

# The War for Southern Independence

## Part 1

CivilGate

Abe, we understand  
many of your  
contemporaries  
considered you  
quite two-faced.



## Table of Contents

### 1005 Introduction

#### 1101 Chapter 1: The History of Slavery

1101 Slavery in the New World

1102 Slavery in the Early Colonies

1105 Slavery in the South

1106 Slavery in the North

#### 1201 Chapter 2: Life in the Old South

1201 Yankee Brainwashing

1207 In Their Own Words

1210 Secession

#### 1301 Chapter 3: Why Did They Fight?

1301 The War for Southern Independence

1303 Worlds Apart

1305 The Final Straw

#### 1401 Chapter 4: States' Rights

1401 The Beginning of COTUS

1403 The End of COTUS

**1501 Chapter 5: All Is Fair In War**

- 1501 [Advantage North](#)
- 1503 [A Campaign of Cultural Genocide](#)
- 1504 [Crimes Against Humanity](#)
- 1526 [We Don't Know What We Don't Know](#)

**1601 Chapter 6: We Are Not Enemies**

- 1601 [With Friends Like These](#)
- 1604 [The Conduct of Federal Troops](#)
- 1611 [Compassion, Yankee Style](#)

**1701 Chapter 7: Reconstruction and the 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment**

- 1701 [The South Must Be Punished](#)
- 1702 [Reconstruction](#)
- 1705 [The 14th Amendment](#)
- 1707 [Life After COTUS](#)

**1801 Chapter 8: Summary and Conclusions**

- 1801 [The Cost of War](#)
- 1802 [Why?](#)
- 1804 [What If?](#)
- 1806 [What Should Lincoln and the North Have Done?](#)
- 1808 [Why Should We Worry About the Civil War Today?](#)
- 1810 [The Way Forward](#)
- 1811 [A Harebrained Idea](#)

## Introduction

It's easy to fall into the trap of oversimplifying history. For example, everybody in the North hated slavery and couldn't wait to get rid of it, but those evil racist Rebels in the South, who owned slaves and refused to give them up, wouldn't let them. Those ignorant, barbaric Rebels were willing to destroy the Union rather than give up their slaves. But once *Uncle Tom's Cabin* exposed the cruelty and horror of slavery in the South, Yankees knew they had to take action. Honest Abe came along, kicked some serious Confederate butt, freed the slaves, and kept the country united. And, except for some unfortunate lingering racism in the South, we all lived happier ever after.

Nice story, but it didn't happen that way. It is a myth. It is the product of one of the world's most massive and successful propaganda campaigns. I call it CivilGate.

The Civil War isn't really over. Oh, the North taught those Rebels a lesson all right, kicked their butts. Gave them a sound thrashing the South will never forget, and the institution of slavery in America did finally come to an end. That much is settled. But there are still lingering questions that haven't been answered. There are lingering issues that haven't been fully exposed, explored, or resolved. There are old wounds that haven't completely healed. There are facts that have been hidden for generations. The time has come to expose and face the truth.

Most of us aren't particularly eager to do that. And historians aren't particularly eager to help us. But for those of us who are willing to dig a little deeper than the standard Civil War narrative of CivilGate, we find some very important and painful truths.

The Civil War today isn't being fought on battlefields, it's being fought in books, classrooms, state legislatures, in Washington, DC, and in the courts. Even though our libraries are full of books about the war, very few of their authors were willing to face the

most crucial and difficult questions head on. They tend to gloss over or ignore critical information, picking and choosing the evidence they use and emphasize in order to bolster their perspective and marginalize other views.

I'm not talking about the details of famous battles and generals. I'm talking about getting to the core of how we ended up in a war that took 650,000 American lives, including many civilians. That's more than the rest of America's wars combined. That's about 100 times the number of American military deaths in Iraq and Afghanistan combined. Many historians love to give us detailed accounts of military strategy, weapons, battlefield tactics, and the commanders behind them, but they don't effectively deal with the issue of why they were on the battlefield to begin with. What was in the hearts and minds of those involved in the war? What were they thinking? Why were they willing to fight and die? Why were thousands of innocent, defenseless Southern women, children, old men, and blacks slaughtered and starved to death?

That's what this blogbook is about. I shouldn't need to write it. Historians and scholars should write it. But most of them don't and won't. Why? In part, because it would likely be professional suicide for him.

I don't have those kinds of reservations. You may be wondering if I'm a Southerner, and therefore somewhat less than objective. No. I've lived in Arkansas for a few years, but I don't have roots here, and I've never considered myself a Southerner. I'm not selling anything; I don't have a bone to pick, an axe to grind, or a score to settle. I didn't come into this exercise with conclusions in need of support. I came with questions in search of answers. I hope you will take the same approach.

In fact, when I have heard over the years about Southerners making a fuss about displaying the Confederate flag, etc, my reaction was that the South lost the war, rightfully so, and it's way past time to get over it, already. I was quite content with the classroom version of events, and I considered Abraham Lincoln (AL) to be one of our

greatest presidents, just as most Americans do. That's what I was told, and I had no reason to question it. Really, what difference does the Civil War make now, anyway? It happened a century and a half ago. AL "freed the slaves" and "preserved the Union". Case closed. We have more important things to worry about now.

