

## Shakespeare's Henry V Conclusion: Harmony of Nations, Beyond the Nation State

Suppose you had one country involving Europe and North America, the whole of Europe subject to North America, with one centralized republic or whatever.... wouldn't be a problem, would it?

Don't have any? Cause it all comes down to the same thing. Isn't that what they're running away from? They're running away from the fact that the nation-state has been found in 1986, and this is one of the crucial, in my view, results of the Hitler war, it impugns the nation-state as the highest form of human organization. **(Question: What means "impugn?")** "Impugn" means to castigate, to throw doubts about it. You, see? But that's only MY view, don't take me, don't, you think of it. because you, you, I won't be here in 2000, you guys will be here, and I am sure of one thing, that what Ronald Reagan represents is the last-ditch resort to that narrow proprietary view of a nation-state, you know? "This is my country, at war with this guy..., we fear a man so, so bad who he never himself has said, "This is my land, my native land." It's a proprietary thing, belief in property, "You own this land, and this is mine." And it's a proprietary view of nationalism. *This will go.* It took a long time for the British to see the value of the EEC (European Economic Community.) And it will take a longer time for them to implement it politically, economically...but. this will go.

And what's the real problem with NATO? The problem with NATO is the nation-state. And then what do you think is the problem in Africa? There are two states in North America and fifty states in Africa. Look at that map. Fifty states! Every piece of land is a state. Your cousin living across the river, your cousin, your aunt's son, he is Malawian, and you are Zambian. He has a different passport. It's called "Balkanization," after the Balkan Peninsula, you know? Balkanization. What do you think Jefferson Davis was trying to do to America? What do you think the Civil War was really about? Balkanization, how to balkanize America. And what do you think...the Québécois, huh? What do you think it is they're trying to do, but balkanize Canada? Fifty states in there.

You know how many states there were in Africa at the end of World War Two, in 1945? Four independent states. Four independent states. After the Second World War. All the rest came since the Second World War. Ethiopia, Egypt, mind now, I'm saying independent, got their own top guy, instead of the British or French. Liberia, which the Americans ran, Firestone, Firestone ran Liberia. Not even South Africa was independent, not even South Africa. Because South Africa was a dominion. **(Question.)** No. The rest were colonial territories, spheres of influence, you know, colonial territories and spheres of influence. **(Question.)** Liberia, Egypt, there's a third I'm forgetting, Ethiopia, Sudan, did I get to Sudan? Egypt, yes, Egypt and the Sudan were two. It says they were independent but let me tell you what independence meant. King Farouk, the guy who had the young girls, Churchill described him as "a fat sow, wallowing in the trough of luxury." He changed the Prime Minister of Egypt during the war, **(Sirri Pasha, Nahas Pasha?)** a guy that the British didn't want. You know what the British did? Sent tanks into Cairo and surrounded the palace, and the king backed down, that's how independent it was. And Firestone Rubber in America, they ran Liberia.

You know in 1884 December to January '85, Bismarck called a big meeting in Berlin, The Congress (Conference) of Berlin, to discuss the partition of Africa. The French came and ...about that, the British came, Americans were there...The British...they said to the French, you can have the whole of West Africa except Gambia, Sierra Leone, Gold Coast (Ghana), and

Nigeria...Gambia was nothing, Gold Coast was nothing, Ghana was nothing, Nigeria was a lot of warring tribes...In return, stay out of southern Africa. And the French did that deal. What's happened was these missionaries you guys know about, who goes there with the Bible in (foreign lands), and they're the best intelligence agents... I can tell you from the Guyana side of it, too. They're important guys too, this Livingstone you guys like, huh? They went first, and they would report back who are the warlike tribes, what the land was like for agriculture, what assets they have, and send it back to society, the Edinburgh Society, the Glasgow Society, The British Society. They knew Nigeria was rich, that's what they wanted, you know? So Salisbury and a fellow named Disraeli, you might have heard of Benjamin Disraeli, they screwed up the French there. And the French took that and the French took Chad, Niger, you know, all those brown nut places that only grow brown nuts. Senegal, *Algérie*, Algeria, that's another story, how, I ought to write down, Algeria, involved in this war...

Look, I must, I better get back to Henry V, but the Algerians lent Napoleon money and timber and food during his wars. And the French owed Algeria large debt. after Napoleon was defeated, and the French, Congress of Vienna and the throwback and all that. You know what happened of course incidentally, when they revived the French parliament, *Assemblée*, those who believed in the old regime sat on the right, and those who wanted to overthrow the old regime sat on the left, and that's how you get left and right, and then it started, your left wing and right wing. Anyway, the Algerians had the absurdity, Algeria was part of this Muslim empire, the Turks, remember? And they had the absurdity to ask France to pay its debt, you know? The French answered, they invaded Algeria, put some settlers and stayed there. You know, that's what's happened. Anyway...

