

A BETTER FUTURE: A THEORY

Ricardo Beas -- August 2012

"I spent 33 years and four months in active military service and during that period I spent most of my time as a high class muscle man for Big Business, for Wall Street and the bankers. In short, I was a racketeer, a gangster for capitalism. I helped make Mexico and especially Tampico safe for American oil interests in 1914. I helped make Haiti and Cuba a decent place for the National City Bank boys to collect revenues in. I helped in the raping of half a dozen Central American republics for the benefit of Wall Street.

I helped purify Nicaragua for the International Banking House of Brown Brothers in 1902-1912. I brought light to the Dominican Republic for the American sugar interests in 1916. I helped make Honduras right for the American fruit companies in 1903. In China in 1927 I helped see to it that Standard Oil went on its way unmolested. Looking back on it, I might have given Al Capone a few hints. The best he could do was to operate his racket in three districts. I operated on three continents." --- War Is A Racket!

--- United States Marine Corps Major General and two time Medal of Honor recipient Smedley D. Butler - Wikipedia

"Progress could not have happened without energy. Perpetual energy will free the world"

-- Ricardo Beas

I recently saw the compelling documentary [The Power Principle](#) and was saddened to see all the suffering that has happened throughout the world in the last century under the color of democratizing other countries. With that in mind I write this blog.

OK, so maybe when I said in my last blog that we could change the world without violence was a stretch, after all, there is probably no example of a despot government and its puppeteers ever leaving power without a fight. Maybe if those in power could be convinced that they can be rich and can continue to be rulers, while at the same time their "subjects" could also be well off financially and in

good health, then maybe they would choose to rule in a fair and just way – everybody happy. Putting the mere pleasure of seeing others suffer aside, the problem is, with all the atrocities many rulers have committed, people that would be liberated might seek justice from its prior oppressors (and there is nothing necessarily wrong with that!). This may be the rulers' fears, that's why they press on with an iron fist (a more subtle one in the USA). So it's difficult to see how a positive change for the whole of humanity can ever take place.

In my prior blog I presented two videos dealing with abundant and renewable energy in the form of [Magnetic Energy](#) and [water/hydrogen](#) powered motors and devices. In India they also introduced compressed air powered cars. If you search the web you will see many examples of these types of more efficient, less expensive, self-sustaining, none polluting systems, but yet, they never really get off the ground, in fact we don't even hear much about them in the media (maybe just an “oh, look at that,” never to hear about it again in future news coverage), especially when it happens overseas.

The energy industry is big, lucrative and influential and it is used as a powerful way to control people and nations. Because of this I believe that renewable/unlimited energy can be the liberating agent for the world, but obviously many other things would need to be addressed and changed in order to accomplish complete individual freedom.

Probably the first thing that needs to be corrected is the misleading idea and movement behind Globalization. For two or three decades there has been an increased push to unit the world through binding international/UN agreements under the logic that we now live in a very connected world and that we need to work together if the world is to survive. Yet, after the 2008 global financial crash and resulting crisis, including that of the Eurozone, we have clearly seen that when such connectivity exists, especially in a financial sense, that the troubles of one country can pull the rest of the world with it.

In a recent article by the Associated Press it states that the global economy is in the worst shape since 2009, noting that *"economies around the world have never been so tightly linked, which means that as one region weakens, others do, too... For now, few foresee another global recession. But there is little margin of error: Unemployment is already at recession levels in Europe and the United States."*

(Note: if unemployment is at recession levels, then we are in a recession, [Newspeak](#) not withstanding)

By the way, let me clarify something: Yes, we should all unite in the world for a mutual agreement regarding peace, freedom, choice of religion, reduction of pollution and contamination, helping people in need, etc., etc., but when you give such powers to enforce these ideals (or under the color of these ideals) to a few countries (US, UK, Russia, France, etc.) or even worse, to a single international entity, like the United Nations, we are risking falling into the corruption that absolute power brings with it.

What we need is not Globalization, instead with need LOCALIZATION.

