

# Three Men with Power

Washington, Jefferson, Franklin

In 1811 Thomas Jefferson claimed that America was “the last best hope of human liberty in this world” and many of us (myself included) who were public school children got to affirm this optimistic viewpoint by beginning each new day with a recitation in unison of the national loyalty oath. In pledging allegiance to the republic for which the flag stands, we affirmed that this is “one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.” But if we are to be honest about it, we might more truly affirm that no human institution but God alone is indivisible and if America were truly under God, then our allegiance would be to God, and to God alone, and we would not be asking little children to place their confidence anywhere else than in God and certainly not in any man’s republic, for God alone is just and His truth alone is what sets us free.

With reference to the American revolution, in 1813 Jefferson said: "If ever there was a holy war, it was that which saved our liberties and gave us independence." A "holy war"? Does that mean it was sanctioned by a kind and benevolent God? If so, one might reasonably suppose that it can be squared with the Gospel of the Lord Jesus Christ. (Has anyone tried doing that? Has it not occurred to anyone to make that our standard?) But what if Jefferson’s “holy war” does not measure up? then maybe it wasn’t so holy a war after all.

I remember as children, as part of our indoctrination into the national civil religion, learning about the two Georges, one good, one bad, the good one being George Washington, the bad one being King George III. In our innocency we took all of this in as genuine history and formed our views of the world accordingly. For many decades thereafter I bought into this idealized narrative. But eventually, for truth’s sake, I found I had to revisit this issue because I could not navigate through life on a twelve-year old’s understanding of events.

Based on evidence submitted hereafter, I contend the American revolution was a reaction against a progressive trend then operative in British society and, most significantly, within its legal establishment, opposing, not only the slave trade, but slavery itself. I further contend, the American Revolution was begun for the purpose of undoing British legislation protecting the rights of Native Americans and this because certain privileged Americans were not about to countenance the slow undoing of their mercantile designs. If this assessment is correct, then the "Spirit of '76" marks the turning point when America veered from the norms of

European society and regressed from biblical standards of morality for the sake of preserving a privileged class's right to wring its bread from the sweat of other men's brows.

Fueling plantation owners' fears was a legal decision rendered in 1772 in England regarding an American slave who, after he was brought to England by his master, escaped and declared himself free. The judge in the case, Lord Mansfield, in what is known as the Mansfield Decision, ruled in the fugitive's favor, in effect declaring that at the moment a slave's foot touches English soil or when he breathes England's air, he does so as a free man.

More than just a reflection of the laws found on the law books, cut and dried, legal decisions often mirror the standards of society at large and British society at that time was being swept by a wave of evangelical fervor. One emphasis of the growing Christian movement was that of banning slavery. In 1774, John Wesley (the founder of Methodism) published in England under his own name a tract widely distributed in both England and America, denouncing slavery. With fierce indignation, he pointed a finger of blame at those in Virginia responsible for instituting this inhumane practice, saying:

In order to rivet the chain of slavery, the law of Virginia ordains: "That no slave shall be set free upon any pretense whatever, except for some meritorious services, to be adjudged and allowed by the Governor and Council;" . . . this is the law of Virginia: "After proclamation is issued against slaves that run away, it is lawful for any person whatsoever to kill and destroy such slaves, by such ways and means as he shall think fit." We have seen already some of the ways and means which have been thought fit on such occasions; and many more might be mentioned. One gentleman, when I was abroad, thought fit to roast his slave alive! But if the most natural act of "running away" from intolerable tyranny, deserves such relentless severity, what punishment have these lawmakers to expect hereafter, on account of their own enormous offenses?

From the enormous amount of invective directed at King George III in Jefferson's *Declaration of Independence*, one might overlook the possibility that his wife was considered the greater threat. A vivacious, gifted woman, Queen Charlotte was an artist and fluent in many languages, as well, the mother of fifteen. Though German born, she was of Portuguese extraction, having several bloodlines of Negro ancestry, and she was herself of a dusky appearance. On the back steps in slave shanties, whispering occurred as slaves reasoned among themselves that if the Queen could be black and free, they, too, had a right to be free. I wonder, by what quirk of collective amnesia this woman, America's last queen, has become virtually unknown to the American public? As for the intemperate barrage of criticism, had it so much to do with the King's policies or with his wife's racial heritage?

To keep the peace on the frontier, King George III issued, October 7, 1763, "The Royal Proclamation." Surprisingly enlightened legislation, it states:

. . . And whereas it is just and reasonable, and essential to our interest and the security of our colonies, that the several nations or tribes of Indians with whom we are connected, and who live under our protection, should not be molested or disturbed in the possession of such parts of our dominions and territories as, not having been ceded to or purchased by us, are reserved to them, or any of them, as their hunting-grounds; we do therefore, with the advice of our Privy Council, declare it to be our royal will and pleasure, that no Governor or commander in chief, in any of our colonies of Quebec, East Florida, or West Florida, do presume, upon any pretense whatever, to grant warrants of survey, or pass any patents for lands beyond the bounds of their respective governments, as described in their commissions; as also that no Governor or commander in chief of our other colonies or plantations in America do presume for the present, and until our further pleasure be known, to grant warrants of survey or pass patents for any lands beyond the heads or sources of any of the rivers which fall into the Atlantic Ocean from the west or northwest; . . .

And whereas great frauds and abuses have been committed in purchasing land of the Indians, to the great prejudice of our interests, and to the great dissatisfaction of the said Indians; in order, therefore, to prevent such irregularities for the future, and to the end that the Indians may be convinced of our justice and determined resolution to remove all reasonable cause of discontent we do, with the advice of our Privy Council, strictly enjoin and require, that no private persons do presume to make any purchase from the said Indians within those parts of our colonies where we have thought proper to allow settlement; . . .

With this and other treaties, a frontier truce was achieved. But establishing a line at the Appalachians beyond which White settlement was disallowed, caused much disaffection among land speculators who were counting on windfall profits from the buying and selling of land expropriated from Native Americans. For instance, George Washington owned 60,000 plus acres in the Ohio Territory. When, June 22, 1774, the British Parliament passed the Quebec Act, annexing this region to Quebec, Washington, the one indispensable person to the American revolution was galvanized to turn against the motherland. The Quebec Act was termed one of the “Intolerable Acts” which was given out as justification for revolt.

#### **H E L L B E N T   F O R   W A R**

Upholding Gospel values in America were the Quakers. For their pains, their Philadelphian leadership was incarcerated and taken in chains to Virginia. Before that happened, however, one Quaker, Joseph Galloway, a delegate from Pennsylvania to the 1<sup>st</sup> Continental Congress in 1774, observed that:

One [party] intended candidly and clearly to define American rights, and explicitly and dutifully to petition for the remedy which would redress the grievance justly complained of – to form a more solid and constitutional union between the two countries, and to avoid every measure which tended

to sedition or acts of violent opposition. The other consisted of persons whose design, from the beginning of the stamp act was to throw off all subordination and connection with Great Britain; who mean by every fiction, falsehood, and fraud to delude the people from their due allegiance, to throw the subsisting governments into anarchy, to incite the ignorant and the vulgar to arms, and with those arms establish American independence.

Few, not mentally deranged, would go to war lightly, on a whim. Look therefore to some kind of pecuniary inducement to explain it. In this instance, a significant economic factor motivating the landed aristocracy to rebel against Britain was their indebtedness. In earlier times a loose system of direct trading existed whereby tobacco was shipped to Europe and sold, after which later, perhaps much later, planters would be compensated. But there were many uncertainties involved with this method having to do with the vagaries of markets and the availability of ships. Eventually a consignment system was developed. British merchants appointed what were called "factors" who set up trading establishments in the colonies offering credit and a guaranteed price to plantation owners who consigned their shipments through them to the parent merchants in Britain.

However, when tobacco prices fell, as eventually they did, indebtedness was incurred. The contractual agreements planters encumbered themselves with often contained clauses requiring them to continue supplying the merchant to whom they were indebted. Of this James Madison wrote, an instance "of a man's getting out of debt who was once in the hands of a tobacco merchant" was yet to be discovered. To a French admirer, Jefferson explained: the debts of Virginia planters were "hereditary from father to son for so many generations, so that planters were a species of property, annexed to certain mercantile houses in London." Now we see why plantation owners were so eager for war. It was based on their anticipation that with victory their massive debts would become uncollectible. Of this expectation Irish poet Tom Moore succinctly wrote:

Those vaunted demagogues who nobly rose  
From England's debtors to be England's foes,  
Who could their monarch in their purse forget  
And break allegiance but to cancel debt.

The treaty of peace, concluded in 1783, provided for creditors on both sides of the Atlantic to be paid in full value, which elicited this response from George Mason (the father of Virginia's constitution) in a letter to Patrick Henry: "If we are now to pay the debts due to the British merchants, what have we been fighting for all this while?" Henry, a lawyer with many indebted planters for clients, brought about the defeat of a bill in the Virginia Assembly which would have required compliance.

## LIBERTY B A B B L E

As pervasive as racial prejudice was in 18th century America, Jefferson, in rallying the people for a war of independence, could hardly make slavery the rallying cry, for the vast majority of Americans were not slaveholders or inclined to bleed and die for such a dubious cause. Somehow saying "Give me slaves or give me death!" lacked the resonance of "Give me liberty or give me death!" As any schoolboy knows, it was the latter expression, not the former coined by Virginia slave holder, Patrick Henry, which gained currency. But what did Patrick Henry really mean? When, during the Revolutionary War, the British offered black people their freedom in exchange for fighting on their side, Henry was incensed and accused the British of trying to overthrow the accepted social order. From this one might conclude that his famous expression was nothing but an idle slogan, or perhaps we should view it as his fellow slaveholders may have, as code language meaning "free to hold slaves." In the same speech, Henry declared: "The War is inevitable – and let it come!" This incendiary speech, made March, 1775, helped kindle a war fever among the populace. War was not "inevitable." If it were, he would not have needed to mold public opinion to embrace it.

The Royal Governor of Virginia, John Murray Dunmore (Lord Dunmore), on learning in May, 1775, that Patrick Henry, now "Colonel", was approaching at the head of an army, took his family with him, and beat a hasty retreat from Virginia's capital, Williamsburg, to a ship moored near Norfolk. What was transpiring was this: hundreds of frontiersmen, with muskets in hand, had rallied to Patrick Henry's call to arms. Equipped with buckskin leggings, and wearing green shirts emblazoned in white with the saying: "Liberty or Death," they flaunted tomahawks and skinning knives. Menacingly, they advanced on the capital.

Ascribing his movements to "apprehensions of his personal safety ... that the disorders in Williamsburg ... had driven him from his palace" and that "a certain Patrick Henry ... and followers" were " ... the great terror of all His Majesty's faithful subjects," Lord Dunmore on November 7 issued a proclamation declaring martial law, summoning all able-bodied men to resort to the King's Standard, and, most fateful of all, freeing all slaves and indentured servants belonging to the rebel party who could reach a British garrison. It was this last provision that galvanized the Southern, landed aristocracy against the British cause. In response to this proclamation, George Washington, December 26, 1775, in a letter to R.H. Lee wrote:

If that man [Dunmore] is not crushed before spring, he will become the most formidable enemy America has; his strength will increase as a snow ball, by rolling; and faster if Some expedient cannot be hit upon to convince the slaves and servants of the impotency of his designs. . . . I do not think forcing his Lordship on shipboard is sufficient; nothing less than depriving him of life or liberty will secure peace to Virginia, . . .

Patrick Henry's motley crew soon proved their mettle by decoying Dunmore's forces into a trap, then killing more than a hundred of them. Thus did the War of Independence in the South begin in earnest. (What would Homeland Security think about all of this?)

In October of 1780, with Jefferson as Governor, the Virginia State Assembly voted to give every white recruit who would serve until the end of the war "300 acres of land plus a healthy sound Negro between 10 and 30 years of age or 60 pounds in silver or gold." Not surprisingly, tens of thousands of slaves fled to the British side, including twenty-two of whom were Jefferson's.

#### **WHERE AND HOW DID IT ALL BEGIN?**

Because perpetuation of slavery was a major motivation in bringing about the Revolutionary War, it would help to know more about its origins. Before the dastardly deed was done and slavery became an established institution, Satan whispered in someone's ear:

If upon a Just warre the Lord should deliver them [the Narraguansetts] into our hands, wee might easily have men, woemen and children enough to exchange for Moores, which will be more gaynefull pilladge for us than we conceive, for I doe not see how we can thrive until we gitt into a stock of slaves sufficient to doe all our business, for our children's children will hardly see this great continent filled with people, soe that our servants will still desire freedome to plant for them selves, and not stay but for verie great wages. And I suppose you know verie well how wee shall mainteyne 20 Moores cheaper than one Englishe servant. (Emanuel Downing, John Winthrop's brother-in-law, writing to the same in 1654)

John Winthrop, we may recall from the study of history, became Massachusetts Bay Colony's governor, but, in 1630, before he and his band of pilgrims set forth for the New World, he delivered to them his justly famous "City on a Hill" oration, in which he said:

. . . for wee must Consider that wee shall be as a Citty upon a Hill, the eies of all people are upon us; soe that if wee shall deale falsely with our god in this worke wee have undertaken and soe cause him to withdrawe his present help from us, wee shall be made a story and a byword through the world, wee shall open the mouthes of enemies to speake evill of the wayes of god and all professours for Gods sake; wee shall shame the faces of many of gods worthy servants, and cause their prayers to be turned into Cursses upon us till wee be consumed out of the good land whether wee are going: . . . Therefore lett us choose life, that wee, and our Seede, may live; by obeyeing his voyce, and cleaveing to him, for hee is our life, and our prosperity.

