

TARGET

Intelligence Report

VOLUME XXII No. 234

T U E S D A Y

November 3, 2020

LEADERS AND FOLLOWERS

A class struggle, claimed to have been justified by circumstance and the logic of the day, regardless of historical events that, rightly or wrongly, might have had some bearing on the origins of the class struggle, has more than just a worthy chance of being bloodless, nolens volens.

The class struggle, as well as its claimed justification, more often than not takes on the guise of being undeniably honest and true and being in the best interests of the downtrodden.

This is especially so when a seemingly promising influential class takes great pains to suggest, in order to continue to act as a voluntary guide in respect of the movements of certain aspects of those who would associate themselves with this influential class, those parties who had been carefully singled out to take on an active role in a civil-disobedience activity.

But the leaders of that would-be aspiring influential class, more by accident than by design, take it upon themselves to don the toga of office, distinguishing them from the hoi polloi as the lead actors in the struggle that had the innate ability to explode into violence.

That which the members of the up-and-coming influential class of today seem to have forgotten, however, is that their very actions, meant perforce to have been sedulous in abstaining from exciting the passions of the human '*puppets*' under their sway, either directly or indirectly, could have an inherent diametrical opposite effect.

Youth is amongst the most-generous of followers of that which appears, on the surface, to smack of nobility as well as being right, proper and just and, off-times, youth is the most-easily aroused of those who would appreciate and would gladly accept the august position of being amidst self-appointed spokespersons, leading the charge with regard to a political concept that might well suit one civilisation, at one time in the history of the world, but which might not be acceptable, or could not even be easily translatable into another extant civilisation.

If things transpire into a violent eruption, during a civil-disobedience campaign, leading to ferity and/or the abstruse destruction of private and or public property to the extent that members of appointed disciplinary departments of a government are required to take action in order to quench the flames of that which are deemed to be an unwarranted and illegal activity, more often than not, it is that same readily transparent youth that bears the heavy

brunt of the yoke of justice, being executed in the name of the laws of the government of the day.

If the spotlight is turned onto the up-and-coming influential class, suggesting obliquely that it had been constructively responsible for the unwanted actions of youth, in part or in whole, the influential class could make the claim that it hardly should be held responsible for those actions, claiming 蠟燭照亮別人，卻毀滅了自己 (a candle illumines others, but it consumes itself in exactly the same process).

In The United States of America in the early 18th Century, when segments of the slave population plucked up the necessary courage to revolt, they exterminated, by fire and sword, the property, as well as the lives of their masters and, in many cases, the immediate families of their masters: Men, women and children.

The actions in respect of the insurrection of the slaves, whose lives had been inundated with unimaginable physical pains and irrepressible hardships, the strength of their reactions to their lot was proportional to the oppression of the weight that was thrown off by their actions.

It is said that the recoil is most feared when the bow has been bent furthest from its natural form.

So it was for the iniquities that were suffered by the natives of, mainly, the African Continent, natives who had been kidnapped from their shanty homes, rounded up and, then, transported to The United States of America in sailing ships under the ships' nomenclature of human chattel enslavement, there to be sold legally to the highest bidder at slave auctions.

The lot of kidnapped natives of the African Continent was nothing short, by the standards of today, of an aberrant horror that only the most-evil of men could have foisted upon his fellow Homo sapiens.

The Peasants' Revolt of 1381

One recalls the name Walter 'Wat' Tyler (c. 1320-January 4, 1341-June 15, 1381), who is credited with having led the Peasants' Revolt in England in May of 1381.

He is recorded as having marched, with his motely group of rebels, from Canterbury to London, a distance of about 55 miles, in order to oppose the institution of a poll tax (a poll tax is that which is levied as a fixed sum of money on every liable individual).

The Peasants' Revolt was not only about money – about four pence for each adult, whether or not levied on a peasant or a wealthy individual – but inculcated in their demands was the concept of liberty and social reforms.

That which they were demanding was, inter alia, that each and every labourer should be permitted to work for an employer of his/her choice.

Also, they wanted to end the concept of serfdom and other inflexible social demarcations of the 14th Century England.

The Peasants' Revolt caught fire as uprisings sprang up in many other parts of England, with considerable unrest in Essex and Kent, according to historians' records of that time in the history of England.

The English priest, John Ball (c. 1338 – July 15, 1381), took a prominent role in the Peasants' Revolt of 1381.

At Blackheath, in an open-air sermon, John Ball advocated, among other things:

'When Adam delved and Eve span, Who was then the gentleman?

'From the beginning, all men by nature, were created alike, and our bondage or servitude came in by unjust oppression of naughty men.

'For, if God would have had any bondmen from the beginning, he would have appointed who should be bond, and who free.

