

LaRouche and the Canal treaties

On Sept. 22, 1977, Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr. issued proposed amendments to the new Panama Canal treaties, which were presented to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on Oct. 12, 1977. Excerpts from the amendments follow.

I propose that the principal substantial and otherwise apparent defects in the signed draft of the treaty be remedied by means of issuance of a new policy doctrine statement, updating the Monroe Doctrine. . . .

There were two elements in the influential thinking of John Quincy Adams behind the Monroe Doctrine. First, there were extensive precedents in United States foreign policy, as notably expressed in preceding treaties for the policy of absolute sovereignty of new American republics. More fundamentally, from the political movement associated with Benjamin Franklin and his collaborators leading into the American Revolution and in the establishment of the United States as a federal republic, the principal issue between the United States and His Majesty's government was American commitment to the realization of technological progress in industrial and agricultural development, in opposition to the British policy, as set forth in Adam Smith's colonialist policy in *The Wealth of Nations*, of keeping England's colonies and competitors in a condition of ruralized labor-intensive relative technological backwardness.

The foreign and domestic policy of the founders of the United States, from the roots of the American Revolution through the election of 1828, was the constitutional principle that the proper basis for government and law of a republic was the development of the wealth and culture of the people through promoting an environment of technological progress in discovery, in the expansion of industry and agriculture, and in the educational and free-press policies of the nation. The establishment of sovereign republics committed to those principles and enjoying the benefits of such principles is the purpose and essence of the establishment of the United States and its order of constitutional law. . . .

In the early successes of the American Republic and in the comparable failure of the French Revolution, a fundamental principle was demonstrated.

In the struggle between Federalist Thomas Paine and other friends of Benjamin Franklin, on the one side of the French Revolution, and in the associates of Robespierre on the other side, the allies of Paine sought to establish France as a republic committed to scientific and technological progress under constitutional principles modeled on the lessons

of the United States experience. The followers of Robespierre's faction, including British agents Danton and Marat, offered an opposite conception, mob democracy. It was the success of the latter faction which produced the hideous Red Terror in France, and led to the Napoleonic period through which British hegemony over Europe was established for most of the 19th century.

This demonstrated that the "American System" works, while the British system, and political forms derived from Rousseau and Bentham's "philosophical radicalism," led to chaos and dictatorship. . . .

Thus, in the United States' treaty relations with Panama, it would be an abomination if such treaties promoted the circumstances under which the internal life of Panama favored atrocities of the sort symbolized by the Red Terror of Danton and Marat in 1792-94 in France. It is the vital self-interest of the United States that its neighboring countries be viable republics, which those nations cannot accomplish without the circumstances favorable to technological progress in the expansion of their industry and agriculture. . . .

In this connection, some critics of the treaty . . . have raised the most relevant criticism that this treaty does not adequately consider Panama's need for a climate of technological progress, of fruitful capital formation in the progress of its industry and agriculture and in the corresponding advancement of the employment and cultural opportunities of its people. This criticism is a valuable one. . . .

Other critics of the signed draft treaty . . . including governments friendly to the United States in this hemisphere, have expressed emphatic concern respecting elements of the treaty which appear, in their estimation, to undermine the principle of sovereignty.

There are two things to be done in response to that criticism.

We must, firstly, emphasize the included principle of the Monroe Doctrine, that the sovereignty of the republics of this hemisphere may be breached only by act of war. . . .

We can significantly mitigate the difficulties involved in two ways. First, we can avow, as a ruling doctrine of United States policy, that the practical features of the current draft treaty with Panama are in no sense a precedent for a doctrine of limited sovereignty. . . . Second, we can respond to the viable criticism of the treaty concerning the internal economic development of Panama. . . .

We must therefore supplement the treaty with measures within our proper means to aid the government of Panama in isolating and otherwise neutralizing the anti-humanist, student-led irrationalist forces in Panama. We must aid Panama in neutralizing and isolating the irrationalist forces of destabilization by arranging economic development programs of the sort which inspire and sustain that quality of humanist outlook for which the American Revolution was fought and the establishment of our federal republic and constitution was effected.