

**THE PROGRAM AND MANIFESTO OF THE
AMERICAN NATIONAL UNION PARTY**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction: On the Political Necessity of the ANUP.....	1
The 12-Point Party Program.....	5
On the Ideals of Republic.....	7
On Monetary and Banking Reformation.....	11
On Land Distribution.....	23
On Agriculture.....	27
On Mass-Data Collection.....	33
On Election Reform.....	37
On Education Reform.....	41
A Final Note.....	47

INTRODUCTION: ON THE POLITICAL NECESSITY OF THE A.N.U.P

The political situation in America today, if nothing is done to avert its present course, portends for the American people a rapidly worsening future by nearly any metric one cares to set. Wealth is being concentrated into fewer hands and income disparity continues to trend to the extremes; civil liberties and constitutional rights are no longer respected by authorities; the rapid proliferation of technological surveillance and data collection threatens to undermine human dignity; and the very foundation of Republic— a healthy citizenry that is committed to upholding the principles of civic virtue— is increasingly destabilized. We have thus formed the ANUP simply because we have deemed it necessary; despite the seriousness of the problems there has been little in the way of serious political solutions, or unified resistance against those entities responsible for plundering the country and profiting off of the moral and economic decline of the citizenry— the corporate robber barons and the corrupt political class which serves them.

In spite of their common problems, the American people stand bitterly divided. Averting rapidly approaching economic disaster and the emerging dangers to health and home posed by the unholy marriage of

corporate and governmental powers should be advantageous to all, yet Americans remain factionally separated over sensational, media-driven issues such as “identity politics” or abortion. Let us be clear: the ANUP was not formed for the purpose of declaring vain policy opinions on a laundry list of issues framed by the very corporate powers which we oppose. We shall leave that to the two major political parties, who exist in order to exacerbate these fracture-lines at the behest of their financial masters, civil strife keeping the public at each others throats rather than unified against their common plunderers. No, the ANUP was formed to be an efficient and dedicated force, focused solely on the mission of achieving economic freedom of the nation as against the techno-feudalistic slavery our enemies wish to impose, and for safeguarding the foundations of the Republic. For ourselves, we will never avert the spotlight from the true enemies of general prosperity, never relent in educating the populace on the sources of their current woes, and never stray from the vision of that greater ideal of civilization which may be brought about through securing our reforms.

The nature of our struggle is thus not one of merely another factional player in the political shell-game, contriving “issues” merely as cheap rallying points for garnering political support, but is wholly different: we represent not one demographic or class against another, but stand for a unified nation, a national program for the benefit of every class, all besides that minority of criminal financiers and would be techno-lords who will no doubt see the destruction of their aims in the fulfillment of *our* mission.

What shall we say to he who, though he might agree with our analysis and our proposed program of reforms, nevertheless feels he cannot lend his support to our struggle because of some hot-button issue which he holds dear in his breast, issues which the ANU refuses to take a stance on? We say that we will still have him, if he will join us, and if he realizes that any political organization is not required to accept the framing thrust upon it by other groups which it regards as its rivals and enemies. We would like to convey to him the overwhelming dangers which are now at hand, and assure that we will not obstruct him if he wishes to fight on behalf of his pet issue outside of the Union, but he will not be allowed to conduct that fight in the name of the Union. First, we

have no time for it, and secondly, such issues will only serve to introduce fractions and needless division between Union members, the same divisions which already fracture the wider political landscape and have disrupted the formation of any united front of the people. Just as a worker's or trade union, the ANU exists for a specific purpose. Just as a trade union's official standing on abortion, for example, has no bearing on their ability to negotiate a fair wage, likewise one should realize that if the ANU *were* to declare official opinions on every issue brought to it, this would not matter in any way to the accomplishing of the directives it was formed for, namely: securing economic freedom, or the "pursuit of happiness" which Thomas Jefferson wrote into the Declaration of Independence, and the restoration of a functioning Republican form of government. We would also like to point out the practical matter that many of these pressing "issues" would, for the most part, be solved in any case by the implementation of our economic directives, because such directives will result in elimination of poverty and economic prosperity. Such beneficial changes in condition will doubtlessly accomplish such second-order effects as reducing abortions, reducing racial disparity, and freeing up resources for innovation in "green" climate-conscious technologies, and so if one is invested in any of these particular issues he should not let the ANU's lack of official positions on them cloud his judgement and obscure the fact that the accomplishment of our directives will positively impact these matters in any case.

The political system in America as it stands now is in a state of severe degradation. Factionalism and political extremism is rampant, and people seem to hold their political party affiliations as a matter of personal identity, whilst giving comparatively little thought to the matter of *national* identity, a situation which George Washington sagely forewarned against when he spoke of the "the baneful effects of the spirit of party" in his farewell address. This sort of factionalism within a state is untenable, and it is imperative that this situation be rectified.

Thus, our creation of a citizen's union for the purpose of representing the common interest of the American people against the financial-political class, and restoring functionality to the Democratic-Republican system of government. The purpose of this

writing is one of education: to properly establish the nature of the American form of government and the principles upon which it was based, and in doing so to make clear the conditions which are necessary for its proper functioning. Once one recognizes the healthy conditions, one can determine where these have gone astray, and after correctly identifying the sickness one can better determine its source, and then provide a possible cure. It is our wish that every Union member have a clear understanding of the theoretical principles which inform the 12-point party program, and this basis will be provided in the following work.

THE 12-POINT PROGRAM OF THE ANUP

1. The abolition of the Federal Reserve debt-money system, and its replacement by a truly public National Bank of the United States. 100% Reserve ratio requirement.
2. Institution of a land value tax to replace the property tax.
3. Placing limits on the amount of residential properties owned by single entities.
4. Severe restrictions placed on land ownership by non-residents of the United States.
5. Reforming the political campaign finance system to break the influence of corporate sponsorship and political lobbying.
6. A ban on dual-citizens holding public office.
7. Comprehensive education reform: repealing harmful standardization legislation which constrains teachers, and instituting a tiered school system which allows for elite education to be accessed by merit rather than wealth. A refinement and refocusing of curriculum based on tangible goals.
8. A comprehensive set of programs and directives to improve living conditions and reduce crime in poverty-stricken areas of the country.
9. A systematic review of all laws which may be argued to impinge upon the clear interpretation of rights outlined in the Constitution.
10. A strong rejection of mass data collection on US citizens, including passing additional laws to outlaw such practices whether performed by government or private entities.
11. Redirecting agricultural subsidies from corn and soy production towards regenerative farming and ranching operations.
12. Restructuring of the FDA so that it may once again carry out publicly-funded research, rather than relying on biased and easily-manipulated corporate studies.

ON THE IDEALS OF REPUBLIC

Our word “republic” is derived from the Latin *res publica*, a term used by Cicero to translate the Greek πολιτεία, meaning literally “public affairs” or “public matters”. In his *Des Re Publica*, Cicero argues for the uniqueness and superiority of the Roman state. Through the mouthpiece of Scipio Africanus, he presents Republic as a mixture of the best elements of monarchy, aristocracy, and democracy, which will inevitably corrupt into their respective negative forms of tyranny, oligarchy, and mob-rule if not tempered by a balance of powers such as the Romans have. 'Well then' says Scipio within the dialogue, “a commonwealth is the property of the people, but a people is not any collection of human beings brought together in any sort of way, but an assemblage of people in large numbers associated in an agreement with respect to justice and a partnership for the common good.” Thus, we see in Cicero's writing the core idea of Republic which unifies the various ideas of “republic” across time, ancient and modern, despite all of their incidental differences: a government of collective agreements, i.e. a government of *laws*. John Adams, the foremost theorist involved in the project of American government, who formed his opinions from a study of the politics of antiquity, agreed when he wrote that “good government is a government of laws,” and he defined a republic as “a government in which all men, rich and poor, magistrates and subjects, officers and people, masters and servants, the first citizen and the last, are equally subject to the laws.” Indeed, here is directly echoing Cicero, who writes: “Therefore, since law is the bond which unites the civic association, and the justice enforced by law is the same for all, by what justice can an association of citizens be

held together when there is no equality among the citizens? For if we cannot agree to equalize men's wealth, and equality of innate ability is impossible, the legal rights at least of those who are citizens of the same commonwealth ought to be equal. For what is a state except an association or partnership in justice?"

