

LaRouche stalls globalism in Ibero-America; plotters protest

by Gretchen Small

In the Spring 1996 issue of the U.S. National Defense University's *Joint Force Quarterly*, released in mid-July, the top Kissingerian strategist for Ibero-America, State Department senior policy adviser Luigi Einaudi, complains that, despite "revolutionary" advances toward the establishment of supranational government over the Americas, military opposition in Ibero-America continues to block a crucial next step: the creation of a supranational regional military force. Einaudi charges that the opposition stems from the widespread circulation of "conspiratorial hypotheses," that there is a plan afoot to abolish national military forces in the region.

Einaudi, who is widely known as "Kissinger's Kissinger for Ibero-America," leaves it to another article in the same issue of *Joint Force Quarterly*—a review of *EIR*'s 1993 book, *The Plot to Annihilate the Armed Forces and Nations of Ibero-America*—to name the name of the person they hold responsible for stalling the supranational project in the region: *EIR* founder and U.S. Presidential candidate Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.

LaRouche authored the introduction to *The Plot*, and contributed interviews on the subjects of democracy, and the positive role that the Armed Forces must play in nation-building. Over 20,000 copies of the Spanish-language edition of the book are circulating in Ibero-America, including a 5,000-copy run published in 1994 by the Mexican Defense Ministry for that country's officer corps. *EIR* published an English-language edition of the book in 1994, as it became clear that the Ibero-American demilitarization project was being used as a model for attacking sovereignty in other parts of the world.

Reviewing the book for *Joint Force Quarterly*, U.S. Naval Intelligence analyst James L. Zackrisson advises those who would dismiss *The Plot* as "a LaRouche conspiracy," to think again; it is "on the required reading list at several regional military academies and staff colleges. Students of Latin American

affairs will ignore this book to their own detriment."

This is the second time that the British-led supranationalist mafia have been forced to acknowledge, in print, that *El Complot* (as the book is known in Ibero-America) has gained intellectual hegemony among military patriots throughout the region. Not two years ago, a special edition of the *Miami Herald* prepared for the December 1994 Presidential summit of the Americas in that city, had also included a review of *The Plot*; in that one, an Einaudi crony, the U.S. Army War College's Gabriel Marcella, warned that LaRouche's ideas were gaining currency in the region. "When Lyndon LaRouche has more credibility in Latin America than the Pentagon, that's troubling," said Marcella.

A year and a half later, the Einaudi crowd has not succeeded in eliminating its "LaRouche problem" in Ibero-America; LaRouche's influence has only grown.

In July of this year, Paraguay's Gen. Lino Oviedo became the latest nationalist military officer in the continent to be jailed for opposing the globalist dictate. Dozens have been jailed since 1989, with some, such as Argentine Col. Mohamed Alí Seineldín (ret.), who wrote the Introduction to *The Plot*, serving life sentences. But instead of crushing resistance, the "democratic" reign of terror in the region has sent LaRouche's credibility soaring, as many who first dismissed *The Plot* as too extreme, have since found that events have proven *EIR* right, and have turned to LaRouche for leadership, as the strategist most feared by the British Empire and its would-be world government.

If it's not true, then why is it happening?

This time, the demilitarization crew broke with the usual policy of silencing all mention of LaRouche's existence, and opted to try to take on LaRouche directly, by name, in the realm of ideas—an arena definitely not to their advantage!

'The Plot' in Mexico

Mexico's Ministry of Defense (Secretaría de la Defensa Nacional, SDN) published *El Complot* in 1994 in two volumes. The SDN edition (the cover of which is pictured here) was part of their Library of the Mexican Officer series, with a run of 5,000 distributed to the top officers of the Mexican Armed Forces.

The final paragraph of the back cover reads:

"The Defense Ministry's motive for publishing this work is merely due to its interest that its members be informed about current issues that will broaden their cultural horizons, and not to foster any leaning toward a specific tendency, given that responsibility for this publication lies with its authors and owners, and the book was in no way altered and is being published exactly as written."



EIR's El Complot contends:

1. that a project to take down, and then eliminate, the military as an institution in Ibero-America, began in 1982, in the aftermath of the debt crisis and Malvinas War, all in the name of a "democracy" which also seeks to destroy the other institutional pillar of the nation-state in Ibero-America, the Catholic Church;

2. that the project's sponsors are the powerful financial interests based in London and Wall Street, which are intent on establishing a United Nations-centered world government, to ensure the survival of the International Monetary Fund (IMF) system of looting; and

3. that the ultimate objective of the anti-military project is the elimination of the nation-state itself globally, as a form of government.

