

Free Will vs. Predestination

At the time of publication of this issue of *Fidelio*, the United States of America, and hence the world, is facing the worst financial and strategic crisis in three centuries. At the same time, as a result of a corrupt U.S. Presidential campaign, we lack the kind of leadership in the Presidency required to solve this crisis, as other *great* U.S. Presidents, such as Abraham Lincoln and Franklin D. Roosevelt, were able to do in trying, although less difficult times in our nation's history.

In 1933, the world faced a similar situation. Franklin D. Roosevelt had been elected U.S. President, and was to be inaugurated in March of that year. In Germany, however, Chancellor Kurt von Schleicher, who had an economic policy to deal with the depression similar to that of Roosevelt, was overthrown with the help of the head of the Bank of England, Montagu Norman, and his U.S. agents, Averell Harriman and George W. Bush's grandfather, Prescott Bush. Hitler was brought to power and the rest is history.

If von Schleicher had not been overthrown, it would have been possible to defeat fascism before it came to power, thus preventing World War II, through a Rooseveltian global economic recovery.

This time, the rest of the world is in various stages of revolt against the Anglo-American destruction of the old, Rooseveltian post-World War II Bretton Woods system. It is looking to the U.S.A. for another Roosevelt, but instead it finds a U.S. increasingly controlled by the very forces which brought Hitler to power in Germany.

While the U.S. preaches "Democracy" to the rest of the world, here in the U.S. the Presidential election was so tainted that it will never be known who was

really elected. The decision by the U.S. Supreme Court, spearheaded by Justice Antonin Scalia, to intervene into the electoral process and hand the election to George W. Bush, compounded the damage, by undermining U.S. Constitutional law, just as Germany's Justice Carl Schmitt did in helping to bring Hitler to power. We are faced in this nation with dictatorial rule, under crisis management conditions.

In terms of the U.S. Presidential election crisis, our best hope would have been for the members of the Electoral College to fulfill the intent of the Founding

Fathers, and, acting as "free agents," exercise their "independent judgment" based on the General Welfare clause of the Constitution.

EDITORIAL

The recent call, suggested by Lyndon LaRouche, for Congressional investigation into the charges of vote fraud and ballot irregularities that plagued the entire election process—emphatically including the effective overturning of the 1965 Voting Rights Act—provides yet another opportunity for the nation to reverse the slide into dictatorial rule, by instituting the level and quality of political debate required to meet the crises descending upon us.

This is the avenue afforded us by the U.S. Constitution to prevent from occurring in our own nation, what occurred in Germany in early 1933. In this larger sense, the outcome of the U.S. Presidential election is not predestined, even at this late date.

It is under conditions such as these that the true mettle of a people is tested and that the true nature of man has the potential to be brought to the fore.

The issue is: Will the U.S. population continue to act like slaves, begging for handouts at the back door of the master's mansion? Or will increasing numbers

of U.S. citizens act on that quality which is the characteristic of the human species—*free will*—to change the course of history, from what cowardly fools view as inevitably predestined.

As Plato warned in his *Timaeus*, entire populations have collapsed because they failed to exercise their free will to root out self-destructive features embedded in their cultures. It was not predestined that Hitler come to power in 1933. World War II was not predestined. Both could have been stopped. Nor is it predestined that the United States slide into *fascism*, officiated over by a Scalia-style, Roman Empire “rule of law.”

Why should we believe that globalization is irreversible, that deregulation and privatization are irreversible? Are we predestined to be slaves? Or, are we human beings capable of changing history by exercising our free will?

In his essay in this issue, entitled “Jesus Christ and Civilization,” Lyndon LaRouche notes that “sometimes, the threat or actuality of terrible tribulations awaken in people a willingness to risk much, even to the point of death, to defend civilization from the abyss, and even to add some worthy steps forward. The question is: Whence can they muster the passion required to act so, the passion—in German military science, the *Entschlossenheit*—needed to rescue themselves from the new dark age inhering in their present condition of great folly?”

LaRouche locates the answer to this question in rendering intelligible the ontological paradox of the Crucifixion of Jesus Christ through the idea of the *simultaneity of eternity*. As he writes: “This is precisely the idea which you—*personally*—must recognize, if you are to recognize the principle by means of which our presently imperilled civilization is to be rallied from the doom it is currently bringing down upon itself.”

On the Sublime

‘No man must must,’ says the Jew Nathan to the dervish,* and this expression is true to a greater extent, than one might perhaps concede to the same. The will is the species character of man, and reason itself is only the eternal rule of the same. All nature acts according to reason; his prerogative is merely, that he act according to reason with consciousness and will. All other things must; man is the being, who wills.

Precisely for this reason is nothing so unworthy of man, as to suffer violence, for violence annuls him. Who does it to us, disputes nothing less than our humanity; who suffers it in a cowardly manner, throws away his humanity. But this claim to absolute liberation from all that is violence seems to presuppose a being, which possesses enough power, to drive away from itself any other power. If it is found in a being, which does not maintain the uppermost rank in the realm of forces, so an unhappy contradiction arises therefrom between the instinct and the capacity.

Man finds himself in this case. Surrounded by numberless forces, which are all superior to him and play the master over him, he makes claim by his nature, to suffer from no violence. By his understanding he does indeed enhance his natural forces in an artificial manner, and up to a certain point he actually succeeds in becoming physically master over everything physical. For everything, the proverb says, there is a remedy, but not for death. But this single exception, if it actually is one in the strictest sense, would annul the whole notion of Man. By no means can he be the being, which wills, if there is even but a single case, where he absolutely must, what he does not will. This single terrible one, *which he merely must and does not will*, will accompany him as a ghost and, as is also actually the case among the majority of men, deliver him as a prey to the blind terrors of the phantasy; his boasted freedom is absolutely nothing, if he is bound even in a single point. Culture shall set man free and help him, to fulfill his entire notion. It will make him capable, therefore, of asserting his will, for man is the being, who wills.

—Friedrich Schiller,
from “On the Sublime”

* In Gotthold Lessing’s drama *Nathan the Wise*.—Ed.