



“*MENSHISM!*”

Or what it Means to Be a Real Ecumenical Axiom Busting Human Being

by Pierre Beaudry, January 24, 2014



INTRODUCTION: WHEN LOSING IS WINNING

The living mark of a creative personality does not come from the originality of his works, but from being a *mensh*; that is, from a state of his mind which attempts to discover a solution to a crisis that no one has been able to solve before. That is what Lyn demonstrated on the occasion of Ariel Sharon’s recent passing; the ability to turn the present strategic nuclear war danger into a lasting peace. This means



that whatever is left of true Christianity and true Judaism, today, the nature of those two religions contains the seed of power to establish world peace, and also the responsibility to bring about a durable new golden age of development to seal that peace forever. However, the condition under which this peace can be realized can only come when Christians and Jews join together in an effort to establish a new Peace of Westphalia. How? By jointly becoming a true religion of ecumenical human beings.

I know of four great *menshen* in history who have been able to forecast and apply such a solution to a world crisis, and they were Francois Rabelais, Charlemagne, Nicholas of Cusa, and Lyndon LaRouche.

Figure 1 Chinese Jade Rabbit Mining the Moon for Helium-3

1. WHAT IS A “MENSH?”

In his bestselling dictionary, *The Joys of Yiddish*, Leo Rosten defined “mensch” as follows:

“Rhymes with “bench.” From German: *Mensch*: “person.” Plural: *menshen*.

1. A human being. ‘After all, he is a *mensch*, not an animal.’
2. An upright, honorable, decent person. ‘Come on, act like a *mensch!*’
3. Someone of consequence; someone to admire and emulate; someone of noble character. ‘Now, there is a real *mensch!*’” (Leo Rosten, *The Joys of Yiddish*, Pocket Books/Washington Square Press, New York, 1970.)

In fact, if a “*mensch*” is a real human being, then, a “*mensch*” must also have what Saint-Paul called “*Christian charity*” in accordance with *Corinthian 1, 13*. If that is the case, then, the task of “*being a mensch*” seems to be nearly impossible, because it requires that a *mensch* also be a Christian. The irony behind all of this, and this is not a joke, is that this simple act of becoming human seems to be one of the most difficult things to accomplish, because it involves acting for the benefit of others without expecting anything in return. This means that you have to forget about your own expectations and even make your enemies benefit from your generosity. I know this is a bit much to ask of people, but that is the price you have to pay if you want to be a “*mensch*.”

2. LYNDON LAROCHE IS A MENSCH

“If you have oligarchism, you cannot have menschism.”

Dehors Debonneheure

If you apply the Jewish concept of “*menschism*” to history, you will find several historical figures who have applied the principle to their lives, starting with the Jew, Jesus Christ himself. How so? Because Christ is the creative personality in the form of [HOMOOUSIOS](#), who best represented the personality of a “*divine mensch*.” Thus, Christianity and Judaism have a special bond, as Lyn identified in his defense of Ariel Sharon:

“The principle of this matter is, that the death of a human being, is not the conclusion of the meaning of their having lived. This is the most crucial of all facts presently shared, in particular, by both the original devotions of Christianity, and of the comparable devotions in the still-living roots of Judaism. This, with this common devotion, the living memory of the historical existence of any human being, would be an incompetent one, if taken in the risk of a superficial appreciation of the meaning of the present life of the continued spirit of Ariel Sharon.

That is the crucial personal and also a strategic quality of historical fact now available to us still now, as an appropriate memory of the deceased Ariel Sharon.

As for all men and women, inasmuch as they are, or have been human in their essential characteristics as spiritual beings, rather than merely in a temporarily living, mortal phase, of a continuing personal, but merely silenced existence.

I speak, thus, of the still living matter to have been consigned to memory of his life, by his demise.” Lyndon LaRouche, [IN MY DEFENSE OF ARIEL SHARON](#), LPAC, January 12, 2014.)

Lyn’s reference to the ambiguity of the personality of Ariel Sharon must lead us to understand the crucial paradox of what it means to sacrifice oneself for the benefit of others. This is something that Sharon had once perceived as the goal of his own life, when he was willing to sacrifice territorial claims over the West Bank and the Gaza Strip during his stay as Prime Minister in 2004-2005; that is, when he orchestrated a unilateral withdrawal of Israel from the Gaza Strip. Sharon’s action convinced a group of Rabbis, led by Josef Dayan, to declare a “*Pulsa Dinura*” – A cabbalistic ceremony calling on God to put a death curse on Ariel Sharon, because he was planning on “clearing Israel out of the West Bank.” ([SHARON TARGETED WITH ‘DEATH CURSE.’](#) World News Daily (WDN), July 26, 2005.) Sharon suffered a stroke on January 4, 2006.



