



The Politically Incorrect Guide to the Founding Fathers

Brion T. McClanahan

Download now

Read Online ➔

The Politically Incorrect Guide to the Founding Fathers

Brion T. McClanahan

The Politically Incorrect Guide to the Founding Fathers Brion T. McClanahan
The truth revealed--and PC myths shattered--about the Founding Fathers.

Tom Brokaw labeled the World War II generation the "Greatest Generation," but he was wrong. That honor belongs to the Founders--the men who pledged their lives, fortunes, and sacred honor for the cause of liberty and independence, and who established the United States. This was a generation without equal, and it deserves to be rescued from the politically correct textbooks, teachers, and professors who want to dismiss the Founders as a cadre of dead, white, sexist, slave-holding males.

Now, a clear-sighted conservative historian, **Dr. Brion McClanahan**, does just that. In ***The Politically Incorrect Guide to the Founding Fathers***, he profiles Washington, Adams, Jefferson, Madison, Franklin, and other important Founders; traces the key issues of the day and shows how they dealt with them; and in the process details the Founders' deep faith, commitment to the cause of independence, impeccable character, and visionary political ideals.

Even better, ***The Politically Incorrect Guide to the Founding Fathers*** proves that the Founders had a better understanding of the problems we face today than do our own members of Congress. McClanahan shows that if you want **real and relevant insights** into the issues of banking, war powers, executive authority, freedom of the press, freedom of speech, freedom of religion, states' rights, gun control, judicial activism, trade, and taxes, you'd be better served reading the Founders than you would be watching congressional debates on C-SPAN or reading the New York Times.

The Politically Incorrect Guide to the Founding Fathers is a vital guide to restoring a sane, sober, Constitutional sense of responsibility to today's public debates.

The Politically Incorrect Guide to the Founding Fathers Details

Date : Published June 30th 2009 by Regnery Publishing

ISBN : 9781596980921

Author : Brion T. McClanahan

Format : Paperback 354 pages

Genre : History, Politics, Nonfiction, North American Hi..., American History, Literature, American

 [Download The Politically Incorrect Guide to the Founding Fathers ...pdf](#)

 [Read Online The Politically Incorrect Guide to the Founding Fathers ...pdf](#)

Download and Read Free Online The Politically Incorrect Guide to the Founding Fathers Brion T. McClanahan

From Reader Review The Politically Incorrect Guide to the Founding Fathers for online ebook

Alisi ? wants to read too many books ? says

This book is okay and the writing style is almost fun to read. The information shared within is hardly "politically incorrect", however. I give it two stars because I find it a bit hypocritical.

The information isn't new. It's the basic sort of stuff you give if you, say, do a tiny bit of reading on your own. The stance the author took is what set me off, however. His whole foundation is "everyone is dissing the founding fathers and I think that's crap and they're so great and wonderful." He goes into detail into trying to disprove the various indiscretions, trying to tout the founding fathers as ideals.

You know, like "there is no hard 'evidence' that these descendants of slaves were fathered by the president -- even though it was genetically proven they are related -- they **could've** been fathered by his brother so I refuse to believe it" or "yes, I know he WAS a slave holder but he didn't break up families cause he was just such a great, moral guy."

This slant on history is just as bad as believing they are the lowest of the low. Why is it that people can't just accept that they were men of their time? We don't need to read histories about Washington that say he was a vile horrible person because he had slaves or that Washington was the caring, loving founding father who hated slavery (even though he had slaves), refused to break up families, and freed the slaves on his death.

He had slaves. Most people with a bit of money did at the time. It was a terrible thing but it happened. It's our history. Don't candy coat it. Hell, don't tell our history as a way to promote your agenda.

Patrick Trent says

Tells a brief background of important founding fathers. It was rather workman like.

