



YOUR KINDLE NOTES FOR:

A New Birth of Freedom

Robert Ingraham

Last accessed on Friday June 23, 2023

10 Highlight(s) | 0 Note(s)

Yellow highlight | Location: 286

In 1790, shortly before his death, Ben Franklin, together with Alexander Hamilton and other notables, submitted a petition to Congress proposing that all children born on U.S. soil after 1808 would be born free, thus eliminating slavery for future generations. By 1794 every state in the nation—North and South—had shut down the slave trade. Most importantly, it was between 1789 and 1797 that Alexander Hamilton would enunciate and implement his revolutionary economic program of National Banking and Public Credit, a sovereign anti-oligarchical system based on free labor and the willful increase in human creativity and productivity of the entire population. This was intended to define the future, to unleash the rapid development of the potentials within the citizenry, intended by Hamilton for everyone, of every race and creed. The Counter-Revolution The 1801-1825 reign of the Virginia dynasty of Jefferson-Madison-Monroe derailed the intention of Franklin, Washington and Hamilton. Then, following the four year interregnum of the Quincy Adams Presidency, the 12 additional years of Jackson and Van Buren brought the nation to the brink of ruin. By the time of the Polk Presidency in 1845, the proponents of a permanent slave-based economic and cultural order were firmly in control of the nation. This continued up to the Lincoln Presidency.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 631

The 1603 coronation of James I brought the Venetian party more fully into power in London. Many leading English figures now traveled to Venice and consulted with Paolo Sarpi. Robert Cecil, who remained Secretary of State when James took the throne, had paid his visit in earlier years. Others in Sarpi's orbit included Francis Bacon, William Cavendish, and Thomas Hobbes. Both Hobbes and Cavendish would later become major players in the Virginia Company. The creation of a new Venice in London also required new theories of international law, trade, and economics, to justify the anti-Commonwealth practices of a

new maritime/financial empire. At Oxford, the Aristotelian scholar Albericus Gentilis (Alberico Gentile), the leader of a pro-Venetian circle which included John Donne and Henry Wotton, provided that epistemological basis. Gentilis's major work, *De Iuri Belli Libri Tres* ("Three Books on the Laws of War"), which contains a strong defense of the practice of enslaving native populations, dismisses the idea of a society based on the Common Good, and instead argues for a theory of international law based on the primacy of private property rights (see Box 1).

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 783

From the start, the colony was under the thumb of both its financial controllers, the Merchant Adventurers, as well as the royally chartered Plymouth Company, which held their patent (legal right to emigrate). The Plymouth Company, and its later reincarnation the Council for New England, had a monopoly on English settlement in New England, and its leader, Ferdinando Gorges, was very close to the Stuart monarchy, with aspirations to a personal feudal empire in America. In November 1622, King James issued a royal proclamation prohibiting unauthorized trade in the area under the jurisdiction of the Council for New England, making it illegal for the Plymouth Colony to have business dealings with anyone, except those approved by Gorges. In the same year, Gorges attempted to take direct control of all New England colonization by establishing a "proprietary" system of hereditary estates, with land grants to the nobility. Gorges's son sailed, with two Anglican clergy, to establish a new colony in Massachusetts, and to "take control" of all of New England. The Gorges colony failed during the first Winter, and all its survivors returned to England. During 1623 and 1624, several attempts by John Robinson to leave the Netherlands and emigrate to the Plymouth Colony were blocked by the Merchant Adventurers, undoubtedly acting on instructions from the Privy Council and the Church of England. During that same period, there was an unsuccessful attempt by a group of the Merchant Adventurers to take legal "property right" control of the Plymouth Colony and reduce the Pilgrims to tenant farmers. This attempt was defeated by the Pilgrims' agents and allies in London. The

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 817

The paradigm for the way in which the Plymouth Colony organized its civil affairs is found in the nature of the Leyden Church itself. Unlike the Presbyterian system of almost all of the other Puritan and separatist churches, Robinson developed a model, which would later be called Congregationalism. Democratic in spirit, the Leyden Church emphasized the participation of all members in the day-to-day affairs of the church. More to the point, the Pilgrim church, with its emphasis on *agapē*, saw in each one of its Brethren, the potential for a human being to walk "in imitation of Christ." Robinson also initiated a unique innovation, the concept of "Teaching Elders." Other Protestant churches had a hierarchy of a minister, and what were called "Ruling Elders," which were bureaucratic positions of authority. Robinson required that all Elders to be able to teach and lead the congregation. The Plymouth Colony was not a theocracy. From the beginning, all major government officials were elected by majority vote. This was codified with the adoption of a constitution for the colony in 1636.

