

# Columbus's discovery of America and the strategic crisis today

*Lyndon LaRouche delivered this speech by audiotape to the founding conference of the Ibero-American Solidarity Movement, in Tlaxcala, Mexico on May 18:*

I shall begin as I begin many of my campaign broadcasts: "This is Democratic presidential candidate Lyndon LaRouche speaking."

I shall begin by emphasizing, as I have in a number of locations, that what we witness now is not only the recent and continued disintegration of the former Soviet Warsaw Pact empire, but also a parallel and somewhat similar process of disintegration of the Anglo-American world empire which had intended to survive victorious the crumbling of its former Moscow condominium partner.

I shall end, however, after exploring these matters, with attention to the fact that this is the 500th anniversary of the discovery of the Americas by Christopher Columbus, and I shall indicate the significance of that discovery 500 years ago from the standpoint of the process of disintegration of the Anglo-American empire today.

I shall also refer to something else in this process, at the beginning. There is a certain Democratic presidential candidate who is too low morally to be considered really a competitor of mine, by the name of Gov. William Clinton, better known in the state of Arkansas, of which he is governor, as "Slick Willie" Clinton.

Now "Slick Willie" Clinton, in his first term as governor back in the 1970s, had a tendency to grant clemency to death row inmates. He lost reelection on that issue and since then has been a violent, rabid advocate of execution of death row inmates. That gives you already a little insight into "Slick Willie's" character. "Slick Willie" is now, at this moment—I don't know what will have happened by the time you hear me—planning to execute a man on Arkansas death row who "Slick Willie," as a lawyer, knows to be innocent—or, to use legal language, the man has a colorable claim to innocence. But "Slick Willie" plans so far to execute him regardless—as he has already executed *two* death row prisoners as publicity stunts for his election campaign for the Democratic presidential nomination.

Obviously, no thinking and moral citizen of the United States, would support the nomination of such a monster for the Democratic presidential nomination, and certainly would

not support such a man for election as President of the United States.

Killing one person at a time whom one knows to be innocent, as a matter of a public pagan religious ritual, which is what "Slick Willie" is proposing to do, among others, is not as bad perhaps as the Aztecs cutting out hundreds or thousands of hearts of living human beings as a public religious pagan execution 500 years ago; but "Slick Willie" is moving in that direction. We'll see shortly what significance I attach to the connection between the immorality of the Aztec priests, and the immorality of "Slick Willie."

Now there are two things one has to consider here in this connection—actually three points, but two facts which are subsumed by another point, which I shall make.

First of all, briefly, the collapse of the Versailles system, what that means to us, or should mean to us, particularly in the countries of Hispanic America or Ibero-America; secondly, the issue of this immorality, which has overtaken the United States in particular; and thirdly, from what standpoint do we recognize a principal connection between the collapse of the Anglo-American empire now, and the issues of Columbus's voyages of discovery 500 or so years ago?

## The British drive for one-world empire

What we mean by Versailles Treaty is the following. British liberalism was established as a power in 1714-16, with the accession of George I to the newly created, combined thrones of England, Scotland, and Wales. He was the first *British* monarch. This liberalism committed itself to establishing Britain, the Venice of the North, as a new worldwide Roman Empire, based on the model of pagan Rome. That has been the intent of the throne.

The party which came to power in Britain with this accession, the Liberals, were a party which was first known in the period following the Renaissance, and was known as an opponent of the Renaissance. It was called the New Party of Venice: young, usury-practicing bankers, *I Nuovi*, in opposition to the old usury-practicing bankers, *I Vecchi*, of Venice. These forces created what was called the Levant Company, which took over in the late fifteenth-sixteenth centuries, particularly, Portugal and Spain, with their loans and usury, and then moved on to grab control not only of Burgundy in southern Europe, near what is today Switzerland, southern

France around the Rhône Valley, but also The Netherlands, and then moved on northward to corrupt and take over England as well—thus establishing England, together with The Netherlands, as a bastion of a new global, maritime usury-practicing power, the Venetian Party as it was called in northern Europe then, into the eighteenth century. And that is what the British power became.