If a Republic consists, at the most basic level, of this equality under the law and "association... of justice", what then are the necessary conditions which ensure its proper functioning? Quite simply, if the nature of Republic is a system of government in which the particular arrangement of the powers of society is governed by law, then the best performing republic must be the one which successfully serves "an impartial and exact execution of the laws", as argued by Adams. If the laws are to be impartial in their execution and legislated for the good of the commonwealth, it follows that a requirement of the arrangement of governmental powers is that it must, as much as is possible, be formed to resist capture by narrow interests which would aim to use legislation for their own benefit at the expense of the wider society. This idea is what led Adams and the other founding fathers to developing our particular structure of government with its balance of divided powers.

Yet of course a legal structure can never by its own virtues ensure that a state is conducive to the happiness and welfare of a nation. It is often said today that the Constitution is only ink on paper after all, meaning exactly that the "government" so called is not a real entity, but only a conceptual structure which is composed of individual men and women, and ultimately it is only the actions of individual people that make up what we call "government". Again we find this idea in Adams' letters, when in agreement with the classical idea of Republic formerly enumerated by Cicero he states: "There must be a positive passion for the public good, the public interest, honor, power, and glory, established in the minds of the people, or there can be no Republican government, nor any real liberty. And this public passion must be superior to all private passions. Men must be ready, they must pride themselves, and be happy to sacrifice their private pleasures, passions, and interests, nay even their private friendships and dearest connections, when they stand in competition with the rights of society." This statement

by Adams notably contradicts the popular notion of America today that thinks of it as a nation founded only on the ideas of free markets, commerce, and the pursuit of economic prosperity. Such things are incidental to the idea of the United States, and despite their relative merits these were never the foundational ideas of a republican form of government. Adams even goes so far to say that a focus on economic prosperity above public virtue was the greatest danger to the fledgling Republic, when he states that “the spirit of commerce[...] is incompatible with that purity of heart, and greatness of soul which is necessary for a happy republic.” Thomas Jefferson, too, reached along similar lines when he advocated for the possible sacrifice of commercial opportunity for the maintenance of an agrarian way of life which he maintained was the manner of living most conducive to virtue. In Jefferson's view, complex markets and cities formed out of mercantile relations breed dependance of individuals upon systems, and he argued that “dependance begets subservience and venality, suffocates the germ of virtue, and preposes fit tools for the design of ambition.”

The realization that the current polity of the United States is far from that independent and civically virtuous public which the founders envisioned may leave one with the feeling that the restoration of a responsible government of the people is a hopelessly impossible task. Yet, the founders have not left us without warnings and predictions applicable to our present state, nor without insights into the root causes of our currently poor condition. From Thomas Jefferson, especially, we get the distinct impression that beyond the naturally inborn qualities of people, their moral character is most greatly influenced by the necessities and daily patterns imposed upon them by particular economic conditions. His staunch advocacy for farming and cultivation of the earth in scientifically-driven agricultural endeavors was based on his belief that “cultivators of the earth are the most virtuous and independent citizens.” For, Jefferson believed that it was the farming life, the life of tangible, physical owned space and the natural cycles which regulated intervals of work and leisure which allowed individuals to develop their education and abilities in a holistic way. The greatest travesty, Jefferson felt, was the condition of the exploited European wage laborers that he came to know during his time in France, who

“must come to labor 16 hours in the 24, give the earnings of 15 of those to the government, their debts, and daily expenses[...] living on oatmeal and potatoes.”

We do not have to argue for the now impossible implementation of Jefferson's agrarian societal ideal in order to take from his thought the central insight he was providing: it is the taxing and exhaustive labor of industrial society, a mad focus on efficiency and productivity in everything quantitative at the expense of liberal humanistic cultivation, which leaves the working population without the energy, time, or means for truly *qualitative* self-improvement. The undeveloped person, then, becomes an actual danger to the Republic itself, as a weak moral character and lackluster education leave one susceptible to the influence of demagogues, advertisers, propagandists and any other sort of influence peddler. When the morally weak become a critical mass of political power, the safeguards of liberty can not be upheld. Thus, despite the virtues of personal responsibility, at some point one must realize that the mass of a demoralized people are not only a detriment to themselves, but pose a threat to the entire Republic. As such, every man who enjoys blessings, whether of character, wealth, or education, has a vested interest in personally rendering aid to the commonwealth. One who boasts of himself or loudly decries a lack of virtue in others accomplishes nothing good whilst the structures of our civilization collapse around his ears. It is better to put aside haughtiness and think rather how the people may be helped into better economic conditions which are more conducive to the development of virtue. As such, the ANU advocates a mixed and pragmatic economic policy, which, while entrusting to the free market mechanism the task of developing efficient markets, leaves room for strong and decisive economic interventions in the interest of disrupting effective monopolies which obstruct the right to the pursuit of happiness.

ON MONETARY AND BANKING REFORM

One might justifiably wonder why, in the turbulent midst of the contemporary political climate, we have chosen the subject of banking and monetary reform to be the foremost effort of our struggle. It may indeed seem strange that when so many apparently more pressing issues belabor society on all sides, we should be so focused on the minutiae of monetary policy. To this sentiment we offer a simple answer, to be made clear through the course of this work: the Federal Reserve system is the foremost tool by which a small circle of financial interests have acquired, and continue to hold, the power to dominate almost every aspect of life in the United States and much of the rest of the world. It is, in effect, a private monopoly on the production and distribution of currency, and has been for at least the last 100 years engaged in a continual mission of wealth transfer on a massive scale, from all of the working and productive people of the nation to a group of financiers with no national loyalties or allegiances beyond their own narrowly private interests. This has been achieved, and continues to be propagated, primarily by two mechanisms. The first is the practice of fractional-reserve banking, and the second is the mandated use and production of a debt-based central bank currency. We will attempt to describe here the nature of both of these systems, showing in the process that both in fact violate basic tenets of natural law and common sense, and show that these practices have no place within a free republic. We will then present a realistic and coherent plan by which the current monetary system may be reformed for the advantage of the nation, and the damage inflicted upon it by such criminal processes reversed.