So, Grotius's point, our social contract of states has to be opposed by a concept of natural law, that organization-wise mankind is moving further and further towards harmony rather than individual chauvinism. Moving more and more towards that area. And that the old belief in an insular isolationist nationalism is what is failing in the 20th Century. And there is no such thing really as an Atlantic Ocean and a Pacific Ocean by themselves. The waters intermingle by the Indian Ocean and by the Magellan Straits down there, the Straits of Magellan. There's no fixed, fixity in life. So, when this man (Shakespeare?) says here, the law of nations and natural law must both coincide, this man is writing this thing in 1599, 1579? 1590s. But the important thing is he's telling even then what his views are. He's not saying necessarily, look, the nation state is the be-all and end-all. Nothing is a be-all and end-all. Now America consists of Alaska and Hawaii, and there are Americans in this room who don't know that America owns islands in the Pacific. You haven't been to Guam, or Midway, or Wake Island, I've been to Saipan. I'm not saying it is right or wrong, it just exists. And the Russians sold America Alaska and regretted it ever since. That kind of thing. So, he says that.

The other point he says is in Act V, Scene 2.<sup>1</sup> He gets the Duke of Burgundy, a Frenchman, he's going to explain what is wrong with France, in a long speech. This, remember Henry V is 1413 to

---

<sup>1</sup> Henry V Act I, Scene 2

Canterbury:

*"...Yet their own authors faithfully affirm*

*That the land Salic is in Germany,*

*Between the floods of Sala and of Elbe,*

*Where Charles the Great, having subdued the*

1422. Let me put it in perspective quickly to tell you what is happening. The world, the known world is being run by Catholicism. The Pope is in the Vatican, right? and the 14th Century, 1300s, is called the Age of Faith. That was the century in which the popes got Aristotle accepted as the official philosophy, *Scientia*, over the world, through two persons in particular, St. Thomas Aquinas and Albertus Magnus. And that became official (doctrine?) Later on, poor Galileo's going to get in trouble because he wants to rebel against that. I mean Aristotle had some crazy ideas. Everything finds its own level. If a ball rolls on the ground and stops, Aristotelian dynamics says it stopped because it found its own resting place. Along comes Galileo and he says it stops because of friction, an external applied force. But if that force were not there it will continue in a straight line going forever, which is an equally absurd, there is no straight line, there's no such thing as a straight line. Rotational action and (force?) Variations of conic sections, spheres, ellipses, you know, circles, hyperbolas, parabolas, there's no straight lines. And the fact that you take a very small part of it which seems not to be a curve, don't make it a straight line, you're (approximating curves.) Anyway, the point is, now look, Aristotelian science is running the world by papal decree in the 14th Century. Aristotle's an official doctrine, and even good Catholics had every now and then to pay attention to Aristotelianism or lose their work. You know, bright guys, had to pay attention to Aristotle or lose your work.

The Duke of Burgundy says, what's the matter with France? "Even so," this is Act V, Scene 2, line 58

*"...Even so our houses and ourselves and children  
Have lost, or do not learn for want of time,  
The sciences that should become our country;  
But grow like savages..."*

Point. Hypothesis. Without science, man is a savage. It's science that's got us where we are. Contemplate as you are in this room. Is it science that has brought us here, with electricity and clothes, heat, with buttons pushing, huh? If you define science as finding out the harmonies of nature, and putting them to pragmatic use after you find it out, if you define science like that, that's what's got us here with recorders and microphones and writing, and Shakespeare writing and me lecturing on it, hmm? Resolve all that with jackasses and tigers and elephants and Gene Autrys. You know...

So, I give you those two, "natural law" and the view on science, "without science, Man is a savage," to warn you beforehand when you do read this play, that this guy is going to put dramatically in the

---

**Cont'd**

*Saxons,  
There left behind and settled certain French,  
Who, holding in disdain the German women  
For some dishonest manners of their life,  
Established then this law: to wit, no female  
Should be inheritrix in Salic land,  
Which "Salic," as I said, 'twixt Elbe and Sala  
Is at this day in Germany called Meissen.  
Then doth it well appear the Salic law  
Was not devised for the realm of France..."*

mouths of speakers, all the hypotheses you can think of that are dear to Platonists. He uses Chorus, says. "Piece out our imperfections" which is, "Think! Form hypotheses!" Don't just come because I tell you the narrative of the play, it's easy, I'll tell you in a moment. I'll tell you right now. The storyline of the play is easy... I can tell you in a couple of sentences and that's it! But if you are going to Shakespeare merely to study storylines then you're wasting your time. Henry V, who's a dissolute youth, with Falstaff and the others, becomes the King of England, and straightaway changes. The passages you guys have to read you'll find them saying, Archbishop of Canterbury saying "Aye, this man's a scholar now."

