

of western expansion. In fact it was. Oswald told Jay that Vergennes was trying to sell out the Americans on the Mississippi border issue, and that he should not be trusted. Jay fell into the trap, and convinced John Adams—who merely required confirmation of a suspicion to believe in this conspiracy. The concern of both men to make an American-British “commercial agreement” was a great weakness. The affair put Franklin into a most awkward position, and Vergennes into a defensive posture with the British.

Jay’s assumptions were not founded at all, and Rayneval had been falsely accused without substantiated proof. The diplomatic instructions of the time showed that the accounts of Rayneval’s meeting with Shelburne were not prejudicial to the American cause. Both Jay and Adams had violated their instructions. Even though the French-American pact was not officially broken, as to the letter of the alliance, Jay and Adams were asked to justify their actions before the Congress. Congress deliberated the issue during eight days of Dec. 23-30, 1782, issued a rebuke to their ambassadors, and now proclaimed that the United States would not lay down its arms without the explicit agreement of France.

Because of this British attempt at sabotaging the peace negotiations, the American delegates had held secret meetings with Oswald, and the bargaining situation of both Franklin and Vergennes had been weakened. As a result of the difficulties, Franklin ended up losing his claim over a portion of Canada, and Vergennes was not able to restore Gibraltar to Spain. In the end, the imbroglio caused a permanent chill between Vergennes and the American delegation. Spain finally gave in on the issue of Gibraltar, and the peace was signed in Paris, on Sept. 3, 1783.

One year later, John Jay became Secretary for Foreign Affairs (1784-88) and further dismantled the alliance between the United States and France by blocking the signing of the consular conventions between the two countries, and by declaring that the 1778 treaty with France was no longer valid. In 1788, after the death of Vergennes, Jay told the new French Foreign Minister, the Count de Montmorin, that since, back in 1778, Louis XVI had pledged his support to the United States purely on the basis of giving recognition to the independence of America, then now that America had become independent, there should no longer be a need for a French alliance.

The most vicious aspect of this anti-French posture was to feed the malicious propaganda according to which, the Franco-American alliance was so weak inside the United States, that it would not survive a single day after the independence of the United States had been recognized.

With the events beginning with the execution of Louis XIV in January 1793—an execution which Tom Paine’s belated efforts failed to stop, and which was greeted with horror in America—the “Westphalian” alliance between sovereign France and the sovereign United States was broken. John Jay’s 1795 submission to the Congress of a treaty proposal

with England, signalled that this alliance was finished.

What was lost, for Europe especially—as only a few political leaders such as Franklin and Vergennes would have acknowledged—were the precious and arduous diplomatic efforts embodied in the Peace of Westphalia. The Treaty of Westphalia had played a crucial strategic political and ecumenical role of peace and security for all of the nations and principalities of Europe during a period of a century and a half. As does the American Monroe Doctrine, the Treaty of Westphalia still stands today as a great beacon of security on the dangerous seas of world affairs, and it is only fitting that again, today, we call upon its principle of political benevolence to guard against the mounting dangers of a newly formed Anglo-American Roman Empire of war and domination.

Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.

The ‘Florescence of The United States’

This question about the intellectual tradition of the American Founding Fathers, was asked of Lyndon LaRouche by a student from Brown University, during a Nov. 2 “cadre school” for young campaign organizers and volunteers, held in Pennsylvania. LaRouche’s answer traces the Gottfried Leibniz-Benjamin Franklin connection discussed by author Beaudry, and contrasts it to intellectual problems besetting the Founding Fathers.

Q: Why was there such a huge concentration of intellectuals and heroes, and true Americans centered in time around the founding of our nation? What happened to that? . . . If you could touch on, how the populist mentality affected Jefferson, and things of that nature? And how that sort of brought the degree of heroism down, I would appreciate it.

LaRouche: Well, the florescence of the United States, during the 18th Century, begins with the founding of the Massachusetts Bay Colony, which was an enterprise, largely, of the Winthrop family in the 17th Century, and became a joint effort of the Winthrop and Mather families, into the 18th Century; typified by the case of Cotton Mather. For example, Winthrop was one of the great Classical humanist education teachers of that period. His work in geometry, in scientific education, for that period, is quite notable. The Mathers were extremely important, in terms of educational policy, in that period.

