



From the desk of Pierre Beaudry



**THE TRAGIC PARADOXES OF THE THIRTY YEAR'S WAR
AND THE SUBLIME PROCESS OF THE PEACE OF WESTPHALIA.**

(A clinical-strategic study)

8/7/6

by Pierre Beaudry



INTRODUCTION: ARE WE ENGAGED IN ANOTHER THIRTY YEARS WAR?

As it has been widely reported by Lyndon LaRouche since the events of 9/11/01, the unraveling of the Wars in Southwest Asia, and more recently, the invasion of Lebanon by Israel, have been premeditated by a Satanic Synarchist International banking cabal out to destroy, explicitly, and by name, the civilization of the Peace of Westphalia and its system of sovereign nation-states. The current world financial crisis, and the Wars in Southwest Asia are the result of deliberate policies which are intended to push humanity into perpetual warfare, much resembling the genocidal conditions of the Crusades, and of the Thirty Years War of 1618-1648. This is the reason why the present invasion of Lebanon by Israel has all of the characteristics of a dynamic economic function leading to its self-destruction, and to World War III.

During the 17th century, Europe was bankrupt, and the negotiation efforts of the Peace of Westphalia were met with very much the same fears, and the same tendencies to submit to fears, as we see today with the immediate collapse of the currently doomed world financial system. The same imperial and neo-colonial mental characteristics that existed in the 17th century are still with us, today, in the form of a Synarchy International central banking system run by such Nazi-Satan worshipers as Felix Rohatyn and George Schultz. The feudal oligarchical lordship of the Venetian-run Habsburg Empire had the very same mind-set as the oligarchical warlord-banking puppet masters of President George W. Bush, and Vice-President Dick Cheney, who are attempting to consolidate their satanic would be globalization dictatorship regardless of whether nation-states are

destroyed or not. This is what Saint Paul had identified as the real evil of the {*Principalities and Powers.*}

However, the paradoxical anomalies that the process Peace of Westphalia negotiations introduced in the middle of the 17th century represent both very tragic, and at the same time, very sublime moments, which were quite unique in the whole of the history of mankind and which should serve as examples of how to fight for the sovereignty of nation-states today. The Thirty Years War circumstances were tragic situations that had been created by the Venetian imperial oligarchical system of Ultramontanism. The Venetian controlled Ultramontane Papacy in Rome was aimed at destroying sovereign nations-states that Charlemagne, the Jewish Radanite Ambassador-Merchants of the Khazar Kingdom, and Haroun al-Rashid had initiated at the turn of the 9th century AD, and whose principle had been reestablished by Nicholas of Cusa during the Italian Renaissance.

It was this Venetian Ultramontane predecessor to the current Synarchy International that launched a massive anti-Semite campaign against the Jews and the Muslims, during the 10th and 11th century, and which is being replicated again today through the same international oligarchical banking centers. The Synarchy International's intention of this second millennium is exactly the same as that of the first millennium Crusades, and the same that conducted the Thirty Years War. However, the solution of the Peace of Westphalia was brought about through the resolve of one individual, Cardinal Mazarin. Today, one more time, the world is fortunate to have another Cardinal Mazarin amongst us, in the person of Lyndon H. LaRouche Jr. who has explicitly proposed returning to the principle of the {*Advantage of the other*} of the Peace of Westphalia with the Roosevelt New Bretton Woods policy in order to secure the rights of sovereign nation-states against this Venetian-Anglo-Dutch New Imperial World Order.

1. HOW « HISTORY GUIDES THE WILLING, AND DRAGS THE UNWILLING. »

It is impossible to properly identify the events of the Thirty Years War, without confronting the tragic imperial {*hereditary principle*} of oligarchism that initiated it with the superior sublime principle of the {*Advantage of the other*}, the power of {*agapè*}, that guided Mazarin to put an end to that war. The war had been such an excessive tragic butchery of humanity resulting in Germany's population being reduced from 16 million to 4 million people in thirty years of war, while no less than 30,000 villages and towns were destroyed. In order to set boundary conditions that will be respectful of the historical specificity of the Thirty Years War, I shall use one guiding feature that stood out from among all others, during the entire period of the war, and which was the case of Palatine. Today, « Palatine » could be spelled as « Palestine. »

I will now show how the principle of the Peace of Westphalia put an end to the war in 1648, by solving the crisis in the Palatinate which had been the trigger that started

the war in the first place, back in 1618. But, first, let me give you the context in which this war was initiated.

The Thirty Years War started with a Venetian fabricated religious conflict over the electorate of Palatine and ended with the partitioning of the same electorate, for the benefit and the advantage of the other, that is, for the benefit of the Protestants. The tragic war had been triggered by a Venetian deployment to get the bigoted Catholic Austrian Emperor, Ferdinand II, to light the flames of a so-called religious war between the Protestant Elector of Palatine, Frederick V, and his close childhood friend and brother-in-law, the head of the Catholic League and brother in-law, Maximilian of Bavaria. However, those were merely the puppets that were manipulated by the central banking system of Venice. The real purpose of the war was the complete destruction of sovereign nations-states.

In 1621, more fuel was added to that explosive conflict and the war rapidly spread outside of Germany, when the same Venetians got Spain to end their truce with the Netherlands, and got them to renew hostilities, which had started 50 years earlier. After Louis XIII of France and Gustave Adolphus of Sweden decided to join their forces in order to come to the assistance of the Protestant Princes of Germany, in 1631, the rest of Europe began to be plunged into this so-called religious war through one provocation after another, by the same Venetian central banking interests. This conflict had been rigged to become a perpetual war with the aim of imposing the rule of the Habsburg Empire over all of the dismembered nations of Europe.

Even though the Swedes were eager to grab the territory of Pomerania, and the French under Louis XIII and Richelieu were dreaming of recapturing the old Lotharingie Empire on the west bank of the Rhine River, these different carrots, luring the different parties into acquiring more territories, was not of a crucial significance, because the motives behind the Venetian oligarchy was never greed as such, but *{power}*, pure satanic power of manipulating entire human populations as herds of cattle and culling them. What was at stake in this war was the difference of principle between the power of the empire and the power of the general welfare. As it is, again today, with Felix Rohatyn and his worldwide Conferences of Mayors, the fight is between the central banking control of an imperial system of feudal cities, or the republican constitutional control of sovereign nation-states.

By 1635, Spain was at war with France, and then Portugal joined the allies of France, along with Savoy, Italy, and Franche Comté. By that time, the whole of Germany was ablaze and the only nations of Europe that were not involved in the Thirty Years War were England, Poland, and Russia.

A first serious attempt at stopping this genocidal cycle of plundering and vengeance, and restoring peace to Europe, was made 18 years after the war had begun. In 1636, Pope Urban VIII, proposed to become the personal mediator between the Catholic powers in Cologne. However, when the Imperial forces of Austria and Spain jointly invited France to come and negotiate, without the presence of her Protestant allies,

France refused to go. And even if the French had gone, neither Austria nor Spain would have granted safe-conducts for their negotiators. Furthermore, neither the Netherlands nor Sweden were willing to surrender the lands of the Catholic Church that was demanded of them by the Imperials as a precondition to the negotiations. The Imperial conditionalities for conducting peace negotiations were simply mad and this first Vatican attempt failed miserably. However, this was the period when Urbain VIII realized that the only way to stop this tragedy was to change the axioms that led to the war in the first place. So, in 1639, he sent to France his personal envoy and negotiator, Giulio Mazarini.

Cardinal Gilles Mazarin and Comte d'Avaux were both sent to Cologne as plenipotentiaries. D'Avaux had been an ambassador conducting diplomatic relations with Sweden for a number of years, and Mazarin had been a skilled ambassador of the Vatican, ever since Urbain VIII had become Pope in 1623. Initial discussion began in Cologne concerning the choice of cities for future negotiations, and on how to solve the difficult question of safe-conducts for the negotiators. The Imperials were not interested in the peace and the Habsburg Emperor decided to hold a diet at Ratisbonne instead. The diet was always the imperial format in which the Habsburg Emperors measured their power and control over the German Electors.

A breakthrough toward a peace began on December 25, 1641, when a preliminary treaty was signed in Hamburg by the mediation of King Christian of Denmark. The difficult question of safe-conducts was resolved and the decision was taken to hold negotiations for the Catholics Princes and the French in Münster, while the Protestant States and the Swedes would meet in Osnabrück. The negotiations were to be held no further than about thirty kilometers apart, in the region of Westphalia.

In 1643, the King of Denmark proposed April 28, 1643 for the date of settlement of the safe-conducts, and May 15th, for the opening of the negotiations. However, King Louis XIII died on May 14th, a few months after Richelieu had also passed away. This, plus a new series of imperial delaying tactics, had the effect of postponing the negotiations until March, 1644, when a new French Plenipotentiary, Count Abel Servien, replaced Mazarin and joined Comte d'Avaux in Münster, two days before the Mediator of Pope Urbain VIII, the Nuncio Chigi, arrived in the same city. Mazarin was recalled to Paris and was nominated Prime Minister of the French Regent, Anne of Austria.

For Mazarin, the idea of the Peace of Westphalia was not something that simply happened to grow and develop out of the course of that human tragedy, as a sort of by-product, or outgrowth, of the military circumstances of the Thirty Years War. It was an idea whose time had come, but from the outside of the drama itself. The solution to the conflict represented the historical discovery of how to apply the personal governing principle of {*agapè*} to the social interactions between governments and nations. In other words, the personal governing principle had to become intrinsic to the general welfare of sovereign nation-states: a principle which was willfully and deliberately chosen to change the course of European civilization at the level of international affairs. The principle of the Peace of Westphalia was so powerful that, when the tragic leaders realized they were

about to lose everything, they decided to change their axioms. It was only a matter of time, when the situation became so untenable that history began to lead the willing and drag the unwilling into opening the road to establishing sovereign nation-states everywhere in Europe.

2. TWELVE CHARACTERS: THEIR PARADOXES AND CONTRADICTIONS.

The real tragic stage of the Thirty Years War included the following list of twelve players, and their respective anomalies, who were chosen, not only to represent personalities in their own specific historical settings, but also because they represent the anomalies which are characteristics of the wars that had been tearing apart Europe ever since the creation of the Habsburg Empire. This first identification of anomalies will then be followed by an examination of how the Thirty Years War was created and manipulated by the Venetians, and how the five-year period of the negotiations of the Peace of Westphalia (1643-1648) led by Mazarin finally put a stop to this insanity.

The overriding force that brought the entire process of negotiation of the Peace of Westphalia to an extraordinary success, in October of 1648, was caused by what Lyndon LaRouche has called the application of the « *{Dirichlet Principle}* », that is, the realization that each small part of the peace process had the power to affect a change in every other part of the whole, and that if one paradox did not unleash such a power throughout the whole process of the negotiations, another one did. The specific explosive axiomatic potential that all such anomalies embodied was that, out of historical necessity, each of those anomalies reflected an increase power in the rate of change of the failing diplomatic, military, and political axioms of the preceding two centuries. Thus, each one of the following twelve anomalies had the power to bring about a real solution to the crisis, the only such solution since the powerful Italian Renaissance of Nicholas of Cusa had given rise to the first commonwealth nation-state of France under Louis Onze.

1-The **Prime Minister of France, Cardinal Gilles de Mazarin (1602-1661)**, was the genius who had discovered a unique way to raise the personal governing principle of *{agape}* to the level of governing relationships between nations. Following the principle of justice of Plato and of Saint Paul, the principle of social justice and general welfare, *{agapè}*, which had been the standard of Nicholas of Cusa during the Italian Renaissance, which was passed on to Jeanne d'Arc and Louis Onze in France, and which had been implemented by Henry VII in England, in the form of the commonwealth of the nation-state, Mazarin was not only attempting to secure the sovereign nation-state of France, but to make sure that Germany would become a sovereign nation-state as well.

Early on, Mazarin was able to forecast that the Thirty Years War would be heading for a general breakdown when the anomalies caused by the fallacies of so-called

« religious warfare » would begin to be overtaken by everyone's necessity to survive. Mazarin knew that he could only win by getting France to sacrifice her own expansionist goals and fight for the benefit of the Germans! There was no guarantee of success. He studied very closely all of the anomalies related to this existential European crisis, including his own, and made the discovery of an applicable universal physical principle that could put a stop to war and bring lasting peace. He ultimately successfully put a stop to the endless cycles of revenge with a principle of general economic welfare that was later carried out by his intendant in France, Jean Baptiste Colbert. This principle alone represented the true power that superceded the policy of violence that the Venetian Party of the Habsburg Empire, had imposed on Europe for a period of no less than 156 years.

