

## KING LEAR LECTURE with Dr. Fred Wills Final Conclusion

That is the point you have to make. You want to know all these rights you were fighting for in the 60's, all you walking about the streets of America, "Give me my rights, my civil rights!" And some ass on [dope] showed up and "I want to exercise my civil rights! It's to get you in the mood where putting everything in a needle in your arm is a right too. Getting AIDS is your right, too. Don't touch the guy. Privacy. He has a right to privacy, you know? Barbarism, everything, right to privacy, you know? That's the mode of Bentham, Bentham was a pederast. He was a pederast. That is why things are as they are and not otherwise. Because education is a question of social control. Mankind is socially controlled by his education. And the oligarchy makes sure that it controls education, curriculum, what you hear and what you see. What you believe. Not only what is reality as you see it, or what is truth or reality is even more important. That's what they do. What you accept as truth or reality. Some of you say, "Look, my church says so, therefore it's true." "My mother says so, therefore it's true." "I remember reading once," or "I remember seeing it in a Three Stooges Movie, therefore it is true," things like that, that's what they do.

And what happens in this play? Here's a kingdom, knights, courtiers, dukes...And then you read how this whole situation gets controlled by Edmund. Chaos results.

**Question:** (from the audience about Edmund) ...In the play he comes on the scene, he's already grown up. Edmund is doing his operations. I had thought of, I mean, who trained him? Did he go, I mean was there some agent who said "Look, here, go back to your homeland, and do this and that."

**Fred Wills:** The play can't deal with the whole life history, right? The play will compress the events for you, so you have to know, you came in a little late, I was telling them the history of the play, the events of the play, the people. The Chronicle of the life of King Lear, see, and in the Domesday Book incidentally, Henry, William the First had written all the property, who owned what, and whose son and all that. So the people in the audience knew what happened. He was brought up in this way, who his father was, how the oligarchy got to this. That's what happened. So, you have to assume that, right? Before the play starts. Don't expect a perfect narration. Shakespeare was sure when he was born, who his mother was, who trained him, then he came along. He will start at a certain juncture and compress events, theatricalize them, and then you got the usual processes of hypothesis formation he used too. But he confused the whole scene! And what I want you to do, is to ask yourself in the end: Why are things as they are and not otherwise? And see if you don't come up with Shakespeare's answer. Because in the final analysis, what happened inconsistent with natural law? Inconsistent with how human beings should intervene in the universe.? And the basis of harmony? Inconsistent with order? That is what happened. Then all this happened. That is what I need you to do. Long enough? Any questions? I have kept you long. Thank you very much.

**QUESTIONS ANSWERED cont'd**

**Question:** about the relevance of Christopher Marlowe's play *The Massacre at Paris*.

**Fred Wills:** How's it relevant? How can I help you?... Marlowe was a gifted fellow, a deliberate conscious agent of, you know, of the republican circles. France had formed the first republic, there were two streams in France. The stream that formed the Dantesque republic in France, the kingdom, you know, the republic, the nation state, and the feudal aristocratic line. Marlowe's friends were from the first, not the second, and the play is in effect saying that the ideal is, that Dudley, and the Marlowes, and Fletchers, Bowmans, and the Shakespeares and what have you, should have a liaison with those in France who were responsible for the Dantesque nation state of Louis the Eleventh, that's what the play's about, see? Anything else?

**Question:** I just have one question. Unless I copied this down wrong, you said that there were three (Platonic questions)

**Fred Wills:** Yeah, and I gave you two. Deliberate. I'll give you the last one, I have to develop it more. I didn't want to give it tonight. There are three, really.

**Question:** Why? (Laughter)

**Fred Wills:** I want you to digest the first question really. Why are things as they are, and not otherwise? You see, every scientist, everybody who believes in science, when you put the problem, that's what, the kind of thing you ask. "Why are things as they are?" And the second, "Have I missed an assumption?" The third...do you know what the Third Law of Thermodynamics is? You know the first two, the third, it's like that... the Third Law is a little bit esoteric. The third Law of Thermodynamics is Nernst's Law, [Walther] N-E-R-N-S-T, a German, dealing with the balance inside the (nervous [neurobiology]) system, axons, it's a little bit esoteric. So I will leave it there for now. The one I want tonight is "Why are things as they are and not otherwise?" So that when you read the play and, see Marlowe's play, or a novel, or a book, and the events occur, you stand back and close the book and ask yourself, "Why are things as they are here?" What to get out of your minds.

Because the same principles in science, drama, poetry, because as Lyn said in the conference, there's no difference between science and art, no distinction really, ask who is of that belief, ah? You know, That's what I mean. "Why are things as they are?" It helps! Anything else? Yes, Matt?

