

*In the years between and , New England and its people came gradually to embody America and, even more importantly, to define true American republicanism. Travelers touring the region described a land of picturesque, romantic landscapes, a civilized wilderness with neat, industrious.*

It The last few days have been extraordinarily difficult ones for Americans who love freedom and value the ideals of life, liberty, property, and the pursuit of happiness. Those are the principles upon which our nation was founded and that most of us hold very dear. But unfortunately we have radicals among us who believe it is their absolute right to violate those ideals to determine what kind of society we should live in. White Southerners apparently, with our abhorrent history. Such is the hypocrisy of the Left. There is now a movement afoot to remove all vestiges of the Confederacy from the South, driven both by the thugs in the streets and cowardly politicians in states and cities across the region. They are aggressively taking aim at historical monuments that honor the Confederacy and those who fought for Southern independence. They are also upset with any monuments honoring slaveholders, even presidents like Washington, Jefferson, and Madison, but also American heroes like Sam Houston. This is really nothing completely new. It has happened before. Today we are just seeing a second phase of it. A cultural cleansing of the South was the goal of Radical Republicans during Reconstruction to completely re-make Southern society. What the Union armies did not do during the war, with their near-total military conquest and destruction of as much of Southern infrastructure as they could muster, fanatical politicians sought to complete with their Reconstruction plan. The Northern intellectual Orestes Brownson of Vermont recognized what was going on in They wanted to make the South like the North. And if it caused more death and destruction, then so be it. Everything you give him, even life itself, is a boon which he has forfeited. On Monday thugs from these leftist groups physically pulled down and destroyed a statue honoring Confederate soldiers in Durham, North Carolina, which had stood since The police stood down and allowed it to happen, but public outrage caused the police to round up the perpetrators and arrest them. Other fanatics threw paint on a year-old Confederate statue in Baltimore, Maryland that depicted a dying Southern soldier. Officials there are working to remove all Confederate memorials from the city. Richmond, Virginia, the capital of the Confederacy, wants a memorial to Robert E. And because of the sheer violence that has taken place across the country, wimpy politicians are giving in to the demands of Antifa and BLM and voluntarily removing Confederate monuments when they otherwise might not have. The day after the awful events in Charlottesville, the mayor of Lexington, Kentucky wants two statues of Confederates removed from the courthouse grounds “ General John Hunt Morgan and John C. Breckinridge, a general and secretary of war who also served as US vice president before the war. The city of Gainesville, Florida just recently removed a single memorial depicting a Confederate soldier to appease the paint-throwers but at least officials there returned the statue to the United Daughters of the Confederacy rather than simply destroy it, as some cities have done. Outside of Atlanta, there is a movement ongoing to wipe away the carving of Lee, Jackson, and Davis etched into Stone Mountain. This includes the Democratic candidate for governor of Georgia who is making it a central part of his campaign. The artistic value of the carving means nothing to them. What is the difference between tearing down monuments and burning books? And the march of destruction continues on and will until we take a stand and stop it.

*CHAPTER 1 New Englandizing America In the years between and , New England and its people came gradually to embody America and, even more importantly, to define true American republicanism.*

When historians discuss reasons for Southern secession, as if the South needed to produce one, perhaps the most important, and sometimes neglected, motive was the protection of the Jeffersonian tradition, essentially the right to self-government. What was this Jeffersonian tradition or ideal? It is our lost political heritage of limited government and federalism, the political ideals that made up what might be called Jeffersonian conservatism. Those traditions came under attack in with the Lincolnian Revolution, which tried to kill it and has nearly succeeded. That is not to say we have been free of political disputes, for they have always been with us and always will. This political fight began the two-party system and gave us our first two parties. The Federalist Party, or Hamiltonians, believed in a strong central government, a national banking system, fiat currency, a national debt, protective tariffs and internal taxes, direct aid to corporations, loose construction of the Constitution, the suppression of civil liberties, and an internationalist foreign policy. The Republican Party, or Jeffersonians not to be confused with the modern-day Party of Lincoln , by contrast, believed in limited government, federalism, sound money, low taxes and tariffs, no national debt, government separation from banks, no subsidies for business, a strict construction of the Constitution, including the protection of civil liberties held by the people, and a non-interventionist foreign policy. Simply put, the Hamiltonians believed in the merits of an energetic national government; Jeffersonians believed in de-centralization and trusted in the people to govern themselves. Under Washington, Federalist arguments won out over Jeffersonian ones, at least on domestic policy. Americans had only recently concluded a war of independence against Great Britain, with taxation being a major issue. In addition to state and local taxes, citizens now faced taxation from the federal government on several articles, which caused many to wonder just why they broke from Britain. What had really changed? Some believed it was worse than it had been under the British. In , the government suppressed civil liberties with the Alien and Sedition Acts, a series of four new laws designed specifically to quash the followers of Jefferson. The crackdown on immigration was solely because most new immigrants from Europe were joining the Republicans, and many of the new laws contained sunset provisions that expired soon after the election of This all proved too much for the American people. This was not the road they wanted to travel down. So in the election of Jefferson and his Republican Party won an overwhelming victory, taking the White House and sweeping both houses of Congress, a triumph Jefferson himself predicted, which stopped the big government offensive and killed the Federalist Party, for it never saw power again, ever. Jefferson concluded with these words: The wisdom of our sages and blood of our heroes have been devoted to their attainment. They should be the creed of our political faith, the text of civic instruction, the touchstone by which to try the services of those we trust; and should we wander from them in moments of error or of alarm, let us hasten to retrace our steps and to regain the road which alone leads to peace, liberty, and safety. He cut spending, eliminated all internal taxes, repealed the Alien and Sedition Acts, and pardoned all those prosecuted under it, including the return of fine money out of the treasury. But he also did something else to totally change the nature of the government – changing its appearance. His predecessors had certainly played the part. Washington dressed gracefully for his ceremony and arrived in a fancy carriage pulled by a team of six white horses. His entourage included marching bands and formations of soldiers. Adams arrived at his ceremony in in a more modest but elegant carriage with two horses. He wore a grey broadcloth suit, but topped it off with an elegant sword. His hair was also well powdered in the finest aristocratic tradition. He walked to the Capitol for his inauguration rather than in a horse-drawn carriage. Residing in the mansion, he opened the door himself when someone knocked, even in his night attire, and removed the large rectangular dining table in favor of a circular one so that everyone present would be considered equal. He also served his guests personally, rather than have a servant do it. These changes may seem trivial and inconsequential but it ushered in an era of republican simplicity for the country and fit perfectly with the Jeffersonian ideal. Over the next sixty years, with only a few exceptions, the nation was governed by these Jeffersonian principles,

