

## The Sovereign States of the Americas The Monroe Doctrine Today

by Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.

*[Published in **Executive Intelligence Review**, Volume 30, Number 36, September 19, 2003.  
[View PDF of original](#) at the LaRouche Library.]*

*The following was released by the LaRouche in 2004 Presidential campaign committee. It constitutes the introductory chapters of a pamphlet which will be issued soon, with additional documentary and graphic material, as indicated in the text. The urgency of the topic necessitates the early release of Mr. LaRouche's conceptual introduction.*

September 4, 2003

Up to the present date, John Quincy Adams remains the most significant of the architects of what might be fairly distinguished as “the working foreign policy of the United States of America.” Although he was already a distinguished diplomat before joining President Monroe’s Cabinet, his matured genius is typified by three of his leading roles in designing our government’s approach to its foreign policies, beginning his part as Secretary of State under President James Monroe, during his role as President of the United States, and, in a later role he conducted, less conspicuously, but with powerful force of influence, as a member of the U.S. House of Representatives. Throughout this, the leading features of that expressed genius included his foresight and contributions respecting the role of diplomacy in defining the future coast-to-coast and north-south borders of the U.S., and in the crafting of U.S. policy toward the other states of the Americas.

His role in defining U.S. policy for the Americas, is associated, most notably, with three model precedents. The first is his crafting of what became known as the Monroe Doctrine of defense of the sovereignty of the emerging states of the Americas against meddling by both the British monarchy and the continental Holy Alliance powers. The second is the parts played respecting U.S. policy toward Mexico, by his Secretary of State Henry Clay and Ambassador to Mexico Joel Poinsett. The third, is typified by his association with a distinguished U.S. Representative, and later President, as expressed by Abraham Lincoln’s “Spot Resolution” against President Polk’s Dick Cheney-like launching of an unlawful war against Mexico. It was, notably, President Lincoln’s leadership to victory in the U.S. war against that tool of Jeremy Bentham’s Lord Palmerston and Napoleon III known as the Confederacy, which led to the expulsion of France’s imperial forces from Mexico, and to

President Benito Juárez's restoration of Mexico's freedom through the defeat of the fascist-like, occupying Habsburg predator known as the Emperor Maximilian.

On these matters of U.S. foreign policy: Since my 1977 attack on the late Walter Lippmann's fraudulent, Fabian's misrepresentation of the Monroe Doctrine, my publicly stated policy, as a Democratic Presidential candidate, toward all of the states of the Americas, has been grounded explicitly, and consistently on those precedents of Adams, as complemented by the work of his collaborators Clay, Poinsett, and Lincoln. So, today, the underlying basis for my U.S. Presidential policy continues to be that which I set forth publicly at the beginning of August 1982, in my *Operation Juárez*, a policy-statement which I had crafted during the preceding month, that in anticipation of the predatory assault on Mexico which erupted a few days after that statement of mine had been first issued. Like Presidents Adams and Lincoln before me, my expressed policy of 1982 toward the defense of Mexico's sovereignty was presented, at that time, and now, as a defense of the sovereignty and welfare of not only Mexico, but each and all of the states of the Americas, including our own.

Look back from the present situation, to the much less unhappy days of 1982 than now. During the Summer of 1982, before the international banker's raid on that nation, Mexico under President José López Portillo was still a strong nation, with a strong sense of its own sovereignty. For all its troubles of that time, it was a nation which, if permitted to do so by the U.S.A., still had tremendous internal capabilities and prospects for unleashing technological and social progress. From the Texas border south, today, everything, everywhere, is far, far worse, than then. Some states of the Americas have lost virtually all substance of the nominal sovereignty formerly allowed them. The poverty is widespread, and deep; chaos, and even madness spreads, or lurks in all corners. In principle, the interests and solutions for each of the nations of our hemisphere are the same in principle as in 1982, but the situation is, qualitatively, a far more difficult challenge than it was back then. Under my Presidency, those difficulties can begin to be overcome.

Today, each and all of the states below the U.S. border are confronted by the paradoxical state of affairs, that the increasingly more radical "free trade" and related, more radical IMF "floating-exchange-rate system" policies imposed upon Central and South America, by the United States, since Spring 1982, have been the greatest single source of the deepening spread of misery throughout that region. Yet, paradoxically, no recovery from those desperate conditions were possible presently without the cooperation of the great, ominous neighbor to their north, our own U.S.A. A new U.S. policy toward those states of the Americas is needed, a policy shaped under the admittedly new, worse conditions which have developed since Spring 1982. What all too few U.S. citizens understand today, so far, what I must persuade my fellow-citizens to recognize, is that the future security of the United States and its citizens

themselves, depends upon the U.S.A.'s adoption of a new set of policies, actually constructive policies toward our neighbors in the Americas, about as much as those neighbors' future depends upon us. I need your help to make that connection clear to our citizens.

For just one of many important examples of that paradoxical situation, look at both sides of our border with Mexico. The U.S. economy of today has degenerated, physically and morally, to the point, that it has come to depend, to a large degree, on the very cheap labor of Mexicans in Mexico, and the mostly cheap labor by persons of first- and second-generation Mexican descent inside the U.S. economy itself. This Mexican-American group is part of a larger, so-called "Hispanic-American minority" which is the largest "ethnic minority-group" inside the U.S.A. It exceeds, for example, the number of Americans of African descent. Yet, where the family ties among this population of Mexican descent, on both sides of the border, ought to strengthen the ties between the two neighbors, a virtually racist doctrine, such as the California Proposition 187 supported by the politically predatory freak-show entertainer and candidate Arnold Schwarzenegger, typifies the abusive follies from the U.S. side which threaten and estrange persons of Mexican descent on both sides of the border. That kind of folly promotes a potential for conflict which may come to threaten the security of both Mexico and the United States.

That much said so far, after a moment or two longer spent on preliminaries, I shall conclude this preface of my report, with one important example of my Presidential policy toward the Americas as a whole. For this purpose, I focus upon a specific example of the special kind of large-scale, immediate cross-border, job-creating cooperation between the U.S. and Mexico which I intend to launch on my first day as President of the U.S.A., in January 2005. That program is labelled a NAWAPA-Plus development of Canada, the U.S.A., and Mexico.

That summary will then conclude my introduction to the body of this report as a whole. In the chapters following this preface, my associates and I situate the overall policy in five following general sections of this report as a whole: some brief, some longer. In the first of those chapters, I have summarized the most crucial features of the global historical setting of international social and political developments, since the 1648 Treaty of Westphalia, in which the relations between the United States and the peoples of Central and South America have been shaped up to the present time. In the second, I have briefly defined the long-term environmental management policy, a Noösphere-management policy, which should already begin to shape our general development perspective for the planet in general, and the related development within the hemisphere of the Americas as such. In the third, I have summarized my view of the division of labor which should emerge among continental regions of development of the planet as a whole: Eurasia and Australia-New Zealand, Africa, and the

Western Hemisphere. In that chapter, I have located my policy for the role of the development in the Americas for the world as a whole.

After that, in the fourth section, my associates have added important details to the historical summary which I presented in the first chapter, added historical facts devoted to the history of intra-American relations of the U.S. In the fifth and concluding section, my collaborators have provided a survey, including relevant maps, of some of the most crucial, proposed projects which my associates and I have either developed, or adopted from the work of others, as goals for long-term development of the Americas which have been worked out during the past quarter-century.

### ***NAWAPA-Plus***

The region of North America known as the Great American Desert, runs between the Rocky Mountains and Pacific coastal mountain ranges, southward, across the southern border of the U.S.A., into the region between the two Sierra Madre ranges of northern Mexico (**Figures 1a–1b**). During the decades following World War II, the Parsons engineering company played a leading role in defining a project called The North American Water & Power Alliance (NAWAPA), with the included intent of conquering that desert by organizing the water flows and production and distribution of power from the Arctic Coasts of Canada, down into Mexico. My intention is an expanded version of that NAWAPA program, which will intersect Mexico's long-standing intention to bring water from its water-rich, mountainous South, along the coasts of Mexico and by inland routes. By joining an extended NAWAPA southwards, and joining with the northward movement of water in Mexico in the region between the two Sierra Madres and in Sonora, and combining this with a modern high-speed rail/magnetic-levitation transport grid-system spread from terminals inside the U.S.A. to Mexico City, the basis for a technological revolution would be established in what are presently still marginal zones of economic activity. (See **Figures 2–3**.)

Such a tri-national (Canada, U.S.A., Mexico) undertaking, would serve as the fulcrum for the kind of water-management system for both water-distribution and barge-traffic needed as an economical solution for such crisis-conditions as collapsing, over-taxed aquifers.