British imperial power was challenged first successfully by the North Americans, in the great rebellion which established a federal constitutional republic in the United States. That was the great defeat of Britain. A continuation of the American defeat of Britain was prevented in France by the British-directed Jacobins, such as Robespierre, Marat and Danton, and the others were allies of the British cause—and then by a Napoleon who, while a British competitor, represented the same essential paganist policy as did imperial Britain, but from a different standpoint. Britain intended to make London the capital of a world empire; Napoleon intended to make Rome the world empire ruled by his son, called the king of Rome. Both were building for a third Roman Empire, just the same way as Philotheus of Pskov had argued for this on behalf of Czarist Russia, Muscovite Russia, some centuries earlier.

The defeat of Napoleon resulted in the creation of the unholy coalition called the Holy Alliance, which set itself up to the rule the world. The Holy Alliance was a partnership of Britain, with a concert of Russia, of Austro-Hungary, and of the Ottomans. This lasted for a short period of time, during which the British and their friends from the continent built up the Freemasons around Mazzini, who in 1848-49 unleashed a wave of terror and insurrection throughout Europe (like 1968, for example, in Europe and the Americas), which brought down many of the governments of that time, and which resulted in pitting Russia, Austro-Hungary, and the Ottoman Empire against one another, essentially, in the Balkans, thus clearing the way for British efforts to establish a British-only world empire.

What happened during that approximately 15-year period, from about 1847-48 through 1862-63, was that Britain attempted to establish the basis for becoming a one-world empire, by betraying and falling upon the spoils of its former allies. This is analogous to what happened particularly in the Yalta agreement and especially from 1955 on, among Britain, Washington, and Moscow—or shall we say Khrushchov and Brezhnev's Moscow—which established a condominium among competing adversaries which ran the world from approximately the period of Yalta, especially from 1955 on. The world was ruled on the basis of Yalta until 1989, by a condominium of this sort among allies and adversaries, Washington, London, and Moscow, to such effect that whatever Moscow, London, and Washington agreed, the world was supposed to submit to that agreement. Otherwise, the world was centered in the political affray, the competition, among these partners in the condominium.

Thus, the collapse of the condominium, in the form of the collapse of Moscow and the Warsaw Pact, over the period late 1989 through early 1991, signified to those in London, that Britain, or the Anglo-Americans, were on their way to establishing a one-world empire on the basis of the collapse of their former Moscow partner, very much as London deemed itself on the road to establishing a one-world empire on the basis of the defeats and mutual conflicts of the Russians, Austro-Hungarians, and Ottomans in the 1850s.

## **Britain and the Confederacy**

What happened, as we all know, is that trouble began ostensibly in Russia, and spread into the United States. The United States was one of the targets, together with Mexico, of an attempted destruction of the heritage of the American Revolution in the Americas, by Britain. And the British and their puppet, Napoleon III of France, intended to create a fragmentation of the United States into a number of squabbling empires, all this directed from London, through the Scottish Rite of Freemasonry. The Confederacy was nothing but a puppet of the British government, operating largely through Rothschild facilities, but essentially through the Scottish Rite of Freemasonry; and through the same arrangements, the British and French, with the support of a complicit Spain, did the same thing in Mexico, in looting that country.

Because Czar Alexander II of Russia intervened in alliance with Abraham Lincoln to defeat the British plan to force the acceptance of an independent Confederate States of America upon Washington, and threatened to make war against France and Britain should the French and British navies intervene to assist the Confederacy to assist in breaking the Union blockade; because of that, Britain was sorely defeated by Lincoln.

The British managed to kill Lincoln through British intelligence. John Wilkes Booth was a British agent; Secretary of the Treasury of the Confederate States of America Judah Benjamin directed much of this. By 1867, the British had already reestablished their foothold in the Americas around the Southern Jurisdiction of the Scottish Rite of Freemasonry, with Judah Benjamin, the Rothschild agent, now in London, doing much of the directing of the creation of that and of the Ku Klux Klan—in point of fact a certain Jewish interest tied to Judah Benjamin, has controlled the Ku Klux Klan from that time to the present time. Just a little incidental note in history.