2011 marked the 150<sup>th</sup> year since the beginning of the Civil War.

That's what I thought until about two years ago. That's what most Americans think. And we think that for a very good reason. That's what we've been told all our lives, what we were taught in school. I would have been perfectly happy to go right on thinking that if I had not, unintentionally, begun discovering a couple years ago that it is a lie. The standard narrative of the Civil War is the product of a massive propaganda campaign which I call CivilGate. Before you simply dismiss that idea out of hand as just another wild-eyed conspiracy theory, please consider what I have to say. I will lay out compelling evidence, I will explain everything, and I will back it up. I will not only say that most of what we accept as true about the Civil War is false, I will prove it.

The truth is that you can easily prove it to yourself. The truth has always been available, although books are now, finally, being written that make it easier to find it and understand it. What's tragic is that few of us have bothered to look for it. But then, why would we? We never suspected there was a need to. Most of the few people who do know the truth don't want you to find out. That, too, is part of CivilGate.

If you're willing to keep an open mind, let's get started. It's going to be a bumpy ride, and it's going to hurt. The truth will set you free, but it probably won't make you happy.

## Chapter 1: The History of Slavery

Legal black slavery existed for about a thousand years, beginning in the 9<sup>th</sup> Century and ending in the 19<sup>th</sup> Century. During that time, over 25 million Africans were taken by force, five million of whom would die while being transported. From the 9<sup>th</sup> Century to the 15<sup>th</sup> Century, Africans were taken from their homes and transported across the Sahara to be sold by Muslims in the northern countries of Africa and in the Mediterranean Sea area. The first step in the process was Africans preying on fellow Africans. This first wave of slavery, known as the *trans-Saharan wave*, accounted for just over 10 million slaves. The second wave, the *trans-Atlantic wave*, began in the 15<sup>th</sup> Century when Portugal established slave-trade posts along Africa's western coast. Christians were responsible for the second wave.

Most Americans are probably not aware that slavery was not a European invention. Long before Europeans became involved, it had been practiced by black Africans and by Arabs. In many African societies, slavery was accepted, and black ownership of other blacks was just a way of life. If that comes as a shock to Americans today, it is probably even more shocking that black Americans owned other blacks – more than 10,000 of them, according to the 1830 census.

Legal slavery in the Western Hemisphere finally ended when Brazil banned it in 1888. Worldwide, legal slavery ended when it was banned on the Arabian peninsula in 1962.<sup>1</sup>

### Slavery in the New World

Well before the American colonies, selling and owning slaves was protected by international law. The Spanish, Dutch, and English had been taking part in slave commerce for some time. Black slavery was introduced into the New World by the

---

<sup>1</sup> SRK, p62-65

Spanish in 1503 and by the English in 1562. The English eventually dominated the slave trade, so it is no surprise that New England came to be a major player in the trans-Atlantic slave trade.

Before the American colonies, there was already a flourishing slave trade along the African Gold Coast, and black slavery was well established in the British West Indies. African intertribal warfare produced plenty of prisoners of war, who were used as fuel for the slave trade with Muslims.

Slaves bound for the colonies were branded and shackled together before being boarded onto vessels for a three-week to three-month voyage. About 84% survived the unbelievably horrendous conditions, after which they were delivered by their slavers to the shores of colonial America.<sup>2</sup>

### Slavery in the Early Colonies

Apparently, the first black indentures arrived on American shores in 1619 on a Dutch ship, although they had not been requested. Exactly how slavery developed in America is a matter of some controversy, but we do know that at first English colonists preferred European indentures, even if they happened to be criminals from English jails. And some black indentures were released at the end of their period of service. But attitudes gradually changed, and by the 1660s colonists tended to look to Africa as their primary source of forced labor, and they began passing laws declaring slavery hereditary.

Working in tobacco and rice fields in the South was not an appealing prospect to early potential colonial immigrants, especially compared to the economic diversity offered by the North. Even Southern whites and Indians already there refused to do it. So, the South was constantly faced with a severe labor shortage. Slavery slowly evolved and became entrenched to solve that chronic problem.

---

<sup>2</sup> PHS

Colonial dependence on indentured servants slowly evolved into a system in which all blacks were presumed to be slaves. The transition is not well understood by historians, but it is clear that by 1676 widespread legalized slavery was a fact of life in Maryland, Virginia, and the Carolinas. Within another 30 years the institution of slavery was well established throughout the South, and to some extent in the North.

And so it was that every colony's legislature enacted laws called *black codes*, defining African-Americans as property, not human beings. Slaves could not testify against whites in court. Slaves were too valuable to be killed for most capital crimes. They were not allowed to learn to read and write, own a gun or a dog, travel without a special permit, gather in groups of more than six, or have sex with white women.

