

Editorial

The costs of U.S. lawlessness

What are the consequences when we permit so fundamental a law as the Monroe Doctrine to be violated, as has been permitted in the case of Britain's aggression against Argentina? One of the most serious was pinpointed by *EIR*'s founder Lyndon LaRouche in a May 6 statement: the extension and consolidation of Soviet strategic power in the Middle East.

LaRouche notes that prior to the clash between Britons and Argentines on South Georgia of March 28, which led into the South Atlantic war, a large group of Senators, organized around Senator Symms, were preparing to submit and enact a resolution upholding the Monroe Doctrine. Most among these same Senators were since stampeded into passing a resolution which violates the Monroe Doctrine and commits the United States to support Britain's interests and actions, no matter what.

The Monroe Doctrine has been the public law of the United States, freshly ratified as law by a series of treaties that culminated in the 1947 Treaty of Rio de Janeiro. Under this law, the British committed an act of war against the United States by military aggression against a sovereign state of the Western Hemisphere, and all officials, elected or appointed, who give aid or comfort to Britain in this matter are formally guilty of acts of treason against the United States.

Not only were the Malvinas islands *de jure* and *de facto* territory of the government in Buenos Aires at the time of the Monroe Doctrine's enactment, but the U.S. frigates *Essex* and *Constitution* had swept British naval forces out of the South Atlantic in the course of securing Buenos Aires' claims to the islands.

"Is it not consistent with our toleration of such treason that we now witness the dissolution of the principle of law before our very eyes?" LaRouche asks.

Throughout the past 36 years and longer, relations among the state of the world have been determined by the respective "superpower" status of the United States and Soviet Union. States might agree or disagree with specific policies of one or both, but both superpowers represented a well-defined standpoint of policy and avowed self-interests of those respective

powers. Their predictability and relative consistency has represented the indispensable standpoint of reference for strategic perceptions and foreign policy of all nations of this planet, LaRouche stresses.

Now, unless U.S. toleration of British aggression is reversed quickly, no treaty with the United States is worth the paper it is written on. The cowardly capitulation of most of Washington to British blackmail has created a foreign policy and strategic vacuum. Except to the extent the Soviet Union fills the vacuum created by Secretary of State Haig's policies, the world has been transformed into a jungle.

The Middle East case is exemplary.

If the Gulf petroleum-exporting region is destabilized by spillover of the Khomeini revolution, Western Europe and Japan will collapse economically, strategically, and politically. The crushing of Iraq would create the preconditions for collapse of Kuwait and Saudi Arabia, as well as Defense Minister Sharon's plan for early destruction of Jordan. As LaRouche warns: "The consequences of such developments are beyond calculability."

As the result of its capitulation to Britain in the Malvinas affair, the United States is left with no credible capability but its so-called strategic nuclear deterrent and a growing sense of strategic desperation. Soviet influence not only tends to be sucked into the vacuum Haig has created in Latin America; only the Soviet Union is currently a credible force for stability operations in the Middle East, as Israel's Foreign Minister Shamir recognizes in his own terms. "We, to the extent we have tolerated Henry Kissinger and Al Haig, may have done this to ourselves, but the fact of emerging Soviet influence is unacceptable nonetheless," LaRouche concludes.

"The power and capability of the United States must be immediately restored. We must act now to kick British military forces out of the South Atlantic. Those who oppose such action against Britain are traitors not only by formal standard of public law; they are traitors in substance, acting to throw the defense capabilities of the United States into the ashcan, leaving us no foreign policy means but our thermo-nuclear arsenal."