

The Hysterical Historical Reaction to J-J. Rousseau: a Brief Correspondence

An Exclusive Book Excerpt

courtesy Recent Political
Publishing, inc.
Worcester, Massachusetts

©1996, Bradley Klein
Industries inc.

(ISSN: Government 206)

With a new introduction by the Translator, Sir Randolph Mack

Introduction by the Translator:

We at the Loquacious Academy in Birminghamshiretonville, U.K., are thrilled to announce the discovery of a series of important historical documents which, in all humility, we believe will revolutionize the modern historical understanding of the father of Eighteenth century political theory, Jean-Jacques Rousseau; and indeed, one might go so far as to say the very existence of these documents puts the later work of Rousseau in a completely new, and hitherto unexpected, perspective. However, before I go on, allow me to explain the source of these amazing papers.

Our discovery came by way of a serendipitous encounter with a man we had been searching constantly for for decades: Sir Bernard Hector Poitier Dijon, mustard tycoon and direct descendant of the founders of the Académie des Sciences et Belles Lettres de Dijon, informally known as the Académie de Dijon, and still more informally, Chuck. Sir Dijon, once he had been properly liquored up, was more than willing to share the private correspondences of his ancestors with us. A few quick trips to the xeroxing room, and voilà! — an historical masterpiece was born.

This volume contains the original and mercilessly unedited correspondence between Sir Randolph Linnea l'Ongtativité II, and Sir Mortimer Cyringe le Thplatt IV, both full partners at the Académie de Dijon, and long-time studiers of the philosophic and political

inquiry that emerged from Rousseau's generation of thinkers.

Little need be said of the socio-economic conditions in which the intellectuals of the day existed; rather, one like myself feels especially moved to point out the priority of concerns as they existed in the two men of Dijon, and stress the reader to inquire as to the primary motivations of the gentlemen in question. Rousseau hit the French intelligentsia like a ton of bricks— an impact similar to the manner in which he hits modern Government students, and we find Sir Randolph and Sir Mortimer's reaction telling. Perhaps history will be the final judge. But I hope not.

And now, without further ado, the world premiere of the initial response to Jean-Jacques Rousseau's first Discourse on the Arts and Sciences.

Correspondence Between Sir Randolph Linnea l'Ongtativité II and Sir Mortimer Cyringe le Thplatt IV, esteemed Partners of the Académie de Dijon

3 March 1750

My dearest Mortimer,

How good of you to send the lovely fruitbasket. Verily, my good man, nature hath not bestowed a better nor more generous example of strapping masculine friendship upon a mortal. Indeed.

Though it may be counted upon as rude, I write to you today not with glad tidings of joyful splendorousness, but in a perturbed state such as that I have never experienced except for perhaps the time when Lady Chivalé farted at the good King's Annual Easter Egg Hunt/Beheading/May Poll Dance/Gluttonous Feast. You see, my good Mortimer, the Académie's annual essay contest has hit an unforeseen snafu, and it taxes one's soul the fruitless searching for a solution of adequacy.

I do not know how to break this to you, you being of the noble soul with sensitive disposition and refined standards, but it seems someone has answered our contest with an actual essay, and not only that, my brother of intellect, the essay ~~takes~~ **takes the negative!!!** (pardon me for spilling ink on the manuscript— my dear hand was shaking as I

scrawled that. (mental note to secretary— putting more ink for certain words gives them a kind of emphasis, a boldness to step forth from their uniformly writ brothers— this might be dangerous, in as much as the peons in the streets might be encouraged to speak up. Still, it may have uses in rhetoric. Assign four grad students to researching this area.)) How could someone answer "No" to the question "Has the Reformation of the Arts and Sciences Positively Affected the Moral Values of the Modern Citizen?!"

You will scarcely believe what you are reading— lo, I scarcely believed what I read, and as Chair of the Faculty Review Committee, I believe *everything* I read. This man, Rousseau, has lined up, with exhaustive citation of intellectual and historical occurrence, the wise Sciences and noble Arts as the main source of unhappiness, chaos, injustice, political disingenuousness, stress, and above all, the sloth of the oppressed.

Of course, we know he is correct— that was the plan from the get-go. The crux of the problem is, from the Académie's perception, a dual-natured one, compounded by the extraordinary skills of the writer Rousseau: what do we do with this hot potato such that Rousseau cannot inflict further damage on the precious institutions wise Caucasian men like ourselves have worked so hard to establish, since time immemorial?

I have enclosed Rousseau's manuscript— may you send your reply posthaste.

Godspeed,
Sir Randolph

7 March 1750

My dearest Randolph,

Shocked!— shocked I am at such an outrage! How will the Académie live this down? For a 38-year-old man to come from the reaches of nowhere, and deliver a screed such as this, challenging the party line that's been so nobly established for so many years? I dare say, this puts our entire Education Committee to shame— imagine failing to communicate the ever-present subtext of academic studies to such a person as Rousseau! He obviously was never inculcated with the important moral philosophies behind the rote recitations of our glorious Grammar Schools— such a man is dangerous, Randolph, and something must be done.

What must be done is the question here. The affect on the masses is hard to predict, as

Continued on page 19