

---

## Book Review

---

# Why Neocons Cannot Write American History

by Gerald Rose

---

### **Our First Revolution: The Remarkable British Upheaval That Inspired America's Founding Fathers**


by Michael Barone

New York: Crown, 2007

352 pages, paperback, \$25.95

Michael Barone, a senior writer for *U.S. News & World Report*, and a frequent commentator for the right-wing Fox News channel, has written what first appears to be a lively account of England's 1688 "Glorious Revolution," which brought the Dutch Prince William of Orange to the throne of England. Yet the conclusions he draws from this history are so strange, that my first thought was that, in order to sell this book in the United States, he had to make it "relevant." (He links, you see, the Anglo-Dutch takeover to the right of a ruler to invade another country for strategic reasons, like Bush's invasion of Iraq.) Barone asserts that America's ability to have a revolution was tied up with William's having turned back the Catholic absolutism of France's Louis XIV, by invading and overthrowing the Catholic King of England, James II. Barone argues that James was not only about to carry out a parliamentary coup, in which he was reshaping the election rules to install his party in power, but that the birth of his newborn son and heir, would insure a successor and possibly several generations of successors, which would consolidate a Catholic succession to the throne of England. That would, in principle, ally England with Catholic France under Louis XIV. This, in Barone's mind, would have made the revolution in America more difficult, because Catholic absolutism was less open to democracy than Anglo-Dutch Liberalism.

Also, according to Barone, if James remained King, it would isolate the Dutch Republic and crush all opposition in Europe to Louis, who had been in an all-out conflict with the Protestant Netherlands. Therefore, William's invasion of England was of the highest strategic importance to the Dutch, be-



cause if their country were boxed in and isolated by a Catholic England and Catholic France, it could be crushed. Barone places George Bush's invasion of Iraq in the same light, and argues that it is only far-sighted leaders who invade other countries for strategic reasons.

He also concludes that the reason for the American Revolution was that the colonists were not afforded the full parliamentary rights of Englishmen, and so fought a war in order to win them. Just a little quarrel among friends.

These are very odd arguments. It is rare history that has such pro-Dutch sentiments. It is only when you know that Barone is a neocon, that they make any sense. When he talks about "Our First Revolution," his

frame of reference is the Anglo-Dutch Liberal system. This should give the show away about our neocons: They are British Liberals; they are not Americans.

How else can you account for Barone's failure to mention the fact that *it was the very government that was brought in with the Glorious Revolution that we fought the American Revolution against?*

Is it possible he did not know that, far from demanding our rights as Englishmen, our New England colonies, as early as the 1630s, had governed themselves under a charter that allowed republican self-government? Is it possible that he did not know that at our Constitutional Convention in 1787, the Founders did not install a parliamentary system like that of England, but a republic which outlawed oligarchism, something that, to this day, England has not done?

Mr. Barone is a Straussian, which means that for him, it is acceptable for the elites to tell lies to the citizens.

### **What Is Anglo-Dutch Liberalism?**

With the Glorious Revolution of 1688, as Barone documents, there was a military seizure of power in England by a financial faction which was run by a Venetian-controlled banking interest in the Netherlands and England. This open



William Hogarth prolifically illustrated the moral degeneration that swept England under William III, and in the aftermath of his reign: here, the speculative frenzy of the famous South Sea Bubble (1721).

secret was described by Benjamin Disraeli, the 19th-Century British prime minister, in his novel *Coningsby*:

“The great object of Whig leaders in England from the first movement under Hampden to the last most successful one in 1688, was to establish in England a high aristocratic republic on the model of the Venetian.... William the third told ... Whig leaders, ‘I will not be a doge.... They brought in a new family on their own terms. George I was a doge; George II was a doge.... George III tried not to be a doge.... He might try to get rid of the Whig Magnificoes, but he could not rid himself of the Venetian constitution.’”