Because of the Pilgrims' policy of religious toleration, as the years passed, several persecuted groups, such as Quakers and Anabaptists, settled in the colony. They were all allowed to vote, and to fully participate in the colony's civil affairs. There was an absolute separation of religious and civil government, and church officials were banned from elective office, which explains why William Brewster never served in the Plymouth government. In the absence of Robinson, it was Brewster, as the elected Elder of the congregation, who led the Plymouth Church. Robinson's

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 1,499

Hamilton's reference to Thomas Hobbes is not capricious, for it was Hobbes, in his *Leviathan* (1651), who first enunciated the explicit doctrine of man-made Positive Law as supreme over human society, a theory of law divorced from any universal concept of morality or the human identity. So-called man-made "positive law" is grounded in the Thomas Hobbes/Adam Smith/Jeremy Bentham belief that human beings are beasts, motivated by the animalistic desire for the "pursuit of pleasure and avoidance of pain." The "rule of law," as defined by Hobbes, is a system of man-made law divorced from any higher concept of natural law, and it is to be imposed on the population through arbitrary rules, to which the people are required to submit. In truth, this British concept of law, a notion of law designed to govern an oligarchical empire, was created in order to overturn and eradicate earlier Christian concepts of law, such as that of St. Thomas Aquinas,

who asserted the primacy of natural law over man-made law, stating that where “it [man-made law] is at variance with natural law it will not be a law, but spoilt law.” Centuries later, in his Letter from a Birmingham Jail (1963), Dr. Martin Luther King would write: “A just law is a man-made code that squares with the moral law or the law of God. An unjust law is a code that is out of harmony with the moral law. To put it in the terms of St. Thomas Aquinas: An unjust law is a human law that is not rooted in eternal law and natural law.”

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 1,682

The slave trade was debated from August 21st to 28th. South Carolina led the fight in demanding an unrestricted slave trade. Morris counterattacked, speaking repeatedly, even at one point proposing—as a provocation—that the constitution prohibit the slave trade, but that Virginia, Georgia, and South and North Carolina be exempted due to their commitment to “human bondage.” Eventually, James Wilson proposed another compromise, one allowing the slave trade to continue for 20 years and imposing a head tax on imported slaves. Morris spoke sharply against it, but it passed. The effect of this “compromise” was that over the next 20 years, from 1790 to 1810, 203,000 additional slaves were brought into the United States. The last slave-related issue was that of run-away slaves. The Convention had already agreed to a clause requiring Governors to surrender criminals for extradition to other states, but on August 28th the South Carolina delegation demanded that fugitive slaves must be included in the definition of criminals. Wilson again proposed a “compromise,” whereby slaves would not come under legal extradition agreements, but slave-owners would have the legal right to enter into other states (or hire someone to do this for them), and seize their run-away slaves, i.e., recover their rightful property. This was the origin of all later “fugitive slave” laws. Again, Morris was vehement in his opposition, but it was voted up by the convention.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 2,550

Between 1787 and 1789, Paine, Jefferson and Lafayette were all in Paris and collaborating very closely. Lafayette and Jefferson actually co-authored the Declaration of the Rights of Man and of the Citizen—adopted on August 26, 1789 by the French National Constituent Assembly—and both subsequently contributed to Paine’s Rights of Man.

This was during the period in which Jefferson stated his opposition to the Constitution adopted at Philadelphia in 1787, and the above named writings are rife with Jefferson's notions of "resistance to tyranny," "agrarian republicanism" and libertarian "individual rights." The unfortunate 1789 Declaration was essentially Jefferson's answer to the American Constitution. Gouverneur Morris, who arrived in Paris in 1789, repeatedly warned Lafayette concerning his association with Jefferson and Paine. Thus, the trap was set. By 1791, the controversy between Burke and Paine (both British subjects) defined the new battle-lines. The choice, as they posed it, was to stand with revolutionary France, or to stand with oligarchical Britain. This dynamic, particularly after the French declaration of war against Britain on February 1, 1793, would play out in the United States throughout the 1790s, exacerbated, in 1797, by the publication of the British/Scottish agent John Robison's *Proofs of a Conspiracy*. The intention was to tear apart the political and social fabric of the United States exactly as had been done in France.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 2,562