Admittedly, such projects ran against the grain of the recent four decades trend of increasing opposition to large-scale public infrastructure of the TVA type, even against regulated systems of combined production and distribution of power. However, the inevitable, and presently catastrophic effects of deregulation, as combined with the accumulated effects of a general depression in progress since 2000, are changing increasingly frightened, even desperate, but sane currents of popular opinion, prompting more and more of our citizens to look back, away from right-wing fantasies such as President Nixon's Southern Strategy and

anti-Roosevelt Democrats' Nixon-like "suburban" fantasy, back into the direction of the world-outlook of the U.S. Franklin Roosevelt Presidency.

During the time since the terrifying, successive blows of the 1962 nuclear-missiles crisis, the assassination of President John F. Kennedy, and the launching of the U.S.A.'s official war in Indo-China, there has been a qualitative shift in public opinion, especially among the first generation of U.S. citizens and Europeans born after World War II, away from the moral values of a productive society, into a cult of "post-industrial" utopianism, an increasingly bankrupt and predatory, pleasure society, toward something often suggestive of the decadence of Rome under Caesars such as Tiberius, Claudius, and Nero. With that shift from "blue collar" to "white collar" values, and beyond, more and more of that shifting composition of the adult population emerging from the aging process's attrition among successive generations, had less and less feeling for, even hostility toward the importance of basic economic infrastructure, and high energy-flux density, in maintaining the productive powers of society per capita. Our economy has been ruined as a result of these foolish changes of the recent span of nearly forty years.

In reality, the stability and net growth of a modern productive economy, such as the pre-1964 U.S.A., requires an investment of about half its activity in combined investment in and operation of basic economic infrastructure. This infrastructure investment must be concentrated, for the most part, in capital-intensive investments. These investments in infrastructure are embodied in, variously, Federal, state, and local functions of government, or in government-regulated, but privately-owned public utilities. Included categories are: production and distribution of increasing ratios of energy-flux density of power; water management and related systems; transportation systems, for both freight and people; the public facilities essential for health-care and sanitation systems; an urgently needed, sweeping reform of educational systems, which must be designed for the rounded development of future citizens as part of a highly productive form of adult society; and, appropriate forms of urban organization which efficiently integrate agricultural zones with residential, industrial, commercial, and public functional modes of habitation and employment.

To illustrate that point, the effective productivity per capita within two otherwise apparently identical manufacturing plants, will vary in proportion to the capital-intensive development of infrastructure in which the plant and its employed population are situated. Thus, the development of the U.S.A. as an integrated nation, required a certain approach to the development of the transcontinental railway system, on which the possibility for the development of agriculture, mining, and manufacturing throughout most of its territory, depended. In other words, the potential relative productivity of labor and private capital investment, per capita and per square kilometer, either increases significantly, or even becomes barely possible, only with increasing capital-intensity of development and operation

of a basic economic infrastructure provided in the modes of governmental, or government-regulated investments in infrastructure-related public utilities.

Any attempt to cheapen costs of goods purchased by deregulation through “free market” policies, will collapse the infrastructure and point-of-production productivity, by such effects as driving capital investment and skills-levels downward, irreversibly, resulting in an inevitable relative collapse of the economy, by cutting short-term prices through depleting essential long-term capital investments in people and facilities. Under such trends, including effects of a zeal for “outsourcing” from cheap-labor markets, entire categories of necessary skills and technologies will disappear from the labor-force and productive capacities, as has been the case in the United States, increasingly, since the beginning of the 1970s, and, a bit later, also on continental Europe.

This effect of so-called “free market” policies can be seen today, as the collapse of the physical standard of living and employment in the U.S.A. today, especially among the lower eighty percentiles of family-income brackets, especially since approximately 1977 (**Figure 4**).

Presently, the U.S.A., the Americas generally, Western Europe, Australia and New Zealand, are nearing the fag-end of a decades-long, “free trade”-driven attrition of infrastructure-development and capital-intensive modes of production. The errant impulse of a succession of economically incompetent U.S. governments, since the pro-fascist turn under President Nixon, is the use of “free market” motives to cause compensatory, “fiscal austerity” measures, austerity measures which curtail precisely those infrastructure investments, services, and employment on which the maintenance of even the present level of output depends absolutely.

The only solution for such cases, is a large-scale increase of productive employment in agriculture, industry, and capital-intensive modes of basic economic infrastructure, as President Franklin Roosevelt did in reversing the catastrophe produced by the Coolidge and Hoover administrations. By raising the ration of those employed in, and capital-intensity of productive output, in respect to both total population and area, and pushing this ration up to levels above break-even for the economy as a whole, a general economic recovery can be achieved. The contrary “free trade” policy, with its side-effects of “fiscal austerity” and “deregulation,” has produced only disaster. Cutting production, lowering levels of technology, will only lead toward the absolute ruin of an economy already in financial difficulties.

Most of the world, outside some important areas of Asia such as China, is already plunging deeper and deeper into bankruptcy brought about by more than three decades of “fiscal austerity,” “deregulation” and related measures. This began in the U.S.A. and Britain, about the time of the outbreak of the Indo-China War and ruinous measures unleashed by

Britain's first Harold Wilson government. For the U.S.A., the general downturn began with the 1966–67 budget. The same trend hit western continental Europe a bit later. The developing sector, including South and Central America, were increasingly hard-hit by the combination of a 1971–72 shift to a “floating-exchange-rate” monetary-financial system, and the petroleum-distribution cartel's shenanigans of the mid-1970s. Under the conditions now existing, about three decades later, the only general solution for each and every part of the world, including the Americas, is large-scale infrastructure-building programs which raise the combined levels of useful employment and long-term capital formation, with emphasis in basic economic infrastructure. Without infrastructure programs such as a NAWAPA-Plus program for Canada, the U.S.A., and Mexico, there is, generally speaking, no longer any hope for any of these nations.

That program of economic resuscitation for Canada, the U.S.A., and Mexico, typifies my policy, but it is only one example, which leaves a number of things of crucial importance yet to be said. In the following chapters, my associates and I explain the distinction.

## **1. The Deadly Change of 1789–1815**

Although the existence of a modern form of sovereign nation-state dates from the successive establishment of Louis XI's France and Henry VII's England during the latter half of Europe's Fifteenth Century, the reactionary, pro-feudalist backlash, led by Venice's reactionary financier oligarchy and the Norman medieval tradition, engulfed Europe in terrible religious and related warfare over the interval 1511–1648. It was only a Europe led by France's Cardinal Mazarin, which ended the terrible religious war of 1618–1648, with his crucial part in bringing about that Treaty of Westphalia which has been the hallmark of sane and moral relations among nation-states ever since.

However, the damage done over the course of Europe's 1512–1648 “Little New Dark Age” of religious warfare, had so crippled Europe's ability to develop genuine republics, that, more and more, the greatest intellects of Europe looked to the Americas, especially English-speaking North America, as the only visible opportunity to sponsor the establishment of a true republic which might be an indispensable model for reform of the governments of Europe itself.

By the middle of the Eighteenth Century, Benjamin Franklin had been established as the figure around which Europe's efforts might establish a true republic in North America. These efforts were centered, for France, in the legacy of Mazarin and Jean-Baptiste Colbert. At the beginning of the Eighteenth Century, the relatively likely prospect that Gottfried Leibniz might become the Prime Minister of England, came and passed. A relative dark age called the English and French “Enlightenment,” spread like a cancer across Europe, until the

eruption of the Europe-wide Classical Humanist movement centered around followers of Leibniz and J.S. Bach such as Germany's Abraham Kästner, Gotthold Lessing, and Moses Mendelssohn, fought back, with significant success, against the sodden sophistry of the Enlightenment. Early, the circles of Germany's Kästner centered upon Franklin as the leading intellect of North America around which to build preparations for a republic in North America.

The point was not missed in Charles III's Spain, or the Spanish colonies in the Americas. The same spirit of the Classical Humanist revolution which mobilized Europe's aid for the cause of a North American republic, produced important, parallel surges toward progress and freedom among Spain's American colonies. Sadly, during the immediate effects of the French Revolution and Napoleon Bonaparte's tyranny, during the 1789–1815 interval, the leaders of those movements in the Spanish colonies were not only crushed, but often literally butchered out of existence, as if by the Adolf Hitlers of their time.