Fractional Reserve Banking

The vast consensus today is that the practice of fractional reserve banking is a necessary and integral part of a developed economy. The average reader may even scoff at our presumption to challenge what is regarded as a quasi-sacred institution—yet we are hardly the first to offer a criticism, and stand at the head of a long and distinguished tradition of advocacy for its opposite: full-reserve banking. That is, the requirement that banks hold 100% of their demand deposits (those deposits which are not subject to time delays on withdrawal, such as any normal checking account) readily on hand; a position which we argue should really be the common-sense and default one, fractional-reserve being the unnatural and flawed formulation. We will not bother to include a long list of prior advocates and quotations as a way of arguing from authority, as we believe the simple logic involved speaks for itself. However, for the purpose of laying out a clearly comprehensible basis to our argument, we will only resort to citing two short passages from the *Digesta*, a compendium of juristic writings on Roman law, compiled by order of the Emperor Justinian. Both of the following are authored by Julius Paulus:

A deposit is something given to another for safekeeping. It is so called because a good *is posited*[placed]. The preposition *de* intensifies the meaning, which reflects that all obligations corresponding to the custody of the good belong to that person.¹

Theft is the fraudulent appropriation of a good while gaining a profit, either from the good itself, or otherwise from the use or possession of it, which by admission of natural law is prohibited.²

Taken together, these quotes show without a doubt that as

-
- 1 Depositum est, quod custodiendum alicui datum est, dictum ex eo, quod ponitur, praeposito enim *de* auget depositum, ut ostendat totum fidei eius commissum, quod ad custodiam rei pertinet.
 - 2 Furtum est contrectatio rei fraudulosa, lucri faciendi gratia, vel ipsius rei, vel etiam usus eius possessionisve; quod lege naturali prohibitum est admittere.

far as the Ancient Roman legal code was concerned, fractional reserve banking could only be regarded as a criminal activity. Thus, it is wrong to assume that fractional reserve banking is some sophisticated financial technology which was discovered in the modern era and responsible for our economic advancement. On the contrary, it is a basic behavior well known since ancient times, the temptation of practicing it being endemic to the position of handling other people's money.

When a depositor deposits a good with a depository, by the nature of the agreement it is the duty and obligation of the depository to not only safeguard the deposit but to keep it on hand and able to be returned to the depositor at the moment he may wish to redeem it. Note that this type of contract- the deposit- is markedly distinct from another type: the loan. Whilst the loan involves a set term, the total transfer of the goods within that term, and the obligation of the debtor to repay the principal (and usually additional interest) at the end of the term, in the case of the deposit there is no set term and no real transfer of ownership— the depository is merely providing a service of securing the goods and they may be demanded back at any time by the depositor.

For a bank to hold only 10% of its total demand deposits in actual cash-on-hand is thus a form of institutionalized fraud, for the banker is making use of the depositors funds as if these funds were his own property to use for his own purposes, rather than the reality that he is merely a providing a service of stewardship for the funds in question. Banks, of course, generate enormous profits by this practice, as it effectively allows them to multiply by 10 the amount of actual deposits they receive, collecting interest on loans generated out of thin air, nothing more in reality than an accounting trick based on the risky assumption that too many depositors will not want to withdraw their funds all at once. The risk usually pays off; as long as trust remains in the solvency of the bank, the process of expansionary credit can go on generating profit. History and logic, however, point to the reality that a “run on the bank” and insolvency is *always* guaranteed given a long enough time frame. Not only do banks going insolvent from unsecured deposits defraud and rob the depositors, but the sudden contraction of credit which occurs when the accounting sheets are nullified creates damaging

ripple effects through the economy. Sharp monetary contractions resulting from bank runs cause upsets in the markets to spiral into catastrophic recessions and depressions. Clearly, the attempt to cheat reality by building an economy on expansionary credit rather than real savings leaves one on quite unstable foundations. No matter the impressiveness of the structure built on them, such foundations guarantee eventual catastrophe.

Debt-based Currency

It was the economic instability engendered by the unsound banking practices like fractional reserve which provided the pretext for a group of wealthy plutocrats to lobby congress and the public for their planned reformation of the country's monetary system, eventually succeeding in having the Federal Reserve Act passed in 1913. In effect, this bill passed on the powers endowed to Congress in Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution, the power to issue a national currency, to a private cartel of bankers. It is necessary to here point out that the Federal Reserve's appearance of a public and government ran institution is nothing more than a carefully constructed facade. The system does have a limited amount of government oversight, it is true: its 7 governors are appointed by the president, and it is subject to a limited audit— however in practice these oversights amount to very little in the way of public accountability. The board governors are always highly interconnected with the large corporate banks, often working for major firms or serving on their boards before or after their terms of service; the audits are limited to a narrow set of information— the decision making processes behind the market operations and all meetings with private-market and foreign financial entities are legally exempt from the audit process. The use of deceptions is clearly evident; the public relations arm of the Federal Reserve officially states that the institution in fact has no “owners”, yet also informs us that “membership” in the system is required of all the large national banks, membership consisting of holding a share of stock which pays out dividends. This is a shockingly blatant attempt at deliberate obfuscation and deception of the public, as holding stock is quite literally a share of ownership. We should, in any case,

be skeptical of the claim that a system drafted, lobbied for, and named (deceptively at that—the system is neither federal nor does it hold any reserves) by a cartel of banking magnates was inspired by a selfless wish to aid society rather than by the profit motive. While the dividend payouts we spoke of have totaled tens of billions of dollars of risk-free money to the large member banks over the years, this is only a comparatively small bonus in relation to the monopolistic economic power granted by the Federal Reserve's market operations. Corporate owners are able to secure immensely lucrative deals for themselves through their influence of the Federal Reserve. For instance, after both the 2008 financial crisis (itself caused by unsound financial practices) and the 2020 economic downturn, the investment mega-firm Blackrock was, in both cases, granted *trillions* of dollars off of the backs of the U.S. Taxpayer for the purpose of carrying out “market operations” according to a plan drafted and submitted by Blackrock itself. This is merely a single egregious example of a century long history of criminal plundering, done by a parasitic class of financiers at the expense of the American people. A full history of central banking in the United States is beyond the scope of this work, as it does not begin with the Federal Reserve itself, but stretches back to the very origins of the Revolution. There are many good works available which the reader might consult for a comprehensive historical education in this matter. Here we can only describe, in relatively simple terms, how this system operates and the great drain it places upon the lifeblood of the nation.

As most everyone is aware, the Federal Reserve currently holds an effective monopoly on the issuing of currency. Look at any bill and one will read “Federal Reserve Note” on the top of the front side. What do these Federal Reserve Notes represent? They are not based on a value like work or any quantity of gold or other good, but are a purely fiat currency, backed by the “full faith and credit” of the United States government. This statement, however, is really only an assurance that the currency will be accepted as legal tender wherever the United States holds power and influence, and while it is not a false statement, it actually tells one nothing about what that unit of currency truly represents. In order to understand that, one must understand the process by which the currency is created and

how it afterwards is distributed into the market. It is not hard to understand. The Federal Reserve, upon deciding to inject money into the markets, has money printed and uses the currency to purchase U.S. Treasury bonds on the open market. Thus, each unit of currency is birthed and introduced into the economy by a swap with *a unit of public debt*. The currency actually *represents* a unit of debt, an obligation of the public to pay, which is why we call it a *debt-based* currency. Do not be confused: a debt-based currency is not equivalent to a fiat currency. A fiat currency may be based on debt, as ours is, but it certainly does not *have* to be. In fact, there is no benefit whatsoever to the public interest to have it so. Any public expenditure, any project or program or production of any kind, can only be accomplished through the real work of the citizenry in some form or another— why then should this work also incur a debt? If our money is truly backed by the “full faith and credit” of the state, what is the need of an independent creditor to receive it by first right? The only party profiting from such a scheme is the banking cartel which makes up the system.

Our congressional budgets always include enormous sums paid towards the interest on the national debt, the amounts of which are increasing so rapidly that it is already impossible that any of the principal shall ever be paid. The interest payments alone are soaking up more and more of the national budget— by 2030, in fact, the payments on the *interest* on the debt will surpass the entire national defense budget, and not long after that will swallow the majority of the entire budget. Why should the citizens put up with the utter madness of working and paying taxes which go into paying down an impossibly expanding level of debt, when it is perfectly possible that our government could simply begin to issue debt-free notes?