Nathan Grooms says

Brion McClanahan's *The Politically Incorrect Guide to the Founding Fathers* gives the reader an idea of what our nation's founders believed about freedom and liberty. Some of the issues that defined America at its birth are still prevalent in today's society. Freedom of speech, a free press, the right to private property, a man's right to keep the fruits of his own labor, freedom the tyranny of the state, and the right to bear arms. These are just a few of the core issues that defined our nation. McClanahan's book gives you a glimpse into the lives of some the men who drafted our Constitution and Bill of Rights in order to better see how they defended these basic concepts that became such a part of our heritage. While he covers the famous names of American history like Washington and Jefferson, he also covers some the lesser known but equally important men of the founding era.

A point that McClanahan brings out is that the early protests against the Crown were demands that their

rights as Englishmen be restored. They embraced the rights of free Englishmen and later applied the same concepts in crafting their own law. It started out not so much a fight against England but a fight to restore for the colonists what they most cherished about the English law.

As someone who has always loved reading early American history I really enjoyed McClanahan's conservative perspective.

Jacob says

This book contains some of the better elements of the PIG guides as well as some of the worse. It doesn't start well, addressing myths and politically correct denigrations of the founding fathers. This kind of thing in the PIG guides is tiresome for me, where I feel that the author wastes time addressing accusations that aren't huge issues or seriously believed by most inhabitants of the U.S. It's also whiny and argumentative to complain about the attacks. In addition, I'm really not convinced of what the author claims the founding fathers would think about the state of today's federal government. Nor am I convinced that they'd be right even if they did think those things. I have a lot of respect for the men and women involved in forming my country, but I don't think they were infallible or that their opinions would be the best thing for our country today.

Fortunately, the bulk of the book is spent doing something much more worthwhile: introducing us to many of the founding fathers who we may not have learned much about due to our watered-down politically correct public education. There are chapters for twenty people, and only six of them are well known (Washington, Jefferson, Adams, Madison, Hamilton, and Franklin). I appreciated learning about "The Forgotten Founders", such as Samuel Adams, George Clinton, Nathaniel Macon and George Mason. I also appreciated getting more than the standard stories about founders we only remember for specific contributions such as John Hancock, Patrick Henry and John Marshall. These summary biographies focus on trying to convey a sense of what these men really did and what their opinions were, which is much better than time spent debunking myths few believe or complaining about their modern treatment.

Ken Yakovac says

Presents exactly what the title proclaims in a concise manner. What I really liked was that the author followed up on topics and anecdotes mentioned in books by Ellison, McCollough and other contemporary authors that had left me speculating about whether or not these writers avoided admitting that the founders held certain views as well as the consequences of certain actions. McClanahan proved my suspicions were warranted. Great debate ammunition for conservatives and constitutionalists.

Michael says

When I saw "Politically Incorrect" I guess I was thinking along the lines of, ironically, the type of writing about our predecessors that McClanahan promptly denounces. The introduction begins by setting this up as a

similar response to useless history textbooks and the resultant murky knowledge amongst our fellow citizens as covered by, say, James Loewen. Then the author immediately criticizes Loewen and others as examples of the leftist, revisionist scholarship that his book is conceived of as an antidote to. That is, in addition to some decent writing about the various founders, there's quite the conservative agenda here.

Much of the content is well written and I feel of interest to anyone desiring a primer about the guys behind all those important documents and Mcclanahan's interpretation of their intentions is likely spot on. Where this deteriorates, however, is with his constant pontifications about how everything that defines the US government these days – mammoth centralized government, welfare state-esque policies, gun control, and other pre-packaged conservative gripes – would prove anathema to our predecessors' intent if they were exhumed tomorrow. Perhaps he's correct (he includes any number of well-positioned quotes that came from somewhere though it's often difficult to determine from what context) but it comes off like so many flippant, incongruous insertions.

