) (JSa1)
http://downloads.bbc.co.uk/rmhttp/radio4/transcripts/20070509_reith.pdf (L5 only)
- Sachs, Jeffrey. Ending America's War of Choice in the Middle East, cirsd, <https://www.cirsd.org/en/horizons/horizons-spring-2018-issue-no-11/ending-americas-war-of-choice-in-the-middle-east> (JSa3)
- Smith, Adam. An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations Books I-V, (1776) Edwin Cannan, ed., 5th Edition, Methuen, London, 1904. <http://www.econlib.org/library/Smith/smWN.html> AS_WN)
- Smith, Adam. The Theory of Moral Sentiments Glasgow, 1759. <http://www.econlib.org/library/Smith/smMS.html> (AS_MS)
- Tuchman, Barbara. The Proud Tower: A Portrait of the World Before the War 1890-1914, Bantam, 1970. (BT1)
- Tuchman, Barbara. August 1914, The First Month of the First World War, , Papermac, London, 1982 (BT2)
- Tuchman, Barbara, The March of Folly, Abacus, London, 1984 (BT3)
- United Nations Charter and Statute of the International Court of Justice, San Francisco, 24 October, 1945, <https://treaties.un.org/doc/publication/ctc/uncharter.pdf> (UNC)
- UNESCO film "Slave Routes: A Global Vision" Author's abstract, introduction and resources » 15 August, 2012 (UNESCO)
- Webster, Sir Charles and Frankland, Noble. The Strategic Air Offensive Against Germany, 1939-1945 HMSO, London, 4 Vols. HMSO, 1961 (W&F i-iv)

Acknowledgements. Again I owe an enormous debt of gratitude to the amazing Nikolaus Fominas who has been such a great friend and tower of strength throughout what has been a rather extended gestation period. And yet, ever patiently encouraging, the wonderful Nik has not only been the most helpful discussant and critic of historical data and ideas, but the most extraordinary fixer of formatting and otherwise enabler of the ANU's and Emeritus Faculty's mysterious computing systems. At the same time it has been and remains a great privilege to be part of ANU's Emeritus Faculty.

Dedication: To Allan Edward Buckley and the multi millions of life-denied and other victims of human folly through history caused by the self-awarded 'special privileges' of individuals and groups, claiming exclusive access to land, engaging in unjust trading practices, colonisation, slavery, wars of conquest - plus repeated 'competitive' wars with one another - all of which has brought humankind's civilizations and the world of Nature extremely close to collapse. And, equally to all who work to abolish such counter-productive practices before it becomes too late to provide future generations with what we have left of a much-depleted natural world.

Ian Buckley,
ANU Emeritus Faculty
Australian National University
ACT 2601 Australia.
CV: http://emeritus.anu.edu.au/members/ian_buckley