This apparent coincidence of a curse against Sharon and a stroke that he suffered is not the point to focus on. Even Torah Law is against such ludicrous curse practices. The point is that the most altruistic and loving action of withdrawing from the West Bank, was considered, in the extreme, punishable by death. How can the greatest act of *menshism* committed by Ariel Sharon be punishable by death? Did anyone intend to give his mortality the character of immortality? Isn’t that irony worth investigating?

Figure 2 Lyndon LaRouche

That action of withdrawing from the West Bank was a sort of Jewish version of the Melian choice that I have recently discussed in [THE FALLACY OF THE ‘THUCYDIDES TRAP’ AND THE MELIAN CHOICE OF EDWARD SNOWDEN](#). The choice embodies an apparent paradox in which your best guarantee of safety is to have your so-called “enemy” live next door to you, or even in the same house as yours, so that he may have an infinite remembrance of your generosity. In a sense, a real *mensh* is a promethean who is constantly concerned with finding new ways to get rid of human oppression, by not compromising with being popular, by not conforming to live like an animal, and by improving his foresights into discovering new ways of making sure, that in the future, the difference between man and animal, will never be forgotten. That’s why it is best for Israel to withdraw from the West Bank.

3. RABELAIS WAS A *MENSH*.

“You cannot alter the future, only the past.”

Dehors Debonneheure

When François Rabelais wrote his first book on the extraordinary stories of *Gargantua*, he became very concerned about the continual state of warfare in Europe between the King of France, François Premier, and the Emperor of Austria, Charles the Fifth. Rabelais began to look for ways to change the *relationship between reason and power*, and he discovered that it was time to change the wrong idea of power that world leaders had in his time. However, he didn't realize to what extent he was ahead of his time in doing so.

In his First Book, Chapter 50: *Gargantua's Address to the Vanquished*, Rabelais described how to establish lasting peace. He recalled the letter that *Gargantua's* father, *Grandgousier*, had written him:



“Whereas other kings and emperors, even such as call themselves *Catholic* [as François Premier called himself], would have miserably ill-treated him, harshly imprisoned him, and asked a prohibitive ransom for him, my father treated him courteously and kindly, lodged him near to himself, in his own palace, and with incredible generosity sent him back under safe conduct, loaded with gifts, loaded with favors, loaded with every evidence of friendship. And what was the result? When he got back to his country, he summoned all the princes and estates of his kingdom, explained to them the humanity he had met with in us, desiring them to deliberate on this, and consider how to show the world an example of gracious honor to match the example we had shown of honorable graciousness. Whereupon it was unanimously decreed that an offer should be made to us of their entire lands, dominions, and kingdom, to be disposed of accordingly to our discretion.” (François Rabelais, *Gargantua and Pantagruel*, translation J. M. Cohen, Penguin Books, New York, 1955, p. 146.)

Figure 3 Gustave Doré's conceptual portrait of François Rabelais (1483-1553).

Rabelais demonstrated how *Gargantua* was a *mensh*, because he had discovered how to make the difference between man and animal through a proportionately that expressed a higher rate of change and progress that existed between reason and power. And that proportionality became a new measure of defining human society as an increase in energy-flux density, as opposed to the ludicrous idea that “time is money.” Consequently, in so doing, Rabelais discovered that human reason had found a way to increase its power over the universe in the same proportion. However, world leaders never considered this idea to be applicable to our world, or to physical reality. Why?

Because, sometimes important ideas exist for a long time in the darkness of the unknown, and are ignored and misunderstood by most people; and then, suddenly, someone is able to seize upon them, because they have become ripe for their time. That is the nature of the time of noetic maturation that

François Rabelais had developed as the creative form of time reversal in his five books, by showing that time reversal is the time of the future that makes you rediscover ideas of the past that never got the chance to fully exist and develop their real potential. Therefore, you should consider yourself lucky when you discover a forgotten idea that was buried in the sands of time, because this means that you just happen to be walking by past history at the right time to change it for the sake of the future.

The letter that François Premier wrote to Charles V during his incarceration in 1525 is typical of the *mensh* attitude of Rabelais, when he wrote about the generosity of *Grandgousier's* magnanimity vis-a-vis his vanquished enemy. The King of France expressed the same sentiment as the expression of an "*honorable compassion*," albeit it was for his own benefit:

« Please have this honorable compassion in estimating the value of imprisonment for a King of France that you wish to turn into a friend instead of a desperate person, and you will then become assured of making an asset of him instead of a useless prisoner, and will have turned a King into your slave for always. » (Henri Lemonnier, *La lutte contre la maison d'Autriche*, Paris 1911, p. 38.)