His big point is, the important thing in life is duty, not rights. That is what he's saying. It is not important in life what your rights are. What your duties are to mankind, to yourself, to the universe, that's what's significant.

And when you shout and follow Martin Luther King and a long list of the illustrious obscure, about your civil rights, somebody has to ask you what your duties are.

Tell me. Is it not your problem at the airport [directed to ICLC organizers]and intersections that these citizens out there don't know their duties?

Why do you think I chose Julius Caesar to stage? I could have chosen Henry V, King John. You think I just chose Julius Caesar like that [snap of finger] to be the first play we're going to do? One of the big reasons that I chose Julius Caesar was, that it has citizens in it, and the citizens are going to be manipulated! And the Roman Empire fell because the citizens no longer cared for truth. One minute Caesar is noble, another minute Brutus is noble, another minute, you know, whoever is... They no longer cared. And I was hoping that by some kind of osmosis this kind of hypothesis can transfer itself to you guys in the field when you go out there, and watch these citizens of America, selling arms to the Ayatollah, putting the profits in Swiss banks, they're citizens.

Or something important is happening, but he turns off, turns the TV station on to the ball game to see where the Jets are playing the Chiefs. So, you know, that kind of thing, opting out.

Whereas I think - look, why did they want to shoot up Reagan? The man is popular. He's a logician, a world citizen... he invaded Grenada, you know? He did so and so... some truth. Why'd they... the press wants to shoot him... But that's what your problem is. The citizens have opted out. Because they don't have conceptualized for them, either by us, we don't do it well, so don't pat yourself on the back, and think I'm going to say you do it well. I don't do it well. You do not dilate on their duties and make their duties so interesting for them to do, that you instigate them, inspire them thereto.

And this is something endemic in this society. You go to marriages and see how quick they are to talk about rights, but how reluctant they are to discuss duties... A little bit of thought for this, you know, a little bit of thought to this, ten minutes at the right moment, on the question of duty. But everybody wants his rights.

"We went to your mother last week; we'll go to see my mother now." "But your mother is exhausting, son..." "But so is yours." And "blah, blah..." and a row goes on 'til the middle of the

night, you know? "You always..." "You never..." those famous words, you know? Suddenly one is surprised...

Well, that is what this play is going into, both of them, as a moral imperative, the duties of a king, a philosopher king, the duties of a citizen. The duties that appertain to roles. Roles don't give rights. Roles give duties. The only right you really have in life is the right to do your duty. And you mustn't make duty sound like something onerous, disgusting, heavy, ponderous, and sledgey<sup>2</sup>.

You think every time I come here, on Saturday night, for instance, I feel like it? I don't tell you. It's not important that I feel like it. It's my duty to come and pass on the little bit I know. Hmm? That is what makes life interesting. And whether our bodies are wracked with cancer and you're suffering pain, but you come out, as a question of duty and be present, and be counted and give of your...that's what's important, not rights and all that crap!

Also in this play, he deals with public and private morality. You know some people say, look, I'm a... My story is, I'm a Mormon and so-so-so, it's my main thing. How do I, now I'm for the country, can I erect my personally stupid philosophy as a public morality, you know? Can I do that? Isn't that what's happening in South Africa, isn't it? They have a private morality there; they really don't like blacks. I mean, I've been there. I've lived there...I went in incognito; they don't like blacks. But then they give a public morality.

You know what Churchill said? Go and read "The Gathering Storm,"<sup>3</sup> Churchill on World War II. First book. And read the chapters on Munich, and what Chamberlain did at Munich. Churchill says the Sermon on the Mount, you know, Moses thing [Christ's Sermon on the Mount of Olives, editor's note], is the highest expression of Christian morality. But that is not the way states conduct their business. Lord Chamberlain, this little Protestant guy from Lancashire (sic)<sup>4</sup> you know, the red rose?

Where was the (living) morality, dealing with Hitler? That's not the way states... it's your private morality. What the hell that has to do with running Britain?

