## **Editorial**

## Toward a Community of Principle

The year 2000 has been declared by the Roman Catholic Church to be a Year of Jubilee, in which the debts of the world's poorest should be forgiven. While this is a worthy cause, it still falls short of what is required to reverse the collapse of civilization today. What is urgently demanded is the revival of a Community of Principle among nations, along the lines that this concept was elaborated by American Secretary of State John Quincy Adams in the 19th century, and by American statesman Lyndon LaRouche today.

LaRouche outlines this principle at some length in his recent *Storm over Asia* videotape, which is must-viewing for all serious strategic thinkers in this period of history. The idea, in short summary, was presented by LaRouche as follows:

"Our interest is to bring into being on this planet, a hegemonic community of perfectly sovereign nation-state republics, which share that commitment to defense of the general welfare, which is the cornerstone of our Federal Constitution; that these nations, which must each be perfectly sovereign—we want no empire, we want no hegemony, we want alliances of the sort which occur only between nation-states which agree that the idea of a community of perfectly sovereign nation-states, is the fundamental interest of each and all."

Were you ever taught about this policy in American history books? Of course not. It is the unfortunate truth that the concepts of the American System of economics, and the corresponding foreign policy ideas of a Community of Principle, have been wiped out of our schools, by those who have been committed to reversing our best republican tradition.

Quincy Adams's formulation of the Community of Principle policy was developed in direct opposition to what the British Empire was proposing in the 1820s. British Prime Minister George Canning had at that time proposed an "alliance" with the young United States, allegedly in the joint interest of defending the states of South America from reconquest by Spain, France, or others. In fact, Canning's proposal would turn the United States into a "cockboat in the wake of a British

man 'o war," Adams said in a memo to President James Monroe, because the United States did not have the military might to defend the sovereignty of the newly emerging republics of South America.

More important, however, Adams wrote, was the fact that the United States did not share a "community of principle" with Great Britain. What that meant, in short, is that the republican system and commitment of the United States was in fundamental disagreement with the imperial, oligarchical system and commitment of Great Britain. And that two such antagonistic systems could not be expected to work together to a common end.

In the particular situation of South America, Quincy Adams was right on the mark. Great Britain's interest in South America was to prevent the development of independent, sovereign industrial republics—as the subsequent history of coups, wars, and imperial financial maneuvers amply demonstrates. The United States, on the other hand, was totally committed to developing such republics, and collaborating with them.

Quincy Adams's policy was continued by Presidents Lincoln, Garfield, McKinley, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, and, to some extent during his short term in office, John Kennedy. Rather than looking for wars, and international enemies, they all sought to forge economic ties for mutual growth and development, all the while respecting the sovereignty of the other nations involved.

It is this policy that must be revived today. That will mean scuttling the International Monetary Fund policy of beggaring thy neighbor. It will mean dumping geopolitics and supranational interventions. It means returning to the fundamental principle which lies behind the Community of Principle: respect for every human being as made in the image and likeness of the Creator. It will mean building sovereign nation-states which can defend the right of all their inhabitants to be treated with the dignity they are due.

This is the fight to be waged, and won, in order to have a truly Happy New Year.

80 Editorial EIR January 7, 2000