operating eventually in what would become the modern Democratic Party. Jeffersonian America was the freest and most prosperous place on Earth. There were no federal taxes on the people, no regulations, no federal police force, and no standing army. Americans had soundly rejected the centralizing ideas of Hamilton and the Federalists, and determined that Jefferson carried the sacred fire of liberty, the true ideals of the revolution. But we must not forget that these were actually American ideals, American principles, and American policies because most Americans believed in them. And even though it was the South that early on dominated national affairs, electing a majority of Presidents, House Speakers, and other national leaders, and, by , dominated the Supreme Court, there were many in the North that held strongly to Jeffersonian ideals, including many Presidents and other leaders. The only real nationalist President during the Jeffersonian years was John Quincy Adams of Massachusetts, whose very election was the result of corruption and who only served one term. Even many Northerners rejected Adams and nationalism. Southerners never ceased to remind their Yankee tormentors that not only state rights but secessionist doctrine had played well in New England well before the Hartford Convention. If anything, regional particularism and state rights doctrine were stronger in the North than in the South until after the War of . Some portray the rift as a Jeffersonian vs. These vast differences were reflected in their political philosophies – the way they believed the country should be governed as well as the foundation upon which it rested. Jeffersonians believed in a de-centralized state, a Union, or compact among the states, where sovereignty rested with the people of the states, and it was those sovereign states that came together to create the Constitution, delegating certain enumerated powers to a new federal government, while retaining all other powers for themselves and always with the understanding that those delegated powers could be recalled at anytime. These ideas are what most Americans, not just Southerners, understood as absolute political truth. William Rawle, a very prominent attorney from Philadelphia, wrote a book called *A View of the Constitution* in , a textbook used most notably at West Point. Lincolnians – people like Lincoln, Daniel Webster, Joseph Story – believed in the concept of a perpetual National Union, whereby the whole of the American people, who they believed created and empowered the Constitution, were deemed sovereign and the states were nothing more than provinces to be dominated and controlled by a central authority, a view that did not really exist until the s. This push toward the creation of a centralized state began with the increase of the New England Yankee, as a distinct group of people in both numbers and influence. Yankees were the polar opposite of Jeffersonians. The New Englander has excellent points, but is restless in body and mind, always scheming, always in motion, never satisfied with what he has, and always seeking to make all the world like himself, or as uneasy as himself. He is smart, seldom great; educated, but seldom learned; active in mind, but rarely a profound thinker; religious, but thoroughly materialistic: This perfectly describes the Hamiltonian, and later Lincolnian, mindset. This is especially true of the abolitionists, who sought, through their magnanimity, to reach down into Southern states, immediately abolish slavery, upset the entirety of Southern society, without so much as a ripple of disruption to the North. And it was not because they cared about enslaved blacks in the South. It was about destroying the Jeffersonian South. Jeffersonians as a whole, and Southerners in particular, never sought to do this to the North, unlike Northern conspiracy theories of the day. Jefferson, as politically astute as he was, saw these differences very early and wrote about them more than six decades before secession, during the darkest days of the Adams administration, to which he served as Vice President. The law, passed by Congress and sent to the President, went much farther in how that help was allocated. Pierce, a Northerner, objected to every aspect of the bill. To do so would, in my judgment, be contrary to the letter and spirit of the Constitution and subversive of the whole theory upon which the Union of these States is founded. This growing philosophical divide eventually came to a head with the emergence of a purely sectional party, the new Republican Party, conceived in after passage of the Kansas-Nebraska Act. The party grew rapidly by coalescing many different elements into it: The South certainly saw the dangers apparent with the Republicans but some Northerners did as well. In other words, if we stick to our ideals, embodied in the Constitution, we will survive the political storms that lay ahead. But that was the problem – Would the Republicans follow the Constitution? Many Northern Yankees had already demonstrated a propensity toward lawlessness and interpreting the Constitution any way they chose, reserving the right to violate it for the noblest of reasons, an attitude described by Brownson. The new Republican Party nominated

a presidential candidate for the first time in , the explorer John C. The platform, though, was strictly about federal territories and the issue of slavery expansion. Yet even though the party was just two years old, Republicans nearly won the election, with Democrats only getting 45 percent of the vote. Two years later, in a fusion with other factions, they elected the US Speaker of the House. The South was beginning to see the political handwriting on the wall. According to Gabor S. Such a plan was greatly concerning to the Jeffersonian South, realizing that the high tariff was designed to enrich the North, deplete the South, and reward well-connected cronies such as railroad magnates and other corporate hacks, who would also gain federal funding for internal improvements that would also benefit the North, while the bank would fund it and be perhaps as crooked and corrupt as it had been under Nicholas Biddle. In short, the new Lincoln government, based exclusively on Hamiltonian principles, would, most assuredly, intervene in the internal affairs of the Southern States and plunder them like never before. He denied the right of any state to secede from the Union. We cannot remove our respective sections from each other nor build an impassable wall between them. A husband and wife may be divorced and go out of the presence and beyond the reach of each other; but the different parts of our country cannot do this. In , Southerners, completely exacerbated by the threats of the North, determined to create a government of their own, one reflecting their principles, and they believed that they had every right to do so, as believers of the right of self-determination of peoples, the very heart of the Declaration of Independence. The contrast then between the Southern and Northern governments was vast. The Confederate Constitution was a culmination of Jeffersonian political thought. It was much like the U. Constitution, because Southerners believed that was their birthright, but it did contain numerous important changes, which only made it more Jeffersonian. If federal officials meddled in state and local affairs, they could be banished from the state. This was one of the crucial components of Jeffersonian political thought, designed solely to preserve federalism. There were also other notable differences in the Confederate Constitution that fall along Jeffersonian lines: God was mentioned in the Preamble. The President could serve only one six-year term and had a line item veto to control spending. All of these provisions upheld the Jeffersonian ideal. Now consider an important question: Was this movement for Southern self-government an act of revolution? Some scholars have said it was. Or does it sound more like what Lincoln did? The answer should be obvious. The South understood and saw very clearly what Lincoln and the Republicans were up to, seceded in order to save and preserve the Jeffersonian ideal, and govern themselves, just as Americans had done 85 years before; Lincoln invaded, not to overthrow slavery, but to conquer the South, end Jeffersonian governance, and fasten on the nation his nationalistic economic policies, in precisely the same stance as the former Mother Country. James Henley Thornwell wrote of these issues in the midst of the war, in a book entitled *Our Danger and Our Duty*, published in . The consequences of success on our part will be very different from the consequences of success on the part of the North.