There is a public morality, says Shakespeare, public morality is consonance with Natural Law. And you can't substitute your private idiosyncrasies, and foibles, and little bits and pieces of nonsense for public morality.

Thirdly, the usual lesson he gives in every single play: when Passion and Reason conflict, Reason must prevail. No matter how often I tell you that, the most unsuccessful thing I've done in this [ICLC] local, since my return in September 1985, is to get across that well applied by...I still see they apply passion, and fuzzy reasoning, and feelings, above Reason. People should know better. Should know better. If Passion and Reason conflict...You are a human being! You have a divine spark. and Reason must prevail.

---

<sup>2</sup> sledgey - British slang for "insulting," practiced in the sport of cricket.

<sup>3</sup> Churchill, Winston "The Gathering Storm," Vol. I, Book One: From War to War, Chapter 17: Tragedy of Munich, Page 320 "Sermon on the Mount" - 1948 Houghton Mifflin Co., The Riverside Press Cambridge

<sup>4</sup> Birmingham (not Lancashire)

"Darling, I haven't got the contraception tonight, but I can't help it. Nonsense! You're not an animal! Postpone it, if your decision is not to make children, you know what I mean. No more messing around. "Darling, um, maybe you shop on Thursday, no need to shop now," and then Thursday comes and it's snowing, everybody's closing, and he don't feel like picking up, scraps the week, I mean do the sensible thing, consistent with your self embetterment.

But, when Reason and Passion conflict, especially in personal relations, hey, they're going to be guys coming to you early in the morning before you've had your second cup of coffee, assuming you had your first, at the airways and intersections, they're preying on you. You don't want to (challenge?) them on the basis of passions, huh? Don't do that. You're not going to recruit people on the basis of pas...We stand for Reason. People are unreasonable out there. They're very unreasonable out there, but we stand for Reason. And we must show that.

Fourthly, Shakespeare deals in this play, I'm not going to give a list of all the hypotheses at this stage, this one, and then we go on with the play and list them as we go along. But he deals here with what I call the tendentiousness of "expert advice." "Tentiousness" means you're arguing what we call "propter hoc," Your argument, it's like if I say, "I love my mother." you know, and I say, "My mother's beautiful." She might be as ugly as sin, you know, that's a tendentious argument, "I love my mother." And to make matters worse, in America, this "mother love," this psychosis, you see it at football games, "Hi, Mom!" Your mother could be as ignorant as ever, but when Mom speaks, she's intelligent. Even though in grade school she dropped out and she was on dope, then she straightened up, went to church and she made you, but she's intelligent. A stupid, ignorant...well, she's intelligent now. That's tendentious. That's medieval, because the medieval age was characteristic for quoting precedent, who said what. "Why is that true?" "XY said it." People like that. No regard for whether XY was intelligent.

Well in this play this is what happens. It's a beautiful thing. Starts on this "expert advice," being tendentious. Henry IV, the father, put the bill before the House of Commons to take away property from the Church. Property that they had got people to leave for them, either by will or by gift.

Now, I'll tell you, in Guyana once, I had a case which I appealed, and I lost. I represent these relatives. This man was a moneylender. A real Scrooge. And this guy suddenly found he was terminally ill with cancer, and within two weeks, joined the church and gave all his estate, realty and purse, to the church, the Anglican Church. And this long list, a wife and children and grandchildren, nothing! Oh, he did leave 20 dollars for the wife because we had the Dutch Law, we had the Dutch Law, he had to leave her a poor share, a portion, you know, to her. He gave her 20 bucks so they can't say he gave the wife nothing. To his favorite daughter he left ten. Wrote it in the will. So, they contest. Well, they're bound to lose. The Archbishop of Guyana is coming with evidence, he was a witness to the will. The judge was an Anglican. So, I mean, you talk about a poor risk. The firm for which I worked said... look, they used to call me "Forlorn Hope Freddie." ["What?"] "Forlorn Hope." When the cases are bad, they send Wills. I sometimes won some brilliant ones, in a bad situation. Anyway, I have this archbishop to cross examine, and I enjoyed myself. And I know I was losing. Judge made it clear, "Mind what," this is the judge, "Mind how you address His Grace." I say, "You mean his disgrace." [The Judge] Says "Mr. Wills, you say that again and I'll..." But he knows what I mean. When he sees young boys, his tongue gets erect, but don't quote me. This is in court. Anyway, so I cross examined this guy and I go through all the

