

PS: Let's also add that in response to the questions of Suzy and Johnny to their dads in the first pdf of this site, the two dads gave their kids, and themselves, the following bookreview and that soon their kids gave them the following link <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Be3hWqy15E>. The kids' fascination with that link was not due to the age of the analyst but to the brevity of the self-contained argument which allowed an overall perspective. Concerning the issue of whether the young girl did understand or was reciting or reading like TV-news persons, which sidetracked some viewers, they said they would prefer the analysis to have been presented in writing by an unknown person so as not to disorient the audience's questions into such irrelevant directions but keep them focused on the argument. OK, let's see the book review:

End this Depression Now!

i. Introduction/Mini-Summary

Since the housing and financial crash of 2008, America's economy has been stuck deep in the doldrums. Indeed, GDP has remained well beneath pre-2008 levels, and employment levels have failed to recover. In an effort to resuscitate the economy, the American government tried first to jump-start it through stimulus spending, and has now replaced this approach with greater austerity. Nothing seems to be working. For Nobel Prize winning economist Paul Krugman, though, the answer is clear: the problem is that the original stimulus effort was too small, and, since that time, the government is moving squarely in the wrong direction. Indeed, Krugman argues that America's current situation bares a striking resemblance to the stagnation of the Great Depression, and that history has taught us what to do in such situations: the government must take an aggressive approach to stimulate the economy into recovery. This is the argument that Krugman makes in his new book 'End This Depression Now!'

Now, Krugman is not a proponent of big government spending under normal conditions. Indeed, even in a recession, Krugman's preferred approach is to drop interest rates in order to spur consumer spending. The problem now is that interest rates are already at zero, and this has not been enough to get consumer spending off the ground, thus leaving the economy in what is called a 'liquidity trap'. For Krugman, the liquidity trap is actually quite common in economic downturns that follow financial crashes (as is the case with the current one, and as was the case with the Great Depression), and is why such slumps tend to be deep and prolonged.

According to Krugman, the best and surest way to save the economy from a liquidity trap is for the government to step in and undertake the spending that consumers won't. That is, the government must stimulate the economy back into action, until consumers can get back on their feet enough to take over for themselves. For Krugman, this is precisely what happened in America during WWII, when the government's military spending served to stimulate the economy and save it from the grips of the Great Depression.

Now, Krugman's opponents will point out that the American government has already tried the stimulus approach during this downturn, and that this strategy did not work, thus showing that it cannot be relied upon. What's more, these same opponents argue that the government's debt is already enormous, and indeed dangerously high, and that further government spending at this point may well render the debt completely unmanageable, if not force the government into insolvency (which is indeed a threat that is currently being faced by several countries in the European Union). Finally, Krugman's detractors maintain that pumping more money into the economy at this time only threatens to drive up inflation to dangerous levels, perhaps even triggering a hyperinflationary spiral.

Krugman, though, claims that he has answers to all of these objections. In the first place, as noted above, the author maintains that the failure of the government's first stimulus effort did not prove

that this approach is ineffective, but that it simply wasn't large enough to do the trick. Second, Krugman argues that though government debt does pose a concern, America's debt is actually not that dangerous by historical standards. What's more, since America has its own currency (unlike the countries of the European Union), it is able to print money to turn over its debt, thus preventing the possibility of bankruptcy. Finally, with regards to inflation, Krugman contends that inflation simply cannot get off the ground in a depressed economy (as the current situation would attest to), and that when it is triggered in an upturn the government can always reverse its policy, thus keeping it firmly in check.

What follows is a comprehensive summary of the main argument in Paul Krugman's *End This Depression Now!*

Here is Paul Krugman speaking about his new book (Part II of the interview is available on YouTube):

.....