Personally I'm not going to defend our massive, often dysfunctional federal government and the resultant off-putting tax burdens supplementing behemoth corporations and hardly anyone else. Certainly if a coach-and-four pulls up to 2009 and drops off Jefferson in his best wig, the ex-Pres would be quite bewildered and perturbed with all this dysfunction as well. Obviously President Three would also express little more than complete befuddlement in the face of the innumerable transformations that have taken place since the Industrial Revolution. He would no doubt raise an eyebrow when the President 43 (and 44) ships thousands of troops off to the Middle East, but then he'd see some national embarrassment like *Dancing With the Stars* and wonder why we're not exiling all those people to Afghanistan! Perhaps gun control would strike him as unconstitutional, but an hour with YouTube might convince him that some people just shouldn't pack heat. As intelligent and well read (in Greek Classics, Ye Olde English Law, and the like) as these gentlemen were – and certainly one could argue for a few timeless principals in political theory – the discussions and debates they had back in the day seem a bit quaint don't they? At the very least, Jefferson's isolationist, agrarian-gentlemen-farmer-sporting-a-love/hate-relationship-with-slavery ideal for each US citizen would have to be pretty damn elastic in regards to the 294 trillion transformations that have impacted our country since 1826.

In contrast, I recently read the aforementioned Loewen's *Lies My Teacher Told Me* and didn't necessarily think his writing was from some resentful, leftist, anti-patriotic standpoint. It was merely an attempt to position these founders as real people that made occasional mistakes so A) every single real human that reads only the canned textbook crap doesn't feel eternally inferior to the flawless, epic heroes presented by some of these "histories" and/or B) current students know these founders even existed as many post-sixties texts purge out an Alexander Hamilton completely to make room for three pages on Helen Keller (while then further purging all controversial aspects of her political activism) and/or C) the current student might find some of these histories interesting instead of simply rote, test-prep trash revolving around the memorization of key dates and titles (such as his example of college freshman understanding Keller as an inspirational hero without knowing a damn thing about anything she did post-Radcliffe).

This is Loewen's agenda and I think it's much more significant and palatable than the simplistic partisan politics that taint Mcclanahan's effort. This is unfortunate. Much of this is well written and accessibly organized. If our politically incorrect author had ditched the incessant political preaching he would have a nice, concise contribution to Founding Father history for those of us who didn't major in US History. Really, I kinda want to bestow three stars on the book, but the obvious predetermined intent of this and, I presume, the rest of the series is simply annoying.

Ryan says

As someone who has studied this period in American history fairly extensively I was insulted! Politically I am barely left of center, and I found this piece to be immensely fallacious. It isn't that facts are blatantly wrong; it is that many are taken out of context or lack any context at all. A true examination of any one of the subjects contained in this book will find the reader wondering if the writer did any research beyond a few Google searches with his agenda in the search bar.

The worse "sin" this book makes: A fairly articulate argument made utilizing partial information presented as a valid whole. The book misleads, it convinces the unwary and uninformed that it presents a deeper truth and in so doing validates modern political dogmas. This is a piece of propaganda at best.

PLEASE,

Before you read this book look up some information on the publisher's series

Here is the Wikipedia page for your convenience: [The Politically Incorrect Guide](#)

SheLove2Read says

It's hard to read about the Founding Fathers and not become teary with a sense of pride and admiration in what they accomplished. Truly they were a generation of "men's men" willing to (and some did) put all on the line for their belief that America had earned the right of Independence.

Mark Geise says

"The Politically Incorrect Guide to the Founding Fathers" is another engaging and quick read in the Politically Incorrect Guide series. Brion McClanahan, one of my favorite historians, focuses on the prevailing thoughts during the founding period and why much of what we learn in history class is misleading or wrong. The American Revolution was not a radical movement; it was instead grounded in the historical tradition of English rights.