Roman Catholic and Anglican history, Henry VIII, this High Mass, Low Mass, Oliver Cromwell, you got to have fun, but I have to come to the will, you know? "Why are you doing that, Mr. Wills?" says the judge. I said, "Because I'm attacking his credibility." He says, "Fine, go ahead. There's no jury there, not a case to have jury testimony, there's only me. And you can attack his credibility, but you have to do a lot to prove that he was lying." Frauds, you know, the Vicar of Christ story and all of that crap. So, I stand there and I said to the Archbishop, I said, "What is your role in all this?" He said, "Mr. Wills, I was the chauffeur. I was the chauffeur. I got some phone call, I went to his house, and I drove him to the legal firm of Cameron and Shepard. He sat down, he made his will, I signed as a witness, and I drove him back. I was a mere chauffeur." And I let a pause...he said, he had convicted himself...Because he gets, the whole property was left to the Archbishop, not to the Church, he got it all. So that's a clear case of conflict. So, I quote back the Scriptures at him, he blushed. I lost the case. And I wanted to be unpolitical, so I had the Party to picket, you know?

You see, I've been telling you guys, Law is a political tactic. Now I have degrees in jurisprudence, dissertations in jurisprudence, distinctions in jurisprudence, Roman, Greek, Hindu Law, and I'm telling you, Law is a political tactic. Has always been. There's no objective highest court or lower court of law to which you go and get a neutral decision. That doesn't happen. If you want to know the aims of a society read its law. If they're jailing people for this and not jailing for that, you know, you learn about, You know if I make you an ambassador and send you to some far away place, chart me, get me the legal code, and just read it, what is a crime, what's not, you learn a lot about the society, because those are what Plato calls the "final causes," the objectives of the society. They punish you when you don't do it. "Thou shalt not steal," Well, what is the meaning of stealing? Do you know that, for instance...shows you the typical England way ... con men. If you con somebody in England out of a million bucks, it's a misdemeanor. Low crime, you can go to jail for three years. But if you steal 10 cents, you can go to jail for life. Isn't that hypocrisy? You, see? And you talk of "white collar crime?" Statistically, "conversion," you know, money coming in to the boss, and the person working for the boss appropriates it, it's called "conversion," "embezzlement." those guys get a suspended sentence, this kind of sentence, you know, they're fined, hmm? A guy in New Jersey left, a doctor, left his house with a needle, and went and killed some woman, remember, you heard it in the news? And went back and he was, he said, "I did it." He confessed. "I killed her, put her out of her suffering." He was tried. He pleaded guilty. He was put on probation, suspended sentence. This is last week. But some youngster now, just turned adulthood, runs through a supermarket, in the same paper I read, stole a loaf, or a cake or something, was caught, and they gave him six months...that's the kind of thing you have here. Anyway, having said all that, these digressions on law are useful, but I must remind you it was in "Oliver Twist," Charles Dickens says, "The law is an ass..." He in fact said the "ass." He didn't put "in." But, uh, one of the few times I agree with Dickens.

Anyway, Henry IV has a bill to do this to the Church, take away their money and their property, and convert it to the state. it's called, nice phrase, "redistribution of income." so the play starts with, "On what basis should you have redistribution of income in society?" You have income, where do you distribute it, on what basis? These priests, now remember this is a Roman Catholic era, and in Britain, the representatives of the Pope are Archbishop of Canterbury, Archbishop of York, Bishops of Ely, bishops of, you know, they are the papal representatives. This is the days of Roman Catholicism. So, these guys are discussing where Henry IV is dead, but the bill is still there. In English Law, the fact that the king that put it there is dead doesn't stop the bill. Because I told

you the last time, "The King is dead, long live the King!" Continue. He says, look, Canterbury, speaking on behalf of the Pope, says, I have an idea. We'll offer him, that if he removes the bill, we'll give him a large sum, larger than we ever gave him, as a grant, and we'll also tell him that he is entitled to certain dukedoms and provinces in France. Now that's putting the pope on the line. So, Henry (V) comes in and they tell him. "Why am I entitled?" and they give their "expert advice." Though, the French will use against you, a thing called the Salic Law, he says. "*In terrum salicam mulieres ne succedant.*" "No woman shall succeed in Salic land." and they say you inherit through a woman, in France, and therefore you can't succeed. Well, our answer is that THEIR king, Hugh Capet and those guys, Louis Capet, THEY inherited through a woman. So, if they're wrong for us, it's wrong for them anyhow. And in any case Charlemagne applied that law to Germany, a place named Meissen between the rivers Sala and Elbe, and he didn't want some (a slur against German women he made there) didn't want them to have issue to run the place, no German woman could run it, and that's what the law is about, all that nonsense \*