

TARGET

Intelligence Report

VOLUME XXII No. 188

THURSDAY

September 3, 2020

ABOUT UNIVERSALITY, DEMOCRACY, LIBERTY, AND LOYALTY

‘It is remarkable that while England is the country in the world where public freedom has longest subsisted, and political institutions are most the subject of discussion, it is, at the same time, the one in which innovations are with most difficulty introduced, and which the most obstinate resistance is made to undoubted improvements.

‘You might alter the whole political frame of government in France with more facility than you could introduce the most-insignificant change into the customs or fashions of England ...’.

The above statements were not penned by the Editor of this medium, but by Anne Robert Jacques Turgot, Baron de l’Aulne (May 10, 1727 – March 18, 1781), a French economist and statesman, originally given the nomenclature of being a physiocrat (from the Greek for ‘government of nature’).

Anne Robert Jacques Turgot, Baron de l’Aulne, today, is best remembered as an early advocate of economic liberalism.

He was, probably, the first economist to have recognised the ‘*Law of Diminishing Marginal Returns in Agriculture*’.

Eight years after the death of Turgot – as he is, commonly, referred by that name, today – most of the poorest people of France took decided umbrage of their plight, resulting in the seeds of Revolution, being sown in Paris in 1789.

Those ‘seeds’ sprouted to become, within a relatively short space of time in the history of the world, the sturdy trunks of implacable political trees.

The above, two opening paragraphs of this essay, alluded to the consequence and the reward of free institutions, without any real concern in respect of a government, a government that is established in the firm belief of freedom and equality between interdependent communities within a society, whereby power is either held by elected representatives, or directly by the people of a country/territory, themselves.

But the above two paragraphs sing the truth of many political situations that take place in many countries of the free world, today – 293 years after the passing of Turgot from this world.

There Is No Love Lost In The World Of Bankers

In an interview with one of the most-senior officials of The Bank of East Asia Ltd on the subject of customer loyalty, the response from this gentleman included statements that went along the lines that his bank knew of no loyalty with regard to its customers – and, perhaps, there never has been any real and lasting loyalty between any bank and its customers ... *‘if truth be known.’*

Customers would not think twice to change banks if they were appraised that they could be able to obtain an improvement vis-à-vis their existing bank’s facilities, this official explained.

When asked whether or not a bank had a constructive duty to customers, the answer that was forthcoming was that the bank acts within the confines of the law that regulates, inter alia, the actions of banks and its employees, licensed in the Hongkong Special Administrative Region of the People’s Republic of China.

The official said:

‘This bank, as with all banks in Hongkong, has a duty to make as much profit as is legally possible. Customer loyalty never is considered – because we know that it does not exist in the real world!’

And About Universality?

Universality is, amongst other things, found greatest in the attachment of people to the customs and usages of their forefathers.

The attachment is, always, substantially pronounced where people have had a considerable share in the establishment or in the enjoyment of the customs and usages to which they have become accustomed.

Thus, the dangers of innovation – whatever may be their colour and or odour of the day – is most feared where the exercise of rights has the longest been unknown.

The ephemerality of the societies, established by most Asian potentates in days gone-by, has been, by and large, doomed, as history has recorded (and, probably, it is likely, always, to be so).

Extant monarchies of Europe have, for the most part, learned that material modifications and or radical changes to existing laws, those altered laws, the seeds of which were originally promulgated in days of yore, are necessary when there has been noticeable embedded progress in the societies over which the monarchies are vested with considerable political power.

The maxim of yesteryear, *‘nolumus leges mutari’* (we do not want the laws to be changed), no longer is applicable in today’s world.

Because it has been determined that laws have to be organic and must, out of sheer necessity, undergo change in accordance with the ever-changing facets of modern life.

Mr John Selden (December 16, 1584 – November 30, 1654), a noted British jurist of his day and a scholar of England's ancient laws and constitution, who sat in the House of Commons for the Borough of Lancaster in 1623, is said to have told King Charles I, in a '*Petition of Right*', drawn by this learned jurist:

'Your subjects have inherited this freedom.'