From an abstract view of this situation, the impossibility of its continuance is clear. If each Federal Reserve note represents a debt obligation on the part of the American people, yet this debt can only be paid by means of the very same debt-based notes, how is the debt ever to be paid, even theoretically? Herein lies the atrocious trick, which ensured an ever-expanding level of debt from the beginning, and taxation that only ever increases and never decreases. Not only is this scheme a blatant pilfering of the American people, but it has had disastrous social effects which

dangerously weaken the morale of the Republic. When the power to create and issue debt has been granted as a monopolized right to a small financial elite, this has the effect of spawning a centre of immoral greed and villainy at the very core of our institutions. Access to this power allows for great fortunes to be amassed for individuals and firms, fortunes which are often used to further subvert the political system. Our politicians, surrounding this nest of finance like starving beggars with outstretched hands, become nothing more than shills-for-hire, and the example this sets is not lost on the public. Trust in leaders and institutions is at an all-time low; what does it do to the character of a people when the public positions which are supposed to be filled by society's best are instead occupied by unprincipled and avaricious liars and fiends? Not to mention the demoralizing effect on the people as they watched the very actors at fault for the 2008 financial crisis 'bailed out' by public money, the executives responsible for the colossal economic ramifications of their own mismanagement walking away not in humiliation and shame but freely, with personal bonuses larger than ever before, whilst great numbers of the working people lost their savings and homes.

The only way to restore the national pride and optimism in our way of life is to make clear that those people who are responsible for enriching themselves through all of our economic crises, the same people who subvert our political institutions and turn our nation into nothing more than an open-air marketplace, will be held accountable. For this reason the ANU places great importance of the issue of monetary and banking reform, for only through this change can the parasitic drain on the country be thrown off and the nation be allowed to heal.

The Solution: Monetary and Banking Reform

The two major issues which need to be addressed in order to restore a stable and healthy national economy are the fractional reserve banking system and the currency which is based on public debt. Amazingly, there exists an elegant and concise solution which may resolve both of these problems concurrently. This solution requires for its implementation only the necessary political will on

the part of the people, as the plan can be wholly accomplished through the legislative power of congress.

First, Congress must use the power issued to it in Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution in order to issue a national currency of the United States. This currency would consist of debt-free treasury notes, completely separate from the Federal Reserve system. Just like the Federal Reserve banknotes, this would be a purely fiat currency, backed by the credit of the state.

This new, debt-free money will then be introduced into the economy by buying up the government debt in the form of U.S. Treasury bonds. The debt held by the Federal Reserve will be bought out first, which essentially means returning all national accounting to the Department of the Treasury, and afterwards all bonds held by private individuals, domestic institutions, and foreign governments.

Simultaneous with the issuance of the new currency will occur the process by which fractional reserve banking will be phased out, which concurrently solves the problem of inflation posed by the rapid money creation just described. Over a set period of time, the reserve requirement on the banks will be increased stepwise to coincide with the new currency issuance. This will have the effect of contracting the total money supply and reversing the dangerous credit expansion which has been allowed by the fractional reserve system, but there will be no radical deflationary effects, since it will be offset by the inflationary pressures of printing the new Treasury notes. Inflationary and deflationary forces will thus coincide and counterbalance, keeping the money supply stable while the debt is erased, and avoiding any disturbances in the day-to-day economic life during the transition.

After the completion of the above process, the nation will stand with zero debt, and a full reserve ratio in the banking sector. The next objective then becomes the dismantling of the Federal Reserve system, which will no longer serve any purpose. Congress can easily accomplish this by repealing the Federal Reserve Act of 1913. Federal Reserve buildings will be nationalized and used for clearinghouses and secure vaults for the newly issued bills, and monetary policy will return to the hands of the people to whom it belongs, in a fully public institution that is subject to all of the

transparency and oversight entailed thereby.

While the above steps are sufficient in themselves to break the backs of the banking cartels and ensure that prosperity and dignity be allowed to return to economic life in this country, there is yet a further goal to aim at. In the ensuing environment occasioned by the successful completion of the already-described reforms, it would be exceedingly prudent and dutiful to posterity, whilst the public is still propelled by the inertia of victory, for Congress to act swiftly to ensure that the power of finance never again has the chance to lay some future stranglehold over the nation. This can be accomplished by a constitutional amendment which prohibits Congress from outsourcing its power to issue currency to private institutions, thus making a future return of the financial powers to our shores nigh-impossible. Such a momentous victory would complete the work started by the venerable Andrew Jackson, who succeeded in a struggle analogous to our own when, in 1836, he cast out the Second Bank of the United States (another deceptively named, pseudo-public institution), only for the financial powers to reassert themselves less than a century later. If we do not expressly forbid their return, these powers will always make use of their enormous resources and established power bases in foreign countries in attempts to regain their position of dominance.

Regardless of the success of the amendment effort, the initial main reforms of the plan will leave the country in a vastly healthier condition, from which it may begin to recover. No longer will massive sums set aside for interest payments swallow up our congressional budget— these crippling payments which leave nothing to show for them erased, freeing up trillions of dollars for either actual productive use, or reducing the level of real tax burden on the country for the first time since the creation of the Federal Reserve over 100 years ago. With taxes reduced, America will begin to enjoy a real growth in savings and economic security year-after-year; a marked difference from the current norm, which is ever-rising inflation, an ever-weakening currency, increasing taxation, and stagnant wages against continually rising costs of living.

From this point on, the money supply can be regulated by the Treasury Department according to formulaic statistical analysis

to ensure smooth liquidity and sufficient money velocity, currency issuance being tied to factors like population growth, economic output and price indices. The notes can be introduced into the markets through government expenditures like infrastructure projects, beneficial programs, and even in interest-free state loans made directly to citizens for housing and approved projects. Barring extreme situations like an existential conflict, the level of taxation could theoretically be reduced over time rather than increased, as government expenditures could theoretically be increasingly paid solely by the new currency issuance when economic productivity is high enough. Indeed, this is a logical and natural state— as technology and efficiency of economic output increases, the cost of living and the burden of work should only go *down*, as would certainly be the case without the parasitic drain placed on the people by the financiers.

This hopeful but entirely possible vision for the future of the nation requires for its accomplishment a united front of all social classes, arrayed against the formidable financial powers. Indeed, it is in the common interest of all who engage in productive work to lend support to this coalition. The working classes who currently suffer from rising costs, stagnant wages, and the indirect taxation of inflation, middle class professionals, salaried workers and small business owners who feel their purchasing power stolen through ever-increasing taxation and a growing mountain of debt, the leading figures of industry, owners of big business and leading executives who are expected first and foremost to only increase returns for the big financial shareholders, all of these groups must see the benefit in looking past the artificial divisions foisted on them by a corrupt system, and working together against the financial powers for the future of the nation.

Some Objections and their Refutations

Objection: Without fractional reserve banking, bankers will not be able to lend money, and the economy will not grow.

Refutation: This statement is false because it assumes that all bank accounts are on-demand deposits, like checking accounts. Really,

there are two types of accounts: the on demand accounts and the longer term savings accounts. Long term savings accounts have set terms before the customer can withdraw, making them really a loan to the bank rather than a deposit. These types of funds the bank can freely use for investment, as long as they bring adequate returns for repayment at the expiration of the term. The 100% reserve ratio only pertains to all funds which customers have a *current* right to withdraw.

O: Less loans will be given out in this system.

R: All else being equal, this may very well be true. Alone, however, is not a negative development. An economy which can only thrive on interest-bearing loans and not savings is not a system favorable to working people. A sound monetary policy based on real savings would stabilize prices and increase individual purchasing power as the economy grows, rather than weakening it. We should no longer accept a situation as normal in which one must pay at least 100% to 150% of the value of a home or car in pure interest.

O: It is good that our central bank is not totally government-controlled. If it were, politicians might be tempted to influence its operation in order to bring about short-term positive effects in the interest of reelection which may engender negative long-term consequences.