Nonetheless despite the Hitler-like butchery of the U.S. co-thinkers of the Spanish-speaking Americas, most notably in Mexico and Colombia, the example of the continued existence of United States itself rekindled the spark of American republicanism in those emerging nations, a spark which was richly nourished by President Lincoln's victory and the U.S. expulsion of the French occupying forces from Mexico. The American System of political-economy, as identified with such names as Alexander Hamilton, Mathew Carey, Frederick List, Henry C. Carey, and Abraham Lincoln, gave impetus to what President Adams, Clay, and Poinsett had worked to effect in Mexico.

The victory of President Lincoln's U.S.A. over Palmerston's and Napoleon III's Confederate assets, established the United States as a great power which would not be conquered from the outside. From about the time of the U.S. Philadelphia Centennial celebration of 1876, the American System of political-economy was spreading in Germany, Russia, Japan, and elsewhere in the old world. However, the developments, centered in France of 1789–1815, had produced lasting differences between the U.S. and European systems of government, differences which have not been cured to the present day. It is those differences which must be understood to locate the historical root of the principal difficulties affecting the relations among the U.S.A., the other states of the Americas, and of Europe, still today.

The American System of political-economy, which is the characteristic intent of the U.S. Federal Constitution of 1787–1789, is implicitly dedicated to a system of national banking and protectionism, as the first U.S. Treasury Secretary, Hamilton, described this. The European systems, insofar as they have been freed from the murky relics of Habsburg rule, are premised upon a system contrary to the intent of the U.S. Constitution, a system sometimes called "capitalism." That form of "capitalism" is a defective system, praised as



“scientific” by the misguided Karl Marx, which has been modelled upon the Anglo-Dutch Liberal system of parliamentary government. The central flaw in such systems of parliamentary government, is the role of what has become known today as “independent central banking systems,” which, periodically, exert a more or less openly dictatorial rule over the governments with which they share power.

These parliamentary systems are to be understood as modern relics of an earlier, medieval arrangement, under which the imperial maritime power of Venice’s financier-oligarchy shared power with that Norman military system infamously associated with Venice’s direction of what were known as “The Crusades,” and the horrid, pro-Inquisitional expulsion of the Jews from Spain by the government of Ferdinand and Isabella, in 1492, and the racist, anti-Christian “purity of blood” dogma of Spain’s reactionary laws. The great ecumenical Council of Florence and the subsequent Fifteenth-Century rise of the modern nation-state, as in Louis XI’s France and Henry VII’s England, had prompted a reaction from the Venice-dominated forces of the period of English history from Henry II through Richard III. This reaction was expressed in such forms as the pro-Inquisition influences on Ferdinand and Isabella, a horrid event followed by the 1511–1648 religious warfare which Venice orchestrated with cooperation of the Habsburg dynasty.

This period of religious warfare spawned a new leading force in Europe, directed by the Venetian financier-oligarchy, but centered by the followers of Venice’s Paolo Sarpi in a nominally Protestant interest traced from the Rhône in France, into the Netherlands, extended across the maritime regions of Northern Europe, including England.

That emerging Anglo-Dutch Liberal system was still Venetian, to the degree that the British East India Company of Lord Shelburne’s Eighteenth-Century Great Britain proudly claimed itself to be a ruling “Venetian Party.” Shelburne’s party was, therefore, the party of usury, the party which, predominantly, reigns over Europe still today.

The characteristic of the Liberal system, called “capitalism” by most, is that a private interest, a consort of private, family-controlled merchant banks, exerts an effective monopoly over the issue and regulation of currency and banking, and thus has its hand on the throats of what claim, ironically, to be sovereign nations.

This conflict between the American and Venetian systems was the cause of the terrible events of 1789–1815 in Europe. U.S. President Franklin Roosevelt understood the significance of that history, as, unfortunately, only a few leading political figures understand that, as I do, today. It must be understood as the key to all leading features of world history since, including the specific problems of the states of the Americas today. Without that understanding, the next President of the U.S.A. would assuredly make a mess of everything important. Therefore, I summarize the highlights of that matter here and now.

### ***Shelburne and the 1789 Birth of Fascism***

The principal author of the French Revolution of July 14, 1789 was Britain's Lord Shelburne, the leading political figure of the twin institutions of Barings Bank and the British East India Company. Shelburne's preparations for his intended crushing of both the English North American colonies and France, had begun at about the time of Shelburne's assignment of his lackey Adam Smith for the ground-work of what became Smith's 1776 attack on the American cause, Smith's so-called *The Wealth of Nations*, better named *Stealing the Wealth of Nations*. Shelburne's direct steps toward launching a revolution against France began during the 1782–1783 interval he was Prime Minister of Britain, the time during which he launched separate peace-negotiations among the United States and U.S. allies France and Spain.

At the point in mid-1789 the French patriots Bailly and Lafayette had crafted a proposed constitution for France's monarchy based upon American principles, Shelburne and his lackey struck from London, beginning that July 14 storming of the Bastille which was organized by Shelburne agents Philippe Egalité and Swiss banker Jacques Necker. Later, other British agents, such as Danton and Marat, who had been trained by, and were directed from London, by the head of Shelburne's Secret Committee, Jeremy Bentham, led the way into both the Jacobin Terror and the first fascist dictatorship of modern Europe, that of the Emperor Napoleon Bonaparte.

Shelburne's agents for this set of operations were concentrated in a pro-satanic freemasonic cult, known as the Martinists, based in Lyons, France, but deeply embedded in the life of France and French-speaking Switzerland. This cult, which was then led by the charlatans Cagliostro and Mesmer, and the fanatic freemason Joseph de Maistre, a cult which based itself on the pro-satanic model of the ancient Phrygian cult of Dionysus, was responsible for the famous Phrygian Caps of the French Terror. The successive "left" and "reactionary" (e.g., "Bonapartist") phases of the French Revolution of 1789–1815 have served as a model for what became known, alternately, as Synarchism, and fascism, during the period between the close of World War I and that World War II.

For example, for the information of our Spanish-speaking readers, the Nazi Party ran a network through fascist Spain into the Spanish-speaking Americas during the period leading into and during World War II. The Mexico base, including the fascist Jacques Soustelle, was centered in the assassins of Mexico's President Obregón, and was used, together with Paul Rivet and John de Ménéil, to coordinate Nazi assets throughout the Americas, a Synarchist network embedded in Europe's terrorist networks, Those same, sundry nominally "left" and "right" networks, left over from the Nazis, were, and are deployed as a subversive pro-fascist network throughout the Americas, from Mexico to Cape Horn, still today. These Synarchist

networks are the greatest internal threat to the security of the nations of the Americas, to the present day.

Shelburne's purpose was threefold. First, his intent, as he had confided this to his lackey Gibbon, was to create a new pro-paganist Roman Empire modelled upon Gibbon's portrayal of the successes and fatal defects of the ancient Roman Empire. Second, Shelburne was determined to eradicate the influence of the American Revolution throughout both Europe and the Americas. Third, as Shelburne had confided to his lackey Adam Smith in 1763, he was determined to destroy not only the North American economies, but also France, that as a part of preventing any development on continental Europe which might threaten the world-imperial designs of the financier-oligarchical British East India Company's position as the world's leading maritime power, an imperial maritime power virtually established by the Company's subjugation of India.

Not only did Shelburne and his lackey Jeremy Bentham follow such policies during the 1789–1815 period of Bentham's rise to power, until the 1830s, as the shaper of British imperial foreign policy and world-wide secret-intelligence operations. Since 1815, Bentham and his heirs ran revolutions around the world, including the Americas, as continued by Bentham protégé Palmerston's control over Mazzini's "Young Europe" revolutions of 1848–49; Bentham trainee Lord Palmerston's deployment of France's Napoleon III; Britain's control of the anti-American slave-trading Spanish monarchy of Isabella II; and the installation of the fascistic beast Maximilian upon the throne of Mexico. This same tradition was continued in such forms as the role of certain leading financier circles of London and New York City in initially putting Adolf Hitler into power in Germany; this was typical of the way certain London-centered financier-oligarchical interests have repeatedly used the Martinist/Synarchist organization originally deployed for the French Revolution, again and again, in their attempts to prevent the rise of land-based power on the continent of Eurasia, as also in the Americas.

The novelty is, that after President Lincoln's victory over Palmerston's puppet, the Confederacy, Britain could no longer conquer the U.S.A. physically. Therefore, there was a shift toward reliance on pro-Martinist/Synarchist networks based in relevant, U.S.-linked, international financier-oligarchical circles, such as the controllers of Vice-President Cheney and former Secretary of State George Shultz today, ultimately shifting the base of their operations to the interior of today's U.S.A.