The idealism was there, or so it would seem, but so also the temptation to do wrong. Not long thereafter, lust for land and for slaves broke forth in mass-murder, rape and, pillage. The event was called "King Philip's War." Local Native American tribes of Massachusetts were overwhelmed and destroyed but not before 600 colonists and 3,000 Native

Americans were killed, and several hundred native captives taken captive who were then tried and executed or else enslaved and sold to Bermuda. As for the Indian chieftain, King Philip, as the Europeans were wont to call him, he was drawn and quartered and his head was cut off, then stuck on a stick for display in Plymouth Plantation's town square for twenty years, thereby advertising to the world where Puritans stood with respect to native peoples.

Slavery in America began on a small scale, in 1619, the year before the Mayflower sailed; for in that year, nineteen Black Africans were imported into Jamestown, Virginia as indentured servants. In 1658, nineteen Jewish slave-dealing families, having been kicked out of Brazil, also came to America's shores. On hearing of Roger Williams' noble experiment to establish a colony practicing tolerance, they showed up in Newport, Rhode Island, to see how well slavery would be tolerated. Quite well, it turned out. Where do we suppose the slave trade was permanently headquartered in America? not as some might have supposed, in New Orleans, Charleston, Richmond, or Atlanta but, rather, in Newport, Rhode Island. Ah, what a bustling port it was in those pre-revolutionary years, the saying then being that Newport was the shipping center "New York can never hope to rival." *Oy, vey!*

Specifically what Jewish merchants were doing in Newport was conducting the "Triangle Trade." Slave-produced sugar and molasses were brought up from Jamaica and from Hispaniola to be distilled in Rhode Island into rum. The rum, then carried to West Africa, was exchanged for human cargo, to be brought to the West Indies on the infamous Middle Passage and so it went. Many million of slaves were brought over alive, while three times as many may have perished along the way.

While trying to assimilate the magnitude of the suffering this entailed, for some fascinating recreational reading, check out any of a number of Jewish web sites on the subject. My, oh, my, how they love to brag up Newport's one-time prominent Jewish community, all the while dancing about the question as to where all the opulence was coming from. As they say, that's for us to know and for the rest of you goyim to find out. And they do know, since many a Jewish historian has documented in detail how the slave trade was a Jewish monopoly. They didn't just own the ships, they crewed and skippered them, as well, and if a slave auction fell on a Jewish holiday, too bad, the auction had to be postponed.

A rich breeding ground for Jewish slave merchants, Brazil, about 1760, drove off one of these less-than-favorite sons, namely, one Aaron Lopez, who gravitated to New Port where he plied the slave trade with such ardor and dedication that he became America's most successful businessman. But there was another side to Lopez, a religious side. A benefactor, in 1763, Lopez laid the cornerstone for New Port's synagogue, a building still standing today as America's oldest surviving synagogue sanctuary.

Not all religion was pro-slavery. In England, those acting under the impress of Gospel truth, particularly those who followed Charles Wesley's teachings, sought to end the institution of slavery throughout the entire British Empire. That is what sparked the American Revolution, the incompatibility of American slavers and English abolitionists. We shall have occasion to show hereafter, America's revolution was fought in the name of freedom and for the rights of man, but in reality, it was a conspiracy *against* the rights of Man. America's original sin was the unholy alliance formed between America's Gentile plantation slave owners and America's Jewish slave dealers without which no war could have occurred in the first instance or have been successfully prosecuted.

Having accumulated 30 transoceanic vessels and more than a hundred coastal vessels, Lopez was well positioned beginning in 1774 when the British began interfering with his slave franchise, to use his private navy to resupply the revolutionary army. As well, he backed the revolution to the hilt with the mammon of unrighteousness, that is, his slave profits.

Meanwhile, George Washington, engaged the services of one, Robert Morris, a Philadelphia Jew, seeing to it that he was appointed Superintendent of Finance for the Continental Congress. Later Morris would do jail time for a fraudulent land schemes, but in the war years Morris was riding high, overseeing the revolution's finances, mostly by collecting funds from another Jew by the name of Haym Salomon. This is where the story gets really interesting.

A Jew whose family hailed from Portugal, Haym Salomon landed in New York City in 1775, a refugee from Poland. Immediately, a revolutionary fervor swept over him such that he was inspired to start spying on the British army. In 1776, Salomon was arrested and jailed for 18 months. Yet, on his release, or should we say escape, since he bribed a jailer with a piece of gold, he somehow made his way to Philadelphia to become the financial angel of the American Revolution. "Send for Haym Salomon." That is what Washington kept saying to Morris whenever finances were tight, which was always. How do we know any of this? For one, in 1975 the US Post Office issued a stamp with Salomon's scabrous visage on it. Uniquely printed on both sides, on its gum side, in green ink, it reads:

Financial Hero – Businessman and Broker, Haym Salomon was responsible for most of the money needed to finance the American Revolution and later to save the new nation from collapse.

How did a recent Polish refugee who just did eighteen months in the slammer amass in the space of a few months more money for the Patriot cause than did all the plantation owners in America, the Continental Congress and everyone else combined? The answer is simple enough, he didn't. Truth be known, Salomon and Morris were merely Jewish conduits for Jewish slave profits. The Jewish Establishment needed to launder its money so as not to raise the suspicion that American freedom was actually the handmaid of Jewish slavery.



After the war, Washington and Newport's synagogue exchanged congratulatory letters:

To the President of the United States of America.

Sir:

Permit the children of the stock of Abraham to approach you with the most cordial affection and esteem for your person and merits — and to join with our fellow citizens in welcoming you to NewPort.

With pleasure we reflect on those days — those days of difficulty, and danger, when the God of Israel, who delivered David from the peril of the sword, — shielded Your head in the day of battle: — and we rejoice to think, that the same Spirit, who rested in the Bosom of the greatly beloved Daniel enabling him to preside over the Provinces of the Babylonish Empire, rests and ever will rest, upon you, enabling you to discharge the arduous duties of Chief Magistrate in these States.

Deprived as we heretofore have been of the invaluable rights of free Citizens, we now with a deep sense of gratitude to the Almighty disposer of all events behold a Government, erected by the Majesty of the People — a Government, which to bigotry gives no sanction, to persecution no assistance — but generously affording to all Liberty of conscience, and immunities of Citizenship: — deeming every one, of whatever Nation, tongue, or language equal parts of the great governmental Machine: — This so ample and extensive Federal Union whose basis is Philanthropy, Mutual confidence and Public Virtue, we cannot but acknowledge to be the work of the Great God, who ruleth in the Armies of Heaven, and among the Inhabitants of the Earth, doing whatever seemeth him good.

For all these Blessings of civil and religious liberty which we enjoy under an equal benign administration, we desire to send up our thanks to the Ancient of Days, the great preserver of Men — beseeching him, that the Angel who conducted our forefathers through the wilderness into the promised Land, may graciously conduct you through all the difficulties and dangers of this mortal life: — And, when, like Joshua full of days and full of honour, you are gathered to your Fathers, may you be admitted into the Heavenly Paradise to partake of the water of life, and the tree of immortality.

Done and Signed by order of the Hebrew Congregation in NewPort, Rhode Island August 17th 1790.

Moses Seixas, Warden

To the Hebrew Congregation in Newport Rhode Island.

Gentlemen,

While I receive, with much satisfaction, your Address replete with expressions of affection and esteem; I rejoice in the opportunity of assuring you, that I shall always retain a grateful remembrance of the cordial welcome I experienced in my visit to Newport, from all classes of Citizens.

The reflection on the days of difficulty and danger which are past is rendered the more sweet, from a consciousness that they are succeeded by days of uncommon prosperity and security. If we have wisdom to make the best use of the advantages with which we are now favored, we cannot fail, under the just administration of a good Government, to become a great and happy people.

The Citizens of the United States of America have a right to applaud themselves for having given to mankind examples of an enlarged and liberal policy: a policy worthy of imitation. All possess alike liberty of conscience and immunities of citizenship. It is now no more that toleration is spoken of, as if it was by the indulgence of one class of people, that another enjoyed the exercise of their inherent national gifts. For happily the Government of the United States, which gives to bigotry no sanction, to persecution no assistance requires only that they who live under its protection should demean themselves as good citizens, in giving it on all occasions their effectual support.

It would be inconsistent with the frankness of my character not to avow that I am pleased with your favorable opinion of my Administration, and fervent wishes for my felicity. May the children of the Stock of Abraham, who dwell in this land, continue to merit and enjoy the good will of the other Inhabitants; while every one shall sit in safety under his own vine and figtree, and there shall be none to make him afraid. May the father of all mercies scatter light and not darkness in our paths, and make us all in our several vocations useful here, and in his own due time and way everlastingly happy.

G. Washington

“A right to applaud themselves,” quite a mutual self-admiration society they had going. Were they deaf to the groins and piteous cries rising from the captured women and children aboard ship in the harbor? In saying that “the Children of the Stock of Abraham” ought to “merit and enjoy the good will of the other inhabitants” did Washington mean Jewish slavers and financiers meriting the good will of people of color? And what of this “gives to bigotry no sanction, to persecution no assistance” stuff? Who were they kidding, anyhow?

On the Liberty Bell in Philadelphia is engraved these immortal words from *Leviticus*:

Proclaim liberty throughout all the land unto all the inhabitants thereof. (*Leviticus 25:10*)

If only “all” had really meant all. It rang out liberty but only for the Jewish Establishment and for slavers, not for African Americans or Native Americans or for women or for the average working man. Did you think the crack in the Liberty Bell came about because someone rang it too hard in celebration of American liberty? The crack better represents all the unhealed fissures separating class, race, and gender. *Leviticus 25:10* is best read in its entirety:

And ye shall hollow the fiftieth year, and proclaim liberty throughout all the land unto all the inhabitants thereof: it shall be a jubilee unto you; and ye shall return every man unto his possession, and ye shall return every man unto his family.

Properly read, this verse is about *ending* slavery, not perpetuating it. Also, it is about reuniting people with their possessions. Not a bankers' bailout, this was a peoples' bailout and when that happens then we will have something to jubilate about.

### L I N C O L N   T O   T H E   R E S C U E

I know there is a God, and I see a storm coming. If he has a place for me, I believe that I am ready.

(Abraham Lincoln)

80 years later, it was President Lincoln who had to deal with the dog's breakfast which Washington and Jefferson had served up as their legacy. In a hundred circling camps, men gathered whom Lincoln as Commander-in-Chief led and together they successfully drove the scourge of slavery from America's shores. But it proved to be a pyrrhic victory for as Lincoln openly acknowledged, he was simultaneously fighting two wars, the one which we're all familiar with against the South, which war he saw through to victory; but the other war, almost never acknowledged, was the one waged against the international money-changers, which war Lincoln lost, and lost ignominiously, for the bankers outmaneuvered him at every turn, then had him snuffed. Said Lincoln: "I have the Confederacy before me, and the bankers behind me, and for my country I fear the bankers most:"

The money power preys upon the nation in time of peace and conspires against it in times of adversity. It is more despotic than monarchy, more insolent than autocracy, more selfish than bureaucracy. I see in the near future a crisis approaching that unnerves me, and causes me to tremble for the safety of our country. Corporations have been enthroned, an era of corruption will follow, and the money power of the country will endeavor to prolong its reign by working upon the prejudices of the people, until the wealth is aggregated in a few hands, and the republic is destroyed.

(Abraham Lincoln)

After several generations without constitutional money, people these days probably find it hard to conceive of coinage made from anything other than pot metal or currency, which is to say, fiat Banker's Notes backed by nothing more than Jewish hot air. Honest specie, not debased, was once the standard. Thus said Lincoln with reference to his ingenious innovation, the Greenback, a national, interest-free currency ultimately redeemable in gold which made a public commodity out of what before had been a banker's bond loaned out at interest. Said Lincoln:

We gave the people the greatest blessing they ever had, their own paper money to pay their own debts.

Banker-inspired resistance in Congress resulted in Lincoln's compromising with the forces of evil so that Congress would continue funding his war. There was another way to go. Did Lincoln not at any one time have half a million men under arms? Certainly, he could have broken away a tenth of them and taken care of matters once and for all. Rather than sending General Sherman southward to burn down Atlanta, he would have done better to have sent him northward to burn down Wall Street. Better yet, Lincoln, following Jesus' example (see *John 2:13-22*), would have done well to take whip in hand set with knots which he personally tied and, as Commander-in-Chief, have led his troops into battle, and by main force have driven the New York Money men from their counting tables, along the way, flogging any who showed themselves recalcitrant, as he drove them down through the streets of Manhattan to the East River, where they could be finished off once and for all. Were there not lampposts and piano wire enough to do justice by them all? Yes, enough to have done justice by them all. In saying this, I am only mirroring Andy Jackson's prescription, who once had this to say to this same crew of malefactors:

You are a den of vipers. I intend to rout you out, and by the Eternal God I will rout you out. If the people only understood the rank injustice of our money and banking system, there would be a revolution before morning.

Looking back on America's Civil War era, German Chancellor, Otto von Bismarck, said:

It is not to be doubted, I know of absolute certainty, that the division of the United States into two federations of equal power was decided long before the Civil War by the high financial powers of Europe. . . . I fear that foreign bankers with their craftiness and tortuous tricks will entirely control the exuberant riches of America and use it to systematically corrupt civilization.

What good was to be achieved in any contest between North and South if at the end of the day both fell prey to the international money-changers? All that blood and treasure expended in vain, the gains made on the battlefield being wiped out behind the scene in the boardrooms of the rich and influential. As for Lincoln's "government, of the people, by the people, for the people," we see what that has come to, namely: government of the bankers, by the bankers, for the bankers, that usury might not perish from off the face of the earth.

For all his sagacity, Lincoln harbored a blind spot; as President-elect, in 1861, on his way to take up his elected duties, he explained to a crowd in New Jersey the source of his views:

You all know, for you have all been boys, how these early impressions last longer than others. I recollect thinking then, boy even though I was, that there must have been something more than common that those men struggled for. I am exceedingly anxious that that thing which they struggled for; that something that held out a great promise to all the people of the world to all time to come; I am exceedingly anxious that this Union, the Constitution, and the liberties of the people shall be perpetuated in accordance with the original

idea for which that struggle was made, and I shall be most happy indeed if I shall be a humble instrument in the hands of the Almighty, and of this, his almost chosen people, for perpetuating the object of that great struggle.

