

EIRSpecialReport

The British Empire: a menace to peace

by Nancy Spannaus, Contributing Editor

Not since the Suez crisis of 1956 has there been a local conflict that was not immediately attributable in the Western propaganda mills as a case of communist subversion or aggression. Soviet presence in Southeast Asia, the Middle East, and Africa—not to mention on the borders of their own state, like Afghanistan and Poland—has made it possible for the official interpreters, East and West, to define conflicts in those areas as part of the primordial fight between communism and capitalism. The fact that the Malvinas (a.k.a. Falkland Islands) crisis breaks this pattern offers significant hope that the actual causal principle behind world strategic conflict may finally become addressed in day-to-day political life.

There can be no question in the mind of anyone informed by historical fact that the Malvinas have been held by the British as a colonial outpost in blatant violation of 1) the United States commitment in the Monroe Doctrine against European colonial expansion in the Western Hemisphere; and 2) U.N. resolutions mandating decolonialization. Yet the British are determined to assert their imperial rights contrary to international law. British imperialism has been caught red-handed in a strategy for world domination that could escalate rapidly into the kind of superpower tensions that would lead to World War III.

The British, who worked behind the scenes to detonate World War I and World War II as limited wars of depopulation, but saw them run out of control, now are visible to all as the detonators of a crisis that could become the third world war by miscalculation.

Trigger for World War III?

Reviewing quickly the way the Malvinas crisis could explode, as our founding editor Lyndon LaRouche has done in previous issues, we can identify three crucial ways it will exacerbate the war danger:

1) If the British succeed in blackmailing or cajoling the United States into backing its colonial prerogative through the Malvinas caper, this will



This U.S. cartoon, published during the 1895 British-Venezuelan dispute over territory in "British" Guyana, is captioned: "Cornering Him: Little Venezuela: "Yah! You big bullies! You daren't go over that fence!" England and Germany (together): "All right, young man, we can wait!"

win the United States not only the enmity of all the Latin American nations, but the general hostility of the Third World which will correctly see the United States, and other European nations who are going along with the British, as enforcers for the looting policy of Britain and its allied international financial institutions.

2) Such a U.S. role would be a de facto surrender of the principle of national sovereignty, as delineated in the Monroe Doctrine and the U.S. Constitution. The further weakening of this principle, which includes the responsibility of nation states to provide for the economic development of their peoples, both in the United States and the rest of the world, will strengthen the power of the supranational institutions who look toward a Malthusian order of famine and conflict.

3) Since neither the Soviet Union, nor a large number of Third World nations can, or will, submit to such supranational dicta, the U.S. alliance with Britain will lead to expanded openings for the Soviet Union in the developing sector, and rapidly to geopolitical confrontation that could easily lead to war.

As clearly as the British imperialists are exposed as provoking war in the dangerous crisis over the Malvinas, however, is the American System alternative to that devastation provided.

The power of the American System

Scratch any oligarch, either from Britain or the continental families, and he or she will not be shy in identifying the American republican commitment to the

idea of progress as the chief obstacle to their total domination of world finance and politics. The quotes of Lord Bertrand Russell which we reprint below give some flavor of the attitude. More recently, that outlook was taken up as official policy by the New York Council on Foreign Relations in its *Project for the 1980s* series of policy papers. While elaborating the policy of "controlled disintegration of the world economy" as the preferred goal for this decade, the authors singled out the "neo-mercantilists" like Alexander Hamilton as, along with certain Marxists, the chief enemies of their supranationalist outlook.

Thanks to the butchery of American history by the British "intellectuals," most Americans—emphatically including our President—do not understand the fundamentals of the conflict between the American System and the British System, much less the fact that it is still the basis for the dramatic world crisis today. The American Revolution, waged as an international war by committed republicans worldwide, was based on the scientifically provable fact that a society based on a landed nobility, the primacy of fixed natural resources as wealth, and the workforce as productive cattle (or sheep) to be milked, had to lead to a regime of constant war, disease, and famine. To counter such an oligarchical regime, best represented at that time by the British monarchy, Hamilton, Franklin, and Washington established a constitutional republic committed to fostering mass education, city building, and continuous technological progress.