## **World War I and Versailles**

From that point on, Russia's policy—at least that around Alexander II and Sergei Witte, later—was to establish a system of economic cooperation across Eurasia, uniting France, Germany, Russia, and China, as well as Japan, in the effort to create a sphere of Eurasian economic co-development among these nations, stretching East-West, and North-South, the axis of development being the development

of railroads. It was against this that the British mobilized, seeking to pit the United States, Japan, France, and Russia against Austro-Hungary and Germany, and against the Ottoman Empire, all at the same time: divide and conquer.

The result of this, because of the corruption of France, the corruption of circles around the czar in Russia, was World War I, the most hideous destructive war in the history of Europe to date.

At the end of the war, the victors, the Anglo-Americans, with their French co-running-dog Clemenceau (the heir of Napoleon III spiritually as well as in other respects), established what became known as the Versailles Treaty or the Versailles system, which ruled the world in the following two decades and which in effect, in reformed form, rules up to the present time.

The purpose of this system, which called itself a geopolitical view of the world, was to ensure Anglo-American world imperial domination, and to achieve that by aid of ensuring that no combination of Eurasian nations would ever again be permitted to arise to replicate the kind of cooperation which Alexander II and Sergei Witte of Russia had in mind for their French, German, and other neighbors prior to World War I.

That broke apart, for obvious reasons. But when von Schleicher and company were coming to power in Germany, around a policy based on the American System model during the 1932-33 period, the Anglo-Americans moved—including the father of George Bush, Prescott Bush—to put Hitler into power *to prevent* what they feared: German-Russian cooperation of some form emerging around von Schleicher and company or some similar combination. That's the reason they put Hitler into power. *The Anglo-Americans put Hitler into power.*

This was not merely opportunism. One must remember, that the Anglo-American factions behind people such as Stimson were racist. They were not only racist against people with black skins, but racist against people who speak with Spanish accents, as one knows from the history of the hemisphere.

### **The rise and fall of the Yalta condominium**

So during the course of World War II, there were the Yalta, Bretton Woods, and San Francisco agreements. The United Nations, the Bretton Woods monetary system, and the Yalta agreements, and other agreements of the same sort, established the Versailles system or continued it in a reformed form.

What came out of that, was essentially defined by Yalta and San Francisco agreements: a condominium among Moscow, London, and Washington—or one might say New York—to rule the world together, in competition, as former allies and sometimes opponents. That was the system that fell apart beginning the end of 1989. First on the Russian side, and secondly, on the Anglo-American side.

That system is collapsing today. There is no possibility that the Anglo-American system in its present form can re-

cover economically from the disaster which now dooms it *in the very near future.*

There are many people, for example, in Central and South America, who will speak about negotiating cooperation with North America, with the United States in particular, and with the International Monetary Fund. Well, there will be no such cooperation, because one of the partners to that cooperation, at least, will soon be dead, to all intents and purposes. The Anglo-American economic power is finished, fatally finished, and cannot be revived in its present form and institutions ever again. Something new is coming, and coming very rapidly on the scale of history—that is, in the next months and two-year period, approximately. Fundamental upheavals such as this century has not seen, are going to sweep this globe. And the world will belong to those who build a new system from out of the ashes of the Anglo-American and Soviet imperiums of the past decades.

So forget the past, forget the institutions of the present, in terms of any long-term calculation; these are merely present features of the landscape, which are soon to be swept aside. The issue is to concentrate on the future, on building the new institutions. That, in essence, is the issue of the Versailles system, as I wish to deal with it so far in general. You have it from other sources and other conferences which have treated this before, and from much written material. But that's the point in essence.

### **How oligarchism really works**

Now, look at another feature of the Versailles system. The Versailles system was based on usury, was based on a system of oligarchy. Many people talk about how the Anglo-Americans or the Yankee imperialists dominate the world, or the British imperialists; but they really *don't know* how it works.

Let me explain briefly. How is the Anglo-American empire ruled? Who are its rulers? Who are those above government, who rule the Anglo-American system?

