

A War Between Two Systems

On January 4, 1995, Lord William Rees-Mogg, the former chief editor of *The Times of London*, wrote in that newspaper: “It’s the elite who matter; in future, Britain must concentrate on educating the top five percent, on whose success we shall all depend.”

Then, on May 21, 1995, Sir Peregrine Worsthorne continued: “People who argue—and some of the wisest in the land, like William Rees-Mogg, most convincingly do—that the only future for this country, and for the Western world as a whole, is to take a veritable axe to the social services, not excluding those aimed at ameliorating the material condition of the underclass, never seem to spell out, or even to consider, the political price, in terms of loss of freedom, that might have to be paid for such economic realism.” He stressed that “rigorous and sometimes cruel belt-tightening—particularly for the relatively defenseless—will be required.” This may mean “having to fall back on a form of authoritarian politics. . . . Since the pain has to be suffered some time . . . why not get it over quickly. This is very much William Rees-Mogg’s argument, and I can see its strength”

What lies behind these calls, on the part of British policy-spokesmen, for a *fascist* Conservative Revolution dictatorship in the Western world? Ultimately, it is that they reflect the interests and tradition of the Venetian/British oligarchy, a tradition which is literally at war with the *commonwealth*, republican tradition of the American System.

As Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr. has emphasized, the conflict today is the same as that between Churchill and Roosevelt during the World War II period. By heritage, we in the U.S. espouse a different system than the British. Our Federal Constitution represents a commitment to universal education, and to the development of the creative potential of each of our citizens, and the expression of this in opportunities for the use of this creative educational development in society to benefit everyone, both now and in the future.

The British oligarchs are committed by tradition to

the Venetian system, to feudal-like conditions in which ninety-five percent of the population remain suppressed and virtually uneducated, while the privileged five percent run the world.

The conflict between these two systems—republican versus oligarchic—finds its clearest philosophical expression in the historic debate between the outlook and method of the republican Plato, and that of his enemy, the oligarchist Aristotle. The political warfare through which this debate has been fought, has shaped

the last 2,500 years of Western civilization.

In the period ahead, humanity’s future will depend upon whether or not

commonwealth republican forces become sufficiently self-conscious of their heritage, to effectively eliminate—once and for all—the Venetian system and its I.M.F.-dominated “structures of sin.” The present ongoing financial disintegration of the world monetary system makes such action imperative.

This issue of *Fidelio* contains four feature articles, each of which reports on important aspects of this conflict. In interconnected ways, they elaborate themes developed by Lyndon LaRouche in his seminal essay, “How Bertrand Russell Became an Evil Man,” which appeared in our Fall 1994 issue:

- “Venice’s War Against Western Civilization,” by Webster G. Tarpley, summarizes the last 550 years of world history, showing how London became “The New Venice,” and how the “British Empire” has used Venetian methods to exercise control over how people think, especially through its corruption of science.
- “Erasmus of Rotterdam: The Educator’s Educator,” by political prisoner Donald Phau. By embracing the Platonic Christianity of the Church Fathers, and attacking the oligarchy’s Aristotelian method, Erasmus devoted his life to establishing the principle that Classical education was necessary for the ninety-five percent of the population Lord Rees-Mogg would now relegate to the scrap heap.

EDITORIAL

- “The European ‘Enlightenment’ and the Middle Kingdom,” by political prisoner Michael Billington, shows that the battle between the British and the American Systems is not limited to the Western world, but is global in nature. Both during the Eighteenth-century “Enlightenment” and today, the Venetian Party has promoted Taoism and Buddhism—China’s most backward cultural tendencies, as opposed to the scientific tradition of Confucius—as models for oligarchic rule in the West.
- In “The Metaphor of Perspective,” Pierre Beaudry reviews how the founding of the first nation-state *commonwealth* by France’s King Louis XI, was the fruit of the Renaissance idea—provoked by the work of Nicolaus of Cusa—that government has a responsibility to foster scientific progress. The invention of projective geometry, or perspective, which was crucial both to the arts and to industry, was centered in France over the succeeding three-hundred year period.

If the American people do not understand the current world strategic situation from this historical-cultural standpoint, then they will be duped into doing the dirty work of the oligarchical enemy of humanity. As Lyndon LaRouche stressed in his keynote speech to the February 18-19 semi-annual conference of the Schiller Institute: “What we’re doing in fighting against the Conservative Revolution, is mobilizing the American people to understand that this is their enemy, the enemy of more than eighty percent of the American people, if they’d only wake up and find out about it. . . . They are the hired or duped lynch-mob of the Rees-Moggs and the Prince Philips of the world, who are out to destroy the possibility that we might reverse the course of oligarchism, and liberate the revolution that was made over five hundred years ago. We liberate it to bring forth on this planet not Paradise, but to continue the revolution which uplifts the oppressed of the world from the condition of being oppressed, to being participants in a process which engages every human being as a person created *in the image of God.*”

Love

*L*ove therefore—the most beautiful phenomenon in the soul-filled creation, the omnipotent magnet in the spiritual world, the source of devotion and of the most sublime virtue—Love is only the reflection of this single original power, an attraction of the excellent, grounded upon an instantaneous exchange of the personality, a confusion of the beings.

When I hate, so take I something from myself; when I love, so become I so much the richer, by what I love. Forgiveness is the recovery of an alienated property—hatred of man a prolonged suicide; egoism the highest poverty of a created being. . . .

The man who has brought it so far, as to gather up all beauty, greatness, excellence in the small and great of nature and to find the great unity in this manifoldness, has already moved very much nearer to the Divinity. The entire creation dissolves his personality. If each man loved all men, so each individual possessed the world.

The philosophy of our time—I fear—contradicts this theory. Many of our thinking heads have made it their business, to mock this heavenly instinct away from the human soul, to efface the stamp of divinity and to dissolve this energy, this noble enthusiasm in the cold, deadening breath of a pusillanimous indifference. In the slavish feeling of their own degradation, they have resigned themselves to the dangerous enemy of benevolence, self-interest, to explain a phenomenon, which was too godlike for their limited hearts. Out of a scanty egoism they have spun their comfortless theory and have made their own limits into the measure of the Creator—Degenerate slaves, who decry freedom amidst the clang of their chains. . . .

Why should the entire species suffer, if several members despair of their worth?

I admit it frankly; I believe in the reality of an unselfish love. I am lost, if it does not exist, I give up the Divinity, immortality, and virtue. I have no further remaining proof for these hopes, if I cease to believe in love. A spirit, which loves itself alone, is a swimming atom in the immeasurable *empty* space.

—Friedrich Schiller,
from the “Philosophical Letters”