
'The LaRouche Plan'

The U.S. strategic mission in Central and South American conflict

by Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.

Democratic presidential candidate Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr. released the following statement through his campaign committee Aug. 6, 1987, under the title, " 'The LaRouche Plan': The Strategic Mission of the United States in Central and South American Conflict with the U.S.S.R."

1.0.—The foreign policy of the United States

Under U.S. foreign policy law, as the intent of the Declaration of Independence and Preamble of our Constitution are concretized by Secretary of State John Quincy Adams's papers on the circumstances and intent of the 1823 Monroe Doctrine, the republics of the Americas constitute implicitly a "community of principle" in common with the United States.

1.1.—Under the administration of President Franklin D. Roosevelt, the U.S. government entered into a series of treaties with the republics of the Americas, all culminating in affirmation of John Quincy Adams's reading of the 1823 Monroe Doctrine, in the Treaty of Rio de Janeiro. Despite the violation of this U.S. treaty law by the U.S. government during 1982 and on other recent occasions, the Adams reading of the Monroe Doctrine remains to date the treaty law of the United States, and is the only treaty law consistent with our constitutional law and vital self-interests.

1.2.—As Secretary Adams clarified the distinctions, to the degree the government of the United States has the means to do so efficiently, we defend absolutely the rights of the sovereign republics of the Americas to enjoy each for themselves that which we seized for our new republic by our 1776 Declaration of Independence, as we affirmed that same universal principle of natural law in the Preamble of our Constitution. Respecting all of those issues of our self-interest which prompted us to separate ourselves from the United Kingdom's authority, each and all of the other sovereign republics of the Americas are accorded the same rights by our constitutional law.

1.3.—Above all, we defend the rights of each among those republics to enjoy a perfect sovereignty, a sovereignty not to be diminished by dictate or other overreach of any foreign national or supranational agency.

1.4.—We defend also their right to seek those benefits of scientific and technological progress, including the promotion of the productive powers of labor in this way, which we seized for ourselves under the first administration of President George Washington. We defend each and all of them against any external effort, including efforts from among our own nationals, to deny them the free choice of those benefits. We include in this prohibition, all efforts to deny them efficient pursuit of those benefits by means of external imposition of conditions of usury.

2.0.—The strategic interest of the United States

Unless we are fools, we dare not do otherwise than our affirmation of the 1823 Monroe Doctrine, as read rightly in the "Drago Corollary," instructs us.

2.1.—Were the United States to find itself in a world dominated by a philosophy of government contrary to and hateful of those readings of universal natural law addressed by our Declaration of Independence and Preamble of our Constitution, our republic could not long endure. For that reason, it is our most vital domestic interest, that we promote and defend a growing community of principle among sovereign republics which are committed to those same principles of universal natural law.

2.2.—Historically, and today, the maintenance of such a community of principle within the Americas is our next to last bastion of defense of the sovereignty of our own republic, on the condition that this is not misconstrued, as in any contradiction to our similar commitment to a larger community of principle embracing states among nations of other continents.

2.3.—The front line of defense of our community of principle, is defense against both the global imperial ambitions of the Russian empire under its present, Bolshevik dynasty, and also against such satanic forces of irrationalism, bent on destruction of civilization, as the outlaw regime presently exerting its murderous tyranny over the people of Iran. This first line of defense lies at the borders of the Warsaw Pact alliance in Europe, Asia, and Africa. In respect to this,

the community of principle within the Americas is the zone of the interior for our community of principle as a whole, and is to be seen so respecting the global depth of our defense along the borders of the front line of defense.

2.4.—The United States, the community of principle to which it properly adheres, and our other allies, are presently engaged in an escalating, global, irregular warfare against the combined forces of the Russian empire, that empire's allies, and its actual or potential assets among those broader forces of irrationalism sharing a common wish for the destruction of our civilization. Our conduct of defensive irregular warfare is buttressed by the military means of our republic and its allies, to the effect of containing the enemy forces' wont to deploy their own military means in aid of their irregular warfare objectives.

2.5.—The principal means of our conduct of irregular warfare against the Russian empire, its allies, and its actual or potential assets, is our vigorous affirmation of the culture, political principles, and economic development upon which the achievements of Western European Judeo-Christian civilization have been founded. The war between our civilization and its adversaries, is primarily a war between two opposing philosophies respecting God, the nature of individual persons, and the lawful ordering of cause and effect in our universe. It is the strengthening of the philosophy responsible for the achievements of our civilization, and strengthening the economic and other material force, supporting that philosophical outlook, which is the premise of our effective mode of defense against our civilization's avowed adversaries.