In the *Gettysburg Address*, Lincoln proclaimed:

Our fathers brought forth on this continent a new nation, conceived in Liberty, and dedicated to the proposition that all men were created equal.

How could Lincoln, then in the throes of a war whose primary cause was slavery, say that the Nation had been "conceived in Liberty"? I can only conclude that he was referring to the founders' expressed ideals, in other words, the concept of liberty which they articulated so well, but otherwise violated or ignored. Conversely, the abolitionist, William Lloyd Garrison, addressing himself to the framers' intent, characterized their document as "a covenant with death and an agreement with hell." It comes down to whether one wishes to take the constitutional framers at face value or not. A little-recognized source of strength for the Confederacy in their contest with the North, was their awareness that they, not the North, maintained a true continuity of purpose with America's founders.

It is to be wondered about Lincoln, whether it ever dawned on him how far removed his beloved country was from the ways of the Almighty whom he professed to serve. As we see from his words above, blinding him was an almost childish, overblown regard for America's founding fathers. For instance, he wrote:

Washington's is the mightiest name of earth. . . . To add brightness to the sun or glory to the name of Washington is alike impossible. Let none attempt it. In solemn awe pronounce the name, and in its naked deathless splendor leave it shining on.

This is worshipfulness bordering on naked idolatry. Worship extended to man is worship withdrawn from God. I take Lincoln for having been a sincere man, yet, in certain respects, sincerely wrong, the victim of a cult of personality. Given his life-long adoration of America's founding fathers, it is to be doubted, had he lived to serve a second term, whether he could have put America on a significantly different path than the original one.

Though having nothing quite so effusive to say about Thomas Jefferson as he did of Washington, Lincoln did say this:

All honor to Jefferson – to the man who, in the concrete pressure of a struggle for national independence by a single people, had the coolness, forecast, and capacity to introduce into a merely revolutionary document, an abstract truth, applicable to all men and all times, and so to embalm it there, that to-day, and in all coming days, it shall be a rebuke and a stumbling-block to the very harbingers of re-appearing tyranny and oppression.

## J E F F E R S O N   A N D   J E F F E R S O N I A N I S M

Virginia-born, Thomas Jefferson (1743-1826) grew of age at Shadwell, a 400 acre estate situated to the east of the Blue Ridge Mountains in Albemarle County. As his late father's oldest son, (who died when he was 14) Jefferson inherited extensively on his 21st birthday, including 22 slaves. Always an avid, disciplined student, he spent long hours at his studies and became an accomplished lawyer. Talented, multi-faceted, Jefferson followed such diverse interests as the violin, art, and architecture. Fluent in both Latin and Greek, Jefferson was the 19<sup>th</sup> century's most prolific writer. Jefferson is best known in his political role as the author of the *Declaration of Independence*. Always, Jefferson looked so good and talked so good, but was his vision for America good?

As one who cut a wide swath across the landscape, Jefferson is not an easy mark for cutting down to size, but if we are honestly interested in our country's past, or in its future, we must compare the man with the myth, and the idealized image with historical reality. In some respects, I hope to confirm what is generally known about him, but in other respects I hope to move the debate into new territory by refuting the fractured fairy tale of America's origins.

Rising above the others from the revolutionary era, Jefferson inhabits a special place the American imagination. Though greatly admired, George Washington, was too remote; Patrick Henry, too feisty; John Adams, too bilious. But Jefferson, through the excellency of his prose, the graceful beauty of Monticello, or his 40 years service in the highest circles of government, recommends himself to us as a man of rare distinction. By combining cool detachment with passionate engagement, Jefferson evidenced a high degree of self-mastery, while his elevated political views regarding the rights of man are as familiar to us as his form and visage. Overall, for Americans, Jefferson personifies their belief that their nation's cause is just, it's foundations secure. Students of his time confess, however, that they find Jefferson baffling; and, too, a hint of scandal nips at his heels, yet Americans continue to take solace in their felt need to have this man represent their highest ideals.

Though initially it was Washington, a man of action, who played the greater role in gaining America its independence, we do not speak of "Washingtonianism," for he was not, as was Jefferson, so much a man of ideas, but, rather, we speak of Jeffersonianism or of "Jeffersonian democracy," yet no founding father was more problematic than was he. In 1874, a prominent American historian, James Parton, said: "If Jefferson was wrong, America is wrong. If America is right, Jefferson was right." Right or wrong, which is it? Let us find out.

How is it that we hear the loudest *yelps* for liberty among the drivers of Negroes? (Dr. Samuel Johnson)

Was Thomas Jefferson a revolutionary freedom fighter who, as he put it in his *Declaration*, was willing to put his "Life", his "Fortune" and his "sacred Honor" on the line for the sake of abstract principle, or was he, as chief spokesman for the slave holding class, trying to protect their mutual slave empire? In other words, was he seeking to risk all or was he seeking to preserve all? A prodigious self-maximizer, Jefferson wanted it all: fame, fortune, and luxurious living, but also a reputation for sagacity and passionate commitment to what is right and good. Thus, he said:

I have sworn upon the altar of God eternal hostility against every form of tyranny over the mind of man.

Great sounding stuff but was it real? Did he actually mean it? For instance, how do we square his wanting, not to limit slavery, but to spread it throughout the land? And yet he is on record for proposing that very thing. In a bid to tip the balance in favor of America's becoming *all* slave Jefferson said to Congressman John Holmes in 1820:

Of one thing I am certain, that the passage of slaves from one State to another would not make a slave of a single human being who would not be so without it, so their diffusion over a greater surface would make them individually happier, and proportionately facilitate the accomplishment of their emancipation by dividing the burden on a greater number of coadjutors.

In 1819 the issue before the U.S. Congress was that of conditioning Missouri's entrance into the Union with anti-slavery restrictions. In opposing such restriction Jefferson claimed that it was the "exclusive right of every state to regulate the conditions of the different descriptions of men composing a state." Long before others did, Jefferson discerned in this controversy the shape of a coming civil war. He knew America could not long endure half slave, half free. He wanted it all slave. To his friend, John Adams, he wrote:

It is the most portentous one which ever yet threatened our Union. In the gloomiest moment of the revolutionary war I never had any apprehension equal to what I feel to this source.

The following year in a letter to Congressman Holmes, Jefferson characterized the Missouri controversy memorably, saying it was "like a firebell in the night." He anticipated that a geographical divide "coinciding with a marked principle, moral and political, once conceived and held up to the angry passions of men, will never be obliterated and every new irritation will mark it deeper and deeper." This was said regarding the Mason-Dixon line being extended westwardly, dividing southern slave states from northern free states.

In the fall of 1820, the as yet unresolved question regarding Missouri took a new turn when the U. S. House of Representatives again rejected its admission into the Union as a state because of a clause in its territorial constitution directing the state legislature to prevent

freedmen from settling in the state. To the House this appeared a violation of the Constitutional guarantee entitling the citizens of each state "all privileges and immunities of citizens in the several states." Jefferson's position was that black people were not citizens, period, but property, a legal view upheld by the U. S. Supreme Court some thirty years later in the infamous Dred Scott decision, a ruling in which it was determined that no black person has any rights that a white person need pay heed to and that therefore blacks could not be afforded recourse to the legal system.

If ever there was a time for Jefferson to exercise moral leadership and thereby head off the cataclysmic conflict he so clearly foresaw was coming, it was then. But instead of advancing a plan, even in outline form, to end slavery, he again demonstrated his essential orientation as a white supremacist. And rather than deal with the impending crisis in any realistic way, as his letter of December 1820 to Albert Gallatin, indicates, Jefferson, with almost child-like peevishness, made the most wild and outlandish claims, stating:

For if Congress once goes out of the constitution to arrogate a right of regulating the condition of the inhabitants of the States, its majority may, and, probably will, next declare that the condition of all men within the Unites States shall be that of freedom; in which case all the whites south of the Potomac and Ohio must evacuate their States, and most fortunate those who can do it first.

In February of 1821, with the Missouri issue still before Congress, Jefferson wrote in his autobiography:

Nothing is more certainly written in the book of fate than that these peoples are to be free. Nor is less certain that the two races, equally free, cannot live in the same government. Nature, habit, opinion has drawn indelible lines of distinction between them. It is still in our power to direct the process of emancipation and deportation peaceably and in such slow degree as that the evil will wear off insensibly, and their place by pari passu filled up by free white laborers. If on the contrary it is left to force itself on, human nature must shudder at the prospect . . .

If Jefferson, the idealist, saw injustice in the treatment being meted out to black people, then why not support their being given a territory of their own in America? If he didn't believe they could be integrated freely into the country he had founded, why not let them have one of their own? Was not the North American continent big enough that they might have a territory of their own? Indeed, James Monroe, at a time when he was in a position as President of the United States to do something about it, suggested this very expedient, but Jefferson nixed the idea. Instead, Jefferson would have black people sent back to Africa. But what if they didn't want to go or no longer spoke an African language? In 1811, the other Jefferson, the pragmatist, advised:



. . . take measures for procuring on the coast of Africa, an establishment to which the people of color these states might, from time to time, be colonized, . . . Having long ago made up my mind on this subject, I have no hesitation in saying that I have ever thought it the most desirable measure which could be adopted for gradually drawing off this part of our population, most advantageous for themselves as well as for us. . . . Indeed, nothing is more to be wished than that the United States would themselves undertake to make such an establishment on the coasts of Africa. Exclusive of motives of humanity, the commercial advantages to be derived from it might repay all its expenses. (Thomas Jefferson to John Lynch, 1811 ME 13:12)

In the not too distant past, African Americans' ancestors had been chained-up, then packed like sardines into the holds of ships. Were they now to suffer the same outrage in reverse? Worse still, was Jefferson's trying to justify this expedient for pecuniary advancement?

### **R E P U B L I C   O R   E M P I R E ?**

In the eyes of empire builders men are not men but instruments. (Napoleon Bonaparte)

Beginning with Cuba, though it was not a country whose subjects spoke English or who were even predominantly Caucasian, yet, in 1809, to James Madison, Jefferson wrote:

I candidly confess that I have ever looked on Cuba as the most interesting addition which could ever be made to our system of States.

Jefferson is not speaking here as a champion of liberty but as a champion of empire and for the extension of slavery, yet, covering his tracks, he would say such things as:

Possessing ourselves the combined blessing of liberty and order, we wish the same to other countries.  
(Thomas Jefferson to A. Corey, 1823 ME 15:481)

Or:

That we should wish to see the people of other countries free is as natural and at least as justifiable as that one King should wish to see the Kings of other countries maintained in their despotism.

(Thomas Jefferson to Albert Gallatin, 1817 ME 15:132)

From the passages above one might suppose Jefferson held national sovereignty to be inviolate and as sacrosanct. But behind-the-scenes he supported Napoleon's attempt to suppress Haitian independence. To his general, Leclerc, Napoleon wrote:

Jefferson has promised that the instant the French army arrives all measures will be taken to reduce Toussaint [the Haitian leader] to starvation and aid the army.

Behind Jefferson's policy was the fear of Haitians being seen by their American colored counterparts as enjoying their freedom. For 65 years, from Jefferson's time until the close of

the Civil War, so as to impoverish their country, the U.S. embargoed Haitian produce. Said *Time Magazine* recently regarding Jefferson's policies toward Haiti:

Haiti's very existence highlighted the deepest contradictions of the American revolutionary experiment. Though the U.S. Declaration of Independence stated that all men were created equal, Haitian slaves and free men and women of color battled what was then one of the world's most powerful armies to prove it. Yet how could the man who wrote about freedom in such transcendent terms have not seen echoes of his struggle in the Haitians' urgent desire for self-rule? Possibly because as a slave owner and the leader of slaveholders, he could never reconcile dealing with one group of Africans as leaders and another as chattel. So Haiti's independence remained unrecognized by Jefferson, who urged Congress to suspend commerce with the nascent republic, declaring its leaders "cannibals."

In perpetuation of Jefferson's sorry legacy, between 1898 and 1934, the United States Marines invaded Cuba 4 times, Nicaragua 5 times, Honduras 7 times, the Dominican Republic 4 times, Haiti twice, Guatemala once, Panama twice, Mexico 3 times and Colombia 4 times. The US has intervened militarily in foreign countries more than 200 times. It currently has more than a 1000 overseas bases in more than 100 countries. Once the veneer of liberty is stripped away, little substantive remains except empire. As we see above, Jefferson's *modus operandi* was to issue flowery affirmations about the rights of man, then violate them with impunity. Hypocrisy was the mainspring of his being.

#### **P O L I C Y   T O W A R D   N A T I V E   A M E R I C A N S**

As problematic as was Jefferson's dealings with Black Americans, one should see how he dealt with Native Americans. In a missive, whiffy with condescension, to the Chiefs of the Cherokee Nation, Jefferson wrote:

My children, this is what I wished to say to you. To go on learning to cultivate the earth and to avoid war. If any of your neighbors injure you, our beloved men whom we place with you will endeavor to obtain justice for you and we will support them in it. If any of your bad people injure your neighbors, be ready to acknowledge it and to do them justice. It is more honorable to repair a wrong than to persist in it. Tell all your chiefs, your men, women and children, that I take them by the hand and hold it fast. That I am their father, wish their happiness and well-being, and am always ready to promote their good. . . . My children, I thank you for your visit and pray to the Great Spirit who made us all and planted us all in this land to live together like brothers . . .