**Chapter 3 : Jeffersonian vs Hamiltonian Government | Survival Monkey Forums**

*New-Englandizing America A Prussian Monarch, an American Hero: Early Republican Royalism and Parallels between the Cult of Frederick the Great and Celebrations of the First American President.*

SocietyWritings "Liberalism and Progress" Oct. The author seems to have been only a civilian general, as his name does not appear in the army Register, and we suspect that he has never served in any army, hardly in a band of filibusters. From his English, and his inability to see any thing in our habits or manners, in our civil or military service, to commend, we should judge him some disappointed foreigner, who at the breaking out of our civil war, had offered his services to the government and had them refused. He regards himself as qualified for any post from pathmaster to president, or from corporal to commander-in-chief of the the armies of the United States, which makes against the theory that he is a foreigner, and would indicate that he is a native, and "to the manner born. He blames the government for entrusting important commands to men who have been educated at West Point, and insists that if it will appoint Americans to the command of its armies, it should appoint civilians, who have not been narrowed, belittled, and cramped by the pedantry of a military education. He prefers instinct to study, and the happy inspirations of ignorance to the calculations of science. He thinks our true course is to invite hither the military adventurers so numerous on the continent of Europe, and who can find, in consequence of their devotion to democracy, no employment at home, and give them the command of our armies. He does not seem to be aware that we have tried his theory pretty thoroughly in both respects, and have found it not to work well. We passed in the beginning over the army, and made nearly all our high military appointments from civil life. In our first batch of major-generals, not one was taken from the army, and only one was taken who had been educated at West Point. The government commenced with as great a distrust of West Point and a military education and military experience, and with as great a confidence in the military instincts and inspirations of civilians or political aspirants, as our author himself could desire, and with what wisdom the contry knows, to its sorrow. Most of our civilian generals have proved sad failures; West Point is now at a premium, and would remain so, but for the wretched policy of making most new appointments in the army from the ranks, thereby spoiling good sargeants and making poor officers. Something besides bravery even is demanded of an officer. Gentlemanly tastes, habits, education, and manners, a knowledge of his profession, and an aptitude to command men, are necessary. Appointments from the ranks, as a reward of extraordinary merit, is well; but they should be sparingly and judiciously made. When we make appointments from the ranks the rule, they cease to be the reward of merit, and degrade the army and impair its efficiency. In the beginning of the war, we had almost any number of foreign adventurers in our service, but we have been obliged to get rid of the larger portion of them. If the nation cannot from itself officer its own army, it had better not go to war; for it is pretty sure to fail if it does. Then war as made here assumes a peculiar character. Carried on over our vast extent of country, much of it either a wilderness, or sparingly settled, in a manner so different from what the training and experience acquired in European armies and wars fit one for, that foreign officers can be of little use to us. Neither the strategy or the tactics of a Napoleon would secure success here. The men who enter a foreign service are, besides, rarely the best officers in the army of their country, and are usually as such as their own government does not care to employ. We maintain, too, that though West Point is susceptible of improvement, nowhere are young men better trained for the profession of arms, and it is very little that the men from abroad, who seek commissions in our army, can teach our West Pointers. The great objection to our army officers at the opening of the war was their lack of experience in commanding, moving, and manouevering large bodies of men; but the foreigners who seek to enter our armies equally lack that experience. At the opening of the war, there were some who were mad enough to wish the government to invite Garibaldi to come and take command of our army; but Garibaldi, however successful he might have been as the tool of Piedmont or Mazzini in stirring up insurrection, and as a partisan commander, never commanded nor proved himself capable of commanding an army of thirty thousand men. Besides, his proper place in this country would not have been in the federal army, but in that of the rebels. To fight against rebellion and revolution in defence of legal authority and established government

