

On the “Crusade for Democracy”

& An Introduction to Post-Marxian Pattern-of-History Theory

Theodore Dana Hall, Ph.D.

“Can it be that Providence has not connected the permanent felicity of a Nation with its virtue?”

--George Washington

“We now stand ten years past the midpoint of a century that has witnessed four major wars among great nations. Three of these involved our own country. Despite these holocausts America is today the strongest, the most influential and most productive nation in the world. Understandably proud of this pre-eminence, we yet realize that America's leadership and prestige depend, not merely upon our unmatched material progress, riches and military strength, but on how we use our power in the interests of world peace and human betterment.”

--Dwight D. Eisenhower (1961)

Only yesterday, it seems, the United States was viewed by most of its citizens, and by peoples throughout the world, as a great liberator. With the defeat of the Axis powers just a few years behind him, a confident President Eisenhower announced the start of America's next mission—a march to bring the blessings of democracy to all the world, a “crusade for democracy.”

“What you resist you become—unless you win,” the renegade libertarian philosopher-scientist L. Ron Hubbard once said. Well ... we didn't win. Today, the USA is widely viewed as the world's foremost imperialistic ogre. *In a fifty-year period, we've devolved from liberator to monster!* A recent poll conducted by the BBC (in some forty countries) indicates that a great many people on our planet view the United States as the principal threat to world peace.

What went wrong?

One: We, the People allowed ourselves to be caught up in the post-World War Two hoopla concerning America's new role as “leader of the Free World” and powerhouse crusader for democracy. I liked Ike. I still like him. But I see the crusader policy goal he articulated as unfortunate, as it provided a pretext for the global conquest plans of the very complex he warned against—the “military-industrial complex.”

All but forgotten was the wise counsel of President Washington, who told us that the key to national success (and security) is minding our own business. Do not become

“entangled” in the affairs of other nations, he said. Today, we are most *entangled* nation on Earth!—and our neo-con leaders, mouthing the rhetoric of Eisenhower, are intent on entangling us even further.

For an interesting article on the American crusade for democracy prior to Ike, read James Bovard’s “Killing in the Name of Democracy.” [1]

By the way, the least entangled of the major powers, Japan and China, are the ones that seem to be doing really well these days.

Two: We can’t very well be a nation that minds its own business, happily creating the good life, if our politicians are ruled by a “military-industrial complex” hell bent on domination of the planet. The conspiracy writers call this complex the “New World Order.” I have an objection to this call, and it’s this: What’s labeled the New World Order is not the real New World Order. The real New World Order is the American system established under the Articles of Confederation and the Constitution, which recognizes the populace (“We, the People”) as the sovereignty-holders. “Sovereignty” means *the ultimate power*. Old World Order: Monarchs have the sovereignty. (“I have some disturbing news from our colonies in North America, great Sovereign ...”). New World Order: We, the People have the sovereignty. (“Those detestable rebels now claim that sovereignty doth belong to the people in general, and not to Your Majesty.”)

George III was not at all happy about losing his North American colonies, and so he commissioned British intelligence to come up with a plan for destroying independent republicanism in America and wherever else it might raise its ugly head. Intelligence conferred with a number of important families in Britain and on the continent, and lo & behold, before long came up with a good plan. Eventually, the reactionary conspiracy came to be known as the “New World Order.” Call it what you wish, but know that it is the *reactionary* elitist New World Order and not the people-power New World Order.

Fast forward to December 23, 1913. While many, if not most, Congresspersons were home or on the way home for the Christmas holiday, Congress passed the Federal Reserve bill, and Wilson signed it into law. Essentially, what the Act did was privatize the power to regulate the American financial system. The Federal Reserve, or “Fed,” is a private organization whose stockholders are major international banks. The New World Order was elated. The Order got to become the fourth branch of government.

Who lost out? We the People, we the stockholders in the public corporation termed the United States of America. In 1912, the USA had no national debt. Think about it. No debt. Zero. Today, We the People, collectively and individually, are enslaved by a multi-trillion dollar debt. Also losing out were the peoples of the planet, as the Fed was to serve as financier of the imperialistic economic agenda of the supranational Order.

Will the American people ever re-possess the power to regulate the financial system? Yes ... after the Order falls. The Order will fall, you know, and at the moment, it seems to me that the most probable cause of the fall will be Mother Nature, which the Order has

so egregiously violated. The Order is well equipped to deal with its human enemies, but when the battlefield itself turns against it, that's something else.

As a Oneness man (i.e., one who sees all people as cousins), what I would prefer to see is a transformation of the Order rather than its destruction. Such a thing *can* happen. The principals in the Order *can* come to realize that their ideological basis, Malthusian Darwinism, is madness—and repudiate it. [2] They can pay their karmic debts to the people of this planet by reading *Power Vs. Force* (David Hawkins) and then committing themselves to cultivating real power--the power of compassion and service to life.

To tie this all this into the main theme: There are two foreign policy traditions in our American history. One is the tradition of anti-imperialism, as represented by the first George W; the other is the tradition of imperialism, as represented by the current George W—and a number of presidents before him. At the present, the imperialists, supported by the New World Order, dominate our politics. For most these individuals, the “crusade for democracy” is merely a cover, a means of giving the color of noble virtue to their predatory enterprise and thereby enlisting the cooperation of the populace. That the populace has been so slow in realizing this is certainly one the things that “went wrong.”

Three: If we're going to go on a crusade for democracy, don't you think we ought to have a very clear idea of what democracy is? Well, we don't. For most Americans, it means simply “majority rule,” which is a very inadequate definition. I'm afraid that the political science department of our intellectual establishment has not served us as well as it should have. Allow me to define democracy from an holistic point of view, i.e., as it exists within the pattern of history....