The 464-page book lays out the philosophical underpinnings of this British imperial project, identifies its principal operatives—Harvard's racist theoretician Samuel Huntington, Luigi Einaudi, and a nest of "social scientists" operating out of American University's "Democracy Project"—and outlines the Hamiltonian economic policy required to secure true national security, and break with the IMF. *El Complot* also documents the overtly racist roots of the plot in the "Black Legend" promoted by British historiography, which blames

"Spanish Catholic authoritarianism" for all of Ibero-America's ills, as contrasted to the purportedly "benevolent colonialism" of the British Crown. A leading current ideologue of this school, cited glowingly by Huntington, Einaudi, Zackrisson, et al., is Harvard University's Lawrence E. Harrison (see p. 55).

Zackrisson, assigned the job of countering *EIR's* "conspiratorial hypotheses" in *Joint Force Quarterly*, opted for the robust argument, "Nobody here but us chickens." The facts presented by *EIR* may be true, and the cited policy discussions may all be occurring, he acknowledged, but "it stretches credulity to accept that these facts combine to form a conspiracy," or any *policy commitment* (see box).

Williamsburg blunders, all over again

Joint Force Quarterly, the magazine published for the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff by the Institute for National Strategic Studies of the National Defense University, commissioned the book review of *El Complot* for a special package on "Security in the Americas," which included articles by Defense Secretary William Perry, U.S. anti-drug and former U.S. Southern Command chief Gen. Barry McCaffrey, and the State Department's Einaudi. With financing provided by the U.S. Army's Southern Command, *Joint Force*

Quarterly took the unusual step of simultaneously issuing a Spanish-language offprint of the Americas section of its issue—all, that is, except Zackrisson’s review, “Of Cabals and Complots.” It was left out, *EIR* was told, “for space reasons.”

Zackrisson’s “no conspiracy here” argument might carry more weight, if the other articles in the issue did not promote precisely the policies exposed by *El Complot*. The gist of the *Joint Force Quarterly* package is that Ibero-America is enjoying such “sweeping economic progress,” in a “geopolitical situation . . . markedly more peaceful,” that the time has come to develop national militaries more “appropriate” to the demands of “transnationalism” and the global “market economy.” Multinational operations, such as Organization of American States (OAS) or UN international peacekeeping missions, must take the lead in the projected new regional defense configurations, they insist.

The so-called “Williamsburg process,” the seemingly endless series of meetings which have followed the July 1995 Williamsburg, Virginia summit of the defense ministers from the Americas, is presented as the means to restructure regional defense. Defense Secretary Perry calls the “Williamsburg process” a “procedure based on dialogue and consensus-building and techniques to energize and consolidate democracies.”

General McCaffrey, who has otherwise correctly warned that narco-terrorism (a phrase taboo in many quarters in Washington) is in fact a major threat to hemispheric security, admitted in *Joint Force Quarterly* that “national military forces do not cause most regional ills.” But that said, he then claimed that “appropriate militaries” are needed. Ibero-America’s navies make a mistake, he wrote, when they seek “blue water capabilities instead of more functional brown water ones, purchasing diesel submarines and destroyers instead of coastal and riverine patrol craft, while air forces acquire jet air-to-air fighters instead of short take-off and landing utility aircraft, coastal patrol aircraft and helicopters. Their armies feature main battle tanks, artillery, and conscript regimes instead of professional active/reserve units organized for peacekeeping, counterdrug and engineering/medical operations.”

Rowboats for the navies, kites for the airforce, and walking-sticks for the armies? How can Pentagon officials complain about their credibility gap in Ibero-America—as compared to LaRouche—when they buy into the British-concocted “Williamsburg process,” which insists there is peace and progress in the region, even as every nation in the area (including that favored paragon of monetarism, Chile), faces imminent economic and territorial *disintegration*, under the combined assault of the International Monetary Fund and narco-terrorists?

