

EIR Special Report

U.S. Central America policy: Bring back the Monroe Doctrine!

by Susan Welsh

At an international conference near Washington, D.C. Nov. 24-25, the Schiller Institute called for the new Reagan administration to take up the 1823 Monroe Doctrine of John Quincy Adams as the basis for a thorough revamping of United States foreign policy. That doctrine formed the foundation for a community of principle between the nations of North and South America, and for excluding marauding European colonial powers from the affairs of the hemisphere. Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr., in his speech to the conference, declared that the Monroe Doctrine must now be expanded in scope, to include the republics of Europe, and those nations of Africa and Asia that are aspiring to free themselves from the last vestiges of colonialism.

"This must not be misinterpreted," LaRouche cautioned; "it does not mean, and should not be misunderstood to mean, a kind of imperial domination exercised by the United States. It must be a pact of friendship and alliance among republics which are each fully equal in respect to their sovereignty in all matters of economic and political life. Among the ranks of its friends, the United States must never aspire to anything more than the status of first among equals."

The Schiller Institute's conference was attended by nearly 2,000 people from 50 countries, and their aim was to shape the policy of the new Reagan administration at a time when the grip of Henry Kissinger and the Eastern Establishment over the presidency had been weakened by the overwhelming mandate which the President received on election day. "The United States of 1776 is not yet fully awakened," said LaRouche, "but forces within our government and among our citizens are sitting up and rubbing their eyes."

Subsequent panels at the conference, including those presentations which we highlight in this *Special Report*, took up the question of how this kind of transformation is to be achieved.

The urgency of this intervention is most clearly seen in the fast-moving developments around the Central America crisis. On Nov. 11, Defense Secretary Caspar Weinberger had issued warnings to Nicaragua, the Soviet Union, and its allies, invoking the Monroe Doctrine in reference to the threatened introduction of "of-



NSIPS/Philip Ulanowsky

The Schiller Institute is challenging the Reagan administration to relaunch the original conception of the Monroe Doctrine to deal with the crisis in Central America. This is a far cry from the gunboat diplomacy for debt collection advocated and practiced by Teddy Roosevelt, Henry Kissinger, and the International Monetary Fund. It would put U.S. relations with the other countries of the hemisphere on a new and positive footing. Here, Fernando Quijano addresses the panel on Central America at the Schiller Institute's conference.

fensive" weapons in Nicaragua by the Soviet Union. This hint at a U.S. military intervention was precisely the misunderstood notion of the Monroe Doctrine that LaRouche warned about in his speech two weeks later. Were the United States to launch an invasion of Nicaragua, it would merely play into the hands of Soviet strategic designs, leading to a withdrawal of American troops from Western Europe, as Henry Kissinger and his friends at Georgetown University's Center for Strategic and International Studies have demanded. In addition, every nation in Ibero-America would turn against the United States as a neo-colonialist threat to its own sovereignty, and would view this country as a marcher lord for the International Monetary Fund and the New York, Swiss, and London banks.

After the Schiller Institute's conference, an open fight over Central American policy broke out within the administration. Weinberger publicly attacked those State Department officials who are seeking to embroil the United States in a Vietnam-style military quagmire in Nicaragua to the National Press Club on Nov. 28 (see article, page 56), the defense secretary carefully delineated the conditions under which a military action would occur. "The President will not allow our military forces to creep—or be drawn gradually—into a combat role in Central America or any other place in the world," he said. "And indeed our policy is designed to prevent the need for direct American involvement."

The Schiller Institute conference's panel on Central America was the principal forum for discussion of expanding the Monroe Doctrine. Fernando Quijano, Executive Committee member of the Ibero-American Labor Committees,

laid out the historical background of the doctrine, its basis in natural law, and the way it could be implemented today.

The economic policy of the United States toward the Third World, he said, represents a flagrant violation and betrayal of the Monroe Doctrine. The Ibero-American debt is now \$350 billion—a result of the high-interest-rate policies of the U.S. Federal Reserve and the International Monetary Fund's austerity measures, which the U.S. State Department and the Treasury have fully supported. The result has been the most unabashed colonialist looting the world has ever seen.

Quijano traced the thinking behind this to Teddy Roosevelt, whose "corollary" to the Monroe Doctrine stipulated that the United States could intervene in Ibero-America to enforce debt-collection. Roosevelt, like the British whom he emulated, was a thorough-going racist, who called the Ibero-Americans "Dagoes," because they were "unruly" and incapable of maintaining order. This is the ideology of Henry Kissinger and company today.

Debt, natural law, and the Monroe Doctrine

We continue with major excerpts from Mr. Quijano's subsequent discussion of debt, natural law, and the Monroe Doctrine.