2- After the deaths of Louis XIII and of Cardinal Richelieu, in 1644, Louis's wife, the **Regent of France, Anne of Austria**, who was also the sister of the King of Spain, had been won over by Pope Urbain VIII and by Mazarin to the principle of the *{**Advantage of the other**}*, and consented that France put end the war against the Habsburg Empire in defense and in favor of the interest of the Germans. Anne was a truly generous person who wanted a true peace for Europe. As a French Queen, she was willing to fight for the freedom of the Germans of both Protestant and Catholic denominations, because the real issue of winning the peace was economic justice for all people. Since Louis XIV was only 10 years old in 1648, his mother had given the control of the government to Mazarin, who would not have been able to successfully negotiate the Peace of Westphalia without such a royal understanding and consent.

3- The Plenipotentiaries, **Henri of Orleans, Duc de Longueville; Comte d'Avaux; and Abel Servien**, were the three primary French negotiators who took care of the day-to-day discussions at the Münster and Osnabrück negotiating tables. They were accomplished Ambassadors who were completely steeped in the principle that Mazarin wanted to implement to end the war. Of all of the negotiators of the Peace of Westphalia, they were ostensibly the only ones who had a complete understanding of Mazarin's intention. The French Plenipotentiary paradox was: « *{**We cannot win the war against the Habsburg Empire unless the German Electors joined the French forces, but France cannot win over Germany to her side, unless she sacrificed her own interest for the benefit and the advantage of all of the German states and principalities.**}* » After announcing to the Princes of Germany that the negotiations were exclusively for their own benefit, and not for the benefit of France at all, they established that the only condition for their attending the Münster and Osnabrück meetings, was to negotiate « in good faith » for their own interest.

4- The **Elector of Brandenburg, Frederick William**, played the role of a neutral Elector of the Habsburg Empire who had been able to apply an economic form of the Mazarin principle within the borders of his own German region. He was the first Elector to convince many others to come to the negotiating tables in Westphalia. During the period of the negotiations, Frederick William expressed to Mazarin the crucial anomaly that he was confronted with, and which stated: { *I agree with the Mazarin principle of the Advantage of the other*}, but, if I apply it to myself, I am going to get killed. }

5- In 1618, while Bohemia was being manipulated by Venice to initiate a revolt against the Emperor, Ferdinand II, the transfer of the Palatinate and its Electoral dignity to the **Maximilian, Duke of Bavaria**, triggered the beginning of the Thirty Years War. The Duke was the primary ally of the Emperor of Austria, and headed, with him, the powerful Catholic League. (3) Because of this crucial alliance, the Duke was the most important German leader that France had to rally to her side in order to stop the war against the Habsburg Empire, and win the peace for Germany. The Duke of Bavaria was also caught in a deadly paradox, which reflected the contradictory wartime condition that every German leader had to address, at one moment or another. The anomaly can be stated as follows: { *It is clear that if I maintain my alliance with the Emperor, the war is going to go on, and I am going to lose everything. However, if I negotiate the peace, I am going to have to sacrifice everything for the benefit of France.* }

6. The **Vatican Papal Nuncio, Fabio Chigi, Bishop of Nardo**, was the key Mediator of the Peace of Westphalia. He was an ally of Pope Urban VIII, who had deployed Mazarin to be the advisor-negotiator to Louis XIII, in 1639. During the negotiations, Chigi always leaned on the side of justice, and took the responsibility of being the official watchdog of the Venetian Mediator, Louis Contarini, who was put officially under his command by Mazarin. The historical account that Chigi was a « resolute opponent » of Mazarin at Münster is simply a lie concocted by Venice and by the Integrist-Ultramontane faction of the Catholic Church. The apparent disagreement over the issue of Mazarin not wanting peace was a fallacy that Mazarin had identified and clarified in a letter to Servien, as we shall report below. Regardless of the Contarini attempts at sabotage, the relationship between Chigi and Mazarin reached the intended peace result.

Both Ultramontanism (Roman Church) and Gallicanism (French Church) were synthetic forms of imperial ideologies, and both were run by the Venetians against Mazarin and Chigi to destabilize the Peace negotiations. The role of Chigi was twofold: one, he represented the interests of the Vatican, and two, he was a moderator among the Catholic belligerents of different countries. Both commitments had made him a defender of Mazarin's view of the { *Advantage of the other* }. However, after the death of Pope Urban VIII, in 1644, the new Integrist-Ultramontane Pope, Innocent X, was so upset with Chigi's refusal to organize against the peace that he wrote a bull { *Zelo Domus Dei* }

(1648) against the « Protestant heretics » and against the Peace of Westphalia Treaty itself.

7. The **Ambassador of Venice, Chevalier Louis Contarini**, was a mediator at Münster under the control of the Vatican Nuncio, Fabio Chigi. Contarini had more than often been found to be leaning in favor of the House of Habsburg. In point of fact, Venice was running the Habsburg Empire, the Thirty Years War, and was attempting to run the peace negotiations as well. From 1492 until 1648, European history had been dominated by the Venice fondi, the central bank for perpetual warfare; and the rule of warfare manipulation that the Venetians played, each against all, was based on suspicion: suspicion between Catholics and protestants, as well as suspicion among factions inside of each religious denomination. On the Catholic side, the divide and conquer tactic used by Venice was the fight between Ultramontanism and Gallicanism. The policy of Venice was well captured by Blaise Pascal when he stated: *{Since right could not be transformed into might, then, might have to be transformed into right}*.

8- The main **Ambassador of Spain was Gaspard de Bracamonté, Comte de Pegnaranda**, first Plenipotentiary of the King of Spain. This negotiator made the extraordinary move of accepting the Dutch proposal, in the Peace Treaty with the Netherlands, stating that a peace between France and Spain should also be included in the official document of their Treaty as a precondition for the establishment of the Netherlands as a Sovereign and Independent Republic. Mazarin had recommended to the Dutch plenipotentiaries that a way to resolve this *{three-body problem}* between the Netherlands, France, and Spain, was to achieve congruence between the three nations such that one was required to eliminate the difference between the other two. Interestingly, such a « complex domain » problem reflected the manner in which Carl Gauss later developed the physical geometry underlying bi-quadratic residues by achieving « congruence » between three numbers by way of having one of them divide the difference between the other two.

9- The **Habsburg Emperor, Ferdinand II**, was a bigoted Jesuit type who had been convinced by the Venetians that the so-called Protestant « heretics » were deployed to subvert his German Electors, destroy his Holy Roman Empire, and make France the dominant monarchy of Europe. The Czechs of Bohemia were provoked into a revolt against the Emperor in 1618, and Ferdinand's religious fanaticism became the fuel that kept the Thirty Years War going. His mad fanaticism destroyed the Holy Roman Empire which had divided Europe since Charles V, in 1519. It was his son, Ferdinand III, who ultimately signed the Treaty of Westphalia, in 1648.

10- The **French military commander, Henri de Turenne**, executed all of the tactical military advances in conformity with Mazarin's strategy of winning the peace, not the war. At the age of 33, Turenne became Marshal of France, and joined his troops with those of the Prince of Condé to vanquish the imperial troops of the Duke of Lorraine, led by the Count of Merci, at the siege of Fryeburg in 1644. Turenne succeeded in accelerating the end of the Thirty Years War by avoiding a decisive victory over Bavaria. Turenne joined his forces with those of the Swedish General, Charles Gustave Wrangle, during their invasion of Bavaria, and his overpowering threat became instrumental in convincing the Duke of Bavaria to ally himself with France against the Emperor. Turenne later became a traitor and joined the leaders of the Fronde, with his brother, the Duke of Bouillon, against Mazarin and Queen Anne.

11. The Swedish allies of France were the crucial military force that made the difference, on the battlefield, between winning the war and winning the peace. The « new model army » of **King Gustavus Adolphus** was the most modern and most rapidly deployable military force of all of the armies engaged in the Thirty Years War. The joint French and Swedish armies represented a superior military force over the Imperial forces of Austria. However, because the peace plans of Mazarin might have been jeopardized if the army of General Wrangel had engaged the enemy too forcefully, and too quickly, the Swedish army had to be held back from taking too much offensive against the Duke of Bavaria.

12. In the middle of the war, at the crucial turning point of 1630, **General Albert Wallenstein (Albrecht Eusebius Wenzeslaus of Waldstein)**, the "Bohemian Beast," as he had been called, was stripped of his command and disgraced as the leading commander of the Austrian army. He was forced to retreat to his private quarters in Gitchin. The reason for his demise was, reportedly, because "he had obtained absolute power in every part of the Empire", and wished to command the imperial army without any imperial authority over him. Wallenstein's strategy, and his far-reaching reputation as a great military commander, became such that he succeeded in forcing his independence upon the Emperor. As Schiller reported, Wallenstein declared: "No! Never will I accept a divided command. No -- not even were God Himself to be my colleague in office. I must command alone, or not at all." Wallenstein had thus put the Emperor into a deadly paradox:

{Either the Emperor restored Wallenstein as the Commander in Chief of his armies and the Emperor would lose his authority, or, he did not restore Wallenstein, and the Emperor would lose the war by lacking unity of command.}

The irony of this tragic paradox was that the chief cause of the Austrian Empire's defeat was Wallenstein's restoration at the head of the imperial army. This paradoxical situation led to Wallenstein's assassination in 1637, and ultimately brought the demise of

the Austrian army, which became paralyzed by the inability to unify its military command under the leadership of the Emperor. Thus, Wallenstein's strategic plan had played in favor of the demise of the Empire and for the liberation of Germany. Wallenstein had become the Father of German unification. (3)

This assembly of twelve characters was chosen for one specific purpose: to show how their combined interactions became crucial for the implementation of the universal principle of the *{Advantage of the other}* from which was ultimately derived the community of principle uniting the sovereign nation-states of Europe. The key that unlocked the secret of this successful endeavor came from the same principle of international law and general welfare that the *{Monroe Doctrine}* of John Quincy Adams was later to establish as the spearhead of a community of interests for the nation-states of the Americas.

In fact, this form of power of natural law, as LaRouche derived the notion originally from the pre-Aristotelian Greeks Solon of Athens, Thales, Pythagoras, and Plato, which was formulated for the first time in the « *{Concordancia Catholica}* » of Nicholas of Cusa, and applied in the commonwealth of Louis Onze, was also expressed by the Pact of Utrecht, which brought together the unity of the seven provinces of the Netherlands, in 1579. After the Peace of Westphalia of 1648, Leibniz revived it in the form of an anti-Lockean principle of « *{pursuit of happiness}* » which became the constitutional foundation of the American Republic.

3. THE CENTRAL PARADOX OF THE THIRTY YEARS WAR

It was the personal genius of Mazarin that brought about the understanding which historically led the belligerents of the Thirty Years War to come together and accept his negotiating principle, but only at the point where the entirety of Europe was about to be totally destroyed from within. From 1644 until 1648, Mazarin had trained his Plenipotentiaries at Münster to understand that there existed no internal solution to the crisis, and that everyone had exhausted their tragic resources by continuing the war.

