



# BARAK OZYMANDIAS SAT ON A WALL...

A Political Gestalt Experiment

by Pierre Beaudry, February 1, 2013



## Ozymandias

*I met a traveler from an antique land  
Who said: Two vast and trunkless legs of stone  
Stand in the desert. Near them, on the sand,  
Half sunk, a shattered visage lies, whose frown,  
And wrinkled lip, and sneer of cold command,  
Tell that its sculptor well those passions read  
Which yet survive, stamped on these lifeless things,  
The hand that mocked them and the heart that fed:  
And on the pedestal these words appear:  
"My name is Ozymandias, king of kings:  
Look on my works, ye Mighty, and despair!"  
Nothing beside remains. Round the decay  
Of that colossal wreck, boundless and bare  
The lone and level sands stretch far away*



Percy Bysshe Shelley, (1817)

*“The Constitution’s separation of powers features, of which the Appointments Clause is one, do not simply protect one branch from another. These structural provisions serve to protect the people, for it is ultimately the people’s rights that suffer when one branch encroaches on another.”*

The US Court of Appeal for the District of Columbia Circuit.  
January 25, 2013.

---

---

**THE POLITICAL GESTALT FUNCTION OF THE NAIL THAT LOST A KINGDOM.**

The January 25, 2013 US Court of Appeal decision against Barak Obama's violations of the American Constitution is going to be a historical watershed for more than one reason. Yes, Obama is guilty of those crimes against the US Constitution, and he will be going down in history for the traitor that he is; but, there is another aspect of this Court decision which I wish to bring to the attention of the reader, which is that this historical legal decision provides us with a unique political gestalt of axiomatic change that the human species is currently experiencing in this present worldwide moral breakdown crisis. American citizens are uniquely situated to arm their leadership with such a change in the coming period. No other citizenry is capable of doing it.

The irony of this Court Decision lies in the fact that it has all the appearances of being a routine decision ruling over an alleged unfair labor practice in the District of Columbia against the National Labor Relations Board (NLRB), while, in reality, it is a case which cannot be disposed of without indicting the President of the United States for crimes against the Constitution of the United States. As the Introduction of the Court decision states:

“While the posture of the petition is routine, as it developed, our review is not. In its brief before us, Noel Canning (along with a movant for status as intervenor whose motion we will dismiss for reasons set forth hereinafter) questions the authority of the Board to issue the order on two constitutional grounds. First, petitioner asserts that the Board lacked authority to act for want of a quorum, as three members of the five-member Board were never validly appointed because they took office under putative recess appointments which were made when the Senate was not in recess. Second, it asserts that the vacancies these three members purportedly filled did not “happen during the Recess of the Senate, as required for recess appointments by the Constitution. U.S. Const. art. II, § 2, cl. 3.” ([United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit](#), Argued December 5, 2012, Decided January 25, 2013, p. 3)

Obama made the labor appointments by overriding the authority of the Senate, and therefore, he subverted the separation of powers established by the Constitution. Thus, what was a routine question of negotiating wage and pension increases turned out to become the first indictment in the entire history of the United States of a President of the United States for abuse of power. This is the case of the horseshoe nail that lost a Kingdom. As the story was told by Benjamin Franklin:

*“A little neglect may breed mischief...  
For want of a nail, the shoe was lost;  
for want of a shoe, the horse was lost;  
for want of a horse, the rider was lost...”*

Benjamin Franklin, *Poor Richard's Almanac*, preface (1758)

In other words, because Obama did not wish to be bothered by the Senate on his appointments to the National Labor Relation Board (NRLB), this little undesirable situation has now threatened his complete demise. This is how sometimes stupid and arrogant people shoot themselves in both feet. The interesting part of this story, however, is still to come.

# United States Court of Appeals

FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

Argued December 5, 2012    Decided January 25, 2013

No. 12-1115

NOEL CANNING, A DIVISION OF THE NOEL CORPORATION,  
PETITIONER

v.

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD,  
RESPONDENT

INTERNATIONAL BROTHERHOOD OF TEAMSTERS LOCAL 760,  
INTERVENOR

Consolidated with 12-1153

On Petition for Review and Cross-Application  
for Enforcement of an Order of  
the National Labor Relations Board

*Noel J. Francisco* argued the cause for petitioner. With him  
on the briefs were *G. Roger King*, *James M. Burnham*, and *Gary  
E. Lofland*.

*Miguel A. Estrada* argued the cause for *amici curiae* Senate  
Republican Leader *Mitch McConnell* and 41 other members of  
the United States Senate in support of petitioner/crossrespondent  
*Noel Canning*.