As LaRouche warned in his October 1995 campaign document, *The Blunder In U.S. National Security Strategy*: “The United States is presently in the process of shooting itself in the foot all over Central and South America,” by continuing to adhere to the policies embodied in the so-called “Williamsburg process,” a “virtual reality” of “utopian sociological and market policies” which, if continued, “could have virtually

fatal consequences for U.S. security,” globally.

Kissinger’s Kissinger

In *El Complot*, *EIR* identified Luigi Einaudi as at the center of the team which put together these disastrous policies. Einaudi cut his teeth profiling the Catholic Church and the military in Ibero-America for the RAND Corp. He was then brought into the State Department in the early 1970s, as he himself emphasizes, by (Sir) Henry Kissinger—the very same Kissinger who openly confesses himself a British agent of influence on all important policy matters. For over 20 years, as successive U.S. Presidents have come and gone, Einaudi has remained the behind-the-scenes *éminence grise* of State Department policy for the Americas.

As George Bush’s ambassador to the OAS, Einaudi directed the transformation of that body from a forum for hemispheric policy discussion, into a regional instrument of supranational government. He, along with his leading Ibero-American ally, now a convicted felon, ex-President Carlos Andrés Pérez of Venezuela, took the lead in attempting to overturn the principle of sovereignty and non-intervention into the affairs of other nations, under the cover of the demand for a “collective defense of democracy.” In his *Joint Force Quarterly* article, Einaudi gloated that since the 1989 fall of the Berlin Wall in particular, Ibero-America has been used as a global pilot project “in efforts to define the legal grounds for international cooperation in support of democracy.”

Einaudi thought no administration could remove him; he smugly assured Peru’s *Caretas* magazine in Nov. 26, 1992 that “the privileged role which I have played in the OAS [under Bush] will continue” under the incoming Clinton administration. He did lament, however, Bush’s defeat at the polls, unhappy that “a multilateralist and internationalist President, former ambassador to the United Nations—a first-class President from the international standpoint—has lost the election to a governor who knows very little about international questions.”

When President Clinton failed to confirm Einaudi in his OAS post, he returned to his role as a behind-the-scenes controller on behalf of British policies, esconced as senior policy adviser to Secretary of State Warren Christopher. Analysts at the National Defense University today describe Einaudi as the single most influential U.S. official on civil-military policy for Ibero-America.

Globalist malthusian that he is, Einaudi’s article in the *Joint Force Quarterly* rails against “population overflow,” cheers the “dismantling of centralized economies” in Ibero-America, and decries “the evil . . . of protectionism”—upon which the United States itself was founded—for its “appalling destructive power.” He places two initiatives on the agenda of the “Williamsburg process”: the formation of an inter-American peacekeeping force, under the threat of “if you don’t agree, we’ll invade” (see Documentation), and the establishment of an internationally controlled regional arms control regimen, to limit national military purchases.

Bush league strategy

The Spanish-language offprint of the *Joint Force Quarterly* Americas package, contained just one ad, aside from the one for its own subscription: a full-page ad for the American University School for International Service's "Democracy Project"—the very network of plotters identified in *El Complot* as the operations center for the demilitarization project.

American University set up the Democracy Project in 1986 as "a pioneering effort to establish a cadre of experts" to direct the assault on the military. Advised by Einaudi from the outset, in 1990 the team produced *The Military and Democracy: The Future of Civil-Military Relations in Latin America*, a book better known in Ibero-America today as *EIR* named it: the "Bush Manual."

The book, written for "experts," skipped the usual propaganda line which paints the Ibero-American military as corrupt, drug-runners, human rights violators, and would-be dictators, and went straight to the real issue behind the anti-military policy: As an institution, the Ibero-American military remains an obstacle to economic globalization. Military doctrine holds that economic development is a matter of national security, and that the military officer's mission includes a responsibility to uphold "Western Christian values," as the basis for national development.

A visit to the Democracy Project's web site on the Internet, advertised in *Joint Force Quarterly*, found that, ten years later, the Bush Manual team—still headed by Louis

Goodman, U.S. Agency for International Development (AID) official Johanna Mendelson, and the Uruguayan deconstructionists Juan Rial and Carina Perelli—is still at it, and has now expanded to the rest of the globe, training and "instructing" government officials, and setting up a similar network of non-governmental organization (NGO) activists, in Russia, eastern Europe, Asia, and Africa, all based on the "successes" of their operation in Ibero-America.