2.6.—The use of irregular forms of lethal force, or extensive use of regular military means, is deployed solely as this is necessary to contain the adversaries' efforts within the domain of irregular warfare.

3.0.—Facing the strategic threat within the Americas

Our Russian imperial adversary and its allies and assets, are engaged in an elaborated strategic design for transforming the Americas into a zone of armed conflict, into which to draw the resources of the U.S., away from the front line of global U.S. defense in Europe, Asia, and Africa.

3.1.—This strategy takes its roots from earlier than the 1917 establishment of the Bolshevik dynasty, in the form exemplified by the activities of Communist International master-spy M.N. Roy. This became the official, principal doctrine of Russian imperial strategy for Asia, Africa, and Hispanic America, at the 1920 Baku conference of the Communist International. The continuity of the Baku Comintern policy is expressed inclusively in the fact that Russian-directed subversion in Central and South America is directed by the Orientalist section of Soviet intelligence.

3.2.—This Soviet strategy for the Americas is directed against the specific interpretation of the 1823 Monroe Doctrine supplied by Secretary of State John Quincy Adams, and

is premised on the presumption that a foolish government of the United States will misinterpret the Monroe Doctrine in the manner prescribed by President Theodore Roosevelt's "Roosevelt Corollary."

The crux of the strategic issue within the Americas, is whether our government shall align its policy of practice with the "Drago Corollary" reading of the Monroe Doctrine, or continue the follies, to Russian imperial advantage, of opposing "Roosevelt Corollary." If we persist in policies of practice congruent with the "Roosevelt Corollary," as the Bolshevik dynasty is confident we shall, then the Russian empire will inevitably succeed in its current strategic plans for Central and South America.

3.3.—The pivot of the current Russian imperial strategy for Central and South America is Russian-directed narco-terrorist subversion and insurgency. The crucial flank, of the Americas as a whole, against which this Russian strategic thrust is directed, is the Andean spine: Colombia, Panama, Ecuador, Peru, Bolivia, and Chile. The currently operational Russian plan for operations along this spine, is a reworked version of the so-called "Che Guevara doctrine," as articulated by Régis Debray's *Revolution in the Revolution*.

If the Russian empire succeeds in its current strategic thrust along that spine, it has outflanked and enveloped Central and South America as a whole, and can so unleash similar, developing potentials in other nations of the region, either to gobble them up, or to embroil the forces of the United States in a "super-Vietnam War," a modern "Thirty Years War," among the 350 million people of Central and South America.

a) This plan is being assisted currently by elements of the Socialist International, including the bureaucracies of the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions (ICFTU) and International Metalworkers Federation, who are currently deployed as an anti-U.S. political influence, who are collaborating with Moscow's forces in the region, even in ostensible conflict with their longstanding co-thinkers within the AFL-CIO international department and American Institute for Free Labor Development (AIFLD). This is also being aided, wittingly or not, by forces within the U.S. campaigning variously for legalization of the drug-trafficking within the Americas, such as the Inter-American Dialogue, or for alliance of military plotters with "anti-communist" drug-traffickers against overtly Communist Party-allied guerrilla, and drug-trafficking forces.

b) The present Russian plan demands the early establishment of putatively "right-wing military governments" in Colombia, Peru, and other nations.

c) Russian reasoning is clever.

In these countries, there are extensive Soviet-controlled terrorist and guerrilla forces, such as the Tupac Amaru and Shining Path (Sendero Luminoso) in Peru, and the FARC, M-19, and so forth, in Colombia. However, these armed, Soviet-directed forces lack the extensive base of political and

logistical support to conduct a successful armed insurgency. To conduct an effective armed insurgency requires a political and logistical base of between 70-100 persons in the civilian population for each armed guerrilla in the field.