Since most slaves worked either in Virginia tobacco fields or South Carolina rice plantations, that is where the greatest potential threat of slave rebellion existed. But even in those areas, revolts and runaways were rare. An important part of the explanation is that, even before being boarded onto slave ships, blacks had been intentionally mixed with other tribes to impose a language barrier. So, not only did blacks not speak English, Spanish, French, or Indian, they often couldn't even communicate with each other. Any coordinated attempt at revolt was usually impossible, nor was it even contemplated, given their demoralized state.

How then, were slaves able to cope with such unbearable living conditions? Mostly through sheer determination to survive, and hope for a better future, if not in this world, then in the next. They developed a unique lifestyle which revolved around family, church, and faith. This rich culture is reflected in their music, dance, medicine, folktales, and traditions. It is truly a heroic story of stoic courage and resourcefulness.

Here are some other interesting facts about slavery. Although the first Africans arrived in Virginia in 1619, the term *slavery* did not arrive until 50 years later. By the mid-1700s,

Americans imported about 7000 slaves each year from Africa and the Caribbean. By 1763, free and slave African-Americans comprised 15-20 percent of the American population (more per-capita than today), 90% of them living south of Pennsylvania. By 1830 there were 3000 slaves in the North, with more than 2 million in the South. In 1835, about 40 percent of Virginians and 66 percent of South Carolinians were black. About 95% of them were slaves.

Obviously, it is difficult to understand how slavery could have been so deeply entrenched in America in light of the principles of freedom embraced so eagerly and passionately by early Americans. Whatever had happened before, no matter who was at fault, America had a chance to start with a clean slate on slavery with the Declaration of Independence (DOI) and the Revolutionary War. On July 4, 1776, every state had slaves, but not one of them rushed to free them.

Looking back on it today through layers of Yankee propaganda, it's not surprising that the Southern states didn't free their slaves, but why didn't the North take prompt and decisive action right from the start of America? Why didn't they abolish slavery in the Northern states and strictly prohibit the slave trade there? They may not have been able to convince or force the South to do the same, but the North could have led by example. They did not. Why? We will find out. America failed to take advantage of that opportunity in the 18<sup>th</sup> Century, and we paid a heavy price for it in the 19<sup>th</sup> Century.

Such a colossal failure was partly the result of colonial rationalization and racism in both the North and the South. Colonists managed to convince themselves that Africans were not human beings, but simply property. European scientists had argued that blacks were an inferior species. The color black was associated with evil and witchcraft. Ministers taught that God had relegated blacks to an inferior status as part of the curse of Ham. All that, together with the South's desperate need for labor, and the North's insatiable lust for profit, provided sufficient justification in the colonial mind for slavery and the slave trade.

Most Southern colonists were not proud of slavery, but they considered it a necessary evil, and they assumed that it would eventually go away. Many of the prominent Founders privately acknowledged that it was an evil institution, and they had no interest in perpetuating it. Yet, they did little to end it, and some participated in it. The prospect of the peaceful demise of slavery, while not necessarily unreasonable at first, evaporated later with the invention of the cotton gin. During these colonial years, leaders were mostly content to kick the can down the road rather than confront the issue squarely.<sup>3</sup>

More than anything else, slavery in America was a failure of government to do the right thing. It is unrealistic, perhaps, to have expected our fledgling federal government, or even our state governments, to put a sudden, complete stop to the institution of slavery. After all, by that time it was such a well-established institution that dealing with it was extremely complex. But time after time, our federal government failed to take appropriate steps to deal with slavery once and for all, even if that meant adopting a policy and program that took several years to fully implement. Instead, our government leaders continually avoided the issue, sought temporary compromises, and left the problem for someone else to deal with later.

### Slavery in the South

Tobacco quickly took center stage in the Virginia Colony. Tobacco production required land and labor. Plantation owners came to rely on indentured servants to provide the required workforce.

Not only did cultivation require a lot of land initially, but that soil was depleted quickly. In 1617 the Virginia Company offered 100 acres of land to anyone willing to emigrate to the colony. Better yet, for most people, was the offer of 50 acres for every head-of-

---

<sup>3</sup> PHS

household plus an additional 50 acres for every adult family member or servant. Large plantations sprang up, each initially having a riverfront so ships could dock there. Then, settlements pushed further inland.

Slavery spread to other colonies. Maryland, then the Carolinas, followed Virginia's lead. Colonists in the Carolinas at first attempted to enslave Indians, but when that proved unsuccessful, they turned to blacks for forced labor. Conditions were especially harsh on slaves in the Carolinas, because rice and indigo production required long hours of exhausting physical labor in harsh heat and humidity. The first Governor of Georgia, Gen James Oglethorpe, prohibited slaves and rum, but neither policy was popular, and neither lasted long.<sup>4</sup>

### Slavery in the North

When England gained possession of the Dutch colony, which came to be known as New York, it was already populated with Swedes, Dutch, Indians, English, Germans, French, and African slaves.<sup>5</sup>

But owning slaves was not as popular in the North, because it wasn't practical. The North outgrew its labor shortage much faster than the South, so it didn't need slaves. It didn't want them in the North, because they were unwelcomed competition for jobs. So they gradually began to get rid of slavery in the North shortly after the Revolutionary War. They weren't motivated by morals or principle or compassion or racial tolerance, but by money and racism.