**Question:** (about an academic who drew parallels between King Lear and King James)

**Fred Wills:** Oh, is that the one by the woman, [Lilian] Winstanley? Well, she is a, what I call a pseudo-Platonist. You know what the oligarchy does? Are you Platonic? They'll put a guy like Descartes, you know, they'll put somebody who seems to be on your side, but they are really theirs. And she'll say "All of Shakespeare's plays are allegories, of political import." What is important to educating Englishmen of his time. Then she'll make comparisons of documents, records, to prove points, hmmm? But when you get down to it, she has the nominalisms of Platonism, but her method is Aristotelian. She's well known, Winstanley, and a lot of these producers and directors in Stratford on Avon follow her. They follow her. They follow her and [care] what she said. "Othello is a jealous ass, Lear is a mad old fool."

**Question:** But, I mean in terms of parallels between Henry the Eighth and his one son and daughter...

**Fred Wills:** She draws a parallel between Catherine de Medici and Coligny, she draws that herself, and Rizzio and Bothwell (Mary, Queen of Scots) You see because James's mother, Mary, and his father was Darnley, that's another parallel she draws. She's a well-known critic, see? But the thing same, as you know by now, when you know where a writer is coming from, you're better able to assess, whether their perspective on things is the same. They not gonna let me, a good Platonist, come through! You know? But they let such pseudo-Platonists come through as can make you believe in. Look, I think Leibniz's biggest mistake, as far as I can see, He fell for that. ... Don't go in the ring with these guys! Descartes was sent out to say that the issue was action at distance. Next thing you know Leibniz is arguing (about) action at a distance and ether and all that. And they draw the rules and they have the Madison Square Garden and they're fighting there, the oligarchy does. And she's that. It's like Nahum Tate. Nahum Tate as you know rewrote Shakespeare as 'presentable.' And for a long time up to now, these corrupt texts you find where you can't be certain what is what, Nahum Tate, most of the time, is responsible...you know, things like that. It's an operation.

**Question:** What do you think?

**Fred Wills:** ...I think she deals with some truth, I was attacking her conclusions. I agree with her, that this was a play about how Elizabeth had just died... you your wife a Danish name, James the First, and you have French connections to the French aristocracy... the Scots and all that, that is true. He did that. And then, when you go further...See, I'll put it this way: if you have a murder case in Britain and you murder in Palisades Park, and the same case in America, American lawyer will alibi, "I was never here! I was in Cape Cod." Then you fly in [the evidence] "I was in Palisades Park, but not there." Just in case some witness says "I saw you." See the point? So, you got another truth, and then they twist them. So she did

KING LEAR LECTURE with Dr. Fred Wills Final Conclusion

that with truth. ... I'm in good territory. No problem. So you have to be sufficiently sagacious to see where they are coming from. To understand it like that. And she has the sound of racist, I think, racist, pride ... She will never accept [Robert "Pooley"] Poley (fl 1568 – after 1602) is an ass. I would say Poley is an ass, but she would never say that. I would say [Charles] Lamb is an ass, I think he is, she won't. She thinks she must justify them, even though she disagrees here and there [] The biggest thing they did with Coleridge is to give you the ancient narrative, "In Xanadu did Kublai Khan they had you guys. They say what you wanted, hmm.

**Audience member:** This idea of custom, and the bastard son...Peter Bourne just wrote a book... it's the first biography of [Fidel] Castro that has been written.

**Fred Wills:** Did he say Castro's a bastard? (Laughter)

**Audience member:** No, no, no. He says Castro...yes, he is a bastard. But, in addition to that he says Castro is first a Jesuit, then a Cuban, then a Marxist. And then he goes on...

**Fred Wills:** He missed one. He missed the first one. Lawyer.

**Audience member:** What? (Chatter) Ah, I didn't know it!

**Fred Wills:** Castro's a lawyer, then a Jesuit, then a Cuban... but the most important is he's a lawyer.

**Audience member:** What he actually goes on to say is that, he makes, in the book, I read the synopsis of it, and he goes through this whole thing of how men with ambitious power, like Jesse Jackson, who's also a bastard, like Adolf Hitler was a bastard, and he goes on and on...

**Fred Wills:** But isn't that an empirical inference? 'Well the guy is a bastard and he happens to have power. 'Examine all the famous people in history who were bastards and therefore', ...

**Audience member:** Well, this is Peter Bourne.

**Fred Wills:** I know. What they do is, [] (crosstalk) They call it theories of exclusion. One of theirs is to disorient you. What empiricists do is arrange things to suit what they want. Most of the time they have the conclusion they want beforehand. And they get what data will suit it, then leave the rest out. Hey, I can write a thesis that Henry VIII was a great king, and I can write a thesis he was a bad king. You know? And I'll tell you this: when I was in

## KING LEAR LECTURE with Dr. Fred Wills Final Conclusion

universities in Britain, those empirical bastards... 'Did you see my papers?... I want to get certified, a degree...,' you put what they want you to..."Newton's a great man, Third Law, Second Law, ..." 'Cause I want to get certified. Then they found out everything was malarkey...]