The old axioms of warfare, as well as the old axioms of diplomacy had utterly failed, and the solution to the unstoppable crisis had to come from the outside. At least, this was the way that the situation was imposed on France, considering that Louis XIV was too young to rule, that the sister of the King of Spain, Anne of Austria, was the regent ruler of France, and that her Prime Minister, Cardinal Mazarin, was an Italian envoy of the Vatican, the negotiator of Pope Urbain VIII. These combinations of « foreign » interventions, primarily coordinated through the Vatican, gave a distinctive flavor that the issue of peace for Europe was not a French idea at all, nor was it a French decision, but was, in fact, the result of a concerted network of correspondents that had coalesced primarily around Urbain VIII, Bishop Chigi, Cardinal Bentivoglio (1), Cardinal

Mazarin, Anne of Austria, and the Queen of Denmark. It was an ecumenical Europe that was emerging from outside of the Venetian-led Imperial crisis of civilization, very similar to the ecumenical efforts of Charlemagne, Haroun al-Rashid, and the Jewish Radanite Merchant-Ambassadors of the Khazar Kingdom that had been established, around the year 800, during the Carolingian Renaissance against the barbarians of the Roman Empire. And the same enemy, then, was the Imperial Venetian Ultramontane cabal. (2)

Mazarin knew that the desperation of war would irremediably lead all of the warring factions to a general breakdown, a situation that could only be handled with total determination, on his part, to either continue the war for another ten years with total vigor, if need be, or bring all parties to come to terms with his understanding of a lasting peace for the whole of Europe. It was just a matter of time and of social justice. This meant that by the early 1640's, the French-Swedish alliance might have had the means to win the war, but not yet the means to win the peace. The boundary conditions for solving this historical anomaly had to be set with the collaboration of the German Electors, and were expressed by a catch 22 type of paradoxical situation in which the Germans were forced to admit:

{« Either, we continue the war and kill each other off to the very last, or we lose everything by making peace for the benefit of France»}.

On the other hand, the French-Swedish alliance found itself boxed into a similar paradox where the French would have to admit:

{« We cannot win the war against the Habsburg Empire unless the German Electors joined the French forces, however, France cannot win over the Electors to her side, unless she sacrifices her own self-interest for the benefit and the advantage of the Germans.»}

In other words, France could win the war, but could not win the peace against Austria on the strength of her own military forces and of those of her ally Sweden alone. She could only do it with German allies. Thus, the true French self-interest lay in the hands of the Germans. There was no other choice. The fallacy of composition of European diplomacy had come up against the necessity of such a historical axiomatic change: the establishment of an *{agapic}* community of principle between the sovereign nation-states of Europe was an idea whose time had come. Therefore, the Peace of Westphalia could only get started when France, that is, the regent, Anne of Austria, gave the Germans the assurance and the right to prevail over the need she had of them in order to secure a peace with Austria. Such was the *{strategic agapic intention}* that Mazarin used to open the negotiations of Münster and Osnabrück.

However, when the Jesuit historian of the Peace of Westphalia, Father Bougeant, S. J. wrote the history of the negotiation period, he could not bring himself to see the Christian principle of *{agape}* involved here. He could only see the deformed shadows of an evil motivation of power behind Mazarin's « cunning deceptions. » Bougeant wrote:

«*{It was also with this motivation that the Plenipotentiaries were ordered to begin the negotiations with the interests of the Allies in mind, in order to tie them more and more to France by this proof of zeal, and to deter any suspicion that might arise through some infidelity on their part, if they were to decide to begin by promoting their own interests. To this first mean, Mazarin proposed a second one, which was to be no less effective. It was to bring into his own views, that is, to the interest of France, even the allies of the Emperor, as in the case of the Duke of Bavaria, and other Princes and States of the Empire, who supported the party of Ferdinand. And since the perspective of their own self-interest was the only thing that could bring to fruition the success of this project, he (Mazarin) wanted to make them believe, as if that were to be at all possible, that France was completely disinterested in this war, only had an army to defend them, and only had their liberty and security at heart. At least he flattered himself in convincing them, which was true, that if France could obtain the satisfaction she was attempting to get with this Peace Treaty, they would themselves benefit greatly from it, not only because France would have forced the Emperor to restitute to the Nation (of Germany) its ancient freedom and all of its rights, but because, once she were well established in the neighborhood of Germany, she would be able to help the Princes and the States against any attempt of oppression on the part of the Emperor. He (Mazarin), most of all, wanted to get the Duke of Bavaria to realize that, by favoring the demands of France, he would be working for his own benefit, since this was the most infallible means of guaranteeing his control over the High Palatinate and of acquiring the dignity of the Elector. }*» (Père Bougeant, S.J., *{Histoire du Traité de Westphalie}*, Tome II, Paris, Chez Pierre-Jean Mariette, 1764, p. 36.)

The reader should know that Father Bougeant hated Mazarin with a passion, always attempted to depict him as a double-dealing and hypocritical diplomat, and, in his entire history of the Treaty of Westphalia, had not once referred to the principle of the *{Advantage of the other}*, or to the Christian principle of *{agape}*, as the only conceptual basis for the Peace of Westphalia. For Bougeant, the real purpose of Mazarin was to swindle countries into forced agreements by devious means. This was also the conclusion of the founder of the Synarchy, Saint-Yves d'Alveydre, in his *{Mission des Souverains}*. In fact, Bougeant himself admitted that he had failed to understand the secret of Mazarin. In a totally frustrated form of confessional gossip, Bougeant concluded:

«*{In fact, since the success of this enterprise required a profound secret, nothing was more highly recommended to the plenipotentiaries, and they executed their orders so well that it was never possible for the Mediators, nor for the enemies, not even for the friends of France, to ever penetrate the depths of this mystery that was hidden in the policy of Cardinal Mazarin.}*» (Bougeant, Op. Cit., Vol. I, p.37.) As one old Geezer once put it, for a Jesuit, the answer to creativity is always:« C'est le mystère! »

On April 6, 1644, the two French Plenipotentiaries of Cardinal Mazarin, Count d'Avaux, and Abel Servien wrote a circular letter to all of the German principalities,

inviting them to come and negotiate the peace in Münster and Osnabrück. This action represented a turning point that brought about the possibility of a real negotiating dialogue, which had been bogged down for a period of two years, both in Münster and in Osnabrück. However the letter had an absolutely provocative and a slow caustic effect on all of the enemies of France, including France itself, because it was based on the Christian idea of « loving your enemy », which is not exactly the state of mind of a warring party. The letter stated:

« {After several years of delay brought about by the House of Austria and her Allies, and since the French plenipotentiaries traveled to Münster filled with the hope of a soon to be established peace, we were stunned to see that no deputies had been delegated neither from the Electoral College, the Princes, or the States, nor from the particular States that compose the Empire. It was nonetheless in favor of German liberty that France and Sweden had taken up arms, both of them having resolved to leave the territory of those States only after having reestablished all of the States of the Empire in their own rights.

« However, if the Allies of the House of Austria attempted to persuade him (the Emperor) that this invitation was merely a pretext that the two allied crowns were attempting to use in order to lure them into their own particular advantages, it would be easy for those Princes and representatives of those States to judge by themselves simply by coming to Münster and witness everything that would be going on. They would also discover that no general and lasting peace were possible unless it were concerned with all of the States of the Empire. And, since war and peace are not things that concern only the Emperor, France also, has too much self-interest, for the sake of her own security, in promoting German liberty, and to never consent in letting it be oppressed.

« The fact is that this was the primary motivation for the war, especially the fact that the House of Austria had for a long time been accused of aspiring to become the Monarchy of all of Europe, and seemed intent on establishing her center in Germany, on the ruins of German freedom. It is in that spirit that so many rights had been abolished, that laws had been violated, that Magistrates had been despoiled, that Princes and Electors had been banned by the Empire. Still to this day, at the diet of Frankfurt, the Emperor has no other view than to become master of the articles of peace, and if the States did not oppose him, that would be the end of their liberties.

« However, since the most favorable opportunity has arisen to remedy these abuses, the time has now come for you to send your deputies to Münster and to Osnabrück. It was with that intention in mind that France had painstakingly obtained safe-conducts for all of your States, and that if you were to let such precious moments flee, you would find yourselves into trouble when, after the peace had been achieved throughout Europe, you were to discover that your tranquility depended solely on the sovereign goodwill of the Emperor, and even of the Kings of Spain.

« For example, the peace of Prague, which had been settled without your participation, had only become the seed of new troubles, which would have been avoided if you had been consulted. Finally, your honor and your interest, equally, demand that you be present in Münster, because, in an alternate Assembly, you would be playing a very mediocre part in the ratification of the Treaty, and you would never be very well informed of what really happened in Münster and in Osnabrück. Furthermore, the Emperor would very easily become master of the proceedings, over which you would have no control, and communications from one place to another could not be done properly and would cause the negotiations to linger on interminably because of the great distances involved. » (Bougeant, Op. Cit., Vol. II, p. 52-54)

The reader should try to imagine, for one moment, what would happen in Israel today, if the just described state of mind were to prevail, and if the Israeli government were to invite its opponents to such a peace negotiation. This first circular letter was received by the German Princes with complete disbelief. Most of them were initially convinced that the plenipotentiaries were addressing them without the back up of Mazarin and of the Queen of France. Suspicion reigned. They found normal that the allies of France would meet in Münster, but that their enemies were also invited to the same assemblies was very unusual and everyone was taken aback for fear that this would be a trap.

In point of fact, none of them responded and required an official letter from the French Monarchy. Thus, Mazarin wrote a new letter, signed by Louis XIV, five months later, on August 20, 1644, to convince the Germans that the offer was official and serious. At any rate, this first reaction from the Germans begged the question: « How can you tell if this invitation to negotiate is for real or not? What is the difference between this letter of d’Avaux and Servien, and what Bougeant said above about the « insidious plan » of Mazarin? » How can one identify the truth?

At first glance, no difference seems to exist between the two writings. They have the appearance of saying exactly the same thing. But, if one follows the *{intention based on the common good}*, as opposed to the *{intention based on deception}*, one is struck immediately by the existence of the two different manifolds, two different world views, one of which was, in reality, about to supercede the other!

4. HOW WALLENSTEIN’S TRAGEDY WORKED FOR THE UNIFICATION OF GERMANY.

Wallenstein’s degradation by Ferdinand II in 1630, as the head of the Austrian Army, was an important turning point halfway through the war. Fearful of this powerful Commander, the Emperor made the mistake of listening to his advisors and removed Wallenstein from his command, because he wished to keep control over him and maintain his own failing authority as the sole commander in chief of his Empire. In this true to life historical tragedy, the Emperor preferred losing his best commanding officer

rather than having to bow down to what he considered his underling. This Imperial decision was going to cost the Habsburgs the entire war. On the other hand, as LaRouche pointed out, even though Wallenstein recognized the moral need to betray the Habsburgs in order to save humanity, he chose to fail at being effective as a true human being by becoming a self-righteous tragic figure who decided to « feel good » about himself and pursue the oligarchical hereditary principle of *{might makes right}*.

The news of the decision to oust Wallenstein should not have surprised anyone who understood that it should not have been any more unusual for the Emperor to obey his Electors, than it would have been for him to obey Wallenstein as his top military commander. Thus, when a Commander in Chief listens to the ill advice of envious lieutenants, it is the entire central command structure that collapses. The reason for Wallenstein's demise was obvious. Wallenstein was fixated on his own personal « self-interest » which is always a tragic flaw in any commanding position. He was following his own ambition instead of searching for the principle that would have brought everyone the peace. So, it was his apparent triumph as a military Commander that brought Wallenstein's tragic demise.

Wallenstein decided to act in accordance with what he thought was his own self-interest, was biding his time secured in the illusory knowledge that the day would come when the Emperor would require his services again. Meanwhile, Ferdinand feared that Wallenstein would be plotting some revenge against him, and thought it might be better to have him closer at hand, rather than risk the threat of a loose cannon ready to strike back at him with his own independent forces at some unforeseen moment. Wallenstein was known to be able to raise an army overnight. No matter what Ferdinand's rationalizations were, they confirmed in spades the corrosive action of the evil Venetian weapon of « suspicion ».

In the end, the Emperor wrote to Wallenstein, personally, to recall him back as head of Austria's failing army. Wallenstein accepted, but on one condition, that he would be as free, as he had been before, to devise his own independent course. And, again, Ferdinand failed to secure the « unity of command » under his own control when Wallenstein rejected his offer of having his son head the army with him. Wallenstein rejected the offer with the famous words: « *{'No! Never will I accept a divided command. No -- not even were God Himself to be my colleague in office. I must command alone, or not at all.}* »

On the other hand, from the standpoint of Mazarin, the very circumstance which required that Ferdinand be deprived of his authority in the armies of Germany was playing in favor of establishing an independent Germany. After a short period, as soon as Ferdinand had accepted the conditions of Wallenstein's return as the independent head of his own imperial army, this very division of powers meant that German Generals and other Officers began to see themselves as the sole masters of their destinies, and so, the sovereignty of the Empire was passing, ever so insensibly, into the hands of the German military leaders. Hence, Wallenstein had been working for the benefit of the liberation of Germany. After all it was Wallenstein who said: « *{The time has arrived for dispensing*

altogether with electors, and that Germany ought to be governed, like France and Spain, by a simple and absolute sovereign.» (B. H. Liddell Hart, {*Great Captains Unveiled*}, Greenhill Books, London, 1989, p. 178.)