Available at the Internet site, for example, was the reporter's report from a three-day conference in May 1995, organized by American University's Democracy Project, on the subject of "Civil-Military Relations in Latin America: Lessons Learned." Like-minded experts from other regions were invited to discuss the "Applicability of Lessons Learned in Latin America to Other Regions."

What a stew of one-worldist garbage that was! The premise of the conference, as Argentina's Ambassador to the OAS Hernán Patiño Meyer stated in his keynote speech, was that "by the year 2000, we will be living in supranational regions and groups," and security and sovereignty must be redefined to reflect that reality.

International reality requires a reduced military and a reduced civilian state, Costa Rican parliamentarian Constantino Urcuyo agreed, but he cautioned that "proposals for a collective regional . . . approach to security (which, by definition, will diminish the relative influence of national armies) are unlikely to succeed *right now* since the concept of the nation-

LISTEN TO LAROUCHE ON RADIO



*Frequent Interviews with
Lyndon LaRouche on the
Weekly Broadcast "EIR Talks"*

ON SATELLITE
4 p.m. ET
Galaxy 7 (G-7)
Transponder 14.
7.71 Audio.
91 Degrees West.

SHORTWAVE RADIO
Sundays 2100 UTC
(5 p.m. ET)
WWCR 12.160 MHz

**Cassettes Available to
Radio Stations**

**Transcripts Available to
Print Media**

Local Times for "EIR Talks" Sunday Shortwave Broadcast on WWCR 12.160 MHz

Adis Ababa	0100*	Little Rock	1600
Amsterdam	2300	London	2200
Anchorage	1300	Los Angeles	1400
Athens	2400	Madrid	2300
Atlanta	1700	Manila	0600*
Auckland	1000*	Mecca	0100*
Baghdad	0100*	Melbourne	0800*
Baltimore	1700*	Mexico City	1600
Bangkok	0500*	Milan	2300
Beijing	0600*	Minneapolis	1600
Belfast	2200	Montreal	1700
Berlin	2300	Moscow	0100*
Bohemian Grove	1400	New Delhi	0330*
Bogota	1700	New York	1700
Bonn	2300	Nogales	1500
Bombay	0330*	Norfolk	1700
Boston	1700	Oslo	2300
Bretton Woods	1700	Paris	2300
Bucharest	2400	Philadelphia	1700
Buenos Aires	1900	Pittsburgh	1700
Buffalo	1700	Prague	2300
Cairo	2400	Rangoon	0430*
Calcutta	0330*	Richmond	1700
Caracas	1800	Rio de Janeiro	1900
Casablanca	2200	Rome	2300
Chattanooga	1700	St. Louis	1600
Chicago	1600	St. Petersburg	0100*
Copenhagen	2300	San Francisco	1400
Denver	1500	Santiago	1800
Detroit	1700	Sarajevo	2300
Dublin	2200	Seattle	1400
Gdansk	2300	Seoul	0700*
Guadalajara	1600	Shanghai	0600*
Havana	1700	Singapore	0530*
Helsinki	2400	Stockholm	2300
Ho Chi Minh City	0600*	Sydney	0800*
Honolulu	1200	Teheran	0130*
Hong Kong	0600*	Tel Aviv	2400
Houston	1600	Tokyo	0700*
Istanbul	2400	Toronto	1700
Jakarta	0500*	Vancouver	1400
Jerusalem	2400	Vladivostok	0800*
Johannesburg	2400	Warsaw	2300
Karachi	0300*	Washington	2300
Kennebunkport	1700	Wellington	1700
Kiev	2400	Wiesbaden	1000*
Khartoum	2400	Winnipeg	2300
Lagos	2300	Yokohama	1700
Lima	1700	Yorktown	1700
Lincoln	1600		
Lisbon	2300		

* Mondays

state retains much of its weight in the region” (emphasis added).

According to a report by El Salvador’s Gerardo Le Chevallier, a conference workshop concluded that “the traditional geographic and economic notions of nation-state have to be redefined.” Regional free trade accords will force this redefinition through, he said, an assessment which Brazilian sociologist Alexandre Barros, another founder of the Bush Manual team, shared. Barros argued that trade accords will lead to the “eventual need to integrate” the militaries into a regional force.