Methinks the Great White Father speaks with forked tongue. In a letter he wrote in 1803 to the Governor of Ohio, William Harrison, President Jefferson took another tack entirely:

You will receive herewith an answer to your letter as President of the Convention; and from the Secretary

of War you receive from time to time information and instructions as to our Indian affairs. These communications being for the public records, are restrained always to particular objects and occasions; but this letter being unofficial and private, I may with safety give you a more extensive view of our policy respecting the Indians, that you may the better comprehend the parts dealt out to you in detail through the official channel, and observing the system of which they make a part, conduct yourself in unison with it in cases where you are obliged to act without instruction. Our system is to live in perpetual peace with the Indians, to cultivate an affectionate attachment from them, by everything just and liberal which we can do for them within the bounds of reason, and by giving them effectual protection against wrongs from our own people. The decrease of game rendering their subsistence by hunting insufficient, we wish to draw them to agriculture, to spinning and weaving. The latter branches they take up with great readiness, because they fall to the women, who gain by quitting the labors of the field for those which are exercised within doors. When they withdraw themselves to the culture of a small piece of land, they will perceive how useless to them are their extensive forests, and will be willing to pare them off from time to time in exchange for necessaries for their farms and families. To promote this disposition to exchange lands, which they have to spare and we want, for necessaries, which we have to spare and they want, we shall push our trading uses, and be glad to see the good and influential individuals among them run in debt, because we observe that when these debts get beyond what the individuals can pay, they become willing to lop them off by a cession of lands. At our trading houses, too, we mean to sell so low as merely to repay us cost and charges, so as neither to lessen or enlarge our capital. This is what private traders cannot do, for they must gain; they will consequently retire from the competition, and we shall thus get clear of this pest without giving offence or umbrage to the Indians. In this way our settlements will gradually circumscribe and approach the Indians, and they will in time either incorporate with us as citizens of the United States, or remove beyond the Mississippi. The former is certainly the termination of their history most happy for themselves; but, in the whole course of this, it is essential to cultivate their love. As to their fear, we presume that our strength and their weakness is now so visible that they must see we have only to shut our hand to crush them, and that all our liberalities to them proceed from motives of pure humanity only. Should any tribe be fool-hardy enough to take up the hatchet at any time, the seizing the whole country of that tribe, and driving them across the Mississippi, as the only condition of peace, would be an example to others, and a furtherance of our final consolidation. . . .

I must repeat that this letter is to be considered as private and friendly, and is not to control any particular instructions which you may receive through official channel. You will also perceive how sacredly it must be kept within your own breast, and especially how improper to be understood by the Indians. For their interests and their tranquillity it is best they should see only the present age of their history. I pray you to accept assurances of my esteem and high consideration.

With a botanist's cold regard for a beetle under his magnifying glass, Jefferson preserved Indian lore. In his book *Notes on Virginia* he speaks favorably of their culture and prowess,

while as President he received Native American delegations with becoming graciousness. But none of this added up to actually watching out for their interests. Jefferson declared that the Indians should be pursued until each tribe “is exterminated or is driven beyond the Mississippi,” and so it was to be. It was under Jefferson that genocide became national policy.

#### THE GRAND BARGAIN OF 1790

Without knowing the full story, one might have supposed, based simply on his words, that Thomas Jefferson had forever been centralized banking’s foe. To John Taylor in 1816, he wrote:

The system of banking [I] have . . . ever reprobated. . . . And I sincerely believe, with you, that banking establishments are more dangerous than standing armies; and that the principle of spending money to be paid by posterity, under the name of funding, is but swindling futurity on a large scale.

Again one might be excused for thinking Jefferson inalterably opposed to centralized banking based on his 1791 essay “Opinion on Bank”, wherein he wrote:

The incorporation of a bank and the powers assumed [by legislation doing so] have not, in my opinion, been delegated to the United States by the Constitution. They are not among the powers specially enumerated.

In reality, it was Jefferson’s backroom deal with Alexander Hamilton, that resulted in the First National Bank of America being established in 1791 and given a 20-year charter. How and why Jefferson compromised his principles on this matter is a strange and curious tale.

Let us begin by finding out what was going on in Pennsylvania. Freedom was going on and this was deeply disturbing to America’s founding frauds. Specifically it was Pennsylvania’s gradual abolition of slavery act of 1780 which caused them consternation. The Act read in part:

. . . we are unavoidably led to a serious and grateful sense of the manifold blessings which we have undeservedly received from the hand of that Being from whom every good and perfect gift cometh. Impressed with these ideas, we conceive that it is our duty, and we rejoice that it is in our power to extend a portion of that freedom to others, which hath been extended to us; and a release from that state of thralldom to which we ourselves were tyrannically doomed, and from which we have now every prospect of being delivered. It is not for us to enquire why, in the creation of mankind, the inhabitants of the several parts of the earth were distinguished by a difference in feature or complexion. It is sufficient to know that all are the work of an Almighty Hand. We find in the distribution of the human species, that the most fertile as well as the most barren parts of the earth are inhabited by men of complexions different from ours, and from each other; from whence we may reasonably, as well as religiously, infer, that He who placed them

in their various situations, hath extended equally his care and protection to all, and that it becometh not us to counteract his mercies. We esteem it a peculiar blessing granted to us, that we are enabled this day to add one more step to universal civilization, by removing as much as possible the sorrows of those who have lived in undeserved bondage, and from which, by the assumed authority of the kings of Great Britain, no effectual, legal reliefs could be obtained. Weaned by a long course of experience from those narrower prejudices and partialities we had imbibed, we find our hearts enlarged with kindness and benevolence towards men of all conditions and nations; and we conceive ourselves at this particular period extraordinarily called upon, by the blessings which we have received, to manifest the sincerity of our profession, and to give a Substantial proof of our gratitude.

This enlightened piece of legislation, as emancipations go, was most conservative in its provisions. For instance those born just before this Act became law would have to continue another 28 years in slavery that their masters might recoup the cost of raising them. On the other hand, this bill made those blacks already free, more equal under the law by removing the prohibition on interracial marriage, also by allowing them to testify against whites in state courts. The only rights not extended to them were those of voting and of serving in the state militia. The Mason-Dixon Line separated Maryland from Pennsylvania. After this legislation was enacted, that Line came to symbolize the divide between North and South.

This act of emancipation did not simply fall as a bolt from the blue. Behind it was a long gestation period as Pennsylvania's founding sect, the Society of Friends (Quakers) worked out among themselves what posture to adopt toward slavery. Though it took them an unconscionably long time to hash this out, eventually the Quaker came down strongly opposed to it. A leading Quaker educator, Anthony Benezet and John Woolman, were able to persuade Philadelphia Quaker Yearly Meeting to officially come out against slavery in 1758. In 1775, Benezet founded America's first anti-slavery society in Philadelphia, the Society for the Relief of Free Negroes Unlawfully Held in Bondage. By the time of the American revolution, the Quakers were no longer in the majority in Pennsylvania but they did establish a moral climate. That is why their leadership was arrested and taken away in chains to Virginia in 1777, to shut them up. Jefferson openly acknowledged, there was no love lost between him and the Quakers. In 1810, in a letter to the author, Samuel Kercheval, he wrote:

You expect that your book will have some effect on the prejudices which the society of Friends [the Quakers] entertain against the present and late administrations [James Madison's and his own]. In this I think you will be disappointed. . . . You observe very truly, that both the late and the present administrations conducted the government on principles professed by the Friends. Our efforts to preserve peace, our measures as to the Indians, as to slavery, as to religious freedom, were all in consonance with their professions. Yet I never expected we should get a vote from them, and in this I was neither deceived nor disappointed.

Suddenly assuming utmost urgency in the minds of the South's plantation aristocracy, was the need to establish America with a capital city located in the South, otherwise how could they properly maintain the standards of deportment commensurate with their station and to which they had become accustomed? That is to say, how were they travel to the nation's capital to conduct the nation's business, if they didn't bring along with them their retinue of liveried slaves? But if they took their slaves to a province where African Americans were free and freely seen to be free, how were they to keep their slaves from bolting?

This wasn't there only concern. It was the general drift toward egalitarianism, that is, the empowering of the common man which they found disturbing. After all, not all patriots were insincere as were these plantation dandies. For instance, there was Thomas Paine, author of the pamphlet, *Common Sense*, and in Vermont, the hero of Fort Ticonderoga and leader of the Green Mountain Boys, Ethan Allen.

#### **B A I T   A N D   S W I T C H**

Resolved: that these united colonies are, and of right, ought to be free and Independent States, . . .

(Continental Congress, 1777)

America fought its way to freedom under the Articles of Confederation for it was the Articles of Confederation which guaranteed States rights and that, States rights, presumably is what the war was all about. Then just four years after the fighting had ended and a treaty of peace had been signed, the rug was pulled out from under liberty's cause. Rather than "Independent States," in a fundamental shift in objectives, the new goal became one of consolidated empire.

Just as Washington's leadership was instrumental in winning the war, so also was his leadership essential in replacing the Articles of Confederation with the US Constitution, for he was the one who presided over the closed-door Philadelphia convention where this change was made. Wrote Washington:

We have probably had too good an opinion of human nature in forming our Confederation. Experience has taught us, that men will not adopt and carry into execution measures that are best calculated for their own good without the intervention of a coercive power.

One of the drafters of the US Constitution, Alexander Hamilton, formerly Washington's aide-de-camp, and his on-going confidant, unlike Jefferson or Madison who were always careful to cover their every move with talk of freedom, was frank enough to say that it will have "the good will of the commercial interests ... the good will of most men of property," but opposing it would be "the democratical jealousy of the people which may be alarmed at

the appearance of institutions that may seem calculated to place the power of the community in a few hands and to raise a few individuals to stations of great prominence.”

Even stodgy, old Samuel Adams, Boston’s aging firebrand, had to concede in a letter to Richard Henry Lee in 1788 the sad, true nature of the work he was engaged in:

I confess that as I entered the building I stumbled at the threshold. I met a National Government, instead of a Federal Union of States.

One of the new provisions of the Constitution was to accommodate the creation of a district not to accede a 100 square miles to serve as the nation’s capital in which Congress would “exercise exclusive legislation.” The next step for the South’s founding frauds was to make sure the new federal city would be located in the South. But this is where things got a little sticky. The US Congress began considering possible locations all up and down the Atlantic seaboard. In 1789, by a tie-breaking vote cast by John Adam, Congress approved Germantown, Pennsylvania as the Nation’s “Federal town.” Needless to say, this decision did not sit well with the Southern plantation class. The South wanted no part of a Republic where slavery was peripheral. Jefferson himself saw this as a make or break issue, that it could result as he put it, in the “dissolution of our Union at this incipient stage.” To get the votes they needed in Congress, to reverse what they saw was a revolting state of affairs, those representing the southern states’ slave interests, namely, Jefferson and Madison, would have to dicker with Hamilton who represented the northern faction.

But first, a little about Hamilton. Unlike Jefferson who was born into money Hamilton married into money. Before he struck it rich, however, Hamilton grew up in Barbados and knew privation, his divorced mother having died when he was yet a child. An aunt provided him with money to go to King’s College (later Columbia.) Thereafter he involved himself in the American revolution and excelled in all that he did on the field of battle as an artillery officer. At the ripe age of 20 he became one of Washington’s leading advisors.

Overlooking his humble beginnings, Hamilton, expressed as his political philosophy:

All communities divide themselves into the few and the many. The first are the rich and well-born, the other the mass of the people. The voice of the people has been said to be the voice of God; and however generally this maxim has been quoted and believed, it is not true in fact. The people are turbulent and changing; they seldom judge or determine right. Give therefore to the first class a distinct permanent share in the government.

For all his aristocratical views, Hamilton was light years ahead of Jefferson on matters of race. For instance, in a letter in 1779, to John Jay, then the President of the United States, he wrote:

The contempt we have been taught to entertain for the blacks makes us fancy many things founded in neither reason nor experience. . . . An essential part of the plan [to enlist African-Americans as soldiers in the Revolution] is to give them their freedom with their muskets. This will secure their fidelity, animate their courage, and I believe will have a good influence on those that remain by opening a door to their emancipation. This circumstance, I confess, has no small weight in inducing me to wish the success of the project; for the dictates of humanity and true policy equally interest me in favour of this unfortunate class of men.

Both Jefferson and Hamilton had entered President Washington's cabinet at the same time, the former as the Secretary of State and the latter as the Secretary of the Treasury. They served together most uneasily until finally Jefferson, seeing that Hamilton had Washington's ear more than he did, resigned. But that parting of the ways was yet several years off. Meanwhile, over a bottle of Madeira one afternoon, the two men worked out their nation's future together. Hamilton, with his Rothschild connections, wanted a central bank and he got it, the First US Bank, with a 20 year charter. That would be pleasing to the New York money men and certain European investors.

Hamilton also wanted to federalize State debt. In a way this wasn't totally unreasonable. The Southern States had not suffered the brunt of the War so much as did those in the North and so did not carry the debt load the northern states did. He calculated the total debt left over from the war at \$77.1 million (or roughly \$750 billion by today's standards). Of this, \$11.7 million was owed to foreign governments, \$40.4 million was the result of domestic debt, and \$25 million the result of war expenditures of the various states.

Hamilton also wanted to pay off state bonds at full face value. In many instances, war veterans had been paid off for their service in state-issued bonds which were so depreciated in value as to be worthless. These war veterans with seemingly worthless bonds were approached by friends of Hamilton who generously offered to buy their bonds for as little as 5 cents on the dollar. If the bonds were now to be paid at full face value, naturally, these speculators would make out like bandits. Thomas Jefferson protested Hamilton's plan, that it would enrich a "corrupt squadron of paper dealers." By way of a counter-proposal, Madison suggested that Congress should set aside some money for the original owners of the debts who tended to be ordinary Americans, not speculators. Since tracing out who were the original owners would have been difficult, if not impossible in many instances to implement, this idea went nowhere. Besides, nearly half the members of Congress themselves had invested in such bonds and stood to gain by Hamilton's proposal. Madison was grandstanding. He never pushed his proposal. As did Jefferson, Madison knew what was at stake. As he rightly said:



History records that the money changers have used every form of abuse, intrigue, deceit, and violent means possible to maintain their control over governments by controlling money and its issuance.

Hamilton held all the high cards and Jefferson and Madison both caved. One more side deal had to be worked out. So that Hamilton could round up the required number of votes, Pennsylvania's congressmen needed placating. This was achieved by having the capital moved temporarily to Philadelphia from New York until the Potomac river site was ready. The law mandating all of this passed July 26, 1790. Washington, exercising the prerogative granted him by law, chose a malarial-infested swamp whose only advantage was that it was contiguous with his Mount Vernon plantation, making for him an easy commute.