5. THE STRATEGIC TURNING POINT: WINNING THE PEACE BEFORE WINNING THE WAR

While Mazarin was attempting to start the negotiations in both Münster and Osnabrück, both the Austrians and the Spanish Imperials were contesting the nature of the full powers given to the deputies, and were, thus, postponing the beginnings of the negotiations indefinitely. The objections were artificially based on the fact that the imperial deputies could not negotiate based « on good faith alone », without their masters having the right to change the very truthfulness of the proceedings into some fallacy of composition, whenever they so desired. The opposition of the Imperials was based on the objection to the fact that « full powers » meant that the delegates had to have total freedom to negotiate « on good faith » for their own advantages, and that, even if the negotiations were being held in two different places, there was not going to be two peace treaties, but a single one, in which one depended on the other.

Very rapidly, it became clear that the objections of the Imperials were all fallacious, and that they were simply temporizing in order to buy time and postpone the end of the war, or find another pretext for another conflict, by sophistry. Since such an artificial deadlock was more difficult to break than a negotiating process based on « good faith, » the Plenipotentiaries were forced to add different expedients to their patience and made new propositions for full power conditions to be used simultaneously both in Münster and Osnabrück. The Mediators forwarded the new French proposal and the deadlock was broken.

The Swedes were also very upset and were threatening to walk out of the preliminary negotiations of Osnabrück because they were not being given sufficient recognition by the French. The Swedes had several times complained of having been left out in the cold by their ally. In his {*Thirty Years War*}, Schiller remarked that « France had taken upon itself to moderate the advances of the Swedes, by proportioning, perfidiously, the support she was giving to them depending on their success in battle, that is to say, by abandoning them when they were becoming too strong, and by supporting them when they were close to failing. » (Schiller, {*Histoire de la Guerre de Trente Ans*}, traduit par Madame La Baronesse de Garlowitz, Paris, Bibliothèque Charpentier, 1891, p. 448.) This confirms that Mazarin's tactics were to keep the Swedes at arms length because of the delicate negotiating position that Bavaria represented for the peace as a whole.

It was with similar arguments that Bougeant assumed, falsely, that the peace was acquired more by perfidy and by force of arms rather than by negotiating. He was wrong. This false underlying assumption was based on the fact that the German Electors decided

to come to Münster because the French had already militarily conquered the West Bank of the Rhine River. That is false simply because the only intention that could have brought the French to such an advantageous position on the Rhine, in the first place, would have been that of the conscious principle of winning the peace before winning the war. The following will show how this was the case.

At the end of summer 1644, a dramatically new situation had developed. The French Army had just suffered a humiliating defeat at the battle of Dutlingen. This last imperial victory increased the boldness of the Emperor, and at the same time consolidated his alliance with the Duke of Bavaria to such an extent that both of them wished to extend the war further. The two most important allies of the Emperor were the Duke of Bavaria, and the Duke of Lorraine. Mazarin knew that unless he could win the Duke of Bavaria over to his side, he could not win the peace. This is why he was willing to extend the war for « another ten years, » if necessary.

The Duke of Bavaria had been the main leader of the German faction allied to the Emperor. He was bound to him by family ties as well as by Catholic affinity, but he had not yet entered into possession of the High Palatinate that he had bought from the Emperor, and which had been the trigger of the war, back in 1618. The Duke considered that his chances would be very thin indeed, if the French were to conspire to restore the Protestant Prince Karl Ludwig of Palatine to this electorship, since, being a Protestant, he was already a French ally. However, Maximilian also knew that Mazarin was highly interested in giving him the High Palatinate, either by way of arms or by peace treaty, but only if he were to become detached from the Emperor, and join the French alliance with Germany. In this manner, Mazarin would gain the most valuable ally, and his chances of winning the peace for the Germans against the Emperor would, indeed, be very high, if not certain.

The following account will demonstrate how the tactical advances of the French army were following the negotiating strategy of the peace of Westphalia, and not the other way around. The irony was that the best way to demonstrate one's seriousness about peace was to win battles in the war. Mazarin demonstrated in a letter to Servien that, in the gambles of war, it is the loser who wishes to postpone the war indefinitely, in the hope that fortune will soon change to his advantage, and that he will soon be able to win back what he had lost. The argument had been used to demonstrate to Chigi how much he was in favor of peace. On the other hand, wrote Mazarin, « *it is the victor who wishes to bring about the peace as rapidly as possible, wishing not to gamble his advance any further, for fear that ill winds might force him to lose the terrain that he has already gained.* » (Letter LXXXII.) The case in point is exemplified by the major victories of the Duke of Condé and the Viscount of Turenne in defeating the Bavarian regiments on the west bank of the Rhine River, during the campaign of 1644.

After his Dutlingen victory, the Duke of Bavaria had become the master of the region, and made the decision to have the Duke of Mercy lay siege before Fryeburg. Turenne saw in that decision a chance of recovering the honor that the French had lost in the defeat of Dutlingen, and joined his forces with the Swedish forces and those of

Condé. The Bavarians were caught by surprise and became both the siege forces and the besieged forces. Battling on both sides, as it were, the Bavarians entered the city just in time before Condé arrived with 10, 000 new troops. Although the Swedes were too late to save the town, the now larger allied armies of Condé and of Turenne were then ready to battle the formidable Bavarian Count de Merci.

A battle ensued which lasted five hours with great loss expended on both sides. However, Condé succeeded in chasing his enemy and in capturing the high grounds of a hill, while Turenne took control of a well-protected pass to the valley. This near victory required going all the way, but the advance of the Swedish-French alliance was forced to a stand still by the coming nightfall, and Condé decided to suspend the victory and wait until the next day. As could be expected, upon realizing that the French had conquered both the mount and the pass through to the valley, Count de Merci took the wise decision of retreating his forces, under the cover of night, and brought his army out of danger by taking up defensive positions onto the next high ground behind Fryeburg. The next day, after another fierce battle raged, and where both armies lost evenly, the Count de Merci was forced out again and retreated to Hobentwiel. The raising of the siege of Hobentwiel became the first of a series of decisive Bavarian defeats.

Subsequently, the Swedish-French troops acted as if they had become invincible. They were embolden by the encouragement of Mazarin who, at the time, was writing to Turenne every few days, exhorting him to win the battles in order to win the peace, that is, with the intention of sparing the Duke of Bavaria, by not « pushing him to the last hostilities. » (Mazarin Letter XC to Turenne, August 1644.)

On the other hand, the Duke of Bavaria wrote a letter to Mazarin, complaining that Turenne was threatening to invade his entire territory. (Letter from Mazarin to Servien. XCIV.) Here, as the Mazarin correspondence shows, it was clearly the idea of winning the peace by negotiation which drove Mazarin to win the battles, and not the opposite. Turenne was told in no uncertain terms that his invasion of Bavaria was not aimed at extending the borders of France into Germany, but was aimed at forcing the Duke of Bavaria to change side, in order to win the peace. Indeed, Mazarin was demonstrating that he had no intention of winning the peace by simply winning military battles and gaining territory.

During the following weeks, taking advantage of the favorable situation, Turenne and Condé took Manheim and Spire, then Philisburg which required only 11 days of siege. From that moment on, the French soldiers did not even take the time to pitch their tents and dig trenches in front of the towns. They took Landau, the Castel of Magdeburg, Bingen, Baccarach, and Creutznach. Both Worms and Oppenheim opened their doors to Turenne, and Mayence gave itself up to Condé under such advantageous conditions that the Prince of Mayence decided to join the allies of France and signed up, on the spot, for the negotiations at Münster. The French troops were increasing in numbers as they were moving ahead because the Germans would join them in proportion to their conquest. During this whole campaign, France gained control of the whole region of the Rhine River, from Basle to Cologne.

As it were, the Imperial forces of Ferdinand were even worst off on the Elbe River than the Bavarians were on the River Rhine. Not only was the Emperor losing on the battlefield, but also he was at his wits end in attempting to stop the French Plenipotentiaries from recruiting more allies from among the German States of the Empire. By September of 1644, the negotiations broke down one more time, because the Imperials could not approve of the French terms that said: « ***treating jointly with our allies*** ». The Imperials were making difficulties at every word, attempting not only to postpone the negotiations, but trying to force a negotiation where each article, and each state, were to be treated separately.

The Count d'Avaux made it clear that France intended to simply conclude a peace jointly with all of the Princes and all of the towns: « A resolution that the King of France would never depart from. » It was made utterly clear that the negotiation could only go forward if the Princes and the States of the Empire were to send deputies representing their own « self-interests ». As an added difficulty, the Venetian Mediator, Contarini, even went as far as to propose that all the « self-interests » of the German allies of France should be managed by the French Plenipotentiaries, just as those of the Empire, be managed by the Emperor's Ambassadors. The Imperials and the Venetians never stopped attempting to deter the German Princes from sending their own representatives to Münster and to Osnabrück, and the Emperor was so desperate that he almost called for a diet at Ratisbonne, where he was to preside, himself, in order to discuss the solutions to the different German problems, under his own authority.

On September 4, 1644, the French Plenipotentiaries sent a second circular letter, in which they reiterated their initial offer and added that they were even disposed to accept uneven conditions. The second letter stated that « ***We have already extended the olive branch, and have even accepted inequitable conditions that were proposed to us... and we have also even abandoned some of our rights and some rights of our allies as well...because it was purely out of kindness that the King, purely out of love for peace, to which he decided to sacrifice all of the rights which were his by virtue of the preliminary Treaty ... because the King gave us the power to accept all of their demands, and we are disposed to do that, what could be holding you back from this moment forward ? Let us get together, each on his side, let us chose the formulas, the clauses, the precautions, the terms that you wish, even to the point of completely exhausting the Mediators, let us eliminate anything that might cause umbrage to the most defiant mind. We shall consent to everything providing that our Adversaries agree, in advance, to negotiate in good faith.*** » (Bougeant, Op. Cit., Vol. III, p. 601.) This last opportunity was too good to miss. The allies of the Emperor were shocked to hear such language and, this time around, were totally pleased to accept those negotiating conditions which favored only them and not the French. At that point, the Germans no longer had any doubts as to the intention of France and its disposition toward their benefit. They began to send delegations to the Westphalia region.

The Elector of Brandenburg, Frederick William, and the Elector of Cologne, were the first ones to call upon the Bishops of Wirtzburg, the Dukes of Mekelburg, of Saxony

and of Wurtemberg, the Prince of Anhalt, and several other representatives of Imperial cities, to write back to the King of France and tell him that they were accepting the invitation of the French Plenipotentiaries. Even Count de Trautmansdorff, under the pretext of leaving Vienna to visit his properties, went to pay a visit to the Duke of Bavaria, in order to convince him to join the Münster negotiations. This was a major breakthrough. After three weeks of recriminations both the Emperor and the King of Spain finally gave up all of their litigious points, and accepted all of the French Plenipotentiaries conditions. It was based upon a true understanding of the « intention » of this second letter that most of the German allies of the Emperor finally decided to come to Münster for the negotiations, in 1644.

6. THE PARADOX OF THE DUKE OF BAVARIA AND THE PROCESS OF AXIOM BUSTING.

As the negotiations immediately opened, the first propositions put on the table were from the French Plenipotentiaries. They were formulated in a general outline that included three essential points: 1) A general amnesty; 2) A return to the state of affairs of 1618; and 3) A pulling out of all of the French troops from the soil of Germany.

Such a disinterested proposition not only disconcerted everybody but also smashed all of their usually accepted axioms. The expression Bougeant used was « *it broke up all measures* » ». The reaction of Bougeant was entirely clinical. At first, he could not believe that the French Plenipotentiaries could propose something that was so contrary to their own self-interests. Even modern historians are incapable of figuring out the significance of this principle of {*magnanimity*}. Bougeant was convinced it had to be a ruse, and that being the case, he thought that if the Emperor were to accept the proposal, France would be in a real pickle, because, either the Plenipotentiaries would be forced to renege on their pledge, in which case it would be a dishonor for France, or they would have to keep their word and it would definitely be prejudicial to France. Either way, thought Bougeant, it was definitely detrimental for France.