McClanahan explores some of the major points of the Revolutionary period and the late 18th century and early 19th century in the American colonies and early United States. Because this is a politically incorrect guide, he makes sure to emphasize that the Founding Fathers generally believed in gun rights, were suspicious of immigrants, and opposed redistributive government. McClanahan spends the second half of the book profiling individual members of the founding generation, including both well-known (George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, etc.) and obscure (John Taylor of Caroline, Nathaniel Macon, etc.). I learned a lot about some more obscure, yet still very important, members of the founding generation.

I enjoy both the writings of Brion McClanahan and the Politically Incorrect series, so I was bound to enjoy "The Politically Incorrect Guide to the Founding Fathers." For those interested in light reading about this period, this book is for you. Like the other Politically Incorrect Guide books, you can find many solid reading recommendations in here as well.

John says

THE P.I.G. GUIDE TO THE FOUNDING FATHERS makes for especially good reading during a new presidential election cycle (today is the long-awaited showdown between Obama and Romney), but it is perhaps the most lackluster of all the P.I.G. books. Each chapter is a sort of "mini-biography" of each of the men whom the author views as being critical to the initial founding of the United States. With twenty such bios to pour over, it's a bit of a slog, and, by the end, you will probably have trouble keeping straight who did what. It also gets pretty repetitious, as the author keeps treading and re-treading over the same historical ground, albeit from different perspectives. Lastly, the book--as other reviewers on this sight have pointed out--is not really all that politically incorrect. The author simply holds the Founding Fathers in higher regard than do most modern academics, and he is willing to give them the benefit of the doubt in instances where others are prone to assume the worst. The most useful thing to take away from this book is how far America has strayed from its Constitutional roots...and how prescient many of the Fathers were in predicting just such an outcome, which was why many of them despised the Constitution and fought to retain ultimate authority with state and local governments, rather than a new federal one.

Bryce says

A mere two pages in, not even past the introduction, after reading about "feminists," "liberals," "women," and the "left-leaning" written about in incredibly condescending, derogatory terms, I realized I stumbled across a book Not Intended For Me. And like that time in 8th grade when I wandered into the boys' room by accident, I wanted to back my way out as quickly as possible and hope no one noticed my brief presence.

Rebecca says

I like this one the least of the PIGs I have read. Most of the other authors break down between facts, analysis and opinion, but McClanahan mixes his thoughts in. And he has *plenty* of thoughts. I would have preferred it if he'd let his information stand on its own, because it was powerful enough without his commentary. I don't really mind that he has opinions, because we all do and at least he's upfront about his, but he seemed rather overly biased, without giving any reason for his stance. I think I've been in Civil War Re-Enactors meetings where I didn't see so much ire directed at Northerners. I'm fairly anti-Yankee, but even I thought his apparent belief that Virginian farmers are God's men and industrial Northerners are all evil and bent on the destruction of the Union was...a bit much. Calm down, son, I get the point.

I do think it's funny that Anti-Federalists get such a bad rap today, probably because they "lost," and history is written by the victors. But it's amusing to read their complaints against the Constitution, most of which came absolutely true, and see the reactions of the Federalists. "Career politicians? That's just crazy! No one would do that!" Of course, the Founders' main problem was that they assumed that future leaders would read the Constitution and abide by, which virtually no politician in the last 150 years has seemed capable of doing.

You could get a good academic argument about whether, even though the Anti-Federalist were proved right eventually, the Federalists were right *at the time*. I'd like to be the class that had that conversation.

Also, some of the "forgotten" Founders aren't so forgotten if, like me, you read Johnny Tremain approximately eleven-bazillion times in school, and if it is, in fact, still sitting on your bookcase now. Just a thought.

Jim says

Outstanding study of the founding fathers. Debunks a lot of the myths that have developed over the years. Should be required reading in all schools.

Roy Helge says

Hardly politically incorrect, but factual and interesting in the parts where the author isn't fighting straw men or debunking "myths" of his own creation. Expressing admiration and praise is all well, but the text suffers from over use of swear words such as "liberal" and "democrat".

