

AMERICAN SYSTEM

Henry Carey: 'Two systems are before the world'

The 1976 inauguration of Jimmy Carter as President ushered the members of the Council on Foreign Relations "Project 1980" into the White House. Since then, on energy, every road to clean, safe, efficient nuclear power has been roadblocked by the Administration and choked with mobs of Schlesinger-encouraged antiprogress environmentalists. On economics, Carter's program for national austerity has been necessitated by the tight-credit, wildly inflationary policies from both the Treasury Secretary and the Federal Reserve. On foreign policy, U.S.-USSR military showdown has become the lawful end of trade wars, import-export restrictions, and raw materials looting from the developing sector. And the glue to hold this national leadership insanity together is Dope, Incorporated, the City of London's worldwide dope business determined to send this nation's population into economic depression "high as a kite."

The Council on Foreign Relations "Project 1980" has absolutely no precedent in the American System. This Dark Ages blueprint stems from only one model: *The British System*.

The conflicting nature of the world views of these two systems is not well known to Americans living in the 20th century. And for that reason this week's American System column presents excerpts from a pamphlet written by Henry

Carey on the difference between the American and the British systems, titled *The Harmony of Interests*.

Henry Carey, one of the foremost economists of the 19th century, joined with Abraham Lincoln to found the Republican Party. Theirs was a political fight to revitalize the national commitment to continue the policies of the Founding Fathers, and especially the industrial development policies launched by Alexander Hamilton, a figure named by the Council of Foreign Relations as an enemy.

"...Two systems are before the world. ... One looks to pauperism, ignorance, depopulation, and barbarism; the other to increasing wealth, comfort, intelligence, combination of action, and civilization. One looks toward universal war; the other to universal peace. One is the English system: the other we may be proud to call the American system, for it is the only one ever devised the tendency of which was that of *elevating* while *equalizing* the condition of man throughout the world.

"Such is the true *mission* of the people of these United States. ... To diffuse intelligence and to promote the cause of morality throughout the world, we are required only to pursue the course that shall diffuse education throughout our own land. ... To improve the political condition of man throughout the world, it is

needed that we ourselves should remain at peace, avoid taxation for the maintenance of fleets and armies, and become rich and prosperous. ... Doing these things, the addition to our population by immigration will speedily rise to millions, and with each and every year the desire for that perfect freedom of trade which results from incorporation within the Union, will be seen to spread and increase in its intensity, leading gradually to the establishment of an empire the most extensive and magnificent the world has yet seen, based upon principles of maintaining peace itself, and strong enough to insist upon the maintenance of peace by others, yet carried on without the aid of fleets, or armies, or taxes, the sales of public lands alone sufficing to pay the expenses of government.

"To establish such an empire—to prove that among the people of the world, whether agriculturists, manufacturers, or merchants, there is perfect harmony of interests, and that the happiness of individuals, as well as the grandeur of nations, is to be promoted by perfect obedience to that greatest of all commands, 'Do unto others as ye would that others should do unto you,'—is the object and will be the result of that mission. Whether that result shall be speedily attained, or whether it shall be postponed to a distant period, will depend greatly upon the men who are charged with the performance of the duties of government. If their movements be governed by that ignorant selfishness which leads to the belief that individuals, party, or national interests are to be promoted by measures tending to the deterioration of the condition of others, it will be late."

—Barbara Gould