Charles V did not respond in kind. Instead, he forced the King of France to sign the humiliating Treaty of Madrid where François Premier was forced to relinquish the Duchy of Burgundy and the Charolais region to the Emperor of Austria. However, François Premier was not consistent, either, because at the same time he was pleading for Charles V's "*honorable compassion*" he was asking Suleiman the Magnificent, ruler of the Ottoman Empire, to flank Charles V from the East. Suleiman responded as per his own imperial ambitions:

"I, the khan and sultan of Mediterranean, Black Sea, Anatolia, Karaman, Kurdistan, land of Persian, Damascus, Aleppo, Egypt, Mecca and Medina, Jerusalem and all of the lands of Arabian, Yemen and all of many other countries; Son of the Bayezid, Son of the Sultan Selim, Shadow of the God, Sultan Suleiman Khan and you, governor of the France, Francis...You have sent to my Porte, refuge of sovereigns, a letter by your faithful agent Frangipani, and you have furthermore entrusted to him sundry verbal communications; you have informed me that the enemy has overrun your country and that you are at present in prison and a captive, and you have here asked aid and succors for your deliverance. (...) Take courage then, and be not dismayed. Our glorious predecessors and our illustrious ancestors (May God light up their tombs!) have never ceased to make war to repel the foe and conquer his lands. We ourselves have followed in their footsteps, and have at all times conquered provinces and citadels of great strength and difficult of approach. Night and day our horse is saddled and our saber is girt. May God on High promote righteousness! May whatsoever He will be accomplished! For the rest, question your ambassador and be informed. (...)"

(— [Answer from Suleiman I to Francis I of France](#), February 1526.)

Thus, the secret of Rabelais' *menshism* was that the relationship between reason and power had to be shaped by the following constraint: *Time is to change as reason is to power; because, if time reversal were to be the measure of changing the past, then, reason had to be the measure of power*

determining the future. Rabelais had discovered the secret of the Peace of Westphalia a hundred years before its time and he expressed it in the following manner:

“Such is the nature of gratuitousness. Time, which gnaws and fritters all things away, only augments and increases the value of benefits. For one good turn freely done to an intelligent man grows continuously by his generous thoughts and remembrances.” (Ibidem, p. 147)

4. CHARLEMAGNE WAS A *MENSH*

As early as 719 AD, the Southern French city of Narbonne was under the control of the Spanish



Saracens and remained under the Arabic rule for forty years until the father of Charlemagne, Pepin the Short, took back the city after a siege of seven years. It was Charlemagne, through the institution of his “*Missi Dominici*” who made of Narbonne one of the most important cities of the Carolingian Empire under an ecumenical rule that partitioned the city into three sectors, Catholic, Jewish and Muslim.

According to a Manuscript from the city of Narbonne, found in the archives of the Abbey of Lagrasse, in 791, the Jewish King of Narbonne sent a delegation to Charlemagne led by the Jewish leader, Isaac, accompanied with ten other representatives of the Narbonne Jewish community. This was the same Isaac the *mensh* whom Charlemagne later sent on a mission to Baghdad as his ambassador to Haroun al Rashid, in 797. In his magnanimity, Charlemagne gave the delegation “the privilege of naming a king of their nation and religion and gave them the right to govern the part of the city where they resided. The Jews had synagogues, schools and palaces, etc. and their city had great doctors.” (*Notice sur un manuscrit de la bibliothèque du musée*, par P. Lafont, architecte, Narbonne, Imprimerie de Caillard, 1870, p. 35.) According to the Jewish historian and world traveler, [Benjamin of Tudela](#):

Figure 4. Charlemagne (768-814)

“Narbonne was one of the most famous cities known for its Law. It is from that city that the Law circulated to other regions. One will find there wise men and very celebrated princes, the chief among them being Rabbi Kalonyme, son of the Grand Prince Theodore, who is identified in

his genealogy as among the descendents of David. [...] Among the main representatives are R. Abraham, head of the council, R. Machir, R. Judah, and several other prominent figures leading the Jewish Academy of Narbonne” (Quoted by Gustave Saige, [*Les Juifs du Languedoc*](#) , Alphonse Picard, Éditeur, Paris, 1881, p. 14)

The ecumenical doctrine of Charlemagne should be understood as the first application of an ecumenical principle to a city-government in Europe before the 1648 Peace of Westphalia. Although there are apparently no written Jewish record that such an ecumenical governing principle was applied to the city of Narbonne, and no further information regarding the “Law” that Benjamin de Tudele mentioned, the fact that the royal edict was recorded in several French publications attests to the intention of Charlemagne and must be attributed to him by inference.