would have been a novelty to him, and contrary to his native instincts. Our author is a decided democrat, in the European sense of the word, and complains that the American people are not truly and thoroughly democratic. He has no sympathy with our people, and thinks them false to their own democratic principles. What brought him here, if a foreigner, and induced him to offer us his valuable services, which appear to have been rejected, was his sympathy with democracy, and hostility to all other actual or possible forms of government. All this may be very well in him, only he is on the wrong side, as would have been his friend Garibaldi. The struggle in which we are engaged, notwithstanding what some silly journalists write and publish, is not a struggle for the triumph of democracy. So to understand it is to misunderstand it; and we always regret to find friends of the Union urging the war as a war between the northern democracy and the southern aristocracy. Such many have tried and are still trying to make it; but such is not its real legitimate character. On our side it is a war in defence of government, of authority, and the supremacy of law. It is a war in vindication of national integrity, and in defence of American constitutionalism. The very thing our author would have us make the principle and end of the war, is that which the war is waged against. We wish to abolish slavery as far as it can be done without appealing to humanitarian or revolutionary principles: Politically, southern society is no more aristocratic in its constitution than northern society: In the present struggle, southern society has proved relatively stronger and more energetic than northern society, because in southern society the people are marshalled under their natural leaders, under men who are intrinsically superior to the mass, and felt to be so; while in the northern states they have been marshalled under no leaders or under artificial leaders, not superior and often inferior, to those they are commissioned to lead. No society that has not a natural aristocracy, if we may borrow a phrase from Thomas Jefferson, has any real cohesive power, or any more strength than a rope of sand. We have some madmen amongst us who talk of exterminating the southern leaders, and of new-Englandizing the South. We wish to see the free-labor system substituted for the slave-labor system, but beyond this we have no wish to exchange or modify southern society, and would rather approach northern society to it. The New Englander has excellent points, but is restless in body and mind, always in motion, never satisfied with what he has, and always seeking to make all the world like himself, or as uneasy as himself. He is smart, seldom great; educated, but seldom learned; active in mind, but rarely a profound thinker; religious, but thoroughly materialistic: He has his use in the community; but a whole nation composed of such as he would be short-lived, and resemble the community of the lost rather than that of the blest. The Puritan is a reformer by nature, but he never understands the true law of progress, and never has the patience to wait till the reform he wishes for can be practically effected. He is too impatient for the end ever to wait the slow operations of the means, and defeats his own purpose by his inconsiderate haste. He needs the slower, the more deliberate, and the more patient and enduring man of the South to serve as his counterpoise. The South has for its natural leaders, not simply men of property, but men of large landed estates, and who are engaged in agricultural pursuits: They of course are less fitted, in a country like ours, to lead than the landholders, because agriculture with us is a broader and more permanent interest of the nation than trade or manufactures. We insist that it were a gross perversion of the war to make it a war against Southern society or the Southern people. The war is just and defensible only when it is conducted as a war of the nation for its own existence and rights against an armed rebellion. In the war the nation seeks to reduce the rebels to their allegiance, not to destroy them, not to exile them, not to deprive them of their property or their franchises; it seeks to make them once more loyal citizens, and an integral portion of the American people, standing on a footing of perfect equality with the rest, not slaves or tributaries. Southern society must be respected, and in any attempt to build up a new South out of the few Union men left there, northern speculators, sharpers, adventurers, and freed negroes, is not only impolitic, but unconstitutional and wrong. Such a South would be a curse to itself and to the whole nation; we want it not. With here and there an individual exception, the real people of the South are united in the rebellion, and under their natural leaders, and any schemes of settlement that does not contemplate their remaining with their natural leaders, the real, substantial, ruling people of the southern states, will not only fail, but ought not to be entertained. They must have the control of affairs in their respective states, and represent them in the councils of the nation. The nation cannot afford to lose them; if it could, it need not have gone to war against them. The bringing of the negro element, except in states where it

is too feeble to amount to any thing, into American political society will never be submitted to by either the North or the South. We must suppress the rebellion; but with the distinct understanding that the southern states are to be restored, when they submit, to all the rights of self-government in the Union, and that no attempt in the mean time shall be made to revolutionize their society in favor of northern or European ideas. If in our haste, our wrath, or our zeal we have said any thing that can bear a different sense, it must be retracted. Friends of constitutional government, and of liberty with law, may justly sympathize with our government in the present struggle; but not European radicals, democrats, and revolutionists, for the principle of the struggle is as hostile to them as it is to the southern rebels. In this war the nation is fighting northern democracy or Jacobinism as much as it is southern aristocracy, and the evidence of it is in the fact, that the people cease to support willingly the war just in proportion as it assumes a Jacobinical character, and loses its character of a war in defence of government and law. The administration may not see it; and the philosophers of the New York Tribune and Evening Post, well convinced as they may be that something is wrong, may deny it, and propose to cure the evil by doubling the dose of radicalism; even the people, while they instinctively feel, may not be fully aware that it is that which holds them back; but so it is, and nothing for years has given us so much hope for our country as this very fact. It proves that, after all, the popular instincts are right, and that while the people are ready to carry on a war to preserve the constitution and government, they are not prepared to carry on a war for revolutionizing either. These foreign radicals and revolutionists who complain of our democracy, that it is not thorough-going and consistent, and does not press straight to its end, ought to understand that there is no legitimate sympathy between them and us, and that they cannot fight their battles in ours. We are not fighting their battles, and those of our countrymen who think we are, begin already to find themselves deserted by the nation. The American people, however ready they have been to sympathize with revolution, and encourage insurrection and rebellion in foreign nations, therein imitating the English Whigs, are yet very far from being revolutionists in the interior of their souls, and for their own country. Our author, who professes to side with the Federalists, keeps an eye on the revolutionary movements in Europe, and a considerable part of his work is written with the express intention of forwarding them. He rejoices at the spread of democratic ideas in England, in Germany, and in Italy, and he expresses his hope that the democratic party will rise again in France, and hurl the emperor from his throne. We trust we love liberty and free government as much as does this disappointed foreigner, or American with foreign sympathies and notions: Every enlightened well-wisher to European society would rejoice to see the whole race of European revolutionists exterminated, or converted into loyal and peaceful subjects. True liberty was never yet advanced by subverting the established government of a country. Europe has lost far more than it has gained by its century of insurrections, revolutions, and civil wars, and the new regimes introduced have left fewer effective guarantees of civil freedom and personal liberty than existed before them. Providence may overrule evil for good, but good is never the natural product of evil. We know, in censuring the revolutionary spirit of modern society, we are placing ourselves in opposition to the whole so-called liberal party of the civilized world; but that is not our fault. The liberal party so called has its good side and its bad side. Some things in it are to be commended, and other things in it, whoever would not stultify himself must condemn. Man is by nature a social being, and cannot live and thrive out of society; society is impracticable without strong and efficient government; and strong and efficient government is impracticable, where the people have no loyal sentiments, and hold themselves free to make war on their government and subvert it whenever they please. People must feel not only that it is in their interest to sustain government, but that it is their moral and religious duty to sustain it; and when they have no moral sense, no religion, and no loyal affection, they should know that they cannot sustain it, and society must cease to exist. A nation of atheists were a solecism in history. A few atheists may, perhaps, live in society, and even serve it for a time, where the mass of people are believers and worshippers, but an entire nation of real atheists was never yet founded, and never could subsist any longer than it would take it to dissipate the moral wealth acquired while it was as yet a religious nation. It was well said by the late Abbe de La Mennais, before his unhappy fall: The great misfortune of modern liberalism is, that it was begotten of impatience and born of a reaction against the tyranny and oppression, the licentiousness and despotism of governments and the governing classes; and it is more disposed to hate than to love, and is