As a result, Bougeant reported mistakenly that this proposition had « *broken up all of the Duke of Bavaria's measures, and had caused all of his hopes to vanish* » ». This is an interesting comment because the proposal was an axiom buster, but it had precisely the opposite effect: in fact, of giving a much greater hope to the Duke of Bavaria and to others. Here, the potential of the {*Dirichlet Principle*} had been fully activated and the news of these « French proposals » had the effect of imploding the axioms of everyone in the German negotiation teams from Münster, Osnabrück, and from Vienna.

Within a matter of days, the unbelievable news was announced in every Catholic and Protestant church in Europe. The peace was at hand.

The French attempts at rallying the Duke of Bavaria, Maximilian, to the Crown of France goes back to the Treaty that Louis XIII made with him in 1631. But, because of

the Duke's alliance with Ferdinand II, the French never succeeded in breaking him away. As a result, France created a military alliance with Sweden. It is important to understand, here, that the alliance with Sweden would not have taken place if the Duke of Bavaria had joined with France earlier on behalf of the interests of Germany. It is with that in mind that Mazarin will keep the Swedish army of Wrangel at arms length, and attempt everything to accommodate the Duke of Bavaria in the hope of forcing him to break away from the Empire.

The mission was not an easy one. Maximilian was a proud man and his commitment to Ferdinand II was not superficial. Both were school comrades at the same College of Ingolstadt, when they were young, and they had remained friends since then. However the death of Ferdinand II, in 1637, broke the most sacred bond that had tied the House of Bavaria with the House of Austria for so long. Maximilian did not have with the Emperor's son the same ties of friendship and obligation. That was the time when the Duke began to show some interest for the French proposals.

Schiller gave a clear estimate of how the Duke of Bavaria was overwhelmed by the military circumstances during the beginnings of the negotiations. He wrote: « ***In fact, the Brandenburg, governed by a great man, had adopted the neutrality system; Saxony was also forced to accept that course. Spain, being harassed from all sides could no longer make sacrifices in order to feed the war inside of Germany; Denmark had already pulled out with its peace treaty with Sweden, and a long truce had condemned Poland to inaction. In order to reduce the Emperor to a complete isolation in the middle of his huge empire, and put him at the mercy of France, all that remained was to pull Maximilian away from his cause, and nothing was neglected in order to obtain that result.*** » (Schiller, Op. Cit., p. 444.)

In 1644, Maximilian, was getting old and feared that if a Peace Treaty was not signed before his death, the new emperor would take over his army and his Bavarian leadership role as head of the Catholic League. He also feared that the Peace Treaty might force him to renounce his rights over the High Palatinate Electorate, which he had lost at the beginning of the war. Because of this, he was more favorable to a Truce than to a Peace Treaty. He also feared the fact that a reduction of the superiority of the House of Austria would also correspond to a reduction of his own House, if a victorious France were to restore the Palatinate to the Protestant son of Frederick V, Charles-Louis. That is why, what the Duke of Bavarian feared most of all was that, if France were to win, he would lose everything to the interests of the French crown.

However, the Duke of Bavaria also entertained the thought that if the Queen of France wished so desperately his alliance, she would have to respond positively to the requests he would ask of her. Thus, it was clear that France would have to help the Duke reconquer what he had lost since 1618, including the electoral dignity of the Palatinate. Moreover, it was also an open secret that France was quite capable of reinstating the Protestant Prince Charles-Louis as Elector of Palatine, and that the French army of Turenne, which had made a victorious advance along the Rhine River during 1644, was

quite capable of invading the borders of Bavaria, and include Charles-Louis within the ranks of his army. All of these thoughts, and more, were besieging the Duke endlessly.

As a result of this increase in density of singularities, a paradoxical anomaly began to take form in the Duke's mind at one end of which a dark cloud appeared to be dominating his thoughts in which he could only see himself going down in defeat. The paradox he was grappling with can be formulated as follows:

« {Either I continue the war, in an alliance with the Emperor and I lose everything to a French military defeat, or I break away from the Emperor to make peace, and I am going to have to sacrifice everything for the benefit of France.} »

Thus, after examining what was possible and what was not possible, the Duke of Bavaria began to see things he had never seen before, and entertained thoughts that he had never thought before. The impossible began to be possible. He began to consider giving up the axioms that were condemning him to death, one way or another. He had not yet discovered how to get out of the mess he had himself helped create, thirty years before, with the collaboration of Venice and the Emperor, but he knew he had to get out of the situation he was in before he died of old age.

The military leaders of the older generation, of which he was part of, had either all been killed, or were dying out. A new generation, which was born during the Thirty Years War, and which knew no other life than the culture of destruction and the sophistry of court intrigues, had convinced him that he had to take a courageous stance against the Empire. He did not understand the younger generation of leaders, hated them, and did not trust a single one of them. However, instead of continuing fighting them, he decided to find a solution and not leave the new generation to its own destructive devices.

Somehow, the Duke discovered he had to leave something immortal behind, after his own mortality had passed away, and which was to serve the next generation. He had finally realized that the Empire was the cause of war, that it was the Venetian and Austrian financial system, with their banking cabal, that were the cause of all the destruction of the last thirty years. Those were the circumstances in which the Duke was introduced to the Mazarin solution. He was made to realize that he could not solve his dilemma without destroying the House of Austria's power grip over Germany.

Furthermore, the restoring and growth of the economic well being of his own people could not be sustained unless all of the states of the Empire were united and freed from war to develop and expand their agriculture, industry, arts, and were able to restart commerce by organizing a massive canal and river infrastructure system that would unite all parts of Germany. In other words, the potential that one part of Germany was able to realize, would have a decisive impact on all of the other parts, something akin to the transformation of the whole of the German society, similar to the rural electrification that Roosevelt created in the United States after World War I.

Thus, the advantages that Bavaria was being offered by France were not for the benefit of the Duke alone, but had to be shared with the rest of Germany. In other words, the idea of a community of principle, typified by John Quincy Adams, for the development of the Americas, began to take hold in Maximilian's mind. The Elector of Brandenburg, Frederick William, had entertained the same idea.

Therefore, the Duke's fear of seeing French power encroaching more and more over the States of Germany began to dissipate and his fears were transformed, instead, into a burden of responsibility that he had the pleasure of undertaking on behalf of other regions of Germany. Thus, the idea of a unified nation-state of Germany was born, based on the general welfare of all Germans. From that moment on, it became clear to the Duke that if he wanted France to help him achieve the unity of his own region by securing for him the Electorate of the High Palatine, he had to help France unify the rest of Germany into a potential republican nation-state, and had to be willing to cede the Lower Palatinate to the Protestant, Charles-Louis. In point of fact, Charles Louis was given first opportunity to be the recipient of the advantage of the other. The Catholics began to work for the benefits of Protestants, and Protestants were rapidly made to realize that their interests resided in sharing back the same benefits with the Catholics. Maximilian of Bavaria had discovered the means of ending all wars!

In the end, Maximilian realized that there was really no other intention in the Peace of Westphalia than for the nation of France to grant him these benefits under the condition that he accepted doing the same for his fellow Germans in the other states and principalities. Thus, a lasting peace meant the fostering of the benefits to those of the other faith.

Moreover, the Duke of Bavaria's fears of seeing the German party of France becoming more and more powerful, as the power of the Emperor were to diminish proportionately, also began to make total sense to the extent that he realized that his leadership, in initiating this benefit to other German regions, with the help of France, would be so well received by other German Princes, that his own actions, in this regard, would greatly contribute to the safety not only of his own state, against any French danger of invasion, but this would also become the best defense and security against any encroachment by the House of Austria against any other State in Germany.

Therefore, in October of 1644, the Duke of Bavaria made a crucial decision and wrote letters to Cardinal Grimaldi in order for him to intercede in his favor with the court of France. Mazarin replied to Cardinal Grimaldi that if the Duke was sincere, he should send his representative to Münster in order to open the negotiations. At the same time, in order not to offend the Duke of Bavaria, Mazarin prevented Charles-Louis of Palatine from joining the French armies, which were, at the time, in control of the Palatinate.

In order to show his good intentions, the Duke of Bavaria released his French prisoner of war, Marquis of Noirmoutier, and sent him to Paris with the Jesuit Père Verveux, his confessor. Mazarin's patience had finally paid off, as he then told the Queen: « *All I can count on is myself and time* ».

Mazarin was very happy because the example the Duke of Bavaria was setting had caused a shock wave throughout Germany. Most of the other Electors were convinced to join the negotiations as well, especially the Elector of Mayence who had already sent an ambassador to Paris. The attachment of the Duke of Bavaria to France would weaken so much the position of the Empire that it would also force the Emperor, by then Ferdinand III, to consider treating with France separately and independently from Spain. However, Mazarin rejected all of the offers of the Duke of Bavaria to negotiate separately in Paris, because this would have divided his own forces and would have given the Swedes, who would have been offended, the opportunity to attempt a separate peace with Vienna.

The proposals of the Duke of Bavaria were as follows:

1. The Duke asks the King of France to take him under his protection, with his entire House and States, including his brother, the Elector of Cologne, pledging not to give any assistance of men and money against France and its Allies, and preventing the Viscount of Turenne from making any hostile move against Bavaria.
2. That the Circles of Franconia, Swab and of Bavaria receive the same grace, under the condition that they keep all of their advantages, rights and privileges, without demanding anything of them that would go against the Emperor and the Holy Roman Empire.
3. That the Duke of Bavaria keeps all of his troops within his states and that they remain armed in case of some revenge on the part of the Emperor.

France was willing to accept discussion of any proposal, provided it were initiated in good faith, but it could not be done from Paris, because that would set a precedent for separate peace negotiations. The court of France immediately sent these propositions to be discussed in Münster with the provision that these same proposals be made public and sent to the Emperor so that no misunderstanding could stand in the way of the negotiations, in any form of defiance on the part of the Imperials or from the Spaniards, who were already spreading the lies that the Duke of Bavaria was about to sign a separate peace Treaty with France in Paris.

The response was also made to the Duke of Bavaria that it would not be prudent at all to give to the Viscount of Turenne the military order that the Duke was asking before the Treaty had been signed, unless the Duke was willing to disarm his troops immediately as a proof of his peaceful intention. The Duke agreed and sent a delegate to Münster.

This defection of the Duke of Bavaria was a deadly blow to the empire, and opened new possibilities for the German Catholic Union. Mazarin was then determined to bring the issue to resolution and to use French military victories to accelerate the peace process. After the victory of Condé at Norddlingen, Mazarin decided to press the

envelope on the Duke of Bavaria. However, on the one hand, he feared that a major victory against the Duke might bring him to ruin, on the other hand, he feared that a lack of resolve on his part might push the Swedes and the Protestants to increase erratically their offensive against Bavaria. At any rate, as long as the Duke maintained his affiliation with the Emperor, the Swede and French troops would have control over his territories and Mazarin would maintain a daily monitoring of the situation.

Then, on March 14, 1647, after a year of seeing his territories being taken piece by piece, the Duke of Bavaria signed a truce with France and Sweden, by which he was announcing that he was officially abandoning the Emperor, who was then, the young Ferdinand III. This was a major breakthrough for the prospect of peace because the continuation of the war rested on William's continued alliance with the Habsburgs. The Imperials were furious and cried high treason, but without avail. It was too late to turn back, the deed was done.

During the summer of 1647, despite the fact that the Duke of Bavaria was momentarily pulled back onto the side of the Emperor, Mazarin pressed on with Condé's army. After Condé won a major victory at Lens, it became clear that France had the capabilities of taking on Spain all by itself. The French, then, gave the decisive blow. As the Duke of Bavaria was still hesitating, Wrangel and Turenne led their troops into Bavaria and the old Duke, who was seventy four years of age at the time, was forced out of his capital city, Munich. Meanwhile, the Swedes had invaded Bohemia and had taken Prague. These last victories of the allies finally broke the will of the Emperor and both he and the Duke of Bavaria opted for peace at last. Ironically, the war was about to end precisely where it had started.