The following section on CHARLEMAGNE’S NARBONNE EXPERIMENT: THE WORLD’S FIRST ECUMENICAL CITY, is taken from my earlier report on [THE TRUTH ABOUT THE JEWISH KHAZAR KINGDOM](#). Medieval Jewish historian, [Abraham Ibn Daud](#) (1161) wrote:

*“Then King Charles sent to the King of Baghdad [Caliphate] requesting that he dispatch one of his Jews of the seed of royalty of the House of David. He hearkened and sent him one from there, a magnate and sage, Rabbi Makhir by name. And [Charles] settled him in Narbonne, the capital city, and planted him there, and gave him a great possession there at the time he captured it from the Ismaelites [Arabs]. And he [Makhir] took to wife a woman from among the magnates of the town; *...* and the King made him a nobleman and designed, out of love for [Makhir], good statutes for the benefit of all the Jews dwelling in the city, as is written and sealed in a Latin charter; and the seal of the King therein [bears] his name Carolus; and it is in their possession at the present time. The Prince Makhir became chieftain there. He and his descendants were close [inter-related] with the King and all his descendants. ([Abraham Ibn Daud](#), *Sefer Ha-Qabbalah* (Book of Tradition), 1161.)*

The ecumenical result of Pepin’s victory over the Saracens in Narbonne in 759 reflected a clear motivation that the King of Gaul had the intention of establishing a peaceful co-existence among the Abbasid Caliphate of Baghdad, the Jews of Gaul, and the Christians of Narbonne, with the idea of creating a triply governed city in France. But, the idea of not engaging in war was not enough to establish a true Peace of Faith based on mutual development through the collaboration of such different beliefs. Something new and of a higher axiomatic level had to be introduced into the dynamics of that period. This was further confirmed by Tuleda, who travelled to Narbonne in 1165, and who explained why the Davidic family of King Machir (*Makhir* 755-793) was given such a great honor and privilege. At the request of Charlemagne, [Machir of Narbonne](#) was said to have created a Talmudic school in the city of Narbonne which became a model of ecumenical studies that the Alcuin monasteries emulated later in France. So, the question is: what was that new principle that was required to seal the dynamics of the Peace of Faith congruence among the three religions? What was the One that was to rule over the Many?

The new King of the Jews was brought to Narbonne by the Radhanites, a group of Jewish merchants originating from the town of Radhan near Baghdad, who took residence in Southern France under the leadership of their new King, in their new European capital of Narbonne. These Radhanite merchants became the backbone of an effective ecumenical alliance between Charlemagne and Harun Al-

Rashid, and began to organize extensive commerce primarily between Narbonne and Baghdad. The Radhanite Trading Company had already established extensive trade routes from their home base of Radhan, covering much of the civilized world from Europe, North Africa, Southwest Asia, Central Asia, and as far away as India and China. As such, the Radhanites became the ambassadors of Charlemagne wherever they travelled around the world, their mission being to conquer new peoples to Charlemagne and Haroun's ecumenical outlook.

This Radhanite contact with Charlemagne was also put on the record by historian Cecil Roth who reported that during an audience with Charlemagne, the Jewish Ambassador said to him: ***“Further we ask of you that there might always be a King of our own nation in Narbonne, as there should be and as there is today. It is at his command that we have come before you. He belongs to the family of David and comes from Baghdad.”*** (Cecil Roth, *The World History of the Jewish People, The Dark Ages, Jews in Christian Europe 711-1096*, Volume 11, Jewish History Publications Ltd. Rutgers University Press, 1966, p. 131)



In order to demonstrate that the ecumenical policy was his new policy, Charlemagne granted the Jewish ambassador's request to have their King under his protection. Therefore, nine years after Charlemagne's father had given them the right to have their own government; the Jews of Narbonne had a King ruling hereditarily over them during the next five centuries, until the 13th century. Thus, in the middle of the 9th century, the Languedoc region of France had become a territory for refugees, for universal understanding, and for the Peace of Faith, welcoming all other faiths from the four corners of the civilized world.

Figure 5 Church and Synagogue side by side, from Raban Maur (780-856), *De Universo*.

According to historian Rabbi David Katz, ***“He (Charlemagne) granted to them, for their own use, a third of the city and the right to live under a ‘Jewish King’ as the Saracens lived under a Saracen king, name Matrand.”*** (Katz, *The Jews in the Kingdoms of Spain and Gaul*, Medieval Academy Monograph no. 12, Appendix III, p. 159.) This establishes that in the very first year of his reign, Charlemagne initiated an overpowering peace policy among Christians, Jews, and Muslims with the collaboration of Harun al-Rashid's grandfather, al-Mansur (754-775), ruler of the Baghdad Abbasid Caliphate. This is also confirmed by French historian G. Saige who reported that many of the Saracens living then in Narbonne, as did Suleiman Ibn Arabi, were pro-Abbasid and were granted equal rights with the Jews to govern the city. (G. Saige, *Les Juifs du Languedoc*, Paris, 1881, p. 42) Thus, in 768, Narbonne became the first triply connected ecumenical kingdom in the world.