abler to destroy than to build up. Wherever you find it, it bears traces of its origin, and confides more in human passion than in divine Providence. The great majority of its adherents, even if they retain a vague and impotent religious sentiment, and pay some slight outward respect to the religion of their country, yet place the state above the church, the officers of government above the ministers of religion, and maintain that priests have nothing to do with the affairs of this world. They forget that it is precisely to introduce the elements of truth, justice, right, duty, conscience into the government of individuals and nations in this world, as the means of securing the next, that institutions of religion exist, and priests are consecrated. Politicians may do as they please, so long as they violate no rule of right, no principle of justice, no law of God; but in no world, in no order, in no rank, or condition, have men the right to do wrong. Religion, if any thing is the *lex suprema*, and what it forbids, no man has the right to do. This is a lesson liberalism has forgotten, or never learned. In our last Review we defended civil and religious freedom and pointed out to the oscurantisti in church and state, wherein and wherefore they mistake this age, are laboring for an impossibility, and fail to recall men to faith, and to reestablish in its integrity the unity of Christendom; but whoever inferred from what we then said that we have any sympathy with political atheism, reasoned from premises of his own, not from any we ever laid down or entertained. Almost entire volumes of this Review are filled with refutations, such as they are, of political atheism, and the defence of the authority of religion for the human conscience in all the affairs of human life. There are elements in modern liberalism that it will not do to oppose, because, though liberalism misapplies them, they are borrowed from the Gospel, are taken from Christian civilization, and are, in themselves, true, noble, just, and holy. Nor can we recall modern society to that old order of things, that liberalism began by opposing, even if it were desireable, which it is not. Many things we may seek to save from being overthrown, which, when overthrown, it would be madness to attempt to reestablish. But we have never denied that modern liberalism has an odor of infidelity and irreligion, and assumes an independence of religion, that is, of conscience, of God, which is alike incompatible with the salvation of souls and the progress of society. Liberals, if they would study the question, would soon find that religion offers no obstacle to any thing true and good they wish to effect, and even offers them that very assistance without which they cannot effect or preserve it. It is the mad attempt to separate the progress of society from religion that has rendered modern liberalism everywhere destructive, and everywhere a failure.

Chapter 4 : Creating an American Identity: New England, - Stephanie Kermes - Google Books

*New-Englandizing America \* A Prussian Monarch, an American Hero: Early Republican Royalism and Parallels between the Cult of Frederick the Great and Celebrations of the First American President \* Failed Republicans: Images of the British and the French \* Hero of Liberty: New England Celebrations of General Lafayette during his Visit in*

It gives me a great deal of pleasure to get the ball rolling here to the hardest working man on this tournament, he never sleeps, and he certainly never sleeps now since he just had the birth of a little baby girl, and we want to congratulate him. It has been a whirlwind two weeks for me as far as my baby girl, so I am extremely pleased to be here. Good morning, thank you all for coming, and welcome to the fifth annual Deutsche Bank Championship media day. We have a great day planned for you today, and we have a lot to share. Gil Hanse, course architect. Gil is an amazing architect. He and his team have worked diligently in the off-season to really enhance this golf course. His work speaks for itself. He used stack sodded and chunk bunkers, chocolate drop mounds and fescue grasses to really enhance this golf course esthetically, as well as putting a little strategic and challenging element to the game. Brad Faxon is also here with us today. What can I say? Thanks so much for joining us. He is the new general manager and director of golf here at the TPC Boston. Brad has come from TPC Michigan. He and his team have put together endless time and effort into making this championship great for all of us, so thank you very much to your team for your help. You will hear from each of these individuals later on today, but first we are so excited to be at the forefront of the action as the PGA TOUR enters into the new era of golf with an exciting season long points competition called the FedExCup. In addition to our founding club partners we also have two new network partners this year that are going to broadcast the event with the Golf Channel and NBC Sports. We also are for the second year in a row proud to continue our program of Birdies for Charity. Birdies for Charity is an initiative that allows nonprofits to leverage the championship for fundraising. Lastly, the event is very special because of our fan-friendly atmosphere. The Deutsche Bank Championship prides itself on this, and we pride ourselves on a holiday experience. We also have added some new fan enhancements this year. We have increased our bleachers at 18, we have increased bleacher seating at the 16th hole, which is now a new par 3, which is 40 yards shorter than it was before, as well as being able to watch that from all sides. Thus we embark on a new era in golf called the FedExCup. Some of the greatest moments in sports come from Playoffs. What you guys are doing here is setting the curve for a lot of other tournaments, particularly your fan and family friendly environments. To the TPC Boston staff who does a tremendous job. But I was really excited when I picked up the paper this morning and I read through the current standings, Tiger Woods is first, Vijay Singh second, Jim Furyk with his victory yesterday moved to third, Phil Mickelson fourth in the current FedExCup points standings. Pretty darned good leaderboard with three weeks to go in the regular season. So we will be extremely interested to be back here for the Deutsche Bank Championship, second stop of the Playoffs, and we appreciate the support and the coverage that the media is providing not just for this event but for the PGA TOUR as a whole, and we hope the Playoffs provide you a format and a platform, as well, for increased coverage. It gives me a great deal of pleasure to introduce our next speaker. Thank you very much. But really to be home here. And I also include a lot of the folks in this room in this, and I really do mean that. The press has been a huge supporter of ours and really makes this work. One of my philosophies if you can kind of stay happy and be around happy people that happy things happen. We want to be a special week. And I think the culmination of that is now upon us. We know this event is going to be better. I know the TOUR is very open to think about it and to work with us. Everybody wants to be the first guy to win the Cup. So we are very excited to be part of a mini-major, if you will, in terms of where it is. We also love our slot. So we love that aspect of it. So thank you all. You saw some of the pictures today. I would love to hear your comments. To be able to make these changes in six months with -- would you say a small budget or a big budget? Depends on where you come from. I know that Tiger made a comment, this is one of the greatest sports towns in the country. It gives me a great deal of pleasure to introduce Gil Hanse. Brad took my line. I was going to blame him for everything that goes on out there. Thank you for coming out today. I hope you will enjoy what you see. It has been quite a process, and as