Go back to the question of *I Nuovi*, the new men of Venice, the Levant Company. What's their form of government? Their form of government is the *fondo*. The unit of government is the *fondo*. The *fondo* is like a financial trust or foundation, which is set up in perpetuity. It is supposedly immortal. It's not a human being, it's a trust, which operates on the basis of a covenant. And this trust is presumably an immortal personality. The trust is administered by groups of people who perpetuate themselves, that is, a group of directors or trustees who perpetuate themselves by recruiting new trustees to replace old ones, by firing some of their own members, acquiring new ones, and so forth and so on. And thus does the trust perpetuate itself biologically, as well as on paper. These trusts are often associated with names of wealthy or aristocratic families; but the families do not control the trust, in the sense of being stockholders; rather, the trust controls the families. The model for this form of trust

or *fondo* is the pagan Roman law of the family, the law of the *pater familias*. That is, the trust, this non-human, quasi-immortal entity, is the *pater familias*, who can adopt heirs, who can disown heirs, who can have heirs killed, even—a trust which runs through a selection of executives or trustees who are coopted in various ways to perform that function.

When we speak in North America or in England of *the families*, we're speaking of an aggregation of these trusts, or these *fondi*, which can have this power. So if one were to speak of a Rockefeller, one is not speaking of a biological Rockefeller; one is speaking of Rockefeller trusts, foundations. And similarly, all the other numerous powerful families, such as Warburg or Rothschild, as well as the British royal family, which is such an entity. We're not speaking about the biological personalities, the heirs; we're speaking rather of the institution of the quasi-immortal trust.

Now these trusts deem themselves to run the world, pretty much as the Greek pagans describe the gods of Mt. Olympus. These are very nasty people. Zeus was the top god, he had the most power to strike others down and do evil things; the gods as a whole were cutting each others' throats, squabbling about each other, manipulating nations, doing all kinds of nasty things, but they were deemed immortal—like the *fondi*. And they would meet in assembly to make sure that the arrangement under which the gods ruled the world, the trusts, and in which the ordinary people were merely virtual slaves to the gods, was perpetuated forever.

That's what we mean by oligarchism.

The oligarchy has a third class called the demigods, in which you have such scoundrels as Henry Kissinger. Henry Kissinger is nothing, he's not very intelligent, I've heard him engaged in a private conversation for which he was being paid, presumably as an "expert." The man is an absolute fool. It's obvious that Henry Kissinger doesn't really know anything. He is simply a messenger boy, into which other people put messages for him to utter. He's a very evil, very stupid little man, who plays his part apparently satisfactorily from the standpoint of those who own him.

But nonetheless, to the public, he appears like a demigod. He is not a power in his own right; he is not a trust; he doesn't represent the level of power of an aristocrat or a noble financial family, but he is really somebody who does errands; he has a privileged position as a trusted errand-runner for those who employ him. And the world is full of all kinds of politicians and technicians and others, who run errands, in terms of managing society for the trust formation—these disembodied immortal gods above.

So we have the pagan gods, the trusts; we have below them the demigods, typified in the most disgusting way perhaps by Henry Kissinger; and then we have the people who are considered the helots, the slaves, the proletariat, or what-have-you, who can be killed.

For example: Now the oligarchs say there are too many people; therefore, what are they going to do? They're going

to cull the flock, as if human beings were not human beings but simply sheep, to be slaughtered, when they become too numerous. What do the human beings have to say about this? *Nothing*. You are only a helot; your "betters," your powers-that-be, your ruling institutions, will decide whether you live, you die, you starve to death. They'll come in and perform vasectomies or a similar operation to make you sterile—by law. What right do *you* have to have children? Only the immortal gods, the foundations, can decide. And the foundations are dominated, *primus inter pares*, by the gods of London, New York, and Washington: these families.

That is what the issue was, with the Versailles system.

The American System, like the Renaissance before it, was based on the notion of the sovereignty of the individual, as *imago viva Dei*. Oh, there are many imperfections in the American System of the Founding Fathers of the United States—that's all to be granted. But however imperfect a reflection, the virtue of the American System, its success, was premised on nothing but the fact that it reflected the influence of those such as Leibniz who represented in turn the Christian Golden Renaissance of the fifteenth century, the Golden Renaissance of Nicolaus of Cusa. As Friedrich Schiller put it, in his way, the only opposition to this pagan oligarchical system in all of European history over more than 2,500 years, has been precisely that kind of force, the force typified in one sense by Solon of Athens, by Plato, and of course which is contained within Apostolic Christianity, as opposed to some of the new manufactured varieties, which were cooked up later. And that brings us, of course, to the issue of Columbus.