7- THE FREEDOM OF THE NETHERLANDS AND THE THREE BODY PROBLEM

In the opening first chapter of his *{Disquisitiones Arithmeticae}*, Gauss established a very simple and beautiful principle of « congruence » underlying the process of counting numbers from the standpoint of the complex domain. Gauss stated that such a congruence could always be achieved between any three numbers A, B, C, when A, divides the difference between the two others, B and C. Then B and C are said to be congruent with respect to A. It was with a similar measure of « congruence » applied to solving the difficult problem of involving peace between three countries, such as the Netherlands, Spain, and France that Mazarin helped the Netherlands achieve their independence in May of 1648, a few months before the Peace of Westphalia itself was established. As we shall see, though the process was subverted and was ultimately made to fail, the effect of this type of « congruence » acting upon the process of the Peace of Westphalia as a whole, had the force of generating a « potential » which resulted in rapidly spreading the remedy of this type of solution everywhere else in all of the negotiating teams of the Münster and Osnabrück negotiations.

The solution to this kind of problem became available to the plenipotentiaries when Mazarin responded to the difficulty the negotiators of the Netherlands had in attempting to reduce the level of conflicts between France and Spain. The Netherlands were a key ally of France during the Thirty Years War, and the better elements among the Plenipotentiaries wanted to cause a durable peace process to take hold between France and Spain.

Three years after the Münster negotiations had begun, the French Plenipotentiary, Count of Servien, was sent by Mazarin to La Haye to deliver an extraordinary speech to the leaders of the Seven Provinces, inviting them to join France in a common peace agreement that would lead to the creation of the Sovereign and Independent State of the Netherlands. The significance of this durable peace was not only to give a decisive blow to the Hapsburg Empire, especially by ending the Spanish war that had lasted for eighty five years, but also had the effect of forestalling the creation of the Anglo-Dutch Liberal designs on the continent. A strong Treaty of Friendship between Holland and France was viewed as the strongest possible guarantee of peace for the whole continent.

The idea of Mazarin was not simply a peace treaty, but the establishment of a lasting peace after the Treaty had been signed. Servien said : « ...I have orders to sign with your Lordships, in the least possible time, the last resolutions to conclude a general peace, and to come to agreement with you, that both parties sign Treatises for the execution of a durable peace after the conclusion of war had been reached.[...] We have to make it known to our enemies that because of our union, they could never contravene against the Treaty between us without having to fight France and the United Provinces at the same time... » (Bougeant, Tome III, p. 102.)

The problem solving process involved in this statement was actually triggered by an insult from the Venetian Mediator, Contarini, who stated that the Netherlands delegation « did not have the judgment, the dexterity, nor the necessary resolution to conduct such a delicate negotiation. » (Bougeant, Op. Cit. Vol III, P. 80.)

It was the Count d'Avaux who suggested in the name of Mazarin that the deputies of the Netherlands should include in the document of their treaty with Spain «*{a clause whereby it was stated explicitly that the Netherlands would not sign the peace unless France was also satisfied.}*» The idea was then taken up to the Spanish delegation by MM. François Donia, Guillaume Ripperda, and Adrien Klandt who also stated quite directly that « *{they refused to ratify the treaty unless the interests of France were to be explicitly enclosed in the same Act.}* »

At that point, the Spanish Plenipotentiary, Antoine Brun, and the Archbishop of Cambrai, went to report this to the Spanish Ambassador, Count Pegnaranda, who seized the moment, but realizing as well the danger that the introduction of France in the treaty arrangement between Spain and the Netherlands might cost Holland its independence. Thus, the alliance between France and the Netherlands held only by a thin thread, which might come to break at the least incident.

However, the amazing feat was that the first Ambassador to the King of Spain, Count de Pagnaranda, about whom both Mazarin and Servien had doubts, came back to the Plenipotentiaries with his decision to endorse the proposal. He stated, without even offering it for debate: « I give my consent that on each sheet of paper, following the articles of agreement and the signatures of both parties, it should be added by the United-Provinces a clause declaring for their part that if France were not in agreement with Spain, the agreement would be null. » And in order to dramatize the event even further, the Spanish Ambassador made a sign of the cross on the table and swore *{por santa cruz}* stating that « his intention was to negotiate in good faith, and to conclude a peace with France. » Thus, all of seventy-eight articles of the Treaty between the Netherlands and Spain were to be signed and ratified.

The official Treaty agreement, which was tabled separately in Münster, was immortalized in the famous painting of *{The Swearing of the Oath of Ratification of the Treaty of Münster, 15 May 1648}* by Gerard ter Borch, and was to include a statement which accompanied the first articles declaring the Sovereignty and Independence of the Republic of the Netherlands, stating:

« {The States of the United-Provinces having engaged themselves in making peace with Spain solely under the condition that it also be done jointly with the King of France, declare that the signed articles with the Lords Plenipotentiaries of Spain, would only have a true Treaty effect, when France were to receive full satisfaction; and we regard this clause as having the same value as if it were inserted in the said articles, and as having the same force and the same authority.}»

This harmonious arrangement, however, was not going to last more than a year, when the Spanish delegates, led by Gaspard Pagnaranda and Antoine Brun, were going to sabotage the plans for the peace treaty between Spain and France.

On January 30, 1648, three of the eight Dutch Plenipotentiaries, Jean Knuyt, Guillaume Ripperda, and François Donia, signed secretly a separate treaty with Spain, including a guarantee of ratification in three months. The news of the event was dropped like a bombshell in Münster and produced the most astonishment among allies and enemies alike. One of the Dutch plenipotentiaries, Godard de Reede Nidershort, was so upset that he refused to sign with his colleagues and wrote a lengthy letter explaining why he considered this to be a dishonorable action on the part of the Netherlands. The French delegation wrote an official reprimand, stating that this was against all of the former alliance treaties between the two countries. Even Mazarin got the 10-year-old Louis XIV to sign a letter to the leaders of the United Provinces, on February 14, 1648, forgiving their mistake but enjoining them to reconsider. Since the ratifications had not been exchanged, they could still refuse, before there should be a completely irreparable offense. However, neither party changed their position: the Netherlands wished to have peace right away, because Spain wished to continue the war with France. Most historians of the Thirty Years War took this « reason » at face value.

However, this sudden decision was never explained, and even Dutch historians, to this day, have concocted all sorts of unseemly stories in attempting to cover up and justify this desire to make peace at all cost, and as quickly as possible. Wanting to reach a peace agreement is one thing, but something very serious must have convinced the Dutch delegation to break their friendship with France; so serious, that they preferred to give credence to an enemy, against whom they had been waging war for over eighty five years. What could have brought about such a sudden unexplained change of heart, just four months before the Dutch Declaration of Independence, and nine months before the signing of the Peace of Westphalia?

There is an explanation which tells a lot about the Venetian type of manipulations that Contarini was a master at, and that the history books have failed to make public, but that Bougeant has reported on, and which is to be found in a letter from M. Lyonne addressed to M. Servien. The letter, which was sent sometimes after February 1648, established that, according to a reliable source in Brussels, there was a visit made by two Dutch plenipotentiaries to Antoine Brun's residence concerning the « ludicrous idea » that there existed a secret negotiations going on between the French and the Spanish crowns. To anyone who wished to believe gossip, this was not unbelievable at all. As unseemly as this story may have sounded, especially in times of war, this was the trap of « suspicion » that the deputies of Holland were lured into.

Spanish Ambassador, François Brun, opened his doors to the Dutch deputies, served them drinks, and, after a few cordial « mazarinades » jokes, he managed to loosen them up and elevated the discussion in favor of the Netherlands sovereignty and independence. Very quickly, Brun had their confidence and their total attention. The Dutch deputies were already prepared to believe whatever their newly found friend was about to tell them on the subject of whatever they wished to know. Brun followed the Venetian rule whereby there is no greater dupe than the one who wishes to believe in someone who is warning him about not being duped.

After having demanded of them total secrecy and an inviolatable silence, about what he was about to tell them, Brun revealed the content of the secret negotiations that he claimed had been going on, behind the backs of the Netherlanders, for some time, between France and Spain. According to Lyonne, « *{he (Brun) told them that he could no longer keep them ignorant of the fact that Spain always had a secret negotiation with France, which could be concluded at any opportune moment, by simply saying « yes », because all that was required was to give consent for the marriage of the Infante of Spain with the King of France, which included the Lower Countries as a dowry... }* » (Bougeant, Op. Cit. Vol. III, p. 358.)

Those two poor Dutch deputies completely swallowed the story, hook, line, and sinker, and hurried back to their delegation after having sworn to Brun that their secret shall remain inviolatable, and thanking him for having shown such confidence in them. This was the epitome of how the Venetian weapon of suspicion worked and won so many battles against the principle of the *{Advantage of the other}*. Once the idea that France's intention could have been to insinuate herself into a peace Treaty with the Netherlands, in

order to be in a better position to take them over, after a marriage with the Infante of Spain had been arranged with the 10 year old Louis XIV, was too unbelievable to be true, unless one's axioms were operating from the assumptions of Venetian suspicion and intrigue. If there had been a price offering for this successful intrigue, Venice would have given Brun the **{Iago Award}** with the qualification of **{summa cum laude}**. A decade later, what had been simply another internal intrigue of the peace process became a reality, when Louis XIV, did in fact, marry the Infante and made a claim for both the Netherlands and the Succession of Spain.

This tragic deception was a replay of Shakespeare's **{Othello}** in which Iago is portrayed as the pure self-centered Venetian taking advantage of others, in opposition to the character of Desdemona whose love and concern for others is the bedrock of her life. It was the Venetian idea of « suspicion », that is, of succeeding in fooling someone, which became the epitome of destruction of the Thirty Years War. Iago's success in fooling Othello came from the fact that Othello was only too willing to be duped by some non-visible enemy « beyond his horizon, » that is, beyond his « anters vast and deserts idle. » Instead of looking into the unseen, beyond the axiomatic rim of his fishbowl horizon, beyond the physical geography of his comfort zone, as LaRouche would say, he was willing to be deceived, and became hooked by Iago into believing that his wife was a whore.

Thus, outside of the national boundaries of the Netherlands, to the south, lived a race of « whorish monsters » whose dark powers could destroy the quiet life of the United Provinces. The protection of the self had suddenly replaced the protection of the friend, and thus, the friends (the others) became monstrous forms « whose heads grow beneath their shoulders. »

8. A CHANGE OF MANIFOLD TO THE PRINCIPLE OF GRATUITOUSNESS.

The lower manifold, which we can call the Venetian **{manifold of deception}**, reflects a series of anomalies which reside at the extreme boundary of the oligarchical system, and which were generally known in the court system as « intrigues.» Such intrigues acted as a function that tended to accelerate the time frame in which the system was breaking down, and exacerbated the axiomatic system of the Thirty Years War which had reached the breaking point by the end of 1644. It was Mazarin's ability to destroy this old Venetian slime mold of creating foreign relations by « intrigues » that put an end to the Thirty Years War system.

The higher manifold of Mazarin, had the effect of causing a non-linear and axiomatic change everywhere inside of the political system of Europe, and did bring about a real solution, a true peace, because it brought about a sublime socializing process that could turn tragedies of « self-interest » into sublime actions of generosity, thus, putting an end to the dominating power of « suspicion ». The replacement on the first manifold by the second, that is, the replacement of « self-interest » by « self-interest of others », proved to be an effective application of a universal physical principle capable of

replacing the source of warfare by a true peace. The uniqueness of what Mazarin introduced as a new rule of conduct resided in the fact that it could only increase the benefits to all, with time. This was the most important aspect of the functional effect of the principle of the Peace of Westphalia.

Contrary to any other known universal physical principle, the use of the *{principle of gratuitousness}* had an effective action such that it was able to grow effectively with time. In fact, everything that God created, including life itself, fritters away, as time goes by, except for an act of giving « gratuitously. » The discovery of principle occurred when one realized that the only thing that effectively grew proportionately with time was the act of giving freely something good to another, without the intention of receiving anything in return. Such an act of benevolence had a power to grow indefinitely in the memory of those who benefited, and was thus, cognitively recognized as being accepted as the pure disinterested gift that it was.