Brad said, it seemed like a very long six months but it really was a very short six months. From the time the tournament left town last September, thankfully we did have a decent December to work in, and we were able to go ahead and work through December and really accomplish really everything we had hoped for out there. We got to the point after daylight savings time where they brought in temporary lights so we could work until about 8: As Brad mentioned, what we were really hopeful of doing was trying to create a golf course that looked and felt a little bit more like New England. So hopefully the golf course will feel and look a little bit more rustic and a little bit more like New England. You can always make bunkers so deep, you can only grow rough so thick and tall and you can only have greens so fast. I think these are the things that architects are going to have to rely more and more on as we go forward with technology and as good athletes as these gentlemen are and the way they play the game. I have to thank certainly Tom Brodeur, the golf course superintendent, and his staff. Mostly for Brad, would the New Englandizing of this course have been possible or have been a tough sell without the leverage of the FedExCup, with the turnout of players, to change it as much as it has been? I think the golf course needed to be improved. I think that FedEx probably made it happen quicker than it might have, but also, I think it was something we needed to do anyway. The TOUR has been a great partner. We also have to be cognizant of the membership here, as well. But I did get a call from Tim last year once we shook hands on FedEx, and it all happened incredibly quickly. We really decided to do the golf course after -- I think it was after. There was a few months out there we were banging in the dirt. After really October it was short of a miracle because the weather made it possible to still work into January last year. Hats off to Gil and his partner Jim Wagner to get this all done on the clock. I think one of the main areas will be the 15th hole. So taking away their visibility is I think the strategy or part of the overall feel of that golf hole by putting a bunker in their way. This is a tournament that I started playing when I was 19 years old. I would have liked to play better than I have. He currently leads the FedExCup point standings with 20, points in 11 events. Can you take us through what happened down the stretch last year and what you remember? I was able to keep away from Vijay and roll on from there. Well, I think it will be even deeper than it has been in the past. All the players that have played there have thoroughly enjoyed their experience in the event. Tell us a little bit about the Tiger Woods Learning Center that benefits from this tournament. I understand that the numbers have grown to 8, Well, the Learning Center, the first one out in Orange County has been phenomenal. The community has thoroughly embraced it. Everything has been a tremendous success so far with the Foundation, the Learning Center. Have you heard about the changes at the course and did you think this -- what did you think of the course before, and do you think it needed to be changed? I think every player will enjoy the experience. What in particular did you like about the course changes? And secondly, you mentioned earlier about expectations. As the tournament that your Foundation has been involved with, could you have expected five years ago that it would be a Playoff site and that type of thing? So the answer to that would be no. But for the past couple years certainly some changes have evolved, and here we are. I think their commitment to the event and the experience of all the players as well as the spectators has been top-notch. I think golf fans everywhere are quite familiar with the lessons that your dad instilled in terms of your profession. They may not be quite as familiar with the life lessons that he instilled in you. How do you apply that to your roles as a husband and a father? As far as my intent, my intent is to play all the Playoffs.

**Chapter 5 : The Cultural Genocide of the South Marches On “ Mississippi Conservative Daily**

*Table of Contents List of Figures ix Acknowledgments xi Introduction 1 New Englandizing America 15 A Prussian Monarch-an American Hero: Early Republican Royalism and Parallels between the Cult of Frederick the Great and Celebrations of the First American President*

Yet most true conservatives may not realize that their closely held philosophy of limited government originated in the South. It is a Southern institution, and conservatives outside the South are espousing Southern values, whether they know it or not. It is a clash that is still raging today. In essence, the real breakdown today is not Republican or Democrat, Liberal or Conservative, but Hamiltonian and Jeffersonian. This is the sum total of our whole political dispute. All the fundamental conflicts in our history were adumbrated during the first decade of the General Government in the contest symbolized by these two men. Concentrated in the South, Jeffersonians, by contrast, believed in limited government, federalism, sound money, low taxes and tariffs, no national debt, government separation from banks, no support for corporations or big business, a strict construction of the Constitution, including the protection of civil liberties held by the people, and a non-interventionist foreign policy. Simply put, the Hamiltonians believed in the merits of government; Jeffersonians trusted in the people to govern themselves. Operating under the label of Federalists, Hamilton and his arguments carried the day during the Washington and Adams administrations, the first twelve years under the new Constitution. But Jefferson and his new Republican Party won a great victory in , taking the White House and sweeping both houses of Congress, a triumph Jefferson himself predicted, which stopped the big government onslaught and killed the Federalist Party, but not Hamiltonian thought. He was no pseudo-conservative! Over the next sixty years, for the most part, the nation was governed by Jeffersonian principles, operating in what would become the modern Democratic Party. This was one of his legalistic arguments against the right of secession, or in his way of thinking, his belief that he could hold the South in the Union by force and against Southern will. Under such a belief, Lincoln was an imperialist. In a political sense, though, Lincoln was wrong. Opinions abound, from both sides of the Mason and Dixon Line, that the two regions were polar opposites. And most sentiments were quite strong. One Mississippian, writing to former governor John A. Quitman in , put it this way: He was captured more than two weeks ago with all his family. General Smith has surrendered, and the people of the South are slaves “to the vilest race that ever disgraced humanity. Northerners also held similar views, though not necessarily as harsh. We differ like Celt and Anglo-Saxon, and there is no sufficient force“to keep us together against our will. This is something the Jeffersonian South did not want to see, but what the imperialistic-minded Lincoln had in mind all along. Even foreigners saw the differences. Yet by the late s, Southerners were moving closer and closer toward separation, which a great many Northerners, though not all, were unlikely to allow without a struggle. We wish to see the free-labor system substituted for the slave-labor system, but beyond that we have no wish to exchange or modify Southern society, and would rather approach Northern society to it, than it to Northern society. He is smart, seldom great; educated, but seldom learned; active in mind, but rarely a profound thinker; religious, but thoroughly materialistic: Jeffersonians, however, did not think this way at all. Jefferson himself saw these differences very early and wrote about them more than six decades before secession. Yet the Hamiltonian Lincoln denied the right of any state to secede from the Union. We cannot remove our respective sections from each other nor build an impassable wall between them. A husband and wife may be divorced and go out of the presence and beyond the reach of each other; but the different parts of our country cannot do this. In his first inaugural address he dealt with the issue of sectional unhappiness far differently than Lincoln would 60 years later. The Confederate Constitution was a culmination of Jeffersonian Conservatism. It was much like the U. Constitution but with numerous important changes. If federal officials meddled in local affairs, they could be banished from the state. This was one of the crucial components of Jeffersonian political thought, designed solely to preserve federalism. There were also other notable differences in the Confederate Constitution that fall along Jeffersonian lines: The President could serve only one six-year term and had a line item veto to control spending. But the contrast with the Northern government was vast. And as a result, the