Look back from today to 1940, when the remaining forces of the British army were chiefly threatened with liquidation as a force, at Dunkirk. At that time, Defense Minister Winston Churchill turned to U.S. President Franklin Roosevelt, for common actions to prevent admirers of Hitler from among even British oligarchs from turning Britain and its navy over

to a Synarchists' alliance against the U.S.A., an alliance intended to be assembled from among Britain, defeated France, from Italy, Germany, and Japan. When we take into account the financier-oligarchical circles of both New York City and London, who had put Adolf Hitler into power in Germany in 1933, the way in which those same financier circles supported Roosevelt and Churchill against the Synarchist continental alliance with Japan, is most remarkable. Those English-speaking financier-oligarchical interests which had been zealous to put Hitler into power in 1933, discovered themselves to be unwilling to become mere colonies of a continent-based Synarchist international led by Hitler. So, they supported Roosevelt and Churchill against Hitler then, but returned to practice their evil old ways, after June 1944, once it was certain that the war was coming to an end.

Until August 1945, when the nuclear bombs were dropped on civilian targets at Hiroshima and Nagasaki, the financier oligarchies of Britain and the U.S.A. were not prepared to import the Synarchist pestilence which Shelburne had inflicted upon continental Europe. The change came, when the followers of Bertrand Russell's imperialist dogma of "world government through preventive nuclear warfare" was adopted by that utopian U.S. faction associated with Vice-President Dick Cheney today. The change was, and is, that the enemy was no longer from outside our borders, but largely within.

Prior to Hiroshima 1945, the effect of what is today known as the Synarchist International, in its sundry operations, including major wars and revolutions on the continent of Europe, had been essentially "geopolitical": Britain's determination to keep Europe largely under the imperial and intellectual domination of the United Kingdom, and in the grip of the Anglo-Dutch Liberal parliamentary model of financier-oligarchical control. This meant to British geopoliticians, to keep the nations of continental Eurasia at each other's throats. Today, since Hiroshima, the pro-Synarchist financier-oligarchical interest is determined to use the United States itself as its base of operations for such a form of imperial world power. It is these habituated tendencies, as spread from Eighteenth- and Nineteenth-Century Europe into other parts of the world, including leading ideologies within the U.S.A. itself, which are the only source of essential differences in the way of thinking about the world at large between Europe and the U.S.A. from the French Revolution of 1789–1815, up to the present time.

### *The Crucial Difference*

To understand the task I face, as a U.S. Presidential candidate, within the Americas at large today, consider the break in the trans-Atlantic continuity of European culture which developed as a result of the effects of the 1789–1815 developments leading into Metternich's Congress of Vienna. The essential division is between the original intention of the U.S. Federal Constitution of 1787–1789, and the prevalence of the Anglo-Dutch Liberal model of parliamentary government, still today. We in the U.S. have, in large degree, submitted to

the treasonous introduction of the anti-Constitutional Federal Reserve System, a concoction of the British monarchy of Edward VII, foisted upon the United States by the pro-Confederacy Presidents Theodore Roosevelt and Ku Klux Klan fanatic Woodrow Wilson.

Until the events of approximately 1789–1806, from the storming of the Bastille to Napoleon's defeat of Prussia in the battle of Jena-Auerstedt, the leading political current in Europe was the Classical Humanist renaissance, a revival of, explicitly, the legacies of both Gottfried Leibniz and J.S. Bach, spread from the Germany circles of Kästner, Lessing, and Mendelssohn, into France, England, North America, and elsewhere. This anti-"Enlightenment," Classical Humanist influence, had been the most crucial element in the broader basis for 1776–1789 international support for the cause of independence of the United States.

The spectacle of the Jacobin Terror, followed by Jacobin Napoleon Bonaparte's emergence as the first modern fascist dictator, unleashed successive waves of cultural pessimism, especially following such signal events as Napoleon's crowning himself a new Caesar and Pontifex Maximus, and his triumph at Jena-Auerstedt. This wave of cultural pessimism is what is known as the Nineteenth-Century Romanticism which assumed the form of acute pessimism in the wake of the 1815 Congress of Vienna and the Metternich-sponsored, fascistic Carlsbad decrees. These successive steps of political and moral degeneration of prevalent European culture, led into the emergence of such forms of pessimism respecting the nature of mankind, as radical positivism and the emergence of the existentialist current from such predecessors of Nazism as Schopenhauer, Richard Wagner, and Nietzsche: the so-called "Conservative Revolution" represented in the United States today by the self-styled "neo-conservatives" gathered momentarily around Vice-President Dick Cheney. Similar trends toward Romanticism spread into the United States itself, as around the neo-Kantian Concord circles of Ralph Waldo Emerson *et al.* and the pro-Napoleonic, South Carolina founders of the Confederacy.

Although Napoleon's rule ended with his transport to St. Helena, the Martinist cult which had run, successively, both the Terror and Napoleon's tyranny, lived on. G.W.F. Hegel, the leftist who turned obscene admirer of Napoleon, wrote the theory of the Napoleonic dictatorship; the Martinist freemasonic cult of Talleyrand survived Napoleon's defeat to run Restoration-monarchy France by appointments of Britain's proconsul, the Duke of Wellington. Martinism, still steered by Jeremy Bentham and Bentham's Lord Palmerston, ran the revolutions of 1848, and brought Napoleon III to the throne. Martinism, then becoming known as Synarchism, grew as a force during the later Nineteenth Century and pre-organized World War II on behalf of Britain's "Lord of the Isles," Edward VII. The Synarchist International as such, organized the succession of fascist regimes leading into World War II. The cult was spread throughout the Americas.

The cultural legacy of Martinism/Synarchism infects much of the world to the present day. Its influence comes to the surface in sundry ways.

Contrary to the Martinist/Synarchist freemasonry, the exemplary cases of John Quincy Adams' role, the inspiring role of President Abraham Lincoln, and Franklin Roosevelt, demonstrates a deeply embedded cultural potential, within a national tradition, that of our own nation, transmitted over successive generations. I illustrate that transmission by reference to my own case.

Excepting a trace of American Indian descent, my first ancestors in North America arrived in the late Seventeenth Century, in Quebec and English immigrants into Pennsylvania, respectively. The line of English descent featured notable leaders of the anti-slavery movement, including a certain Daniel Wood, my great-great-grandfather who was a contemporary of Lincoln, and an admirer of Henry Clay, from the locality of Woodville in Delaware County, Ohio. This celebrated Daniel Wood was a frequent topic of first-hand accounts at my grandparents' dinner-table, as I observed, with some fascination, back during the late 1920s. Both sets of my grandparents were born during the 1860s. The Quebec side immigrated into the U.S. as a picaresque figure of some distinction among the circles of his peers. His wife bore Irish ancestry. The Scottish side, my maternal grandfather, came to the U.S.A. in 1862, as a babe, accompanying a professional Scottish dragoon, a fierce man when wielding saber or whisky, who had come to the U.S. to join the U.S. First Rhode Island Cavalry against slavery. The dragoon's brother was a rather famous Scottish sea-captain for the White Star line, who, among his other achievements, induced his brother to give up that saber which my great-grandfather had used to punctuate points of an argument, too often for the comfort of the local whisky-drinkers of Fall River, Massachusetts. My son has added Jewish ancestry to his credentials, and his children have added Polish to the package as a whole.

In short, I am, for all my lack of certain additional ancestries I was not awarded, typically a product of an American melting-pot cult tradition. That, in itself, is an emphatically North American cultural distinction; that melting-pot characteristic of many among us, is a specifically American cultural characteristic, even through mixed-up ancestries such as my own, while frequent, are not the universal among us. Family brawls aside, for those who share the kind of melting-pot background I have, racism and chauvinism are not specifically American cultural traditions, but aberrations contrary to the essential features of our national character.

The working point to be emphasized, is the manner in which cultural traditions are transmitted across many generations, not only by reading reports of various sorts, but through first-hand transmission through family and related transactions at the dinner table,

and otherwise. I have been sometimes startled, and often fascinated by recollections of my frequent experience with the way such intra-family cultural influences pop up from a span of two or more generations past. There is a specifically American cultural type, in this sense.

Through contrasting this experience with what I encounter among typical cultural representatives of other parts of the world, the practical significance of my own experience of a specifically American culture, emerges.

For example, until changes introduced during the 1960s and later, a typical public-school education emphasized actual American political history. There was a great deal of what is lately called “spin” in the textbooks and classroom proceedings, but a sense of history, including our nation’s own, was there for all of us who attended a reasonably competent sort of public schooling. These resources were available to the child and adolescent through books generally, and library books in particular. We had a sense of history, including our own national history, most emphatically; it was not always exactly truthful, but the provocation to discover that history was there. Later, in my dealing with cultures from outside the U.S.A., since my military service in South Asia during World War II, I have accumulated a sensibility of the practical effects of differences in culture upon the way in which experience is perceived and preferences registered, as we move from persons of one national-cultural background to another. If we reflect upon our own cultural development, in attempting to understand the roots of a different cultural development in others, we gain the ability to understand the relevant forms of cultural difference between the U.S.A. and Europe, or the U.S.A. and the cultures of South and Central America.