Disraeli was referencing the fact that Venice had no king, and for that reason, was misnamed a “republic.” Venice was run by powerful financial families who constantly overrode the nominal head of the system, the doge. The Senate elected the Council of Ten, from which was selected the real power in Venice: the Inquisition-like Council of Three. James Fenimore Cooper has a brilliant discussion of this in his novel *The Bravo*.

Without any doubt, in 1688, the “Whig Grandees,” as Disraeli called them, came to power in England, and by 1763, installed and consolidated a Venetian system.

The irony is that, since 1688, for 320 years, there has been not been a single English monarch on the throne (the Hanoverian dynasty being German in origin). While the Stuart kings often ruled against parliament, and Oliver Cromwell banished parliament in his last years, from 1688 until today, the English parliament has sat continuously. This gave enormous power to the oligarchy of England. William of Orange, who later became King William III of England, had to rule through parliament in the Netherlands, and as Barone points out, it was William’s training to do so.

In Barone’s paean to Dutch rule, he points out that the Bank of England, which was established in 1694 under William, was modeled on the Bank of Amsterdam. The Bank of England was set up to fund the debt contracted by England during its war with France, since one of the first acts of William’s rule was to launch a war against France’s Louis XIV. The Bank of England was set up to take this debt, which it did in conjunction with the British East India Company. In this way, England was systematically looted by the Anglo-Dutch oligarchy.

EIR’s Allen Douglas has recently documented, in an unpublished paper, the process by which the Venetians set up the



interlocking Bank of Amsterdam and the Dutch East India Company, as well as the British East India Company and the Bank of England—all of which was premised upon control of huge supplies of gold and silver, the international trade which Venice had dominated since the 11th- and 12th-Century crusades. The Serene Republic made staggering fortunes from the varying values of gold and silver exchanged between Europe and the East, all the way to China, and its control over East-West bullion flows also enabled it to manipulate the value of gold and silver currencies in Europe almost at will, just as floating exchange rates, established in August 1971, after the Nixon Administration delinked the U.S. dollar from gold, allowed international financiers to make hundreds of billions of dollars in currency speculation.

### Venice and the Great 18th-Century Bubbles

By the late 16th Century, a Venice threatened by the rise of the new nation-states in Europe, increasingly deployed her enormous wealth from her own trade, to take over the rising Atlantic maritime powers, the Netherlands and England, by establishing their central banks, their stock exchanges, and their East India companies. Venice, which was debt-free by this time, had established the first central bank and stock exchange in history, and held an astonishing 14 million gold ducats in her treasury. These funds she deployed to Amsterdam and London, to found the Bank of Amsterdam in 1609, which controlled the world bullion trade through the 17th, and most of the 18th Century, which was the lifeblood of the Dutch and British East India trade, as it had been of Venice's own. Though she still engaged in trade, Venice secured far larger fortunes—and continued political influence—by speculating in gold and silver, as before, but now, also, in the stocks of both East India companies, in the stocks of both the Bank of Amsterdam, and the later Bank of England, and in the Dutch and British stock exchanges. Venice's subtle hand was also evident in its orchestration (through Amsterdam) of the largest bubbles in history, the South Sea and John Law/Mississippi bubbles in England and France, respectively.

In his famous pamphlet, "The Conduct of the Allies," Jonathan Swift made the devastating argument that while the war against France was, to all intents and purposes, won by the Dutch and English allies by 1709, the Whigs who controlled Queen Anne would not let her conclude a peace treaty. Swift describes in detail how England had been placed under an enormous debt to the Bank of England and the British East India Company.

It was Swift's pamphlet that laid the basis for the 1710 Revolution of Queen Anne, in which she threw out the Whigs and installed Lord Harley as the head of her government. In Graham Lowry's brilliant history, *How the Nation Was Won*,<sup>1</sup> he details Swift's role in this fight. Harley attempted to set up

his own banking arrangement under the South Sea Company, which later was set up and bankrupted in what was known as the "South Sea Bubble." In the wake of the bursting of the South Sea Bubble, Robert Walpole consolidated Whig domination of the parliament.

