A New Role for the U.S.A. Today

by Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.

This paper was written on Oct. 21, 2002, upon request by the editors of the Turkish magazine Yarin*, and published in their December issue.*

Turkey today is, like many other nations, primarily a victim of the follies embedded in the current policies of the U.S.A. at this moment. Those policies are susceptible of sudden change, possibly, hopefully, soon. However, that change requires two things: understanding the current internal U.S. economic and political situation, and knowing how to influence that situation, with the help of concerned forces from around the world.

Start with the recklessness of current U.S. national security dogma, and proceed to analyze both the situation and its remedies from that starting-point.

The present, foolish military policy of the U.S.A.'s George Bush Administration can not be competently understood except as the current outcome of a long, 1944-2002 conflict between the U.S. military tradition of patriots such as U.S. Generals of the Army Douglas MacArthur and Dwight Eisenhower, on the one side, and, on the opposing side, the so-called "Utopian" imperial policies of the U.S. followers of Britain's H.G. Wells and Bertrand Russell. The recruitment of these U.S. "Utopians" to the Wells-Russell doctrines, occurred as a new, mid-Twentieth-Century outgrowth of a long continuing conflict between the two leading political currents in U.S. internal history.

From the beginning of its struggle for freedom against British tyranny, in 1763, the leading currents of what became the United States of America have been divided between the patriots, which were led, over the 1763-1789 interval, by the towering intellect of statesman-scientist Benjamin Franklin, and the opposing, London-allied faction, the so-called "American Tories," who were typified by the notorious Judge Lowell and the British Foreign Office asset of Jeremy Bentham, the Bank of Manhattan's treasonous Aaron Burr. All of the internal political history, and foreign policy of the U.S.A. have been defined, since that time, by the shifts of leading political power, back and forth, between these two mutually opposed currents.

For example, I am a continuation of the first current, that of figures such as Cotton Mather follower Benjamin Franklin, and of such leading figures as Presidents Washington, James Monroe, John Quincy Adams, Abraham Lincoln, James Garfield, and Franklin Roosevelt. As the real power in Washington shifted, beginning the mid-1960s, from elected Presidents, into the hands of cabals represented by such National Security Advisors as Henry Kissinger and Zbigniew Brzezinski, treasonous American Tory traditions have often dominated U.S. domestic and foreign policy-making during extended intervals, and on specific issues, during the 1964-2002 period as a whole. These Tories included such pre-Civil War, slaveholder-allied Democratic Presidents as Andrew Jackson, Martin van Buren, Polk, Pierce, and Buchanan. The list includes, later, President Grover Cleveland, and Confederacy sympathizers such as Presidents Theodore Roosevelt, and Woodrow Wilson. It also includes those U.S. allies of London's Montagu Norman who put Adolf Hitler into power in Germany, in 1933.

The American Tory current underwent a qualitative transformation at the close of the 1939-1945 World War II. This group of President Franklin Roosevelt's political adversaries, allied itself with rabid British imperial Utopians such as H.G. Wells and British Lord, Earl Bertrand Russell. These combined Anglo-American circles, led world-wide by Russell, combined the ideas of world government, as presented in Wells' 1938 book *The Open Conspiracy,* with the idea of developing and using nuclear weapons, as weapons so terrifying that nations would give up their sovereignties, and would submit to the kind of world government which Wells and Russell demanded. This faction, organized personally, top-down, by Earl Russell, organized the nuclear bombing of Japan's Hiroshima and Nagasaki, and set into motion what became known from 1945-1946 onward as the anti-traditionalist, "military-Utopian" faction of the U.S.A. and Britain. The joint effort created the U.S. Air Force as an independent arm within a nuclear-Utopian "triad." The related operations of the U.S. RAND Corporation and its satellite "think tanks," formed the core of what retiring President Dwight Eisenhower later named as a "military-industrial complex."

This Utopian faction, which has adopted the so-called "Clash of Civilizations" doctrine of Bernard Lewis, Zbigniew Brzezinski, and Samuel P. Huntington, is typified within the present Bush Administration by U.S. gangster-steered, Israeli right-wing circles associated with U.S. Vice-President Dick Cheney and with U.S. Senators John McCain and Joseph Lieberman.