There are several points of comparison to be acknowledged in the setting of this report.

First of all, people of differing cultural backgrounds become conscious of, and react to those differences. The reaction is often functional in character, rather than merely negative or positive. Those among us, in the U.S.A., who have a knowledgeable view of modern world history, as I do, are able to recognize the nature of, and causes for the differences between the convergent ways of thinking of Europeans and North Americans during the pre-1789 decades, and after the events of 1789–1815. Those who shared the late-Eighteenth-Century Classical Humanist tradition then, as between those in North America and Germany, had a greater relative affinity on crucial matters of statecraft than is met among educated strata of the U.S. and Europe today.

For example: The most important such divergence for today is the degree to which Europeans conditioned to a sense of “rightness” of the Anglo-Dutch Liberal parliamentary model, resist the idea of ending the reign of independent central banking systems, including the present form of authority accorded to the IMF. We, in the U.S.A., have a clear historical precedent for such ideas, in our Federal Constitution and otherwise. Europe thinks of a

difference between capitalism, as defined by the British East India Company's mis-education of Karl Marx, and socialism, either as the only desirable, or simply abhorrent only alternative to such capitalism. Like Karl Marx, the typical European rejects the American System of political-economy as an illiterate frontiersman's aberration, or, as simply proven to be "wrong" by the generally accepted standard of educated European tradition. For example, an educated European will usually insist that the basis for the original Bretton Woods system is John Maynard Keynes. He simply refuses to recognize that the U.S. system was never intended to establish a central banking system of the sort to which Keynes' notion might be applicable, and that Franklin Roosevelt's approach was always that of the American System standard of Alexander Hamilton, and of Hamilton's collaborator, and Roosevelt's most honored ancestor Isaac Roosevelt.

On that same point of difference, the typical view from Central and South America today, tends to be similar to that of the European. This is aggravated by a widespread hatred against "Yanqui imperialism"; one tends to think the worst of any idea, even if that thought is, in fact, based upon a lying version of history, if that idea is associated with one assumed to be one's evil oppressor.

The leading point which I am stressing in this connection, is the following.

The practical problem the next President of the U.S.A., and also the rest of the world, must face, is that there is no solution for the presently onrushing general breakdown crisis of the world's present, floating-exchange-rate monetary-financial system, except by eliminating all vestiges of independent central banking systems, through bankruptcy reorganization of the existing world monetary-financial system. That monetary-financial reorganization, on which the near-term survival of civilization now depends absolutely, requires the uprooting of those aspects of both government and tradition which reflect the long hegemony of the so-called independent central-banking system, that in favor of the precedent of the American System, as typified by the argument of Treasury Secretary Alexander Hamilton.

As a result of the global impact of these economy-related and cohering historical-cultural considerations, I have a distinct world role to play as the next President of the U.S.A. The pivotal feature of that role is my unique responsibility for bringing nations together, not only to put the presently bankrupt world monetary-financial system into receivership by governments, for reorganization in bankruptcy. My uniquely American, leading role on this account is to ensure that we bring to an end the rule over this planet by concerts of independent central banking systems, including the presently wretched form which the U.S. Federal Reserve System has assumed under the successive misleaderships of Paul Volcker and Alan Greenspan.



The problem I confront on this account is, that the institution of the independent central banking system is not only a form of institution; it is a deeply rooted cultural characteristic of that Anglo-Dutch Liberal model of parliamentary system which gave the world such monsters as Lord Shelburne and his Jeremy Bentham. This cultural impact is deeply rooted in the accumulated effects of its persistence upon even the minutiae of life within European and other nations. Therefore, anyone who seeks to uproot that tradition, will be subjected to ten thousand deadly ambushes from those who sense themselves as having a culturally rooted deep interest in those institutionalized habits built up around that Anglo-Dutch model. The roots run very deep in European culture; it is precisely such roots we must pull out, roots which should have been pulled out for all of European civilization at the close of the Eighteenth Century, when they were first pulled out, at least temporarily, and on several later occasions, inside the U.S.A.

The institution of the consortium of private, family-held merchant banks is very old, even much older than the financier oligarchy of medieval Venice. It is an institution with deep Latin roots in the principles of Roman family law, the legacy of the Delphi cult of Apollo earlier, and Tyre and the ancient Mesopotamia referenced by the use of “the Whore of Babylon.” That conception of the role of money and finance is a heathen legacy which affects the way in which the notion of property is defined, with which most nations still define money as such. Today, only a suitable American President were likely to represent the cultural and related potential to bring the nations around the table, and say, “Clear the table of this rubbish. We are assembled here to create a new system free of such evil relics of the past.” It is on this pivotal point, that the American Revolution of 1776–1789 expresses a unique moral authority for leading the world out of the morass which the legacies of Venice, Lord Shelburne, and the Martinists have imposed upon more than two centuries of modern history up to this point. Only a U.S. President who represents that role is likely to enjoy the moral, cultural qualifications needed to lead the nation at this most critical point in modern world history. With all my personal burdens taken into account, and suitably discounted, I remain, for the moment, the only candidate who could play such a role competently.

### ***Three Reigns of Terror***

Since 1789, globally extended modern European civilization has been subjected to three principal intervals of Martinist/Synarchist terror, which have each added to the crippling of civilization’s moral capacity to avert and overcome the effects of those great shocks. The first of these was the British East India Company’s orchestration of the French Revolution and its Napoleonic sequel. The second was the way in which the effects of World War I were exploited to produce that Synarchist pestilence of Hitler *et al.* The third was the combination of allied terror-bombing of civilian targets which culminated in the launching of Bertrand Russell’s age of imperial preventive nuclear warfare, with President Truman’s dropping of the

nuclear bombs on the civilian targets of Hiroshima and Nagasaki. The latter unfolded in such forms as the 1962 nuclear missiles crisis, the assassination of U.S. President Kennedy, and the launching of the U.S.'s official war in Indo-China. The cumulative effects of these three, and related, interspersed shocks have greatly crippled the intellectual and moral powers of entire populations.

Coming back from World War II, I watched the terror expressed by President Truman's evil act against Hiroshima and Nagasaki in the eyes of those who had just returned from the preceding war. I saw most of them transformed, thus, into something much less than themselves. I saw the nightmare in their eyes during what became known as the "Cold War" of the late 1940s and the 1950s. I watched men and women go insane, *en masse*, during the most critical days of the 1962 missiles crisis. I saw the aggravated effect on the minds of my generation and its children, as President Kennedy was shot down. I saw the degradation induced by the plunge into the useless journey into Hell which was the 1962–1972 U.S. Indo-China war. I felt that I had lost them all, as if they were lemmings who have run off the cliff in terror.

These kinds of things have happened, *en masse*. If we do not understand this, we shall not muster ourselves to heal that hurt in them. If we do not, what, then, might become of humanity?

Leading Martinist ideologues, such as Joseph de Maistre, have been explicit. The object of the Martinist freemasonic cult, and its Synarchist continuation, was to destroy the conception of man associated with Europe's Fifteenth-Century Renaissance, the conception of man expressed by the American Revolution, The model was the ancient Phrygian cult of Dionysus, the same pro-satanic theme later stressed by Friedrich Nietzsche. Use a great terror to ready populations to worship the coming of the Dionysus who is the great beast, a creature who commits crimes so monstrous, so unthinkable, that terrified populations will embrace the feet of that oppressor with unquenchable love, seeking to do to others as he, the monster, has done before their eyes.

The model for such modern forms of such terror existed in the Spanish Inquisition, in the religious war launched by Spain's Philip II, and the Thirty Years War. It was against this cult of terror that the Treaty of Westphalia wisely focussed its anti-Hobbesian, anti-Lockean medication of the political soul: *the advantage of the other*. The wont to do evil which such terror instills in the susceptible observer, is the goal and method of the Martinist such as Joseph de Maistre, or the Adolf Hitler of the holocaust against his Jewish victims.

The three principal cycles of Martinist/Synarchist bestiality I have thus singled out as relatively most crucial for history today, are the accumulated scars of the soul which the nations and populations of extended European civilization continue to bear as part of their

legacy today. This legacy corrupts the soul like a vile disease; the cure is, in part, to be aware of this, to recognize how such experiences have worked, to recognize, for example, that to admire Napoleon Bonaparte, or his spiritual descendant, Adolf Hitler, is as if to worship Satan within that tabernacle which is yourself.