Under these circumstances, it became imperative for the British East India Company to extend its looting practices worldwide. The central question of the American Revolution was the unbelievable rates of looting that were required to prop up the imperial system installed by the Bank of England and the British East India Company. It was British East India tea that was dumped in Boston Harbor in protest against the tea tax. Far from bringing stability to England, rapacious looting and perpetual war were brought to power in England by the Anglo-Dutch revolution.

### Whig Takeover of England

The first Earl of Shaftesbury, Anthony Ashley-Cooper (1621-83), created the Whig party, which came to power in the wake of 1688. While Ashley-Cooper died in exile in the Netherlands, it was he, along with John Locke, who created the Whig opposition to both King Charles in his later years, and laid the basis for the "Invitation to the Prince of Orange," which asked William to invade England, with 20,000 men, ostensibly to save England from a Catholic monarch, James II. Shaftesbury was a political chameleon: He was immortalized as the character Antony in Thomas Otway's devastating satire *Venice Preserved* (1660s). In it, Antony is an old whoremaster, a Venetian senator, who demands that his prostitute whip him. Even Charles II, King of England during the restoration of the monarchy after the Protectorate of Oliver Cromwell, called Shaftesbury the "biggest whoremaster in England." Charles was in a position to know, since he was notorious himself for the depravity of his own and his court's conduct.

His house philosopher John Locke provided the system by which the organizing principle for human relationships was not truth, which Locke insisted was unknowable, but the social contract. This is a direct continuation of Thomas Hobbes' *Leviathan*, which was an excuse for the Cromwell Protectorate or any tyranny to ensure that in the war of "each against all," there be a modicum of security, in which life was protected by the State. Hobbes' argument was that you needed a powerful central authority to interpose its will in this war of each against all.

Locke was discovered and promoted by Shaftesbury, whose career was remarkable for his complete lack of principle. He was on the inside of the Cromwell Protectorate; then, when it was clear to him that the Protectorate would not be around forever, he changed sides to support the restoration of the monarchy under Charles II. His role, however, was as the leader of the parliamentary opposition, which later was known as the Whig party.

This opposition came to a head in the replay of the "Gun-

1. Washington: Executive Intelligence Review, 2004 reprint of 1988 edition.

powder Plot,” in which false testimonies were organized by Shaftesbury to create a scare around an alleged Catholic plot to murder Charles II, known as the Titus Oates affair. The reason this affair was hoked up, was the violent opposition to the ascendancy to the throne of Charles’ brother James II. The “Gunpowder Plot” was a Venetian operation, in which the parliament and King James I were to be blown up by Catholic fanatics. The Titus Oates affair was a direct replay of that.

What was really going on, was of a totally different character. From the standpoint of Venice, the fires of religious war had to be constantly rekindled, and it was essential to use England in the destabilization of the continental powers. Most importantly, Shaftesbury and Locke were critical in bringing the monarchy under the control of the parliament. Venice’s control was exercised through the barons who ran the parliament, which had the right to increase taxes, which were used mainly to raise funds for wars. It was essential to Venice that the Stuart monarchy, which was close to France, be destroyed.

Yet on the more profound level of fundamental theory, the issue is the method used by Venice to destroy nation-states. It is here that the philosophical radicalism of Locke was critical. Thomas Hobbes was trained directly by Galileo, who was a protégé of Paolo Sarpi of Venice. The philosophical radicalism of these men goes by the name of Liberalism. Both these philosophers reject the idea that truth is knowable, and assert that what is knowable is that which impinges on the brain through our senses. They reject the idea of a uniquely human soul. In fundamentals, that is what Anglo-Dutch Liberalism is about.

