

Henry IV, Part II

Dr. Fred Wills: Henry IV, Part II

"Does the end justify the means?" Well, you see, that only, you can only pose that question, it's like the famous question whether honesty is the best policy, you've heard that one? Well, if honesty has to be a policy, then it's not honesty. It should be natural, you know, a natural thing. But any society, any civilization, that has a maxim that says honesty must be the best of policies is a devilish, decrepit, immoral society. It shouldn't be a policy! A deliberate sitting down, "I shall be honest."

So, "ends justifying the means." Shakespeare believes that life is processual, fundamental reality is process. So, the means are as much a reality as the end. They're intertwined. You can't separate them in Aristotelian fashion: Method. Result. Methodology. Ontology. This will produce that. You can't separate them. So, it is ridiculous to argue, according to Shakespeare, that, whatever you're doing will justify your result. And he takes it up in Henry V, when we come to it, because he faces the question, "When is War justified?" You know, when is physical arms justified? When is that ever justified? And he deals with it in Henry V, and I don't want to advance my lecture to Henry V, because there are a lot of beautiful, poetic passages in Henry V, the prologues and the epilogues, and the choruses...So that happened (Gaultree Forest).

Now, what about the comic characters? Oh, by the way...well, I'll tell you about the famous lines in a minute. Falstaff, from the first Henry IV, he's now going to fight in Yorkshire, and he's going to pick up men on the way, but being Falstaff, he had an appointment before - marital relations," and Falstaff turns up at the Battle of Gaultree late. He turns up when John of Lancaster, the royal troops are arresting people, and one stupid knight named Sir John Coville, he's escaping, and Falstaff captures him, says, "Aha." This proves he was in the battle; "I want a reward," you know.

Now, two characters, who I would suggest to you, Falstaff and Prospero, I think are the best, in my view, personally, drawn characterizations by Shakespeare, Prospero in *The Tempest*...no, Caliban, my mistake, Caliban and Falstaff, I thought were the best drawn characters. He uses him to satirize, now this is what Shakespeare does in Henry IV, Part II. He makes him satirize chivalry, this business of "your turn, my turn," you know?

You know, the Battle of Agincourt, as many men died, as in a minor commando raid in World War II. In the whole battle. In 1346, and I think the play refers to it, this is an earlier battle now (the ***Battle of Crécy***), Edward III stood on a hill, while all these Frenchmen came to fight the British, and "The Black Prince" the guy was called, his son, he let him run the army, and they beat up all these Frenchmen, while he stood on a hill. And when you assess its toll, "total victory" says Holinshed, says the count of all the, you check the deaths and captured, it's a fantastic situation. A hundred (English) men haven't died yet. It was a big battle. Well, you may say, they don't have the scientific engines of mass destruction that the modern age has. You could say that. But the point I am making is that...well, you know the point...I don't think I need to explain...

Falstaff turns up, and he's satirizing all this crap, all this chivalry. "I want my reward! I captured Sir John Coville." Of course, they don't want to give them his reward. He writes to describe when they booze, and the whole of the thing now, starts to deal with the satirization of "What is law?" "What is justice?" And what is the relationship between natural law and positive law, positive justice. What is the relationship, for instance, between what is happening to Ed Spannaus and what is happening to Bob Greenberg (LaRouche co-defendants)¹ huh?, in relation to natural law? What is that? And this guy's beautiful, is Shakespeare, He names the two judges Mr. Justice Shallow and Mr. Justice Silence, first thing he does. And believe you me, Shallow is shallow, and Silence ought to be silent. You know? He also, he deals with conscription,² you know, when Falstaff is conscripting people, they won't fight, and you know the names he gives to the conscripts? I got a note here: Mouldy, Shadow, Wart, Feeble, Bullcalf. Now, why is he doing that? He's trying to teach you that nominalism is unimportant. Because the fellow with the most ridiculous name is the brave one, you know, so you can't judge by a name. You can't say, if you're a Republican I suppose, you don't want the successor to Reagan to be Dole, because his name is Dole. You don't want that. Nor do you want to see this be Nunn, because his name is Nunn. Whatever you wish to say about them, you know? And he gives you...should you, how, how, on what basis do you conscript for an army? And is personal loyalty the best method of picking allegiance? Or is financial reward? Or is it donatives?³ What you get afterwards?

Because, you see, this is important. The Roman Empire ended up with a Praetorian Guard ⁴ encamped outside Rome. And that Praetorian Guard decided Roman history, decided who would be emperor, and who would not. And they worked for donatives.⁴ When things were bad, they, and you have promised them something if you were made emperor, they get rid of the emperor and put you. At one stage the Praetorian Guard held up the Imperial Crown on auction! Yeah. Whom, or who bid big bid for this crown, and then somebody bid so much, and he became emperor. His name starts with a "J," can't remember what his name was (Didius Julianus.) That's how bad it is, how bad it was. And you know Tigellinus and all those guys, who kept Nero in power for their own purposes, you know, kept Caligula around, mad as a hatter, you know? But it serves a purpose. Because the locus of power is in this Praetorian Guard. And any historical event you study, you have to study where is the locus of power. Unless you know the locus of power, you'll be like a Don Quixote, tilting at windmills. Actually, you know the allegorical... you know. You have to know that.

Well, this is the feudal system. William the Conqueror in 1066 comes over from France, Normandy, fights the Battle of Hastings...and establishes in the end the feudal system. Now he owns all the land. "I'm the landlord," that's how we get the word *landlord*. "And I divide the whole land, and these are my tenants." Tenants, you are barons and knights.. So, you are my tenants, then you have *your* tenants, all the way down. And each tenant owes an obligation. If it's money, it's called ... *rentes*, hence the word *rent*, that's why you pay rent. Sometimes you have some nice terms,

"You're to provide two geese per year to the knight." I've seen that. Or "your first-born daughter must serve in the kitchen of the lord," like that. Things like that. If you were not in the feudal system for some reason, and you're outside the feudal manors and estates, you aren't a serf, you're a *villein*, hence the word "villain," meaning, because they usually stole. That's the system, where power existed in that form. The problem is, how do you centralize power when that happens, because that's a system which presupposes a decentralization of power.

And the impression you must or ought to be getting from these historical plays so far, is that Shakespeare is attacking the feudal system, especially in the sense that it decentralizes power and prevents a strong nation. And it's not an ancient quarrel, it exists today! Because surely if you stand back and look at American history, in 1986, what is really happening is, how strong should the states be, should they be weak or strong? That has always been the argument here. Sure, Marshall and those guys believed in a strong central government. True, Reagan believes, give more power to the states. But do you really - it's for you - I'm not going to give you my view, you really think you can be a superpower in a modern, dangerous age with decentralized power? Where Idaho, you have to wait on opinions from Idaho? And Rhode Island, and..., huh? Think you can do that? Because both these countries are federal states now. The USSR is a federated state. Twenty-six republics and 106 autonomous things. And this is a lot of states over here, too. You think you can really operate on a decentralized basis? Because that's the whole problem. Don't you need centralization in the face of danger?

You really think you can exist in history by just diffusing power out? Everybody's centralizing, even the Europeans are trying to form an EEC, whether it's good or bad is not a matter. But then guys come here now with some 18th Century philosophies about state rights. About state rights. And a man sits down in the White House, once, 1952 to 1960, you may not be aware of this, and decides that an important thing like oil in America, whether he was going to grant California people the sole rights of exploiting California oil. Dwight Eisenhower did that. He had made an election promise. Even if it's so big, you see.

So, this is what Shakespeare is dealing with here, too. Look how this Falstaff and the others are raising arms. You have to go and talk to the local "Macho Man." "Could you let me have a few of your people?" "But what do I get for this?" "Well, if you come up for a vote in Parliament, I'll vote for your...whatever." Duty to raise people (troops)! Do you think you can really raise, defend the country on the basis of rights? What about the hypothesis he's saying, that if you raise arms and defend the country on the basis of duty, the man in the street will say, "I have a right, I don't want to join your blasted army," you know, they ain't going to raise nothing. Don't you feel - it's for you to think, I don't know - but we exaggerate rights, and the Russians exaggerate duty, they go too far, with the duty crap, but we go too far with rights. And then the push comes to the shove, huh? You know? And it will come to the shove one of these days.

You know what amuses me? Guys asking for their individual rights, to transport arms, which will kill children, and women. And they want, they speak about their individual rights, that's amusing to me. I don't understand this, I'll tell you one fact I know for sure. If you increase the level of arms in any society, you increase the level of violence. You can believe it. Say, if you are in your house, and a burglar comes in, you got a baseball bat and a telephone, you want that. But if you know you got a revolver with six shots, where are you taking that? It's there. You're also being told something very arithmetically funny: that \$30 million worth of arms is a drop in the bucket. They're kidding. Because I used to be a Minister of Trade and I had to buy arms a couple of times. Which you buy from Americans, but you don't buy from America. These guys are smart. You want arms? You can get American arms. But they invent middlemen. And max- and put to the production, as costs, you know, insurance, freight, and they take, rake off there. If the middleman costs a million, the middlemen are costing two million, that's extra profits they get. I'll tell you something worse. They sell you the guns without the bullets, then hold you up to ransom for the bullets. All that I know. And then give you a cock and bull story that giving guns to Guyana was not in "the security interest of America." Because the statute says here, read the Federal Register. You can only sell arms if it is in "the security interest of America."

So, the sale of arms to Iran had to have a certification by the President, that the sale of arms to Iran was in "the security interest of America." The truth, of course, is that's a cover story. They decided - you know what a cover story is? In case you get caught, what will you say? You been with your girlfriend, but in case your wife asks, you've been to see your sister. That's a cover story. Now, you're going to sell arms to Khomeini, I mean. it's so stupid. To me, the larger the events get, the more stupid they get, and comical. How're you going to sell TOW missiles and spare parts, and you're not selling to Khomeini? You know? Anyway, the point is the cover story. If we are found out, we're going to say, "Moderates." That was the cover story. We're trying to get them because Russia is in the ball - if we're found out. But you guys are not trained to look for cover stories. So then, "my President," as they say, get's up and says, "We were trying to open...to find moderates," you believe it. That's the cover story.

You know the famous one, in Grenada? "We're going to rescue students." That was the cover story. The students were amazed that they were being rescued. If you're found out, that's what you will say. After all, remember what happened in, Carter with students? That was a cover story. The truth is, (Oliver) North, I'm telling you what I know about. North went around, they needed something to happen, to give - they'd had foreign policy failures, right? And he went around to those islands, (Edward) Seaga (PM Jamaica), and this woman (Eugenia) Charles (PM) in Dominica. He drafted the letter that they would send to Reagan. This was, they tell me here, you know, I'm quoting them, so if you want to quote me, quote me. And the idea was, give the, send the letter to Reagan to intervene in Grenada. What helped them is, like the last straw, eh? (Bernard) Coard and them go and kill (Maurice) Bishop. ⁵ You know that, made it easy. So, Reagan's great foreign policy thing, he beat Grenada!

One more division, the island would have sunk! One more division, the island would have sunk. And he beat them. Seventeen casualties, you know, seventeen American casualties, and they shot a madhouse, they let lunatics in Grenada, lunatics, you know, escaped, and all that. And the very airstrip, that they say was going to take Cuban military jets immediately took American military jets, you know, that kind of thing. You know this. I mean, that was the cover story. So, Reagan will go down in history, for his only foreign policy success, he conquered Grenada

You want me to follow up this story? You know what the court did? This is how wicked this is. They just had a trial. A friend of mine was the prosecutor ...Hudson-Phillips is his name. Hyphenated...Black guy. And, um, fourteen are to be hanged. You hear what I'm telling you? Fourteen are to be hanged, twenty other lesser sentences. Fourteen are to be hanged, including Coard's wife (Phyllis).⁶ Now you do think, rather, well you can't believe them, do you think Speakes, Larry Speakes (White House Press Secretary) then, will come and tell you guys what is happening in Grenada? Those are the decisions handed down two weeks ago. They're hanging Coard)⁷ who, they should hang him for the, well, kill me for my " bad verses," is it?...They are supposed to hang him for that. And his wife went to UWI (University of the West Indies) and all that. But they'll hang them! Don't take my word, when you go tomorrow, read in the last, read any, any newspaper, because it was in the papers here. I got my news from the Times. I cut it out. I know all these people. They're crazy. I don't agree with their political philosophy. But you can't go and tell people around the world, you can have whatever government you want, provided it's one WE want. You can't do that. You have to have other methods of encouraging them away from

what they are doing. But not that. Because you're going to make them more adamant to do. So, when they hang Mrs. Coard, you wouldn't even hear. Some Black woman in Grenada they hanged. That's what you know. They don't want to say all of that. OLIVER NORTH! And don't take my word, go and check the evidence, don't take my...That's how I know Oliver North.

Notes:

- (1) Railroad! U.S.A. v. Lyndon LaRouche, et al. Commission to Investigate Human Rights Violations , Washington, D.C. 1989 Compiled and edited by Edward Spannaus
- (2) Conscript – a form of compulsory military service, a draft.
- (3) donatives – a gift of money or bribe to soldiers from the Roman emperor
- (4) Praetorian Guard – a unit within the Imperial Roman Army assigned as personal bodyguard or intelligence agents for the Roman emperor.
- (5) Maurice Bishop – Prime Minister (March 13, 1979) Revolutionary Government of Grenada from The Jewel Movement which in a “bloodless coup” overthrew Eric Gairy government.
- (6) All fourteen death sentences were subsequently commuted to prison terms
- (7) Bernard Coard was the former Deputy Prime Minister of Grenada’s “Revolutionary Government -1982 - The New Jewel Movement

<https://www.telesurenglish.net/opinion/Bernard-Coard-The-Intellectual-Author-of-Grenadas-Revolution-20190314-0016.html>