French historian G. Saige also noted that not only was the Jewish King of Narbonne, Rabbi Machir, one of the three rulers of the city, but that his Davidic House was also given governing powers over a vast area of the Narbonnaise region, including Septimania, the Toulousain region, and the Spanish March. According to a modern French author, Francoise Buffat, who recently wrote a novel on this historical event: *“The wife of the first Jewish King of Narbonne, the niece of Isaac the Radhanite that Charlemagne dispatched to Baghdad as his ambassador, Judith, is the flamboyant heroine of this historical fresco in which love stories and messianic hopes incites the reader into the most perilous voyages. The young Queen will brave the seas in order to go to the kingdom of the Khazars where the prophecy of Elijah may become reality.”* (Francoise Buffat, *Judith reine de Narbonne*, Geneva, Slatkine, 2007.)

After Charlemagne’s confirmation of the Jewish King of Narbonne, Pope Stephen III (768-772) wrote a letter to Bishop Aribert of Narbonne, complaining about the Jews. According to answer.com, *“The Pope deplores the confirmation which has been made by certain kings of the right of the Jews to possess hereditary domains. These kings are not named, but it is clear that Pope Stephen refers to Pepin the Short, Carloman, and Charlemagne. Stephen suggests that this privilege be revoked.”* (Answer.com/ [What was the ancestry of Machir of Narbonne?](#))

Pope Stephen III was not the only Roman Prelate to display his venom against the Jewish people. After the death of Charlemagne, his three grandsons sabotaged the Ecumenical movement of their grandfather at the Oath of Strasburg of 842, where the Venetians began a systematic destruction of the new Charlemagne cultural platform and gave rise to the Ultramontane genocidal faction of the Vatican.

To pin down the crucial idea in this matter, consider that for Charlemagne, the sovereign Jewish nation of Narbonne was integrated fully within his Christian domain, and the patriotic self-interest of each religion was considered as the equivalent of the nationalist self-interest of a sovereign nation-state. For Charlemagne, the defense of Christianity was the equivalent of the defense of the sovereign nation-state of the Christians that integrated Islam and Judaism.

The same principle applied to the Jews, and to the Muslims. Haroun Al-Rashid also considered the self-interest of Islam as the equivalent of an integrated national home for other sovereign religions; a nation welcoming other nations within itself as a principle of self-development. It should be noted that the full realization of this idea of political sovereignty was never fully developed in the history of mankind. The closest approximation was the creation of the nation-state of France under King Louis Onze who applied the principle of Cusa’s *Concordancia Catholica*, in 1477. This crucial new notion of sovereignty was such that a concordance had to be sought for between the other two faiths, as an expression of the principle of the Holy Trinity.

In 2009, Ukrainian historian, Andrew Kania, published a useful insight on the subject of [The Peace of Faith](#). His understanding of Nicholas of Cusa was particularly interesting with respect to a rare Renaissance painting on the subject of ecumenicism. See **Figure 6**. Although the article is filled with confusing elements, he nevertheless properly references *The Three Haloed Figures* painting as reflecting the central epistemological concern of Nicholas of Cusa not only on the subject of the unity of the Trinity, but also as a solution to the differences among Judaism, Christianity, and Islam. He stated: *“Cusa was to articulate his vision of a new order of co-existence in his work, The Peace of Faith, a work*

significantly influenced by the 14th Century Catalan Mystic, Ramon Llull. To Cusa, the crux of the conflict between the three religions lay in the failure to understand that what seemed to be a disparity in religion, was in fact, a diversity of rite – for Judaism, Christianity, and Islam, all swore a singular devotion to the same God – and all claimed descent from the same father of the faith – Abraham.” (Dr. Andrew Kania, [The Peace of Faith](#) . An address delivered at the Aula, Blackfriars Hall, The University of Oxford, 4th Dec 2009).



Figure 6. *“The Three Haloed Figures.* Fifteenth Century representation of a dialogue on the Unity of the Trinity captured in the ironic characteristic of simultaneity of eternity among Moses, Jesus, and Mohammed by an anonymous artist. From the Franciscan cloister of Santa Maria della Pace, Sassoferrato, Italy.” ([The Peace of Faith](#))

It was for the purpose of [The Peace of Faith](#) that Nicholas of Cusa established his trinitarian principle. He showed not only that it was possible to achieve such a lasting peace, without diluting the truthfulness of each religious belief, but that a higher conception of divine truth could only be achievable, epistemologically, by establishing a harmonic congruence among the elements of the trinity, that is to say, projected from outside of their individual particularities and by neutralizing the differences between the other two religions. After the fall of Constantinople in 1453, Cusa wrote about his own discovery as follows:

“After the brutal deeds recently committed by the Turkish ruler at Constantinople were reported to a certain man, who had once seen the sites of those regions, he was inflamed by a zeal for God; with many sighs he implored the Creator of all things that in his mercy he restrain the persecution, raging more than ever because of different religious rites. It happened that after several days--perhaps because of long continued meditation--a vision was revealed to

this zealous man. From it he concluded that of a few wise men familiar from their own experience with all such differences which are observed in religions throughout the world, a single easy harmony could be found and through it a lasting peace established by appropriate and true means. And so in order for this vision eventually to come to the notice of those who have the decisive word in these great matters, he has written down his vision plainly below, as far as his memory recalled it." [...]