He does his best to raise the FOUNDING FATHERS to semi-godhood, but fails.

The book has long passages of interesting history of the today lesser known statesmen and thinkers of the early 19th century. But there are no revelations about hiddent truths. This is the same information that you'll find in any serious history book - but then without all this "evil liberals try to defame my gods"-crap.

Without the two first chapters, this book would have gotten a 4-star rating from me. But I am not american, and I do not get teary-eyed whenever the FOUNDING FATHERS are mentioned, or the CONSTITUTION and LIBERTY etc. And I get incredibly fed up with a guy that tries to argue against windmills and deify albeit very smart but normal people.

Nathan Albright says

When the writer of a book on the Founding Fathers sounds like he could pen the preface to a new version of the Anti-Federalist Papers without batting an eyelash or even a moment's hesitation, it is fair to question the sort of perspective that a book provides. While in general I could be considered a moderate nationalist in the vein of 17th century politics [1], I find the Constitution a great improvement over the Articles of Confederation. The issue is that any government that is powerful enough to defend and protect its people and its territory and its interests is going to be powerful enough to oppress those people, and being under a government that is obviously oppressive of human rights and interested too much in interfering with natural justice has made quite a few people (including the author) long for more anarchical times. This is certainly understandable, but lamentable. When it comes to government there is a fatal dilemma and no amount of structural designs can relax the need for eternal vigilance on the part of the governed, which makes this book a bit disappointing shrill given the author's obvious bias.

This book is divided into two parts and twenty-three chapters. The first part of the book examines the myths, realities, and issues faced by the founding generation, at least in the author's skewed perspective. First, the author looks at various myths, attempting to debunk what is said critically about the founding fathers and slavery (1). After that the author views the American Revolution as a conservative one (2) and discusses the

issues at stake in the Revolution concerning representation and the executive, in which he is partly right but partly wrong (3). The second part of the book consists of the remainder of the book's chapters, with one chapter focused on each of twenty founders (II). The author first spends his time talking about the big six founders: George Washington (4), Thomas Jefferson (5), John Adams, whom the author does not like nor respect (6), James Madison (7), Alexander Hamilton (8), and Benjamin Franklin (9). The rest of the book allows the author to wax eloquent and in his biased fashion about fourteen forgotten founders, namely: Samuel Adams, brewer extraordinaire (10), Charles Carroll of Carrollton (11), George Clinton (12), John Dickinson (13), Elbridge Gerry (14), John Hancock (15), Patrick Henry (16), Richard Henry Lee (17), Nathaniel Macon (18), Francis Marion (19), John Marshall, whom the author really dislikes (20), George Mason (21), Roger Sherman (22), and John Taylor of Caroline, whose secessionist ways the author deeply approves of, to the hurt of his credibility (23).

Overall, there are quite a few problems with this work. For one, the author appears not to understand that while political incorrectness can be a very good thing that incorrectness from the point of view of historical reality is not ever a good thing. Likewise, this book suffers a great deal because the author views the founding generation not on its own terms, but with at least two layers of historical hindsight, namely his unreasonable and lamentable regret for the defeat of the rebels during the Civil War on the one hand and his understandable and sensible lament for the corruption of contemporary activist government. If the author had at least attempted to let the people of the past stand for themselves and not stand in for two centuries of political drift and decadence in our own society, he might have been charitable even to those with whom he disagreed. Instead, the author shows a lamentable bias that is so outrageous that this book will likely only be fully enjoyed by those who share it, which does not include me.

[1] See, for example:

<https://edgeinducedcohesion.blog/2018...>

<https://edgeinducedcohesion.blog/2018...>

<https://edgeinducedcohesion.blog/2016...>

<https://edgeinducedcohesion.blog/2016...>

<https://edgeinducedcohesion.blog/2013...>

<https://edgeinducedcohesion.blog/2012...>

<https://edgeinducedcohesion.blog/2011...>