Returning to Greece's problems and the issue of whether her problems were like Canada's, USA's or Europe's, Suzy and Johnny said they did realize, along with Krugman too, that Greece did have additional problems besides the ones that Krugman and the "girl" considered soluble. Suzy also liked a pdf circulated by McKenzie, after his return from the island, describing a public discussion in an informal, outdoors "faculty gathering" of mostly social nature (*social gathering*, not *gathering for social issues* etc!). Johnny liked more one page written by Mr Yiannis as accompaniment to a posting of their rehearsal, to explain why its content was not chauvinistic on behalf of Greece. Here we present part of the former and all of the latter:

Pseudoproblems and pseudosolutions? Farcicomedies or farcitragedies? Solvers or pranksters?
Answer: Verba Volant, **Scripta** Manent (=sayings fly, **writings** stay)

Capitalism is the worst system until a better one is found
By Anon Ymous or by "Whatwas Hisname?"
(but not by Mel Brooks' *Ab Normal**)

Just googled it to be W. Churchill

.....Many things were discussed yesterday in the café but few can be still remembered so as to be later examined in peace and at length for the seriousness of their nature. I submit mine in writing. It just repeats my, somewhat too loud, objection to the pseudoargument implicit in the well known motto above but I hope the humor of the motto, whether explicit or implicit, allows a kind of happy coexistence of all the parties involved in the discussion even if they remain mutually unconvinced and/or unconvincing... The value of the present pdf I consider as greater than only the value of the ones of the "delete before you read"-type and than the value of the ones of the "forget after you read and delete"-type, but certainly smaller than the value of the ones of the "save after you read"-type...

If I were a literature or philosophy instructor maybe I would speak about our disagreements as one taking place in a Platonic cave, but being a physics instructor in close collaboration with the colleagues who are mathematics instructors I will be speaking of our discussion, and of the discourse in the whole present society of which we are a micro-image, through a different metaphor, from some aspects being a more accurate metaphor and from some other less accurate, but at least being more akin to our profession: Our society, when discussing such concerns, is like a classroom of our days in which a mathematician has posed a geometry problem without saying if it is easy, or hard, or even soluble, and left after saying that opening books is allowed and collaborations between students are not only allowed but welcome and encouraged. At least in our days some ignorant student would do show up to present a trivially wrong solution and then add "if nobody has a an alternative (wrong) solution then my (wrong) solution is right". And even people would show up who would check the validity through voting because through ignorance or laziness they would not check it otherwise (and possibly even people would show up who would try to affect voters by cheating or threatening). The analogy with the case in hand is clear: Classroom is society in general but also, in particular, every group that discusses these issues, like e.g. we do. Wrong solution is capitalism. The analog of the mathematician who did know the solution of the problem (or if it was not soluble at all) does not exist*, ignorant students are ourselves, shutting each other up by saying things like "if you don't know a solution don't express an opinion at all". We are doubly ignorant: 1) as solvers (but OK, who could blame us for that one? How can we all be solvers of difficult problems?) 2) As imaginary knowers who are not content just to repeat "if you don't know a solution don't express an opinion at all" but also reach the point of saying "if you don't know a wrong solution different from mine then my wrong solution is not wrong". OK, of course geometry and sociology are not similar all the way, so the analogy is mistaken in some essential parts, but their differences are of the nature of the differences of geometry from biology or psychology in which, again validity would not be argued about in the above irrational ways. Voting is fine for many things related to decision making and choice (see also *) but we all know that when the available options are limited by obstructing news about their existence it begins to sound as coercing, terrorizing, i.e. physically forcing voters. Both to understand these points through examples and to return to the issue of Greece's problem let's outline some steps that are needed to make understandable a phrase, often repeated these days, going like: "The problem with Greece is that she never really knew capitalism. The solution for her is to finally see the light. Better late than never"

*or maybe is e.g. some Nobel level economist like e.g. Krugman who can't convince even democrats that they should take a look into his book's proof that the crisis is not inevitable but a result of choice, not even convince the know-alls among us to read his book "End this depression now!", and of course neither would he convince fellow Nobelists like Milton Friedman, who choose differently (google e.g. with *Milton Friedman Pinochet IMF*, or with *The economist and the dictator Friedman Pinochet*).