The year is 1823, and the British Empire and the Holy Alliance are determined that the oligarchical system should not be further challenged by the formation of more constitutional republics modeled on the young United States. The Holy

Alliance wishes to deploy on behalf of Ferdinand VII of Spain and retake the formerly Spanish colonies in the New World. The British, more intelligently, wish to establish their pre-dominance over Ibero-America through a neo-colonial system of trade and loans, by offering an alternative to the Holy Alliance—the Holy Alliance that they had helped create, still coordinated in every conceivable machination, and were still a part of! The United States wisely does not fall for the trap of siding with Britain against the “bad” imperialists; instead, it issues the Monroe Doctrine on Dec. 2, 1823. It reads: “The American continents by the free and independent condition which they have assumed and maintain, are henceforth not to be considered as subject for future colonization by any European power. . . . It is impossible that the Allied powers should extend their political system to any portion of either continent [North and South America—F.Q.]

gering our peace and happiness; nor can anyone believe that our southern brethren, if left to themselves, would adopt it of their own accord.” The author of the Monroe Doctrine, Secretary of State John Quincy Adams, had made clear even before this declaration that “the whole system of modern colonization was an abuse of government, and it was time that it should come to an end.” . . .

The Monroe Doctrine rests completely on the fundamental concepts of natural law and cannot be separated in any manner from the doctrine that went into the founding of the United States: George Washington, in his farewell address of 1796, stated: “Observe good faith and justice toward all nations. Cultivate peace and harmony with all. Religion and morality enjoin this conduct; and can it be, that good policy does not equally enjoin it? It will be worthy of a free, enlightened, and, at no distant period, a great nation, to give to mankind the magnanimous and too novel example of a people always guided by an exalted justice and benevolence.” Washington, wanting to take no part in the oligarchical conflicts that were wrenching Europe, stated in the same address: “Europe has a set of primary interests, which to us have none, or a very remote relation. Hence, therefore, it must be unwise in us to implicate ourselves, by artificial ties, in the ordinary vicissitudes of her politics. . . .”

The Monroe Doctrine evoked rage and anger in oligarchical Europe. Metternich, the idol and role-model of Henry Kissinger, stated: “In their indecent declarations they have cast blame and scorn on the institutions of Europe . . . in permitting themselves these unprovoked attacks, in fostering revolutions wherever they show themselves, in regretting those which have failed, in extending a helping hand to those which seem to prosper, they lend strength to the apostles of sedition, and reanimate the courage of every conspirator. If this flood of evil doctrines and pernicious examples should extend over the whole of America, what would become . . . of that conservative system which has saved Europe from complete dissolution?” Canning was more succinct but not less enraged: “We cannot acknowledge the right of any power

to *proclaim* such a principle; much less to bind other countries to the observance of it”! Kissinger is still enraged by it! . . .

Henry Kissinger and Teddy Roosevelt

The Monroe Doctrine, in its opposition to all form of colonialism and neo-colonialism, is being blatantly violated by Kissinger and by the U.S. government when they endorse the usurious debt collection of the likes of Paul Volcker, the IMF, and the New York, British, and Swiss bankers. That usury is colonialist! What is being implemented today is the Roosevelt corollary to the Monroe Doctrine, which is what Kissinger in his Central American Commission report bases himself on. The Teddy Roosevelt corollary stated that the United States had the right to intervene militarily in Ibero-America in order to re-establish order in cases of chaos and to ensure that the Ibero-American countries paid their debts to their European creditors! What did this have to do with the Monroe Doctrine, you wonder? Very little. Nevertheless, the argument went on to state that if an Ibero-American country did not pay its debts, then the European powers would be forced to intervene militarily and would reluctantly end up occupying the country in order to ensure “financial responsibility.” That obviously would violate the Monroe Doctrine, so better if the United States itself intervened militarily to collect the debt! Not only was Teddy Roosevelt failing to keep European oligarchical imperialist practices out of the New World; he was putting the United States at the service of those very practices—a violation of every principle enunciated by the founding fathers of the United States, contained in the U.S. Constitution, and expressed with total clarity in the Monroe Doctrine.

With no hesitancy in following the British example, Teddy Roosevelt’s corollary was implemented on numerous occasions: While the British had gone into Egypt to restore “financial responsibility” and ended up staying 70 years, the Marines went into Nicaragua in 1909 (no MiGs were found), again in 1912, and pretty much stayed there without interruption until 1933. The Marines went into the Dominican Republic and headed straight for the Treasury, took the gold and shipped it back to the New York bankers, and manned the customs houses in order to collect more. President Wilson, the man whom Jimmy Carter emulated, invaded Veracruz, Mexico in 1914, because the Mexican government and army there refused to raise the U.S. flag and give it a 21-gun salute as a form of an “apology” for an incident that had occurred with U.S. sailors. Examples are unlimited; my time allotted is not.