Andrés Fontana, from Argentina’s Institute of Foreign Service, emphasized that “values . . . can be changed through practices and routines,” such as sending armed forces out on international missions. It is necessary to “design armed forces that would lend themselves to some kind of collective approach to security issues,” he said, and to “discourage approaches that would strengthen the tradition of national approaches to security in favor of intermediary (subregional and regional) perspectives.”

Lunatic ideologues? Yes, but maintained as part of the U.S. national security permanent bureaucracy nonetheless. The welcoming address for that May 1995 conference was given by AID Assistant Administrator for Global Programs Sally Shelton-Colby, who praised the Democracy Project for its work over the years in gaining acceptance within U.S. government circles, and for “democratization” and such redefined civil-military relations. In fact, since George Bush’s 1989 invasion of Panama, the Bush Manual team at American University has been sent on official missions for the U.S. State Department’s AID to El Salvador, Ecuador, Guatemala, Paraguay, and Argentina, and they work with the U.S. Information Agency’s international visitors program.

For all their effort, the plotters are still not popular. Carina Perelli, one of the four directors of the Bush Manual, reported unhappily to the May 1995 conference that people in Ibero-America do not view the military as a threat, or wish to see it dismantled. Her Uruguayan think-tank, PEITHO, surveyed public opinion in the Andean countries of Peru, Ecuador, Venezuela, and Colombia, to gather “empirical data regarding popular attitudes toward the military.”

What did they find? “That the majority of respondents agreed to the need for an army and the continued existence of an armed institution. . . . Most people agreed that the present size of the armed forces was adequate and were satisfied with the size of the military budget. When asked about the purpose and role of the military and the future of military service, most believed that the military should concentrate on traditional defense and development polices. National defense, defense of the Constitution, and socio-economic development ranked high.”

The worst result, in her eyes, was that “the survey revealed that the armed forces enjoy more citizen confidence than civilian political leaders, and ranked second only to the [Catholic] Church in that regard.”

Documentation

By James Zackrisson, an analyst with the Office of Naval Intelligence; excerpts from “Of Cabals and Complots,” Joint Force Quarterly, Spring 1996:

It is easy to dismiss the theme of this book as yet another odd conspiracy theory. After all, the blurb on the back cover tells us that the introduction is by “U.S. economist and former political prisoner” Lyndon H. LaRouche. I would suspect this publication has not sold well in the United States: a search of a library network showed only three holdings of the title in the country. Yet it has sold thousands of copies in Latin America and the Mexican military has printed a special edition of more than 500 [sic] copies. It is reportedly on the required reading list at several regional military academies and staff colleges. Students of Latin American affairs will ignore this book to their own detriment. But if it is only a LaRouche conspiracy, why is it attracting attention among Latin American readers?

The answer is in its alternative definition of terms used in works on civil-military relations. If one accepts this ersatz jargon, most of the book makes sense. For instance, there is a lot of discussion in the United States over the proper roles and missions of the armed forces of Latin America. There *are* specialists and policy wonks who think that the money spent on the militaries in the region would be better applied to other government functions. There *are* those who think that there is no credible regional threat to the sovereignty of the nations in the hemisphere, so their armed forces should be dismantled. There *are* academics mentioned throughout this book who meet regularly and present papers on such topics. But it stretches credulity to accept that these facts combine to form a conspiracy.

The opening section of *The Plot* [written by Lyndon LaRouche] spells out its underlying hypothesis in detail. Essentially there are two conflicting axiomatic social systems. One, based on paganism, posits that man is an animal. . . . The second system, based on the Bible, envisions man as created in the image of God, by “virtue of a creative potentiality which corresponds to God as the Creator of the Universe.” . . . These systems of society are at odds with one another, and have been since the beginning of recorded history, or as Mr. LaRouche eloquently puts it, “since the role of Solon of Athens in kicking out the usurers and establishing a republic based on law at Athens, which is the real beginning of European civilization.”

Without the hyperbole, this makes sense. . . .

While this book rehearses some useful data, it is all manipulated to support the tangled web of conspiracy outlined above and loses credibility. The assumption that the United States, acting at the behest of British imperialism, plots to undermine and destroy the armed forces of the region through

nongovernmental organizations, academic symposia, and obscure or nonexistent agents is of course patently absurd. If the U.S. military was plotting to annihilate counterpart militaries in Latin America, it would use its own assets instead of LaRouche's bizarre register of academics, diplomats, and the rest of his cast of characters. While those people no doubt have influence, they certainly do not enjoy as much as *The Plot* ascribes to them. . . .