No nation before had ever attempted to accomplish what the Americans set out to do. Yet despite its relative isolation, and continuous attempts of the British to splinter the country through sectional warfare in particular, the United States was phenomenally successful. Its dirigist system of protection for manufactures, its national bank, its fostering of the development of the population's mental and moral powers, and its encouragement of scientific and technological progress led the United States to be the model for development for Germany, Japan, Russia, and the bulk of Latin American nations. No one in the pre-Civil War period would question the assertion of Henry Carey, Lincoln's chief economic adviser, that the fundamental fight in the world was between the American System of "universal peace" and industry and the British System "slavery and war."

The foreign policy of the United States during the first 100 years was based on the knowledge that the survival of the American System required its expansion against the imperialists. It was not sufficient for the United States to merely build up its independent strength, and certainly not to build it up by laying claim to the natural resources of other nations, as Great Britain and the other empires did continuously. What was necessary was an expansion of trade and commercial relations that contributed to the most rapid increase in well-being and industrial capability of all the countries involved. The American System recognized the benefit in the increased enrichment of other nations through technological progress and urbanization because such progress increased the wealth of the world overall—in direct contrast to the imperial view of competition for scarce resources. The American System rejoiced in the creation of strong sovereign nations committed to industrial progress; Great Britain and her oligarchial allies committed every resource to destroy them.

One of the nodal points in defining this American System outlook was the Monroe Doctrine of 1823. Although erased from the memory of most Americans, the Doctrine is remembered in certain Latin American nations as proceeding from a positive commitment to national sovereignty against the British. It is also remembered clearly in Great Britain, from the standpoint of being an obstacle to the commitments Her Majesty wishes the United States to honor.

The basic form of opposition which Britain has to the Monroe Doctrine is to insist that supranational commitments of the United States—either to the United Nations or to its NATO spinoff—supersede the United States's commitment as a sovereign nation to protect other sovereign nation states. Dressed up in moralistic disguise, this is the same argument that Britain used throughout the 19th century to maintain as many of its

police powers as possible. Presuming that one nation's increase in wealth must always proceed at the expense of another's, and probably at the expense of its territory as well, the British demand the national prerogatives of development must always give way to the strongest power. Whereas this power was the British Empire directly in the last three centuries, it has usually been wielded through the international financial institutions today.

There is no basis for providing equitable means of development for all the nations of the world without the guarantee of protection for sovereign nation states, guaranteed to have their own means, especially national credit, to build up their own human and industrial resources. The Monroe Doctrine as a commitment to protecting national sovereignty therefore must take precedence over any general dictum against use of force, or other Aristotelian legalisms. Without a base of sovereign nation states, there can be no just international order.

The new imperialists

It would be tragic if the world were not to take this opportunity of exposure of the British imperialists to remove their power once and for all. By taking aim at the hulking British fleet, the whole slew of evil oligarchial powers which stand behind it can be knocked off as well.

As our review of the extant British empire elaborates, the power of Great Britain is virtually identical with the invisible hand of Adam Smith. Control of raw-materials markets, control of insurance ratings through the pacesetter Lloyds of London, control over credit creation in the offshore free-enterprise zones or through the financial police organizations like the International Monetary Fund and World Bank—these are the kinds of power London exerts. And there are many who are allied with, or work through, London in this current imperial adventure, like the Swiss, Venetian, and Hapsburgian oligarchs, who are anxious that British refrain from the crass use of force, and rely instead on the behind-the-scenes manipulations that have served their cause so well. Others see in Britain's new imperial adventure the opportunity to shake out the monetary system, and consolidate more control, especially in Switzerland.

It is this financial oligarchy, so fanatically committed to their looting policy that they will risk World War III, that must be challenged fundamentally in the weeks ahead. Oligarchic economics—the source of British geopolitics and imperialism—is the cause of the world's motion towards war. A new world monetary system based on the common commitment of sovereign republics to industrial progress—a worldwide Monroe Doctrine, if you will—can wipe it out for good.