Often, we must do good, so that we might defy the evil legacy which reaches from within us to take us over, and win that fight by doing good with audacity, not out of a negative sense of obligation, but out of a passion to experience within ourselves the act of doing a good which defies the legacy of evil which Martinism/Synarchism typifies. The North American will do good for the people of South America only if this action is impelled by a compulsion to defy evil *within himself, or herself*, by doing good. Great good is not done out of the negative quality of a sense of obligation, a duty; great good is done out of the passion to fulfil a mission, a mission of the quality which is, in and of itself, the realization of being no beast, but as human as a beneficial creature made in the likeness of the Creator must be. In Greek, for the sake of *agapē*.

Martinism—synarchism—must be brought to an end now. The mission of freeing mankind from the worship of the presently still prevalent misconceptions of banking and money is key to that urgently needed result. True wealth is, as our Cotton Mather and Benjamin Franklin taught, the act and fruit of doing good.

## 2. Long-Wave Vernadsky Cycles

The full development of such a NAWAPA-Plus program, will span a capital-cycle of about two generations—fifty years, including a primary construction cycle of about a quarter-century. This is comparable to the present long-term development program of China. China's long-term infrastructure building, such as the Three Gorges Dam and kindred ventures, will develop the interior regions of China with significant improvements, leading into a take-off growth of productivity to erupt during the second twenty-five-year interval of a fifty-year span. The development of the system NAWAPA-Plus development, from the Arctic down to Mexico's southern border, will be a comparable effort. This includes not only the abiotic aspects of the system, but must also allow for the water systems settling in, and the progress of forestation and other integral features of the functioning, completed installation. There will be a significant improvement in the levels of employment and living conditions of populations from the start, but reaching a degree of relatively prosperous, preliminary phase of economic equilibrium of key, initial project-elements as such. As in the post-war U.S.A. of the middle 1950s, the initial projects will require the cumulative progress achieved over a decade or more.

These estimated time-tables are based on two somewhat overlapping sets of facts. First, what has been learned from similar kinds of work from the past, as under President Franklin Roosevelt. Second, a branch of physical science, *geobiochemistry*, as developed by one of the most accomplished scientists of the Twentieth Century, Russia's famous geobiochemist Vladimir I. Vernadsky's concept of the *Noösphere*. Second, the relationship of scientific progress to the needed functional, as much as quantitative transformations of the Biosphere.

Vernadsky, working from the same general standpoint of experimental physical chemistry as his teacher D.I. Mendeleev, defined the processes of the planet Earth as a combination of three distinct classes of physical causes: non-living, living, and human-mental-creative. I shall not go into the details of the science involved, except to indicate the importance of Vernadsky's work for long-term management of the natural resources on which society depends. I focus on comparing certain common features of two examples of the problem of global management of these resources, that of those Eurasian and American regions in which the greater part of resources to be developed are to be found on those continents today.

The experimental methods developed and refined by Vernadsky and his followers, showed that, first, life is an anti-entropic principle which can not be derived from non-living processes; it is an independent principle of the universe, which interacts with non-living processes, but is not derived from them. Second, the anti-entropic, human creative processes, by means of which discoveries of universal principles are made and applied by mankind, do not exist in the typical physics of non-living processes, and do not exist among forms of life lower than man. These three distinct, interacting principles, have experimentally distinguishable characteristics, just as the axiomatically anti-entropic living processes have a different time-scale, and tend to take over what is usually assumed to be the axiomatically entropic non-living domain, and as the characteristically anti-entropic human creative processes have a different time-scale and tend to take control over both the non-living and living.

Contrary to the popularized delusions among many self-styled ecologists, human progress does not necessarily occur at the expense of the well-being of other living processes, but, rather, with the guidance of science, the Biosphere as a whole is improved by man in ways which the Biosphere could not benefit otherwise. The implication of the work of Vernadsky, and others, is that the universe is overall, characteristically anti-entropic, not entropic, and that man as a species makes possible a degree and rate of anti-entropic development of both abiotic and living processes not possible other than by mankind's intervention.

The one qualification to be said on the conflict between entropy and anti-entropy, is that man must will to cause the anti-entropy to progress, a will which must be informed by the progress of science.

The relevant results of those distinctions include the following.

The mineral resources on which society presently depends, are found in economical concentrations, chiefly, in sedimentary deposits, where those concentrations have been left as “the ashes” of living processes. Thus, there is a rate at which such deposits are being depleted by man, as compared with the rate at which equivalent deposits are being produced. In some cases, the presently achieved rate of exhaustion of relevant deposits presents society with a serious medium- to long-term challenge.

We must consider a combination of ways for dealing with those limits on known types of sources which we either know or suspect to exist. One way, is management of choices of materials used for manufacture. Another way is to attempt to accelerate the processes by which living processes “gather” and concentrate certain minerals. Another way, is controlled transmutation, which may be feasible in more ways than we have previously suspected. There may be means other than “brute force” modes of thermonuclear fusion, which can cause desired transmutations to occur.

The development of the Biosphere is of more immediate importance. The increase of efficient and useful growth of living processes, such as grasses, trees, and what-not, is the best known, anti-entropic way to transform solar radiation, directly, or indirectly into useful biomass, and better weather. We already know much; we have much more to learn; in the meantime, we must practice doing better with what we do know.

There is another, often overlooked human dimension to these matters of managing the Biosphere: the fact that man’s mind, our power to discover and deploy universal physical and kindred principles, sets the human species absolutely apart from and above all forms of animal life. The specifically anti-entropic power of the human mind, a power so defined, enables man to transform the Biosphere, and also the abiotic domain at rates which tend, by their nature to overpower the lower forms of abiotic and biological processes.

This power, which sets mankind above the beasts, is typified by the power of the individual to make an original valid discovery of a universal physical principle, or to re-create the act of making such a discovery. To the degree we cease to treat large portions of our populations as if they were human cattle, and emphasize forms of education and employment that nourish the development of the creative powers of the mind of a larger ration of our people, the rate of human mastery of our planet will be accelerated accordingly. We may master the seeming limits of the Biosphere, only by seeing man in his true nature, as the expression of the Noösphere.

The conquest of the Great American Desert shared between the U.S.A. and Mexico, and the proper development and use of vast areas of the Biosphere, in addition to the great mineral

resources, of South America, are a great challenge to cooperation among sovereign nations of the hemisphere over, immediately, the next half-century to come. Such is the challenge within our hemisphere; an analogous challenge is faced in Eurasia, Africa, and Australia/New Zealand.

### **3. Our Planet's Noëtic Regions**

The present physical-economic challenges of our time divide the planet as a whole among, chiefly, three principal continental regions: the Eurasian continent, Africa, especially sub-Saharan Africa, and the Americas. Australia and New Zealand are of auxiliary significance. In each of these cases, the long-term view is premised on studies of the functional interdependency between certain principal concentrations of population and of long-term natural resources, with initial emphasis on mineral resources, as this matter is addressed in the preceding chapter. The three principal factors defining each of these regions in a functional way are: 1.) The political-economic relations within the region as a whole, as defined in physical-economic, rather than monetary-financial terms; 2.) The 25- to 50-year span of principal and associated development of basic economic infrastructure of power generation and distribution, water management, mass transportation, urban development, and sanitation; 3.) The very-long-term physical-economic management of the Noösphere.

The political-economic characteristics of each include the following highlights. It will now become clearer why a more adequate approach to the treatment of the Americas as a continental development region, had to wait until we were willing to consider the lessons to be learned from the work of Vernadsky.

Eurasian development for today is defined primarily in terms of long-term physical-economic relations pivoted among Europe, the Eurasian nation of Russia, and the population-centers of East, Southeast, and South Asia. This development defines a qualitative shift of population from emphasis on the riparian areas bordering seacoasts, toward development and increasing concentration of population and production in areas more deeply inland. This development requires a massive and long-term development of the large-scale systems of basic economic infrastructure needed to render these more inland areas fully habitable in a way suitable for high-gain production.

Although Asian nations such as India, China, Japan, and Korea, are capable producers of relevant capital goods, the present needs for development of inland and other underdeveloped regions exceed the present and immediately foreseeable capacities of those portions of Asia. This defines a special opportunity for long-term trade with Asia, for western and Central Europe. In general, the basis for this trade depends upon a foundation in long-term capital formation for infrastructure and related projects of twenty-five to fifty-year

maturities. This represents a change in the history of economy; with the introduction of high-speed transportation through economic development across the interior of the Eurasian continent, land transport becomes absolutely cheaper, and much quicker, in general, than sea transport: since land transport operates through areas in which transport is integrated with local production of wealth.