As Lyndon LaRouche has developed in his writings, this question was no abstraction.<sup>2</sup> In the process of forging our Declaration of Independence, this came to a head on the question of Locke’s insistence upon life, liberty, and property, versus the Leibnizian view, which this country was founded on: “life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.”<sup>3</sup> Leibniz’s view of

the matter can be found in his essay, “On Felicity,” about the “science of happiness.”

## The Shaftesbury-Locke Slave Constitution

The abomination of the pro-slavery, pro-oligarchical Shaftesbury-Locke constitution for South Carolina has been thoroughly documented by *EIR*.<sup>4</sup>

Slavery, as a mass institution in the American colonies, was first introduced in Carolina by Locke and Shaftesbury. While slavery had previously existed in the colonies, it was mainly for domestic work. The mass importation of slavery from Barbados’s horrific sugar plantations became the model for South Carolina; by 1708, thirty-one percent of the population of Carolina were slaves (the Carolinas split into North and South in 1712). By 1724, the slave population of South Carolina rose to 32,000 out of 46,000 inhabitants, or 69.5%; these slaves were used in the production of rice. This system was then imported into Virginia for tobacco production.

This is where Lockean philosophy leads. If we deny the uniqueness of the human soul, and that man is made in the image and likeness of God, then slavery is a perfectly logical outcome.

Yet Barone, and in fact, most courses in American history, place Locke as one of the most important philosophers in affecting the American Revolution, through establishing Anglo-Dutch Liberal rule in England. I think we have shown that Anglo-Dutch Liberalism was an abomination to England and America.

The Whigs, as Jonathan Swift clearly understood, represented nothing but the unbridled looting of England by the Bank of England and the British East India Company.

It was well known in England at the time that Shaftesbury, and later Robert Walpole, the founders of the Whigs, were two of the most corrupt politicians in English history. It was under Walpole that the Bank of England and the East India Company came to power. The cultural degeneration of England was documented pictorially by the political cartoonist William Hogarth, whose widely circulated engravings showed the moral degeneration that swept into England under Walpole, in particular. That is what came to power in England under William III, and was fully realized in the establishment of a doge system with the ascendancy of the House of Hanover under George I (1714).

While it is shocking that a history can be written today that characterizes our American Revolution as the advent of Anglo-Dutch Liberalism, what else can you expect from the neocons, who would have sided with the Tories and against the American patriots in our Revolution?

2. For example, in “Our Economic Policy: Animation and Economics,” *EIR*, Nov. 12, 2004, LaRouche laid out the fundamental issues as follows: “The American System of political-economy is derived, by way of the influence of Gottfried Leibniz, from the combined effect of the founding of the anti-feudal, modern sovereign form of nation-state during the 15th-Century Renaissance and the founding of modern international law of nations by that 1648 peace Treaty of Westphalia which ended the 1511-1648 period of religious warfare in Europe. However, over the period of the wars of France’s King Louis XIV and the subsequent ‘Seven Years War,’ the waning former imperial power of Venice’s ruling financier oligarchy, produced a situation in which Venice’s financiers reincarnated themselves in the new role as an Anglo-Dutch financier oligarchy embedded in the maritime power of the India Company of the Netherlands and England. The triumph of the British East India Company over its continental rivals, at the February 1763 Treaty of Paris, established the Anglo-Dutch Liberal model of financier oligarchy-controlled parliamentary systems, as the characteristic form of organization of international finance and political-economy up to the present day.”

3. See Robert Trout, “Life, Liberty, and the Pursuit of Happiness,” *Fidelio*, Spring 1997. Available at [www.schillerinstitute.org](http://www.schillerinstitute.org).

4. Phil Valenti, “The Anti-Newtonian Roots of the American Revolution,” *EIR*, Dec. 1, 1995; Anton Chaitkin, *Treason in America: From Aaron Burr to Averell Harriman* (Washington: Executive Intelligence Review, 1999); and a recent unpublished paper by Fred Haight.