John Adams put it this way:

---

<sup>4</sup> PHS

<sup>5</sup> PHS

Argument might have some weight in the abolition of slavery in Massachusetts, but the real cause was the multiplication of labouring white people, who would no longer suffer the rich to employ these sable rivals so much to their injury. The common people would not suffer the labor, by which alone they could obtain a subsistence, to be done by slaves. If the gentlemen had been permitted by law to hold slaves, the common white people would have put the slaves to death, and their masters too perhaps.<sup>6</sup>

It's important to understand that the North did away with slavery in a way that protected Yankee property rights and avoided economic or social disruption. No Northern state passed a law granting freedom to an existing slave. They passed laws granting freedom to children of slaves after a specified date once they reached a particular age. Frequently, however, just before the child reached that age, the owner would remove him / her to a Southern state to avoid granting freedom, or more likely the child would be sold into slavery in the South. Based on this system, there were still 236 slaves (for life) in New Jersey, for example, until just a few years before the Civil War, and it would have allowed slaves in the North until 1873 had the Civil War not intervened.

Generally, free blacks in the North were treated as second-class citizens, and they often experienced living conditions worse than Southern slaves.

One way of evaluating the quality of life in the North and South is to compare the number of people with disabilities, such as those considered deaf, dumb, blind, insane, or idiotic.

One in every 1000 white persons had such a disability, including both Northerners and Southerners.

Southern slaves fared much better than whites, with only one in every 1464 being so disabled.

Free Northern blacks, however, suffered an astonishing rate of one in every 506.

<sup>6</sup> SRK, p84

The North didn't embrace slavery, but it embraced the slave trade. Some of their first victims, however, were not Africans, but Native Americans. They traded them for black slaves in the Caribbean islands.

It's interesting to note the contrast between how Massachusetts and Virginia treated Native Americans. While Massachusetts was busy kidnapping and enslaving Indians, Virginia was passing a law making it illegal to enslave or deport a Native American under any circumstances. Then on October 5, 1778, Virginia became the first state to outlaw the slave trade, ten years before Massachusetts took action. In fact, it was the first time any government in the civilized world had acted against the slave trade. They had tried many times before in Virginia, but the English government wouldn't allow it.

Britain's refusal to allow Virginia to outlaw the slave trade was one reason for the Revolutionary War. And it wasn't just Virginia, it was most of the Southern States that wanted to end it. After the Revolutionary War, it was no longer England that prevented them, it was New England, in alliance with two Southern States. It was this alliance that produced the Constitutional protection of the slave trade for 20 years. According to CivilGate, it was the South, the whole South, and nothing but the South that perpetuated slavery in America. There is no mention of the fact that it was the North and only two Southern states that perpetuated the slave trade.

Yankees also sold two children into slavery in Barbados because their parents had been associating with Quakers. Several Quaker ladies were publicly whipped and thrown into prison in the process.

Why would Yankees think slavery is evil, but selling slaves is just good business? Did they not see the hypocrisy of marching into the South, beginning in 1861, supposedly to free slaves they themselves had sold?

Eventually, of course, there was a constitutional provision prohibiting the slave trade. But it was not in the United States Constitution (COTUS). It was in the Constitution of the Confederate States of America.

The first American slave ship was built in 1637 and sailed from Salem, Massachusetts. The slave trade soon became the foundation of Yankee commerce, capital, and investment, and it involved all the businesses that supported the slave-traders themselves.

Here's how it worked. Slave ships in New England would take on a load of fish and rum. That cargo was traded in Africa for slaves. The slaves were traded in the West Indies for molasses. The molasses was sold in New England to make more rum. A bit of profit was made at each step, and a grand time was had by all. Except by the slaves.

The trip from Africa to the West Indies, and other similar journeys, were known as the *middle passage*. Slaves could spend as much as a year aboard slave vessels, living in the unsanitary  *tween deck*. Living conditions were unimaginably cruel and brutal. The dead, near dead, and those with a contagious disease were thrown overboard. About a third didn't survive the trip. Still, the Yankee slave traders made a nice profit.

Even after Congress made it illegal to import slaves into the United States, New England was still very active in the slave trade for over 200 years, because there were ready markets in the Caribbean and South America. Slaves picked cotton in the South, and that cotton was turned into calico in Northern textile mills. The calico was then traded for ivory and slaves. So, even though the North didn't embrace slavery *per se*, they profited from Southern slave labor. And Southern slave labor came from Yankee slave-traders.

Most nations in the world at that time were trying to stop the slave trade internationally. The US had outlawed the slave trade, but it did not allow European agents to board and

search American vessels. So European slave ships carried an American citizen and an American flag. If they were stopped for a search, they would quickly sell the ship to the American passenger, fly the American flag, and avoid capture. French and British efforts to effectively police the slave trade drew howls of protest from New England states.

Imagine that! Could those have been the Yankees who a few years later were (supposedly) so eager to eradicate slavery in the South? Could they be the same Yankees who have sanctimoniously cleansed themselves of all slave sin, and who conveniently blamed all the evils of slavery on those racist Rebels?