Under the present governments of Colombia and Peru, notably, such broader logistical and political support from sympathizers in the population is not available. The establishment of a military regime of the types mooted for Colombia and Peru, would transform the internal political situation to the decisive advantage of the Soviet-directed guerrilla and terrorist forces. The Communist slogan for Peru, is "military government before 1988; Communist victory by 1990."

d) Recently, the policies of the U.S. State Department and other elements of U.S. government policy-shaping, have been steering U.S. government practice into that prepared Russian trap. This is the case in current U.S. policy toward Nicaragua, Panama, and other localities; this is the impact of the U.S. support for imposition of IMF "conditionalities" and matching "debt-for-equity" schemes of debt collection. The Russian dictatorship is relying upon a continuation of such U.S. policies to ensure success of its strategic perspective for Central and South America.

e) We are committed to changes in the policies of practice of the government of the United States, the which will return that practice to the correct interpretation of the Monroe Doctrine, by Adams and Drago, and which employ this correction as the premise upon which to defeat the Russian imperial irregular warfare strategy for the Americas.

3.4.—The Russian plan for development and support of its armed assets in Central and South America, is premised upon four principal assumptions of practice:

1) The promotion of so-called "nativist" particularisms, as typified by the ideology spread, largely via the University of Ayacucho, Peru, by French-speaking ethnologists in the tradition of synarchist Paul Rivet, to create the cult of Shining Path (Sendero Luminoso). The focus upon "the Indians and *mestizos*" of the Andean spine, by Ché Guevara and Fidel Castro during the early 1960s, is exemplary.

2) The Russian adoption, over the period 1962-67, of Mao Zedong's 1950s (and, later) "opium wars" against the United States, as a major strategic weapon for undermining Western civilization, and the unleashing of this effort beginning 1967.

3) The establishment of Soviet-directed, Syria-centered international terrorism in 1967, and the use of Soviet-directed drug-trafficking operations to provide crucial margins of logistical and political support for both international terrorist and guerrilla insurgencies.

4) The projection of the effects of U.S.-based filibustering, and application of the "Roosevelt Corollary," to defame the Monroe Doctrine which those U.S. malpractices defamed in practice, and thus to promote the historical lie, that there is an intrinsic conflict between the nations and

peoples of Ibero-America and the principles of law and economy upon which the first administration of President George Washington was premised. This is the gist of the Soviet propaganda campaign against "Monroeism" throughout Ibero-America, as elaborated in the pages of the Soviet *América Latina*.

3.5.—The four facets of Russian irregular warfare capabilities are the key assets of the Russian subversion which must be targeted for disruption or obliteration, as appropriate, in a victorious combat against Russian-directed insurgency in the Americas. That is the destructive component of the U.S. strategic mission in Central and South America.

3.6.—The destructive components of the U.S. strategic mission for the Americas are to be complemented by a nation-building policy, of assisting governments of the sovereign republics in realizing their goals of such extensive development of basic economic infrastructure, agricultural improvements, and employment in modern investments in industries, as promote the per capita and per hectare wealth and social-political stability of the existing governments of those republics. No action by agencies of the U.S. government, or agencies otherwise alien to the sovereignties of the republics of the Americas, shall be supported or tolerated if it shall have the effect of denying any among the sovereign republics of the Americas of efficient pursuit of such nation-building objectives.

3.7.—The government of the United States is committed to such military assistance to the sovereign republics of the Americas as we are able, and as they shall require. However, it is our resolution that this shall be done solely to assist those republics in winning the war against Russian-directed subversion by their own means, and to their own honor in victory. Except as the U.S. military is required in very specific situations beyond the means of national or regional forces of the republics of Central or South America, military forces of the United States shall not be engaged in a land war in Central or South America.

4.0.—The case of Nicaragua: findings and policy

To make clear the new strategic mission of the United States' actions within the Americas, it is unavoidable that we stress here the follies of the so-called "Contra" tactic against Nicaragua.

4.1.—What was, historically, a filibustering interest within the United States, an interest with Georgia-based family ties to one-time U.S. President Theodore Roosevelt, established a long reign over the nations of Central America, a reign known as the era of the "banana republic." Under the reign of interests associated with the interests of the United Fruit (Brands) and W.R. Grace companies, these "banana republics" were denied the rights of truly sovereign republics. Their local governments were *comprador* entities, appointed and dismissed at the pleasure of the relevant, filibus-

The 'Drago Doctrine'

The debt crisis of the turn of the century reached its climax in December 1902, when Germany, Italy, and Great Britain sent gunboats to blockade the ports of Venezuela after Venezuela announced it could not meet payments on its foreign debts on time. On Dec. 29, Argentine Foreign Minister Luis María Drago outlined, in a letter to Argentina's ambassador in Washington, "considerations with reference to the forcible collection of the public debt." Drago called the principles, since incorporated into Western Hemisphere law, "the Financial Corollary to the Monroe Doctrine."

