

System created the false appearance that the special monetarist interests of lower Manhattan were the determining feature of national-capitalist self-interests.

Wilson's policy toward Mexico was a direct extension of the pro-monetarist counterrevolution against the U.S. Constitution and associated policies which had been prepared most notably by the preceding actions of the Roosevelt administration and Rockefeller-linked Taft administration. Directly contrary to John Quincy Adams, in particular, contrary to Lincoln, Wilson overthrew the U.S. principled self-interest in the sovereignty of Latin American republics.

Wilson's wretched hypocrisy in connection with Mexico is the proper source of insight into the moralizing of his "Fourteen Points."

What of such precedents as the Texas affair and the Mexican-American War? Taking the character of the 1828-1860 period as a whole into account, there is a double aspect to both affairs. Some will not be pleased by what we must properly say on this account, but truth is truth, however it may offend liberals' prejudices.

The founding perceptions upon which this nation was established were those of the *Idea of Progress*. That means, in practice, that the nature and rights of nations and cultures are not "culturally relativist." We do not regard all cultures and nations as equally deserving of sovereignty or survival. That is not an imperialist policy: it does not specify a policy of U.S. acquisitions of the areas occupied by more backward nations and cultures. It is rather a statement of U.S. national self-interest in the realization of the proper rule of the *Idea of Progress* as a universal, natural law governing the entirety of the human species. Any one who does not recognize such a clear statement of principles in the Declaration of Independence and U.S. Constitution — written, predominantly, by the same set of authors approximately two decades apart in time, must be indeed an illiterate.

Was it then correct for the American branch of European humanist culture to absorb the territories occupied by a miserable, relatively bestial culture of indigenous Americans? Absolutely. Was it correct to absorb Texas and the areas taken in the Mexican-American War? Historically, yes — for the same reason. The only legitimate moral and related policy question in such affairs is how we treated the human beings we were obliged to bring quickly into a successful participation in our more appropriately human levels of culture.

These actions of the pre-1860 period were not only permissible (at least as actions overall) but imperative, because of our adversary relationship, in fact, to

a British power determined to subvert and crush us. The affair of the British agent and U.S. traitor, Aaron Burr, in itself justifies entirely Jefferson's Louisiana Purchase — a point on which Lippmann's analysis is predominantly correct as far as it goes. We had to develop the United States, territorially, as well as in respect of its internal life in areas existing at any time. We could not tolerate the relinquishing of those areas of development contiguous to our existing borders by either colonial powers or by weak, unreliable, nominally-independent states which were inherently the instruments for British-coordinated actions against our vital interests.

However, to the extent that hemispheric neighbors were truly sovereign and viable republics, or struggling against British-controlled forces to become such, it was our duty, as we had means of force or maneuver to accomplish this, to defend the sovereignty of those republics *even against factions which might temporarily gain governmental power in our own nation*.

Neither the policies of the founding fathers nor our own vital national interests to the present day can be separated — as Lippmann attempts to do — from questions of political economy.

Humanism, the body of epistemological development and associated natural law counterposed to both feudalist scholasticism and nominalism, is rooted in the scientific perception of the nature of the absolute difference which separates man from the lower beasts. This humanism subsumes both industrial-capitalist society and socialist modes of extending the capitalist form of extended reproduction. Humanism is rooted in the principle that it is the duty of society to perfect itself, to bring its ideas and willful practice into conformity with universal law. Humanism breaks with scholasticism axiomatically concerning the content of natural law. Scholasticism assumes the natural order to be essentially fixed respecting appropriate knowledge and individual and general conduct. Hence, respecting law, scholasticism sees Roman law, feudal law, common law, and so forth as being properly convergent upon a common set of underlying determining principles. Humanism defines development, society's progress through the realization of scientific discoveries mediated through the creative mental processes of individuals, as the kernel of natural law, and defines the progress of societies to higher orders of technology as the indispensable material complement of providing the cultural conditions for advancing the qualities of the individual.

Although our argument for those principles is significantly better informed than that of the founding fathers, in respect to all essential conclusions for policy what we argue is explicitly stipulated in the Declaration of Independence and Constitution, and

The Case of Walter Lippmann



A Presidential Strategy
by Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.

Campaigner Publications Inc.
University Editions
231 West 29 Street
New York, N.Y. 10001
Editor-in-Chief: Nancy B. Spannaus
Editor: Paul Arnest
Book Designer: Efthalia DeGroot
Book Production: Elizabeth Moriarty and Dana Squires
Cover Designer: Efthalia DeGroot

Copyright 1977 © by Campaigner Publications Inc.
All rights reserved
ISBN 0-918388-06-6

Printed in the United States of America