[http://www.cadc.uscourts.gov/internet/opinions.nsf/D13E4C2A7B33B57A85257AFE00556B29/\\$file/12-1115-1417096.pdf](http://www.cadc.uscourts.gov/internet/opinions.nsf/D13E4C2A7B33B57A85257AFE00556B29/$file/12-1115-1417096.pdf)

---

This historical legal decision is like Schiller's Cranes of Ibis and is hanging over the head of every member of the US Congress, like a sword of Damocles, which is about to fall on their heads at any moment. What this means is that the Court of Appeal decision is like a gestalt picture being projected on the minds of every member of Congress, as a test case for the discovery of a hidden mental image representing the significance of Obama's crimes with respect to the American Constitution. This US Court of Appeal decision is also causing a revelation in the minds of the American population made to coincide with the current strategic crisis.

Barak Obama has committed many illegal actions during his reign as President of the United States over the last four years, but, all of a sudden, like a gestalt of disparate spots projected on the flat wall of Plato's Cave, a hidden image is beginning to stand out which most people have not yet seen the significance of before; an invisible image hidden inside of a gestalt picture and generated inside of your mind, which represents all of the Constitutional crimes that this President had committed, and which has suddenly become visible for a handful of American citizens. This gestalt takes the form of a forty-seven page court indictment against Obama.

However, there is also another hidden image buried within the hidden image of this legal gestalt, which is not too difficult to discover, which is the image of your congressman's ass hanging out of his office window. You cannot see it with your eyes for reasons of dignity, but you can see it very well with your mind's eye. The great advantage of this legal action is that it now gives a cover for your congressman's former fears of telling the truth, and provides a shield for him to hide, thus giving him the opportunity to become truthful at last. The Court actually ruled:

"This will not do. Allowing the President to define the scope of his own appointments power would eviscerate the Constitution's separation of powers. The checks and balances that the Constitution places on each branch of government serve as "self-executing safeguard[s] against the encroachment or aggrandizement of one branch at the expense of the other." *Buckley v. Valeo*, 424 U.S. 1, 122 (1976). An interpretation of "the Recess" that permits the President to decide when the Senate is in recess would demolish the checks and balances inherent in the advice-and-consent requirement, giving the President free rein to appoint his desired nominees at any time he pleases, whether that time be a weekend, lunch, or even when the Senate is in session and he is merely displeased with its inaction. This cannot be the law." (Op. Cit., p. 26)

This decision is, in essence, the rejection of the Carl Schmidt argumentation in favor of expediency such that Adolph Hitler had taken for the purpose of circumventing German Constitutional law. And this is why the US Court concluded:

"We cannot accept an interpretation of the Constitution completely divorced from its original meaning in order to resolve exigencies created by — and equally remediable by — the executive and legislative branches. [...] In any event, if some administrative inefficiency results from our construction of the original meaning of the Constitution, that does not empower us to change what the Constitution commands. As the Supreme Court observed in *INS v. Chadha*, "the fact that a given law or procedure is efficient, convenient, and useful in facilitating functions of government, standing alone, will not save it if it is contrary to the Constitution." (Op. Cit., p. 39)

Here, the Court decision is applying its full power of effectiveness in making sure that whatever convenience or expediency that might have been used against the other two powers of government, as pretext to be defined as primary, cannot stand as reasons to counter the Constitution's intent. And then, suddenly, everything comes together and Obama becomes completely boxed in. That's the gestalt function of the law. There is no way out. There are, currently, 42 Republican Senators who have already signed an *Amici Curiae* in support of the Petitioner/Cross-respondent Noel Canning. Where are the Democrats? Where do they stand on the Constitution?

The most fascinating aspect of the dynamics of our federal government is that it is made up of three different powers, the Supreme Court, the Congress, and the Presidency. All three must act on each other as three different minds seeking congruence among them in such a manner that one does not outstretch its own power over the other two, but instead, increases the power of the other two in balance with reason and for the benefit of the general welfare of the American people. As Leibniz put it:

“All beauty consists in a harmony and proportion; the beauty of minds, or of creatures who possess reason, is a proportion between reason and power, which in this life is also the foundation of the justice, the order, and the merits and even the form of the Republic, that each may understand what he is capable, and be capable as much as he understands.” (Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz, [On the Establishment of a Society in Germany For the Promotion of the Arts and Sciences](#), 1671.)

“The form of the Republic” implies that citizens must be educated in this principle of proportionality between reason and power in a manner such that the creative powers of others are prioritized and made to be in congruence with the constitutional framework of the political power of a constitutional government. This does not imply the adoption of the democratic form of thinking from the bottom up, but the adoption of the republican process of thinking from the top down, from the vantage point of the three-mind congruence as those minds were involved in establishing the Peace of Westphalia. This means that the principle by means of which one is capable of knowing as much as he is capable, and capable of as much as he is able to know, requires the rejection of the democratic principle of going along to get along, and necessitates the adoption of the principle of the advantage of the other. This also means that, when it is required, one has to dare go against the ruling authority.