"As creator, God is three and one; as infinite, he is neither three nor one nor any of the things which can be spoken. For the names which are attributed to God are taken from creatures, since he in himself is ineffable and beyond everything that can be named or spoken. Since those who worship God should adore him as the beginning of the universe, yet in this one universe one finds a multiplicity of parts, inequality and separation (for the multiplicity of stars, trees, human beings, rocks is obvious to sense), nevertheless, the beginning of all multiplicity is unity; therefore, the beginning of multiplicity is eternal unity. An inequality of parts is found in the one universe, since none is similar to another; but inequality descends from the equality of unity; therefore, before all inequality there is eternal equality. A distinction or separation of parts is found in the one universe; but before all distinction there is a connection of unity and equality, and from this connection separation or distinction descends; the connection therefore is eternal. But, there cannot be more than one eternal. Therefore, in one eternity there is found unity, the equality of unity, and the union or connection of unity and equality. So the most simple beginning [principium] of the universe is unitrine, since in the beginning that which has been derived [principiatum] must be enfolded, but everything that has been derived declares thus that it is enfolded in its beginning, and in everything that has been derived such a threefold distinction is found in the unity of essence. Therefore, the most simple beginning of all things will be threefold and one." (Nicholas of Cusa, [On The Peace of Faith](#) , 2000, trans. H. Lawrence Bond, Chapters I and 7.)

I have never found a single historian who spoke of the sovereignty of religion or of an ecumenical alliance among nations with such epistemological insights as developed by Cusa, who recognized that the question of the *Filioque* was clearly aimed at establishing this new political state of mind as a higher culture of dialogue among the three religions of the Book. This extraordinary omission, on the part of historians, is not surprising, however, once the alert reader factors in the fact that there existed no greater danger to the Venetian plans for the Crusade wars than such a peace of faith. This is why the Narbonne project lasted no more than about 90 years, and the traces of its existence were immediately erased as if such an idea had never nourished the soil of the Languedoc.

No one should be surprised to learn that most of the chronicles of that region have also disappeared, notably, the one by William of Padua, who reportedly wrote *Gesta Caroli Magni ad Carcassonam et Narbonam* at the request of abbot Bernard at the Abbey de la Grasse, yet the document is nowhere to be found today. Another book, also requested by the same Abbey de la Grasse, was allegedly written by another monk by the name of Philomena, and with the same title, but scrambled differently as *Seu Gesta Caroli Magni, de Captione Carcassonoe et Narbonoe Civitatum, et ad constructionem monasterii Crassensis*. This last chronicle was recently published in French by Louis Fédié, Philomena: *Chronique historique du temps de Charlemagne*, Editions Lacour-Olle. However, Fédié happens to be a kook who is involved in the biblical mystification of Rennes-le-Chateau, and who

indulges in the British-run fallacy of composition known as *Holy Blood, Holy Grail*. This smells very much like a modern cover-up story similar to medieval fallacy of composition known as *The Song of Roland*, which was aimed at taking the thunder away from the axiom busting work of Charlemagne.

In fact, Charlemagne's biographer, Einhard, clearly indicated that what happened at Ronceveaux, on August 15, 778, had nothing to do with an epic battle, but was merely a surprise hit and run attack on the rear baggage train of Charlemagne's army returning from Spain, by a renegade bunch of Basque highwaymen who stole some of their baggage. Three people were killed in the unfortunate ambush: the King's Cook, Egginhard; the count of his palace, Anselm; and an unknown Lord of the Breton Marches by the name of Roland. It was this treacherous Basque ambush in the narrow pass of Ronceveaux that was turned into the fabulous fallacy of composition known as *The Song of Roland* three hundred years later, in order to stir-up enthusiasm for the crusades and bury forever the memory of Charlemagne's ecumenical alliance with Muslims and Jews.

During his own lifetime, Charlemagne also witnessed the sabotage of his efforts in that region of Provence by the emergence of a new heresy known as Adoptionism, which came out of Toledo during the 780's. This heresy prompted Charlemagne to reconfirm the Jewish King of Narbonne in 791, and to launch the polemic of the Holy Trinity with the idea of the *Filioque* at the Council of Nicaea in 794. Charlemagne was conscious that the axiomatic limitations of each faith could be surmounted by the appropriately corresponding conception of a triply-connected manifold that had to be religiously and epistemologically viable. It was a similar triply-connected congruence which later became the basis for the principle of the *advantage of the other* at the signing of the Treaty of Westphalia, in 1648. The reader should also remember that the same region of the Languedoc was also the theater of the Albigensian genocide, another heresy created, and then condemned by the Dominicans, in order to institute a police watch inside of the Roman Church, under the guise of the infamous theology of the Cathar executioner himself, Thomas Aquinas. (See my report on *THE ULTRAMONTANE PAPACY, PART I:*)