Today's growing conflict between traditionalist senior U.S. military, and those wild-eyed Washington war-mongers,

Turkey's Yarin *magazine, widely read in the circles of the government in Ankara, has featured major analyses by U.S. Presidential candidate Lyndon LaRouche; this headline appeared in the June issue. LaRouche's discussion of the American Presidency in Yarin's current, December issue.*

sometimes described as "chickenhawks," who avoided military service in their youth, is typical of the conflict between traditional U.S. patriots and Utopians inside the U.S. government over the course of the 1944-2002 period to date. Vice-President Cheney and Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld are the obvious, leading official spokesmen for a fanatical commitment to a full-blown, reckless, Utopian doctrine of practice. Now, for these Utopians, the defense of their policy itself becomes the only interest they defend. The monstrous aftermath of the "preventive war" war they propose, is ruled out of consideration, and so are the rational alternatives to launching such an unjustified, unnecessary war.

The Utopian strategic doctrine behind the officially stated "preventive war" doctrine, is equivalent to a return to the conditions created by the imperialistic, Habsburg-led religious warfare of Europe's 1511-1648 interval. Such warfare is directly opposite to the traditional U.S. policy of such leading foreign-policy specialists as Benjamin Franklin, John Quincy Adams, and James G. Blaine. The traditional standpoint of our leading patriots has been, that the vital, long-term strategic interest of the U.S.A., is to bring into being a community of principle among the members of a planetary system of respectively perfectly sovereign nation-state republics. The Utopians have a directly opposite, imperial policy. They are currently committed to ending the sovereignty of all nations, in favor of an English-speaking world empire modelled on the memories of ancient Babylon, imperial Rome, and Byzantium.

The present situation of Turkey and neighboring states, should be seen as an illustration of the importance of returning the U.S.A. to foreign policies like those of such leading U.S. patriots as Franklin, John Quincy Adams, Abraham Lincoln, Blaine, and Franklin Roosevelt. Whereas, all the civilized strategic thinking of modern Europe and the Americas, is traced from that 1648 Peace of Westphalia which ended the Habsburg-led religious warfare of the 1511-1648 interval, the Utopians, such as Bernard Lewis, Zbigniew Brzezinski, and Samuel P. Huntington, have been committed, explicitly, since the mid-1970s, to unleashing religious warfare against and among Islamic populations as a road toward the establishing their version of a new, eternal world-empire.

The Economic Danger of War

Like the world as a whole, the determining issue of life on all parts of our planet today, is the interconnection between, on the one side, the Bush Administration's present, obsessive lunge toward what would soon become the most devastating of the so-called "world wars" suffered by our planet, and the accelerating plunge of the planet as a whole into the worst economic collapse in living memory. To restate that crucial point: As long as the present Bush Administration clings to maintaining the policies of the present, hopelessly bankrupt world monetary-financial system, general warfare, of various kinds, will be as inevitable throughout our planet as the so-called New Dark Age which struck a Fourteenth-Century Europe; that, as a result of Europe's failure to eliminate the usurious practices of imperial Venice's so-called Lombard banking system.

For example, the attempt to impose "IMF conditionalities" on Brazil is, at this moment, among the most likely causes for a rather immediate, chain-reaction collapse of the IMF system. The IMF, and the current Bush Administration, are caught between the economic rocks of a financial Scylla and Charybdis.

The attempt to impose such conditionalities would either provoke Brazil into a sovereign default, which would collapse the authority of the IMF system; or, if Brazil conceded to such conditionalities, would collapse Brazil, leading to a chain-reaction collapse of the international monetary-financial system. The Brazil economy is both the keystone of the entire, already imperilled economy of Central and South America, and the most vulnerable flank of the U.S. banking system. The continued refusal of the current Bush Administration, to acknowledge that reality, would be, in and of itself, a cause for that administration's foolish attempts to distract attention from the political troubles caused by the collapse of the inter-

nal U.S. economy, by foreign military adventures.

That Brazil case points to the reasons, that the security of civilization as a whole depends upon adoption of a suitable, peaceful alternative to that presently, hopelessly bankrupt world monetary-financial system. In brief, the world's present, global, historically determined strategic situation is as follows.

There is a systemic connection between that economic situation and the current, Utopian war policies of the Bush Administration.

Historically, the Utopian policy of Cheney, Rumsfeld, et al., is traced in European history as the common characteristic of the Babylonian, Roman, Byzantine, and Venetian forms of imperialism.