In the preamble of his '*The Declaration of Rights*', it was declared that the states do not pretend any right to frame a government for themselves, but strive only to secure the religion, laws, and liberties, long possessed, and lately endangered; and, their prayer is only this:

'That it may be declared and enacted, that all and singular the rights and liberties asserted and declared, are the true ancient and indubitable rights and liberties of the people of this kingdom ...'.

About 143 years later, Mr Edmund Burke (January 12, 1729 – July 9, 1797), an Irish statesman and philosopher of note of his day, a Member of Parliament, between 1766 and 1794, in the House of Commons of Great Britain, stated, amongst other things with regard to Mr John Selden's Declaration of Rights:

'By adhering in this manner, to our forefathers, we are guided, not by superstition of antiquarians, but the spirit of philosophical analogy.'

Mr Edmund Burke went on to state:

'In this choice of inheritance, we have given to our frame of policy the image of a relation in blood, binding up the constitution of our country with our dearest domestic ties, adopting our fundamental laws into the bosom of our family affection; keeping inseparable, and cherishing with the warmth of all their combined and mutually reflected charities, our state, our hearths, our sepulchres and our alters.'

The above principles, expounded by Mr Edmund Burke, the essence of which was essentially and initially penned in part (and in spirit) by Mr John Selden, more than a century before, to a great extent, have not been abandoned ... to this day.

When the insurrectionist inhabitants of the 13 original colonies of America cast off the yoke of Great Britain in that which came to be known as The American Revolutionary War (1775 - 1783), and established the country, today named The United States of America, they retained, for the most part, the laws, religion, institutions – with the exceptions of the monarchical and aristocratic parts – no massacres or proscriptions, no confiscations or exiles, disgraced the rise of their liberty; and, no oblivion of the past was made the foundation of their hopes for the future.

The insurrectionist's main complaints, prior to their determination to seek absolute freedom from Great Britain by force of arms, rested on allegations of excessive taxation and the absence of colonial representation in the British Parliament.

The formation of the Continental Congress by members of 12 original colonies coordinated their resistance from the British and, taking note of that which they had learned from studies of successive British Administrations of that which was British-Colonial America, established committees and conventions with the sole purpose of seizing political power, once and for all times.

Today, it is a distinctive trait of the growth, not of the free, but of the inappropriately named democratic spirit that is alleged to pervade throughout the human population of The United States of America, numbering about 333 million, men, women and children.

It is well accepted, today, that when such a spirit of the people of a country has become universal, it must be affirmed that freedom is at hand.

According to population statistics, obtained and collated by The United States Census Bureau, the three, most-prominent ethnic groups of The United States of America, today, comprise approximately: 241 million Caucasians; 42 million African-Americans; and, 16 million Asians.

The second-largest ethnic group make stentorian claims that they have been, and continue to be, treated dastardly by the Caucasian majority – and especially by certain members of a large number of police departments, throughout the country.

The riotous actions, witnessed today, initially led in the main by militant African-Americans, but their ranks, having been fast swollen by opportunists who determined to perpetrate criminal acts in order to enrich themselves, devoid as they are of any inkling of virtue as they went on one rampage after another in dozens of major cities throughout The United States of America over the past few months, and they continue so to do, to this day, their execrable violence toward members of the various police forces in the cities that they attacked, did not go unnoticed.

(In centuries past, ethnic men, women and children, kidnapped from their homes on the African Continent, for the most part, were shipped to The United States of America where they were treated as human chattel to be bought and sold at auctions and, for many, they were treated no better than their masters' horses and dogs.)

That which the African-Americans are demanding, today, are the righting of wrongs, perpetrated upon them in the past, and continuing to be done to them, in part or in whole, to this day.

The African-Americans, living in The United States of America, do not seek freedom – because they have been led to believe that they are entitled to freedom in accordance with The Constitution of The United States, The Constitution, delineating the national frame of Government, a fundamental principle that was enshrined by the Founding Fathers of the country, first ratified on June 21, 1788 – but they do desire to be treated in the manner to be able to enjoy the same rights and privileges as the majority ethnic Caucasians.

