

Editorial

The question of sovereignty

In a message from India upon being notified of the 79-1 Senate approval of U.S. support for Great Britain against Argentina, and of Secretary Haig's official commitment of the U.S. government to the British cause, *EIR* founder Lyndon H. LaRouche stated:

"This humiliation has been meant by our enemies, the British monarchy, to reduce us to a second-rate, quasi-bankrupt country deploying its military against nations of the developing world in defense of British colonial interests. As I have outlined, America's policy toward the developing world ought to be part of a 'grand design' for the industrial, technological, and scientific development of the formerly colonial world. . . . Either the American people rally on behalf of the Founding Fathers' cause in building this nation, or the American people shall have tragically lost their moral fitness to survive. Let us help rally them."

Senator Jesse Helms, Republican of North Carolina, was the other American leader to speak on behalf of reason. Addressing the Senate on the evening of April 29, the Agriculture Committee Chairman and Chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee's Subcommittee on Latin America stated: "What we face is the possibility of severe strains to the inter-American system as a result of the dispatch of the British fleet to the Western Hemisphere. U.S. diplomacy has failed by allowing even a highly regarded European ally to display force in the South Atlantic, thereby polarizing the Americas. . . ."

"Britain's intervention in the Western Hemisphere in 1832-33 violated the Monroe Doctrine, which had been specifically proclaimed to contravene intervention from Imperial Russia in Alaska, and from the British, French, and Spanish Empires in Latin America and the Caribbean. The British presence in the Falklands was thus, historically, an anomaly. . . . Legalistic interpretations of the [Rio] Treaty will be of little avail in preventing most of the nations of the Americas, left and right, from

unifying against British imperialism.

"Should that happen, then the U.S. could find itself isolated from its hemispheric allies as a result of its failure to deter Britain from its show of force.

"Having failed to prevent the crisis from developing, the U.S. should act to reconcile our two allies. Can Britain's claim to a colonial outpost 8,000 miles from London be upheld in the face of the overwhelming trend against colonialism? . . ."

"The British claim to these islands in 1832-33 was without foundation. The seizure not only was a violation of international law prevailing at the time . . . but it was a violation of the no-transfer principle of the Monroe Doctrine. . . ."

"We had been presented with a Gulf of Tonkin-like resolution without the benefit of careful study and reflection on our obligations. . . . Fortunately, major changes [in the Biden Resolution] have been made [at Helms's behest—ed.]."

"There have been those that have argued that our obligations to NATO come first. . . . It is my belief that the NATO treaty related to wars in the European theater—wars of Communist aggression. For years, it has been generally held that the NATO boundaries are limited to the North Atlantic down to the Tropic of Cancer. . . ."

"I am not at all persuaded that the NATO treaty can be invoked as a rationalization for legal support of Britain in the crisis. . . . The principal objective for the U.S. at this time is to promote a peaceful resolution of this crisis. The only solution to the matter would be one which recognizes the underlying sovereignty of Argentina to the Malvinas Islands. We must insist that both sides cool off and proceed with direct face-to-face negotiations on substantive matters. . . ."

"My position is certainly not anti-British; rather, I have tried to view this issue on purely a basis of historical fact and our true national-security interests. I cannot allow my affection and respect for Prime Minister Thatcher to obscure the reality of the matter. The stakes are too high. . . ."