'And, therefore, I exhort you to consider that now the time is come, appointed to us by God, in which ye may (if ye will) cast of the yoke of bondage and recover liberty.'

But the Peasants' Revolt was strongly opposed by a significant portion of the English society of the day, including the nobility as well as wealthy religious establishments (of which, John Ball had been excluded).

On or about June 13, 1381, it has been recorded that the peasants reached London and crossed London Bridge.

Once in the city, they were said to have attacked civil targets, destroying legal records, opening prisons, sacking homes, and killing individuals whom they thought had been associated with the Royal Government.

King Richard II (then 14 years old) was said to have met with the rebels on the day, following their entrance into London.

King Richard II was said to have verbally agreed to make numerous concessions with the rebels, including to give full pardons to all those involved in the rebellion.

The rebels, their demands, having been met, satisfactorily, it had been recorded, they dispersed.

But Walter 'Wat' Tyler and his immediate followers were not dispersed.

The following day, June 15, 1381, Sir John Newton, a servant of King Richard II, attacked Walter 'Wat' Tyler, calling him: *'The greatest thief and robber in all Kent'*.

When Walter 'Wat' Tyler attacked Sir John Newton, he was restrained and placed under arrest by the then Lord Mayor of London, William Walworth.

A fight ensued and Walter ‘Wat’ Tyler attempted to stab the Lord Mayor, but the Lord Mayor was saved by his armour.

In retaliation, the Lord Mayor was said to have slashed Walter ‘Wat’ Tyler across the neck and head with his sword while another of the servants of King Richard II stabbed Walter ‘Wat’ Tyler, severely wounding him.

Walter ‘Wat’ Tyler was, eventually, taken to Smithfield and publicly decapitated, his head, having been placed atop a pole and, then, carried through London and, lastly, displayed on London Bridge.

That was the end of the Peasants’ Revolt of 1381, with the rebels, being hunted down and eventually executed.

As for verbal concessions of King Richard II, they were, all, revoked.

Ignominious Cruelty

It is widely accepted that fear is, quite often, the chief source of ignominious cruelty: Men massacre their fellows because, inter alia, they are apprehensive of death, themselves.

The value of the property of others, be it belonging to friend or foe, is determined to have been set at a nugatory amount, or of little real consequence, where aggressors have little to lose in the struggle for class superiority (or, for that matter, even class equality), or, in the righting of historical multiple purported social wrongs, thrust upon the aggressors through no material fault of the downtrodden.

Persons respect property when they have grown up under the influence of their attachments.

For those with little or nought attachments toward property, they have little concern when the fires of civil disobedience obliterate that which they do not covet.

To such people, it is an anathema for the arraying of attachments for all to bear witness in order to publicise the treasures of the possessor.

One may ask the question:

‘What is the difference between men of years upon this earth and of children, reared on the breast-milk of their mothers? One deals in baubles, paintings and statues, be they, having been made of marble, of gold, or of a more-base materials; and, the other deals in babies’ rattles, noise-makers and rag dolls. One is more expensive than the other, no doubt, but which is the more foolish?’

It is widely held that to the man of virtue, horrors of the day are but a single raindrop in the oceans of life.

It has been written by the great philosophers of centuries past that the road to virtue is via virtue, itself; the impulse to become virtuous causes one to love virtue ... for itself – and nothing else.

It is, also, recorded in the annals of history that amongst the greatest of material increases in mankind, where positive steps have been taken to right the wrongs of the past, are to be found in the lower classes of society ... not in the aristocracy; and, rarely in kings, queens and emperors.

This was due to the fact that, in the lower classes of society, the light of the candle was, always, found to be sufficient to illumine their lives with regard to the principle of a population that is least restrained by prudence.

This appears to have been a fundamental principle that has rendered the maintenance of liberty for any considerable length of time in the history of successful civilisations.

The descendants of the poor are forever increasing their numbers except within disastrous circumstances that had the result as to put a stop to the growth of the population in this class.

It is written that the humblest class within a society, having the least political weight, are overlooked in their first struggles for freedom; the privileged classes, on the other hand, having acquired privileges, not proffered to the lower classes, resist their extension to the lower classes that they perceive as being their inferiors.

That which is often overlooked, however, is that descendants of the people of one epoch have the ability to become the privileged class of the next generation.

On the basis of pristine liberty, the oppression of oligarchy is, ultimately, established.

The happiness in man has never depended on the amassing of a fortune: Nothing is more preposterous than to assume that good may be weighed by the measure of riches, hidden under one's bed or in vaults, for one cannot commove reasonability with unreasonable baubles.

Each century has its particular daring: The boldest, weary of philosophy that seems more and more to delve into the realm of the academic, venture, casting caution to the wind, in order to explore those frontiers, formally forbidden.

-- E N D --

***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.