You had a similar development, that occurred in Pennsyl-



Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz (1646-1716) and Benjamin Franklin (1704-89); their connection is the basis for understanding the American Intellectual Tradition.

vania, around Jonathan Logan, who was [William] Penn's man in Pennsylvania. And the University of Pennsylvania is actually an off-shoot of the work of Logan.

Benjamin Franklin's development initially was associated with Cotton Mather, in Boston. And then he fled, and went to Pennsylvania, because what became the Essex Junto crowd in Boston, made things hot for him. And he came under the influence of people such as Jonathan Logan; but it continued his Mather background. Franklin emerged as a leading intellectual scientist of the United States, or America at that time. And became closely involved, especially from the 1760s on, with Europe.

The Debate After Leibniz's Death

Now, the interesting thing about Benjamin Franklin: Franklin was the one who started the Industrial Revolution in England. Franklin, personally, supervised—around the idea of coal, and, in the Midlands of England, the use of canals and coal, to develop to develop the industry—the industrial development of England. And, continued that role. Together with chemists like Joseph Priestly and others, he was the one who sent [James] Watt to Paris, to study under [Antoine] Lavoisier, to develop the Watt steam engine. So, Franklin, at this period, was the organizer of the Industrial Revolution of England—as an American! But he was a member of the British Royal Society, as well.

Franklin was also caught up in something else: In the early part of the 18th Century, there was a great fight in the Americas, between two tendencies. One was the pig tendency, which was the followers of John Locke. John Locke represented what we call today, “shareholder value.” Pro-slavery shareholder value. It was typical of Anglo-Dutch

imperial maritime philosophy, of the Dutch and the British oligarchy.

So, what happened at that point, was that a great debate occurred, after the death of Leibniz, in North America, between the factions of supporters of Leibniz, and [of] Locke. And, in the process, in 1776, under the influence of Franklin, the Declaration of Independence denotes Leibniz's “life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness,” rather than the pro-slavery policy, which was later adopted by the Confederacy, as “life, liberty, and property”; or, what is called “shareholder value” in the Supreme Court today.

So, the conflict was over the nature of man: Romanticism versus Classical tradition. The Classical tradition, in the United States, was fostered from Europe, by a very interesting fellow—Abraham Kästner, one of the great scientific thinkers, and one of the great Classical thinkers, in art, of Germany. Kästner was born in Germany, in 1719. He came from the same group of families that Leibniz came from, from Leipzig, in that period. He was related to the famous banking family of Itzig, which was related to the Mendelssohn family—also of Leipzig. He was also the “doctor-father” of [Gotthold] Lessing, the great dramatist. [It was] Kästner who was dedicated to defending and promoting the ideas of Johann Sebastian Bach and Leibniz, against the Wolfian and other influences in Europe; who organized the German Classical revolution of the late 18th Century.

How the Battle Arose for American Freedom

This German Classical revolution spread into England, through rather a diluted form, of the “Lake Poets” such as Wordsworth, but more specifically, Keats and Shelley, who epitomized the Classical tradition spread, from Germany,

back into England. For example, Shakespeare was [treated as] a piece of garbage, at that point, in England. It was Lessing who, together with his teacher, Kästner, organized the study of Shakespeare and other writers, which created the German Classical dramatic tradition, based in part, on both the Greek Classic and the work of Shakespeare. So, we have Shakespeare, in the English language today, as a result of a German, Kästner, and his student, Lessing, in Germany in that period.

So, this period, from about 1763, is when Europe began to unite in defense of the American colonies' freedom, against the attack on the American colonies by the British monarchy, at the end of the [French and Indian] War between Britain and France. At that point, the British, no longer needing the Americans to deal with France, turned on the Americans, and began to loot us, and destroy our liberties. So, a great struggle over the question of liberties, arose in 1763, on the basis of the British Empire's attack on the rights of the colonists in the Americas.