It is typically the case that in the wake of empire comes great opulence; also great squalor. Nothing better exemplifies this than the Nation's capital. Besides being a showcase of reflecting pools and cherry blossoms, and watering holes where heads of state congregate, it is also a slum-ridden, garbage-strewn, rat-infested, hell-hole, the murder capital of the Nation.

From its inception, the District of Columbia was awash in corruption. Without a penny securing the deal, title to 6000 lots was given to Washington's close personal friend, Robert Morris, the Philadelphia financier who, as Treasurer of the Continental Congress was the alleged financial angel of the American Revolution. (Actually, it worked the other way round, the American Revolution helped finance Robert Morris to the tune of at least \$80,000.) With a near-monopoly on building sites in Washington, Morris jacked the price through the roof, practically bringing all development to a standstill. For a while Washington was nicknamed "Morristown." Later, after one of Morris's schemes went awry, he was forced into bankruptcy which led to his doing a year in the slammer.

Even Thomas Paine, the author of *Common Sense*, the good man who came up with such striking expressions as "summer soldier" and "sunshine patriot" was corrupted. In 1781, Robert Morris, then Secretary of the Treasury, in his diary wrote of having made Paine the proposition that "for the service of the country he should write and publish such Pieces respecting the propriety, necessity, and Utility of Taxation as might be likely to promote the Public Service of America as the war does and ultimately rest on the Taxes to be raised in the U. S." Though already on record as opposing distant taxing authorities, Paine at first resisted this proposition but eventually succumbed. In a more patriotic moment he wrote:

Tyranny, like hell, is not easily conquered; yet we have this consolation with us – that the harder the conflict, the more glorious the triumph. What we obtain too cheap, we esteem too lightly: It is dearness only that give everything its value. Heaven knows how to put a poorer price upon its goods; and it would be strange indeed, if so celestial an article as freedom should not be highly rated. (*The Crisis*)

## THE HIDDEN HAND

It was the genius of Jefferson, to realize that the upper class, no matter how outnumbered, through its wealth, through superior networking, through control of the press, through use of political contributions, could dominate the entire political process. In other words, it would be business as usual.

There is a lingering tradition in the United States that the men of the eighteenth century who laid the foundations of our system of government broke violently from political experience and sought their guidance in the abstract principles of the rights of man. As a matter of fact, however, the Revolutionary Fathers had no quarrel with the fundamental English institutions under which they lived; their revolt was against the colonial policy of the British government, -- a protest against definite measures which affected them adversely, not a demand for the realization of the equalitarian notions enunciated in the Declaration of Independence which served very well to justify the Revolution, but afforded no practical basis for the reconstruction of the political system after British dominion was thrown off. Neither in the creation of the state governments nor in the formation of the Union did the Fathers depart very radically from experience, and even their departures were reactions against concrete abuses rather than attempts at ideal creations. . . . as most of them were staid and conservative men, well schooled in the actual management of public business, they had neither interest nor desire to lead them into experiments into theoretical politics. The sources of American government, therefore, are to be sought not in the realms of political philosophy, but in the dry records which describe the institutional heritage with which the new nation began its career of independence. (Charles A. Beard, Readings in American Government and Politics, 1910)

If perchance Jefferson's system required less overt repression to achieve and run than did others, it was only because it relied more on manufactured consent, a price we all pay 24/7 in having to live with the mass media's weapons of mass deception. A death-dealing arrogance, the culture of deceit overwhelmed humbleness. The US of H, the United States of Hypocrisy, forever talking peace, forever making war. On reflection, isn't the root of conspiracy, the well-honed illusion? In writing to Justice Joseph Storey, Chief Justice John Marshall in 1821 described Jefferson as being:

. . . among the most ambitious, and I suspect the most unforgiving of men. His great power is over the mass of the people, and this power is chiefly acquired by professions of democracy.

## THE CULT OF PERSONALITY

For a thousand years the Anglo-Saxon nation had answered to a king and though republicanism had its appeal, yet authoritarianism also retained its appeal. As a man on a white horse, literally, George Washington, arguably one of the revolution's few indispensable figures, by his magisterial bearing and iron will, fulfilled a subliminal longing. That fewer these days are making pilgrimage to Mount Vernon than to do Monticello may have to do with Jefferson's republican pen which is more attuned to our time, but in colonial times, particularly during Washington's lifetime, it was Washington, not Jefferson, who was "first in the hearts of his countrymen." The two men are a study in contrasts, the one heroic, the other cultured, they ceased altogether communicating one with the other after a letter of Jefferson's surfaced in which a veiled reference to Washington was made as the Sampson "shorn by the harlot, England." After Washington's demise in 1799, Jefferson emerged from his shadow to play a growing behind-the-scenes role in the development of the "empire of liberty."

## MANIFEST DESTINY

In a country having many competing religious sects, finding unity in a state religion was not practical. But certain tenets of one of those sects, that of the Puritans, did provide a unifying vision leading to a civil religion. Said John Winthrop (1588-1649), aboard ship on his way to Massachusetts Bay Colony, where he would serve as governor:

For we must consider that we shall be a City upon a hill. The eyes of all people are upon us.

With a "virgin" continent before them (though it had been settled for millennia) they tailored a theology justifying their seizing it. Thus they defined the "New" world as the Promised Land, which needed to be redeemed from its Canaanite inhabitants while the "Old" world was Babylon. As one Puritan theologian wrote:

. . . there never was a Generation that did so perfectly shake off the dust of Babylon, . . . [nor] a place so like unto New Jerusalem as New England. (Increase Mather, 1677)

The premier Puritan theologian of his day was Increase Mather's father, Cotton Mather. He wrote:

Awake, Awake, put on thy strength, O New English Zion, an put on the Beautiful Garments, O American Jerusalem, . . . Put on thy Beautiful Garments, O America, the holy City! . . . [the] New-English Israel . . . (Theopolis Americana)

Expectantly, Jonathan Edwards wrote:

. . . the most glorious renovation of the world shall originate from the new continent . . . the sun of the new heavens and a new earth, . . . Shall rise in the west, . . . god caused the sun, to go from West to East, when

Hezekia was healed . . . which is often used by the prophet Isaiah as a type of the latter days.

(*Thought on Revival*)

With all of this triumphalist theology floating about it, it would not be long before the weight of it, like an elephant's foot, would come crashing down on the heads of native peoples. Writing in 1676, the Quaker Edward Wharton said with keen insight:

Our rulers, Officers, and Councillors are like as men in a maze, not knowing what to do: but Priests [ministers] spur them on, telling them the Indians are ordained for destruction; bidding them go forth to Warr, . . .

William Bradford's contemporaneous account, *History of Plymouth Plantation*, describes John Mason's raid on a Pequot village in 1639:

Those that scraped the fire were slaine with the sword; some hewed to peeces, others rune throw with their rapiers, so as they were quickly dispatch, and very few escaped. It was conceived they thus destroyed about 400 at this time. It was a fearful sight to see them thus fyer, and the streams of blood quenching the same, and horrible was the stincke and the scente thereof to God, who had wrought so wonderfully for them, thus to inclose their enemies in their hands, an give them so speedy a victory over so proud and insulting an enemy.

The Puritan's vision for a continent-wide empire was the creed that created a nation but not quite as they envisioned it. New England's theocracy did not long survive the arrival of the 18<sup>th</sup> century. The strictures of Puritanism were too severe. Certain isolated doctrines of the Puritan establishment were perpetuated even as the underlying theology was jettisoned. The term "Manifest Destiny," coined by John L. Sullivan in 1845, well-expresses America's expansionist principal. He wrote:

. . . The right of our manifest destiny to over spread and to possess the whole of the continent which Providence has given us for the development of the great experiment of liberty and federative development of self government entrusted to us.

That which was orthodox in Puritanism has fallen into abeyance, but that which was heretical has prevailed. Comforting is the thought to some that Providence and Power can be combined.

#### **QUOTE WITHOUT COMMENT**

Wrote Walt Whitman:

I will be empires, overshadowing all else, past and present, putting th history of Old-World dynasties, conquests behind me, . . . I alone inaugurating largeness, culminating time, If these, O land of America, are indeed the prizes, the determinations of your soul, be it so. . . . We see our land, America, her literature, aesthetics, etc., as substantially, basic elements

and loftiest final meanings, of history and men . . . on which all the superstructures of the future are permanently to rest. (*Democratic Vistas*)

#### **NOT EVERYONE WAS FOOLED**

Taking the measure of the movement which the “patriots,” so-called, had unleashed, John Allen of the Methodist Episcopal Church, said in 1774:

Blush ye pretended votaries for freedom! ye trifling patriots! who are making a vain parade of being advocates for the liberties of mankind, who are thus making a mockery of your profession by trampling on the sacred natural rights and privileges of Africans; for while you are fasting, praying, nonimporting, nonexporting, remonstrating, resolving, and pleading for a restoration of your charter rights, you at the same time are continuing this lawless, cruel, inhuman, and abominable practice of enslaving your fellow creatures . . . (John Allen, *Watchman's Alarm*, 1774)

In June, 1798, Congress revisited the issue of race by passing legislation to exclude free African Americans from service in the US Navy and the Marine Corps.

The Fugitive Slave Act of 1793 not only facilitated the return of fugitives to their masters but also led to the kidnaping of free blacks who were then sold into slavery. Thus in 1797, when 16 black slaves who had recently been set free in a lawful manner through the efforts of Quakers in North Carolina, arrived in Pennsylvania and learned that as a result of the Fugitive Slave Law they were in immanent danger of being re-enslaved by slave traders operating under its protection, they turned to the Pennsylvania Abolition Society to take up their case and petition Congress on their behalf. In the House of Representatives, James Madison responded for the record, stating that appeals from African Americans "have no claim on their attention," since "the Constitution gives them no hope of being heard here." Thus spake his venerated majesty, the "Father of the US Constitution."

#### **CARING NOT FOR THE LAND**

To the masters of slaves, the haughtiness of dominion combines with the spirit of freedom, fortifies it, and renders it invincible. (Edmund Burke)

In the course of comparing European farming methods with America's, Jefferson touched upon the cause of wastefulness with the latter:

It [results] from our having such quantities of land to waste as we please. In Europe, the object is to make the most of their land, labor being abundant: here it is to make the most of our labor, land being abundant. (*Notes on the State of Virginia*)

But not all were wedded to this approach. For instance, in the Shenandoah Valley, thrifty farmers of various pacifistic sects, pietists, as they were known, were employing agri-

cultural methods that had been worked out long before by their Old World ancestors, whose tidy farms were not allowed to degenerate but were kept productive from generation to generation by crop rotation and by applications of manure. They kept no slaves, nor would they have let a slave touch their sacred soil, for their methods required pride of workmanship and were not such as can be extracted from a slave.

Beginning in early colonial times, huge tracts of land in America fell into the hands of a favored few such that at the time of the American Revolution, there were only 350 large plantation-owning families in all of Virginia of whom Jefferson's was one. Among this class arose the desire to maximize the profits of their land holdings by developing a cash crop suitable for transport to distant markets in exchange for hard currency and manufactured goods. That crop was tobacco; the market, Europe. Thus was a market economy established which became the root of American capitalism. But mono-cropping tobacco quickly wore out the land and much crop land was abandoned in ruined condition.

In comparing European Serfdom to American chattel slavery we see where in Europe Medieval serfs were allowed to work part of the time for themselves and part of the time for their manorial lord, in America slaves had no such right. Whereas the serf usually was attached to the land and could maintain his family intact, in America, the slave was freely bought and sold with no regard to his family connections. Whereas in Europe if a serf ran away and was able to stay a year and a day in a town without recapture he was considered to be free, but in America, there was no time limit. Slavery was forever. Jeffersonian democracy in fact represented a backward step toward the Dark Ages.

#### **S E C U L A R   F A I T H**

It would seem from the evidence that Jefferson felt himself competent to begin a new, secular faith. Driven by an almost messianic vision of himself, Jefferson imagined that he could lead mankind out of superstitious darkness into the light of a new day. In creating America, he created a vehicle suitable to fulfill his calling. A guest of Jefferson's at Monticello, a Frenchman, Marquis de Chastellux, may have come as close as anyone to putting his finger on Jefferson's motivation when he said that he is:

. . . a philosopher, in voluntary retirement from the world and public business, because he loves the world, inasmuch only as he can flatter himself with being useful to mankind. (1782)

To that end, through the power of ideas artfully expressed, Jefferson wrote America into existence and, in the process, created a civil religion, ostensibly based on Enlightenment principles, having flag, rituals, holidays, and sacred documents and songs. Its pantheon of saints included the founding fathers. As if he were a Roman emperor, like Caesar Augustus,

whom he most admired, Jefferson had many idealized paintings and sculptures made of himself. In France, in 1785, he engaged the services of Jean-Antoine Houdon to travel to America and do a statue of Washington from life. Jefferson himself sat for Houdon in 1789. In 1786, in London, Jefferson sat for a portrait by Mather Brown. In London, Jefferson encouraged an aspiring American artist, thirty year old John Trumbull to do a series of paintings on the American revolution. Today, Houdon's marble statue of Washington stands in the Virginia Capitol while Trumbull's: *Signing of the Declaration of Independence* hangs in the rotunda of the United States Capitol. Charles Wilson Peale painted Jefferson in 1791 and Rembrandt Peale in 1800 and Gilbert Stuart in 1805. Even in his last year of life, Jefferson had a life mask made of himself by the sculptor, John Browere, who so bungled the job that Jefferson nearly suffocated on the spot. Utilizing the world's best artistic talent, Jefferson, was making sure that his sacred image would be forever immortalized.