R: This argument comes out of a failure to recognize that we do not currently have a problem with politicians influencing bankers, but rather always the opposite. It is the monopolized control over the issuance of money which makes the bankers the center of gravity in terms of power and influence. It is only right that a Republic keep this great power under public control. Furthermore, we have advocated for a regulation of the money supply determined by an open and transparent mathematical formula that would be little susceptible to influence from politicians without such a thing being immediately obvious to everyone.

ON LAND DISTRIBUTION

We believe, as Jefferson did, that well distributed land ownership does much to morally improve a people through the requirement of vigor and virtue for its maintenance and improvement, and in addition imparts a sense of responsibility in the political process to those who own a tangible share of the country. Thus we view the concentration of land ownership into fewer hands, and the dispossession of so many people from any hope of self-ownership, as one of the greatest threats to our civic order. “Legislators cannot invent too many devices” writes Jefferson, “for subdividing property.”

From the determination of these societal effects springs the resolution of the ANU to legislate for a wider distribution of land ownership. While Jefferson himself proposed such radical measures as giving, by government grant, 50 acres of arable land to every free adult male citizen, in our contemporary situation changes can only be made by helping to influence market forces. Simply put, the price of land must be decreased through an increase in supply. While the state cannot create more land, nor justly appropriate and redistribute what is already privately owned, it can pass measures to increase the land available for purchase.

Allow us to describe an economic situation: a wealthy rentier owns vast swathes of country land which he has invested in, along with many rental units in an urban area, and other empty buildings in the city which he has bought as investments. The rentier derives an income from his rental units, which of course he is entitled to, as he is responsible for the upkeep of the building which he owns and providing a proper living space for his tenants,

according to his contractual obligations. The job of the landlord is a very real job, and despite the accusations of some, it is work that adds value to the society by maintaining viable places in which people may work and live. The rent which he extracts from his tenants is not the only way that he enjoys an increase in wealth, however. As the entire society improves through labor and invention, the value of the very land itself increases, and so as a benefit of the collective efforts of the labor of himself and those neighbors who surround him, the landowner enjoys a corresponding increase in his property values. The key point here is that the rentier gains additional wealth on his rental properties, and *also* any buildings that he owns which may be simply sitting unused and unimproved. Thus, on the property which he does nothing but retain ownership, he benefits from the work of other people. On the property which he rents out, he benefits double: once in the increase of the property value, and again in that he may charge higher rent for the use of the now more valuable land. The man who rents the property, however, benefits none in the improvement of the society, but actually suffers, for his rent is increased and he sees no corresponding increase in his wealth. In essence, the wealth which is generated by the increase of the property values, which occurs as a result of the collective effort of the working people, is “absorbed” by the landowners, whether or not they do anything to contribute to that collective work. This amounts to essentially a free profit gained off of the backs of others, as the land increases in value due to the actions of the collective society- one man's improvements to a property, or business, have the effect of raising the value of the neighboring ones, and so creating an incentive to hold land as passive investment, leaving holdings vacant and unimproved as merely calculated values in portfolios which are managed for people who will likely never step foot on what they own. This practice can be easily disincentivized by replacing property taxes with a land value tax. Such a scheme of taxation will no longer penalize small holders by increased taxes as they make improvements to their property, whilst holders of vast tracts or plots of key locational value will be faced with paying a substantially higher share of the tax, encouraging them to either divide and sell their holdings, or else put it to productive use.

In addition, foreign land ownership within the country must be restricted. It is only through a neglect of the responsibilities of government that the state could allow for wealthy foreigners to hold great acreages whilst so many of our own citizens must be contented with being priced out of the land and housing markets. Property of foreign ownership which exceeds a certain acreage threshold (determined by factors of the local market) we would require to be listed for sale within a certain time frame from the passing of our directive.

The last measure undertaken for the distribution of property ownership will be a strict limit placed on the ownership of residential property by corporate entities. Concentration of home ownership and management, being beneficial to no one except a small group of large-scale investors, must be broken up by limiting quantity of properties owned to what a single proprietor could feasibly manage. While a landlord or rentier on a reasonable scale practices a legitimate profession and fulfills a societal need, huge investment-management conglomerates can only pose a threat to a fair housing market.

ON AGRICULTURE

Any serious study of the various problems of American agriculture and their solutions will reveal a subtler and more complex picture than what might be portrayed by some of the interested parties involved.

Everyone is familiar by now with the tension between large-scale, so called “industrial” farming operations and the opposite ideal of the small family farm. Related to this opposition are other conflicts: sustainable or regenerative agriculture versus conventional methods, pastured livestock versus feedlot-grown, diverse crop rotations versus a mono- or duo-grain rotation, and so on. These oppositions arise from differing opinions regarding effects upon the natural environment, ethical treatment of animals, what constitutes good economical practices, and perhaps most critical of all: effects on human health. From one point of view, agriculture in the way it is currently conventionally practiced is massively successful; farmers continue to reap record yields year after year, food prices remain relatively cheap by historical standards, and we are told that America's highly efficient methods of grain production, particularly corn and soybeans, are able to 'feed the world' through the sheer volume of surplus that we produce.

From another point of view, however, our agricultural methods are failing spectacularly on many points. Intensive farming operations with little to no diversity of species have drained the soil of nutrients, and require massive inputs of artificial fertilizer which runoff into rivers and oceans to create massive “dead zones” devoid of oxygen and life; the unnatural living conditions of stock animals is like a window into some industrial hellscape; furthermore, the

food raised and grown in these ways increasingly lacks the level of nutrients found in cultivars of the past, mass use of insecticide, herbicide, and fungicide, and their infiltration into the soils and waters result in chronic sickness and cancers in human and animals, and the ever-increasing concentration of food production has made our society utterly dependent upon fragile and complicated logistics networks for very survival. Many will wish to contrast these developments with the oft-romanticized ideal of the small family farm, where healthy animals feed on green pastures among patches of trees and vegetable gardens, and the farmer, after putting in his honest labor tending to the fields and his animals brings his product to local markets to feed the very townspeople whom he lives near and shares a common polity with.

The reason why the former description is the reality and the latter is a rapidly fading dream of the past is a simple matter of costs, incentives and yields. Many people would quickly point out that the current system is in place due to government subsidies which distort the markets, favoring large-scale production of corn and soybeans. While this is part of the picture, it is far from the sole, or even the main, reason why this remains the dominant mode of production. The truth is that the current agricultural methods are so rigidly set in place because they are the methods which achieve the greatest yields, and the greatest profit for the producer at the lowest cost for the consumer. Essentially, the current formulation has been settled on foremost by the mechanism of the free market. For the adherents to the “get big or get out” mantra of Nixonian Secretary of Agriculture Earl Butz, the debate stops here. Yet, we can recognize from our position at the end of decades during which such systems have dominated, that there are other, real costs incurred, perhaps not factored into the market mechanism of price discovery. Just on the subject of human health, the great increases in refined corn and soy products like cooking oils and sweeteners are clearly largely responsible for the drastically reduced standards of national health in comparison to the past, leaving Americans consuming more calories but less nutrients than ever before. It is undeniable that the mass industries built up to produce and market these products have driven the negative changes in the American diet, thereby weakening the vigor of the nation and incurring great bloat

on the healthcare system as obesity, diabetes and heart disease continue to rise.

Thus it seems that we find ourselves in a difficult situation in regards to agriculture and national health, when the methods which are causing a health decline are able to dominate the market partly by being sold at the lowest prices, outcompeting higher quality food on the largest markets. As said above, it would be irresponsible of us to attribute this market dominance to state favoritism, when it is clearly the result of a market process. Economies of scale resulting from technologically-intensive methods, along with the access to global markets in which to sell surplus production, favor the centralization and consolidation of agricultural firms, and processes which extract the greatest possible yield from a given piece of farmland, despite that these practices will eventually lead to the total degradation of the farmland itself. As such, there is a conflict between short-term economic decisions of increased profits and long-term sustainment of the enterprise.