A special role is played in this by Russia and Kazakhstan. Scientific potentials of Russia, presently kept largely fallow, will be of crucial importance in the development of the region between the western and eastern portions of the Eurasian continent as a whole. Within this setting, we should foresee the establishment of long overdue peace and peaceful cooperation in Southwest Asia, as contributing a cross-roads connection between the Mediterranean and Indian Ocean region.

This does not signify the exclusion of the Americas from this Eurasian development; it signifies the qualitative greater role of internal economic development, rather than external trade, within Eurasia itself.

The rational development of the African continent requires both the uprooting of the intentionally genocidal policies imposed upon Africa, from the U.S.A. and elsewhere, under population-control policies, such as then National Security Advisor Henry A. Kissinger's NSSM-200, adopted during the 1970s. On condition that that presently continuing practice of genocide is ended, the great challenge for Africa's development is the development of the large-scale basic economic infrastructure, on which the rational economic development of the nations, especially those of sub-Sahara Africa, will depend absolutely.

Central and North Asia, and the African continent contain two leading concentrations of the mineral resources on which the future of humanity presently depends. The third is the vastly underdeveloped nations of South America.

### ***Terra-Forming the Americas***

Successful manned exploration of the interior of the Solar System began, chiefly, in Germany during the 1920s and 1930s, and was taken over chiefly by the U.S.A. and Russia during the decade immediately following the close of World War II. By the early 1950s, the U.S.A.'s adopted space pioneer Wernher von Braun posed the task of sending a flotilla to Mars, a space-flight which von Braun described, explicitly, as a version of Christopher Columbus' voyage of rediscovery of the Americas. Our late friend Krafft Ehrlicke described to us in detail his design for the kind of production facility, to be built on the Moon, which would be indispensable for bringing mankind to other planets. After Krafft's death, during late 1985 into early 1986, I developed a proposed forty-year policy, in his memory, for establishing a working science-city under the surface of Mars. At the same time, I emphasized that any

technology suited for developing a sustainable science-city under the surface of Mars, would enable us to master what might have been considered the most forbidding places on the surface of the Earth.

Speaking in generalities, we human beings must come to face up to our obligation to manage the ecology of our planet as an enlightened farmer turns a wilderness into prosperous agriculture. The vast areas of virtual waste-land in the North and South of the Americas, considered together with the vast mineral and biological resources of the hemisphere, especially the mighty Amazon system, are one of the great challenges for science and mankind. How could any man, woman, or child be poor in a part of the world inherently so rich as this one could be made to become?

We may look at Australia and New Zealand with the same eyes we aim at the three principal continental regions. We can increase the function of life on this planet; we can, with aid of use of principles of life, improve the management of the abiotic processes of our planet. Therefore, we of the Americas, must adopt a long-ranging program of this kind as our mission for the “inner space” of the planet we presently inhabit. With such a program we may be certain that the population of South America will be greatly increased during the remainder of the present century, and, yet, the time could come, at some not distant time, when no child need be poor.

The practical mechanism we require for both missions of that sublime quality, or even more ordinary ones, can be, and must be brought into being as our response to the profound economic crisis which grips the hemisphere, especially in southerly regions, today. We must, as I proposed in my 1982 *Operation Juárez*, develop a new credit-mechanism within the hemisphere, through which we create and manage large flows of created long-term, low-cost credit, credit generated by sovereign governments acting in concert, for capital improvements in basic economic infrastructure and production technologies, at borrowing costs of not more than 1–2% net annual simple interest.

Inside the U.S.A. itself, the included intent of this continental program of economic development must include the expansion of those industries which produce the capital goods which our partners in Central and South America require. We must also develop crucial fountains of technology from within various regions of the hemisphere. All of this must function within the framework of an economic protectionist form of fixed-rate monetary order among the currencies of the Americas, similar to the successful initial phase of the original, post-war Bretton Woods monetary-financial system.

The development of such an arrangement and perspective within the Americas will directly complement and mesh with the similar system of continental-wide cooperation now emerging within the Eurasian continent. These two continental systems, will be the



foundation for a global system with many features of the intent and functioning of the immediate post-war Bretton Woods form of protectionist system based on fixed exchange-rates and gold-reserve denomination of fixed-rate convertibility.

With the establishment of such a fruitful form of cooperation between Eurasia and the Americas, we shall be able to supply the aid urgently needed for the principal large-scale infrastructural features of the development of Africa, especially sub-Saharan Africa. In the meantime, our ability to push through a NAWAPA-Plus program of cooperation among Canada, the U.S.A., and Mexico, will attest to the continent as a whole, that we are determined to succeed in our stated goals for all of the hemisphere, and beyond.

### ***Culture and Nation***

When I hear the words “world government,” I remember the Biblical Tower of Babel, and I wonder: Could that Biblical account be true? Then, I think of “world government,” and I know that the principle expressed by that Biblical account is true, whatever the actual time or place that account might refer to. It is true because it would be the certain consequence of world government to produce a tragic result of precisely that general classification.

I explain that point, as briefly as possible, and as much as my duty here requires.

The essential difference between man and beast, is that only the human individual is capable of discovering those experimentally validatable universal principles, such as Kepler’s unique discovery of a universal principle of gravitation, which are not directly accessible to the senses. In the use of spoken and written language, bestiality takes the form of simple dictionary-like alleged meanings of words. These are so-called literal meanings, or, in technical terms, they represent a nominalist point of view, such as the nominalism of the medieval irrationalist William of Ockham.

In the literate use of language, as in great Classical poetry or drama, words do not have simply literal meanings. Literate speech refers to ideas which correspond to realities existing beyond the simple experience of our senses. Intelligent speech, even among relatively illiterate people, is distinguished by the role of irony; Classical poetry is typical of this role of irony.

As we are assured by speakers of Spanish in Ibero-American nations today, the same root language, Spanish, has different connotations as we move from the conventional Spanish used in one part of Central and South America to another. These differences are chiefly expressions of irony, the same kind of irony presented by all great Classical poetry and drama. By irony, we mean an array of multiple meanings of words and phrases, according to the context in which they are expressed.

In any culture, the history specific to that culture is reflected in the differences among the ironies which have become built into a national language-culture through successive generations. The capacity of a people to express what Shelley pointed toward as “profound and impassioned conceptions respecting man and nature,” lies in the apt employment of such legacies of irony. It is through the sharing of such ironies that a people is enabled to arrive at those insights by which it can effectively govern itself, by means of which poor Sancho Panza might have become able to govern an island.

If we attempt to transform existing, irony-rich languages into a nominalist form of argot, we strip a people of the power to govern itself intelligently. It were better, in every respect, to develop self-government around a language rich in such a repertory of ironies, and as free as possible from slavery to nominalism. Let the speakers from different nations come to understand themselves and others through comprehension of the bridge of ironies by which two language-cultures may develop the insight needed to govern both the internal affairs of each, and the relations among them all.

The notion of special forms of mission-oriented cooperation among a group of nations which have some closely interdependent set of goals, requires that cooperation not be degraded into something like a Tower of Babel. Rather, let the differences in understanding be the ironies which prompt the several nations to make discoveries which would probably never be thought of if matters were left to each nation to solve in isolation from the other. Let our differences make us richer, in knowledge and in spirit.

What I propose is a system of sovereign nation-states of the Americas as a whole, as such a region.

---

### ***Appendix: Synarchism as a System***

To understand efficiently the psychological mechanisms underlying those beastly practices known variously as Martinism, Synarchism, and fascism, the following is essential.

In Plato’s *The Republic*, Socrates describes man’s perception of the universe around him as like the shadows cast upon the wall of a dimly lit cave. Our senses are part of our mortal organism, which, therefore, do not show us the universe around us, but, rather, present us with the reaction of our biological sense-perceptual apparatus to the impact of the outside world upon them. It is only through what Vernadsky identifies as the *noëtic* powers of the human mind, that the human individual, and only the human individual is able to recognize the existence of unsensed universal physical principles, through solving those paradoxes of sense-perception which betray the efficient presence of a universe beyond the scope of sense-perception as such.

In the language of modern mathematical physics, the difference between substance and shadow, between experimentally validated discoveries of universal physical principles and mere sense-certainty, is reflected in what Carl Gauss, in opposition to Euler and Lagrange, defined, in 1799, as the *complex domain*. In other words, the discrepancy between the shadow-world of sense-perception and the principles expressed by the real universe beyond sense-perception, is the difference between our ephemeral mortality, and that real, unseen universe which is acting to produce those apparent discrepancies which Johannes Kepler had defined as typified by the elliptical eccentricities expressing the physically efficient impact of the unseen universal physical principles from beyond the shadows of a merely apparent reality. Such is the physical science first introduced by Gauss's successor, Bernhard Riemann.