From the inside of modern European thinking, imperialism is an expression of what is called Romanticism, as distinct from the Classical tradition. "Romanticism" always means a cultish fawning upon the morally defective cultural legacy of the ancient Latin Roman Empire. However, although ancient Rome is the generic model, the more immediate form of dominant influence of Romanticism today, stems from Venice's long role as a leading imperial maritime power of Europe and the Mediterranean region.

Even after the weakening of Venice's power as a state, during the decades following the 1648 Treaty of Westphalia, the policies of Venice's far-flung financier oligarchy and diplomacy continued to dominate Europe of the late Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries. With the subsequent downfall of Habsburg power, over the 1815-1848 interval, political systems, such as the Netherlands and British monarchy's, defined a form of state based on the model of the former imperial maritime power of Venice's financier oligarchy; this became the relatively hegemonic power of a central banking system throughout Europe.

This shift of emphasis in Venice's influence, was expressed chiefly by the rise of the power of the Dutch and British East India Companies, especially during and following the reigns of William of Orange. The influence of these Venetian-steered institutions became known through Eighteenth-Century Europe as "the Venetian Party," a political-ideological current more commonly referenced today as the Anglo-French "Enlightenment." The American Tory cultural current within the U.S.A., is a product of that influence of that same Anglo-Dutch "liberalism."

There is a direct, systemic connection between the Anglo-Dutch liberal tradition of the American Tories and the current Utopian thrust for an ever-expanding, perpetual Middle East war. The key to understanding this connection is the decadent form of both the U.S. Federal Reserve System and the International Monetary Fund, which came into being, beginning Aug. 15, 1971, with the replacement of the 1945-1964 Bretton Woods system by the present, "floating-exchange-rate" system. The significance of the U.S. Federal Reserve System's part in today's U.S. Utopian military adventures, must be assessed in two successive phases.

All European political systems derived from the Anglo-Dutch liberal model have a systemically, fundamentally different moral, economic, and political character than that American System of political-economy implicit in the U.S. Federal Constitution, as described by U.S. Treasury Secretary Alexander Hamilton, and leading economists such as Mathew Carey, Friedrich List, Henry C. Carey, and Carey's student E. Peshine Smith. Implicitly, under the U.S. Constitution, the issue and control of currency and of banking are under the control and direction of the U.S. Federal government, with subsidiary authorities left to the governments of the states. Thus, implicitly, the economic system of the U.S. Constitution requires the supremacy of national banking, and implicitly outlaws that Anglo-Dutch system of central banking characteristic of European states. This issue of national sovereignty versus central banking, has always been a pivotal difference of principle between the American patriots and American Tories.

Through virtually treasonous ventures, such as the van Buren-Jackson land-bank swindle, the fraudulent U.S. Specie Resumption Act of the 1870s, and the British monarchy's creation of the U.S. Federal Reserve System through the action of King Edward VII's New York agent Jacob Schiff, the U.S.A. has been repeatedly looted by foreign liberal interests. The Federal Reserve System has represented an effective approximation of those European central-banking practices which are anathema to the U.S. Constitution. Its establishment, under Ku Klux Klan fanatic Woodrow Wilson, transformed the U.S.A., for a time, from a sovereign nation-state into a virtual British Commonwealth appendage of the British monarchy and the Bank of England's pivotal role world-wide.

That state of affairs was reversed, to at least a significant degree, under President Franklin Roosevelt. The cuckoo, the Federal Reserve, still sat, stuffing itself, in the nest, but the power of the U.S. Presidency held it significantly in check. The later, crucial change, to the new, 1971-2002 form of the Federal Reserve System, began following the 1963 assassination of President John F. Kennedy, with the launching of the 1964-1972 U.S. war in Indo-China.

Prior to 1965, the United States remained the world's leading producer economy, and the backbone of the continuing economic reconstruction of continental Europe and Japan, among other locations. Beginning the Indo-China war, and the full-scale launching of "the rock-drug-sex youth-counterculture," the United States underwent a deep-going transformation in character, echoing what occurred in ancient Rome following the close of the Second Punic War. Especially under National Security Advisors Kissinger and Brzezinski, the post-1971 U.S.A. was transformed, at an accelerating rate, from the world's leading producer society, into an imperial-parasitical form of what was called variously a "post-industrial," or "consumer society."

