Editorial

The causes of history

Patriots of all nations should draw a lesson from the long overdue discrediting of Britain's Lord Dacre, the historian Hugh Trevor-Roper, who had induced the London *Times* to pay a hefty sum for the so-called Hitler Diaries by swearing on his reputation as a historian that they were authentic.

Not only did the diaries, which have a very smelly trail leading back to Nazi "nostalgics" behind them, turn out to be as fraudulent as Trevor-Roper's reputation as a historian, but equally importantly, Trevor-Roper's reputation as a historian is as fraudulent as the poorly cooked-up Hitler Diaries. The significance of that is that Trevor-Roper has played a key role in hiding the roots of what was well known in the nineteenth century as the American System of political economy, the American System whose memory has survived in the United States mainly through the efforts of this magazine's founder, Lyndon LaRouche, and elsewhere through its energetic adoption by the Japanese.

The American System centers on a government policy of promoting technologically advancing industrial progress, through government-financed infrastructure projects, the granting of patents for inventions, and use of credit and fiscal policies to encourage productive investment in agriculture and industry by individuals. The roots of that outlook are deeply embedded in the Florentine Renaissance of Leonardo da Vinci and Niccolo Machiavelli, were shared by such northern European Renaissance thinkers as Erasmus and More, and flowered in the 17th century as the "mercantilist" policy of French finance minister Colbert and the "kameralist" school in Germany, together with the Campanella school of political economy in southern Italy.

When Benjamin Franklin and the other American founding fathers found themselves forced to rebel against the evil policy of the British Empire, which forbade its colonies from all industrial development, they turned to the example of the "mercantilists" like Colbert, the Neapolitan school of political economy, and the notions of statecraft which had been developed

by the continental European thinkers from the Renaissance through Leibniz. Alexander Hamilton launched the young United States on its way to industrial greatness by emulating the conception of economics as the "science of technology" which had been inherited from the Renaissance humanists.

Trevor-Roper's career, from at least 1957 when he became Regius Professor of Modern History at Oxford, was built on covering up this reality. Trevor-Roper maintained that mercantilism was an austerity policy brought about when people in the mid-17th century realized they could no longer afford the luxurious courts and overblown bureaucracies of Renaissance humanism, and decided to make national economies "live within their means." His terribly British assumption is that technological progress, to expand the potential relative population-density by expanding the productive power of the economy, either does not exist or is insignificant. As for Renaissance humanism, it was to Trevor Roper a "failure," swept away in the tide of the inevitable Inquisition and religious reaction.

Nowhere in this version of history are there any fundamental causes, only a vague spirit of the times, and at most "structural weaknesses" which caused the state to collapse in the face of revolutionary tides. Trevor-Roper built his career analyzing the "general crisis of the seventeenth century" without ever mentioning the fact that the crisis culminating in the genocidal Thirty Years' War was brought about because a triumphant oligarchy engaged in the Venetian-modeled looting practices that then became the model of the British System of political economy so rightly hated by our founding fathers.

The victory of the Inquisition, the arm of the oligarchy, was no more inevitable then than its revival is foreordained today. Trevor-Roper and the other false intellectuals who want to bring back Hitler would only make it so by blinding us to history. The first lesson of the Hitler Diaries Hoax should be to assume that every major premise of a decorated British historian is a lie.

64 National EIR May 24, 1983