In theology, this division between perceived shadow and unseen substance, defines the efficient principle of the human mind as that which sets the human individual absolutely apart from, and above the lower species of life. Theology so defines the embodiment of this superior, *noëtic* quality, as the human soul.

Prior to Europe's Fifteenth-Century, Italy-centered Renaissance, the general condition of mankind was based on the practiced presumption that, although there might exist something in the universe beyond the powers of sense-perception, that something might nonetheless be believed to exist, but could not be actually known. The latter, exotic distinction, was typical of those ancient sophists who perpetrated the judicial murder of Socrates over precisely this issue, and such modern nominalists as the medieval William of Ockham, as also such followers of Ockham as the empiricists Paolo Sarpi, Galileo Galilei, Thomas Hobbes, David Hume, and Immanuel Kant. The various expressions of the view that man's knowledge of the physical universe is limited to sense-certainty, coincide with the practiced opinion of such as Britain's Thomas Huxley and Frederick Engels, that man is essentially an animal, distinguished, perhaps, in degree, but not in principle, from lower forms of life.

In European history, this difference between the Platonists and the nominalists, respecting the nature of man, is key to the millennia-long struggle to free mankind from forms of society in which a relatively few subject the many to the practical status of either wild (hunted) or herded cattle. The feudalism practiced under imperial rule of medieval Venice and the Normans, is an example of this. The system of slavery is an example of this; the system of feudalistic *peonage* in oligarchy-dominated aspects of Mexico's past is an example of this. In modern times, the defense of the practice of keeping the generality of mankind practically in that virtual status of cattle, is typified by such cases as John Locke, the Physiocrat Dr. François Quesnay, and the Adam Smith who copied (some say "plagiarized") his own doctrine of "free trade" from Quesnay's bestialist doctrine of *laissez-faire*.

In medieval times, the struggle to free man from the juridical status of human cattle was expressed by the centuries-long effort to overturn that pro-bestial, *ultramontane* tradition of ancient imperial Rome merely typified by the Code of Diocletian. This struggle is typified by the work of Dante Alighieri on behalf of the specificity of the Italian language, and his defense of sovereign government in his *De Monarchia*. It was only during the Fifteenth-Century Renaissance, that works such as Cardinal Nicholas of Cusa's *Concordantia Catholica* and *De Docta Ignorantia* cleared away the rubble of pro-bestial, imperial *ultramontanism* sufficiently to give birth to modern, scientifically progressive nation-states such as that of Louis XI's France and Henry VII's England. It was in these states that, for the first time in known history, the sovereign was made subject to that obligation of natural law, which is to defend not only the sovereignty of the whole nation, but to bend his own will to the service of the general welfare of all of the people and their posterity.

That division between pro-bestial *ultramontanism* and *humanism*, has been the root-issue of all the bloodiest conflicts in globally extended European civilization since the Fifteenth-Century Renaissance. Martinism and Synarchism are outgrowths of the pro-bestialist definition of man expressed by the modern Venetian-Party tradition of Sarpi, Galileo, Hobbes, Locke, Quesnay, Shelburne's Adam Smith, and Immanuel Kant. The distinction among such pro-bestialists as these is, that the Martinist cult which Britain's Lord Shelburne unleashed upon the world, carries the pro-bestialist, *ultramontane* (imperialist) impulse to such extremes as Adolf Hitler's holocaust against the Jews, and even worse.

The facts bearing upon the foregoing matters are readily available to qualified scholars and relevant others. What is often lacking, even among relatively many specialists who have their evidence in good order, is a want of comprehension of the systemic principle which, so to speak, makes Martinists/Synarchists such as Cagliostro, Mesmer, and the monstrous Joseph de Maistre "tick." The solution for that shortcoming is to be found along the lines of the argument I have summarized in the preceding paragraphs.

Pose the question, thus: How is the utopian (*ultramontane*, "*integrist*") cult of Martinism/Synarchism/Fascism—like the "preventive nuclear war doctrine" of H.G. Wells and Bertrand Russell, and the Unification of the Sciences cult—derived from ancient, medieval, and modern forms of nominalism, such as modern empiricism and existentialism?

In principle, the mechanism used to effect such results, can be most quickly understood by putting one's mental finger on the nature of the intrinsic fraud of Euclidean geometry. The relevant argument runs as follows.

### ***The Cartesian Model***

Nominalism denies the experimentally knowable existence of discoverable universal physical principles beyond the scope of sense-perception. However, it leaves its believers free to imagine what might be “out there, beyond,” a belief which depends upon nothing but an arbitrary choice of some doctrine which could be made to appear to explain away the questions of principle which lie beyond the powers of sense-perception. These arbitrary choices are sometimes named “self-evident truths,” or “principles *a priori*,” such as those doctrines of a Euclidean geometry which were introduced as replacement for the previously established constructive geometry of Thales, Pythagoras, Plato, *et al.*

On this account, the leading Eighteenth-Century mathematician Abraham Kästner (1719–1800), the most important of the teachers of both Gotthold Lessing and Carl Gauss, pointed out that those paradoxes exposed by work from Kepler through Leibniz and Jean Bernoulli, required the junking of aprioristic Euclidean geometry, in favor of an ante- or *anti-Euclidean geometry* which returned to the standpoint of the *constructive geometry* of the school of Pythagoras and Plato. This notion of an anti-Euclidean geometry, more or less explicitly stated in Gauss’s 1799 definition of ***The Fundamental Theorem of Algebra***, was established, implicitly, by the opening paragraph of Bernhard Riemann’s revolutionary 1854 habilitation dissertation, on the subject of ***The Hypotheses Which Underlie Geometry***.

The general study of the implications of the elliptical functions of astronomy, had been prescribed by Kepler as, together with the related development of the calculus later developed by Leibniz, work assigned to future mathematicians. This had led Leibniz’s follower Kästner to pose the importance of developing an anti-Euclidean geometry to replace the neo-Euclidean, Cartesian geometries rampant among the Eighteenth-Century empiricists’ Enlightenment. This had led Gauss to his explorations of the deeper implications of elliptical functions, and those related notions of the general principles of curvature of the complex domain which Riemann brought to a crucial point of fruition.

A purely arithmetic mathematics may be referenced as typical of a radically empiricist standpoint. A Euclidean or Cartesian mathematics typifies the introduction of arbitrary belief in purely fanciful forms of “self-evident” definitions, axioms, and postulates, as replacement for those competently defined universal physical principles whose experimentally efficient presence is expressed mathematically by Gauss’s and Riemann’s successive definitions of the complex domain. The key to discovering the mechanism of Martinism/Synarchism/Fascism and radical positivism generally, is to see the implications of extending the application of arbitrary, utopian forms of definitions, axioms, and postulates from the domain of mathematics, into the domain of social theory, law, and religious belief.

Make up your own ideal society. Define it in terms of an arbitrary set of rules of the game, rules whose interconnection is defined as nominalist “consistency.” U.S. Associate Justice Antonin Scalia’s fascist (“Thrasymachian,” Synarchist) doctrine of “text,” is typical of some of the worst concoctions brewed in such ways. The late Professor Leo Strauss’s lying effort to induce his foolish dupes to accept Plato as an admirer of Thrasymachus, is typical of such frauds. The horrors of the Spanish Inquisition are an example of such frauds, in addition to being an important precedent in the design of the Martinist/Synarchist cult today. The recruitment of the ostensibly right-wing strain of Synarchists in Central and South America under the Nazi Party’s direction, and still today, has relied heavily on a specifically fascist dogma of *Hispanidad* which looks back apologetically to such satanic orgies as the Spanish Inquisition and the Habsburg role in the religious wars of the 1511–1648 interval as a precedent for the Dionysiac/Neo-Cathar dogma of such original Martinists such as Joseph de Maistre.

The antidote to such travesties as Martinism and its like, is a clearheaded distinction between the meaning of the verbs “to believe” and “to know.” The hysterical quality permeating the Synarchist’s lying version of the history of the Americas, for example, expresses his need to invent a falsified interpretation of history as a mere belief which might serve a sincerely integrist fanatic’s history as a utopian fiction. It is the blood-soaked, beast-man axiom of fanciful belief in Martinism/Synarchism, which is the most significant distinction of Martinism/Synarchism from other modern forms of nominalist social theory and theology in general.