Step 1: : A bourgeois class in the sense of production in which it was meant and functioning in other parts of the world indeed has not existed.

Step 2: Britain and North America first employed protectionism and only after they took the lead they freed markets; only to their benefit again (For such material see e.g. *Enslaved By Free Trade* by George Monbiot June 06, 2003

Step 3: Leading nations now ruin their own people too and their people try to organize to confront the decisions that led them where they now stand.

If by recommending capitalism one just means, as an idiom, that he recommends diligence it does make sense (grammatically at least; whether one is in favor or against workaholism). To recommend capitalism as medicine for exit from crisis means what? Which of the above three stages of it? For the first it's too late for countries that were not in it from the start. The second sense was applicable to only leading economies (first generation of leading or the next, catching up with the former by leading other still available poordevils). In the third stage one type of proletarian, in order not to feel fucked over, imagines that he himself is doing some of the fucking and shouts to his employer "No mercy for the loafer and the idler. In your position I would screw him", forgetting that the employer does not wait for his advice and that the guy to receive the screwing is already being screwed and is he himself (but through that identification the newly poor middle class man relives vicariously some of the good days where he too was an employer).

Therefore, don't we have to think if other types of collaboration with capitalist economies are possible?

....Deletions acceptable (as we said "...delete after you read". If I could think up of a solution I would say "save after you read" but I can't)

Upshot: Unless what we call "capitalism" is any form of diligence, why should one expect salvation by the capitalism of the older days now that capitalism has been reduced ad absurdum?

PS: A book review for people who like reading:

End this Depression Now!

i. Introduction/Mini-Summary

.....We have seen it (in pages 2,3).....

Note: Nowhere does the author imply that what he says can save Greece too. Europe maybe, but Greece no.

For less bookfriendly readers there's a short video with an analogous argument in:

http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Be3hWquy15E&feature=player_embedded

But watch it: the fact that the argument here is pronounced by a 12-year old girl should not mislead the viewer into believing he is saying a counterargument if he just says: "Oh, her eyes are moving, she is reading her lines somewhere" or "she learned a grownup's argument by heart. She is a parrot!".

Who cares even if she an anteater? If an anteater parroted an argument proving some theorem of Euclid was wrong would it suffice to say "the error of this proof is that its pronouncer is an anteater?". Once a colleague of ours working in a coaching school which before his shift with highschool last graders was hosting English for kindergarten children and had bunnies etc as wallpaper, wanting to pull the leg of his regular students went there earlier and trained the infants to parrot talk like "sir, can't we do this integral by using trigonometric substitution?" etc . So all that is possible, and it is no argument against e.g. doability of integrals etc. The strong part of the video is that it is a short and self contained argument (but, we repeat, does not suffice for Greece's salvation) . Anyway, let's finish by choosing to take Churchill's motto we started with as reconciliating humor instead of an asshole's witticism that it also is (along with his usual "anyone under 25 who's not a communist is an asshole, anyone above 25 who's a communist is an idiot" etc And since we mistrusted his taste by calling his lines an asshole's witticisms let's also return to sender some well known admiring things he had said about Greece during war.

The answer of this site to someone who would say it's too partial on behalf of "Greekness":

1) This site has given as sufficient a number of examples of what it considers as Greekness as would be needed to form an opinion on an issue like e.g. what is the ancient Greeks' approach to geometry. But from nowhere in it does it follow that one who was born a Greek would have less difficulty in implementing it, at least in its part that does not refer to just dancing etc. As well known, Euclid himself, to a person as clever (and as educated, by Aristotle himself as a tutor) as Alexander the Great said "there is no royal road to geometry". So Greek road to geometry (or anything) may mean Euclid's way but doesn't mean "easier for born in Greece". Same, and harder, is the application to non geometric contexts. In short the approach of Greekness to life, politics etc is as universal as mathematics or music etc. If somebody wants to call it "Amereekness" he can be the approach's guest and implement him of behalf of what he wants.