## Columbus and Cusa

What was Columbus?

Well, he was a man, of course. You have his history from other sources at this meeting. But what was he essentially, in terms of his role of discovery in the Americas?

He represented an institutional force with two aspects, which centered around the work of the Golden Renaissance from the third and fourth decades of the fifteenth century. He represented those around Cusa, including Paolo dal Pozzo Toscanelli, and others, who had a new conception of society reflected in part by Cusa's earlier work. Cusa's key work is *Concordantia Catholica*: a new conception of society and a new political conception of man in terms of society. Oh, it was in the Christian tradition and the Apostolic tradition, and it was in the tradition of Augustine and therefore also of Aquinas; it was a Platonic, anti-Aristotelian conception of man. And Aquinas was really anti-Aristotelian, though many will dispute that for various peculiar reasons.

So this group of people did something which had two facets. One, was to develop the science—and I understand you have a report on some of the science behind Columbus's discoveries. These people determined approximately how large the world was, by simple but obvious methods. We

may say after looking at them, that they seem to be obvious today. They're obvious kinds of astronomical calculations, which told them how large the planet is, based on the fact that the planet rotates over approximately 24 hours; and then use that kind of information, and the changes in the declination of the Sun and this sort of thing, and the ocean and some of the planets, to estimate how large the world was. A very good job, as a matter of fact. They constructed estimated maps of the world. They built a science which enabled the navigation to occur, which discovered the Americas.

Secondly, they launched a program of evangelization to outflank the Ottoman Empire in every way possible, as an immediate task, but also to bring the world as a whole into the community of Christian nations. Among their other achievements, they rescued the people of Mexico from a Satanic mass-murderous cult worse than the Nazis, called the Aztec priesthood. And that typifies the great work of these people, through such instruments as Christopher Columbus.

Now today, there are many people who continue and perpetuate the Black Legend: the defamation of this hero, Columbus, who despite all his faults, was a more or less faithful and good instrument of a movement which centered around such leaders as Cusa. Without Christopher Columbus, Cusa's designs could not have been well implemented. So Cristoforo Columbus may not be as great as Cusa by any means, and there may be many others who are perhaps nobler in moral impulses than Cristoforo; but nonetheless, he was necessary *as an instrument* of a policy which was in itself a good policy, a policy which did much good—for the Americas, and for the indigenous peoples of the Americas at that time.

Why do they attack him again today, 500 years later?

The facts are evident, the lies are well known to be lies; why do they publish these lies all over again and defame him? Why do they try to defend people who are committing genocide against the Indian populations, the Aztec priests? With these hideous, obscene, mass-murderous, human-cannibalistic rituals: cutting out the hearts of hundreds of living people, in a spectacle which is even lower in moral level than the debased moral level of the U.S. candidate, Gov. "Slick Willie" Clinton.

Why do they do that?

This brings me to the third point, my concluding point, and the one in which my personal role is most significant.

### Science vs. the oligarchical system

I have recently completed for publication a paper on the subject of metaphor.

The material in that paper is not new to me, nor to things I have taught in my classes or expressed otherwise. It's just presented in a new way, in what I believe is perhaps a more useful new way, than before, at least more useful for the times before us now.

I have emphasized many times that the characteristic of



*The evangelization rescued the people of Mexico from the murderous Aztec priesthood. Shown here is a monument to Don Vasco, "the father of the Indians," in Quiroga, Michoacán, Mexico.*

a society is not to be found by studying the specific policies of a society at any one time; but rather one must study the way in which a society *changes* its policies, and find in that method of change, the characteristic feature of a culture, a society.

From that standpoint, we have two methods. One method, is the method of the oligarchy, the method which we can see most luridly underlined, in the policy changes which have affected the United States, for example, over the period from the Watts riots, say, of 1965, to the present, 1992, or from the period of the Kennedy assassination to the present time—approximately the same thing. That expresses oligarchism at its worst. This is usury. This is a movement against everything which we call Christian civilization. It's a movement

against human rights. It's a movement to exacerbate the conditions of life of people below the Rio Grande border, from the standpoint of the United States.