In seeking to find a religious motivation for Jefferson's activities, let us consider a project near to Jefferson's heart, one engaging his attention off and on for nearly twenty years, that being the development of his own Bible. The Jefferson Bible (downloadable free off the internet) combines into one, the four Gospel accounts, minus those parts Jefferson considered suspect or even spurious: the miracles or the resurrection. Its last verse has to do with the rock being rolled in front of Jesus' tomb and there he leaves the matter. In his letter to Dr. Benjamin Rush, 1803, Jefferson said:

To the corruptions of Christianity I am indeed opposed, but not to the genuine precepts of Jesus himself. I am a Christian, in the only sense in which he wished anyone to be: sincerely attached to his doctrines in preference to all others, ascribing to himself every *human* excellence, and believing he ever claimed any other.

Along the same lines, to his mentor and friend, William Short, in 1820, Jefferson wrote:

But while this syllabus [a composition of Jefferson's comparing Jesus to other philosophers] is meant to place the character of Jesus in its true and high light, as no impostor Himself, but a great Reformer of the Hebrew code of religion, it is not to be understood that I am with Him in all His doctrines. I am a Materialist; he takes the side of Spiritualism; he preaches the efficacy of repentance towards forgiveness of sin; I require counterpoise of good works to redeem it, etc., etc. It is the innocence of His character, the purity and sublimity of His moral precepts, the eloquence of His inculcations, the beauty of the apologies in which he conveys them, that I so much admire; sometimes, indeed, needing indulgence to eastern hyperbolism. My eulogies, too, may be founded on a postulate which all may not be ready to grant. Among the sayings and discourses imputed to Him by His biographers, I find many passages of fine imagination, correct morality, and of the most lovely benevolence; and others, again, of so much ignorance,

so much absurdity, so much untruth, charlatanism and imposture, as to pronounce it impossible that such contradictions should have proceeded from the same Being. I separate therefore, the gold from the dross; restore to Him the former, and leave the later to the stupidity of some, and roguery of others of His disciples. Of this band of dupes and impostors, Paul was the great Coryphaeus, and the first corruptor of the doctrines of Jesus.

Jefferson's willingness to edit a text thousands of years old is hard to fathom, unless he felt that he could improve on it. Maybe he thought he knew Jesus better than did Jesus' apostles whose portrait of Jesus Jefferson overruled.

Jefferson's expressed disapproval of forgiveness is another curious feature in his religious make-up. He tended to be rigidly unbending in his judgments:

Error is to be pitied and pardoned: it is the weakness of human nature. But vice is a foul blemish, not pardonable in any character. (Thomas Jefferson, 1776)

In 1798 Jefferson in all modesty wrote:

I know my own principles to be pure and therefore am not ashamed of them. On the contrary, I wish them known and therefore willingly express them to everyone. They are the same I have acted on from the year 1775 to this day, and are the same I am sure, with those of the great body of the American people.

Confident in the wonderfulness of what he had created, Jefferson in 1821, in a prophetic way, wrote President James Monroe, saying:

It is impossible not to look forward to distant times, when our rapid multiplication will . . . cover the whole northern, if not the southern continent, with a people speaking the same language, governed in similar forms, and by similar laws; nor can we contemplate with satisfaction either blot or mixture on that surface.

#### **DEEDS SPEAK LOUDER THAN WORDS**

Monticello, its clay soil, not suitable for commercial farming, was fit only for making bricks. In reality, it was the equivalent of a puppy mill, only instead of puppies it was Negroes whom Jefferson was breeding. He had hundreds of slaves and on his demise made provision to free only five, those being related to Sarah Hemings, a slave who was Jefferson's wife's half sister and some say Jefferson's concubine. As for the rest to whom he had promised freedom, they went to the auction block and were sold into the Deep South, a virtual death sentence. Free to own slaves was the only kind of freedom Jefferson approved of. No slaver ever went to bed of an evening fearful of anything old Tom was liable to do. But the word of truth is:

When you have done it unto one of the least of these my brethren, you have done it unto me.



So what was Jefferson really doing at Monticello with the approximately 600 slaves who at one time or other fell under his dominion? A totally fascinating article, appearing in 2013 in the Smithsonian Magazine, titled “The Dark side of Thomas Jefferson,” by Henry Weinck:

One cannot question the genuineness of Jefferson’s liberal dreams,” writes historian David Brion Davis.

“He was one of the first statesmen in any part of the world to advocate concrete measures for restricting and eradicating Negro slavery.”

But in the 1790s, Davis continues, “the most remarkable thing about Jefferson’s stand on slavery is his immense silence.” And later, Davis finds, Jefferson’s emancipation efforts “virtually ceased.”

Somewhere in a short span of years during the 1780s and into the early 1790s, a transformation came over Jefferson.

(Unlike Davis, I do question the genuineness of Jefferson’s liberal dreams. I think the evidence shows that he was a complete hypocrite from the get-go. Nevertheless, let us follow his logic and see where it leads.)

The very existence of slavery in the era of the American Revolution presents a paradox, and we have largely been content to leave it at that, since a paradox can offer a comforting state of moral suspended animation. Jefferson animates the paradox. And by looking closely at Monticello, we can see the process by which he rationalized an abomination to the point where an absolute moral reversal was reached and he made slavery fit into America’s national enterprise.

We can be forgiven if we interrogate Jefferson posthumously about slavery. It is not judging him by today’s standards to do so. Many people of his own time, taking Jefferson at his word and seeing him as the embodiment of the country’s highest ideals, appealed to him. When he evaded and rationalized, his admirers were frustrated and mystified; it felt like praying to a stone. The Virginia abolitionist Moncure Conway, noting Jefferson’s enduring reputation as a would-be emancipator, remarked scornfully, “Never did a man achieve more fame for what he did not do.”

So what was it that Jefferson did not do? Let us read on:

The critical turning point in Jefferson’s thinking may well have come in 1792. As Jefferson was counting up the agricultural profits and losses of his plantation in a letter to President Washington that year, it occurred to him that there was a phenomenon he had perceived at Monticello but never actually measured. He proceeded to calculate it in a barely legible, scribbled note in the middle of a page, enclosed in brackets. What Jefferson set out clearly for the first time was that he was making a 4 percent profit every year on

the birth of black children. The enslaved were yielding him a bonanza, a perpetual human dividend at compound interest. Jefferson wrote, "I allow nothing for losses by death, but, on the contrary, shall presently take credit four per cent per annum, for their increase over and above keeping up their own numbers." His plantation was producing inexhaustible human assets. The percentage was predictable.

In another communication from the early 1790s, Jefferson takes the 4 percent formula further and quite bluntly advances the notion that slavery presented an investment strategy for the future. He writes that an acquaintance who had suffered financial reverses "should have been invested in negroes." He advises that if the friend's family had any cash left, "every farthing of it [should be] laid out in land and negroes, which besides a present support bring a silent profit of from 5. to 10. per cent in this country by the increase in their value."

The Smithsonian article continues on with telling detail about Jefferson's opulent lifestyle:

Thomas Jefferson's mansion stands atop his mountain like the Platonic ideal of a house: a perfect creation existing in an ethereal realm, literally above the clouds. To reach Monticello, you must ascend what a visitor called "this steep, savage hill," through a thick forest and swirls of mist that recede at the summit, as if by command of the master of the mountain. "If it had not been called Monticello," said one visitor, "I would call it Olympus, and Jove its occupant." The house that presents itself at the summit seems to contain some kind of secret wisdom encoded in its form. Seeing Monticello is like reading an old American Revolutionary manifesto — the emotions still rise. This is the architecture of the New World, brought forth by its guiding spirit. In designing the mansion, Jefferson followed a precept laid down two centuries earlier by Palladio: "We must contrive a building in such a manner that the finest and most noble parts of it be the most exposed to public view, and the less agreeable disposed in by places, and removed from sight as much as possible."

The mansion sits atop a long tunnel through which slaves, unseen, hurried back and forth carrying platters of food, fresh tableware, ice, beer, wine and linens, while above them 20, 30 or 40 guests sat listening to Jefferson's dinner-table conversation. At one end of the tunnel lay the icehouse, at the other the kitchen, a hive of ceaseless activity where the enslaved cooks and their helpers produced one course after another.

During dinner Jefferson would open a panel in the side of the fireplace, insert an empty wine bottle and seconds later pull out a full bottle. We can imagine that he would delay explaining how this magic took place until an astonished guest put the question to him. The panel concealed a narrow dumbwaiter that descended to the basement. When Jefferson put an empty bottle in the compartment, a slave waiting in the basement pulled the dumbwaiter down, removed the empty, inserted a fresh bottle and sent it up to the master in a matter of seconds. Similarly, platters of hot food magically appeared on a revolving door fitted with shelves, and the used plates disappeared from sight on the same contrivance. Guests could

not see or hear any of the activity, nor the links between the visible world and the invisible that magically produced Jefferson's abundance.

Finally, the Smithsonian article takes us behind Monticello's classical facade into the bowels of hell. Let us look at one facet having to do with the nailery:

A letter has recently come to light describing how Monticello's young black boys, "the small ones," age 10, 11 or 12, were whipped to get them to work in Jefferson's nail factory, whose profits paid the mansion's grocery bills. This passage about children being lashed had been suppressed — deliberately deleted from the published record in the 1953 edition of Jefferson's Farm Book, containing 500 pages of plantation papers. That edition of the Farm Book still serves as a standard reference for research into the way Monticello worked.

He launched the nailery in 1794 and supervised it personally for three years. "I now employ a dozen little boys from 10 to 16 years of age, overlooking all the details of their business myself." He said he spent half the day counting and measuring nails. In the morning he weighed and distributed nail rod to each nailer; at the end of the day he weighed the finished product and noted how much rod had been wasted.

The profit was substantial. Just months after the factory began operation, he wrote that "a nailery which I have established with my own negro boys now provides completely for the maintenance of my family." Two months of labor by the nail boys paid the entire annual grocery bill for the white family. He wrote to a Richmond merchant, "My groceries come to between 4. and 500. Dollars a year, taken and paid for quarterly. The best resource of quarterly payment in my power is Nails, of which I make enough every fortnight [emphasis added] to pay a quarter's bill."

In an 1840s memoir, Isaac Granger, by then a freedman who had taken the surname Jefferson, recalled circumstances at the nailery. Isaac, who worked there as a young man, specified the incentives that Jefferson offered to nailers: "Gave the boys in the nail factory a pound of meat a week, a dozen herrings, a quart of molasses, and peck of meal. Give them that wukked the best a suit of red or blue; encouraged them mightily." Not all the slaves felt so mightily encouraged. It was Great George Granger's job, as foreman, to get those people to work. Without molasses and suits to offer, he had to rely on persuasion, in all its forms. For years he had been very successful — by what methods, we don't know. But in the winter of 1798 the system ground to a halt when Granger, perhaps for the first time, refused to whip people.

Throughout Jefferson's plantation records there runs a thread of indicators — some direct, some oblique, some euphemistic — that the Monticello machine operated on carefully calibrated brutality. Some slaves would never readily submit to bondage. Some, Jefferson wrote, "require a vigour of discipline to make them do reasonable work." That plain statement of his policy has been largely ignored in preference to Jefferson's well-known self-exoneration: "I love industry and abhor severity." Jefferson made that

reassuring remark to a neighbor, but he might as well have been talking to himself. He hated conflict, disliked having to punish people and found ways to distance himself from the violence his system required.

Thus he went on record with a denunciation of overseers as “the most abject, degraded and unprincipled race,” men of “pride, insolence and spirit of domination.” Though he despised these brutes, they were hardhanded men who got things done and had no misgivings. He hired them, issuing orders to impose a vigor of discipline.

It was during the 1950s, when historian Edwin Betts was editing one of Colonel Randolph’s plantation reports for Jefferson’s Farm Book, that he confronted a taboo subject and made his fateful deletion. Randolph reported to Jefferson that the nailery was functioning very well because “the small ones” were being whipped. The youngsters did not take willingly to being forced to show up in the icy midwinter hour before dawn at the master’s nail forge. And so the overseer, Gabriel Lilly, was whipping them “for truancy.”

Betts decided that the image of children being beaten at Monticello had to be suppressed, omitting this document from his edition. He had an entirely different image in his head; the introduction to the book declared, “Jefferson came close to creating on his own plantations the ideal rural community.” Betts couldn’t do anything about the original letter, but no one would see it, tucked away in the archives of the Massachusetts Historical Society. The full text did not emerge in print until 2005.

Lilly [one of Jefferson’s foremen] . . . understood his importance to Jefferson when he renegotiated his contract, so that beginning in 1804 he would no longer receive a flat fee for managing the nailery but be paid 2 percent of the gross. Productivity immediately soared. In the spring of 1804, Jefferson wrote to his supplier: “The manager of my nailery had so increased its activity as to call for a larger supply of rod’ . . . than had heretofore been necessary.”

Maintaining a high level of activity required a commensurate level of discipline. Thus, in the fall of 1804, when Lilly was informed that one of the nail boys was sick, he would have none of it. Appalled by what happened next, one of Monticello’s white workmen, a carpenter named James Oldham, informed Jefferson of “the Barbarity that [Lilly] made use of with Little Jimmy.”

Oldham reported that James Hemings, the 17-year-old son of the house servant Critta Hemings, had been sick for three nights running, so sick that Oldham feared the boy might not live. He took Hemings into his own room to keep watch over him. When he told Lilly that Hemings was seriously ill, Lilly said he would whip Jimmy into working. Oldham “begged him not to punish him,” but “this had no effect.” The “Barbarity” ensued: Lilly “whipped him three times in one day, and the boy was really not able to raise his hand to his head.”

Flogging to this degree does not persuade someone to work; it disables him. But it also sends a message to the other slaves, especially those, like Jimmy, who belonged to the elite class of Hemings servants and might think they were above the authority of Gabriel Lilly. Once he recovered, Jimmy Hemings fled Monticello, joining the community of free blacks and runaways who made a living as boatmen on the James River, floating up and down between Richmond and obscure backwater villages.

There is much, much, more to be said about Jefferson and his treatment of his slaves and none of it does him any honor.