There does exist a growing body of knowledge and practices for the implementation of new(or rather in many cases, old) ways of farming and animal husbandry which may reverse many of the environmental damages inflicted by conventional methods— so-called “regenerative farming” practices which do not require fertilizer, tilling or pesticides, and restore the durability of the topsoil along with the bioavailability of the nutrients within it. Regenerative farming practices could eliminate fertilizer runoff, return nutrient density to food, and ensure long-term health of the soil. Farmers who have employed these methods already, after an establishment period of a few years, have consistently increased the profitability of their acreage, thus making it a smart choice economically for farmers with the willingness and resources to make the conversion. About one-fifth to one-third of this increased profit comes from reduced input costs, as the farmer is no longer needful of fertilizers or sprays, but we must recognize that the majority of the added profit comes from a higher premium price paid by the consumer. The actual yield per acre drops by up to a third when compared to conventional methods (though they also become less volatile, achieving predictably consistent results year after year and being less effected by adverse weather events) and

the lower volume is offset by a higher price, justified by the product being of a higher quality.

Let us be clear: it is inevitable that regenerative farming practices will spread, due to its increased long-term profitability and sustainability, allowing also the renewed economic viability of small-scale farming operations. However, the situation is still tenuous, since it rests on the demand for a higher quality product, a level of demand which is sensitive to the wider economic environment. In addition there will always be a significant portion of the population who, through lack of education or care, will continue to provide a market for the lower quality food produced by harmful and unsustainable practices, and since it is uncertain that conversion to regenerative practices will make economic sense for the very large operations currently enjoying hefty advantages, it is not assured that the natural spread of regenerative farming alone will spell the end of conventional farming. Some government intervention to push markets towards regenerative farming and the dominance of higher quality food will thus be necessary, keeping in mind that such interventions only make sense when paired with our monetary reforms, which will reduce the overall cost of living and offset any overall raise in food prices. As it stands, a people should not be forced into a situation, as many are today, in which extremely cheap food prices have become necessary for survival; such a situation brings about the dominance of low quality products when people do not have the means to afford anything else. Any reformation of the country's agricultural situation depends on a citizenry with stable incomes and lowered costs of living in other areas, if we are not to resort to austerity. Any attempt to change agricultural production models on a wide scale, as so many political actors carelessly advocate, without addressing the declining trend of real incomes amongst American workers, would be a sure disaster. Increasing incomes and lowering cost of living in other areas will do much to increase the demand for higher quality food before any actual state intervention on the production side is ever needed. The actions taken by the state can thus be marginal.

The first action which the state can undertake is to redirect the current agricultural subsidies away from the minority of large corn-and-soy operations which they currently favor, and towards

investment in smaller-scale, decentralized and sustainable ones which produce more varieties of vegetable and animal products. Further funds may be generated for these positive investments through additional taxation imposed upon products deemed to be harmful to health, this having the benefit of reducing the economic viability of their production. This health tax can be imposed upon corn and soy sold for the production of refined products like high-fructose corn syrup and soy based cooking oils. Breaking the profitability of these harmful products will ideally hurt their competitiveness and market share against healthier products. There are additional actions which may be taken in the form of *deregulations* which can encourage the regeneration of localized markets, such as allowing farmers to obtain new “farm-to-table” USDA food licenses that would grant them the ability to make and sell products from their own yields, a process currently obstructed by multiple bureaucratic impediments like obtaining multiple separate and expensive licenses.

ON MASS-DATA COLLECTION

There are contemporary problems which, though unknown at the time of Adams and Jefferson, can best be understood— and thus solved— by following those basic principles which they left for posterity: the merits of decentralized power and influence and the dignity of the individual. If one is to take these principles to heart, one must thereby realize the extremity of the danger posed by the ever-growing powers of our so-called “big tech” and “big data” institutions. Indeed, one could hardly envision the development of any systems more emblematic of centralization, inequality, and occult opacity than these, nor any set of tools with a greater capacity to be used for the nefarious purposes of tyranny and exploitation. Through the mass collection of behavioral data on individuals through their digital devices— what they read and write, where they go and what they do, what they buy and *when* they do all of these things— vast information stores are collected which may then be fed to complex, self-modifying algorithms, purposed to uncover correlations within the data. Algorithms designed for catering product and media recommendation to consumers, through a process of 'machine learning', constantly refine their own parameters in order to better match the preferences of the user based on the behavioral correlations of himself and of similarly-classified others.

The use-cases of this sort of process, however, go far beyond the seemingly innocuous recommendations of songs and products. What we are witnessing is a sort of human-algorithm enmeshing; as human behavior continues to “train” the algorithm, conversely the algorithm begins to train the human— inherent to the process is that

human behavior becomes both an input and an output. Besides the concerns over the unpredictable run-away effects of such a self-perpetuating process, there is the real possibility of inputs being fed into the cycle by the few who have access to, and control over, these algorithms— that directives issued by these controllers can be purposefully placed in order to modify human behavior on a massive scale. Through the mass quantization of human behavior and the concentration of this immense store of data in a few powerful hands, we face the risk that humanity be divided into two distinct classes: the engineered and the engineers. Rather than the traditional way of exacting a system of total and centralized control through a monopoly on violent force, those who today control the information capital can sway entire populations through subtle manipulation of their interactions with the now all-pervasive digital mediums. Engineers can decide how events are perceived by selecting which information will be propagated and which will be suppressed, and even tailor propagandistic messages to be effective on certain types of individuals. The very thoughts and concerns of a person's mind may be implanted from without to best serve the goals of some influence peddler or another— there can be nothing more adverse to that spirit of individualism and moral responsibility necessary for republic than this.

To condemn the technologies themselves through which this process occurs is unnecessary. One should not be tricked into believing that the data-collection regimen which they propagate is in any way integral to the basic functions for which they are used in the first place. Whilst developers will claim their data collection is for the stated purpose of “improving user experience”, in reality it is collected for the purpose of selling off to data brokers who deal in human behavioral data, buying it from and selling it off to private institutions and government agencies alike. Indeed, this is how our government bypasses certain restrictions placed on their own data collection, simply buying it from these brokers. Every startup website, application, even home appliances and car manufacturers, all seek to collect as much data as possible for the main purpose of selling it off to the brokers as another form of generated income. The largest tech companies, who benefit the most from the data collection, do much of their own in-house, and invest billions into

developing ever more sophisticated algorithmic analysis. The purely physical resources which are needed to accomplish such storage and analysis are immense, requiring vast server farms and data storage facilities, and a great deal of raw computing power to sift through the trillions of bytes of data constantly being collected and transcribed. Access to these data stores and the algorithms used to sift meaningful correlations from it are thus the privilege of a tech-elite, who use the sophisticated market analysis insights gleaned from them in order to easily outcompete any competition which might arise to their firms, further centralizing the markets over time. Because digital technology currently touches almost every consumer market there is, this is a worrying development, as it may mean the development of monopolistic powers on a level not previously seen. Even more ominous than the purely economic implications are the socio-political ones, as highly centralized power has been given the ability to not only influence public opinion on a given issue, but to actually frame the very issues which the discourse consists of. While it is true that “traditional” forms of mass media also hold this capacity, these are much more easily identifiable as individual entities and thus easier for the citizen to consciously be aware of their bias and specific agenda. In the case of algorithmic consensus shaping, by contrast, one might be shown a flood of posts about a topic coming from all manner of seemingly unconnected individuals, which are unknowingly selected for propagation based on the agreeableness of their message to some certain design. The user thinks he is witnessing an outpouring of grassroots opinion, in reality there is a hidden selection mechanism crafting his experience. Because of the automatic algorithmic nature of the current toolset available to the large tech firms, little manual intervention is needed. Someone could, theoretically, input into a computer a set of behaviors and attitudes that they would prefer the public to exhibit, and the algorithm, taking these parameters as an end goal, would set off attempting to influence the masses in the best way it can— a “best” which is constantly improving as the process is continually refined. This is merely one example of many tactics which may be employed by someone who wishes to shape a consensus, made possible only by the particular nature of digital technologies.