The religious authority of Charlemagne is important to grasp here, because he had a true understanding of his historical role in being an instrument of what he called "*The Will of God.*" He was not a fundamentalist, but a true genius from the standpoint of his calling. He had a profound understanding of his function as a King that he took from the Bible, and especially from the Old Testament. He understood his kingship as the ecumenical instrument of God, in the same way that the authority for the creation of Jewish kings was given by God to the Prophet Samuel in establishing the kinships of Saul and David. Charlemagne was quite explicit about this. As historian Kleinclausz noted about Charlemagne's royal and priestly anointment, "*Charlemagne thus became, by virtue of his anointment, something greater than a king: he became a king-priest, like this David to whom he was often compared by his friends, and whose name they readily appended to his own.*" (A. Kleinclausz, *Charlemagne*, Librairie Hachette, Paris, 1934, p. 60) It was from that standpoint that Charlemagne never considered himself a so-called "Roman Emperor," but rather as a biblical king. In fact, quite deliberately and consciously, he had chosen to be a Jewish King!

During the decade following Charlemagne's death in 814, his ecumenical efforts were abandoned by his son, Louis the Pious, but were pursued by other associates, notably by Alcuin's student, the Benedictine monk, Raban Maur (c. 776-856), and by Archbishop Otgar of Mainz (825-847) who were both explicitly engaged in the peace of faith. Otgar was Charlemagne's Justice Minister and later became

the chaplain of his son, Louis the Pious. It was Archbishop Otgar who had supported Louis the Pious against his own son's lust for power, Louis of Germany, in an attempt to prevent him from taking over the territory of Eastern Gaul, west of the Rhine River. Otgar tried in vain to stop the civil war among the three grandsons of Charlemagne. In spite of his efforts, the Ecumenical Kingdom of Charlemagne was dismembered after the Venetians instigated the evil Oath of Strasburg of 842. (See my report, [CHARLEMAGNE AND HAROUN AL RASHID, PART I](#).)

5. NICHOLAS OF CUSA WAS A *MENSH*.



Just after the fall of Constantinople, in 1453, Cusa realized that a true peace of faith was possible only if an ecumenical understanding of the three great religions of the Book could understand what true immortality meant to mankind. If this were to be realized, the oligarchical wall between the East and the West would fall and mankind would witness the greatest Renaissance in human memory.

As I have quoted above, in the opening statement of the first section of his book, [On The Peace of Faith](#), Cusa established clearly the requirement for peace in the world between different religions, and most emphatically, between the East and the West. What Cusa did was to demonstrate and prove that those wars of religions were not caused by religion, but by the Zeusian imperial outlook of the Roman Empire and the Ottoman Empire. In the opening section of his second section of his book, Cusa gives the solution to this East-West division as follows:

Figure 7 Nicholas of Cusa (1401-1464)

“Finally, as all these prophets could not sufficiently overcome the Prince of Ignorance, He had sent His Word, through which He has also created time. The Word clothed itself with humanity, in order in this manner to finally illumine the docile man with free will, so that the latter would see that he would have to walk not in accordance to the outer, but rather to the inner man, if he hoped to revert one day to the sweetness of immortal life. And since His Word put on the mortal man, witness was given in his blood of the truth, that man is capable of eternal life, for the sake of which his animal and sensible life are deemed as nothing, and that that eternal life is nothing other than the deepest longing of the inner man, i.e., the truth, which alone is desired, and which, since it is eternal, nourishes the intellect eternally.”
(Ibidem)

Thus, only immortality represents the true goal of *menshism*, which can only be attained through this yearning for the peace of faith and when the animal life in us is being done away with. Why? Because immortality is the future of the intellectual power of *menshism* in a single orthodox faith. As Cusa put it: “*Since, however, the truth is one and is impossible not to be comprehended by every free intellect, all diversity of religion ought to be brought into one orthodox faith.*” Then, he added:

“*The Lord, King of Heaven and Earth, heard the sighs of the murdered and the fettered and those led into servitude, who suffer thus on account of the diversity of their religions. And since all who practice or suffer such persecution, are led to it for no other reason than that they believe, thus to promote their salvation and to please their Creator, the Lord has taken pity on His people and agreed to the plan to lead all diversity of religions through mutual agreement of all men harmoniously back to a single, henceforth inviolable religion.*” (Ibidem)