In the United States, the insurrection against Constitutional government began on February 23, 1791, in response to Alexander Hamilton's issuance of his *Opinion on the Constitutionality of a National Bank* and the signing into law two days later, by President Washington, the legislation creating the Bank of the United States. The establishment of the National Bank and the creation of the system of sovereign Public Credit was violently opposed by Thomas Jefferson and James Madison, as well as Jefferson's protégé James Monroe. In June of 1791, Jefferson and Madison traveled to New York City to meet with Aaron Burr and Robert Livingston to plot a campaign to destroy Hamilton. Three months later, Jefferson began to establish a series of newspapers, beginning with the *National Gazette* in Philadelphia. Others, including the treasonous *Philadelphia Aurora*, soon followed. From the beginning of this conspiracy, Jefferson and his underlings posed the issue as one of "republicanism," as defined by the new revolutionary government in France, versus British allied "monarchical" interests. These were not simply "political differences." This was the unleashing of an attempted counter-revolution. The immediate goal was to drive Hamilton from office, reverse his banking and credit policies, obliterate the intention of the Constitution, and import the Jacobin disease into the United States. Keep in mind that in 1791 the American Republic had been in existence for only two years. Jefferson's intention was to overthrow constitutional government before it could take root.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 3,599

The African Free School was created in 1786, only three years after the Treaty of Paris which secured American independence. It was a project of the New York Manumission Society, and among its primary sponsors were John Jay, Stephen Van Rensselaer, and Alexander Hamilton. It opened its doors on November 1, 1787 with an enrollment of sixty students, both boys and girls, all of whom were free blacks. By 1789 the school began to admit slave children (with the permission of the owners). Over the years, six additional branch schools were opened, and by 1834, 1,400 students were enrolled. It is not possible to know the total number of children who attended classes over that forty-five year period, but it must have been several thousand, and given that the black population of New York City in 1840 was 16,000, it is clear that a sizable percentage of black children were educated in these schools. In 1799, in an unprecedented act, John Teasman, a former slave, was hired to run the school, which he did for the next ten years. The curriculum included reading, writing, arithmetic and geography. Later, more advanced instruction in subjects such as astronomy became available. It was no coincidence that the establishment of the Free School was one of the first actions of the Manumission Society. Education was viewed as the key to upward progress, personal improvement and good citizenship. In Philadelphia, Richard Allen, James Forten, Absalom Jones and other leaders of both the Free African Society and African Methodist Episcopal Church placed education for black children at the top of their list of priorities. In both New York and Philadelphia there was also an emphasis on moral improvement, seen as essential for becoming a contributor to the new nation. The overwhelming majority of Free School students were slave children, former slaves, or the sons and daughters of slaves. The idea was to give them the skills and the self-worth to propel themselves upward.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 4,048

Racism was not born in America. It is not part of the genetic make-up of white Americans. Racism, and the practice of slavery, are a heritage derived from Empire and Oligarchism. Find its roots in ancient Rome. Find it in medieval Venice. Find it in the Dutch and British Empires of the 17th and 18th centuries. Oligarchical dominion, human bondage, the pursuit of monetary wealth and power—this is all the heritage of oligarchical rule, and this is the horrifying nightmare which colonists

traveled to America to escape. The American Revolution was a declaration of war against that old oligarchical system; and that revolution has been the light of the world for the last two hundred and forty-one years. Nor was the promise of that revolution limited to eradication of chattel slavery. Remember Franklin Roosevelt's dedication to the plight of the Forgotten Man. The promise of America is intended for all of the people. Martin Luther King's 1963 Washington D.C. speech was given fifty-four years ago, the same year as the murder of John F. Kennedy. Is it not time—is the date not already past due—for our own “new birth of freedom” to be fully realized? The patriots of the 19th century lived through sixty years of betrayal from 1801 to 1861. Is it not now our time to cash the promissory note, to achieve justice for all Americans, for all of our people together? Our enemy resides in the oligarchical elite of London, Wall Street, and Brussels. They seek to divide us, to pit us against each other. They know that the people are desperate, and desperate people, people who are losing hope, can be infused with rage, manipulated and defeated. The rich are getting richer, and the poor are getting poorer. How better to maintain power than to have the poor fight among themselves. The solution to this crisis will be found in the mind, the morality, and the mission of Alexander Hamilton, the organizer and founder of the United States Constitution. Remember the American Revolution. As Frederick Douglass said of the Declaration of Independence, “Cling to this day—cling to it, and to its principles, with the grasp of a storm-tossed mariner to a spar at midnight.”

Note:
