

Diktats of Unanimously Agreeable Governance and of Universally Acceptable Religious Beliefs Necessary for Civilized Coexistence

By

Sankarshan Acharya¹

First Draft December 29, 2007

Revised November 27, 2015

Abstract: This paper presents a unique unanimously agreeable rationale of fundamental fairness to enunciate unanimously agreeable rational diktats for governance, religious and scientific beliefs and tolerance necessary for civilized coexistence. Unanimous agreeability and rationality of fundamental fairness conform with the ancient philosophy of *Hindutva*. Gandhian socialism shaped by Mahatma Gandhi and Jawaharlal Nehru as well as the Anglo-American capitalism amount to surreptitious robbery and subjugation of enterprising individuals and hence antithetic to unanimously agreeable fundamental fairness and *Hindutva*. I argue that Gandhism cannot be unanimously agreeable rational definition of tolerance. Neither can Gandhism be the basis of unanimously agreeable rational definition of tolerance needed for civilized coexistence. Unanimously agreeable fundamental fairness akin to *Hindutva* is uniquely necessary for tolerance, civilized coexistence, patriotism, individual prosperity and freedom.

1. Introduction

This paper presents unanimously agreeable norms or diktats for governance, ethos and beliefs for tolerance, civilized coexistence, individual prosperity and freedom. It presents a unifying philosophy or rationality for diverse religious and scientific beliefs and how all such beliefs conform with unanimously agreeable norms of governance and universal religion. The principal rational arguments of this paper are the following:

- Fundamental fairness is universally agreeable and rational.
- Unanimous agreeability and rationality of fundamental fairness conform with the ancient philosophy of *Hindutva*.
- Both Gandhian socialism shaped by Mahatma Gandhi and Jawaharlal Nehru and Anglo-American capitalism amount to surreptitious robbery and subjugation of enterprising individuals and hence are antithetic to unanimously agreeable rationale of fundamental fairness and *Hindutva*.
- Gandhian Socialism cannot be a unanimously agreeable rational definition of tolerance.
- Neither can Gandhism be the basis of unanimously agreeable rational definition of tolerance needed for civilized coexistence.
- Unanimously agreeable fundamental fairness, akin to *Hindutva*, is uniquely necessary for tolerance, civilized coexistence, individual prosperity and freedom.
- Either Gandhian socialism or Anglo-American capitalism or a mix cannot result in sustainable prosperity, freedom, tolerance and civilized coexistence.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows: Section 2 presents how human thinking (philosophy) has inherently revolved around unanimous agreeability. Section 3 presents how this thinking was shaped in ancient India as *Hindutva*. Section 4 defines tolerance based on unanimous agreeability and rationality. Section 5 concludes.

2. Unanimously Agreeable Norms or Diktats

The humanity was once captivated by Leon Walrus' theoretical idea of Benevolent Dictator (central planner) who could collect data on preferences and budget constraints of all individuals to make economic choices for the latter in order to attain first-best efficient level of allocation of resources for production. Central planning was vigorously experimented in several countries after the crash of Laissez Faire Capitalism-unbridled robbery of private and public wealth-in USA and Europe led to World War II. Central planning could not attain efficiency because even inherently efficient individuals misrepresented their preferences to fetch more resources to produce less.

After World War II, the US and Europe experimented with Regulatory Capitalism by (i) giving freedom to individuals to create wealth, which attracted talents from all over the world and (ii) facilitating a few Robber Barons to usurp private wealth through surreptitious financial shenanigans. Regulatory Capitalism crashed in 2008. The US Congress-appointed Financial Crisis Inquiry Commission blamed the

Regulators, Robber Barons and established academic experts for their failure to avert the manmade (avoidable) crisis.

2.1 Unexpected poll verdicts after the financial catastrophe of 2008

Unprecedented poll verdicts around the world since 2008 show a lurch towards a unique and unanimously agreeable diktat of No-subsidy Mantra in Governance² which seeks to disband subsidies based on privilege and social status. The unprivileged common people (comprising the rich, middle-class and poor) have realized since 2008 that the diktat of unanimously agreeable No-Subsidy Mantra in governance can beget an efficiently competitive economy and uproot the source of decreed privilege, i.e., legalized robbery of public and private wealth. This realization has resulted in election victories for any individual or party that pledges to uproot the established system of robbery or to undermine a winner who deviates from his pledge to change the system after rising to a position of privilege:

- For illustration, Mr. Barack Obama was an underdog in the 2008 US presidential polls. Then the market crashed, causing massive loss of private wealth. People responded positively to Mr. Obama's call for change of the established system. His party, however, lost in a Democratic senatorial bastion in Massachusetts in 2010, as soon as people observed Mr. Obama negotiate nontransparently backdoors with healthcare insurance companies and union leaders. The Massachusetts seat was retaken by a Democrat, Ms. Elizabeth Warren, for pledging to penalize Wall Street, the source of privilege.
- Mr. Narendra Modi in India rose to power from modest upbringing to become the Chief Minister of Gujarat. Mr. Modi was, however, vigorously opposed by the very sources of privilege in USA and India due to their fear that he would dictatorially eliminate fundamentally unfair privilege. The Juggernaut undoing privilege everywhere, however, marched on. The privilege creators in USA had to "Modyfy" their views of India under Mr. Modi in November 2013. President Obama then removed the American ambassador in India and Mr. Modi appeared invincible as he won election after election.³
- After occupying a position of privilege, Mr. Modi dilly-dallied on his pledges, hobnobbed with the same sources of privilege and, thus, appeared to retract from his positions. This led to a spectacular rise of a decimated Aam Admi Party headed by Mr. Arvind Kejriwal who pledged credibly to remain an unprivileged common man, even after winning Delhi election resoundingly.
- Mr. Kejriwal's opponents have expressed fear that he is dictatorial, which is detrimental to democracy within AAP as well as India. If Mr. Kejriwal, however, becomes a "dictator," to follow the diktat of No-Subsidy Mantra in governance, he will be unanimously adored. We will then have super-democracy or Ram-Rajya with absolute support of most, if not all, voting for him in future polls.
- Mr. Kejriwal has not so far committed to the No-Subsidy Mantra in governance. His pledge to have a corruption-free rule is subsumed within the No-Subsidy Mantra in governance, but this is not enough for AAP to win elections for ever. USA and Europe too have had such corruption-free governance. Why did the American and European economies crash in 2008 with millions of good jobs lost and trillions of dollars of hard earned wealth wiped out? It is because of surreptitious usurpation of private wealth through laws, acts and policies of the government with the robbed wealth flowing to the privileged class.

- Thus, Mr. Kejriwal's or Mr. Modi's pledges for a corruption-free India will do nothing to stop the massive legalized robbery of private and public wealth by the privileged class through laws, policies, procedures adopted in parliament.
- India like China may see rapid economic growth as their wealth creators are lured to produce and serve with their animal instincts. But until the surreptitious system of robbery is repealed thoroughly, the economy (whether in rising India or China) will crash just like it has in USA, Europe and Japan.
- Indians have already detected the surreptitious system of robbery of their hard-earned wealth and have resorted to savings in gold and real-estate that they think could not be robbed. Continuance of this system will lead to severe manipulation of gold, real estate and currency (rupee/yuan) prices to shock Indians and Chinese (as badly as the Americans, Europeans and Japanese were), if they already have not been.

2.2 Congress Party of India can rise again by reviving its March Towards Unanimously Agreeable Governance

A paramount test/implication of the No-Subsidy Mantra in Governance is to ban private funding (small or large) of elections and to let the public/government exchequer bear a candidate's election expenses up to a fixed sum plus a variable amount pegged to the number of votes received.

The only political leader ever to speak before an elected body of representatives anywhere in the world for public funding of elections is Mr. Rahul Gandhi of Indian Congress Party. Mr. Gandhi was even supported by the opposition leader in Indian Parliament, Mr. L.K. Advani. A tide of No-Subsidy Mantra thus surged.⁴ But it ebbed with a rising Modi wave, founded with a hope that an individual with modest upbringing could transform India, akin to the hope underlying the Obama wave in USA in 2008. Mr. Modi has embraced the constitution as his religious script. He has, however, not expressed volition to repeal any existing law, act, policy, rule or procedure which facilitates surreptitious usurpation of public and private wealth. Any such volition would have led him to amend the constitutional preamble to stop all laws and policies that facilitate usurpation of public and private wealth, now and in future.

Lack of such volition on the part of Mr. Modi and his party must have led to a resounding Delhi poll verdict in favor of the Aam Admi Party by wiping out established parties like the BJP and Congress from the state. The AAP and its leader, Mr. Kejriwal, sounded sincere in their pledge for corruption free governance. Common people continue to dread corporate funding and takeover of established parties. The Delhi verdict shows that no charisma or wave can any longer countervail the thirst of people to eliminate subsidies, especially, to corporations.

As the Modi government marched for undoing the system of privileges and Rastriya Swyamsevak Sangh issued a statement to rethink on quota policy, BJP's opponents united before the Bihar polls to tell voters how the RSS/BJP planned to eliminate quotas unless they voted for the anti-BJP coalition. The BJP-RSS failed to articulate:

- That quotas based on birth to certain castes, tribes or religion are fundamentally unfair and not unanimously agreeable.⁵
- That the current quota system enriches and entrenches the privileged in power by essentially depriving/robbing the vast majority in each quota category and that this is fundamentally unfair.

- That quotas, if at all, should be based on poverty (economic status) as opposed to being birth to certain castes, tribes or religions, because even a perfect system of governance could make some talented families poorer due to the natural law of large numbers making them unable to compete with relatively richer families.
- That the ulterior goal of quotas of uplifting poorer families can be accomplished uniformly fairly for all Indians irrespective of their birth to certain castes, classes or religions.

The BJP lost Bihar because of lack of clarity on quota policy while the united opponents succeeded in keeping the people polarized based on caste and religion. BJP lost by 7.9% difference in vote count to the allied opponents, which means a 4% tilt in its favor could have resulted in a win.

The issue that political leaders have to resolve now is whether they can survive by subsidizing their non-corporate constituents with largesse like free water and cheap electricity, while bestowing corporations with all kinds of reliefs. Those producing water and electricity will not toil for subsidized voters. This issue maybe why AAP got barely above 50% of the vote in Delhi or the coalition in Bihar got 41.9% of the vote. The state-level winners will eventually lose their charm within their states, let alone become pan-Indian winners, if they rely on subsidizes for their constituents by penalizing the rest and by taxing the public exchequer.

This means that a vigorous revival of any losing party of India is still possible if the party can shed its past and credibly articulate the No-Subsidy Mantra as the only unanimously agreeable principle of governance available for sustainable welfare of people. This will enlighten people that not seeking doles from politicians is the only way to eliminate legalized privilege thriving from surreptitious robbery of their public and private wealth. The recent budget presented by the BJP reduced subsidies somewhat. But ex-PM Dr. Manmohan Singh has correctly criticized that this budget failed to take advantage of the current economic tailwind to cut deficit by further reduction of subsidies.

Being the only political leader to speak forcefully in the parliament for public funding of elections, Mr. Rahul Gandhi is the only credible leader who can pledge a stop in the flow of private funds to elections and political parties. He can, thus, be the only credible global political leader to champion the No-Subsidy Mantra in governance to be unanimously acceptable among people. People will not hold him responsible for lapses of erstwhile Congress leaders if he credibly pledges to repeal all laws and policies that now facilitate usurpation of public and private wealth and avers to amend the constitutional preamble to prevent enactment of any such law in future. By doing so, he will effectively convert the Indian National Congress to an “Unprivileged People’s Party,” which could attract even non-political individuals like me as members.

2.3 Dawn of A Unifying Philosophy to Attain Individual Freedom

Humans pine for freedom. Fighting among various communities—based on nationality, privilege, race, skin color, class, caste or religious beliefs (including scientific and agnostic)—has, however, stifled individual freedom. Communal leaders have artificially created the divisions to command people within their communities. People remaining beholden to their communal leaders tend to provide free service and produce to the kith, kin and cronies of their leaders. The leaders devise ways and means of preserving the identities of their communities to enjoy free goods and services. The leaders, their kith, kin and cronies thus enjoy privilege through subjugation of people within each community. Communalism dilutes individual freedom. Individual freedom is antithetic to the mission of communal leaders.

Self-serving communal leaders foist moral hazard (blackmailing) tactics to keep individuals confined to their respective communities to provide free goods and service to the kith, kin and cronies of their leaders. The moral hazard of communal leaders include the following:

- Ostracizing individuals who advocate unity and deviation from communal norms.
- Punishing for blasphemy (criticism of identities of a commune).
- Prosecuting for treason of individuals who transcend communalism to promote unity for individual freedom.
- Inducing people within a community to fight for their freedom from the shenanigans of other communities.
- Indoctrinating masses of people that they are inferior to a few anointed *Masters of Universe* (god's children) with the power to rob public and private wealth for first-best privileged status by subjugating the rest (those robbed of their hard-earned wealth) to second-best sustenance..

Research shows that moral hazard stifles liberty⁶ and supports the current unconstitutional, unstable and inefficient system of money and finance.⁷ The only way for individuals to attain freedom from moral hazard shenanigans of their self-serving communal leaders is (a) to embrace a unified philosophically (or universalism)⁸ and (b) to demand institution of unanimously agreeable No-Subsidy Mantra in Governance.⁹ Individuals can then resolve moral hazard efficiently and, simultaneously, obviate alibis of communal leaders to prosecute or penalize any individual. Universalism is the only efficient antidote to subjugation through moral hazard shenanigans of communal leaders. Universalism is thus inherently desired by all humans longing for their freedom.

Common people have of late recognized how moral hazard stifles their freedom and how universalism can beget their liberty. The recent spate of reversals in poll verdicts worldwide and concurrent confrontation (violent and verbal) among communal leaders of all hues harbinger a triumph of universalism over communalism,

The unifying philosophy and the unanimously agreeable principle of governance for civilized coexistence of humans have been discovered (through decades of selfless research¹⁰ since 1991) to beget individual freedom from surreptitious subjugation going on via the current system of money and finance. Established communal leaders have been, however, working overtime to block dissemination of such research discoveries. Their obvious mission is to perpetuate self interests by suppressing innate human longing for freedom through commonly acceptable principles of governance and unified philosophy for coexistence. The self-serving leaders want to enjoy first-best status by keeping the vast majority of wealth creators financially (invisibly) bonded. Empirically, the kith, kin and cronies of communal leaders have become richer than the rest. The current unprecedented degree of inequality shows rampant financial bondage of the vast majority of people. This is unsustainable in equilibrium and will inevitably crash as people march towards financial freedom.¹¹

Absolute knowledge¹² on universalism has been permeating rapidly, despite the efforts of self-serving leaders to suppress spread of such knowledge. Recent poll verdicts globally indicate that people are marching towards a moral hazard free system of money and finance for stability, fundamental fairness and efficient survival. This march will eventually undo the artificial divisions foisted on people by self-serving communal leaders of all hues. It is, therefore, prudent for self-serving communal leaders to give up their designs and facilitate a moral hazard free system of money and finance for coexistence of humans.

2.3 History of Subjugation and Prohibitive Cost of Obfuscation of Fundamental Truth paramount to Individual Freedom

Even though the discovery of a moral hazard free system of coexistence is unprecedented, suppression of public dissemination of such discoveries by self-serving leaders is not:

- Ancient Indian texts describe how self-serving leaders (narrated as devils) frequently disturbed saints meditating to discover fundamentally fair rules for coexistence of humanity and how those (such as Krishna) that demolished the devils to establish fair rules for co-existence (such as Gita) were later revered as ‘god.’ The word ‘god’ stems from German *got* which appears to stem from Krishna’s family name ‘Goud.’
- The devilish genes did not obviously perish even after the humans carrying them were vanquished in the epic Mahabharat war, which was actually won by Krishna. These genes simply mutated to improvise newer systems of subjugation. They formed more sophisticated avenues that appeared to be unanimously acceptable and, hence, fundamentally fair. For instance, they established temples dedicated to Krishna—who was revered as a reincarnation of the almighty—to invoke people to offer (surrender) their hard-earned produce for salvation and union with god after death.
- The Church formalized the ancient Indian temple guidelines of surrendering personal assets for salvation as a new system of tithe by which people offering one-tenth of their produce would reach god through Christianity. The late Pope John Paul has publicly stated that Christianity is the best path to reach god. People have eventually discovered, however, such rules of temples and churches as designs to rob their hard-earned wealth before death, just like the modern system of money and finance does.
- A new leader (Mohammed) emerged to exploit the emerging abhorrence of people to idolizing and worshipping human saviors like Krishna and Jesus as reincarnation or son of god. Mohammed claimed to be the prophet designated by the almighty god to script new rules (Sunnah, Sariat and Quoran) for governance of humanity. Mohammed was so confident about him being the only messenger of god designated to script how the humanity should be governed that he deemed anyone not accepting his scripts as infidels with no right to exist without conversion to Islam. Mohammed made his scripture sacrosanct, not amenable to amendment by evolving wisdom of humanity.
- Mohammed’s wisdom that everyone is equal synchronized with the then emerging chorus against the worshippers of reincarnations and sons of god. Ironically, though, Mohammed made himself superior by making himself the sole prophet of god. He never substantiated his tryst with almighty god (his Allah). He never defined Allah rationally, but asked everyone to believe in his rendition of the message from Allah.
- Mohammad ushered an era of invasion to usurp others’ hard earned wealth and to force people to accept Islam. The loot and mayhem of Mogul invaders in India and their forcible conversion of people to Mohammedan religion (Islam) does not prove superiority of the Islamic system of governance. It rather proves that Islam too became another system of usurpation of others’ hard earned wealth.
- Mohammed’s point that no one was superior to others perhaps shaped the idea of democracy with equal votes for every individual. Islam, however, did not become a superior religion. Most Islamic countries have abandoned Prophet’s idea of equality to be ruled by monarchs.

- Humanity could not see rational rendition of god in any religion. Science being shaped rationally then engulfed human thinking. An Oxford University Professor and Nobel Prize winner, Bertrand Russell, has claimed that rationality of science triumphed over every religion and god. But Russell too failed to define god rationally. Comparing something rational (science) with another (god) not defined rationally is obviously incoherent and irrational. The system of scientific beliefs cannot, therefore, be proclaimed to be superior to beliefs based on religion and god. The dogma that science is superior has helped establish a new system of beliefs, Academic Religion.
- Academic Religion has shaped the currently established second-best system of governance¹³ of humanity. The Academic Religion has been shaped by erstwhile Christian missionaries like Oxford, Cambridge, Harvard and Yale after their transformation as elite universities. The elite universities have anointed themselves as the keepers of Academic Religion by ensuring that other universities followed the elite to be counted as propagators of superiority of Academic Religion.
- The epicenter of Academic Religion has been top gurus or experts designated to prepare disciples (students) to work hard and create wealth with inspiration from and dedication to the gurus as well as to a few specially chosen star students anointed as the Masters of the Universe (MoU). The MoU collaborate with lawmakers to enact laws supported by academic papers published in journals controlled by the gurus to facilitate surreptitious robbery of public and private wealth. The MoU then share the loot with the elite Academy as charitable donations and with the lawmakers as political contributions. Anyone in the academy who challenges the foundation of Academic Religion is ostracized and eventually eliminated from the academy.
- The Academic Religion like all other religions has crashed in 2008. The 2008 financial crash was worse than the Great Depression, according to the Federal Reserve Board. This crash involved a panic-driven run on \$7.8 trillion of previously uninsured bank debt and \$3.5 trillion in previously uninsured money market funds. It caused loss of trillions of dollars of hard-earned wealth and millions of good paying jobs.
- The Financial Crisis Inquiry Commission appointed by the US Congress has found in its report released in 2011 that the 2008 financial crash was caused by the failure of the established experts and Masters of the Universe, i.e., the guardians of the Academic Religion. The academy has indebted students with \$1.4 trillion of debt that they cannot easily repay. This debt does not count the loss of hard-earned savings of parents spent in training their children in Academic Religion which has failed according to the US Congress.
- The Academic Religion chooses a few to become the Masters of the Universe to enjoy first-best status by robbing hard-earned wealth of others and to share the loot with the elite academy and lawmakers to spread the punditry to the rest of humanity. This keeps the vast majority perpetually robbed of their hard-earned wealth so that they have no wherewithal to challenge the robbery in court or otherwise.
- The origin and spread of Academic Religion and associated system of robbery can be traced back to ancient India which founded the organized university education in Ratnagiri of Odisha (my birthplace that nurtured me for 22 years) and Nalanda and Taxila in Bihar:
 - Before the advent of organized education, the privileged Kings and princes were educated by Brahmin saints who meditated to discover new knowledge.
 - Being superior due to knowledge acquired from meditating saints, Kings wielded enormous power among their uneducated subjects and established a system of robbery of wealth created by the hard-working subjects. As mega robbers, kings appointed provincial lords who would loot private wealth through divisional collectors.

- British merchants (Masters) discovered the ancient Indian system and improvised it through commercial enterprises called companies. Companies became repertoires of wealth in forms of debt and equity securities. Companies generated profits (allocated to debt and equity) by employing people at wages significantly lower than the prices of products and services sold to people.
- When unprivileged people got used to investing in the same companies to become rich, the privileged Masters devised financial market shenanigans to loot such investments.
- The Masters shared the loot with monarchs (rulers) who, during a depression caused by rampant looting, distributed food and cloth to the surreptitiously robbed/deprived wealth creators and energized fresh blood (youngsters) to work hard for pittance to create wealth to be looted again.
- The rulers ostensibly penalized the collectors (to please the public) while authorizing the latter to keep robbing the wealth creators surreptitiously. The collectors allowed to share such loot could not rise to speak against the rulers. Those that spoke or did not want to rob were shunted out of the system.
- Everyone has been, thus, allowed to rob others and no one dared to voice loud enough against an obviously unstable system. The system crashed on its own when wealth creators stopped persevering.
- This is how the once-wealthiest country in the world (India) turned indolent and idolatrous with perpetual prayers for reemergence of another savior to change the system.
- The usurping ‘foreign’ monarchs then turned inwards to turn their developed nations indolent.

2.4 Systemic crash of 2008 has paved the path towards fundamental fairness, efficiency and stability

The lesson of the 2008 crash is that no one (including robbers) would like to be robbed and that systemic robbery causes indolence of wealth creators. For stability (equilibrium) and efficiency, if not fundamental fairness, therefore, the system of robbery will have to be dismantled. This epistemic truth (unanimously agreeable to all) has triumphed and will prevail, thanks to the selfless discoveries.

The rational course towards restoration of equilibrium (stability), fundamental fairness and efficiency is as follows: wealth creators will stop creating wealth for the robbers (i.e., avoid playing the game of robbers), demand a return of their surreptitiously stolen wealth, and pursue for dismantling of the system of robbery. The robbers will then have no wherewithal to challenge the public demand. This course has already started with numerous lawsuits against the US government.

The hubris of modern punditry/doctrine/academics-designed for robbery of public and private wealth-has ultimately turned out to be no different from the bygone religious dogmas about reaching heaven and god through a temple, a mosque, or a church.

2.4 Modern Academic Religion

The **Academic Religion** is a design for send-best status of enterprising principals (citizens) that have the talents and skills to persevere and create globally competitive goods and services:¹⁴

- The Academic Religion now gripping humanity has permitted only a select few to become rulers of states and chief executives of companies and academic institutions to enjoy first-best status with all kinds of privileges by subjecting the rest to second-best sustenance. Erstwhile religious missionaries have been converted to be temples (universities) for propagation of Academic Religion to indoctrinate a selected group of people to serve as dedicated gendarmes of this religion.
- Ordinary people are driven by the lure of “achievements” of the selected few gendarmes without deciphering that most such achievements are based on wealth robbed from wealth creators. The embedded media publicizes the achievers and suppresses the truth about the loss to the vast majority. Cooperating academics are rewarded to suppress discoveries that this system of robbery is fundamentally unfair (unconstitutional), inefficient and unsustainable. Most academics have to cooperate for their survival. The researchers that expose the shenanigans of Academic Religion by discovering alternative systems to attain first-best efficient status of all principals (citizens), uniformly fairly, are purged from the academy with their research not published in the controlled elite academic journals to discredit them before public.
- Robber Barons ensure that they (a) periodically decimate any significant wealth accumulated by middle-rung self-made successful entrepreneurs (like the unprivileged hedge funds and money managers), (b) destroy career of any academic researcher that dares to expose the truth about instability, inefficiency and unconstitutionality of the fundamentally unfair second-best system in order to preemptively thwart potential challenge and (c) throw crumbs of the loot at the keepers of the system in the academy and government who continue to indoctrinate people to keep faith in this religion.

2.5 Lessons for Individuals

Every doctrine/punditry/sophistry designed to subjugate humanity has crashed eventually. The financial catastrophe of 2008 publicly bared the underlying instability of the punditry behind the current system of robbery. In fact, the Financial Crisis Inquiry Commission Report released in 2011 finds that the 2008 crisis was manmade (avoidable) due to a failure of established academic pundits in the industry, academy and government.

The pundits behind the current Academic Religion were fully aware of the instability of the established system since at least 1991, when my research paper on efficient resolution of moral hazard¹⁵ was first mimeographed at the Federal Reserve Board. They and their counterparts in industry and government simply made hay while it shone by presuming that the robbed public was either stupid or lacked the wherewithal to protest. Most of the academic models published in so-called esteemed journals presume that the public is stupid. When confronted, a top guru in the academy once admitted to me as such. Most crucial government policies, based on their published research, are predicated on stupidity of the public.

I learnt early on from a top revered academic guru about how the crucial results (conclusions) of his models were predicated on tacitly presumed stupidity of the public. Since then I worked on models in which the public could not be fooled. This is why my models were not published in academic journals controlled by the top gurus with a hope that I would vanish from the academy or perish before anyone ever knew of the profound truths discovered in my research.

It is perhaps the tacit support of the public for my selfless research that the discoveries from it could not remain blacked out for ever. This is notwithstanding my expectations to the contrary. Once I discovered

the modus operandi of Academic Religion, I became indifferent to any reward from the system of robbery it fostered.¹⁶

The established gurus could block publication of my models on begetting first-best status for principals (citizens) in the journals they controlled. They could even have a temporal pyrrhic victory until 2008. They could not, however, prevent the truths discovered in my models from being bared by the 2008 collapse of Academic Religion. The truths have now permeated among the principals. The principals can now undo the established system to prevent robbery of their hard-earned wealth. To serve their best interests, i.e., to not be robbed of their hard-earned wealth, the principals can appoint appropriate governors, presidents and chief executives of universities, publishing houses, companies and regulatory agencies. Their ability to do so is rapidly gaining momentum among principals comprising the rich, the middle-class and the poor among all castes, religions, races and nationality. It seems to be the dawn of a new era of proscription of any rule, law, act, policy or procedure that facilitates even surreptitious usurpation of public and private wealth.

3. How Terms Hindu and Hinduism were Coined

This section is based on inference from anecdotes and publications on Hinduism and *Hindutva*. I have defined *Hindutva* as the ancient philosophy of not usurping others' wealth even surreptitiously. This philosophy grew in India more than 3000 years BC. The profoundness of this philosophy for economic prosperity and for civilized coexistence must have led India to contribute 23% of global economic output. Colonial and neocolonial rulers with vested interests have strategically painted the people of India as idolaters and pagans (unenlightened) for celebrating the memory of authors and preachers of a profound philosophy that is necessary for civilized coexistence of humans. The primary motive of these rulers has been to perpetuate their global strategy of (a) engaging a few regional satraps or gendarmes to rob the enterprising households so that it is easier for the rulers to usurp a few satraps surreptitiously through blackmail (moral hazard) and (b) continually and clandestinely eliminating the disobedient collectors.

3.1. Who the Indians are?

The term "Hindu" was first coined by the Arabs to mean the inhabitant of the land to the east of river Sindhu. Sindhu flows through Pakistan, a country carved out of India in 1947. Europeans learned about Arabs acquiring from the land of "Hind" the knowledge on numerals and mathematics and merchandise like spices and condiments. The word "Hind" sounded like "Ind" to the Europeans. Arabs called the land of "Hind" as "Hindustan," which was christened by Europeans as India with the Hindu inhabitants as Indians.

Hindu or Hindustani thus means Indian. This writing is not about "Hinduism," which is a caption used to connote the "religion" of the majority of Hindustanis. *Hindutva* is a Sanskrit term that means the essence or ethos or philosophy of Hindus.

Vinayak Damodar Savarkar - a self described atheist - first used the term *Hindutva* in a pamphlet, "*Hindutva: Who is a Hindu?*" in 1923 to mean Hinduness. He used Hindu as an individual of Bharatvarsa, called India in English and Hindustan in Arabic. Savarkar and his followers believe that all Indians must possess a common sole or identity or ethos or philosophy or *Bharatiyata* or *Hindutva* or

Indianness. Indians who have converted to Islam or Christianity or Buddhism abhor the term *Hindutva*, lest they may be pressured to practice ancient cultural mores to give up their acquired religions.

Recent research offers a unified philosophy of governance which universalizes the notion of religion and god.¹⁷ One need not, therefore, subscribe to disunity among humans based on their beliefs. It is prudent to not make any religious connotation of the Sanskrit word, *Hindutva*, that truly means Indian ethos.

The purpose of this paper is not semantics of what constitutes *Hindutva*. It is to rationally discover the ancient Indian ethos as akin to the modern constitution.

To restore their national pride, Indians must discover their ethos, which represent their identity or sole or philosophy without worrying about the subjugation suffered over centuries.

To begin with, why were the Indians subjugated? The Indian civilization was in the forefront of agriculture and commerce. India contributed about 23% to global production. Indians were in the forefront of mathematics, science and medicine. This attracted the invaders to India. This led to India's subjugation by mangling the Indian thinking. The ethos that had made Indians creative and productive vanished thereafter from India. The industrial world established their societies based on Indian ethos to be as prosperous as they are now. Indians perhaps would have been in the forefront of industrial revolution if they were not shackled due to colonial rule.

Indians can no longer abdicate their responsibility in discovering their ancient ethos lost over the centuries of domination. Why? It is because these ethos, discovered by decades of research, are essential for prosperity and stability of society that all Indians now long to attain, despite their divers religious beliefs, castes and languages.

How Indians call their lost philosophical identity is immaterial. It may be *Indianness* in English or *Hindutva* in Persian-Sanskrit or *Bharatiyata* in Hindi and in most other Indian languages. Let's not blur the Indian national identity with any Indian religion, caste, language, or theism or atheism. Identity is like the common citizenship of every Indian sole.

3.2 Two Natural Divisions among Humans

Let's focus on the discovery of Indian national identity or philosophy or ethos at least to regain contribution to global production, service and creativity. Christening the ethos as *Hindutva* or *Bharatiyata* or *Indianness* is really incidental to the process of discovery of ancient Indian philosophy that made the country most productive in the world.

There are two natural ('god ordained') divisions among humans across caste, religion, race, language, ethnicity and national boundaries. One group devises all feasible sophisticated shenanigans to usurp others' wealth which includes labor, life and physical and intellectual properties. This group includes even the idling poor who rally for largesse from politicians with a lure of bribes for votes. The other group perseveres to build own physical and mental faculties to accumulate wealth and to fight for elimination of all kinds of usurpation schemes.

Acquisition and preservation of wealth is very necessary to enjoy liberty. Every liberty-seeking human including the usurpers, therefore, acquires and preserves wealth and resents usurpation of own or common wealth.

It is irrefutably true that humans cannot coexist as a civil society if usurpation of private and common wealth is allowed even surreptitiously through sophisticated Acts of Parliament.¹⁸ This profound truth dawned on Krishna to propound *Dharma* (the kernel philosophy of Gita) to not usurp private and public wealth and to fight for elimination of recalcitrant usurpers.

Dharma is necessary for viability of human society. It is also essential to preserve plants, animals and other natural resources on earth. For example, fiat money is propped by the productive labor (mental and physical) of a nation. Printing money for distribution to the unproductive people is surreptitious usurpation of the producers. Those who receive the printed money without obligation to repay through production and service and those who grant such largesse to rule are together usurping and subjugating the productive labor. Such usurpation for subjugation is akin to the infamous Pashakhela of Mahabharat using which the Kauravas usurped all the wealth of the Pandavas to subjugate the latter to toil. Usurpation not only transgresses *Dharma*. Usurpation also causes destruction of limited natural resources and pollutes earth as the artificially propped-up nonproductive beings consume and excrete without producing or cleaning the environment. The policy of inclusiveness being bandied around the world should be to motivate everyone to produce, serve and clean the environment, not to grant largesse to the idlers by printing money on the back of productive labor. Granting such largesse to remain in power is *Adharma* and unconstitutional. It is unsustainable in the long run.

It is a hapless irony that the same people who worship Krishna or express belief in *Dharma* and swear to uphold the constitution are blatantly and nonchalantly steeped in the *Adharma* or unconstitutional acts of usurpation. It is also striking how the humanity has considered it necessary to proscribe all forms of usurpation of public and private wealth by adopting *Dharma* as the crux of the modern constitution for governance of nations. Yet, the satraps ruling humanity are nauseatingly improvising and sophisticating surreptitious shenanigans to legalize usurpation of private and public wealth by transgressing the very constitution they have sworn in.

After Bertrand Russell won Nobel Prize by arguing that science has triumphed over religion ("Religion and Science," Oxford University Press, 1961), common people looked forward to learning from the scientists who formed a fountain of truth – the academy. Since every religion is based on god, Russell's argument implied that science had triumphed over both religion and god. But neither Russell nor anyone else has ever defined religion and god, rationally or scientifically. The assertion about triumph of science (which is founded on rationality) over concepts such as religion and god (which hitherto have not been defined rationally or scientifically in the extant literature) cannot be rational or scientific.¹⁹ Yet, economists affiliated to the academy have rationalized numerous sophisticated shenanigans for usurpation of private and public wealth as science and rulers have adopted such unconstitutional and inefficient shenanigans as laws.

3.3 Discovery of Indian Ethos or Philosophy

In view of the two natural divisions among humans, one can rationally infer that ancient humans philosophically longed for (i) united, peaceful and prosperous living, and for (ii) learning and acquisition of new knowledge. This must have been also the driver of common ethos or philosophy of ancient

Indians that was lost in centuries of subjugation. How? India was prosperous by producing 23% of global GDP. No prosperous country today is disunited or internally violent. This means Indians were non-violent and living peacefully. Only their peaceful coexistence could lead them to discovery (knowledge or science) of the truth about the unknown elements of nature.

Whether Indians' ancient knowledge is superior to the current knowledge in the developed world is unimportant for issue of discovery of ancient Indian philosophy. What is important is that Indians' knowledge then was superior to that of the rest of the world, as one can rationally infer from observations that only relatively superior knowledge has led nations to achieve relatively higher productivity. Because Indians were producing relatively the highest of all nations before invasions, they were more knowledgeable than others then.

After invasion and colonization, India's GDP has dropped to about 1% and has not advanced much after independence. The West and Japan have become relatively as prosperous as they are today only because of a process of peace and steady acquisition of relatively superior knowledge that Indians are not able to achieve. It is because the ethos that had imbibed the ancient Indian civilization has become a part of the currently developed world. Indians now are hopelessly behind, relative to other developed nations because of dissociation from their ancient ethos. Even after independence, Indians have been unable to fathom, let alone embrace, the unifying ancient ethos that had made their nation the preeminent economic power.

Indians have so far failed to recover their ethos because, after independence, the elite in power achieved and relished nonpareil relative prosperity for themselves and their families and friends. It did not occur to them that they should cultivate collective wisdom - which is possible only in independent universities - to recover and permeate their national ethos to make the nation prosperous. The idea of the ruling elite was to simply print more and more rupees to usurp most of it and to distribute the remainder to local political workers to bribe the voters to garner their support for entrenchment in power to relish relative individual prosperity within India. This process badly weakened the international value of rupee, leading to a rude shock to the ruling elite in 1991 after India's foreign currency checks bounced.

It is, therefore, necessary that Indians recoup and cultivate their ethos through independent universities like (Nalanda, Taxila and Ratnagiri) which had made India the nonpareil productive center of the world. Even the ancient universities were victims of nepotism. Currently, though, the private universities run by politicians and connected mafia established through usurped public development funds are as hopeless as the government-funded universities like the IITs and IIMs to cultivate and disseminate national ethos. Moral hazard due to uncontrollable dependence on robbed wealth or government funding with political interference has stifled universities worldwide. News reports show that the president of a prestigious university like Columbia U wants to but cannot remove his business school dean (an ex-presidential economic adviser connected to Wall Street) despite the latter's irrational public policy discourse because of the funds he gets from Wall Street to the university due to such discourse. The only way universities can play their role as fountains for discovery and dissemination of truth vital for civilized coexistence is if they adopt a system of reward for research on unanimously agreeable fundamental fairness and dismantle the current system of reward prevailing in business schools and economics departments.²⁰

For a nation to be as prosperous as India was before subjugation, Indians must have followed a philosophy of effective governance to create equal opportunity and liberty for all.

Universal prosperity within a nation is possible only if every individual has an environment of equal opportunity and freedom to produce, create and think based on own talent and perseverance within the domain of common laws. Such an environment can be created and maintained only by efficient rules of governance driven by the kernel of constitution (to not usurp public and private wealth even surreptitiously) and characterized by official accountability, credible actions against corruption and adherence to optimal rules as exemplified in the nations that have prospered.

Triumph of good over evil is subsumed in ancient Indian philosophy. A follower of *Universal Religion and God* could rationally infer that Krishna and Rama might be the individuals that vanquished the evil forces to establish good governance and universal prosperity.²¹ Only then would they be revered by the humanity around them. Composers of Ramayana and Mahabharat might have exaggerated to sell their stories, but the crux still was elimination of evil forces to establish efficient rules of governance, to ensure equal opportunity for prosperity based on talent and perseverance.

Establishing liberty, justice and equality before laws enacted for fundamental fairness must identify India. Mahatma Gandhi was massively supported by all Indians in nonviolent Satyagraha to defeat the mighty 'evil' colonial rulers that meted indignity and inequality based on skin color. The evil forces have always been engrossed in creating unequal opportunity for themselves by unfairly subduing talented and productive individuals. Thwarting such forces within society has been a remarkable Indian philosophy.

Division of labor was based on talent, skills and perseverance. This is relevant even in the modern world to achieve productivity and competitiveness of a society. The principle of division of labor in India was distorted to be privileges by birth, propagated as a divisive caste system that is haunting India even today.²²

Longing to live in unity despite diversity in religion, caste and language has to be a part of ancient Indian ethos. One can see such longing pervasively present in every village or nook and corner of India. The colonial rulers resorted to divide and rule after they were threatened by the Hindu-Muslim unity in Sepoy Mutiny (first war of India's independence) in 1857.

3.4 Current Indian Longings and Modern Constitution

The Gita, composed in India, is the oldest script to stipulate how the humanity should live together. The Bible, Quoran and the modern philosophy (Academic Religion) were composed much later to prescribe rules of governance of humanity that followed the authors of these scripts. The inter-religious fight is thus about whose rules on governance are wiser or fairer for humanity. Unfortunately, most religious and political leaders strive for imposing their own parochial wisdom and fairness, as opposed to the unanimously agreeable rational norms for civilized coexistence. This has divided Indians inherently longing for unity and peaceful co-existence.

True leaders of humanity like Mahatma Gandhi or Abraham Lincoln have succeeded in envisioning and articulating common longings to induce people to fulfill the same through common struggle. But that all ancient and modern leaders have failed to discover any unanimously agreeable rational philosophy or norm of governance for freedom is obvious from the fact that the world is roiled by establishment of a fundamentally unfair (unconstitutional) system of robbery which has financially bonded the vast majority of enterprising individuals.²³

3.5 Triumph of ancient Indian philosophy for economic prosperity

True individual freedom necessitates a **new transparent constitutional preamble** to never mandate any other constitutional provision or rule of law or economic policy to facilitate usurpation of private and public wealth, even surreptitiously. India can economically lead the world again because it is imbued with the ancient philosophy of *Hindutva* consistent with the new transparent constitutional preamble, which is absent from modern constitution, deliberately, to perpetuate a legalized system of robbery. This is the basic cause for the ongoing economic depression which started with the financial catastrophe of 2008. Once this constitution pall is unveiled, enterprising individuals will be rejuvenated to persevere for prosperity and freedom. This necessitates vigorous universal prayers and preaching (as started by the author since 2003) of the ancient Indian (Rama-Krishna) philosophy of *Hindutva*: to not allow usurpation of private and public wealth.

The ancient Indian philosophy resulted in nonpareil economic prosperity of India with 23% contribution to global output. The contribution of India to the global economy then is as much as that of the U.S. now, though with a significant difference. India did not include any exotic financial derivatives like credit default swaps or collateralized debt obligations to its output then, as the U.S. is doing now. Even President Obama has pointed out that such exotic financial derivatives may contribute to economic growth, but not to the prosperity of people.

The latest research – based on the most extensive DNA matching – shows that humans (after popping in Africa) migrated to and settled in India before emigrating northwards to Europe and northern Asia. This finding supplants the previously held view that humans went directly from Africa to Europe via Sinai and then immigrated to India. The latest research concludes that most, if not all, the biological features of humans found globally (Causian, Mongoloid, etc.) are present among Indians. One can rationally infer from this research:

- That India was the cradle of human civilization.
- That India was later invaded by people of Indian origin who had emigrated from their ancestral land.
- That the Moguls and British invaders were of Indian origin.

Clash of ethos (ancient versus modern) is the primary historical reason for invasions. Otherwise, the local Indians would have welcomed their invading cousins and the latter would not have demolished their own ancestral culture and heritage. The emigrants must have harbored ethos antithetic to the ancient Indian philosophy. By mangling and obliterating the ancient cultural vestiges in India, many of the invaders provided an unmistakable proof about their angst and vindictiveness towards ancient Indian philosophy which had caused nonpareil economic prosperity for India.

Genes carry indelible memory which mutates to the next human carrier upon birth. This is why a baby (untrained at birth) cries for food when his survival is endangered due to hunger. An untrained baby remembers upon birth what hunger means and how he should respond based on memory mutated to the genes he carries at birth. Such genetic memory means that India's invaders could have recalled their origins and the potential causes of their emigration, at least subconsciously. The fact that they destroyed their ancestral vestiges indicates their genetic memory being vindictive towards ancient Indian ethos which had once triumphed.

Why were the invaders so vindictive?

Vindictiveness arises due to a sense of defeat of one's ethos. The reckless destruction of Indian heritage and culture by the invaders were punctuated by their volition to establish superiority of their 'modern' ethos. That the invaders were hell-bent to establish superiority of their 'modern' ethos is obvious because they not only built their own monuments by demolishing ancient Indian temples, but also called the local Indians idolaters, pagans, and heathens with unenlightened souls.

India's invasions were, thus, primarily due to vindictiveness towards ancient Indian philosophy and for establishment of invaders' modern ethos for usurpation of wealth after torturing and killing the locals.

Even lately, the Pope had stated that the only path to god is Christianity. The Southern Baptist Church of USA has distributed pamphlets and booklets to convince American Hindus to adopt Christianity; the church has even lighted candles on Diwali to enlighten the unenlightened souls from India. The Moguls, driven by superiority of their ethos, destroyed and disfigured ancient Indian relics which prominently embodied the ancient Indian philosophy.

The focus here is *superiority of ethos* (ancient versus modern) in attainment of economic prosperity for freedom of enterprising individuals. So, what is superior in the modern (Western or Mogul) ethos? Since old religions do not govern Western nations, we need to focus on their economic philosophy propagated through modern Academic Religion that has crashed during the financial catastrophe of 2008. The essence of the now crashed Western economic philosophy is surreptitious usurpation of others' wealth for eventual subjugation via financial bondage of enterprising individuals. This is antithetic to the ancient Indian philosophy. The modern ethos guarantee an eventual subjugation of enterprising individuals, while ancient ethos foster attainment of freedom.

That the failed modern philosophy is economically inefficient, unconstitutional and unstable (bound to fail) has been proved within a general equilibrium model of mathematical economics which was first mimeographed by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System when the author was a financial economist in 1991.²⁴ This model has also mathematically proved within the most general economic equilibrium model ever scripted in the literature that the ancient Indian philosophy (Rama-Krishna Dharma) is (first-best) efficient and stable, i.e., would eventually triumph and prevail.

Proponents of the prevailing second-best (inefficient) system have insinuated that my persistence with the US Congress to adopt first-best rules helped destroy the prevalent second-best system. But my pursuit with political leaders for establishment of first-best efficient principle in governance is implicit in modern constitution and explicit in *Hindutva*. It has been driven simply by a desire to establish the most efficient system to beget first-best status for the principals (citizens) for stability and economic efficiency. I am glad that the US Congress has adopted many of my proposed efficient policies and is acutely conscious of the necessity to repeal the unconstitutional and unsustainable system of surreptitious robbery. The difficulty to wean away the robber barons and associated political leaders from the established system of surreptitious robbery is the principal reason for the current serious policy paralysis permeating the world after the collapse of this system in 2008. Printing and borrowing \$14 trillion by the US over the last seven years has only raised the degree of inequality between the very rich and the rest, unprecedentedly and unsustainably. The Indian government has forfeited lakhs of crores of rupees of corporate taxes to keep the economy humming; ex-Finance Minister has conceded after the UPA lost in 2014 that such large

corporate tax relief necessitated massive government borrowing and consumer price rise leading to rejection of the government in power.

India should nevertheless rejoice over the triumph of its ancient philosophy because it is not as badly embroiled in systemic robbery (because fewer individuals have been indoctrinated to depend on financial assets) as the western economies are. India can restructure its constitution and rules of law based on its ancient ethos:

- a. That had once led to nonpareil economic prosperity of India.
- b. That has triumphed once again in 2008, as revealed by the ignominious defeat of the prevailing system of surreptitious usurpation and subjugation.
- c. That has been mathematically proved to be economically most efficient (first-best) and constitutional in a more general model of economic equilibrium than ever scripted in the literature.
- d. That has prevailed over the invaders' ethos of usurpation and subjugation, which has been surreptitiously practiced in the West (by transgressing their own constitution) and which has been ignominiously exposed in 2008.

Recent research shows that the first-best efficient, constitutional system (rules of governance) is actually the same as the ancient Indian philosophy necessary for economic prosperity.²⁵ Now there is no need to invoke Rama or Krishna to adopt a modern form of ancient ethos as first-best efficient and fundamentally fair system for equilibrium according to the most general model of economics than ever scripted. Any rational challenge to the ancient Indian philosophy or equivalently to this first-best efficient equilibrium must be based on a more general model. The challenger has to prove (not simply opine with economic jargons) that a system of surreptitious or direct usurpation and subjugation is economically more efficient and fundamentally fair [constitutional]. No one has challenged the first-best efficient economic equilibrium results so far. This is why the US Congress has adopted most, if not all, of the efficient and constitutional rules obtained in this first-best policy research.

Indian rulers need not be gloomy because the ancient Indian philosophy has once again triumphed and prevailed. I say "once again" because Rama and Krishna had already defeated the usurpers and subjugators during their times to establish the superiority of their ethos for economic prosperity commonly longed by people. The continual gloom in India is perhaps because post-independent rulers willy-nilly adopted the system of surreptitious usurpation and subjugation from the West while trying, unsuccessfully, to convince Indians about its efficacy. This system has enriched and entrenched many rulers, their kith, kin and cronies. Most Indian rulers have thus far remained satiated about their well-being as a result of the philosophy of surreptitious usurpation and subjugation. They had so far believed that people would not notice being surreptitiously usurped and subjugated.

What is superior about Mogul ethos? Moguls have been driven by destruction of others' life, property and heritage. This amounts to direct usurpation and subjugation, as opposed to the surreptitious approach in the Western economic philosophy. Any form of usurpation or subjugation is actually antithetic to the ancient Indian philosophy and is economically inefficient and unconstitutional.

3.6 Origin of Capitalism driven by Modern Philosophy of Surreptitious Usurpation

Rama and Krishna epitomized a philosophy of eliminating usurpers and subjugators. Rama's philosophy can be inferred from his actions narrated in Ramayana. Krishna's actions narrated in Mahabharat as well as Gita more explicitly outline this philosophy. While Rama and Krishna defeated the usurpers and subjugators, they could not extinguish the genes which sought comfort through usurpation and subjugation of others. Many of the dominant carriers of the comfort-seeking genes must have emigrated India, after getting defeated by Rama and Krishna and after most Indians revered Rama and Krishna. Making others work is the essence of the brand of capitalism that is driven by the modern philosophy of surreptitious usurpation. Such capitalistic philosophy is antithetic to the ancient India philosophy of eliminating the usurpers and subjugators. This is perhaps why Indian rulers have not been attracted towards such capitalism after independence. Ironically, the Indian emigrants established capitalism in Europe. They too have developed the system for surreptitious usurpation and subjugation practiced in the West. The emigrating Indians have also crafted the Mogul ethos to extinguish the ancient Indian philosophy and to establish their ethos of subjugation and usurpation.

After humans settled in India, they must have cultivated two competing and antithetic ethos: capitalism which relies on usurpation and subjugation and the Krishna-Rama philosophy of elimination of usurpers and subjugators. The capitalists clashed with the followers of Krishna-Rama philosophy and emigrated from India after a decisive defeat. India guided by the Krishan-Rama philosophy prospered enough to contribute to 23% of global output.

*Capitalism founded on unanimously agreeable fundamental fairness is inherently desired by humans for freedom and is consistent with Hindutva. Fundamentally fair [constitutional] capitalism is, however, antithetic to the modern philosophy of surreptitious usurpation for subjugation.*²⁶

3.7 Decline of India's Prosperity

Prosperity lulled the ancient Indians to forget how Krishna and Rama had vanquished the usurpers and subjugators: better weapons of the time like quoits and spears and skillful operation of weapons and better strategy, e.g., of endearing the Pandavas to defeat the Kauravas or uniting Banar Sena against Ravana.

Rama and Krishna's success had made Indians believe that "god" periodically reincarnates in the form of a human to destroy the subjugators and usurpers. But, during the same time India prospered, the emigrant capitalists driven by their modern philosophy were developing better weapons and pining for returning to their ancestral land that had vanquished them, philosophically. The emigrants came with better weapons and strategies to loot as well as physically subdue the Indians. The invaders were even armed with new modern dogmas to supplant the ancient Indian Dharma.

3.8 The policy issue now

Should the Indian parliament or ruling Cabinet promote rules based on the repeatedly vanquished philosophy of usurpation and subjugation? The answer is NO. India should, therefore, repeal all laws which amount to surreptitious as well as direct usurpation and subjugation. There should be absolutely no subsidies based on birth to certain religion, caste or political class.

Most people following any religious faith cannot be blamed for the philosophy of their religion or their caste or class. It is because they were forced to have their parents' religion, caste or class at birth, when they were children without independent philosophical maturity. A modern nation— aspiring to be a global knowledge leader—should offer a platform of a unifying philosophy and repeal existing rules which reward followers of specific religious or political ideologies.

Krishna and his uncle Kansa belonged to Gouda caste. Yet, Krishna eliminated Kansa because the latter usurped others' wealth and subjugated people. Krishna did not believe in rights based on birth to a caste in his time. He could become a Maharaja with the largest army and also the most influential philosopher in his time. A Rajput, Rama, could become an ascetic-mendicant in the jungles, while his brother Bharat rejected the kingdom bestowed on him surreptitiously. A Brahmin, Ravana, was a very powerful king. The reason for bringing these ancient events to the discussion here is that the caste system then was for division of labor with rewards based on talents, not on birth-rights.

So, the ancient Indian philosophy during 3000-5000 BC (times of Krishna and Rama) did not allocate rights based on birth to certain castes. The concept of religion did not exist then. The only ethos that mattered then was elimination of usurpers and subjugators to bestow equal opportunity for people to prosper based on their skills, perseverance and integrity. Even Rama did not assign a Brahmin author to write Ramayana. Rama's message converted a marauder to become a saint (Valmiki) who scripted Ramayana on his own volition.

Ramayana and Mahabharat have been certainly exaggerated by their authors. But the sole purpose of such exaggeration is to ingrain in the minds of people the ancient Indian philosophy to not usurp others' wealth and to not subjugate others by any means. The invaders termed Ramayana and Mahabharat mythology—discourse of Mithya (lies). They obviously wanted to brainwash the Indians with the antithetic philosophy of usurpation and subjugation. The modern economics profession, which has perpetuated the philosophy of surreptitious usurpation and subjugation, can be proved to be a mythology which crashed in 2008.

So, without being dragged by the rubric of mythology, it is important to simply focus on the two antithetic ethos—(i) usurpation and subjugation and (ii) elimination of usurpers and subjugators.

The philosophy of eliminating the subjugators and usurpers to offer equal opportunity to everyone for enterprise and perseverance must have led to the pre-invasion era economic prosperity of India, which according to Adam Smith, was about 23% of global output.

Indians should celebrate now because their ancient economic philosophy, which had once made India nonpareil and enviable, has triumphed and prevailed once again. There is no reason for Indian rulers to be gloomy when the Indian philosophy has triumphed. It is true that the country needs and will soon see a radical adherence to first-best efficient rules of law by repealing the failed second-best (subsidy and birth-right driven) rules as well as financial market shenanigans.

4. Unanimously Agreeable Definition of Tolerance needed for Civilized Coexistence

This section defines tolerance rationally and shows its consistency with *Hindutva*. A rational articulation of tolerance should start with the most tolerant human in modern history: Gandhi has been hailed as

Mahatma and named father of Indian nation. Top scientist Albert Einstein talks of Gandhi: "Generations to come, it may well be, will scarce believe that such a man as this one ever in flesh and blood walked upon this Earth."

4.1 Gandhism is not rationally and unanimously agreeable tolerance

Gandhi has called for unity in humanity through personal sacrifice and tolerance. But he failed to unify people because his call amounted to bondage of enterprising individuals to serve indolent usurpers. Such call for unity could not be unanimously agreeable. So, it failed. Notwithstanding universal admiration of his persona:

1. Gandhi did not know/discover any unanimously agreeable principle or unifying philosophy of governance.
2. He was parochial and racial for targeting eviction of the British, not of the colluding Indians, from Colonial Raj. Gandhi did not fight for universal liberty of people. He pleaded with the British rulers in South Africa that Indians were superior to blacks.²⁷ This exhibited his inherent belief that he and fellow Indians were racially superior to deserve better status than black South Africans.
3. Gandhi was first allied with the British. Only after failing to achieve equal status with the British, he joined the fight against the British Rule in India. This indicates that he would have perhaps not joined the struggle for India's independence, had he attained proper status and employment in UK, South Africa or India under British Rule.
4. Why did Gandhi anoint Pandit Nehru as the first prime minister of India by transgressing party democracy that had overwhelmingly elected Sardar Patel to be the PM?²⁸ Gandhi's action shows that he was prejudiced towards elitists and against the vast majority of non-elite Indians.
5. Gandhi personally failed to earn sufficient income (through production of goods and services for others) to defray his living expenses in India, UK and South Africa. He thus failed to financially liberate himself. This failure perhaps led him to austerity and asceticism to remain self-reliant and to depend on others only for his freedom movement. Financial dependence from those embedded with the British rule led to a neocolonial India upon independence. As a result, Gandhi could not liberate the vast majority of non-elite Indians.
6. Gandhi chose a prime minister (Pandit Nehru) who thoroughly divided India based on language, caste, tribe and social status with parochial satraps appointed to control people within each division. This divisive strategy of administration and control weakened enterprising Indians so badly that they were defeated in the 1962 war with China.

Gandhi cultivated a psyche among people to think of joining politics only after their repeated failures to earn their own livelihood through production of goods and services for others in society. Many people and their leaders now consider the Gandhian disobedient movement a legitimate strategy to blackmail government institutions with an ulterior motive to usurp indolently the fruits (goods and services) of labor of enterprising individuals. Enterprising Indians have been thus enslaved by Gandhism bequeathed to

India upon independence. Gandhism retarded enterprising individuals' willingness to produce their best. Many of them emigrated. India's economic output suffered.

Gandhism is, therefore, not tolerance. Neither could Gandhism be the basis for defining tolerance rationally and unanimously agreeably.

4.2. Islam and democracy couldn't attain human freedom

The architect of Islam, Mohammed, and the builder of modern America, Abraham Lincoln, emancipated slaves in their times but could not create a sustainable path towards freedom. Islam started with proclamation of equality of all humans and became a dominant religious path to freedom. But monarchs or dictatorial heads running most Islamic countries considered themselves as superior to the Muslims they ruled. Democracy then ensued by granting equality of every vote to elect rulers. But the current financial bondage of a vast majority of enterprising individuals in the democratic world shows that freedom has eluded humans.

In September 2015, I watched a recently released movie on Prophet Mohammed. This movie is approved by the Egyptian government as factual. Mohammed saw how kings in Mecca were claiming to be descendants of god and using their lineage to capture slaves. He went hiding in the caves to script edicts - known as prophecy of Allah - which he dispatched to the kings practicing slavery. While the kings read the edicts, many slaves mustered courage to escape captivity and embrace Islam. Kings were thus enervated. Weakened kings had no option but to accept Islam. A few kings continued to fight against the followers of Islam even without the slave power, but ultimately saw in Mohammed a selfless individual seeking equality of all humans.

Mohammed and his Islam could not still unify people because the freed slaves followed scripts (Quoran and Sunnah and Sariat) as sacrosanct and failed to catch up with rising scientific knowledge. After Mohammed died, **kings exploited Islam's popularity to restrict even the enterprising Muslims to the confines of the scripts by keeping them away from rapidly evolving science.** Middle East was one of the frontiers of new knowledge before the advent of Islam. It has now become one of the most unscientific regions as the freed slaves inspired by Islam did not consider it necessary to learn science to produce goods and services for others. Most Islamic nations became un-Islamic with kings turning dictatorial to subjugate Islamic masses. Mogul kings invaded India and Indonesia to do the same thing: enslave by robbing hard earned wealth of enterprising individuals.

Prophet Mohammed has been rendered redundant by democracy founded on the basic thrust of Islam to grant equal right to everyone. Could democracy free the humans? The most revered democratically elected U.S. president, Abraham Lincoln, faced this question. He followed (consciously or subconsciously) the Mohammedan strategy of liberating slaves in USA with his famous emancipation declaration. But he did not make his will sacrosanct. He created land-grant universities to offer the best quality education based on latest research to the working class to build what is now known as modern America, contributing to 23% of global GDP.

But, alas, the American system crashed and the economy collapsed in 2008, which publicly bared how the vast majority of enterprising individuals has been financially enslaved. Much of the economic growth and size of US GDP has been financially engineered.

4.3 Rise of unanimously agreeable rationale and philosophy of governance

When I warned the US Congress about the necessity to repeal the system (rules) of unconstitutional robbery, I noticed at the same time (2003) that India did not need rules for similar robbery of private and public wealth. In 2003, Citizens for Development started rational discourse with Indian leaders on such issues. The secretary of President Kalam once told me fondly that I was troubling the staff at Rastrapati Bhavan as they had been instructed to submit well-organized files containing CFD memos and all relevant citations downloaded for Dr. Kalam. Dr. Kalam had invited me in 2003 (when I was in Hong Kong) and some others for a chat over internet to develop India.

The kinds of actions taken by Vajpayee-Kalam duo and then Kalam-Manmohan duo drew the attention of the U.S. White House with remarks from President Bush like who had organized a meeting between Hindu and Muslim 'fundamentalists' in July 2003 and later from the New York Times columnist Thomas Friedman about the irreversible path to greatness of India (championed by CFD) by opening new IITs, IITs, NICERs and AIIMSs.

Following my January 2005 memo on Enhancing American Competitiveness²⁹, the White House held a secret communication (published later in Washington Post) with the State Department to somehow keep India on the side of USA as a friend even by offering nuclear and other restricted technologies. The offer of Bush Administration to India took Prime Minister Manmohan Singh and his delegation (visiting USA in 2006) by so much surprise during a joint Indo-US meeting that the Indian team had to bandy around hand written notes to make their impromptu response on the spot, according to news reports published then.

As India progressed with first-best efficient strategies pursued by President Kalam with PMs Vajpayee and Singh, eyebrows were raised by Anglo-American strategists about India rising under the missile man, who had 'taken away' missile technology secrets during his past visits to conferences in USA. Dr. Kalam could not get a second term as president and Dr. Manmohan Singh had to surrender power thereafter. How this was orchestrated still intrigues me. But I was certainly targeted after the US Administration was positively swayed by my memos. For example, my paper on *A Unifying Philosophy of Governance*³⁰ reached the Vatican via the White House. It must have unnerved the Christian establishment in USA to force Google to blank out the link to this paper in Google searches in mid-2006. I had to write to the president of Google to restore the link in Google searches on unifying philosophy of governance; I argued how this paper offered a universal platform for success of a demand-driven information disseminating giant.

I was once worried about too many downloads of the paper *A Unifying Philosophy of Governance* in many middle-eastern countries. But the **Arab Spring** followed and the Google head for middle east was found responsible for distributing papers and then arrested. The Anglo-American establishment seems too frightened to let its embedded media publish the details about the papers distributed in middle-east to trigger Arab Spring.

Spring in India too dawned. Recall how Mr. Narendra Modi was ostracized by 'intellectuals' in USA and was even banned to deliver a scheduled video conference speech to the students and faculty at the Wharton School of U Penn. The ulterior reason for the ban seemed obvious to me: ***Mr. Modi would somehow continue to follow first-best efficient governance to make India great again and subvert the established Anglo-American system of unconstitutional robbery.*** Even my talks on first-best efficient

governance and on how I landed in such research - scheduled by some research-minded students and faculty - were cancelled by administrators of Oxford University, Xavier Institute of Management at Bhubaneswar, Institute of Mathematical Applications in Bhubaneswar and Berhampur University.

I wrote a memo to President Obama on November 4, 2013 entitled "A Sound Basis for USA-India Relation is Emerging: First-best Efficient Governance."³¹ The US responded promptly. After this memo was circulated, significant events have occurred starting with removal of US ambassador to India:

- Goldman Sachs Upgrades India - November 5, 2013
<http://www.indianexpress.com/news/goldman-sachs-upgrades-india-to-marketweight-raises-nifty-target-to-6900-pts/1191098/>
- **US says ready to work with Modi if he becomes PM, blames media for visa row**
[Press Trust Of India](http://www.indianexpress.com/news/us-says-ready-to-work-with-modi-if-he-becomes-pm-blames-media-for-visa-row/1192383/2) : Washington, Fri Nov 08 2013, 08:50 hrs
<http://www.indianexpress.com/news/us-says-ready-to-work-with-modi-if-he-becomes-pm-blames-media-for-visa-row/1192383/2>
- Goldman Sachs stands by our "Modi-fying our view" report after government finds it "objectionable" - November 9, 2013
<http://timesofindia.indiatimes.com/business/india-business/Goldman-Sachs-stands-by-Modi-fying-our-View-report-after-govt-calls-it-objectionable/articleshow/25443440.cms>

The above narration is just a very brief glimpse of the efficacy of first-best efficient governance in the wake of vivid failure of Islam, Democracy and Gandhism in liberation of people. The historical freedom movements failed because they were devoid of any unanimously agreeable rationale or philosophy of governance. The failure has frightened establishment leaders everywhere.

4.4 Rational and unanimously agreeable definitions of tolerance

In a RATIONAL comprehensive general model of the economy, I have proved that first-best efficient governance is attainable in equilibrium.³² The first-best efficient governance is fundamentally fair. So, it can be called Fundamentally Fair Constitutional Capitalism. Fundamental fairness is unique and unanimously agreeable since (a) no one including the unfairly privileged (e.g., a defeated political leader) prefers unfair treatment (meted, e.g., by the winning leaders), and (b) likewise no one including robbers prefers to be robbed. Constitutional Capitalism is, therefore, a unique unanimously agreeable rationale and philosophy of governance available to mankind. This is not a dogma or presumption imposed or ordained by the author. Constitutional Capitalism is attained in equilibrium within a contemporary rational economic model, which means that it is necessary for stability (so that people do not kill each other) and is efficient (so that limited natural resources including environment are not decimated). Expressed as a simple preamble, Constitutional Capitalism connotes: the state (government of we the people) should not facilitate robbery of public or private wealth, even surreptitiously. This preamble is akin to the ancient philosophy scripted as the thrust of Gita, the message of Krishna, articulated in a paper on this philosophy.³³

This paper presents rational and unanimously agreeable norms in (a) governance, (b) economic policy, (c) constitution and (d) religious and scientific beliefs for civilized coexistence. The basis of unanimous agreeability is that individuals do not prefer to have their wealth (including life) robbed, even surreptitiously.

This preference is unanimous because even robbers do not want to be robbed. I argue that unanimously agreeable norms are necessary for civilized co-existence of humans and are consistent with the ancient philosophy (*Hindutva*), which originated in India more than 3000 years BC and scripted in the form of Gita³⁴. Gita is considered by Courts of India as a philosophical document. The basic ethos of Gita is explicit and transparent: the state (King Dhristarastra) must not allow anyone (including privileged princes like Duryodhan) to take away others' (Pandavas') property even surreptitiously (through Sakuni's rigged game of Pashakhel). The modern constitution ordains freedom through rights to property, liberty and pursuit for happiness of individuals. But it has tacitly allowed establishment of a system (rules) of governance to facilitate surreptitious robbery. Individuals accumulate property like home and retirement savings with a hope to attain freedom, eventually, which they cannot achieve if they are robbed, even surreptitiously. The ancient philosophy of Gita prohibits robbery of any kind, and, thus, guarantees hope for individual freedom. The modern philosophy-underlying the established system (rules) tacitly allowed by constitution for surreptitious robbery-cannot, however, achieve individual freedom. Widespread or inclusive economic prosperity can be attained only if the constitution and rules of law are unanimously agreeable which will be consistent with ancient ethos but not modern philosophy.

A triumphant philosophy originating in India and resurrected by an Indian within contemporary rational research must have induced every nation to befriend India for civilized coexistence under Constitutional Capitalism. Intolerance and tolerance can now be defined unanimously agreeably and rationally:

Intolerance is transgression, even surreptitiously, of the unanimously agreeable principle and philosophy of governance. Tolerance is strict adherence to the unanimously agreeable principle and philosophy of governance (by letter and spirit) despite personal hardship.

The rational implications of unanimously agreeable rational definitions of tolerance and intolerance are very profound:

- *Establishment of a system (rules) of governance-even if it has been enacted democratically-to facilitate fundamentally unfair (unconstitutional) robbery is intolerance.*
- *Any direct, tacit or muted approval, consent or demeanor implying favor towards an established system (rules) of governance-even if it has been enacted democratically-to facilitate fundamentally unfair (unconstitutional) robbery is intolerance.*
- *Demeaning, insulting or suppressing the author/promoter of fundamentally fair (constitutional) system (rules) of governance is intolerance.*
- *Personal sacrifice involved in propounding, pursuing and propagating a fundamentally fair system of governance is tolerance.*

For example, a favorite Bollywood film hero like Shah Rukh Khan remaining taciturn towards the established system of fundamentally unfair robbery (shielded by democratically enacted laws) is intolerance. Ironically, a large chunk of his income stems from enterprising fans who are systemically robbed. Remaining quiet about systemic surreptitious robbery amounts to tolerance of intolerance meted to his fans. I have once sent some of my memos to this favorite hero of mine. Did he throw them? Why is Bollywood reticent about the mega systemic robbery driven by rules of law passed democratically to shield the robbers? Another favorite Bollywood hero of mine (Amitav Bachhan) has once disclosed his

preference in his next life: to speak up everything he wanted to, which meant to me that there was a lot that he wanted speak but was afraid to do. My dear Amitav Bachhan, speak up, you still have a long vibrant life; you have nothing to fear except your fear.

Hollywood is not afraid of speaking against mega systemic robbery. I have watched the trailer of a new movie, **Big Short**, which is slated to be released on December 11, 2015: When four outsiders saw what the big banks, media and government refused to, the global collapse of the economy, they had an idea: The Big Short. Their bold investment leads them into the dark underbelly of modern banking where they must question everyone and everything. Big Short story is written by Michael Lewis and played by lead actor Brad Pitt. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=LWt8hbUkG9s>

I am not surprised about the logs to my website coming from Beverly Hills in Los Angeles.

So, my dear Shah Rukh Khan, intolerance is being subdued by the juggernaut of unanimously agreeable principle and philosophy of governance. You and other Bollywood leaders need to join this bandwagon, or else you lose out to Hollywood!

4.5 How intolerance has become systemic

Assuming that no one can rationally disprove the above unanimously agreeable rational definitions of tolerance and intolerance, it is easy to decipher recent instances of intolerance in India and elsewhere:

- A. The authors/writers advocating to urinate on Hindu gods like Krishna are intolerant for tacitly demeaning the authors and followers of the principle of unanimously agreeable rationale and philosophy of governance. Those who killed such intolerant authors/writers have taken a grave risk of being prosecuted and jailed for taking the law into their hands out of desperation that the establishment had surreptitiously facilitated such intolerant writing by not chastising the authors/writers of intolerance. The killers acted desperately against intolerance engineered by powerful vested interests - like the book publishers controlled by mega robbers that compensate intolerant authors/writers to perpetuate systemic unconstitutional robbery by suppressing reemergence of any unanimously agreeable rationale and philosophy of governance. The killers were, however, irrational and inefficient at least for their own sake.

Incidentally, I have faced enormous intolerance including serious threats of unemployment, raid and arrest for writing against unconstitutional robbery. I have, however, remained within the current law even if such law has been found by my research to be unconstitutional, inefficient and unstable. I am determined to have my freedom to pursue and propagate research on constitutional capitalism even though it is antithetic to the unconstitutional system of robbery established by powerful vested interests wishing to have me financially ruined. I found very early on that the Gandhian civil disobedience of fundamentally unfair laws was inefficient and irrational and that Gandhi had failed to achieve what he longed for, unity and liberty. The only way to achieve unity and freedom of humanity is to remain steadfastly independent to continue rational research and discovery of unanimously agreeable rules of governance that no vested interests could publicly reject. Of course, I have always perceived the tacit support of enterprising individuals everywhere who prop even the indolent usurpers.

- B. It is intolerant to incessantly broadcast rationality of intolerant authors and writers using political and academic pundits who are funded and/or famed by the mega robbers who have established and perpetuated the unconstitutional, inefficient and unstable system (rules) of robbery by surreptitiously suppressing publicity of the unanimously agreeable principle and philosophy of governance.
- C. Media is intolerant to suppress the message of unanimously agreeable rationale of fundamental fairness scripted as the thrust of Gita and its enunciator, Krishna,³⁵ while it glorifies a British-origin professor, Wendy Doniger, of the University of Chicago and her Anglo-American publisher (Penguin-Random House) to assassinate Krishna's character as an amoral sexual creature.

Lynching death of a person for eating beef is obviously less monumental than disemboweling the wherewithal for survival of the vast majority of enterprising individuals through systemic robbery that depresses and slowly kills a multitude. Count, e.g., (a) the number of enterprising Indian farmers committing suicide because of usuriously high interest rates on loans they take to produce food for those that charge such rates on usurped money created on the back of such enterprising individuals, (b) the number of deaths due to unseemly high prices of medicines charged for gain of 'paper pushing' hedge funds but produced by moderately compensated enterprising researchers, and (c) the number of unemployed graduates depressed due to massive debt taken for education with a promise for better jobs that do not materialize due to shenanigans of mega robbers.

4.6 Defeat of irrational forces of intolerance

Why should a famous publisher (Penguin-Random House) and an author/professor (Wendy Doniger) at a top university (U of Chicago) - who have been painted as rational by the Indian elite and who have been funded surreptitiously by mega robbers - withdraw their case from Indian courts for distributing their 'scholarly' book on painting Krishna as an amoral sexual creature? Did they think that the Indian courts would deviate from rational judgments? No. They know that Indian courts:

- are driven by fundamental fairness,
- consider Gita (message of Krishna) as a fundamentally fair philosophical document,
- know of Krishna as the enunciator of the ancient philosophy of fundamental fairness, and
- can find that the U of Chicago and the Anglo-American publisher have vested interests:
 - A. to peddle their irrational punditry through a 'scholarly' book to establish superiority of their modern philosophy of fundamentally unfair and unanimously disagreeable systemic robbery,
 - B. to undo reemergence of the unique unanimously agreeable philosophy of fundamental fairness which is paramount for civilized co-existence of humans within a contemporary comprehensive general equilibrium model of the economy,
 - C. to assassinate the character of the original author (Krishna) of unanimously agreeable ancient philosophy of governance, and
 - D. to undermine contemporary research on unanimously agreeable, fundamentally fair first-best efficient constitutional and stable governance to decimate its challenge to the modern philosophy of systemic robbery.

The Western media, funded by the fundamentally unfair system of robbery, obviously want to deface the antithetic ancient philosophy of fundamental fairness. The only reason for why the Indian media and pundits have joined their western counterparts to support the irrational and fundamentally unfair system of robbery is obviously to fetch some pecuniary and non-pecuniary crumbs from robber barons. But they are exposing their irrational punditry and undoing the government that had supported them so far. They will now face a public that is increasingly longing for unanimously agreeable and fundamentally fair governance for civilized coexistence.

Existence of unanimously agreeable principle and philosophy of governance will be inevitably publicized, despite surreptitious attempts to suppress it, and the media run by robber barons will be undone. Even the Pope has talked about the necessity of rationality and unanimity during his recent tour of the USA without, of course (!), mentioning the contemporary author of the unique unanimously agreeable system of governance driven by the juggernaut of fundamentally fair preamble: that the state must not allow robbery of private and public wealth, even surreptitiously.

5. Unanimously Agreeable Country and Patriotism

Questions have been raised about patriotism towards countries of democratically elected leaders and of widely popular stars. What is a country? Islam considers itself an independent country with allegiance of all Muslims, scattered over many politically bounded nations, to one god (Allah), as opposed to multitude sons or reincarnations of gods. The Indian diaspora, living abroad, cheers in unison for development of their motherland. They sound as if they are beholden, with an implicit allegiance, to their motherland-country. Christians in disparate countries have arrogated a right to convert others into their religion, as if they together constitute a country. Many scientists and doctors think of a borderless world with no allegiance to politically bounded nations. Individuals thus have divers implicit allegiance beyond borders of politically bounded countries of their abode. Is it still possible with such disparate individuals to agree, unanimously and rationally, to any specific definition of Country and associated Patriotism? YES.

In the wake of his electoral defeat in 2008, the U.S. presidential candidate, Senator John McCain, wrote me to join a select group of individuals he had chosen for his country-first campaign. I agreed with a condition that Senator McCain meant by Country all the enterprising individuals that produce globally competitive goods and services to prop everyone including the rulers. My allegiance to such Country is anchored in my selfless pursuit to serve the best interest of this Country. Senator McCain did not respond to my reply, but his country-first campaign has become dormant, if not dead. This reinforced the epistemic veracity of my definition of Country.

My Country is borderless. This borderless aspect is consistent with the implicit wish of followers of religions (like Islam, Christianity, Judaism, Buddhism and Hinduism), atheism and science, scattered all over the world. There is nothing more patriotic than serving the best interest of those (the enterprising individuals) who prop my existence on earth. Everyone will agree to strengthen, not weaken, the hands that feed. My definition of country is thus unanimously agreeable.

Those who have instituted a system (rules) of governance to rob the enterprising individuals (i.e., to bite the hand that feeds) with a firm belief that the robbery would never be detected or contested may privately disagree with my definition of Country. But can they publicly disagree with my definition of Country? NO. In fact, if Robber Barons had realized that their system of surreptitious robbery would be eventually exposed (as in 2008), they would wholeheartedly have agreed to dismantle their system of unfair privilege, lest the robbed enterprising individuals would stop working and demand recovery of the loot with incarceration of the robbers. For example, what would the richest individual on earth (Hosni Mubarak, ex-President of Egypt) would be thinking in jail: freedom with normal wealth earned by serving the Country versus incarceration for the \$85 billion accumulated through surreptitious robbery.

If there is anything like salvation, it is to work for those who truly prop one's survival. I learnt this basic value from the unflinching allegiance of dogs to those that feed them, except that I have discovered (as a human being) the TRUE MASTERS, the enterprising individuals everywhere as constituting the Country, as opposed to the self-anointed Masters of the Universe (Robber Barons) who treacherously eviscerate the Country.

We can now fathom patriotism of anyone towards the unanimously agreeably and rationally defined Country. Consider, for example, patriotism (towards India) of two top Bollywood stars, Amir Khan and Shah Rukh Khan. They have claimed to be patriotic and majority have agreed as per news reports. But have they discovered their TRUE MASTERS, the Country of enterprising individuals (within India and abroad), who toil to earn and part their savings for entertainment to financially prop the stars? The stars' quietude and tolerance of the systemic robbery of their toiling fans shows unawareness of their true Country and, thus, proves irrationality of their claim for (unanimously agreeable and rationally defined) patriotism.

India like any other politically bounded geographical territory is composed of two subsets of people: enterprising individuals (true Country) who prop everyone and the usurpers who only sap the Country. Any claim of patriotism for India, but not for the Country within India, will mean allegiance only to the usurpers that sap the Country. The usurpers that sap and weaken the Country as well as those who have allegiance towards the usurpers are rationally unpatriotic.

The Robber Barons have obviously succeeded over millennia to continue their system of robbery of the Country by anointing and inducing tamable pundits and political leaders willing to share the loot to chime favorably for such a system. But their 'invincible' might failed to suppress the Country forever, thanks to selfless dissemination of research on fundamentally fair and unanimously agreeable system of governance (the essence of Hindutva) that uniquely serves the Country's best interest. The catastrophic financial crash of 2008 not only bared the systemic robbery of the Country but also made clear that the first-best efficient system of governance (essence of Hindutva) is unique, fundamentally fair, unanimously agreeable, and necessary for civilized coexistence and stability of the Country.

The degree of wealth disparity between the ultra-rich and the rest has widened unprecedentedly despite creation of \$14 trillion of new money in USA and trillions of dollars elsewhere in the world over the last 7 years. This has alarmed political leaders because a similar spike in wealth inequality had led to the wrenching Great Depression in which the Country revolted against the Robber Barons, leading to the creation of the Federal Reserve. The Federal Reserve has admitted that the 2008 crisis was worse than the Great Depression, which was triggered by the market crash of 1929 following a spike in wealth disparity. The unprecedentedly growing wealth disparity—despite the massive credit expansion globally—proves that printing and borrowing of money endlessly (Keynesianism) cannot redress the adverse cataclysmic impact of financial market crashes caused by the established fundamentally unfair (unconstitutional) system of surreptitious robbery that makes the ultra-wealthy richer by financially bonding the rest.

The bigwig Robber Barons and Emperors and their allies who have thus far presumed superiority of their philosophy and legitimacy of their privilege—stemming from robbery of the Country—are now getting increasingly disquiet and despondent. They can no longer paint Hindutva as some esoteric mythology perpetuated among unenlightened idolaters;

- a) whose dark souls need candle light on Diwali for enlightenment (as the U.S. Southern Baptist Church once did),
- b) who should be induced to accept Christianity as the best path to reach God (as the Pope John Paul once said),
- c) who deserve to be killed for refusal to embrace Islam (for which a mountain pass for killing Hindus was named as Hindukhush),

- d) who should be treated as orphans for emigrating to serve the Country abroad (as stated by a Harvard 'scholar'), and
- e) whose revered savior (Krishna, the author of Hindutva) is painted as an amoral sexual creature (by author Wendy Doniger of University of Chicago in her book published by Penguin Books - Random House).

The borderless global Country cannot be fooled any longer, for it now knows the epistemic truth about Hindutva as necessary for civilized coexistence, efficiency and stability. Rationally and unanimously agreeably, Hindutva is the unique fundamentally fair system of governance available for mankind for efficient civilized coexistence, i.e., by consuming the least from the earth's limited environmental resources. This does not mean that the Robber Barons and Emperors and their associates have surrendered. For their survival and sway over the Country, they will continue to keep the Country divided based on race, gender, religion, caste, politically demarcated country of origin, language, etc. They will suppress the spread of a unifying philosophy or universal religion and god. They will try all their best to undo the triumph of Hindutva by continuing to rob the Country and by throwing crumbs from the loot at the anointed-rewarded academic pundits and political leaders for spreading anti-Hindutva myths. Duryodhan of Mahabharat did not surrender!

My experience, however, indicates that the fundamentally unfair, unanimously disagreeable and irrational system of robbery has been all but vanquished. One tell-tale indication is the fiasco of the propaganda unleashed during the 2014 election in India to defeat a Hindutva leader by linking him to Hitler:

- The 2014 Indian election was portrayed as a contest between the RSS and the Indian National Congress.
- News reports had then vehemently portrayed the RSS as an organization that did not struggle for India's independence and killed Mahatma Gandhi who was the frontier of the Indian National Congress that won independence of India:
- Enterprising Germans as well as most Europeans and Americans were as despondent and disquiet (as they are today) after they had lost their hard-earned wealth and were unemployed before the Nazi Party of Hitler rose to power.
- The Nazi Party perhaps figured out that the traders in London had caused the crisis. An angry Hitler then bombed London. It was like the angry Arab militants bombing Wall Street for causing the 2001 market crash.
- In the aftermath of the 2008 financial crisis, many angry students, professionals and professors likewise protested by occupying Wall Street with tacit blessing from political mentors and like-minded pundits. Many members of US Congress were very angry and ready to make punitive actions against Wall Street. The anger was contained after I wrote memos to President Obama and members of U.S. Congress about the necessity to repeal the established system of robbery, not to be vindictive towards those who operated the system. I wish someone had convinced Hitler with such memos to repeal the system of robbery rather than killing people.
- Instead of thinking about reforming the system of robbery, Hitler waged an irrational war against almost everyone. The US went against Hitler only after he cornered France that had helped US gain independence from UK.³⁶
- The Nazi Party had used the revered Hindu symbol of Swastika. The Robber Barons exploited this visual Nazi Party symbol to link the Hindutva leader, Mr. Narendra Modi, to Hitler with a view to foiling the revival of Hindutva. Their motive was very clear: suppress Hindutva by all means, lest the Country will:

- a) demand institution of Hindutva as it is the only fundamentally fair and unanimously agreeable system of governance needed for civilized coexistence and stability of humanity,
 - b) recognize that only Hindutva, not the current antithetic fundamentally unfair system of robbery, is supported by economic equilibrium within a contemporary comprehensive long-run mathematical model of the economy that even the Robber Barons and their elite academic gurus have failed to refute, and
 - c) know that the Robber Barons are opposed to Hindutva because they want to remain unfairly privileged by robbing and enervating the Country with the prevailing fundamentally unfair system of robbery.
- That the Robber Barons failed is obvious from the following:
 - a) Publication in 2013 of my paper - proving that the established system is unconstitutional, unstable and inefficient - in the Journal of Financial Intermediation that claims to have 18 Nobel Laureates as authors.
 - b) US Congressional Financial Crisis Inquiry Commission's factual finding in 2011 that the Robber Barons and their gurus in the elite academy and cohorts in government regulatory agencies including the Chairman of the Federal Reserve were responsible for causing the manmade (avoidable) crisis of 2008.
 - c) Foiled attempt to assassinate the character of the author of Hindutva (Krishna) as an amoral sexual creature through publication by a top Anglo-American publisher, Penguin Books-Random House, of a book authored by Professor Wendy Doniger of U of Chicago.
 - d) Fiasco in trying to sway the US Congress that the financial crisis of 2008 was caused by invisible hand (god), not by the established system of robbery, notwithstanding the publication by the Oxford U Press of a book authored by Yale finance professor Gary Gorton. This book was highly recommended by bigwigs in the elite academy of economy and finance. Yet it could not sway the US lawmakers, thanks to my research and memos submitted since 2003 and to a specific rejoinder in 2010 that the elite experts and their disciples (Masters of the Universe and government regulators including the Federal Reserve) were in fact lying in their testimony that no one saw the crisis coming. Their testimony might have meant that no human being saw the crisis coming and that the crisis was, therefore, caused by god and that I could not be human (their god?).
 - The Robber Barons and their associates in the US government had made Hindutva leader, current prime minister Mr. Narendra Modi of Bharatiya Janata Party, untouchable as of end of October 2013. I wrote a memo to President Obama on November 4, 2013 explaining how the unanimously agreeable and fundamentally fair first-best efficient system of governance (the essence of Hindutva) was necessary to strengthen the bond between both the Countries of USA and India.³⁷ The US government then decisively and expeditiously decided to remove the US ambassador to India and to build the needed rapport with the Hindutva leader, because he was not a reincarnation of Hitler and that he espoused a philosophy that could unify Countries worldwide.
 - In a way, Hindutva is a benevolent diktat of unanimously agreeable rationale of governance that even the currently privileged Robber Barons and their allies have to embrace to serve the best interest of the Country as well as for their own survival.