So let's come back to renewable energy, let's say magnetic energy. No rocket science behind it, I even thought about it as a perpetual source of energy when I was about 13-15 years old. In a general sense, I envisioned a wheel with magnets in an angle distributed equally. Such wheel would be within another wheel whose magnets would also have the same angle, except that the magnets would be positioned in a way not to attract, but to repel the smaller wheel's magnets, thus creating perpetual rotation of the inner wheel. This in turn would create energy by motion of the motor attached to the inner wheel; and that is pretty much what they have proved to be possible. Another recent example of magnetic energy is the [Japanese magnetic powered motorcycle](#).

In the 80's a friend from Mexico had the same concept for a perpetual magnetic energy generator, something that could be easily adapted to home use, so he designed such a system and submitted two patent applications for such concepts to the United

States Patent Office. They were denied. He submitted a third patent in 2000 and shortly thereafter it was denied. About six months later he received a letter from the U.S. Department of State ordering him to cease and desist to continue submitting patents or to continue to work on any project related to any form of perpetual, magnetic or renewable energy sources of any kind. Shortly thereafter his U.S. border crossing passport was revoked.

What kind of logic is this? Doesn't our government want us to have unlimited energy to free ourselves from foreign energy sources? Could we not be the pioneers of such technology? There are only a few answers that might make sense as to why the patents were denied and my friend was intimidated in that way: If magnetic energy or other similar abundant sources of energy became the primary energy of the future,

1. Thousands of millions of dollars in investments in the petroleum industry would be wiped out. All fuel using devices would be obsolete.
2. Millions of direct and indirect jobs associated with hydrocarbon production and use would be lost. The impacts of those lost wages would impact communities throughout the world.
3. The world economy is based on hydrocarbon energy and therefore many countries would collapse. The transition to magnetic and other forms of inexpensive energies would take decades to develop.
4. The people that own all these industries would lose trillions of dollars. Investments financed by these companies in other fields would disappear.
5. There would no longer be a monopoly of energy production and distribution. All nations would become independent and thus no country would be at the mercy of American, British and International corporations that have been for ages (as noted by Major General Butler) monopolizing many countries' resources, ruining their lands and oppressing their inhabitants in order to maintain such control.

It is my belief that renewable/perpetual energy can be the door through which we can finally solve the problem of equality, freedom and can give us the ability to enjoy life at its fullest. Here is my theory:

For most of us, we are born to parents that take care of our needs and once we become adults we have to work to survive. In our present global monetary system, our labor (human energy, mental and/or muscle) is converted to money, which we are paid with for such labor. That money is what we use to buy food, clothing, shelter, property, transportation, toiletries, medicines, toys, our recreational necessities, etc. Obviously the more money we spend on these things, the less money we have and the less we can spend on other things.

Based on the above and excluding inherited wealth, it can be argued that wealth mostly comes from human labor, as labor produces the money we need to purchase things. We then subsequently determine how much "labor/money" something is worth.

So, when we speak of poverty, or "lack of resources," what we are really talking about is lack of money to buy such resources.

So, what's energy got to do with it? Here is one example pertaining to food products. Gasoline and diesel are expensive to produce and transport, and you continually need them to power the tractors and machines that work in our fields and farms, and the seeds and resulting crops are transported to their respective users consuming these fuels. These crops are processed by equipment that requires electrical power. Electricity is produced using oil, coal or gas, which also require fuels to generate and transport it. We also need electricity to power all the water pumps, the machines in the factory, the lights of the factory and supermarket, the traffic lights. All the packaging materials will also need to be produced and transported; and employees will use fuels to transport themselves to work. So in every step of producing a final product, from buying seeds to plant to getting a box of cereal in your kitchen in the morning, energy was needed.

Pretty much any sort of product we have has had tens if not hundreds of interventions in different ways were energy was needed in order to make the product available. If you remove the cost of all that fuel that was needed, how much would the cost of the item be reduced? A quarter, one half, 90 percent?