United States nearly lost its constitutional republic during this War of Northern Aggression and the later period of Reconstruction. It does not seem to me as if I were living in the country in which I was born. Modern scholars have also made note of this fact. As the Hamiltonian James M. McPherson points out in *Abraham Lincoln and the Second American Revolution*, after the war the old decentralized federal republic became a new national polity that taxed the people directly, created an internal revenue bureau to collect these taxes, expanded the jurisdiction of federal courts, established a national currency and a national banking structure. The United States went to war in to preserve the Union; it emerged from war in having created a nation. The loose union of states became a nation. Other scholars have also noted at how profoundly the nation had been changed. By the time of Appomattox, the United States had changed. Reconstruction, like the war before it, continued the goal of destroying the old Jeffersonian Union and erecting a new one in its place, one based on government control rather than on individual liberty. Unlike Lincoln, they believed the Southern states had, in fact, seceded from the Union, or at least used it to their advantage, viewing the South as conquered territory to be treated as such. Senator Zachariah Chandler of Michigan said it this way: He has no right to life, liberty, property, or the pursuit of happiness. Everything you give him, even life itself, is a boon which he has forfeited. They wanted the complete subjugation of the region, vindictive punishment of the rebels, the overthrow of all Southern state governments, and the confiscation of all land and homes. Peoples from the North and West would then be sent to the South to repopulate it, ensuring that it would remain firmly Republican and solidly Hamiltonian. In other words, they wanted to make the South like the North, sweeping away all vestiges of Southern culture and politics. As a conservative, Cleveland saw himself as one who could, as President, put the spilled milk back in the bottle, or at least some of it. This is why the Hamiltonians of his day fought so hard against his election as President, for Cleveland stands out as the lone Jeffersonian among all Presidents from Lincoln to Obama, a statesman who held as tight to those principles as any President in American history. First elected in , after twenty-four consecutive years of Hamiltonian White House rule, Cleveland became the first Jeffersonian to serve as President since before the war. A quarter century of corruption, profligate spending, high taxes, and ever-expanding government had been the norm. When Cleveland entered office, he instituted honest government, ended presidential luxury, slashed the bureaucracy, halted out-of-control spending by vetoing a record bills, protected the massive budget surplus that Republicans were all too eager to spend, and reduced the national debt by 20 percent. Not a bad record for a first term. In , he was defeated for a second consecutive term by Benjamin Harrison, although he won the popular vote. Though determined not to seek another term, he quickly changed his mind when he saw what the Hamiltonians under President Harrison were doing to the country, and what some were doing within his beloved Jeffersonian Democratic Party, moving it closer to the Party of Lincoln in the hopes of being more successful in future elections. In , Cleveland threw his hat back in the presidential ring and, like Jefferson in , took back the White House and led his party to a sweep of both houses of Congress, the first time Jeffersonians controlled the entire government since under James Buchanan. The future seemed bright indeed. Yet, sadly, fate intervened. During his second term, from to , Cleveland faced a severe economic depression, one that had resulted from the massive re-imposition of Hamiltonian fiscal policies during the preceding Harrison Administration. A month before Cleveland took his second oath of office, the economy began to crumble. And even though neither he nor his party had anything to do with the collapse, and even though he used Jeffersonian methods to end it within two years, Cleveland and the Democrats received all the blame. In the mid-term election in Democrats were routed, losing both houses of Congress, and in , the Hamiltonians were back in charge with the election of William McKinley. To get around that label, Democrats began shedding Jeffersonian principles and began embracing more Hamiltonian ideas. The Southern political philosophy of Jeffersonian Conservatism that died with Grover Cleveland has never been resurrected, for today we have no major party that espouses those values. It is only alive in the hearts of true Sons of the South.

**Chapter 6 : Englandizing Tomorrow's Subjects | Eradica**

*Creating an American Identity examines the relationship between regionalism and nationalism in New England between and During that period New Englanders and their neighbors in New York and Pennsylvania used trans-Atlantic symbols at the same time as a model and an antithesis in the creation of their own national identity.*

I tend to lean toward that which Governs least Governs best. It is rather long but well worth the read and it uses excerpts from letters written at the time. This was originally published on The Abbeville Blog on October 18, 2011. What is true conservatism? Yet most true conservatives may not realize that their closely held philosophy of limited government originated in the South. It is a Southern institution and conservatives outside the South are espousing Southern values, whether they know it or not. It is a clash that is still raging today. In essence, the real breakdown today is not Republican or Democrat, liberal or conservative, but Hamiltonian and Jeffersonian. This is the sum total of our whole political dispute. All the fundamental conflicts in our history were adumbrated during the first decade of the General Government in the contest symbolized by these two men. Concentrated in the South, Jeffersonians, by contrast, believed in limited government, federalism, sound money, low taxes and tariffs, no national debt, government separation from banks, no support for corporations or big business, a strict construction of the Constitution, including the protection of civil liberties held by the people and a non-interventionist foreign policy. Simply put, the Hamiltonians believed in the merits of government; Jeffersonians trusted in the people to govern themselves. Operating under the label of Federalists, Hamilton and his arguments carried the day during the Washington and Adams administrations, the first twelve years under the new Constitution. But Jefferson and his new Republican Party won a great victory in 1800, taking the White House and sweeping both houses of Congress, a triumph Jefferson himself predicted, which stopped the big government onslaught and killed the Federalist Party, but not Hamiltonian thought. He was no pseudo-conservative! Over the next sixty years, for the most part, the nation was governed by Jeffersonian principles, operating in what would become the modern Democratic Party. This was one of his legalistic arguments against the right of secession, or in his way of thinking, his belief that he could hold the South in the Union by force and against Southern will. Under such a belief, Lincoln was an imperialist. In a political sense, though, Lincoln was wrong. Opinions abound, from both sides of the Mason and Dixon Line, that the two regions were polar opposites. And most sentiments were quite strong. One Mississippian, writing to former governor John A. Quitman in 1850, put it this way: He was captured more than two weeks ago with all his family. General Smith has surrendered, and the people of the South are slaves "to the vilest race that ever disgraced humanity. Northerners also held similar views, though not necessarily as harsh. We differ like Celt and Anglo-Saxon, and there is no sufficient force to keep us together against our will. This is something the Jeffersonian South did not want to see, but what the imperialistic-minded Lincoln had in mind all along. Even foreigners saw the differences. Yet by the late 1840s, Southerners were moving closer and closer toward separation, which a great many Northerners, though not all, were unlikely to allow without a struggle. We wish to see the free-labor system substituted for the slave-labor system, but beyond that we have no wish to exchange or modify Southern society and would rather approach Northern society to it, than it to Northern society. He is smart, seldom great; educated, but seldom learned; active in mind, but rarely a profound thinker; religious, but thoroughly materialistic: Jeffersonians, however, did not think this way at all. Jefferson himself saw these differences very early and wrote about them more than six decades before secession. Yet the Hamiltonian Lincoln denied the right of any state to secede from the Union. We cannot remove our respective sections from each other nor build an impassable wall between them. A husband and wife may be divorced and go out of the presence and beyond the reach of each other; but the different parts of our country cannot do this. In his first inaugural address he dealt with the issue of sectional unhappiness far differently than Lincoln would 60 years later. The Confederate Constitution was a culmination of Jeffersonian Conservatism. It was much like the U. S. Constitution but with numerous important changes. If federal officials meddled in local affairs, they could be banished from the state. This was one of the crucial components of Jeffersonian political thought, designed solely to preserve federalism. There were also other notable differences in the Confederate