How, if possible, are these worrying developments to be stopped? First, one must recognize the obvious fact that the entire process depends on the initial data collection itself. If this first step is interrupted, the whole process becomes impossible. Without the mass of data, the algorithms have nothing to analyze, and the capacity to socially engineer humanity through digital mediums is dealt a severe blow. The legal basis for an opposition to mass data collection lies in the Founders' intentions behind the 4th Amendment, and the protection against “unreasonable searches and seizures”. This Article of the Bill of Rights is implicitly a right to privacy— when it was written down, a physical entering and searching of one's home was the way in which someone might “collect data” on an individual. Just as this spirit of general protection of privacy was the basis for later laws related to wiretapping telephones and filming with cameras, we must continue to update our legislation to match technological process and draft new laws that grant firm and unambiguous protection against digital data collection, on the basis that it clearly violates the intentions of the 4th Amendment. It would be a grave mistake to shrug off the threat of mass data collection because of their relatively abstract and impersonal nature when compared to targeted, individual spying, which may seem to be more obviously invasive. On the contrary, it must be made known that it is precisely the massive scale of the current data-collection efforts which makes it such a threat, and swift government intervention is both justified and necessary for putting an end to the practice, if we wish to avoid a future in which humans are reduced to little more than data points in a system of mass control. We reject the idea that some have claimed, that this development is an inescapable outcome, a necessary result of continued technological progress and a sure destiny for humanity. We rather believe that it is a goal pushed towards by certain powerful actors and institutions for their own benefit at the expense of others, and that by restricting their powers this tragedy can be averted.

ON ELECTION REFORM

The greatest danger to the Republican form of government is that the will of the citizenry will be bypassed through the hidden influences of wealthy individuals and special interest groups, taking advantage of a lack of moral fiber in elected officials to promote legislation which benefits themselves at the expense of the nation as a whole. Unfortunately, no-one can deny the reality that this very threat has not only long since taken hold in our country, but has reached such extreme levels that our government looks ever less like a representation of the citizen body than an open-air market for corporations, foreign actors and special interest groups. Ironically, the regulation of “lobbying” practices has probably done more harm than good, in that it gives the practice an appearance of a real “industry” and a plausible respectability. No-one could argue in good faith that “lobbying” is a real line of work, or something with any productive benefit for the common good whatsoever. Why should the American people allow it? An outright ban on lobbying is not really achievable, for the actual act of “lobbying” is really nothing more in practice than two individuals talking to one another, something which can hardly be regulated. No, to put an end to the corrupting influence of special interest advocates over legislators, the only solution is to strike at the method by which benefits are provided to the latter. Our country has already banned the obvious methods of bribery such as outright gifts or cash payments, but the lobbyist still has at his disposal the contribution of campaign funds, and the promises of future employment, usually consisting of a phony position set up for the ex-official to collect a substantial paycheck. Thus our current regulations only force the

cash bribes to be channeled through political action committees or delayed until the person is out of office, doing little to stop the practice. After all, the nation's capital is still swarming with lobbyists, and politicians consistently seem to get wealthier from their time during and after office. Unlike the two major parties collecting money out of this arrangement, the ANUP will not pretend to turn a blind eye to this practice, but will use every available means to root it out. For one, all businesses and corporations must be barred from making political donations. There is no valid reason from the standpoint of the national interest to allow corporate sponsorship of political campaigns. While the law *does* currently prohibit corporations directly funding political campaigns, it is simple for any corporation to route the money through a PAC, or Political Action Committee, a simple and easily performed step which makes the whole process perfectly legal. This loophole must be closed by disallowing corporations to form or donate to PACs, ideally solved by a constitutional amendment which will give congress the ability to restrict political donations, setting up a standardized distributed system of public campaign financing which neutralizes the advantages of the wealthiest.

Another quite astonishing situation which undermines the integrity of our government is that of our admittance of dual-citizenship in the United States. Currently there is no law which prohibits dual-citizens from running in elections or holding public office— in fact, these persons are not even required to disclose their dual-citizenship status. The threat that this poses to our Republic should be imminently obvious. Divided national loyalties can only result in conflicts of interest when foreign policy decisions must be made regarding the countries of origin in question. The fact that legislators, judges and other public officials have no requirement to disclose their possibly contradictory loyalties when making policy decisions or legal judgements is a critical breach of the trust of the American people. Who is to say that certain people in our government might not even have a question of *divided* loyalty, but are simply put into their positions by their home countries in order to advance those countries' interests? This possibility becomes all the more threatening when one considers the financial and other power that a nation state might bring to bear in order to assist their

agent in reaching positions of power- a power much greater than any individual or small organization could ever hope to wield. If we wish to continue as a serious nation, the allowance of the dual-citizenship concept must be recognized as a patent absurdity.

ON EDUCATION REFORM

It can hardly be denied that our current system of public education is to be found in a pitiable state. Indeed, it is almost unanimously disliked by students, teachers, and the wider public alike. By almost any metric one cares to employ, we have failed to uphold the educational standards of past generations. Rather than accept this state of decline, we should make every available effort to strive for increases in performance and results in succeeding generations. But what standard are we to look to? For, the trend of legislation in recent decades has been towards greater standardization of method, and a particular focus on test results in math, science, and literacy; these efforts have not only been ineffective but harmful, and must be abandoned. We should, in order to take proper stock of the situation, examine our basic principles and assumptions about education, determine where we have strayed, and correct our course. In order to judge the effectiveness of our educational model, we must first of all clearly determine what the goals of schooling actually should be, as the current vagueness on this point has only resulted in a lack of direction, and a colossal waste of time and resources.

What, then, are the goals of education? Why does anyone go to school? To sufficiently answer this question, we must recognize that there exist distinctly separate kinds of education, formulated for entirely different goals and thus requiring the employment of different means. In fact, we propose that it is largely this confusion between different species of education that has led to lack of clarity in our goals, and thus an indecisiveness in the means employed—Americans seem to think that the purpose of going to school is the

same for everyone, and that it is to “get a job”, or to “get smarter”, things which schooling can not indeed accomplish, looking at the matter simply and directly. When holding confused notions about what schooling actually can accomplish, legislators are surely doomed to go on inventing more harmful and ineffective reforms. Of course it is known that schooling does not increase actual intellectual ability of the pupil to any significant degree, this being more or less ingrained at birth, or at least in early childhood development, thus we do not go to school to “get smarter”. Also, our schools have never been meant as, and never could be, vocational training centers. To say that schooling is meant for “getting a job” is only a recognition of the fact that universities and companies prefer students with higher grades and test scores, and has no bearing on the curriculum itself. One cannot base a program of education reform on increasing the “job-getting” efficiency of schools, as this amounts to reform designed to simply raise grades and test scores. Yet, the best schools and the best jobs will always prefer the high end of the distribution, one can not change this fact by attempts to raise grades across the board. Despite the obvious inconsistency, this is exactly the principle of thinking behind many of the greatest legislative failures in recent times. We hear about the failure of our education system always in terms of grades and test scores, and other quantifiable statistics which are compared across the nations of the world, and the discussion around education has become so narrowly focused on these quanta that it seems the scores and grades themselves have become the ultimate care of the system, rather than the knowledge which those grades are supposed to represent.