The authors of this book compiled all the right data and then applied it to a single argument. Their logic, however, involves the assumption of a causal relationship between the intent of events and people involved. That assumption is unquestionably false. Nonetheless the book currently is commanding a growing following within the militaries of Latin America. Thus it should be studied as an insight into one of the influences on members of the armed forces within our hemisphere.

Luigi Einaudi, senior policy adviser to Secretary of State Warren Christopher; excerpts from "Security and Democracy in the Region," Joint Force Quarterly, Spring 1996:

There is also a panoply of problems associated with the United States. The disproportion of power between the United States and its neighbors, turned into fear by the historic use of that power to intervene militarily, has blocked clear subordination of the military instrument—the Inter-American Defense Board (IADB)—to the political body (OAS). The reasoning is that, if the latter is authorized a military arm, the United States (with its disproportionate power and the votes it will control) can justify military intervention in Latin America or the Caribbean under international law. One extreme formulation of this anxiety is that, using democracy and human rights as excuses, the U.S. seeks to use OAS and IADB as mechanisms to place armed forces in Latin America under its command as enforcers of U.S. intervention.

Two other hypotheses about U.S. policy circulating within Latin American military circles are that with the Cold War over, the United States wants to abolish all national military forces in the region because it considers them obstacles to democratic enlargement and commercial expansion, and that the United States seeks to coopt Latin American militaries as police to fight the drug war outside its borders. There are two major flaws in these conspiratorial depictions of U.S. policy. The first is that these are "big lies," incorporating enough from authentic concerns emanating from Washington to give them an air of plausibility. The second is that such misunderstandings in the past prevented effective regional cooperation that could have forestalled the use of force. . . .

With the Rio Treaty in disuse and no provisions in the OAS charter for the use of force, armed peacekeeping activities will be left either to the United Nations or to unilateral action by the United States. Neither is a satisfactory embodiment of collective regional will.

Introducing racist Lawrence E. Harrison

by Gretchen Small

A simpleminded book, *Underdevelopment Is a State of Mind—The Latin American Case*, written by Lawrence Harrison, a 20-year veteran of the U.S. State Department's Agency for International Development (AID), and published in 1985 by Harvard University, is touted as *the* authoritative work on how Ibero-America must be fundamentally changed to become "democratic."

To hear some people talk, the book is a work of fundamental insight, a "must read" to make policy for Ibero-America. U.S. National Defense University analysts told *EIR* that Harrison's *Underdevelopment* outlines the premises of their work on Ibero-America today. Harrison presented the thesis of his book at an NDU symposium on Security in the Americas, the proceedings of which were then published in 1989 in an NDU book of the same title.

And Samuel Huntington, Harvard University's racist "clash of civilizations" theoretician told Argentina's daily *Clarín* on June 30, that his view on Ibero-America, is the same as Harrison's. That is not surprising, since Harrison wrote *Underdevelopment* under the guidance of Huntington, during a stay at Harvard. Harrison thanks Kissinger's Luigi Einaudi, also, for help in drafting the book.

Colorado's fascist former governor Richard Lamm has endorsed the book as of "immense importance" in showing "the crucial relationship between culture and progress." There was no need for the American Enterprise Institute's propagandist Michael Novak, who tries to sell Adam Smith to Catholics, to endorse the book; Harrison cites Novak's work throughout, as in agreement with him.

There is no "theory" to Harrison's book; it is raw racism, combined with a fawning admiration for the British Empire, as the selection of quotes below are sufficient to demonstrate. Readers not familiar with British historiography's "Black Legend" on Spain, can get here their first taste of this drivel. Harrison and his advocates call this "cultural determinism," a theory, they argue, which follows from the work of German turn-of-the-century sociologist Max Weber, and his book *The Protestant Ethic and Spirit of Capitalism*.

As for "cultural determinism," Lyndon LaRouche, interviewed by the radio satellite broadcast "EIR Talks" on July 24, dismissed it as lunacy: "There are people who believe that if certain international institutions can induce certain government institutions 'to believe in' something, because this combination of national and governmental institutions has power, that the exertion of that power on behalf of a belief, will make