In counterposition to this, Ibero-America promulgated the Drago Doctrine. Luis Maria Drago, the Argentine foreign minister at the turn of the century, correctly basing himself on the Monroe Doctrine and on Alexander Hamilton, stated unequivocally that force could not be used to collect the debt. The incident that necessitated this pronouncement was the British, German, and Italian shelling and blockading of Ven-

ezuelan ports in retaliation for non-payment of the debt. It was this intervention which the British used to convince Teddy Roosevelt to issue his corollary.

That is, sovereignty cannot be conditioned and forced by individuals. Drago went to state that naturally this meant that all national sovereignties are equal and to be equally treated and respected, regardless of the power at their disposal—a principle which we in the Schiller Institute must insist on, for the violation of the sovereignty of a small and powerless Ibero-American or African country will be used as a precedent by the bankers dictating terms to the most powerful of sovereign states—the United States.

Today, the principles of the Monroe Doctrine are represented by Lyndon H. LaRouche. Not only has he demanded the implementation of that doctrine in the case of the Malvinas, but he has gone on to create an economic doctrine that would end colonialism once and for all—Operation Juárez. In all fairness, it must be mentioned here that U.S. Sen. Jesse Helms also called for the implementation of the Monroe Doctrine in the case of the Malvinas, but he has not been very clear on the issue of its violation by usurious debt collection.

The implementation of the doctrine

Now, the question is how do we apply the Monroe Doctrine in Central America? The answer is simple, the United States and Ibero-America must apply it *fully*. As the Monroe Doctrine states clearly, there can be no choosing between the “bad” imperialists and the “civilized colonialists,” between the Russian Empire and the Anglo-Swiss-American financial oligarchy. Both represent a deadly threat to the sovereignty, security, and continued existence of Ibero-America and the United States.

How do we prevent Russian MiGs from being installed? The MiGs could not have been introduced to Nicaragua if the State Department and National Security Council (NSC) of the United States had not consciously sabotaged the efforts to have a peace treaty signed between the Central American countries and the Contadora group in October. That protocol, which Nicaragua signed, prohibited the future introduction of weapons of that nature into Central America. Instead of the NSC gleefully leaking documents showing how successful it was in blocking the Contadora Treaty, it and the rest of the U.S. government should quickly rush to remove the U.S. impediments to the signing of that treaty, which would clear the way for the signing of it by the rest of the Central American countries—we probably still have time to stop the introduction of MiGs (and F-5s) in Central America if that procedure is followed. In fact, given the fact that the Contadora Group in its efforts for peace (Colombia, Mexico, Venezuela, and Panama) base themselves on their constitutions and the best tradition of inter-American law, documents which are coherent with and doctrines that are based on the Monroe Doctrine, the Drago Doctrine, and the LaRouche economic doctrine, I propose that the Schiller Institute give its full

support to the Contadora peace effort. If Contadora succeeds, we will have no MiGs.

Above all, if we are to guarantee the implementation of the Monroe Doctrine, we, the Schiller Institute, must prevent the military intervention of the United States into Central America. Kissinger has already declared Central America an area of “vital interest” to the United States, just like Britain had once declared Antwerp. In short, Kissinger wants the United States to abandon “moral precepts” and to apply British Hobbesian diplomacy through a military intervention into Central America. Meanwhile the Socialist International—in particular the German Social Democracy of Willy Brandt, et al., which today represents, with the Greenies, those old German imperial interests of the 19th and 20th centuries—is continuing the policy it has had since 1978, that of promoting as many provocations as possible by the Sandinistas and other juvenile delinquents in Central America. The Social Democrats are allied in this policy with the Russian Empire and the Jesuits with their liberation theology. This policy is not new—it has been tried before. Let me quote the Mexican foreign minister in 1912:

“I have received news from trustworthy sources, according to which Germany is pushing the United States to intervene militarily in Mexico with the purpose of tying the United States down to a prolonged war and thus making them the object of hatred throughout all of Latin America. While the United States would be stuck in this trap, Germany would try to present itself as the savior to the Latin American countries, and would begin colonizations and annexations in Latin America.”

That is the policy of the Russian Empire and the Social Democrats today. It is the policy of Kissinger—and no one knows for sure where his British Hobbesianism ends and his Marxist Hobbesianism begins. Kissinger just recently stated that he and Socialist International creature Olof Palme agree on Central America! It is a policy that is intended to decouple Western Europe from the United States—which again is the policy of Kissinger, the Socialist International, and the Soviets. And it is a policy that would cause such turmoil in the United States that the Strategic Defense Initiative, or “Star Wars” program, of the Reagan presidency would most likely perish. And again it is the Soviets, the Socialist International, and Kissinger who have publicly opposed the SDI. Therefore I think that it is a must that the Schiller Institute take the action necessary to banish Kissinger from every position of influence throughout the world, that he be declared *persona non grata* everywhere. I also think it essential that the same treatment be accorded the Socialist International.

To end, I would like to read an epigram by Schiller, “Dignity of Man”:

Stop now, I beg you. Stop talking. Let's feed him,
provide him with shelter. Once Adam is clad, dignity
comes by itself.