The difficulty, however, in securing this principle for a long period of time, stemmed from the fact that very few European leaders, at the time of Mazarin, understood the lasting virtue underlying this republican idea, and that the great majority of them followed the more practical and socially accepted oligarchical « intention » of Venetian suspicion, instead. This explains the initial reaction of the German princes to the invitation to negotiate by the French Plenipotentiaries. Such were also the reaction of those who assumed that the Peace of Westphalia was to be arrived at in the battlefield rather than at the negotiating tables.

9- THE DEMISE OF COUNT D'AVAUX AND THE SIGNING OF THE PEACE

After having succeeded in creating a division within the alliance between the Netherlands and France, the Austrian Empire considered that a similar tactical move should be used to upset the alliance between France and Sweden. Though the Imperials expended much effort in attempting to shake up the fidelity of the Swedes, it was all done entirely without success. Knowing, at that time, that the Swedes would not sign a separate treaty with Vienna, the main concern of Mazarin was to keep the imperials in check by seeing to it that the negotiations between the Swedes and the Emperor would not proceed at a faster pace than that of the case of France.

An ultimate attempt at sabotaging the peace effort involved the Venetian intervention to split the two French Plenipotentiaries, Servien and d'Avaux, on the eve of signing the peace. While the Duke of Longueville had been called back to Paris, a fight between the two French plenipotentiaries was engineered that resulted in having Count d'Avaux pulled out of the negotiations and fall in disgrace. This was another triumph of jealousy and suspicion, by which the Venetians had convinced Servien to accuse d'Avaux of having intrigued against Mazarin. The deadly Venetian combination was that conjectures and suspicions had been shaped into taking the appearance of true facts.

A story was concocted by Contarini, with the collaboration of one of his spies, Promotorio, and according to which d’Avaux had been preparing to make public, after the signing of the peace with the Empire, the proof of « bad governing » on the part of Mazarin. These accusations were very serious, and the mere fact of having lies stand close to certain circumstances of truthful reality was sufficient to establish the credibility of their connections and hence guaranteed the demise of d’Avaux.

□

The significance of this operation did not lie in the character of d’Avaux himself, but in the clinical characteristic of the Venetian method of warfare. The weapon of suspicion was the most powerful weapon of the Venetians. It was not difficult for the Venetians to make the case against an innocent man. This was precisely the method that Richelieu, himself, had bragged about being his own, and for which he was so hated. As Richelieu put it: “*{If you give me six lines written by the most honest man, I will find something in them to hang him.}*” Thus, Servien succeeded in getting d’Avaux expelled from the Westphalia negotiations, and became the only French negotiator to bring the Treaty to its conclusion.

It was a blessing that the Venetian foul operation of having excluded Count d’Avaux, through the intrigues of Count de Servien, did not disrupt the negotiations in any significant way. Though Servien was to be alone in conducting the affairs in Münster, the negotiations with the Empire were about to be concluded, and those with Spain had already broken down with no hope of being restored. The most important object that remained was to assure that the negotiations began with the interests of the German States of the Empire and that secondarily, both France and Sweden were to advance their own negotiations with the Empire at the same pace, but at a later date. It did not matter which German State was going to be negotiated first, since it was agreed that the Treaty could only be signed until all of the interests had been settled.

However, since the negotiations were first made to accept that the advantage of the other were to be given to the *{other faith}*, the Roman Catholic deputies were all forced to accept that the negotiations should begin first with the Protestants in Osnabrück. As for the interests of the Empire and for France, they were to be conducted later in Münster, only after the *{other faith}* had gotten the chance to satisfy its own interests. The fact that the priority of the negotiations were given first to the Protestants of Osnabrück, and not to the Catholics at Münster, created a lot of resentment in the ranks of the imperials, because Mazarin was providing the living proof that the underlying principle of giving the advantage to the *{other faith}* was going to benefit all, including the imperials who were convinced they were losing.

After the procedures for signing each and all of the points of interest had been accepted by each of the two different assemblies, of Osnabrück and Münster, the two last points of contention that were brought into discussion, and were rapidly resolved, in Osnabrück were: 1) the agreement of a joint Protestant and Catholic administration of justice; 2) the agreement on autonomy of religion, or liberty of conscience.

A number of Imperial delegates in Münster were offended by this, and complained, without gaining cause, that the Protestant Osnabrück deputies had become so bold that they had become the sole masters of the negotiations. The truth of the matter was that the delegates of Osnabrück had shifted the sovereignty of interests from the Empire to the benefit of Germany, without regards to the protests of the imperials, and without their approbation. The reason for their boldness and confidence resided in the fact that, aside from France and Sweden, the main Catholic delegates of Mayence, of Treves, of Bavière, and of Wurtzbourg, had also decided to apply the principle of the *{advantage of the other faith}*, and had traveled to Osnabrück to help the Protestant cause! Servien also went to Osnabrück to negotiate the last item that remained unresolved on the agenda, that was, the secession to France of the three Bishoprics of Alsace, that is, Metz, Toul, and Verdun.

IN CONCLUSION: WHY LAROCHE'S SOLARIAN FORECAST IS RIGHT.

It was the forceful implementation of the *{advantage of the other faith}* which caused the breakthrough in the negotiations of the Peace of Westphalia. The effect was comparable to a shock front, as can be illustrated by a Kepler-Gauss-Riemann representation of a conical shock front in the economic complex domain. Imagine the formation shock front generated from the sun's motion, that is, a self-similar conical-spiral function creating the physical formation of our planetary system, in accordance with Kepler's laws and following Riemann's unique experiment of the shock wave. You would see emerging, within the harmonic ordering of the self-similar conical-spiral system as a whole, an axiomatic singularity such as an *{arithmetic-geometric discontinuity}* located in the region of the asteroid belt, between the orbits of Mars and Jupiter. This is the register shift change of our solar system. Look at the axiomatic change of the Peace of Westphalia in the same way ; that is, as the historical register shift of European civilization. Look also at the « shattered planet » as being similar to the natural destruction of the looting Imperialist system by the Venetian-run Habsburg Empire.

This Peace of Westphalia register shift, or the asteroid belt, such as Kepler first approximated it, as in the position of an « exploded planet », which Gauss later confirmed with his discovery of the asteroid Ceres, reflects the area of axiomatic change in the physical geometry of our planetary system, which occurred, naturally, when our solar system transformed itself, during its original formation, millions of years ago. This defines the forecastable quality of long-term economic cycles as Lyndon LaRouche has been developing for the last 40 years or so.

In our solar system, this axiomatic change was represented by the successful passing from the lower geometry of the smaller « hard surface » planets into the higher geometry of the « gas giants ». It was in a similar historical condition that the geometry of the Peace of Westphalia changed Europe as a whole, by passing from the geometry of

a few new nation-states such as France under Louis Onze, and England under Henry VII, to the geometry of a community of principle between sovereign nation-states where new conditions for economic growth in Europe as a whole, started not before October 24, 1648.

LaRouche is absolutely right. We have come to a time where we are no longer mere Earthlings. We must now all collaborate in becoming Solarians. The current financial crisis that is about to erupt visibly worldwide is very similar to that of the effect of an « exploded planet » caused by the current hedge fund speculation-driven shock front of the Synarchy International. As LaRouche showed, there is a solution to this crisis. If the Sun's growing power for the common good had been unable to change its « geometrical intention » lawfully beyond the crisis point of the Asteroid Belt, the solar system, as a whole, would have collapsed on itself at that point a long time ago; and its economic production and distribution of isotope-rich resources would not be available, and mankind would not be around to exploit its economic heritage.

Thus, as Lyndon LaRouche has forecasted the event of such an axiomatic change at this historical juncture of our global economic system, it is required that the process of the current « exploding monetary system » of the Synarchy International be completed and that the orbit of the nations-states of the world be wrenched back into real conditions of physical economic growth for the benefit of all of mankind. This means that Israel must pull back from Lebanon and adopt the principle of the Peace of Westphalia with all of its neighbors. (4)

10. POST SCRIPTUM: THE FRONDE AGAINST MAZARIN.

The French Fronde crisis was meant to coincide with a sabotage of the Peace of Westphalia and the destruction of the French nation-state. The crisis was fed directly by the Spanish Habsburg and by Venice, in collaboration with the British oligarchy. This operation started with the « Arrêt d'Union » presented in the Parliament of Paris, on May 15, 1648, launching the Fronde of Parliament against both Anne of Austria and Mazarin. The Parliamentary coup was made to coincide with the threat of an attack by Spain in Picardi, on the same day, in order to break up the Westphalia negotiations. The Fronde was, in fact, the main reason Spain refused to sign the Peace of Westphalia with France. The Spanish side of the plan failed because, on that day, the Netherlands signed their peace Treaty at Münster and became a sovereign and independent nation-state. This new French civil war, however, started on the same day and was to last for 5 years.

As soon as the Peace of Westphalia was signed, the Venetians ran the Fronde against France from London. The Venetian plan was to destroy the sovereign nation-state of France and institute a Cromwellean style Parliamentary Republic in Paris based on the old feudal Crusade Knighthood principle. If Plan-A did not succeed, then, Plan-B was to launch an absolute monarchy under Louis XIV.

The leaders of this Fronde revolt, however, were divided among themselves. Conti Elbeuf, and Beaufort were total mediocrities who could not even stand in the shadow of Mazarin. The foreign intervention was so blatant that even the Archduke Leopold was brought into Paris from Brussels, invited by the Bourbon Conti, to meet with the Paris Parliament. It was an attempted *{pronunciamento}* which had been so absurd that even the soldiers of Turenne refused to follow his orders. By the end of 1649, the first Fronde had fizzled out and the coup had failed.

On January 19, 1650, Mazarin had the Fronde leaders, Condé, Conti, and the Duke of Orléans, de Longueville, his former Plenipotentiary, arrested and jailed. This arrest was used as the signal for the Fronde of the Princes to organize itself. Two months later, on March 11, 1651, Mazarin was forced into exile and left France with a safe conduct from Anne of Austria to Brühl, near Cologne. There, he wrote the Queen a series of intelligence reports in which he warned her of the dangers of the Fronde and how it was being run from London.

Mazarin listed all of those who were behind the coup attempt to destroy the nation of France, identifying especially the Coadjutor of Paris, Jean-François-Paul de Gondi (1613-1679), Cardinal de Retz, as the « most evil man on earth, » who was the leader of the Fronde working in collusion with the Cromwell forces in England and through the councils of the Ambassador of Venice to Paris, Nini Gondi had views of becoming the French Cromwell.

The Fronde plan, as Mazarin put it, was to consume a « *{Marriage between the City of Paris and the Parliament}* ». This was the code-name that Mazarin used to brief the Queen on the Cromwellean plot for turning Paris into a « popular republic » against the monarchy. Mazarin had reported to the Queen that Gondi said: « If the Duke of Beaufort is Fairfax, then I am Cromwell ». Gondi was a total admirer of Cromwell and he considered him as having been sent by God to England, in order to « punish the English monarchy », and to institute a parliamentary system that would be responsive to the plight of the people, that is, the interests of the feudal principalities who were the neocons of the day. Mazarin described to the Queen how Gondi had been studying very closely how Cromwell had Charles 1st killed in 1649, and how he had instituted the Rump Parliament in London, proclaiming the Republic. In France, this was the forerunner to the other British operation known as Bastille Day of July 14, 1789.

Mazarin described how Gondi had gotten his agent in London to send him all of the revolutionary tracts that had been used during the Cromwell revolt, and especially the written material that showed him how to launch a similar operation in Paris. This included the written documentation which identified the « reasons that London used to kill their King and all of the circumstances of his death. »[Letter 1, April 10, 1651, in *{Letters du Cardinal Mazarin à la Reine, à la Princesse Palatine, etc., 1651-1652}*, Paris, Chez Jules Renouard, 1836., p. 9.]

Mazarin's letters to the Queen explained the following coup scenario. When Gondi got together with Armand de Bourbon, Prince de Conti, they created the

Parliamentary Fronde against the Queen, the King and against Mazarin. Later, they also formed a Fronde of Princes, which was like an alliance of warlords following the spirit of the Normans Knights launching the crusades. The Main leaders that Mazarin warned the Queen against were:

- 1- Jean-Francois-Paul de Gondi, Cardinal de Retz.
- 2- François de Vendôme, Duke of Beaufort.
- 3- Louis II de Bourbon, Prince de Condé.
- 4- Armand de Bourbon, Prince of Conti.
- 5- Henri d'Orléans, Duke of Longueville.
- 6- Pierre de Gondi, Duke of Retz.
- 7- Charles III, Duke of Lorraine.
- 8- Louis II de la Trimouille, Duke of Noirmoutiers.
- 9- Madame de Chevreuse.
- 10- Maréchal Henri de Turenne.
- 11- Frédéric Maurice Duc de Bouillon (Turenne's brother).