#### T H E A L P H A F I G U R E

Jefferson I once thought was America's quintessential man of ideas and Washington as America's quintessential man of action, but I erred on both counts. A third man towered over them both, whose ideas were bigger than Jefferson's, whose actions more decisive than Washington's and without whom there might not have been an American revolution in the first place, much less a successful revolution. And yet this man was so self-effacing that he is often overlooked. In challenging the conventional wisdom regarding America's founding, why should we deal with lesser luminaries? Let it be Franklin whom we confront.

It was Benjamin Franklin's strategic insights, his diplomacy, his charisma, his vision, his initiative, his reputation, and his multitudinous contacts which carried the day for the American Revolution. More so than any other, he was the great helmsman who brought the ship of state to shore. But at what price? The British empire, which had won the hard-fought Seven Year war against France in the 1750's, and was poised to become the dominant power in all the world, only 20 some years later, in 1783, lost to France, Spain and America. In consequence, the Anglo-Saxon people, once poised to become the dominant population on the North American continent are now a small and shrinking fraction of the population of the North American continent. Because of Franklin, Protestant Christianity, once poised to become the dominant religion of the world, is now in retreat to secularism but most of all to Zionism. So what? Who cares? The English throne, the Anglo Saxon people, Protestant Christianity are not intrinsically superior to any other royal house, people or religion. Nevertheless their decline and ultimate demise was Franklin's doing. He sacrificed them all to his vision. But what was his vision? Nothing less than a new world order run by a technological elite, operating along Masonic principals.

In bringing forth upon the North American continent a new nation, one presumably conceived in freedom, with justice and liberty for all, we need to look to the one most instrumental in achieving this, Benjamin Franklin. As the above quote would indicate, he was a man of remarkable sanguinity in facing life's tumults, yet most portrayals of him, as well,

most portraits, hardly do him justice, for the picture they paint is of a portly, sedentary figure, when, in fact, throughout his long life he was a vital, active, hands-on kind of guy.

Contrary to the image we have been given, Franklin, a self-taught swimmer, on occasion, when sailing to or from England, would jump overboard and swim around the ship. Had he lived in our day, I believe, he might have qualified to be a U.S. Navy seal or wrestler, like Jesse Ventura. Healthy, of powerful physique, having great reserves of stamina, Franklin worked unstintingly, often burning the midnight oil, whereby he earned a reputation for being industrious and that attracted many new clients to his publishing house.

Though he was scandalized that the one who said: “early to bed, early to rise makes a man healthy, wealthy, and wise,” didn’t himself rise until noon, yet John Adams was big enough to recognize that it was Franklin’s diplomacy conducted at night, not Adam’s feeble day time efforts which won the day for the American Revolution by bringing France and later Spain, into the fray. It was Franklin’s strategic insights, his charisma, his initiative, his reputation, his multitudinous contacts, not Washington’s ragtag army which turned the tide of war. For instance, it was Franklin’s brilliant diplomacy conducted in a 1774 to Que-bec which kept Canada out of the war.

Flexible, positive-minded, ready to adopt to the situation at hand, Franklin relished the battle. Ironic his saying: “Genius without education is like silver in the mine,” for he never attended school past age six, not that this held him back any, for he taught himself whatever he needed to know. As he said, “Energy and persistence conquer all things.”

"If you would not be forgotten, as soon as you are dead and rotten, either write things worth reading, or do things worth the writing."

Franklin keep his eye on the prize, the prize being his grand vision for America, from which lesser considerations could not divert him. As he said: “He that can have patience can have what he will.”

Thus it is I say that the real study of America’s origins is necessarily a study of Benjamin Franklin. One key to understanding Franklin is that, however audacious, he was always prudent. For him, prudence and audacity went hand in hand. Said Franklin:

Let all men know thee, but no man know thee thoroughly.

When he married, he chose a prudent, provident partner, Deborah. In various respects it was a marriage of convenience for they spent long years apart and he had long term arrangements with other women.

When Franklin become postmaster of America in 1753, he used this position to establish

a network of people loyal to him. Some have said that he operated as a spy-master and he did indeed admit to having purloined certain correspondence to advance the revolutionary cause, which, when revealed, caused a scandal leading to his removal from his position.

At about age 15, Franklin overthrew the Calvinistic religion he was raised in and at age 25 adopted Masonry, ultimately rising to provincial Grandmaster of Pennsylvania. Again he used his position to create a network of friends useful in his pursuit of revolutionary activity.

Herein did prudence showed itself again: in his autobiography, Franklin is able to remember exact details regarding the Junto, a philosophical debating society he started, recalling the names of each member and their individual characteristics, yet never mentions his involvement with freemasonry.

WORKMEN have dug up the remains of ten bodies hidden beneath the former London home of Benjamin Franklin, the founding father of American independence. The remains of four adults and six children were discovered during the £1.9 million restoration of Franklin's home at 36 Craven Street, close to Trafalgar Square. Researchers believe that there could be more bodies buried beneath the basement kitchens. Initial estimates are that the bones are about 200 years old and were buried at the time Franklin was living in the house, which was his home from 1757 to 1762, and from 1764 to 1775. Most of the bones show signs of having been dissected, sawn or cut. One skull has been drilled with several holes. Paul Knapman, the Westminster Coroner, said yesterday: "I cannot totally discount the possibility of a crime. There is still a possibility that I may have to hold an inquest." *(Sunday Times, February 11, 1998)*

That there were bodies were stashed about the premises of his London home was not a matter Franklin chose to divulge in his Autobiography. This is not to say that he was engaged in anything so heinous as ritual murder, though some have proposed this. I suspect nothing so lurid. Rather, Franklin had taken into his home one Rr. William Hewson, a surgeon, who was much given to experimentation for the advancement of medical knowledge. The presence of cadavers was probably the result of grave robbing, and had nothing to do with Franklin's casual association with leading members of the Hell Fire Club.

Although Hewson likely was the one who did the research, Franklin being of a distinct scientific bent, may have been in the background quietly condoning, if not directing, his work. His motto, after all, was "let the experiment be made." That is one way America can be viewed, as a big social and political experiment which had been hatched in Franklin's fervid mind. As for Dr. Hewson, he lasted not very long because he accidently cut himself while conducting one of his autopsies and contracted sepsis which carried him away into the next world.

Like the mad scientist whose creation got out of hand and turned on him, Franklin's

great (should we call it Franklinsteinian?) American social experiment came to bite him in the butt. For instance, his oldest son was jailed as a loyalist supporter of England, a circumstance from which the father-son relationship never recovered. Busy with affairs of state, Franklin was separated at ocean's length from his wife of 44 years, Deborah, and they never saw each other even once the last ten years of their marriage. She died in his absence in 1774. How ironic that their home in Philadelphia was set upon by a mob in 1765 which perceived Franklin as being too pro-British but later, in 1777, the family home was occupied and ransacked by British troops. As for Franklin's most precious papers, these he sent for safe keeping with his friend, Joseph Galloway, but they went missing when his friend, a loyalist, fled to England and lost his home.

Franklin's uncanny ability to prevail with the King of France and his ministers is what broke loose the armies and finances needed to turn the tide of war. That is one of Franklin's most important attributes, persuasiveness. But in charming the French government out of vast sums of money the French monarchy overextended itself financially and collapsed. France was never the same, for in having spent itself into penuriousness, the country was destabilized and this helped bring on the French Revolution. In the ensuing social chaos, Robespierre unleashed his special form of terror and many of Franklin's valued friends ended up on the guillotine. In modern parlance, such unintended consequences are called "blowback." Alas, though a prudent man, Franklin could not always gage the consequences of his actions.

In pursuit of his vision Franklin was instrumental in starting, not one, but two world wars. Following is told in brief his involvement in instigating the French and Indian War.

A people without history is like wind upon the buffalo grass. (Native American saying)

## Braddock's Folly

On April 23, 1755  
at a Tavern located near this spot  
General Edward Braddock  
Colonel George Washington  
and Benjamin Franklin

Met to plan the British  
assault on Ft. Dusquesne  
During the French & Indian War  
(A plaque erected by the Kiwanis Club,  
Frederick, Maryland)



Having been appointed Commander-in-Chief of America, General Braddock came over from England with two regiments of the King's finest. Finding that insufficient preparations had been taken to provision his army, he met with two of America's leading subjects, Washington and Franklin, to remedy this deficiency.

Braddock's plan, one which he shared with Washington and Franklin, was that of advancing up the old Indian trail that ran from the Potomac River to the Monongahela (now Route 40), then fording the Monongahela just below its junction with the Ohio at Fort Duquesne, where he would blow up the French fort with artillery. He indicated that if he didn't get the wagons and horses he needed, he was going back to England. Rising to the occasion, Franklin in two weeks' time had collected 259 horses and 150 wagons but it would have been better for all concerned if he and Washington had let Braddock make good his promises to return home, for two months and a few days later, the General, most of his soldiers, and Franklin's horses were dead, as well as Franklin's wagons were burned. For one, the hauling of cannon up an Indian trail was as harebrained as any in the history of warfare. This, compounded by the use of European military tactics in the wilderness, doomed the mission. Regarding this ill-fated expedition, Washington, who had been commissioned by Braddock to be his guide, wrote:

We were attacked by a party of French and Indians, whose number, I am persuaded, did not exceed three hundred men; while ours consisted of about one thousand three hundred well-armed troops, chiefly regular soldiers, who were struck with such a panic that they behaved with more cowardice than it is possible to conceive. The officers behaved gallantly, in order to encourage their men, for which they suffered greatly, there being near sixty killed and wounded; a large proportion of the number we had. The Virginia troops showed a good deal of bravery, and were nearly all killed; for I believe, out of three companies that were there, scarcely thirty men are left alive.

As the conflict unfolded, the enraged Braddock swore and cursed his troops, demanding of them that they come out from behind or down from trees and fight out in the open "like English soldiers." Pulling out his sword, he slashed away at them, striking down many, including one Joseph Faurett. Unfortunately for Braddock, Tom Faurett was near at hand. Seeing what the maddened General had done to his brother, he raised his trusty musket and unleashed a volley straight at him. The musket ball found its mark, shattering Braddock's arm, blowing out a lung, while knocking him off his horse. He died of his wounds three days later in the arms of George Washington, who, in the heat of battle, was amazingly solicitous of Braddock's well-being, and stood by him to the bitter end.

Meanwhile, from his litter, Braddock persisted in the exercise of his authority, ordering provisions and ammunition be destroyed lest they fall into the hands of the enemy. 150

wagons were burned, the powder casks were staved, and their contents, amounting to 50,000 pounds, were cast into the stream. After that he expired and his body was buried in the trail itself by the remnants of his fleeing army who then ran their wagons over his grave site so as to disguise that a burial had occurred, this so that the Natives wouldn't dig him up and mutilate his remains.

Follows is Franklin's own account of these matters as found in his Autobiography:

The British government, not choosing to permit the union of the colonies as proposed at Albany, and to trust that union with their defense, lest they should thereby grow too military, and feel their own strength, suspicions and jealousies at this time being entertained of them, sent over General Braddock with two regiments of regular English troops for that purpose. He landed at Alexandria, in Virginia, and thence marched to Frederictown, in Maryland, where he halted for carriages. Our Assembly apprehending, from some information, that he had conceived violent prejudices against them, as averse to the service, wished me to wait upon him, not as from them, but as postmaster-general, under the guise of proposing to settle with him the mode of conducting with most celerity and certainty the despatches between him and the governors of the several provinces, with whom he must necessarily have continual correspondence, and of which they proposed to pay the expense. We found the general at Frederictown, waiting impatiently for the return of those he had sent through the back parts of Maryland and Virginia to collect wagons. I stayed with him several days, dined with him daily, and had full opportunity of removing all his prejudices, by the information of what the Assembly had before his arrival actually done, and were still willing to do, to facilitate his operations. When I was about to depart, the returns of wagons to be obtained were brought in, by which it appeared that they amounted only to twenty-five, and not all of those were in serviceable condition. The general and all the officers were surprised, declared the expedition was then at an end, being impossible, and exclaimed against the ministers for ignorantly landing them in a country destitute of the means of conveying their stores, baggage, etc., not less than one hundred and fifty wagons being necessary.

I happened to say I thought it was a pity they had not been landed rather in Pennsylvania, as in that country almost every farmer had his wagon. The general eagerly laid hold of my words, and said, "Then you, sir, who are a man of interest there, can probably procure them for us; and I beg you will undertake it." I asked what terms were to be offered the owners of the wagons; and I was desired to put on paper the terms that appeared to me necessary. This I did, and they were agreed to, and . . . instructions accordingly prepared immediately.

In conversation with him one day, he was giving me some account of his intended progress. "After taking Fort Duquesne," says he, "I am to proceed to Niagara; and, having taken that, to Frontenac, if the season will allow time; and I suppose it will, for Duquesne can hardly detain me above three or four days; and

then I see nothing that can obstruct my march to Niagara." Having before revolved in my mind the long line his army must make in their march by a very narrow road, to be cut for them through the woods and bushes, and also what I had read of a former defeat of fifteen hundred French, who invaded the Iroquois country, I had conceived some doubts and some fears for the event of the campaign. But I ventured only to say, "To be sure, sir, if you arrive well before Duquesne, with these fine troops, so well provided with artillery, that place not yet completely fortified, and as we hear with no very strong garrison, can probably make but a short resistance. The only danger I apprehend of obstruction to your march is from ambuscades of Indians, who, by constant practice, are dexterous in laying and executing them; and the slender line, near four miles long, which your army must make, may expose it to be attacked by surprise in its flanks, and to be cut like a thread into several pieces, which, from their distance, can not come up in time to support each other."

