

---

## Interview: Lord William Rees-Mogg

---

# 'We will have a society which is more elitist'

*Lord William Rees-Mogg is the ideological "mother" of the "Conservative Revolution" that seized control Jacobin-style over the U.S. Congress in the wake of the November 1994 elections. Rees-Mogg favors the dismantling of the "welfare state," and he has been one of the most straightforward advocates of the Information Revolution, with which Alvin Toffler groomed House Speaker Newt Gingrich (R-Ga.), giving Gingrich's hairdo a "Third Wave." Rees-Mogg says that with the coming Information Age, there will be "electronic feudalism" or "slavery" in store for 95% or more of the population.*

*A member of the British House of Lords, Rees-Mogg was the editor-in-chief of the Times of London and the Financial Times. He is currently a member of the board of governors of the British Broadcasting Corp. and one of the leading British propagandists for the destruction of the U.S. presidency.*

*The following interview, conducted by Scott Thompson on Feb. 15, was made available to EIR.*

**Q:** What is your view of the significance of the Newt Gingrich-led Conservative Revolution? I noticed you have mentioned how "Newt's children" would do a sort of march through the institutions.

**Rees-Mogg:** Yes, I think that's very important. I think that he's brought in among these 73 new Republican members of the House . . . some very bright people with strong idealism and who will be the future of the Republican Party to a large degree.

**Q:** You also suggested in an article right after the last elections that this Conservative Revolution could sweep the world.

**Rees-Mogg:** Well, I think that the world is going to face rather similar problems to what the United States will do. We've got to try to make the change from a Factory Age society to an Information Age society. And, we've also got to handle the terrible overhang of government. These are worldwide problems, and you'll find them in all the advanced countries to some extent. . . .

**Q:** I would think that you have a grassroots movement in

the United States, with the relationship you have with James Dale Davidson through *Strategic Investor*. Do you have a populist base in the United States?

**Rees-Mogg:** I think we've got a very interesting base in the United States. In a way, what I think is most interesting about it is that when we started our newsletter, which is about 12 years ago now, we said, well, we think there's a market for a newsletter that is not populist. The word at that time, and still, is associated with newsletters that would say wildly distorted things. . . . We now find that we have got a following, we've got over a 100,000 circulation. . . .

**Q:** I was using the term "populist" in its latest incarnation of being equatable with the Conservative Revolution.

**Rees-Mogg:** Well, I think that's right. Lots of people who sympathize very much with the Conservative Revolution have been and are our readers.

**Q:** In an article you did recently on the Information Revolution, you said that only 5% of the population, an elite, will be needed to do the work. And the remaining 95% will be lost to that process, so they do not need an education of the kind that was generally provided during the Industrial Age. Have you given any thought as to how to control the 95% who are essentially going to be idle?

**Rees-Mogg:** I think we've got to find satisfactory social lives. I mean, if you had a society in which 5% were doing all the work and 95% had nothing to do, it would be a horrible society, obviously.

I believe, in fact, that there is a great deal of work always to be done and many tasks to be performed which can only be carried out by human beings. The parallel, which I don't think I used in that article but which is very striking, is the armed knight. Shortly after about 1000 A.D., they found that on the battlefield, a man on a horse wearing armor could defeat anyone else. And it took all the people in a village—say, a couple hundred people—to provide the resources to put one man on a horse in armor on the field.

And in the Information Age, instead of having citizen armies, with each of them going into the field of the Information Age, what the actual situation—I don't say it will take 200 people to mount one man, but it's going to take 20 people to mount one man. One man will be doing the job at the leading edge and, correspondingly, you're going to have a society which, in terms of income distribution, is much more elitist than the pattern of income distribution we've been used to in this society.

**Q:** In *The Great Reckoning*, you refer to a return to "electronic feudalism."

**Rees-Mogg:** Well, in any rate, you will tend to get that in terms of income distribution. You've got a situation now where people who can take full advantage of the Information

Age, can and do make staggering incomes. And, where the opportunities to make big incomes on a production line are dwindling all the time. . . . The sort of production line income that made the man who was making automobiles in Detroit among the wealthiest citizens of the world, that age is over and it isn't going to come back. It doesn't mean that there will be no work for people to do, but the distribution of income will be different.