Drago wrote in part, "Among the fundamental principles of public international law which humanity has consecrated, one of the most precious is that which de-

crees that all States, whatever be the force at their disposal, are entities in law, perfectly equal one to another, and mutually entitled by virtue thereof to the same consideration and respect.

"The acknowledgement of the debt, the payment of it in its entirety, can and must be made by the nation without diminution of its inherent rights as a sovereign entity, but the summary and immediate collection, at a given moment, by means of force, would occasion nothing less than the ruin of the weakest nations, and the absorption of their governments, together with all the functions inherent in them, by the mighty of the Earth. The principles proclaimed on this continent of America are otherwise. 'Contracts between a nation and private individuals are obligatory according to the conscience of the sovereign, and may not be the object of compelling force,' said the illustrious Hamilton. They confer no right of action contrary to the sovereign will."

tering financier interests, sometimes aided by direct military and related forms of repression from the government of the United States.

Under these auspices, in the nations of Guatemala, El Salvador, Panama, and Nicaragua, there developed a military professional stratum which was intimately tied to its brothers in the U.S. military, chiefly intensely loyal to relations with the United States, and, although increasingly infected with nation-building impulses respecting the future of their nations, willing to follow the instruction of the U.S. State Department even when this instruction was contrary to their patriotic impulses.

Such a case was the role of the ruling family of Somoza in Nicaragua.

Then, at the close of World War II, beginning with the roles of Ambassador Spruille Braden in Buenos Aires, and the role of Nelson Rockefeller's circles in the wartime Center for Inter-American Affairs (CIAA) and later arrangements to similar effect, there came a change in U.S. policy respecting "Latin America" as a whole. Following the U.S. government's overthrow of President Juan Perón, the foreign policy of the United States was bent toward the aim of eliminating, one after the other, those governments of the political forces of Southern Cone, Brazil, Venezuela, and so forth, which had been part of the U.S. strategic depth in the hemisphere during the 1930s and World War II.

By the early 1970s, during Henry A. Kissinger's tenures at the National Security Council and State Department, this drift in U.S. foreign policy lapped against the shores of the nations of Central America. During the administrations of Presidents Nixon and Ford, scenarios were put into place with the intent of demolishing each of the governments,

including Somoza's, which had been long the faithful servant of State Department orders in the region. These developments were the precursor of Project Democracy and the National Endowment for Democracy.

These developments of the 1970s were prepared by the patient subversion conducted by both nominally Catholic "Liberation Theologists" and their nominally Protestant, "charismatic" kindred, in attempting to destroy the Catholic cultural matrix of the Central American and other states of Central and South America. Out of this religious subversion came new insurrectionary movements with certain resemblances in character to that of the Ayatollah Ruhollah Khomeini. One such movement was the so-called "Sandinistas."

Beginning the summer of 1977, through 1979, under the Carter-Mondale administration, these prepared insurgencies were unleashed with, principally, U.S.-based sponsorship, including measures of support conduited through the U.S. State Department. The fact of the Somoza military dictatorship was exploited, to generate the extent of political and logistical support among Sandinista sympathizers, to bring the Sandinistas to power with aid of assistance from the U.S. State Department and Israeli weapons-traffickers at crucial points in the process.

The U.S.-based support for the Sandinistas' insurrection echoed U.S.-based support for Fidel Castro's rise to power within Cuba, and included some of the same forces tied to our intelligence community which had aided Castro during the second half of the 1950s, before those same forces were deployed, in part, to attempt to eliminate the Castro they had done so much to bring to power.

The cry from the Reagan administration, and others, that the Liberation Theologist regime in Nicaragua had "betrayed

the Sandinista revolution," could only reflect the sheer ignorance or misinformation bestowed upon those who raised such a hue and cry. As early as 1978, nothing was secret about the Sandinista leadership's political affiliations with Havana and Moscow. No one was fooled, but those who wished to be deceived, often because they wished to be in step with the U.S. government policy which was crucial in bringing the Sandinistas to power.

4.2.—Then came the "Contra" policy.