Were you ever told in history class that it was Yankee slave-traders who defied international efforts to eliminate the slave trade, and who continued to engage in it?

Was that a Confederate flag flying on those European slave ships? No, it was the American flag. The Confederate flag never flew over a slave ship.

Funny they didn't mention that in school. Funny you don't hear anything about that when they refer to the Confederate flag as the "flag of slavery".

That's CivilGate.

Yankees try to use the excuse that if the South had not been a ready market, the North would never have been in the slave trade. Nonsense. The South was not a viable market for slaves after 1800. Only six percent of all slaves from Africa were brought into the US. The rest (94%) were sold in the Caribbean and South America, where the Yankee slave traders were most active.<sup>7</sup>

---

<sup>7</sup> SRK, p65-70

## Chapter 2: Life in the Old South<sup>8</sup>

Some 5.3 million whites lived in the South in 1860. About 6% of them (300,000) had slaves. About half of those were considered aristocratic planters. The rest owned five or fewer slaves, and often worked beside them, trying to earn a living. Most of the Confederate soldiers came from the vast majority of Southern whites who did not own slaves.

This analysis of life in the Old South is based in part on an official US document, known as *The Slave Narratives*, and on the official US report on the Civil War, known as the *Official Records: War of the Rebellion*.

Robert E Lee wanted slavery abolished, the sooner the better. Jefferson Davis preferred to educate the slaves first, and prepare them for freedom. Others believed that slaves could and should never be prepared for freedom, or granted it. They all agreed, however, that blacks should be treated with respect, as taught in the Bible.

The Biblical defense of slavery had its roots in Puritan teachings in Massachusetts. Slavery as a moral system based on the Bible was taught and practiced in the North and South. Hard as it may be to believe or understand today, that is how most Americans felt about slavery at the time.

### Yankee Brainwashing

By the 1860s, most people in the North had a distorted view of the South. Much of what they thought they knew about the South and slavery was based, for example, on *Uncle Tom's Cabin*, even though its author, Harriet Beecher Stowe, had never visited a

---

<sup>8</sup> SRK, p81-118

plantation, and had rarely if ever seen a slave. Her story was designed to depict slavery in the worst possible light, but it was falsely interpreted as an accurate reflection of Southern slavery. Little wonder most Northerners expected blacks in the South to quickly join the Northern cause in the Civil War by volunteering for the Union army or by rising up against Southern slave-holders. It didn't work out that way.

Just as people had done during the Revolutionary War, many blacks waited to get a sense of which way the winds were blowing before deciding their loyalty. Some did join the Union cause, but only after Yankees were in control of the area. Others remained loyal to the South throughout the conflict. But what the Yankees saw in the South was not at all what they had expected, based on the lies and propaganda they had been fed about slaves being whipped, starved, and worked to death by lazy white plantation owners.

Yankees had been brainwashed into believing that all blacks in the South were slaves, and could not own property. It came as quite a shock when they found that many blacks were free men and women of color, with at least as much freedom as blacks in the North. They were even more shocked to find that many of those free blacks owned slaves themselves. Yankee misconceptions about the South lingered even into the 1960s.<sup>9</sup>

To be sure, there were some cruel Southern slave masters, but that was far from the norm. Relationships between slaves and their owners, and social interactions between blacks and whites in the South were far more complex and cordial than most Yankees realized. Had slavery been predominantly a matter of brute force or cruelty, Yankees' expectations would no doubt have come to pass. But most slave owners were paternalistic, protective, and loving toward their slaves, often working and living closely together in harmony. That's simply the way generations of both blacks and whites had

---

<sup>9</sup> SRK, p133

been raised in the South, and it seemed perfectly natural and satisfactory to both races. Most Yankees knew nothing about what the South was really like.

Yankee historian Frederick Law Olmsted, for example, observed a white and black woman seated together on a train. Their children were eating candy from the same container, obviously enjoying a close relationship that astonished Olmsted and would have displeased most Northerners. It was a common sight in the South, but was never seen in the North.

Kenneth Stampp wrote about a Northerner who noticed in amazement that a group of Mississippi farmers and their slaves were encamped together near a town after hauling their cotton to market. He observed their **cheek by jowl familiarity with perfect good will and a mutual contempt for the nicer distinctions of color.**

Pvt John Haley from Maine wrote this in his diary:

Two-hundred years of slavery have not elevated the nigger or his master. The only advancement has been in the way of unnatural selection; the line of demarcation between white and black is not as positive as true virtue demands, but is dimmed by a kind of neutral tint that cannot but be regarded with suspicion.

Haley held both Southern blacks and whites in contempt for failing to uphold the racist attitudes of the North. That racism is demonstrated also in these words of English abolitionist James S Buckingham in 1842:

This is only one among the many proofs I had witnessed of the fact, that the prejudice of color is not nearly so strong in the South as in the North. [In the South] it is not at all uncommon to see the black slaves of both sexes, shake hands with white people when they meet, and interchange friendly personal inquiries; but at the North I do not remember to have witnessed this once; and neither in Boston, New York, or

Philadelphia would white persons generally like to be seen shaking hands and talking familiarly with blacks in the streets.