Then there's the opposing method, the method of using science to discover truth, and to use that truth to guide us in devising policies which more efficiently recognize the sovereignty of the human individual, an individual who is, under our law, our conception of law, *imago viva Dei—in the image of the living God*—by virtue of the fact that this person is endowed with a divine spark of reason, which enables that human individual to do something that no animal can do; a potentiality within that individual, which makes that individual in the image of the living God—true creative potential.

So we work to discover truth, the truth being a more effective way of governing humanity, of nations governing themselves, so as to foster and protect and nourish the quality of *imago viva Dei* in every human individual, and the sacredly sovereign life of every human individual.

Now what I've done, in this work on metaphor, is to attempt to restate the principle to which I have given most of my adult life. I'll just identify what it's about—you can read the paper in due course—but I'll indicate the relevance of this paper to what is before us today.

All my contributions, which the future will consider my original contributions to the fund of human scientific knowledge, are centered in a very small area. I being but one individual, it is not surprising that everything I might have contributed of any durable value, might be limited to one fairly small area of contribution. Nothing to be ashamed of in that.

### **Human knowledge is not 'information'**

But this small area starts with my interest in philosophy in my pre-pubertal years, working through philosophy, and picking Leibniz as the only philosopher with whom I agreed from the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries—that is, the only notable philosopher. And then coming in my adolescence to defending Leibniz against the attacks by Kant, in Kant's *Critiques*. This prepared me in the postwar period to encounter and to be shocked and angered by, initially, what was called information theory, as presented by a now-celebrated, but deceased, MIT professor, Norbert Wiener, who was also associated with the Cardiological Institute of Mexico for a time.

Wiener attempted to reduce human knowledge to what he called information, to reduce human communication to what he called information. And he defined information in terms of the model of statistical gas dynamics, as elaborated by Ludwig Boltzmann—the so-called H-Theorem—and he used the term *negentropy* to describe a negative entropy which he associated with the organization of information and behavior in a way which was not entropic, and so forth.

But I recognized, that what Wiener was doing was actually the most disgusting and the most dehumanizing thing

which could be done: to degrade human creative powers, human thought, human communication, to merely a statistical form. So I devoted the years 1948-52 (not all of those years, but my energy of thought, my energy of work during those years, was entirely on this one subject), to refuting Wiener. And so in the course of that, by 1952, I had essentially refuted Wiener, had proven him absurd, not only from a negative standpoint, but also from a positive standpoint, showing what the positive alternative was to what Wiener was saying, with respect to human beings.

That became embodied in what many of you know of as my work on physical economy, that is, the influence of Leibniz on me in the first instance in respect to these questions, but also, in my presenting scientific and technological progress as the characteristic of successful human societies, as showing that that depends upon the power to create human knowledge, whether it is original discoveries or simply in the transmission and assimilation of original discoveries by others. This is the basis of scientific and technological progress, and this expresses the true practical nature of human knowledge. But the important thing is, that these forms of true knowledge, knowledge of creative powers, cannot be expressed in terms of any statistical theory or any linear theory or any ordinary mathematics, nor can they be adequately represented in any medium of formal communication, that actually, media and communication merely have a metaphorical relationship to these forms of knowledge.

So, all the work that I have done, and every contribution I have made of any significance to scientific thought, especially in technology and economy in general, is derived from what I worked out during this period, which I have summarily described in some degree in that particular paper on metaphor, as otherwise described again in the published trilogy of prison writings which is called the *Science of Christian Economy and Other Prison Writings*.

### **The power of ideas**

What we're looking at, then, from this standpoint, is this:

I've indicated, in the "Metaphor" paper and other related writings, what the method is which defines the direction of development of society, according to Platonic principles consistent with Augustinian Christianity. The opposition is the oligarchical system, which is ruling now, and which is disintegrating.

I've indicated in some of these papers methods by which we may foster mastery of these methods which I recommend. But what I am seeking to accomplish by these publications, is to transmit this method to a broader layer of people, hopefully much younger than I am, who will grasp the importance of this method, understand the adversary's method from the standpoint of this method I propose, and *institutionalize* the method which I propose as a weapon, *in order to set into motion* social processes which will lead to the establishment of new kinds of institutions which must arise out of the col-

lapse of the oligarchical order now centered in rapidly decaying Anglo-American power.