Let's be conservative and say that prices would now be one fifth of the price. If you are earning \$10 an hour on a 40 hour week, you earn gross about \$1,743 a month, remove 25% in the way of taxes and medical insurance, you get \$1,307. Remove \$700 for an apartment and utilities, and you have about \$600 left to spend on everything else that you purchase. Being that we saw that fuel inflates the price of goods, if we remove the fuel cost our \$600 would now buy 5 times more than before and would now be the equivalent of \$3,000. Would that make a difference in your life? And that is not considering that you would not spend any money on gas for your vehicle, large or small.

Of the different things mentioned where we spend our money, there is also a very important one we have to address and that is medical treatment and the resulting suffering and financial devastation that comes from it, especially with life threatening illnesses.

I received an email yesterday asking that all the people that received the email pray for a cure for cancer. The email made me sad and angry. Why? Because there already are cures for cancer, but these treatments are discredited and their inventors and users attacked to conceal them from the public and discourage others from following such natural, non-invasive and safe alternatives. Examples include French scientist [Rene Quinton](#) and his sea water treatment, [Royal Raymond Rife's](#) microscope and resulting sound frequency treatment, [Harry Hoxsey's](#) cancer therapy, [Dr. Stanislaw R. Burzynski's](#) antineoplastons and many others, as well as numerous homeopathic treatments proven to cure most serious illnesses, such as [Laetrile](#), [vitamins C](#) and [D](#), [alkaline treatments](#), [MMS](#), [DMSO](#), etc.

Like with carbon based fuels, with the size of the medical and medical related industries, some would probably also argue that if the above inexpensive, often unpatentable and toxic-free medical

treatments noted above would take the place of orthodox medicine that it would also results in billions of dollars taken away from the economy and millions of jobs lost.

These types of fears are unsubstantiated and unjustified. Such conversions to new energy sources and more homeopathic medical treatments are not only easy to put in place, but would help to make everything more accessible to everyone. And there would be a transition period that would help accomplish this in an orderly manner, to everyone's benefit.

For those of you who saw the Zeitgeist saga and the third film, [Zeitgeist: Moving Forward](#), it outlines an excellent strategy for localized independent communities taking maximum advantage of their resources by developing self-sustaining community centers, cities that produce their own energy and personal needs, while also trading with other such communities, all managed via a Global Resource Management System, which would enable the best yields, distribution and usage of these products, all by taking advantage of the best technologies, which would also reduce labor.

According to the documentary, physical participation of individuals to run these communities would be minimal, concluding that people would gladly work to help sustain such empowering community, especially when work hours could be substantially reduced due to such technology and management.

The overall ideal behind the Zeitgeist plan is a good one, but it would take us back to a globally centralized system. It would be better instead to have a Global Resources Tracking System, one maintaining information of all global resources (all by voluntary participation of each unit, with no consequences to those that do not), as well as data on all the means of production surrounding them, making all these data available to all, furthering opportunities for trade, instead of arbitrarily distributing such resources for financial or political reasons and for the benefit of those that could control such a system.

By the way, in Zeitgeist they speak about individual energy sources for each community unit, but it would be far better if each home

was independently generating their own energy, such as using a perpetual home magnetic power generator, with a back up from a community power system.

Localization is the concept of control of activity, production and self determination at the smallest level of communal human interaction. Being that power corrupts and absolute power corrupts absolutely, and that human beings have the capacity and potential of exploiting each other, the smaller and more independent the self-sustaining social entity is, the greater ability that entity's individual members will have to control their fate: their customs, resources, development and their ultimate accomplishments and overall way of life.

What if that community does not like blacks, or gays, or Christians? I don't see a problem with that (regardless of me disagreeing with any particular view), if they wish to live in seclusion, they should be allowed to do so. No, they can't send all the black in the world to an island, but they sure can move to an island and live there in a way that makes them happy.

What if you don't agree with their view? Well, just don't visit there, how difficult is that? No need to protest their views. No reason to hate those that may hate us (it may just be that they don't agree with us, not necessarily hate us), if anything, if we think we are right, then all we should do is feel sorry for them ... and wish them well. Is that not the Christ principle? Who are we to save anyone?