During the Revolutionary War, the British offered freedom to slaves who would join the fight against their American masters. Very few slaves accepted that offer. During the War of 1812, when the British captured Washington, DC, they hoped the 1400 slaves and 1000 free blacks there would help them defeat the Americans. They were again disappointed. What made the Yankees think they would fare better in the Civil War? Willful ignorance of history and unfortunate reliance on Yankee propaganda.

One slave put it this way:

I suppose dem Yankees wuz all right in dere place, but dey neber belong in de South. . . . An' as for dey a-setting me free! Miss, us [Negroes] . . . wuz free as soon as we wuz bawn. I always been free!<sup>10</sup>

During the Civil War, virtually all Southern adult white males were in the military. Slaves could easily have overpowered the remaining white population of women, children, and old men. Slaves could easily have escaped, and could have supported the Union effort in one way or another. Very few did so, willingly, at least. Instead, black farmers helped produce enough food to feed both civilians and the Southern army. They helped produce shoes, clothes, and military supplies. They didn't have to; they chose to.

Blacks also made a significant, and largely unrecognized, contribution to the Southern military. When Stonewall Jackson's army occupied Frederick, Maryland in 1862, Dr Lewis Steiner made this eyewitness observation:

Dr Steiner was chief inspector of the US Army Sanitary Commission.

---

<sup>10</sup> SRK, p96

Over 3000 negroes must be included in this number [Confederate troops]. These were clad in all kinds of uniforms, not only in cast-off or captured United States uniforms, but in coats with Southern buttons, State buttons, etc. These were shabby, but not shabbier or seedier than those worn by white men in the rebel ranks. Most of the negroes had arms, rifles, muskets, sabres, bowie-knives, dirks, etc . . . and were manifestly an integral portion of the Southern Confederacy Army.<sup>11</sup>

In 1863, Captain Arthur L Fremantle observed many examples of black loyalty to the Southern cause during Gen Lee's Gettysburg campaign, including a black soldier in charge of white Yankee prisoners. Fremantle wrote:

Fremantle was a British observer attached to Gen Lee's army.

This little episode of a Southern slave leading a white Yankee soldier through a Northern village, alone and of his own accord, would not have been gratifying to an abolitionist, . . . nor would the sympathizers both in England and in the North feel encouraged if they could hear the language of detestation and contempt with which the numerous Negroes with Southern armies speak of their liberators.

When Southern blacks did not flock to the aid of the Union as the Yankees had expected, Yankees attempted to force them to join the Union army. Gen John A Logan wrote to Gen Grant:

A major of colored troops is here with his party capturing negroes, with or without their consent. . . . They are being conscripted.

---

<sup>11</sup> SRK, p90

Salmon Chase, Secretary of the Treasury, received this message in 1862:

The negroes were sad. . . . Sometimes whole plantations, learning what was going on, ran off to the woods for refuge. . . . This mode of [enlistment by] violent seizure . . . is repugnant.

And there was this report from the same plantation the following day:

On some plantations the wailing and screaming were loud and the [black] women threw themselves in despair on the ground. On some plantations the people took to the woods and were hunted up by the soldiers. . . . I doubt if the recruiting service in this country has ever been attended with such scenes before.

Gen Rousseau wrote to Gen George Thomas:

Officers in command of colored troops are in constant habit of pressing all able-bodied slaves into the military service of the US.

Gen Innis N Palmer wrote to Gen Butler:

The negroes will not go voluntarily, so I am obliged to force them. . . . The matter of collecting the colored men for laborers has been one of some difficulty. . . . They must be forced to go. . . . This may be considered a harsh measure, but . . . we must not stop at trifles.

In CivilGate, Yankees point with pride to Southern blacks who served in the Union Army. But they don't mention how they got there, or the vast majority who refused. Or the fact that, once in the Union army, blacks were treated worse than they had been on the plantation.

For example, Sam Marshall was arrested for trying to visit his family. This is what happened to him:

About a dozen of the soldiers did escort him. . . . They tied him to a tree, and stripping him to the waist lacerated his back with a cowhide, the marks of which Sam will carry to his grave.

Far from being compassionate liberators, the North had little respect for the rights or welfare of Southern blacks. Blacks, in fact, had not endured such treatment since they were “liberated” from their homes in Africa. Yankees had no respect for the law, or for COTUS, and they proved it time after time in their treatment of Southern blacks as well as whites.