Karl Marx gave the name “dialectical materialism” to his theory of the pattern of history. Material conditions play a causative role in history, for sure, but it is *belief systems* that provide the real drive behind historical process. Thus I emphasize the importance of beliefs in my theory of historical process, which I call *dialectical idealism*. An *idealism* is a belief system; and a *dialectic* is a conversation (when the parties involved are polite) or a conflict.

The most basic opposing belief systems I term “holism” and “separatism,” the latter being ideology that is significantly separated from holism. We are all born holistics, I maintain, which is to say, the holistic nature of existence is programmed into every cell of our bodies. Supportive of this view is the fact that most, if not all, aboriginal peoples believe that all life forms are *familial*. This vision of life is summarized in the Native American expression “We are all related.”

“Shades of the prison house grow up around us as we grow,” wrote the poet William Wordsworth. True. We are educated in (not born with) separatist modes of belief. These days, certain separatist beliefs are unbelievably extreme. Take for example the “philosophy” of Dr. Eric R. Pianka, *aka* “the Lizard Man,” of the University of Texas at Austin. Dr. Pianka teaches that 90% of the world's population ought to be eliminated

and that airborne Ebola might be the best agent to do the job. [2] With scientists such as Dr. Pianka, who needs terrorists?

Over the course of time, the two basic philosophies of life (holism and separatism) generate political systems. The holistics prefer egalitarian (all are equal) systems, and the separatists prefer elitist systems. I call the series of systems generated by the holistics the “democracy set,” and the series deriving from separatist philosophy the “monocracy set.” Monocracy is rule by one person, or some something or other.

Quick quiz: Is theocracy (rule by the “Law of God”) in the democracy set?—or is it in the monocracy set? Right. The monocracy set. Wouldn’t you consider it incredibly foolish of an individual to devote himself/herself to converting hard-core theocrats, Jehovah’s Witnesses for instance, into strictly secular gays’ rights Democrats? You bet. Yet ... we, as a nation, now find ourselves embarked upon an equally hopeless effort—a crusade to convert our Islamic brethren, who are profoundly theocratic in their political philosophy, into democrats. Go figure.

Now that you’re familiar with the terms idealism and dialectic, let me introduce a third term: *Fractal*. Fractal is short for “fractional version.” Throw a pebble into a still pond and the result is what we call “ripples.” Ripples are *water fractals*. Each ripple has the same *shape* as the other ripples, but a different *magnitude*. Altogether, the ripples form what is called a “fractal set.”

Basic to my theory of the pattern of history is the proposition that political systems are best understood as *ideo-fractals* (ideological fractals) within “sets.” Thus the *democracy set*, *monocracy set*, etc. The formula for a geometrical fractal is, “Same shape, different magnitude”; formula for an ideo-fractal is: “Same essential belief, different magnitude.”

The first democracy (ideo-fractal #1) was established long ago in the ancient city-state of Athens. We remember it today as “Solon’s republic.” (See Reference #3 for link to an article on this republic.) Solon was an aristocrat called upon by fellow aristocrats to save Athens from revolution. Given absolute power, he did so, by instituting a number of political reforms, the most basic being establishment of a new, human code of justice, a law that applied to each and all equally.

Thus it is I suggest that the essential idea behind “democracy” is that a nation ought to have “one law for all”—one humane, civil law. A “Law of God” can’t fill the bill, for the simple reason that those outside the faith suffer, invariably, a reduced status.

Between the fall of the Roman empire and the establishment of the United States, the West was governed, for the most part, by theocratic precepts, such as the “divine right of kings.” The American Constitution and Bill of Rights re-articulated the “one law for all” principle of Solon, expanding that principle greatly by recognizing the people in general (“We, the People”) as the source of the one law—the holders of the *sovereignty*.

American independent republicanism represents ideo-fractal #2 in the democracy set. Same basic idea (one law for all), different magnitude (the people are the source of the one law). As the American system is part of the democracy set, it can be called a democracy; however, the more specific label is, as indicated, “American independent republicanism” (A.I.R.). Want a “new breath of freedom”? Try A.I.R.

In the not distant future, we’ll see yet another great expansion in the democracy set. Ideo-fractal #3 will be based upon the finding of the emerged and emerging holistic sciences, especially physics and biology, that the universe is in fact a “one thing.” The specific name of #3 will be “holocracy.”

To summarize the democracy set: Solon republicanism = one law for all; American independent republicanism = one law for all, and the source of the law is We the People; holocracy = One law for all, and the source of the one law is the people, and all peoples are one.

With all the above in mind, what say you now to “crusading”? I have just one more thing to say, at the moment. Ever since Constantine had his soldiers paint crosses on their shields, the cross has been the chief power symbol of the monarchs. “*In hoc signo vinces.*” In this sign, you will conquer.

In my book of symbolism, the cross translates “mankind divided against himself.” Typically, monarchs are obsessed with empire building, and, inevitably, they find it necessary to invoke the “crusade doctrine” (divide and conquer) in the realization of their imperial dreams.

In contrast, the chief power symbol of the holistics is the circle. This symbol, which references the matrices of life (sun, planet, the single cell, etc.), represents the *family of all life forms*. The dream of the holistics is to create peaceable kingdoms, not empires.

References

[1] See www.antiwar.com/orig/bovard.php?articleid=8448.

[2] <http://www.sas.org/tcs/weeklyIssues2006/2006-04-07/feature1p/index.html>.

[3] See <http://www.biofractalevolution.com/democracy.pdf>.