We can all learn from other nations and their ways of life, but no one should compel others to adapt to a way of life not acceptable to them. And who would not want the best things in life?

As to the individual communities, such social structures would demand the least amount of government intervention. It would not be a one government entity, like an executive branch, creating 100 different agencies and these in turn creating further governmental or quasi-governmental bodies. These existing types of entities once given some "thing" to regulate, then they start wasting all their resources on how to regulate such thing and their related activities, while charging high fees and issuing citations and fines for non-

compliance to their rules, which overburdens society with unnecessary regulations that make it difficult to survive in this ever more expensive world and in turn limits innovation and thus prosperity for all.

There should only be one role of government and that is to ensure that everyone has a right to freedom and happiness and that everyone be allowed to exercise their will as long as it does not harm others.

Yes, to have a city building department, which issues recommendations on how to build safer homes, to inspect properties and rate them for their conformity to those standards, would be great, but it would not be OK for that department, through police force, to have a home demolished because the owner is so poor that all he could put together was somecardboards, tires and used wood to create a shack in a small property that became accessible to him in Tijuana, Mexico. He is safer in that shack than he would be without a home. Or for the city to fine you and make you tear down the room you made out of your garage without a permit so a relative with limited resources could comfortably live there. All the homeless living in the canyons of San Diego, CA, what codes are they breaking by simply trying to survive?

Here is another example. Another friend of mine (no, I'm not making up friends, I just have some pretty smart ones) developed a small water system that can be used to reclaim the water used in your home, making it potable. It's very inexpensive to build and requires minimum servicing. It would reclaim the water from the shower and your washing machine (no toilet or garbage disposal discharges) and the resulting water discharge could be either reintroduced into the home for normal consumption as well as be used for all gardening needs.

My friend wanted to patent his invention so he invited me to participate and I did all the research, contacting local and state agencies and also surfing the web. As it turns out, there are others that have developed similar systems but this one could be patented for its uniqueness. The problem was, no local agency will let you use it or would issue you a permit for it and might even give you a fine

for using it and would make you remove it (and if you don't remove it, they would probably arrest you).

The denial to operate such systems came down to (1) the agency can't prove that the water is safe consistently, and (2) even if you use it for gardening, if the runoff could get into the drain it might contaminate the water (yes, the clear, clean and refreshing water that every day runs down our sewers).

After trying hard for a while what finally made me give up on the project was that I spoke to a gentleman that had a similar system and had participated in government meetings to get it approved and he told me flat out that he had spent a million dollars already and it would never be allowed, giving me all the details to substantiate such claim.

Imagine the impact of such systems on our present water needs? Good for us, but bad for those who control, sell and ration the water and those who regulate it. How sad it that? Is that how we want government to protect us? Not me.

This idea of minimum government intervention is also the basis for the roots of Anarchy. Contrary to the modern definition of what anarchy is, that of mayhem and lawlessness, the word simply refers to the idea that groups of rulers should not decide the faith of or exploit the people under them. Prince Peter Kropotkin of Russia (1842-1921) explained it this way:

Either the State for ever, crushing individual and local life, taking over in all fields of human activity, bringing with it its wars and its domestic struggles for power, its palace revolutions which only replace one tyrant by another, and inevitably at the end of this development there is ... death! Or the destruction of States, and new life starting again in thousands of centers on the principle of the lively initiative of the individual and groups and that of free agreement. The choice lies with you!

These ideal was expressed in the [Spanish Syndicalism](#) movement, where businesses where reorganized to have a company with no bosses. When that happened, surprisingly [profits increased by over half](#). Also not surprising, the movement was crushed. Syndicalism represents a viable alternative to our present economic system, so long as it allows for other types of systems to operate if others which to follow them (in other words, no protests against those that choose other paths to achieve their prosperity).