During the transition period leading into the Reagan administration, the new administration cut a deal with a complex of political forces centered around former Soviet intelligence asset Jay Lovestone, his friend Leo Cherne, their assets in the international department of the AFL-CIO, and that international department's close, AIFLD, ties with financier circles traditionally associated with "banana republic" interests. This element, which had been the bulwark of the Carter-Mondale administration's machinery, became the Project Democracy operation, tied to the Heritage Foundation, of the Reagan administration, whose aspect inside the U.S. Congress and the national committees of the two major political parties became the National Endowment for Democracy.

Out of this, centered around a homosexual ring inside the Reagan administration and NCPAC, together with Israeli weapons-trafficking interests operating in the Caribbean, came the operation known as the "Contras," which, for reason of its major ties to Reaganite homosexual circles, became also known as the "Maricontras." An operation was set up, centered around a ring of present and former CIA operatives earlier associated with drug-running operations in the U.S. "secret war" in Laos.

a) The Contra operation was not only a policy adopted by the Reagan administration. The revenues of the Contra operation, variously from the U.S. Treasury, drug-trafficking revenues, and other sources, became a pork-barrel of money and political influence for the avaricious; greed gave the Contra operation a life of its own. A shoddy, "Rambo" operation of that sort never could have succeeded, a fact quite obvious to many of the participants. To the greedy, whether the Contra operation succeeded or not became irrelevant. As long as the Contra operation continued, the revenues and political influence gained from it would continue. To them, the Contra farce must be kept alive, lest the wealth and influence derived from it cease.

b) As the U.S. government drifted into a zero-option-keyed process of strategic decoupling from defense of the front line, in Europe and Asia, more and more public relations emphasis was placed upon the pretense, that the administration was heroically fighting communism in Nicaragua.

The institutionalization of the Contra operation was effected following an encouraging Soviet signal, published in an April 1983 edition of the West German newsweekly, *Der Spiegel*. Soviet dictator Yuri Andropov stated, that if the

U.S. would reach "regional matters" agreements with the Soviet government lessening the U.S. commitments in Europe and the Middle East, the Soviet government would encourage the United States to take such matters as it might wish in the matter of Nicaragua. This lengthy *Der Spiegel* interview with General Secretary Andropov was officially underscored by the Soviet press as an official offer to the United States from the Soviet government.

This Soviet offer puts the post-April 1983 U.S. Contra policy in its true light.

c) The sleazy quality of the Contra operation, contaminating with its filth all who touched it with support, is better understood by comparing the Contra operation with the U.S. government's effort to overthrow the government of Panama. If Gen. Manuel Noriega, the principal target of the Reagan administration's coup-plotting, were to be ousted, Panama would be plunged into chaos beneficial only to Soviet and drug-trafficking interests, and the entire Central American region would be destabilized critically, with immediate major deleterious effects on the situation in the Andean spine as a whole.

The Hispanic nations of Central and South America, are bound closely together by numerous linkages along lines of language, cultural, and family ties. Certain key figures in those nations are also key figures in broader circles represented in numerous nations. These nations' leading circles are much closer to one another in this way than the ties among the nations of Western Europe. Nothing important can be done by the United States in any one of these nations, without significant effects immediately experienced in numerous other nations of the region. General Noriega is an exceptionally key figure of this class.

Additionally, documentation of the U.S. government corroborates other proof that all of the allegations popularized against General Noriega by the U.S. Executive and Congress are entirely false, and that most of the allegations were manufactured by drug-trafficking interests of the region to which certain influential U.S. interests, including the National Endowment for Democracy, are closely allied.

General Noriega's included strategic significance, is that he is a linchpin figure in the effort to establish a military advisory committee within the Contadora Group.

The chief source of difficulty impeding the Contadora Group's effort to neutralize the spread of the Nicaragua phenomenon is the recent policies of the U.S. Treasury and State Departments, the State Department's Elliott Abrams most emphatically. Abrams represents firm U.S. opposition to any and all nation-building efforts within the region of Central America and the Andean spine nations. The lack of such nation-building weakens these nations, and prevents them from developing the sources of internal economic and political strength needed to contain the spread of insurgency throughout the region.

d) In the case that Nicaragua were armed with weapons

which gave it a strategic preponderance over its neighbors, the U.S. would be obliged, under the Monroe Doctrine, to strike those weapons out of existence, but by means short of committing U.S. forces to a land war in Central America. Otherwise, Nicaragua is not a strategic issue in itself; it is a Soviet-operated "Malaysian monkey-trap," into which to lure dumb monkeys who might be found in influential places inside the U.S. government.

e) The Nicaragua problem must be addressed by the following measures of irregular warfare:

1) Cooperation with governments of the region to exterminate the growing, processing, and transport of drugs within or through the Caribbean region as a whole, thus destroying the principal logistical support for terrorist and guerrilla operations in the region.