Franklin became the leader of this; in that period and later, made large, direct connections into Germany. And people from Germany and elsewhere came into the United States—a whole array of them. And the American System was based on Leibniz, the influence of Leibniz and related things; on German Classics, on European Classics, from that period between 1763 and 1789—when the catastrophe struck.

So, we had Jefferson going to pieces, in 1789-90, over the issue of—as all of these leaders, went crazy—over the issue of: What had happened with the French Revolution? Here they thought France, with all its weaknesses (and they were not indifferent), but this friend of ours turns against us, in 1790-1791. They went crazy; Jefferson, in particular, pro-French, went crazy. Later, Abigail Adams went a little bit crazy, became pro-British, though her husband, John Adams, the President, did not quite go that far.

After French Alliance Fell: Carey's Whigs

What happened then, you had this division among populists—for example: The French organized, with some knowledge of Jefferson—Jefferson was never a traitor; Jefferson was a confused man, who made a lot of mistakes; but he was never a traitor, as we saw in the case of the Louisiana Purchase, and things like that. But he was a confused man. Without Benjamin Franklin as his mentor, he was not controllable. He went wild. John Adams became largely disoriented. John Adams was weak, because John Adams had Physiocratic tendencies, which had not enabled him to understand economic issues; though some other issues, he understood very well. John Quincy Adams developed.

It was not until 1812, approximately, when Mathew Carey wrote *The Olive Branch*, summarizing key features—remember, Mathew Carey was designated by Benjamin Franklin as his heir, to the publishing empire of Benjamin Franklin. So, Carey wrote this paper, which became an expanding book, called *The Olive Branch*, in which he said:

The Republican Party—that is, the party of Jefferson—and the Federalist Party, had both decayed; hopelessly, irrecoverably destroyed, internally; self-destroyed, largely by the Essex Junto, and the reaction of the populace. The Essex Junto, the so-called “high Federalists,” or the drug-runners at that point. It became a hopeless problem. The Federalist Party did not really exist any more. It had been fragmented, because of this “high Federalist,” this Junto drug-running crowd, as opposed to the others. The Republican Party was a mess. Jefferson, Madison, were absolute messes. Both were controlled, in large degree, by a British agent: Albert Gallatin. A real pig.

So, in 1812, as this was coming on, you had the emergence of Henry Clay, who was actually a Virginian, but who had settled otherwise; and suddenly, on his election to the Congress, became the Speaker of the House. And this alliance of Clay and Mathew Carey set into motion, what became known as the Whig Party. So the Whig Party's development, of which John Quincy Adams became a part, became the attempt to have an intellectual renaissance in the United States. But then, under the conditions of 1815, the Vienna Congress, the British were our enemies, and continental Europe were our enemies. Again, the same problem: The British reacted, with the Spanish and others, to build up slavery, in the United States, in an attempt to bust up the United States, into a bunch of quarrelling, feudal baronies.

Lincoln defeated that. Lincoln was actually one of the greatest geniuses in our history. A real, genuine genius. Lincoln was shot, because he was a genius. And that was done, to disorient us some more. But, then we had this Whig tradition, which was maintained, cut off—again—by the successful assassination of McKinley, who was not the greatest man in our history, but he was a solid man in his own way, with weaknesses and whatnot, and difficulties.

So, we have a period of the destruction, the real destruction, under Teddy Roosevelt, Woodrow Wilson, [Calvin] Coolidge: The first 30 years of the last century, were largely a catastrophe, a cultural catastrophe, a moral catastrophe, for the United States. Roosevelt, Franklin Roosevelt, in a sense, saved the United States, and created the impetus, which, if continued, could have restored the intellectual tradition.

If I look at some of the best writers of the 1930s and 1940s—historians and others, like Samuel Flagg Bemis, who is not perfect in my view, but is another, highly respectable historian, who influenced Franklin Roosevelt—these fellows were intellectually serious. They represented an approximation, at least, of the kind of intellectual integrity and genius that was shown. But, what Roosevelt did, in using people like Harold Ickes and others, with these great projects, was an example of the great mobilization, remoralization of the American people. If that process had continued in the post-war period, we would, again, have had a great intellectual tradition.

We just haven't had it. My view is, we need it. So, let's create it.