He smiled at my ignorance, and replied, "These savages may, indeed, be a formidable enemy to your raw American militia, but upon the king's regular and disciplined troops, sir, it is impossible they should make any impression." I was conscious of an impropriety in my disputing with a military man in matters of his profession, and said no more. The enemy, however, did not take the advantage of his army which I apprehended its long line of march exposed it to, but let it advance without interruption till within nine miles of the place; and then, when more in a body (for it had just passed a river, where the front had halted till all were come over), and in a more open part of the woods than any it had passed, attacked its advanced guard by a heavy fire from behind trees and bushes, which was the first intelligence the general had of an enemy's being near him. This guard being disordered, the general hurried the troops up to their assistance, which was done in great confusion, through wagons, baggage, and cattle; and presently the fire came upon their flank: the officers, being on horseback, were more easily distinguished, picked out as marks, and fell very fast; and the soldiers were crowded together in a huddle, having or hearing no orders, and standing to be shot at till two-thirds of them were killed; and then, being seized with a panic, the whole fled with precipitation.

The flyers, not being pursued, arrived at Dunbar's camp, and the panic they brought with them instantly seized him and all his people; and, though he had now above one thousand men, and the enemy who had beaten Braddock did not at most exceed four hundred Indians and French together, instead of proceeding, and endeavoring to recover some of the lost honor, he ordered all the stores, ammunition, etc., to be destroyed, that he might have more horses to assist his flight towards the settlements, and less lumber to remove. He was there met with requests from the governors of Virginia, Maryland, and Pennsylvania, that he would post his troops on the frontiers, so as to afford some protection to the inhabitants; but he continued his hasty march through all the country, not thinking himself safe till he arrived at Philadelphia, where the inhabitants could protect him. This whole transaction gave us Americans the first suspicion that our exalted ideas of the prowess of British regulars had not been well founded.

As soon as the loss of the wagons and horses was generally known, all the owners came upon me for the valuation which I had given bond to pay. Their demands gave me a great deal of trouble. . . . General Shirley at length relieved me from this terrible situation by appointing commissioners to examine the claims, and ordering payment. They amounted to near twenty thousand pound, which to pay would have ruined me.

As for Tom Fausett, he lived to the year 1819, being nearly 100 years old, and he never suffered any disability for having dispatched America's first Commander-in-Chief.

From an early age to old age, Franklin was an avid advocate for empire. As he said:

"The longer I live, the more convincing proofs I see of this truth, "That God Governs in the Affairs of Men." And if a sparrow cannot fall to the ground without his notice, it is probable that an empire can rise without His aid? We have been assured, Sir, in the Sacred Writings, that 'except the Lord build the house, they labor in vain that build it.' I firmly believe this; and I also believe, that, without His concurring aid, we shall created succeed in this political building no better than the builder's of Babel."

It seems apparent from the above request for prayer delivered at the Constitutional Convention of 1787 that Franklin's God is interested in empire. His God is not interested in Jesus, salvation, the second coming of Jesus, or with a millennial kingdom; rather, his God assists man in the building of empire. But whose God would that be, the God of the Bible or the God of Masonry? Let the reader decide.

Franklin's essential insight was that America was to be a two-tiered society, ruled from above by a scientific (Masonic) elite and from below by Christian morality for the masses. Which was to have the upper hand became fully apparent when Franklin's fellow Mason, Pierre L'Enfant, laid out the plan for Washington, D.C., where all the symbolism is of empire and pagan Rome, and where there is no Christian symbolism to speak of.

"Franklin spoke for the Order of the Quest, and most of the men who worked with him in the early days of the American Revolution were also members. The plan was working out, the New Atlantis was coming into being, in accordance with the program laid down by Francis Bacon a hundred and fifty years earlier.

"The rise of American democracy was necessary to a world program. At the appointed hour, the freedom of man was publicly declared." (Manly P. Hall, *The Secret Destiny of America*)

But why was Franklin interested in empire? He seemed not at all the vainglorious type who sought immortality through public acclaim. Rather, in my assessment, he was driven by a vision of a future in which man gained mastery over the natural world through technological advancement and he saw it as his place to advance that brave new world of science

by helping establish a powerful nation capable of investing in the research that necessarily would be required. Thus he wrote in May, 1783 to his friend, the Reverend John Lathrop:

I have long been impressed with the same sentiments you so well express, of the growing felicity of mankind, from the improvement in philosophy, morals, politics, and even the conveniences of common living, and the invention of new and useful utensils and instruments; so that I have sometimes wished it had been my destiny to be born two or three centuries hence. For invention and improvement are prolific, and beget more of their kind. The present progress is rapid. Many of great importance, now unthought of, will, before that period, be produced; and then I might not only enjoy their advantages, but have my curiosity gratified in knowing what they are to be. I see a little absurdity in what I have written, but it is to a friend, who will wink and let it pass, while I mention one reason more for such a wish, which is, that, if the art of physic [i.e., medicine] shall be improved in proportion with the other arts, we may then be able to avoid diseases, and live as long as the patriarchs in Genesis, to which I suppose we should make no objection.

Clearly Franklin relished his role of public benefactor and to this his many useful inventions, which he freely bestowed on the world, attest. One of his most significant inventions in terms of protecting lives and property was that of the lightning rod. It was widely believed at the time, especially by his Calvinistic brethren, that lightning strikes represent the evident displeasure of an angry God. Even to this day, the Old Order Amish do not use lightning rods because they believe that to do so would constitute an attempt to short-circuit the will of God. But Franklin was more in the mold of the modern secularist who believed that Man could become the master of his own destiny. How would Franklin feel then if he could see how modern society has evolved according to his vision? I think he would have been profoundly disappointed that moral growth and virtue did not keep pace with scientific advance.

We need to recognize that Franklin's concept of the republic was less democratic and more coercive in nature than most of us would be comfortable with. For instance, he wrote his fellow Philadelphian, Robert Morris the following letter, December, 25, 1783, from Paris:

The Remissness [i.e., laxity] of our People in Paying Taxes is highly blameable; the Unwillingness to pay them is still more so. I see, in some Resolutions of Town Meetings, a Remonstrance against giving Congress a Power to take, as they call it, the People's Money out of their Pockets, tho' only to pay the Interest and Principal of Debts duly contracted. They seem to mistake the Point. Money, justly due from the People, is their Creditors' Money, and no longer the Money of the People, who, if they withhold it, should be compell'd to pay by some Law.

All Property, indeed, except the Savage's temporary Cabin, his Bow, his Matchcoat, and other little Acquisitions, absolutely necessary for his Subsistence, seems to me to be the Creature of public Convention. Hence the Public has the Right of Regulating Descents, and all other Conveyances of

Property, and even of limiting the Quantity and the Uses of it. All the Property that is necessary to a Man, for the Conservation of the Individual and the Propagation of the Species, is his natural Right, which none can justly deprive him of: But all Property superfluous to such purposes is the Property of the Publick, who, by their Laws, have created it, and who may therefore by other Laws dispose of it, whenever the Welfare of the Publick shall demand such Disposition. He that does not like civil Society on these Terms, let him retire and live among Savages. He can have no right to the benefits of Society, who will not pay his Club towards the Support of it.

#### **I N   S E A R C H   O F   A   C O U N T E R V A I L I N G   F O R C E**

When other institutions of American life were failing, where was the Church? Was it leading the way onward and upward? Some were. Most weren't, for, in thinking that they were advancing the Gospel, many were advancing Americanism instead:

I love the pure, peaceable, and impartial Christianity of Christ: I therefore hate the corrupt, slaveholding, women-whipping, cradle-plundering, partial and hypocritical Christianity of the land. Indeed, I can see no reason, but the most deceitful one, for calling the religion of this land Christianity. I look upon it as the climax of all misnomers, the boldest of all frauds, and the grossest of all libels. Never was there a clearer case of 'stealing the livery of the court of heaven to serve the devil in.' I am filled with unutterable loathing when I contemplate the religious pomp and show, together with the horrible inconsistencies, which every where surround me. We have men-stealers for ministers, women-whippers for missionaries, and cradle-plunderers for church members. The man who wields the blood-clotted cowskin during the week fills the pulpit on Sunday, and claims to be a minister of the meek and lowly Jesus.

The slave auctioneer's bell and the church-going bell chime in with each other, and the bitter cries of the heart-broken slave are drowned in the religious shouts of his pious master. Revivals of religion and revivals in the slave-trade go hand in hand together. The slave prison and the church stand near each other. The clanking of fetters and the rattling of chains in the prison, and the pious psalm and solemn prayer in the church, may be heard at the same time. The dealers in the bodies and souls of men erect their stand in the presence of the pulpit, and they mutually help each other. The dealer gives his blood-stained gold to support the pulpit, and the pulpit, in return, covers his infernal business with the garb of Christianity. Here we have religion and robbery the allies of each other - devils dressed in angels' robes, and hell presenting the semblance of paradise.

(Frederick Douglass)

Like a giant nutcracker, both Church and Synagogue held Africans and naive Americans in the grips of a great and vicious lie of aggression. Running through rabbinic literature is an anti-black invective which did not originate in the Bible but in Talmudic Judaism. The curse of Ham, what Avraham Melamed rightly terms, "the locus classicus" of Judaism's historic antipathy toward Blacks, is the teaching which identifies Canaan as a Black man

which meant in the benighted minds of the rabbis that all Blacks, regardless of any consideration of their personal qualities, were inferior, hence suited for perpetual slavery. The classic rabbinic texts hold that the punishment visited upon Ham was the transformation of his son Canaan, and all Canaan's progeny, into Blacks. Rabbi Hiyya said, "Ham and the dog copulated on the arc. Therefore Ham came forth dark skinned." It was this rabbinic gloss of the Bible which 15<sup>th</sup> century Renaissance humanists picked up from the Talmud, the Midrash and the Kabbalah and carried into Christian society. The most notorious anti-black racist in Judaism happens to be Judaism's most influential sage, Moses Maimonides, who, in his book "Guide of the Perplexed," taught:

"[T]he Negroes found in the remote South, and those who resemble them from among them that are with us in these climes. The status of those is like that of irrational animals. To my mind they do not have the rank of men, but have among the beings a rank lower than the rank of man but higher than the rank of apes. For they have the external shape and lineaments of a man and a faculty of discernment that is superior to that of the apes.

#### **K H A Z A R I A N   A M E R I C A**

Power pyramids come to a point. At one time that would have been America's original aristocrats: the Astors, the Vanderbilts, the Cabots, the Lodges. No more. They were merely temporary placeholders for the real aristocracy. The pinnacle of power, the pyramid's all-seeing eye, is the international banking cartel dominated by the Asiatic Turks, the Ashkenazi Rothschilds. On the road to their ascendancy one finds such milestones as the Federal Reserve Banking Act of 1913 which granted the Jewish Establishment the privilege of creating currency out of thin air. When a nation loses control of its currency to a foreign power, that's it, that is the end. That is when America died. With this concession under their belt, the powers-that-be were off to the races, taking control of one institution after another: publishing, the mass media, Hollywood, much of academia, the organs of state security, and now through Monsanto, even obtaining a monopoly on food production. Currently they are working to get their arms around the health care system. More surveillance, more invasion of privacy. No longer can it be said that the enemy is at the gate, the enemy is well within the gate, his snout up our arse. One of their malefactors, George Soros, claims that for now the US remains the "main obstacle of a stable and just world order." In a deceptive way, he is right. The US, being what he and his cronies have made it, is what it is. The problem is, they have something even worse up their sleeve – that of subsuming America into the great, one world Plantation. If it happens, it will be a boot-in-the-face forever.

And so the war proceeds on from generation unto generation, with organized Jewry currently in the ascendancy: the Fed, the Press, Hollywood, Monsanto, untold amounts of nuclear weaponry, the Congress, the White House, the Courts, and much, much else being at

their disposal. Their beggar-thy-neighbor approach knows no bounds. In every speck of dust from the doomed world Trade Center is found their handiwork: militarized nano-particles of termite. Their bible, the Talmud, lays it out plainly enough, Gentiles are cattle fit only for the slaughter. Up ahead lies the great culling when the vast majority of “useless eaters” (a term Henry Kissinger used, if not coined) will be put down. The choice is plainly this: either humanity will put an end to organized Jewry or organized Jewry will put an end to mankind. Or maybe God will intervene. But one thing we should remember, once the Playwright walks onto the stage, then the play is over.

As for the Jewish people: they are no more to be blamed for the actions of their self-appointed leaders than were Russians to be blamed for Stalin’s actions, or Italians for the actions of Mussolini or Germans for the actions of Adolf Hitler, or, for that matter, Americans for the deprivations of their depraved leaders – the Bushes, the Cheneys, the Obamas.

Russians, Italians, Germans, Americans, we are all victims of an illegitimate ruling class. Meanwhile, let us make just distinctions, distinguishing victims from victimizers. We don’t blame victims. But it is always right to deal forthrightly with what is evil. Israel, to your tents!

As for the dumbed down nonsense which is passed off as history in the public schools, it is the bane of the students who have to put up with it and when asked, say that history is their least favorite subject. It is not real history of course but indoctrination. Likewise theology. Until it’s done right, it is the most boring topic ever but once we start telling real history and real stories about who God is and not as fractured fairy tales, then these subjects will hold our interest or be useful to us. Telling of our country’s history is too sacred a task to be left to government. Telling about God is too sacred a task to be left to the corrupt, Zionized churches. Alas, in greater Kazaria truth telling is a revolutionary act. We recall that:

Who controls the past controls the future.

Who controls the present controls the past. (George Orwell, 1984)

When I started writing this essay Jefferson was firmly ensconced on his pedestal as one of my cultural heroes, a position he had held since my childhood, for I had early made pilgrimage to Monticello and read his noble words engraved on the Jefferson Memorial’s walls. In a letter in 1812, Jefferson suggested that the US Capitol was “the first temple dedicated to the sovereignty of the people.” If so, Washington must have been the High Priest, since he was the one who officiated at the laying of the cornerstone in a Masonic ceremony. All of Washington’s generals were Masons. Lafayette, too, who was instrumental in bringing the French in to the war. So too L’Enfant, an architectural genius who laid out Washington, D. C.’s streets so as to form the image of the Baphomet. So what at root is Masonry? Judaism for Gentiles. That was my unacknowledged religion, of which I now repent.