On July 20, on the eve of the Okinawa meeting of the Group of Eight nations, a call issued by the “Ad Hoc Committee for a New Bretton Woods” appeared as a paid advertisement in two of Germany’s major dailies, Die Welt and the Frankfurter Rundschau, accompanied by the names of more than 90 of its leading endorsers. It had been published one day earlier in the London-based Al-Arab International. These were the opening shots in an international advertisement campaign on behalf of economist and American Presidential pre-candidate Lyndon LaRouche’s proposed convening of a New Bretton Woods conference.

The call, signed by hundreds of high-ranking personalities worldwide, had, however, been rejected by another of the major German papers, the Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung (FAZ), on “principled grounds,” according to manager Jochen Becker.

Advertisement Text

It was undoubtedly the content of the Committee’s advertisement, as well as the impressive nature of the signers, that grated on the FAZ, whose economics-page editor is a prize-winning devotee of the theories of anti-government economist Friedrich von Hayek. The ad begins: “The governments of the G-7 nations have repeatedly demonstrated their unwillingness and inability to prevent the threatened collapse of the global financial system, through a prompt and thorough reorganization of the system. This renders it urgently necessary that those in all countries who recognize the devastating consequences of a systemic financial crisis, raise their voices. “We, the signers, refer to Lyndon LaRouche as the economist, worldwide, who has analyzed the causes of the systemic crisis in greatest depth, and for the longest time, and who, at the same time, has elaborated a complete package of measures to be taken to overcome it: the anti-crisis program for a New Bretton Woods.”

The ad text cites a resolution pending before the European Parliament, which details a number of measures necessary to establish a New Bretton Woods.

Signatories

Of the hundreds of signers, there are dozens of former members of government, including two former Presidents of their countries—Mexico’s Jose Lopez Portillo and Uganda’s Godfrey Binaisa. In addition, at least 41 Members of Parliament, most of them currently serving, have put their names on the list as members of the Ad Hoc Committee. The largest proportion of these M.P.’s come from Eastern European nations, which have found the experience of the deregulated “free market” to be totally destructive of their industry and living standards.

In addition, many leading intellectuals from the nations of Europe, East and West, as well as some from other continents, have joined the Ad Hoc Committee.

In the United States, the largest portion of the more than 230 public figures who have joined the Ad Hoc Committee are elected officials, most on the state or municipal level. Forty-five current or former state legislative officials are on board, and 76 other elected officials. On the national level, four former Congressmen and one former Senator, Sen. Eugene McCarthy, have urged the formation of a New Bretton Woods System.

On April 15-17 conference in Port Said, Egypt, dedicated to the subject of “The New Silk Road and Its Impact on Egyptian Interests,” included substantial discussion of the Eurasian Land-Bridge proposal put forward by Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr. The conference was sponsored by the Center for Asian Studies of the Faculty of Economics and Political Science at Cairo University, and its proceedings will be published in Arabic.

Conference discussion centered on the question of rebuilding the historic Silk Road with modern technologies, including linking Asia and Europe through transportation networks and development corridors.

Perhaps of greatest interest was the address by Sidqi Abdin on “Europe and the New Silk Road.” Abdin contrasted LaRouche’s approach, with its outreach across the continent, and the European Delors Plan, which was confined to intra-European transport.

“In recent years discussions about
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he wages this fight with a wit and humor that is contagious.

Most people, including most historians, would not necessarily associate Adams with the emergence of the abolitionist movement in America, leaving the field instead to the Lowells, Lawrences, Wendell Phillips, and William Lloyd Garrison. But Adams’ role in shaping the anti-slavery impulse was central, as Miller documents, being, as he was, not only the point man in Congress up until his death in 1848, but the moral reference point for the movement, both during and after his service. After all, it would be the voice of John Quincy Adams that would resonate with Abraham Lincoln and the leaders of the Republican Party, when slavery was finally defeated in this nation two decades later. This would be on a far higher basis than mere abolition, but rather upon those universal principles which this nation had been founded upon, but which had been subverted by the institution of human slavery.

Absolutists North and South

Abolition in America, as much as every other question in this nation’s history, was a battleground for those policies and ideals which represented something truly universal, as opposed to something far less, merely parochial. From the very beginning, this battle over the nation’s character had this quality: Would we as a nation be a republic in form, yet not in substance; would we be nothing more than an ideological vassal of the very British Empire we sought independence from, and thus not really free at all? Slavery itself was a product of this fight, a poison planted upon our shores to foster a love of the very oligarchical and despotic system, “the British system,” as Americans used to understand, that we had made a revolution against.

The opposition to slavery, which had existed with the Founders and continued to mature through the early years of the Republic, itself became a front in this battle, with such abolitionists as Garrison mere pawns of British oligarchical power. For Garrison’s stand, arguing to tear up the Constitution and Declaration, because they “were Covenants with the Slavepower,” was little different from the states’ rights zealots of the slaveholding South, who sought to destroy those same instruments by arguing that they did, in fact, justify the barbaric institution of slavery and the system that created it. In the end, both would destroy this nation, and the republican experiment it represented.

Recognizing that there was not much difference between the absolutists of North and of South, and steering the fight against slavery to more solid ground, was the great contribution of J.Q. Adams in this period. While his voice was raised in opposition, neither of these doctrines of disunion could prevail. What Adams did, which Miller demonstrates brilliantly through his depiction of this period, was to educate the nation in true anti-slavery, making clear that both slavery and its absolutist opponents hated the same thing: the universal principles of the Constitution and Declaration of Independence; and, that this nation was not one of oligarchs, nor were those horrid ideas and institutions which sustained it and slavery, any part of the founding spirit or law of this nation.

Thus, John Quincy Adams was one of those individuals unique in history. He was the indispensable advocate and interpreter of that set of principles which he had not merely been bequeathed by the Revolutionary generation of his parents, but for which he had become one of the proud standardbearers. As a result, he was able, in turn, to shape a generation that produced such as Abraham Lincoln, Frederick Douglass, Thaddeus Stevens, with the ideals and principles both to end the abomination of slavery and to guarantee America’s future. In allowing us to see this—allowing us, in a sense, to stand next to Adams, becoming part of the battle, and therefore to appreciate both this incredible period in our nation’s history and its central figure—Professor Miller has done a great service to us all.

—Fred Henderson