This may sound strange to most people, but the idea of sharing with people is no damn good. What is good is the benefit of the other. That's the only good thing in the universe. Therefore, what must be corrected in your way of thinking is the democratic fallacy that sharing is good. The so-called “golden rule” of mutual benefits is an illusion. The principle involved is not: “I'll scratch your back if you scratch my back.” You ask me why this democratic principle is false. The reason is because the idea of so-called “mutual benefits” always ends up being to the disadvantage of others. It ends up signifying that you are willing to do to the weaker as the stronger does to you.

On the contrary, the general welfare clause of the American Constitution implies that you work exclusively for the benefit of *increasing the power of others*, especially those of the future generations yet unborn. This is the only form of necessity for mankind. That is the only law of progress for mankind. And if mankind doesn't adopt it very soon, it will be doomed. That's the long and the short of it.

---

But this begs a most important question: “Why is there no other possible purpose to mankind than the advantage of the other? Why is this intention of improving others the only necessary intention for mankind’s survival?” The reason is because it is a natural imperative that the next generation be better than the preceding one, and that every effort must be made by society to realize that objective. That is why man’s reason for existing is located exclusively in the future. That is how human society must work. If this purpose is not explicitly established and fostered, mankind will die.

This is where the creativity of mankind’s progress comes in as the only intention that mankind can have in the entire scheme of things. As Lyn put it, “Mankind’s power to create is voluntary. The animal is involuntary. It’s a characteristic of the species.” And, I might add that if this is a characteristic of the human species, the reciprocal is also true, which is that when human beings do not voluntarily act for the improvement of the future of mankind, they become like animals.

Moreover, if some of us succeed in demonstrating this power by actually increasing energy-flux density for the benefit of all of mankind, then, this proves that anyone else can also do it, if one is willing to put his mind and his back to it. However, since that harmony had been broken by the Presidency of Obama, the Court decision has now taken a stand in favor of restoring the checks and balances for that purpose, because the outweighing shift in favor of the Presidency had forced itself upon the domain of authority of the other two. Thus, the balance has to be brought back to a harmonic congruence among the three powers of the Federal Constitution.

However, as Lyn showed, these checks and balances are not the basis of our Government; they are merely the Constitutional shadows of the Leibnizian balance between reason and power expressed in this triply-connected constitutional arrangement. This is where the true underlying principle of increase in energy-flux density to improve the powers of labor is located. As Lyn explained:

“The purpose is *not* checks and balances. The checks and balances are deterrence against what must not happen. But without a commitment to what must happen, checks and balances lead you into disaster. Because all they become is friction.

“[...] Checks and balances do nothing for the nation. They simply deter, presumable, but they’re not very efficient. Because the only thing that’s efficient is actually increasing the productive powers of labor.

“[...] So the purpose of government is to foster creativity, and to make it realized. This is what our species depends upon, and our species is unique; in everything we know about living processes, we are the only one who have a voluntary means of growth and survival. We can create growth by our will, by our intellect and will. No other species can do that.” ([LYNDON LAROUCHE AND THE LAROUCHE PAC POLICY COMMITTEE DISCUSSION](#), Monday, January 28, 2013)

Thus, the purpose of government is not checks and balances, but increasing the power of the human mind to change the universe by increasing the energy-flux density of the human species. And, what makes this Court of Appeal decision so interesting is that this intention is inescapable. As the case of

a gestalt experiment demonstrates, the proof of this power is in the pudding, that is, it comes from the fact that, when you seek and discover the hidden image of a gestalt picture, after you have failed to see it at first, your discovery can no longer be undone after you have seen it. It hangs over you like the Cranes of Ibis, or like the God-giving Holy-Spirit on Pentecostal Day. The US Court of Appeal decision is also causing such an increase in power to take place in the minds of people, because truth is beauty and beauty is truth, and the Supreme Court Judges don't even know that yet.

This is the gestalt of the current world axiomatic crisis that everybody has been scared to look at and that few people have been anticipating with enthusiastic devotion. Although very few people have recognized the hidden image of Obama's demise, this is precisely the time reversal political gestalt that everybody is going to be forced to look at in the immediate future ahead.

Barak Ozymandias is about to have a great fall. This is a time bomb that will explode many times over, each time that someone who did not want to see the truth is finally forced to see it, and only after Ozymandias is down and buried in the sands of history will humanity have its day. That is the beauty of the irony where this Court decision will become completely corrosive for Obama, because it has within it all of the ingredients of the nail that lost the Kingdom.

FIN