2) Technical assistance to governments, to enable them to mop up terrorist and guerrilla bands weakened and isolated by the destruction of revenues from growing, processing, and trafficking in drugs.

3) Nation-building programs based upon development of basic economic infrastructure.

4) Promotion of a literacy campaign pivoted upon U.S. support for the study of Miguel Cervantes' *Don Quixote*, in full, as a standard for literate Spanish classics education, and as a study of a popularized treatment of the citizen's principles of statecraft: the problem of uplifting Sancho Panza to the moral level of capacity for self-government. Here, in this literary work, is a masterpiece suited to the work of nation-building in the dimension of the mind of the Spanish speaker.

The U.S. should assist in sponsoring groups of professional, or good amateur, fluent Spanish-speaking actors, treating the text in the style of the classical stage, viewing *Don Quixote* as written as a drama in the form of classical tragedy/commedia. The U.S. Information Agency should promote the production of a polished film production faithful to the letter and intent of the original text—not the customary Hollywood mockery of art.

5) Recognize that religious irrationalism is among the most efficient means for conduct of erosive cultural warfare against a nation, as the case of Nicaragua today shows. No U.S. assistance to spread of Liberation Theology or charismatic sects in Central or South America, including a ban on U.S. governmental association, in any form, with sects conducting such operations. This should not be construed as the U.S. government taking a position on religious matters, but rather keeping its hands out of this area.

6) As part of the effort to diminish erosive influences in the region, cut-off of all association with, or encouragement to Socialist International and affiliated groups' cultural, political-educational, and trade union activities in the region. It is to be recognized that these currents are very close to the Soviet government today, and represent a cunning form of erosive influence. If other governments will to tolerate such things, that is their affair; the U.S. government must not.

7) U.S. political support for, and technical assistance to voluntary mutual security associations among states of the region.

8) Most favorable terms for assured flow of needed military supplies to governments of the region.

9) U.S. support for a Caribbean-Pacific, sea-level canal through the Panamanian isthmus, both as a security measure and as a lever for catalyzing economic development throughout the region.

The general policy is to deploy positive efforts in the interdependent dimensions of culture, politics, and economics, and to assist nations in maintaining adequate armed defense of their precious cultural heritage. That is the essence of successful conduct of irregular warfare.

f) The policy of the U.S. toward the Nicaragua problem shall be, to crack the problem as a nutcracker cracks a nut. While containing any aggressive intervention by Nicaraguan agencies into neighboring states, and forbidding its development of strategic capabilities which might afford it a decisive advantage over its neighbors, the object is to strengthen the nations around it, culturally, politically, and economically, and to provide those neighbors adequate means of defense at minimal prices. Any irrationalist cult, so deprived of the aura of magic on which its authority depends, so reduced to relative impotence in the eyes of its population, can not long resist a more successful, energetic culture at its borders, especially if the cultural matrix of its own people is more or less the same as that of the neighboring nations.

4.3.—From our borders with Mexico, south to Cape Horn, there are approximately 350 million persons, of nations which share a common Western European cultural origin with our own. For reason of its national culture, each of these nations has a more or less exceptional potential for rapid, efficient assimilation of technological progress. Combined with the population of the United States and, potentially, Canada, this represents 600 million people, aggregate only less than the population of India, and potentially the greatest concentration of economic power on this planet.

Some of these nations are, technologically, culturally well advanced, such as Argentina and the more developed portions of Brazil. Others, including Venezuela, Colombia, and Mexico, have a kindred potential. Throughout the continent, the crying need is for the development of basic economic infrastructure, the precondition for rapid advances in agriculture and industry. By adopting this course of action, in concert with other American members of our community of principle, we can unleash a mighty engine of physical economic growth, and related increases in productivity per capita and per hectare. The force of that growth, and the force of the culture strengthened to promote that growth and political stability, is a crushing force against the enemies of such a process of development. Our strategic task in the hemisphere is to unleash that force, and shape its application to the desired strategic effect.