### In Their Own Words

Over 70% of the ex-slaves represented in the *Slave Narratives* had only good things to say about their life in the Old South. Here are a few examples:

Any time a slave worked over time or cut mo’ wood dan he s’pose to, Massa pay him money for it, ‘cauze when ever one of us slaves seen somp’n we lak, we did just lak de white folks does now. Us bought it. Massa never whupped none of his slaves. . . . No’m none of our slaves ever tried to run away. Dey all knowed dey was well off. . . . Dey [Yankees] offered me a hoss iffen I would go nawth wid dem, but I jus’ couldn’t leave de Massa even dough I did want dat hoss mighty bad. (Isaam Morgan, Mobile, AL)

People has the wrong idea of slave days. We was treated good. My Massa never laid a hand on me the whole time I was wid him. . . . Sometime we loaned the massa money when he was hard pushed. (Simon Phillips, AL)

I was fed just like I was one of the [master's] children. They even done put me to bed with them. You see, this discrimination on color wasn't as bad then as it is now. They handled you as a slave but they didn't discriminate against you on account of color like they do now. In slavery times, a poor white man was worse off than a nigger. (Elijah Henry Hopkins, Little Rock, AR)

Slavery times wuz sho good times. We wuz fed an' clothed an' had nothin' to worry about. . . . (Sarah and Tom Douglas, AL)

Ole Marster dead an' gone an' Ole Mistis too, but I 'members 'em jus lak dey was, when dey looked atter us when we belonged to 'em or dey belong to us, I dunno which it was. De times was better fo' de war. . . . (Jane Georgianna, AL)

I cannot forget old massa. He was good and kind. He never believed in slavery, but his money was tied up in slaves and he didn't want to lose all he had. I knows I will see him in heaven and even though I have to walk ten miles for a bite of bread, I can still be happy to think about the good times we had then. (Gus Brown, Richmond, VA)

After the war many soldiers [Yankees] came to my mistress, Mrs Blakely, trying to make her free me. I told them I was free but I did not want to go anywhere, that I wanted to stay in the only home that I ever known. . . . Sometimes I was threatened for not leaving but I stayed on. ("Aunt" Adeline, Fayetteville, AR)

When Mars Daniel come home he went to my papa's house and says "John, you free". He says, "I been free as I wanter be whah I is". He went on to my grandpa's house and says, "Toby, you are free!" He raised up and says, "You brought me here from Africa and North Carolina and I goin' stay wid you as long as ever I get sompin to eat. You gotter look after me!" Mars Daniel say, "Well I ain't runnin' nobody off my place as long as they behave". Purtnigh every nigger set tight till he died of the old sets. Mars Daniel

say to grandpa, "Toby you ain't my nigger". Grandpa raise up and say, "I is too". (Betty Curlett, Hazen, AR)

I'll tell you lady, if the rough element from the North had stayed out of the South the trouble of reconstruction would not have happened. . . . They tried to excite the colored against their white friends. The white folks was still kind to them what had been their slaves. They would have helped them get started. I know that. I always say that if the South could of been left to adjust itself both white and colored would have been better off. (Cora Gillam, Little Rock, AR)

All dem good times ceasted atter a while when de War come and de Yankees started all dere debbilment. . . . (James Gill, Marvell, AR)

These accounts from slaves of life in the Old South<sup>12</sup> are not proof that slave life was a bed of roses, but it is proof that it was not the crown of thorns portrayed by CivilGate. None of this is an attempt to justify or excuse slavery, or suggest that it should have been allowed to continue indefinitely in the South. But it shows that the Civil War was not the right approach to dealing with slavery. Nor was Reconstruction the way to deal with the war's aftermath.

Reconstruction did not end racism and discrimination in the South, it caused it! Far from being liberators, Yankees were the oppressors. It has already been shown that blacks and whites, before the Civil War, got along better in the South than in the North. What changed that? Yankees! Racism was transported from the North into the South with Reconstruction. Yankees did not end racism in the South, they caused it!

Why was there no significant civil rights legislation until the LBJ administration? During Reconstruction, and after, the North completely dominated every aspect of Southern life. Yankees swarmed to the South to replace Southern culture with Yankee culture.

---

<sup>12</sup> SRK, p96-100

Yankees were in control of government, education, voting, and everything else. If Yankees were such soldiers of civil rights and racial equality, and if Southerners were such devout racists, why did Yankees permit racism and segregation to continue in the South? Yankees had all the power. So why didn't they pass whatever civil rights legislation was necessary to reverse the Southern bigotry and discrimination? There was no longer a South to stand in their way. What was stopping the Yankees from putting an end to all racism and segregation right at the beginning of Reconstruction?

The answer is clear. Yankees did not encounter those conditions, they created them.

### Secession<sup>13</sup>

People were celebrating in the streets of Charleston, SC, on Dec 20, 1860. It wasn't a Christmas party. They were filled with joy because their beloved state had just seceded from the Union and declared themselves an independent nation once again.

A special convention had convened to address the question of secession, and its delegates voted unanimously (169 to 0) in favor of that bold step. Those delegates were hardly hotheads throwing a temper tantrum. They included former governors (5), former US Senators (4), and a former Speaker of the US House. They came from various professions, including members of the clergy and planters. They were all prominent in their community, and they all felt a surge of patriotism. Their declaration included language similar to DOI, and their action was based on that document.

They were not alone in secession for long. Mississippi (Jan 9, 1861), Florida (Jan 10), Alabama (Jan 11), Georgia (Jan 19), Louisiana (Jan 26), and Texas (Feb 1) also exercised their rights to reestablish themselves as free and independent states. By that time they had formed a new confederation, which they called the Provisional

---

<sup>13</sup> CWC, p1-17

Government of the Confederate States of America, and they had established their capital at Montgomery, AL. They chose Jefferson Davis as their first President.