**Q:** Do you think the Information Age, with a 5% elite and 95% underclass, will come to the United States soon?

**Rees-Mogg:** It's happening faster in the United States than anywhere else, because the United States is more advanced in technology. . . .

**Q:** I believe you hold that, as this occurs, the welfare state and the public school system will collapse.

**Rees-Mogg:** Yes, I think that we've got a welfare state which has just grown and grown and grown, along with bureaucratic functions. Unfunded pension systems are likely to be viable for a few more years. Different kinds of pension systems are likely to be viable in more fortunate countries for a while longer, according to the pattern of funding. . . . But, the demographics are against it, the populations are aging, the finances are against it, cumulative debt. . . .

**Q:** You've been writing a lot about Whitewater. You've been writing almost as much lately as Ambrose Evans-Pritchard at the *Sunday Telegraph*. Is one of your concerns that Clinton has undermined the U.S.-British "special relationship?"

**Rees-Mogg:** . . . Basically, I'm a columnist. But the evidence that seems to have been turned up by journalists such as Ambrose Evans-Pritchard, but also other journalists as well, suggests that something, or things that were very serious and bad, took place in Arkansas in the 1980s. The feeling is that the mainline American press has deliberately turned its eyes away from this. . . .

**Q:** It seems that Clinton is ending the U.S. special relationship with Britain to build one with Germany.

**Rees-Mogg:** Well, I think Clinton does not understand Europe at all well, doesn't understand what's happening. I think the Germans, apart from anything else, do not want to have an exclusive German-U.S. relationship, because that doesn't fit in with what they are trying to achieve in Europe. . . .

But, I don't worry about the Anglo-American special relationship, because it seems to me that it functions when it's needed, and I don't think Clinton is going to be around for more than two years, when we shall have someone else to deal with. . . .

## Mike Royko calls Lord Rees-Mogg a 'scumbag'

In an article in the Feb. 16 *Chicago Tribune*, entitled "Rupert Murdoch's Scumbag Connection," columnist Mike Royko takes aim at Lord William Rees-Mogg for his scurrilous attack on the office of the U.S. President. Royko wrote:

"The English have a knack for making Americans feel clumsy and self-conscious. They seem . . . so very civilized. . . . So it is always jarring to look at the English press and find that the journalists seem to be a bunch of scumbags. . . . In this case, the scumbag is one William Rees-Mogg, a featured writer for the *Times*, the big, influential English newspaper. . . .

"Anyway, a few days ago this William Rees-Mogg wrote a column in the *Times* that set out to reveal how much trouble President Bill Clinton is really in. . . . Why does William Rees-Mogg know all this, and we don't? He explains that, too:

"There is no lack of people who do not want this ugly truth to emerge. The name national media—the

*Washington Post*, the *New York Times*, the television network news programs—have done their best to turn a blind eye. . . ."

"So there you have it. But just what do you have? Not much really, Rees-Mogg doesn't go in for details and specifics. . . . It's as if I wrote, 'All members of the royal family are cross-dressing gays who have orgies and eat little roasted babies snatched from orphanages. Believe me, I wouldn't kid you.' . . .

"So why would he write something that is so off the wall? A hint:

"His paper is owned by journalism's No. 1 scumbag—Rupert Murdoch, the international media tycoon . . . [and] a billionaire, who loathes Democrats. He prefers Republican politicians to whom he can give multimillion-[dollar] book advances. . . . If Rees-Mogg's story is true, the Murdoch empire has the resources to dig it out and give us the facts. Instead, his lackeys nip at the heels."

Royko, himself no stranger to scurrilous journalism, attacks Rees-Mogg's intentions, which Rees-Mogg outlined in a Feb. 6 article: "President Clinton is trapped by a process of inquiry from which he would be unlikely to escape even if he were wholly innocent of any wrongdoing."