Constitution that fall along Jeffersonian lines: But the contrast with the Northern government was vast. And as a result, the United States nearly lost its constitutional republic during this War of Northern Aggression and the later period of Reconstruction. It does not seem to me as if I were living in the country in which I was born. Modern scholars have also made note of this fact. As the Hamiltonian James M. McPherson points out in *Abraham Lincoln and the Second American Revolution*, after the war the old decentralized federal republic became a new national polity that taxed the people directly, created an internal revenue bureau to collect these taxes, expanded the jurisdiction of federal courts, established a national currency and a national banking structure. The United States went to war in to preserve the Union; it emerged from war in having created a nation. The loose union of states became a nation. Other scholars have also noted at how profoundly the nation had been changed. By the time of Appomattox, the United States had changed. Reconstruction, like the war before it, continued the goal of destroying the old Jeffersonian Union and erecting a new one in its place, one based on government control rather than on individual liberty. Unlike Lincoln, they believed the Southern states had, in fact, seceded from the Union, or at least used it to their advantage, viewing the South as conquered territory to be treated as such. Senator Zachariah Chandler of Michigan said it this way: He has no right to life, liberty, property, or the pursuit of happiness. Everything you give him, even life itself, is a boon which he has forfeited. They wanted the complete subjugation of the region, vindictive punishment of the rebels, the overthrow of all Southern state governments and the confiscation of all land and homes. Peoples from the North and West would then be sent to the South to repopulate it, ensuring that it would remain firmly Republican and solidly Hamiltonian. In other words, they wanted to make the South like the North, sweeping away all vestiges of Southern culture and politics. As a conservative, Cleveland saw himself as one who could, as president, put the spilled milk back in the bottle, or at least some of it. This is why the Hamiltonians of his day fought so hard against his election as president, for Cleveland stands out as the lone Jeffersonian among all presidents from Lincoln to Obama, a statesman who held as tight to those principles as any president in American history. First elected in , after twenty-four consecutive years of Hamiltonian White House rule, Cleveland became the first Jeffersonian to serve as president since before the war. A quarter century of corruption, profligate spending, high taxes and ever-expanding government had been the norm. When Cleveland entered office, he instituted honest government, ended presidential luxury, slashed the bureaucracy, halted out-of-control spending by vetoing a record bills, protected the massive budget surplus that Republicans were all too eager to spend and reduced the national debt by 20 percent. Not a bad record for a first term. In , he was defeated for a second consecutive term by Benjamin Harrison, although he won the popular vote. Though determined not to seek another term, he quickly changed his mind when he saw what the Hamiltonians under President Harrison were doing to the country and what some were doing within his beloved Jeffersonian Democratic Party, moving it closer to the Party of Lincoln in the hopes of being more successful in future elections. In , Cleveland threw his hat back in the presidential ring and, like Jefferson in , took back the White House and led his party to a sweep of both houses of Congress, the first time Jeffersonians controlled the entire government since under James Buchanan. The future seemed bright indeed. Yet, sadly, fate intervened. During his second term, from to , Cleveland faced a severe economic depression, one that had resulted from the massive re-imposition of Hamiltonian fiscal policies during the preceding Harrison Administration. A month before Cleveland took his second oath of office, the economy began to crumble. And even though neither he nor his party had anything to do with the collapse, and even though he used Jeffersonian methods to end it within two years, Cleveland and the Democrats received all the blame. In the mid-term election in Democrats were routed, losing both houses of Congress and, in , the Hamiltonians were back in charge with the election of William McKinley. To get around that label, Democrats began shedding Jeffersonian principles and began embracing more Hamiltonian ideas. The Southern political philosophy of Jeffersonian Conservatism that died with Grover Cleveland has never been resurrected, for today we have no major party that espouses those values. It is only alive in the hearts of true Sons of the South. Grover Cleveland and the Path to Restoring the Republic. God will not hold us guiltless. Not to speak is to speak. Not to act is to act.

### Chapter 7 : Jeffersonian Conservatism | Abbeville Institute

*New PDF release: The Romantic Idea of a University: England and Germany, Via the past due 18th century, universities in England and Germany had misplaced their experience of function. The romantics then offered them with a brand new one, a brand new concept of a college.*

### Chapter 8 : Table of contents for Library of Congress control number

*Additional resources for Creating an American Identity: New England, Example text Thus, Adams believed her history was popular among her generation due to the fact that, for them, the very causes for the original migration to New NEW ENGLANDIZING AMERICA 21 England had had an important impact on the civil and religious liberties of.*