The Robber Barons are, therefore, despondent and disquiet. They must be feeling ashamed before the US government authorities for their failure to impugn my character because since childhood I have never been inimical towards even those who considered me their enemy. In fact, my research offers first-best existence for all enterprising individuals who prop everyone including the current Robber Barons as well as the rulers. Let me illustrate this point with two alternative choices:

- A. Robber Barons accumulate supernormal wealth and power but the Country eventually learns that it has been robbed by a fundamentally unfair [unconstitutional], unstable, inefficient and unanimously disagreeable system.
- B. Robber Barons quit robbery and, like other enterprising individuals, accumulate normal wealth and power based on service to the Country governed by a fundamentally fair, efficient and stable system that I have pursued for enactment since 1991 with no self-interest and no motivation for publicity, despite enormous risk to my career, family and physical survival.

The Robber Barons' choice obviously should be B, unless they believed that they would forever fool or tame or lure all the enterprising individuals all the time to willy-nilly accept without contest the fundamentally unfair system of robbery. Robber Barons had indeed succeeded over the millennia before 2008 to remain rich and powerful to force everyone to kowtow willy-nilly to their system of robbery. On the contrary, I have always believed in the ability of enterprising individuals to eventually learn the unanimously agreeable epistemic truth found in my research that a fundamentally fair system (which does not facilitate even surreptitious robbery) is necessary for civilized coexistence. Under such unflinching belief, my pursuits obviously amounted to serving the best interest of even the Robber Barons. Instead of rewarding for my research discoveries designed for their best interest, the Robber Barons and their elite academic gurus continued a self-defeating path of suppressing publication of my research in the media they controlled. In the process, the elite academy and established gurus, have been found lacking publication of any research on a system of unanimously agreeable fundamental fairness for civilized coexistence. In addition, they have been found to be following the diktats of Robber Barons to facilitate robbery of the Country.

The Country can now screen those who are truly patriotic towards it from those who are not. More importantly, the humanity can now think of the tranquility, civility and efficiency in its existence by spreading patriotism towards the true Country:

1. The single most source of anger for an enterprising individual is robbery of private and common wealth, facilitated by a system (rules) of governance designed to shield the robbers. The anger is natural because the robbed individual cannot seek justice when all laws facilitating robbery are beyond judicial review.
2. A small percent of angry enterprising individuals facing a legalized system of robbery with no judicial recourse is statistically likely to become mentally agitated and violent to revolt against the state. The state may call it terrorism. But such terrorism can be resolved only through spreading of unanimously agreeable patriotism towards the Country. Trying to induce the robbed Country to be patriotic pawns of the system of robbery will be futile.
3. Spread of true patriotism will make Countries, globally, efficient due to potential reduction in internecine and ensuing tranquility and collaboration among enterprising individuals to create renewable resources for long-run civilized coexistence.

6. Conclusion

This paper has presented unanimously agreeable and rational norms on philosophy, governance and beliefs and argued how these norms uniquely fulfill the common human longing for prosperity, freedom and civilized coexistence. It has also shown that the ancient philosophy of *Hindutva* is founded on unanimous agreeability and rationality and is, therefore, necessary for efficient civilized coexistence of humans with tolerance, individual freedom and prosperity. In contrast, both Gandhian socialism and Anglo-American capitalism amount to surreptitious robbery of enterprising individuals and, therefore, are antithetic to *Hindutva*. The paper also rationally finds that *Hindutva* can, while Gandhian socialism and

Anglo-American philosophy cannot, achieve unanimously agreeable tolerance, individual freedom, prosperity and civilized coexistence.

7. References [Endnotes]

¹Director, Research Center on Finance and Governance, and Founder of Citizens for Development and Pro-Prosperty.Com can be reached by email at sacharya@pro-prosperty.com . I teach at the University of Illinois, but this paper does not express the official view or position of my employer. I am grateful to numerous individuals especially Dr. Bhupal Singh and my students in understanding the unanimous longing for civilized co-existence.

² Acharya, S. (2011), "No-Subsidy Mantra in Governance for the Most Efficiently Competitive Economy," Journal of Regulation and Governance, <http://pro-prosperty.com/Research/Governance-and-Most-Efficient-Competitive-Economy.pdf>

³ Acharya, S. (2013), " A Sound Basis for USA-India Relationship is Emerging: First-best Efficient Governance," <http://pro-prosperty.com/India/USA-India-First-best-Governance.html>

⁴ After circulation of my paper and memos on no-subsidy mantra of governance, India has been dismantling most of its subsidies, the US and European governments are mulling plans to do away with subsidies. The 2016 Republication presidential contestants in USA are openly espousing for elimination of all forms of subsidies. See also Acharya, S. (2011), "Republicans and Democrats agree to cut subsidies to everyone including corporations," <http://pro-prosperty.com/Democrats%20and%20Republicans%20agree%20to%20stop%20subsidies.html>; Acharya, S. (2012), "EU mulls trading tax to generate surplus to compensate for government subsidy to finance industry," <http://pro-prosperty.com/European-Union-Subsidy-Surplus-Trading-Tax.html> ; Acharya, S. (2011), "Global agitations against government subsidy to special interests," <http://pro-prosperty.com/Global%20Agitations%20Against%20Special%20Interests.html>

⁵ Acharya, S. (2005), "Wisdom of Ancient Indian Caste System: Division of Labor," <http://pro-prosperty.com/cfd/index.php?topic=24.0;wap2>

⁶ Acharya, S. (2013), "Arbitrage Pricing of Total Risk of Assets and First-Best Governance of Financial Markets," <http://pro-prosperty.com/Research/moraleazardliberty.pdf>

⁷ Acharya, S. (2013), "Constitutional System of Money and Finance," Journal of Financial Transformation, <http://pro-prosperty.com/Research/Constitutional-Monetary-Finance-System.pdf>

⁸ Acharya, S. (2012), "A Unifying Philosophy of Governance [Universal Religion and God]," Journal of Governance and Regulation, <http://pro-prosperty.com/Research/Constitutional-Monetary-Finance-System.pdf>

⁹ Acharya, S. (2011), "No-Subsidy Mantra of Governance to Attain for Most Efficiently Competitive Economy," Journal of Governance and Regulation, <http://pro-prosperty.com/Research/Governance-and-Most-Efficient-Competitive-Economy.pdf>

¹⁰ Acharya, S. (2013), "We the People Want Constitutional Raj Dharma: First-best Efficient Governance," <http://pro-prosperty.com/India/We%20the%20People%20Want%20Constitutional%20Raj%20Dharma.html>

¹¹ Acharya, S. (2013), " Constitutional Capitalism for First-best Efficient Governance, obtained in general equilibrium based on rational microeconomic analysis, devoid of parochial dogmas, politics or prejudice," <http://pro-prosperty.com/Constitutional%20Capitalism.pdf>

¹² Acharya, S. (2015), "Absolute Knowledge on Governance," <http://pro-prosperty.com/Absolute%20Knowledge%20on%20Governance.html>

¹³ Acharya, S. (2012), "First-best Management Academy: Proposal for Consideration by Global Leaders," <http://pro-prosperty.com/Research/First-best%20Management%20Academy.pdf>

¹⁴ Acharya, S. (2011), " Begetting First-best Status for Principals, Based on First-Best Policy Research: Economically Efficient Constitutional Governance Needed to Attain the Most Efficiently Competitive Economy," <http://pro-prosperty.com/Begetting%20first-best%20status.html>

¹⁵ Acharya, S. (2013), "Arbitrage Pricing of Total Risk of Assets and First-best Governance of Financial Markets,"

¹⁶ Acharya, S. (2013), " Universities Need to Award Research on Stability,

Economic Efficiency and Constitutional Fairness" <http://pro-prosperity.com/University%20Award%20Research%20on%20Stability,%20Efficiency%20and%20Constitutional%20Fairness.html>

¹⁷ See Acharya, S. (2012), "A Unifying Philosophy of Governance," *Journal of Governance and Regulation*, <http://pro-prosperity.com/A-Unifying-Philosophy-of-Governance.html>

¹⁸ The meaning of what is true or false is elaborated in a paper entitled "A Unifying Philosophy of Governance," forthcoming in the *Journal of Governance and Religion* and also available at <http://www.pro-prosperity.com/A-Unifying-Philosophy-of-Governance.html>

¹⁹ See Acharya, S. (2012), "A Unifying Philosophy of Governance," *Journal of Governance and Regulation*, and also available at <http://www.pro-prosperity.com/A-Unifying-Philosophy-of-Governance.html> offers a novel rational philosophical foundation for the concepts of god, religion and science in which the claim that science triumphs over religion is redundant.

²⁰ Acharya, S. (2014), "How Academic Freedom has Eluded the Academy and How it can be attained," <http://pro-prosperity.com/Academic%20Freedom.html> and Acharya, S. (2013), "Universities need to reward research on stability, economic efficiency and constitutional fairness," <http://pro-prosperity.com/University%20Award%20Research%20on%20Stability,%20Efficiency%20and%20Constitutional%20Fairness.html>

²¹ See Acharya, S. (2012), "A Unifying Philosophy of Governance," forthcoming in the *Journal of Governance and Regulation*.

²² Acharya, S. (2005), "Wisdom of Ancient India's Caste System," <http://pro-prosperity.com/cfd/index.php?topic=24.0;wap2>

²³ Acharya, S. (2015), "Why Ancient and Modern Leaders have failed to Liberate Humanity," <http://pro-prosperity.com/Why%20leaders%20have%20failed%20to%20liberate%20humanity.html>

²⁴ Acharya, S. (2012), "Arbitrage Pricing of Total Risk of Assets and First-best Governance of Financial Markets," available at <http://pro-prosperity.com/Research/moralhazardliberty.pdf>

²⁵ See Acharya, S. (2012), "Arbitrage Pricing of Total Risk of Assets and First-best Governance of Financial Markets," available at <http://pro-prosperity.com/Research/moralhazardliberty.pdf>

²⁶ Acharya, S. (2013), "Constitutional Capitalism for First-best Efficient Governance, obtained in general equilibrium based on rational microeconomic analysis, devoid of parochial dogmas, politics or prejudice," <http://pro-prosperity.com/Constitutional%20Capitalism.pdf>

²⁷ Desai, Ashwin (September 15, 2015), "Gandhi's Empire," *Indian Express*. <http://pro-prosperity.com/Gandhi%20allied%20with%20British%20Empire.pdf>

²⁸ "The entire rank and file of the Congress looked at Sardar Patel as the most deserving candidate to be sworn in as independent India's first Prime Minister, given his proven track record of being an able administrator and a no-nonsense politician. Then what really went wrong? To find out the answer, we need to rewind back to 1946.... Gandhi was always impressed with the modern outlook of Nehru. In comparison to Nehru, Sardar Patel was a little orthodox and Gandhi thought India needed a person who was modern in his approach." See <http://www.indiatvnews.com/print/news/why-gandhi-opted-for-nehru-and-not-sardar-patel-for-pm--6689-4.html>

²⁹ Acharya, S. (2005), "Enhancing American Competitiveness," <http://pro-prosperity.com/USPresident013105.html>

³⁰ Acharya, S. (2012), "A Unifying Philosophy of Governance," <http://pro-prosperity.com/A-Unifying-Philosophy-of-Governance.html>

³¹ <http://pro-prosperity.com/India/USA-India-First-best-Governance.html>

³² Acharya, S. (2012), "Arbitrage Pricing of Total Risk of Assets and First-Best Efficient Governance of Financial Markets," <http://pro-prosperity.com/Research/moralhazardliberty.pdf>

³³ Acharya, S. (2015), "Triumph of Ancient Philosophy, Unanimously Agreeable Governance, Economic Ethos and Constitution for Civilized Co-existence," <http://pro-prosperity.com/triumphantphilosophy.pdf>

³⁴ Bhagavat Gita, Wikipedia, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Bhagavad_Gita

³⁵ See Acharya, S. (October 2015), "Triumph of Ancient Philosophy, Unanimously Agreeable Governance, Economic Ethos and Constitution for Civilized Coexistence," at <http://pro-prosperity.com/triumphantphilosophy.pdf>

³⁶ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/France_in_the_American_Revolutionary_War

³⁷ Acharya, S. (2013), "A Sound Basis for USA-India Relationship is Emerging: First-best Efficient Governance," <http://pro-prosperity.com/India/USA-India-First-best-Governance.html>