So, as we look at Columbus today, and the attacks on Columbus, we may say that Columbus did not merely make a discovery; Columbus reflected the two-faceted policy, especially of a group of people centered around Nicolaus of Cusa, and the 1439-40 Council of Florence.

On the one side, it was a movement to evangelize the world in order to create a system of sovereign nation-state republics, according to the principles which Cusa defined, by which human affairs could be brought into order under natural law, and to foster this process, by the development of science. It was that commitment to evangelization, made possible, made realizable, by science, which made a Columbus possible.

When we celebrate Columbus, we honor him because he was an instrument of this policy—not because he was an isolated individual, but rather a hero precisely to the degree he was an instrument of this policy. We also defend this policy against its enemy, the oligarchical plots, the *fondi*, which commit Aztec-priest-like atrocities then and now, against the peoples of this planet.

We do this not merely to do a good thing, not merely because it is the right thing to do, not merely to defend our true heritage, but because we, like Columbus, or better, *must become the instruments of some necessary work which falls to us because of the place and time in which we live*. Just as Columbus was swept up by the force and the movement for evangelization and for science, and accepted that responsibility through his acts of discovery, so we, today, must recognize in the issues of our time what we must do, what we must choose to do, as Columbus chose his mission, to bring to realization what only a great movement of our time can accomplish.

I would suggest to you, in all modesty—because I am aware of my own shortcomings and the shortcomings of my work—that you embrace the concept which I have offered, through the medium of such writings as the article on “Metaphor,” to understand how history is shaped. History is not shaped by constitutions as such, by written resolutions, by laws, by policies; history is rather shaped by a *method* for good or for evil, which causes people and societies to effect successive *changes* in their laws, successive *changes* in their institutions, successive *changes* in their behavior, successive *changes* in their own ways of thinking, which are either for Good or for Evil.

We cannot rule the world by a set of maxims. We cannot rule the world by a set of prescriptions. We can only rule the world effectively by a set of principles which are principles of discovery, scientifically sound principles of *change*; by principles which are imbedded in that one aspect of ourselves which is *imago viva Dei*: the creative powers of reason which are typified in the expression, by true scientific discoveries leading to scientific progress and by the greatest works of classical humanist art.

---

Col. Mohamed Alí Seineldín

---

## We cannot leave the future to the enemy

*What follows is a translation of the speech of Col. Mohamed Alí Seineldín to the founding conference of the Ibero-American Solidarity Movement on May 18. Written and taped at the prison camp of Santa María Magdalena, Argentina on May 10, 1992.*

With deepest joy and satisfaction, I send to all my dear Ibero-American brothers gathered at this honorable conference, a strong embrace, extended also to the citizens and families of the continent who share our concerns and our dreams, to definitively establish a Great Latin American Fatherland.

Also accept my warmest congratulations to you for this great initiative.

As the end of the twentieth century and the beginning of the twenty-first approaches, added to the critical situation in which we live, we are obliged to “*do something*” that is unavoidable, unpostponable, and, most of all, *urgent*.

Your courageous efforts are seen by the Creator, by our forefathers, and by all the great and marvelous people who today—regrettably—are succumbing culturally and socially, the result of mistreatment at the hands of the insidious international organizations, bad policies, and venal domestic leaders.

I wish to thank all of you for your fraternal attitude in inviting me to participate in this honorable meeting. I do so under the name and protection of the Virgin of Guadalupe, the Mistress and Queen of America, and holding high the following slogan: “*Without the reorganization of the Great Ibero-American Fatherland, it is impossible to restructure and restore the national and Christian states.*”

The topic I would modestly bring before you, I am entitling: “Is It Possible To Save the Latin American Subcontinent from the Crisis It Is in Today?”

I will limit myself to the following: 1) an evaluation of the current situation; 2) a forecast of its probable evolution; 3) general measures to overcome the crisis; 4) some reflections.

Regarding the first point, the evaluation, everyone knows in detail the suffering and ills of this, our Fatherland. In any case, I would like to affirm what you know, rather than to offer new facts.