So what *can* schooling accomplish? While one cannot increase the intellectual ability through education, one can inform it and refine it. That is, the pupil can be taught *what* to think and *how* to think. These two aims correspond, admittedly with significant overlap, to two forms of education, each with a different origin, purpose, and set of means. The former, education that deals in *what* to think, is the system of mass education developed in the modern era, usually compulsory and free, which aims to bring up the youth of a nation with a core body of cultural, linguistic, historical, economic, and civic knowledge, allowing for the continuity of a

common national identity among the citizenry and a general level of competence required for the challenges of civic and economic life. We will call this the *general civic education*. Wilhelm von Humboldt, an 18th century Prussian philosopher, linguist, and educator who contributed much to the development of this type of mass education, justified it as follows: “There are undeniably certain kinds of knowledge that must be of a general nature and, more importantly, a certain cultivation of the mind and character that nobody can afford to be without. People obviously cannot be good craftworkers, merchants, soldiers or businessmen unless, regardless of their occupation, they are good, upstanding and—according to their condition— well-informed beings and citizens. If this basis is laid through schooling, vocational skills are easily acquired later on, and a person is always free to move from one occupation to another, as so often happens in life.” Our own Thomas Jefferson comes to similar conclusions when he advocated for a public system, describing its purpose as “To give to every citizen the information he needs for the transaction of his own business, to enable him to calculate for himself, and to express and preserve his ideas, his contracts and his accounts in writing. To improve, by reading, his morals and faculties. To understand his duties to his neighbors and country, and to discharge with competence the functions confided to him by either. To know his rights, to exercise with order and justice those he retains, to choose with discretion the fiduciary he delegates, and to notice their conduct with diligence, with candor and judgement, and in general, to observe with intelligence and faithfulness all the social relations under which he shall be placed.” One is struck by the similarity of both writers in advocating very practical purposes to education, for the benefit of the individual and the broader society. Does our current system show signs of sufficient success in this regard? A cursory look at the state of the country, with a citizenry mostly ignorant of cultural and historical context under which our Republic exists, a large portion of whom being functionally illiterate, would have us say “no”. A look at our own educational history shows that we once were succeeding in the above goals, however. Literacy was generally found to be at a higher level among a greater percentage of the population, the average American knew drastically more

geography than today and could name a wealth of historical events from both world and American history, something one would be hard-pressed to elicit from today's students. What went wrong? There are, of course, many possible factors, and here we can only be concerned with the part played by government policy, which surely can not receive all of the blame. Recognizing this, however, we must also admit that educational reform efforts undertaken in recent decades have indeed been abysmal failures. In an attempt to force standardization of results across the board and bring up the lowest performing segments of the student body, legislators first pushed on teachers and administrations a compulsory focus on standardized testing preparation with No Child Left Behind, and next came a narrow standardization of methodology in the Common Core reforms. The first punished teachers for gaps in student ability that are beyond their control, and resulted in many reluctantly changing their curriculum to a focus on short-term memorization and throw-away "test prep" knowledge rather than comprehensive understanding. The second was a takeover the highly individualized student-teacher relationship by standardized methodology from distant bureaucrats, a measure which has been highly unpopular with students, teachers, and parents alike. The first step towards education reform is thus doing away with harmful legislation, allowing teachers to impart knowledge rather than be drill-instructors for standardized testing, and allowing them a greater degree of freedom in method.

We have mentioned also a different type of education: the education concerned with teaching not only *what*, but *how* to think. This is what we generally refer to today as the liberal arts education. A liberal arts education can contain all of the subjects of the general education, yet in greater breadth and depth, along with the arts, social sciences, and philosophy. The liberal arts education is the oldest form of a comprehensive education, stretching back to antiquity, yet has always been reserved for a relative few. This is because, rather than being a systemized and universal form of general education, it was always meant as an education for those who were destined to be leaders. Through the various subjects, the pupil was to develop critical thinking, decision making capabilities, sound judgement and rhetorical skills in speaking and writing.

Americans today have a strange relationship with the liberal arts education. On the one hand, many think of liberal arts as synonymous with college education, yet truly this is far too late in life to begin embarking on a true course of this type, and if a student is to receive it, instruction should start well before the age of ten. On the other hand, reformers have tried to introduce principles of this kind of education into the general school system, and this has actually been one of the main drivers behind the loss of core knowledge amongst students of recent generations, as rote memorization of facts was deemed less important than the development of critical thinking skills (despite that a traditional liberal arts education nevertheless contains a great deal of rote memorization in the early stages). The problem with these efforts is that the development of these skills is only applicable to a relative few who have the ability and interest to benefit from them, and attempting to teach it to the broader mass who have no intellectual predilections is a waste of time and resources that could be instead used to develop their repository of core knowledge, and the basic math and literacy skills which are currently in such need of support. The few of elite ability also derive no benefit from these efforts, as the version of liberal arts education they are served is necessarily diluted to the point of ineffectiveness, being made to be applicable to the lowest common denominator. Instead of trying to force diluted elements of a liberal arts education into the general education, all students would be much better served by a tiered school system, in which the majority receive the general civic education and the elite few of intellectual ability (students *and* teachers) are placed into the advanced liberal arts programs. Currently, only the privileged students of wealthy and connected families have access to the comprehensive liberal arts education through insular and exorbitantly expensive private academies, a situation which strengthens the maladies of nepotism and constrains the benefits of meritocracy. A publicly funded, tiered school system is the only way to ensure that the best and brightest of the youth, no matter their economic background, receive that education which will allow them to reach their full potential, this in turn being of greater benefit to the nation as a whole.

A FINAL NOTE

The the idea of Americanism sold to us today is in actual fact a completely different picture than the one painted by our founders. What are we told that America represents by our current media and institutions? Or rather, what are we shown? For, it is easy enough for our politicians and figureheads to spout the safe slogan of “life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness” for rhetorical effect, but their actions reveal a more concrete picture. We are shown that the United States is nothing but an open-air marketplace, in which every seat in congress and judge’s bench is for sale. Our politicians and media personnel are handed a list of talking points by their corporate donors, and then have the shamelessness to present these points to their constituents as if they are of the utmost moral imperative! Does anyone who possesses any sense really believe that the massive overreach of the government during recent years has been done only as a necessary evil, out of real concern for the people’s welfare? It is clear that corporate entities, billionaires, and other parties of influence now set the course of the government, and indeed our government has been so intertwined with the wealthiest, internationalist class of actors that we would not be far from the mark in calling our present system an oligarchy. Let it be known, too, that those who are propelled to a position of leadership in a society cast an influence down over the masses, and so the example of sell-out politicians who act as shamelessly self-serving tools of finance and capital has had the disastrous effect of corrupting the moral fiber of the entire nation.

The ideals of the National Union must stand in complete and total opposition to those which are fixed in place by our current

ruling class. We must, for the inspiration of our own ideals, look to those which animated the great struggle which resulted in the birth of our nation, the virtues of *Republicanism*. A republic is a nation ordered by the rule of law, and requires for its continuation and success a great *quality* of citizenry, that is, the cultivation of human virtue. Thus, we proclaim the values of the ANUP to be individual human quality and value as against the reign of quantity and human belittlement; freedom and self-determination of decentralized polities as against centralized control; and the classical virtues of prudence, justice, courage and temperance as against the current warped and selfish “virtues” engendered by our society dominated by finance and greed. All of the main points of the ANUP party program are informed by these core values, and further, every member of the ANUP should strive to the utmost of his or her ability to embody and promote these values.