Over the course of the recent thirty-odd years, there has been a shift in concentration of wealth, from the values of production, to holdings in a "John Law"-style financial bub-

ble of purely fictitious financial assets, so-called "shareholder value." From 1995 on, especially following the August-September 1998 collapse of the LTCM bubble, the U.S.-led IMF resorted to intrinsically hyperinflationary monetary and related methods as a way of temporarily forestalling the already inevitable general financial collapse of the existing IMF system. During 2000, the inevitable financial collapse took over. Presently, the existing form of IMF system is doomed to early extinction, one way or the other.

For me, as a candidate for the 2004 nomination to become the U.S. President, the bankruptcy of the present IMF and Federal Reserve System is a challenge I am prepared to meet. For my American Tory adversaries, it is the end of the universe. Since their power in society rests upon fictitious financial assets which are in the process of evaporating, they react like carnivorous dinosaurs who can lay no more eggs. For the rest of us, as human beings who depend upon real, physical wealth, rather than the empty eggs called today's financial assets, the present crisis presents us with what should be regarded as the hope-filled opportunity and challenge of rebuilding.

Middle East Peace

I must analyze this crisis, and report that analysis; but, I must also present solutions. The opportunities for rebuilding the Middle East as a whole, are typical of the kinds of solutions which every part of the world requires.

As I reported to a June 2-3, 2002 Abu Dhabi conference, the Middle East is today, as in ancient history, the crucial strategic crossroads-area among Europe, Asia, and Africa. Although the unexcelled cheapness of petroleum from the Persian Gulf region, is an important economic-strategic factor today, the role of water, on which life depends, is the most fundamental internal interest of the region as a whole. This is a challenge. It is also an opportunity: the building of the production of power needed for adequate rates of increase of the production of needed water, and the more efficient management of that water, will not bring peace, but there can be no durable peace without adequate such measures.

Let us begin my proposal with a word of caution. Under no circumstances should the United States today become involved with anything resembling the culpable foolishness of that fanatical racist, U.S. President Woodrow Wilson, or the British-French, Middle East scheme known as Sykes-Picot. We must not be engaged in any form of either explicit, or implied attempts to redraw the map within the Middle East region. I emphasize my position as an economist. The following point is most crucial.

The decadent state of most of the world, which has accumulated during more than three decades, is a terrible state of affairs which can not be corrected within a few years. A generation of concentrated investment, chiefly state investment, in basic economic infrastructure, and promotion of long-term investment in technologically progressive, capital-intensive agricultural and manufacturing, will be needed to bring the levels of physical productivity up to the point that we will then be able to say we have reversed the great damage to most of the world during the recent three-and-a-half decades.

This rebuilding and new growth must be done under present conditions of prevalent financial bankruptcy and physical-economic decadence. There are no private sources of financial capital adequate even to begin to meet the challenge. This will require large masses of long-term credit created by national governments. This means credits, in the order of 1-2% simple-interest rate, over as long as 25-50 years. It means the creation and use of such state-generated credit, both for public investments, and for promotion of relevant categories of private agricultural and manufacturing investment.

To sustain interest-rates that low, requires a return to the protectionist system of the original phase of the 1945-1964 Bretton Woods monetary order: fixed exchange-rates, fair-trade pricing, regulatory tariff-agreements among nations, and so on. In short, we require a system of cooperation for mutual aid among perfectly sovereign nation-state republics.

Those measures are necessary, but they will not be successful without the addition of national and multinational mission-orientations, which set long-range priorities respecting national goals and international cooperation.

In short, we must inspire nations and their peoples to rise from the present dust of despair into a clear vision of the better future they will build for themselves. Without affirming the perfect sovereignty of the nation-state republic, such goals are impossible.

To this end, the Presidency of the U.S.A. must accept a new, non-imperial role of leadership in world affairs. This is a role implicit in those qualities and implications of the Preamble of the U.S. Federal Constitution which are historically unique among nations. The former power of the U.S.A. was based on the original commitment of the framers of the republic to the common good, for other nations and for our own. This was understood by great U.S. diplomats such as John Quincy Adams and James Blaine. This was President Franklin Roosevelt's intention for eliminating the scourges of colonialism and free trade from the planet. I would hope it were possible, to persuade the incumbent U.S. President to adopt new advisors who would persuade him to adopt that role as the self-image of his Presidency. It is the image of that Presidency I have adopted for myself. It is the only role which would assure the ability of my republic to survive the terrible financial debacle which now grips its destiny.