2) If one considers that he doesn't disagree with the Greeks' attitude to Greekness but to the approaches to life etc of Greekness itself, i.e. with the "axioms" themselves of that "universal geometry" he can be our guest and formulate and post his own favorite ones (from some other country or culture) and we'll together compare them or be mutually inspired or dis-inspired, expired etc etc.

3) If one, on the contrary, finds the "axioms" quite OK but just disagrees with any possible suggestion that Greeks are able to apply them or to fight to save them from themselves, from their governments, from their allies, from their enemies, from the markets, from the invasion of Western culture, from the invasion of Eastern culture, from the invasion not just culture but non assimilable numbers of immigrants etc he can be Greekness' representative and protector in his own country and save it there calling it "Amereekness" etc as we said)

4) Concerning partiality of this site, it does consider there is one feature making Greeks unique (or at least rare, we're not so informed with respect to what happens everywhere, maybe there are examples elsewhere too, factual or in the imagination of artists*). That feature is that only in Greece**, so great a percentage of people, and in times so recent that some participants still live, died or faced extreme hardship for the sake of those principles (axioms)***. Whether they were too naïve or not, is one question, but whether these principles were worth defending, and whether less naïve people would do it better, would not try it at all etc is another; and it's never too late to try it in new contexts.

5) Similarly the fact that in Civil Wars both sides claim that they implement such principles and they both cover under them atrocities too, doesn't mean that the principles are to blame or not to ever try to implement again but only means that any new trials must be improved. If the ideals themselves are to be thrown away one needs another argument, not the failure of the way they were applied**** or of the way that, e.g. even the best-meaning revolution leads to eventual degeneration and corruption etc (this cycle is eternal; and not attempting anything until a perfected way, for degeneration never to reoccur, is invented, is idiocy worse than participating knowingly in the sure-to-eventually-fail move.

6) Concerning the very reasonable question of why the axioms, principles, ideals, premises etc referred to, above, are not mentioned here the answer is that nothing like all that can be stated in one page but much of all that can be said in one whole site, so see the abstract in the previous page. Also we add that while it does make some sense to keep the rest of the present page in mind, its relevance in the absence of the rest of all this site, or of some equivalent of it, is next to zero.

7) Concerning the very reasonable question of whether any great percentage of Greeks, at least right now, think as above, the answer is: 1) No poll in that direction exists 2) Would knowing this number be relevant for any reasons other than static and idle? E.g. for knowing if a "subject/carrier/..." etc exists to implement them? To observe a "subject" as a guinea pig does make some sense for both observer and observed, but more sense, in global days, would make if great percentages in all interacting countries started thinking if, in interaction, they can form a "subject" etc (for more sense see Kondylis' *Planetary politics after cold war*)

Note: The reference just mentioned is no apology of Greek pathologies. On the contrary, regarding Greece, it's a quite early diagnosis of them. One thing the present page does is to point out how and why to ask if features of the Greek way can help in the global problem. Regarding the pathologies (e.g. see***) we just say that whether Greece itself is salvable or not, the relevance of valid diagnoses/prophesies, when impossible to be coupled with some local or global subject (e.g. because none exists) is only for bet offices etc and lasts only as long as their fulfillment makes them known

*To the best of our knowledge, we have included what we could infer from South America's art (Neruda) and we have tried to put everything into North American contexts too (e.g. in "Mount Bushmore" and other texts)

**We must also learn more about the Civil War in Spain before World War II.

***Does the proximity and closeness in time with historical factors make Greeks different, e.g. more mature in some issues? Some yes, others it makes react to it (e.g. as to a burden) and define maturity as opposing it, others don't know it

****The well known maxim for all that is "Ideals are like train schedules. They don't exist to be precisely kept but to know how long the train delays are" (but of course this is not useless!).