Unlike bankers, where customer loyalty is claimed to be non-existent, overridden by the importance of obtaining the highest legal level of interest on loans, afforded to customers, African-Americans seem to desire something more than just a pecuniary medium of exchange.

Ironically, historical records indicate that the thinking in Great Britain was far ahead of the thinking of the Founding Fathers of The United States of America.

What Is Democracy?

It might enlighten the African-Americans, making demands of the Government of President Donald John Trump, that the word, '*democracy*' is not to be found in either The United States Declaration of Independence (the pronouncement, adopted by the Second Continental Congress on July 4, 1776) or The Constitution of the United States of America, ratified on June 21, 1788.

The reason for this intentional omission was because the Founding Fathers were concerned of the possibility of any form of tyranny – including the tyranny of the majority.

The evils that accompany tyranny were not unknown to the Founding Fathers of The United States of America because they, directly or indirectly, had experienced it, measured out by successive British Administrations of the original British colonies of America.

Thus, the Founding Fathers went to great lengths to ensure that the determinations of successive Federal Governments should not be based on the will of the majority.

As such, the Federal Government has never been democratic.

That to which the Founding Fathers of The United States of America agreed was to secure the citizens the rights to life, liberty and property.

President John Adams (October 30, 1735 – July 4, 1826), the Second President of The United States of America from 1797 to 1801, as well as being one of the Founding Fathers of the country, wrote with regard to property:

'The moment the idea is admitted into society, that property is not sacred as the laws of God, and that there is not a force of law and public justice to protect it, anarchy and tyranny commence.'

The Constitution of The United States of America was designed in order to further the cause of liberty – not democracy.

The Constitution of The United States of America was meant to protect the rights of individuals from the Government of the day ... as well as from the fellow citizens.

To that end, The Constitution of The United States of America laid down clearly, unequivocally and enforceable rules to protect the rights of individuals.

As such, the scope of the government was strictly limited.

What Is Liberty?

Liberty comprises, inter alia, the security of persons and property.

Every man and every woman, while they respect the persons of others, and suffer them to enjoy in quietness of their industry, is certain that they, themselves, will be permitted to enjoy the same blessings at the hands of their fellow citizens.

To live in a state where the laws are equal for all, where they are certain to be executed with moderation and fairness, is to be free.

But where democracy, aristocracy, a republic, or to live under the yoke of a despot, is to suffer laws of partiality, laws that are uncertain and subject of widely differing interpretations at the whim of feeble and irregularly administered governments.

Civil Liberty is the liberty of a community: It is severe and restraining, but its fundamental concept is that of the protection of one's rights.

Civil Liberty is Natural Liberty so far restrained, but only so far restrained as may be necessary for the public good.

Every law that abridges personal freedom, without a corresponding general advantage, is an infringement upon Civil Liberty.

But, at the same time, it is no infringement of liberty to restrain the freedom of an individual(s), when the public good so requires.

Civil Liberty implies, also, obedience to authority and subjection.

In the words of Charles-Louis de Secondat, Baron de La Brède et de Montesquieu (January 18, 1689 – February 10, 1755), generally referred to as, simply, Montesquieu, a French judge, man of letters, and political philosopher:

'Civil liberty consists in the power of doing what we ought to will, and in not being constrained to do what we ought not to will.'

Conclusion

Knowledge is power and the riotous, stentorian actions of African-Americans as well as those riotous individuals of the Hongkong Special Administrative Region of the People's Republic of China would be well advised, in their own best interests, to acquire prerequisite knowledge before engaging in civil disobedience that has the ability to take lives rather than to enrich them.

-- **END** --

*While **TARGET** makes every attempt to ensure accuracy of all data published, **TARGET** cannot be held responsible for any errors and/or omissions.*

*If readers feel that they would like to voice their opinions about that which they have read in **TARGET**, please feel free to e-mail your views to editor@targetnewspapers.com. **TARGET** does not guarantee to publish readers' views, but reserves the right so to do subject to the laws of libel.*