What can we do, individually or as a group of concerned global citizens? Here are some suggestions:

1. Rescind all existing international agreements that do not conform to the specific authority granted by the U.S. Constitution, nor to the principles established therein.
2. Reorganize federal institutions that are catering to private interests that prohibit or obstruct the development, commercialization and usage of alternate means of energy and alternative medical treatments. Such private ventures should only be prosecuted if actual damage to other individuals is established. Government officials proven to have acted in a way that resulted in the concealing and blocking of technologies and medical cures from the public to be criminally prosecuted for crimes against humanity.
3. Transition to inexpensive perpetual and renewable sources of energy.
4. Develop a focus on sustainability not on a global, but in a localized manner, developing all necessary and available resources based on the unique attributes of such individual geographical locations.
5. Establish organizations to manage charitable funds for assistance and advancement of other groups, at local and global levels. No strings attached, not to be repaid. Such organizations will ensure that such charity is used for the intended original purpose. No more than 10% of such funds will be used for administrative expenses.

6. Develop and encourage new structures of corporations based on full employee ownership on the model envisioned in syndicalism. Such majority of employees to decide the direction of the company, yet all employees required to participate. All other forms of business entities to continue to operate as they are. It's up to the people to decide what works better for them.

7. Educate the masses on a jury's right to Jury nullification, where a jury not only determines the facts of a case, but also the law and its fairness and has a right to find anyone not guilty of a crime if it deems it morally appropriate. All judges to instruct the jury of their right to Jury Nullification. Any judge prohibiting the defense or any other person from introducing to the jury their right to jury nullification to be stripped of their authority and be criminally prosecuted for treason to his/her oath of office and therefore the Constitution of the United States, which require him/her to be fair and partial in the administration of justice. Also, said judge to forfeit retroactively any and all income and wages derived from his/her time serving as a judge.

8. Go back to the traditional function of the grand jury, to criminally and civilly bring action against government employees that abuse or take advantage of their authority.

9. No congressman, senator or their staff to meet privately and/or in secret with any representative of any business or organization for purpose of discussing any introduction or changes to laws. All such meetings to be held in public accessible areas and all such discussions to be tape recorded and available for review by any member of the public.

10. No legislation to be considered or passed without providing sufficient review time to study such proposed document by other members of both houses, the media and the public. All proposed documents to be made available via the Internet. All such documents to contain a summary, in layman's terms, listing (1) any and all parts of a proposed law that may affect individual liberties, how and to what extent, and (2) the names of individuals, business, organizations or any other legal entity that will benefit from such legislature, how and to what extent.

11. A proposed legislation to be limited in scope to issues associated directly with it only. For example, a bill on health care cannot contain a provision to fund a war effort. Mixed legislation of this kind to be null and void and without effect.

12. Technologies that go against the production of natural organic and healthy products of consumption to be discouraged, if not prohibited.

13. All items produced to be manufactured in a way to allow for easy and inexpensive upgrades, as well as minimizing the expense of maintaining such things in operating condition (like ink for printers, cartridges should be easy to refill with large containers of inexpensive ink).

These are just some of the ideas that come to mind. Do you have any?

By the way, do you want to know what Major General Butler recommended to destroy the international war racket?

"1. Making war unprofitable. Butler suggests that the owners of capital should be "conscripted" (compelled into military service) before other citizens are: "It can be smashed effectively only by taking the profit out of war. The only way to smash this racket is to conscript capital and industry and labor before the nation's manhood can be conscripted. ... Let the officers and the directors and the high-powered executives of our armament factories and our steel companies and our munitions makers and our ship-builders and our airplane builders and the manufacturers of all other things that provide profit in war time as well as the bankers and the speculators, be conscripted — to get \$30 a month, the same wage as the lads in the trenches get"

2. Acts of war to be decided by those who fight it. He also suggests a limited plebiscite to determine if the war is to be fought. Eligible to vote would be those who risk death on the front lines.

3. Limitation of militaries to self-defense. For the United States, Butler recommends that the navy be limited, by law, to

within 200 miles of the coastline, and the army restricted to the territorial limits of the country, ensuring that war, if fought, can never be one of aggression." From Wikipedia.

So, all we need to do now is move in the direction noted above, because the direction we are following now, by global consensus, will only lead us, unfortunately, to further deterioration of our freedom to enjoy life at its fullest.

Best wishes to all.