The point to be understood, here, is that the historical division between East and West is not a religious matter but a strategic and epistemological matter of mind, which Cusa was attempting to bring to the attention of world leaders through a religious dialogue among Christians, Jews, and Muslims. But,



instead, what happened historically was to use religious war as a means to put an end of the Byzantine Empire by creating a new Empire based on the same design. Thus, the Ottoman Empire began to establish itself as the Door of Europe, after Sultan Mehmed II (1432-1481) succeeded his father in 1451, and established his capital in Constantinople. His strategic success was due in great part to the building of a fortress blocking the Bosphorus and the access to the Black Sea, a fortress known ironically as *Boğazkesen*, which meant “*strait-cutter*” and “*throat-cutter*.” (See **Figure 8**)

Figure 8 The *Boğazkesen*, otherwise known as the *Rumelihisari Castle* seen from the North-East Bosphorus Strait. (Wikimedia Commons)

That physical Bosphorus strait-blockage between the East and the West became the symbol of the oligarchical pretext for an epistemological division of minds on all economical, religious, and political matters separating the East from the West for over six centuries. This imperial insanity was to be replaced by the Berlin Wall, which became a similar East-West mind separator during a period of twenty eight years until its fall in 1989. Now the New Zeusian British-Dutch Empire wants to erect a new wall of terrorism between East and West, using the same pretext of religious warfare between Sunni and Shia Muslims to launch a new Hundred Years War in Southwest Asia.

In this context, I want to bring the attention of the reader to the following interesting historical footnote. The fortification, also known as *Rumelihisan Castle* was not merely a metaphor, it also served as an epistemological warfare warning post. It was built in 1452 by Mehmed II in order to prevent his enemies, notably the Venetians and the Genoese, from coming through the back door of the Black Sea during the Turkish siege of Constantinople in 1453. Later, it was meant to keep an eye on both Westerners and Easterners coming in and out of the East. For instance, any Venetian or Genoese ship coming from the Black Sea which refused to be searched at this border line checkpoint was bombarded and sunk and all survivors beheaded, just to serve as a reminder that a Muslim Zeus controlled the passage of the strait.

Cusa understood the full significance of this strategic choke point between East and West. He knew how the epistemological division between East and West was nothing but an oligarchical trick to push people into religious wars. And, this is what he undertook to solve by investigating the underlying assumption behind the East-West divide. As he said, instruction shall be required as to how this unity of the three religions of the Book can be understood by anyone, because all of the nations cannot be expected to change their faith. And that the answer was to be found in the single underlying religion behind all three. It was only after this failed attempt that Cusa proposed to move the peace of the faith to the continent of America.

That unique religion, however, must be based on a universal understanding of the existence of divinity through which every human being is capable of understanding and applying the universal form of the human creative power of self-perfection; that is, the act of becoming more and more God-like: **HOMOOUSIOS**. It is this idea of becoming God-like, which must be treated as an epistemological characteristic of the human mind, rather than a religious one; and which represents the underlying common ground behind all religions. Moreover, this is the only acceptable underlying principle which can eradicate the division between the East and the West, and do away with oligarchism. As the *Word* of God said in the Cusa dialogue:

“Also notice that there is a certain fecundity in the essence of the rational soul, that is, mind, wisdom, and love or will, since the mind exerts intellect or wisdom from itself, and from both proceeds the will or love. And this trinity in the unity of essence of the soul is the fecundity, which man possesses in his similarity to the most fecund, uncreated Trinity. Likewise every created thing bears the image of creative power, and possesses fecundity in its manner in greater or more distant similarity to the most fecund Trinity, Creator of everything. It is therefore not so, that the creature has its being only from divine being, but rather it has its triply fecund being in its manner from the most fecund three-and-one Being. Without this fecund Being neither the world could subsist, nor would the creature exist in the best manner in which it could be.” (Ibidem)

The fecundity of the creative power of individual human beings, which is also replicated in the Lydian partitioning of classical artistic composition, is what the oligarch Zeus hates the most about human beings, and this is why the wall of misunderstanding was erected between the East and the West, by using the pretext of religious belief to provoke wars. This is how the Jew, the Muslim and the Christian can come to a common understanding that the Trinity of God, understood as the unity of the

creative principle, as opposed to a multiplicity of sense perception. As *Word* acknowledged in the Cusa dialogue:

“Also the Arabs and all wise men will easily see on the basis of these deliberations, that to deny the Trinity is to deny divine fecundity and creative power, and that to acknowledge the Trinity is to deny the plurality and community of gods. That fecundity, which is also a trinity, brings it about that it is unnecessary to have several gods, which mutually support each other in the creation of everything, for the one infinite fecundity suffices to create all that which can be created.” (Ibidem)

Thus, what Lyn recognized in Ariel Sharon’s passing is that the so-called “Jewish problem” is the problem that every real human being has to face, with respect to the future: the case of their own immortality. *Menshism*, therefore, is not a particular yearning located in the Jewish people alone, it is a yearning which resides in those human beings whose mission is to develop the creative powers of others; that is to say, by developing in others the Prometheans power of confronting Zeus and of solving present problems from the future and from the top down, as if from the fecundity of God Himself. Thank God for *menshism!*

FIN