All of the above were part of the Fronde assault against the nation-state of France. Mazarin further warned the Queen that this was the same « cabal » which had forced him into exile, that had been involved in an assassination plot against Cardinal Richelieu, a few years earlier, which had been organized by the Duke of Orléans and the Count of Soissons. Mazarin further informed her in a letter that it was the alliance of Gondi and Conti which had created an assassination plot against Louis XIV.

According to Mazarin, the Duke of Orleans was controlled by Gondi, and Gondi was controlled by the top Venetian agent, Madame de Chevreuse. Mazarin gave the Queen a lengthy briefing concerning the great dangers of having Madame de Chevreuse return from Spain back into her court, because of her constant intelligence between Paris, London, Madrid, and Venice. During the Thirty Years War, Madame de Chevreuse had been a Habsburg agent and had worked for both the Spanish court, and the Duke of Lorraine, against France. She was directly instrumental in preventing Spain from signing the Peace of Westphalia. Mazarin told the Queen that, during the Fronde period, Madame de Chevreuse had her own daughter gain control of Gondi simply by « raising her dress ».

However, Mazarin gave the Queen even more extensive reasons as to why she had to make sure that he would be returned to his former position in order to save the kingdom, and this could only be done, on the one hand, by regaining the loyalty of Servien and Lyonne, as well as that of Le Tellier and Chavigny, and on the other hand, by keeping Madame de Chevreuse and Gondi away from the King.

Mazarin had been exiled for two years after having been falsely accused of crimes against the state. On March 11, 1651, the Parliament issued a warrant for his arrest and accused him of: « having pillaged foreign vessels, having dissipated the finances, of having transferred money out of the kingdom, and of having sabotaged the peace. » None

of the charges were true, of course, but his exile was orchestrated in order to give the opportunity for the Fronde to consolidate itself and come out public ally. As he reminded the Queen in his letters, Mazarin's rule of conduct had always been:

« *{Never be passionate for love or for hatred, but be passionate only for the interest and the advantage of the State and for guaranteeing its sovereignty.}* » (Mazarin, Letter III, in Op. Cit.)

On July 20th 1651, while Condé continued his coup attempt against the Palais Royal, Queen Anne played a counter coup of her own by declaring her son Louis to be of age to be King (at the age of 13), and recalled Mazarin back on December 25 to put him as the head of an army against the invading Spanish troops allied with Condé in Bordeaux. Mazarin's entrance into Bordeaux was a triumph.

From 1651 until his death in 1661, it was Mazarin who reigned over France, not Louis XIV. Young King Louis realized that he could not reign without Mazarin, and that the Crown had been rendered impotent twice when Mazarin had been forced into exile. France had also been devastated during the five years of civil war, and the « combinatory qualities » of Mazarin were the only trusted recourse the young king had against any renewal of sedition by the feudal principalities. The princes were routed out, but the parliament still had pretenses. So, the agitations of parliament were put to an end when, one day after a hunt in Vincenne, the king walked into one of their meetings and declared, « I am the parliament. » The word was later interpreted as meaning: « I am the State. » It was Louis XIV's satanic proclivities that made his reign the most evil reign before the advent of the Synarchist Beastman, Napoleon Bonaparte.

On March 7, two days before he died, Mazarin spoke to the king with a grave tone of severity and authority, telling him that he should not take a new Prime Minister, after he would be gone, that he should take care of all of business himself, and that his Intendant, Jean-Baptiste Colbert, should be chosen to put order in the finances that Fouquet had dilapidated.

Mazarin died on March 9th, 1661, a total servant of the general welfare of the Nation-State of France. The irony of Mazarin's life is that the French oligarchy hated him, and attacked him with all sorts of evil « mazarinades. » However, it was Mazarin who had the last word, when he quipped: « *{They attack me as a foreigner. However, please be to God that Frenchmen would have had the same passion as mine for the benefit of the State!}* » Thus, if the Thirty Years War was a tragedy, and most of its characters were tragic figures, however, the Peace of Westphalia itself, brought about by Mazarin, was the sublime moment that succeeded in putting an end to religious warfare and secured the sovereignty of nation-states up until today's madness in Southwest Asia.

The fact that today's competent military commanders in Israel know that they have walked into a complete suicidal disaster in Lebanon, is a typical reflection of the tragic madness that had taken over every military commander of the Thirty Years War. The question is as LaRouche posed it, again, recently before the American people and

before the Senate: « Will the people and the Senators of the United States recognize the follies of our own time and leap from their seats to act to change their axioms? »

FOOTNOTES

(1) Cardinal Guido Bentivoglio had been part of an extensive network of Pope Paul V, and Urbain VIII, first in the Netherlands, and then in France. His discrete and undisclosed purpose was to neutralize the Venetian-Jesuit influence in France during the so-called « religious wars. » Bentivoglio's brand of diplomacy was patience, tolerance, and the advantage of the other. He attenuated everything that was offensive, sought peace in every conflict and reconciliation with his enemies. He was even willing to endure defeats in order to better disarm his opponents and bring them to a peaceful resolution. As he put it himself: « My services are the more successful when they are least suspected. » In other words, Bentivoglio was the exact opposite of Venetian suspicion mongering of Paolo Sarpi. [See Bentivoglio's *{Lettres diplomatiques}* and *{Memoires}*.]

According to Bentivoglio's memoirs, *{La Nunziatura di Francia}*, young Louis XIII of France was, to a very large degree, controlled by the Company of Jesus, and Bentivoglio's role was to create a neutralizing effect in collaboration with his Borghese networks (Pope Paul V) in Rome, especially Cardinal Caffarelli Borghese. According to his memoirs, the King's confessor, Jesuit father Cotton, was exiled in Avignon by the King himself, in 1617, because he had proven to be too close to the Spanish Crown. His replacement, another Jesuit, father Arnoux, also became the confessor of the Queen-Mother, Marie de Medicis. Her young princesses also had two Jesuit confessors, Fathers Suffren and Marguestaud. According to Bentivoglio, the Jesuits were privy to all of the secrets of the Royal household. Father Arnaud was also later kicked out for having recommended war against the Calvinists in France. According to *{La Nunziatura di Francia}*, it was the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Puysieux, who convinced Louis XIII to get rid of father Arnaud because he had made attempts at getting the King to repudiate the Edict of Nantes, the famous edict signed by his father, Henry IV, which protected the rights of the Protestants in France. Bentivoglio further reported that in 1612, the Jesuits were chased out of the Alpine Canton of Grisons, and they were also kicked out of Poland and the Netherlands, in 1620.

Bentivoglio had first been the Papal Nuncio to the Netherlands, under Pope Paul V, in the early part of the century. Paul V was the sworn enemy of the Venetian monk, Paolo Sarpi. It was Paul V who excommunicated the Doge, the Senate, and the entire Government of Venice in 1600. From 1616 to 1621, Bentivoglio became Papal Nuncio to Louis XIII of France. Bentivoglio was not only the Ambassador from the Vatican, but also protector of the affairs of France in the name of the Vatican. In 1630, at the siege of Casal, Italy, Mazarin had been chosen personally by Cardinal Bentivoglio to successfully bring peace between the Italian warring parties. Four years later, in 1634, Bentivoglio was nominated vice-legate to Avignon, and had been chosen as the successor to Urbain VIII when, immediately after the death of the Pope, in 1644, Cardinal Bentivoglio also

died very suspiciously during the conclave, which gave the opportunity for an anti-Peace of Westphalia Integrist-Ultramontane, Innocent X, to become the new Pope. It was with the high recommendation of Cardinal Bentivoglio that Mazarin had been sent to Paris, in 1639, by Pope Urbain VIII, in order to help Louis XIII develop a strategy for the peace of Europe as a whole.

(2) See my two recent reports: *{How Charlemagne and Haroun al-Rashid Destroyed the Roman Empire and Saved Western Civilization}*, [A6-17-3 /PB_001], and *{The Ecumenical Civilization of the Khazar Kingdom, the Abbasid Caliphate and the Carolingian Empire}*, [A6-28-4/PB_001].

(3) There was also another paradox of note, which was that of Johannes Kepler, who was caught between Wallenstein, pressuring him for good horoscopes on the one side, and the emperor Ferdinand II who would not pay him back the 11,817 florins he owed him on the other side. During his last years, Kepler wanted to build a printing press and publish his awoken dream *{Somnium}*. (Letter of Kepler to Bernegger, Sagan, October 27, 1629.) Wallenstein kept harassing Kepler: « Will I win? Who are my most dangerous enemies? » Kepler wrote Wallenstein a series of horoscopes with double meanings that kept him ambiguous about his delusions. Kepler's paradox was stated by Wallenstein himself, and with total nastiness: « *If I pay you, you will leave me. However, you will decide to stay with me of your own free will because you are hungry and you have become too old.* » (Henriette Chadrak, *{Johannes Kepler, le visionnaire de Prague}*, Paris, La Presse de la Renaissance, 2004, p. 492.)

Wallenstein had ordered Kepler to write him seven horoscopes a week, and blamed him for every bad turn he had during the Thirty Years War. Kepler had no choice but to follow him everywhere he went, until the emperor demoted him as the head of his army, in 1630. Then, Kepler escaped from the grasp of Wallenstein and concentrated on the task of finishing his immortal work. Kepler resolved his own personal Thirty Years War paradox in his *{Somnium}*, in which he stated: « *{When the storm is raging and the ship of State is in danger of sinking, we can do nothing more noble than to anchor our studies to the rock of eternity.}* »

Schiller had also seen the paradoxical situation that emerged from the conflict between the Emperor and Wallenstein, which he reported as follows: “*{Since the compulsory resignation of Wallenstein, the Emperor had defended himself more by the assistance of Bavaria and the League, than by his own armies; and it was this dependence on equivocal allies, which he was endeavoring to escape from by the appointment of a general of his own.}*” (Frederick Schiller, *{The Thirty Years War}*, Book III, Section III.)

(4) An economic *{gift-exchange}* proposal in memory of the Peace of Westphalia and of the Jewish Khazar Kingdom: *{BEYOND THE PEACE OF WESTPHALIA: THE PLEDGE OF A COMMONWEALTH HERITAGE OF MANKIND.}*

Let it be established that since the Earth, and everything in it, has been given to mankind by God as its common dominion to secure, enjoy, and make prosper, every human being and his posterity is fully entitled to the fair benefits and advantages of its entire commonwealth. Thus, every human being, regardless of creed, color, or religion, has the sovereign nation-state right to have adequate access to the fossils of the biospheric and noospheric resources of the earth, anywhere on, above, and under the surface of its lands or seas. Let it be further established that, as a consequence of this common heritage of mankind, this commonwealth domain, expunged of oligarchism, is therefore bequeath to the honor, the benefit, and the advantage of all future human beings yet unborn.

This form of commonwealth was understood by Vladimir Vernadsky as the justice of the noosphere. Vernadsky stated: « ***{The historical process (of our planet) is currently changing radically before our eyes. For the first time, the interest of the masses on the one side, and the free thinking spirit of individuals on the other, are determining the course of human life and are producing the necessary criteria defining the idea of justice. Humanity, in its totality, is in the process of becoming a powerful geological power. Thus, appears the problem of reconstruction of the biosphere for the benefit of a humanity which is freely thinking as a unique entity. This new state of the biosphere towards which we are converging, without realizing it, is the noosphere. }***»

Similarly, American economist, Lyndon H. LaRouche Jr., proposed: « ***{The assurance of both fair prices and adequate supply for what we presently view as the raw materials needs of nations, means that orderly economic relations among sovereign nation-states, require establishing long-term agreements under a new system of fixed exchange-rates, a system in which the stability of supply of needed raw materials at fair prices is the primary factor of a global system of long-term capital formation, through cooperative management to this effect over forward intervals of approximately two generations. }***» This should be considered as an estimated rather than an actual Solarian proposal.

FIN.