The British ‘Anti-Jefferson’ Agenda

The Long Affair is a long-winded attack on America’s third President, Thomas Jefferson, for what author Conor Cruise O’Brien claims to have been Jefferson’s support for some of the bloodiest events in the 1789 French Revolution. At one point, the author goes so far as to compare Jefferson to Cambodia’s genocidal Pol Pot.

While many of the facts presented by O’Brien are in themselves credible, what absolutely strains credibility, is to believe that O’Brien is so opposed as he purports to be, to “revolutionary excesses,” or, for that matter, to Pol Pot. O’Brien himself is one of the chief conceptual architects of the current destruction of the African nation of Zaire, and the rise to power of Laurent Kabila.

Surely, there is another agenda behind this anti-Jefferson enterprise. British agent O’Brien exploits the controversy over Jefferson’s role in history, to promote processes in the United States that will lead to the destruction of the American Republic.

Jefferson was certainly a compromised figure, with significant weaknesses, as documented in “The Confederate Legacy of Thomas Jefferson,” by Richard Freeman (Fidelio, Spring 1997, Vol. VI, No. 1). But, O’Brien distorts the overall picture, and transforms the Jefferson controversy into a scenario for how the United States might be drowned in civil strife, in the years to come.

Falsifying History

Jefferson was a flawed individual; but, he was also a complex man. He was highly educated, and when under the influence of positive figures like Platonist George Wythe, or Benjamin Franklin, his better instincts could come to the fore. Hence, the first thing one must do, if one wants to create a caricatured and misleading portrait of him, is to destroy Franklin.

O’Brien’s depiction of Franklin is nauseating. The entirety of Franklin’s rich experience in France, is encapsulated in one dubious account of his supposed public embrace of the Enlightenment degenerate Voltaire.

Having done this, O’Brien must next create a highly simplistic account of the French Revolution, which draws extensively on the views of Edmund Burke, the Eighteenth-century Irish defender of the British Empire. While Burke ranted against the French Revolution in his Reflections on the Revolution in France, his ravings sidestepped the fact that several of the key dramatis personae were British agents with the assignment to destroy France from within.

By the same token, O’Brien retails the Big Lie that the cause of the French Revolution, was France’s earlier support for the American Revolution, and the supposedly damaging effect this had on French finances.

The worst travesty stems from O’Brien’s account of the impact of the French Revolution inside the United States. While exaggerating the importance of the issue in the United States, he also commits a willful fraud, that fits into the Anglophile, “neo-conservative” agenda in the U.S. today.

In his depiction, the battle-lines are drawn between Jefferson and his allies, on the one hand, against the Federalists, on the other—Alexander Hamilton above all, and by extension, George Washington. In this fight, Jefferson is, of course, pro-French, while Hamilton is falsely portrayed not only as strategically an Anglophile, but also as support-

for the society that it was no part of it.”

Novak admits that in determining his own calling, he had the advantage of “an outside psychotherapist to help me sort things out.”

If there is one factor preventing the Catholic Church from truly pursuing its mission as we approach the Third Millennium, it is the toleration and, even worse, the promotion, of Michael Novak, propagandist for the money changers, whom Christ would drive out of the Temple.

—William F. Wertz, Jr.
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the question of Thomas Jefferson and that philosophical movement known as the Enlightenment. The core impulses that motivated Benjamin Franklin and other Founding Fathers, themselves deeply influenced by the anti-Enlightenment Leibniz, were specifically in opposition to such Enlightenment degenerates as Francis Bacon, Isaac Newton, John Locke, Thomas Hobbes, Adam Smith, Bernard de Mandeville, and Voltaire.

The problem with Jefferson is, that he worshipped the key figures of the Anglo-Scottish Enlightenment. O’Brien is evasive on this matter, because he himself is a propagandist for the Enlightenment. The ultimate expression of this, is his laudatio to Edmund Burke, The Great Melody (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992). In economics and political strategy, Burke was an impassioned supporter of Adam Smith, as was Jefferson.

O’Brien’s ‘New American Civil War’

O’Brien’s evasiveness is driven by the obvious problem: If Jefferson’s bad ideas were caused by his affection for the Enlightenment, then one simply need blame the Enlightenment. To cure the disease, do away with the infectious agent: Destroy the Enlightenment.

Evidently, O’Brien has had a premonition, that the current direction of “Jefferson revisionism,” could lead insightful Americans precisely in this direction. The cleverer British strategists know that the current period of history, in which much of the world has been subjected to Enlightenment modes of thinking, is coming to an end. Either this will mean that the Enlightenment will be finally replaced by a reawakening of the kinds of ideas associated with the Golden Renaissance and promoted by Lyndon LaRouche today, or it will mean that the world crashes into what might be called “post-Enlightenment chaos,” O’Brien has opted for the latter.

O’Brien frets that Jefferson is already becoming the ideological standard-bearer for the right-wing, racist militia groups that are sprouting up in the United States. He paints a dark picture, in which a “new civil war”—a race war on a massive scale—might occur, with the “militant extremists” being part of a “neo-Jeffersonian racist schism” that will rip apart what he calls the American Civil Religion Official Version (ACROV).

“American civil religion,” he writes, “may . . . be the major force working for the preservation of the Enlightenment . . . Enlightenment and democracy are unlikely to survive in the rest of the world if they go down in America. . . . The sacred documents of the American civil religion are Enlightenment documents. . . . The Constitution is an Enlightenment document.” [Emphasis in original]

What is involved here is a threat. O’Brien writes that “the implications of a schism in the American civil religion,” caused by the re-evaluation of Founding Father Jefferson, “are potentially so far-reaching that they defy all prediction. . . . A drama is about to manifest itself.” He feels “awe and foreboding, at the potential consequences in the coming century, for the world as well as for America, of the impending schism in the American civil religion and of the concomitant emergence of Thomas Jefferson—the mystic, implacable Jefferson of the French Revolution—as prophet and patron of the fanatical racist far right in America.”

The message is: Try to extirpate the evil that the Enlightenment has done in the United States, and we will drown you in blood.

Those who are sane among us, will learn from Jefferson’s errors, to seek ways to bury the Enlightenment once and for all, and replace it with truly human forms of thought. By contrast, the Conor Cruise O’Briens of this world want to drive us all into a Dark Age, as the “alternative” to their doomed Enlightenment paradigm. The handwriting on the wall reads: “Zaire.”

—Mark Burdman

The Bold Freshness of Artistic Discovery

“As a child, I grew angry when anyone tried to tell me what I ought to think of a person or a work before I had even had a glimpse of it. Standing before a painting is like encountering a living person: The impression it makes on us arises from that relationship. The information that others are so intent on communicating to us, remains subordinate to that.

“Recalling this induces me to make you the following proposition: Don’t read this book yet. First turn to the picture, to the images. Make their acquaintance. Enter fully into their world. Somewhere in this multitude, with careful searching, you will discover Christ carrying the cross on which, soon enough, He will be crucified.”

On that passionate note begins this little jewel of a book on “The Procession to Calvary” (“Christ Carrying the Cross”), that great picture in the Kunsthistorisches Museum of Vienna, painted in 1564 by Pieter Bruegel the Elder [see page 103]. The author of this work in French, Michael Gibson, is art critic for the International Herald Tribune, and the author of monographs on numerous painters, one of them Bruegel (Paris: Nouvelles Editions Francaises).

Boldly devoting himself here to a single work, which he examines in its many facets, diamond-like, the author