Davis was a planter, and a West Point graduate. He had distinguished himself as a colonel in the Mexican War, as a member of the US House of Representatives, and as US Secretary of War. He had most recently been a member of the US Senate. He was a firm believer in a state's right to secede, and he did everything in his power to make sure his beloved state of Mississippi would not need to exercise that right. But he found it necessary to resign from the Senate and support his state and the South. He hoped to be arrested for treason, because he was supremely confident that he could prove in court the right of secession.

He wanted for the Confederacy liberation from Northern tariffs, expanded free trade, and continued protection of the right to own slaves. The South already had ample protection of slavery. It was a right protected by the Supreme Court (SCOTUS) in the *Dred Scott* decision. AL had, according to his own words, no authority or desire to interfere with slavery in the South. Davis didn't have much confidence in AL's honesty, but he had little reason to doubt him on the slavery issue. He knew that AL and the North were quite content with slavery just as long as the slaves were kept in the South where they belonged. They did not want them (or free blacks) in the territories or the North, because that would mean that blacks would be competing for jobs and keeping wages low.

So it wasn't slavery that motivated the Confederate states to secede. It was primarily the tariff and free trade issues. Tariffs had been a source of friction between the North and the South for years. Now, with the 1860 election, the South could no longer count on getting a fair shake in Congress. The Morrill Tariff of 1861 proved they had good reason for concern. (More on the Morrill Tariff later).

## Chapter 3: Why Did They Fight?

### The War for Southern Independence

It is misleading to label the war of 1861 – 1865 a *civil war*. That implies the South wanted to control the North as well as the South. It did not. It merely wanted its independence, and to be left alone. The *War Between the States* would be more accurate, but still misleading. The war was not between individual states, but between two nations. One bit of proof is found in a soldier's parole papers when he surrendered at Vicksburg. This official US Army document shows the names of the two contending sides as the United States and the Confederate States – two sovereign nations, not individual states. So the war would more appropriately be called the *War for Southern Independence* or the *War of Northern Aggression*.

What difference does it make now, 150 years later? It matters to Southerners who know what the war was about, and what it was not about. The name *War for Southern Independence* draws unwelcome (by the North) attention to the fact that the United States has often supported struggles for independence around the world. The very existence of the United States is due to its own such struggle. Why then, would the US suddenly adopt such an aversion to independence? It raises questions for which there are no legitimate answers.<sup>14</sup>

Most Civil War books and documentaries can tell you in considerable detail about the great battles of the war: the weapons used, the generals on both sides, their battle strategies and tactics, casualties, etc. But very few even make any serious attempt to explain why those men were there on the battlefields in the first place.

---

<sup>14</sup> SRK, p43-45

What was the Civil War about? Almost anyone you ask these days will not hesitate to tell you it was about slavery. Most historians would agree that, in the end, it was only about slavery. They are wrong, and most of them know they are wrong. That fact is easily proven, and is amply proven here.

For one thing, if AL's goal had been to free the slaves, his first battle would have been with SCOTUS, not with the South. The *Dred Scott* ruling had made slavery legal. The Southern states did not do that, the federal government did. AL said he thought he could convince SCOTUS to reverse that decision, but he didn't even try to do so.

Furthermore, the Corwin Amendment alone proves beyond any shadow of reasonable doubt that the North was not initially interested in freeing the slaves. More on the Corwin Amendment later.

The Emancipation Proclamation (EP) is usually pointed to as proof that AL fought the Civil War to free the slaves. But that conveniently ignores several inconvenient truths. EP wasn't issued before or at the beginning of the war, because freeing slaves in the South was not AL's objective. We know that because he said so. This is what he said in his First Inaugural Address:

I have no purpose, directly or indirectly, to interfere with the institution of slavery in the States where it exists. I believe I have no lawful right to do so, and I have no inclination to do so.

According to one excuse, AL really wanted to issue EP right at the start, but he felt he needed to wait until the North had achieved a significant military victory. But that's simply not true. AL didn't even decide to issue EP prior to the summer of 1862, well after the war was under way. And why would he need a military victory first? If he was really on a moral crusade to rid the country of slavery, why would he have not been honest about that right up front, regardless of military successes? Doesn't a president

(POTUS) owe us honesty? Especially Honest Abe! Why on earth would he lie about that?

### Worlds Apart

Here's a bit of honesty. Anthony Trollope was a Brit who travelled in both the North and South during the early Civil War. He concluded that the two sections of America had very little in common other than their language. He said:

The South is seceding from the North because the two are not homogeneous. They have different instincts, different appetites, different morals, and a different culture.

He went on to say that the South had become a separate people, with different habits, morals, institutions, pursuits, . . . modes of thought and action.

In 1988 Dr Grady McWhiney published *Cracker Culture: Ways in the Old South*, in which he also demonstrated that the Civil War was a clash of cultures. Southern society was oriented toward leisure, for example, while Yankees emphasized work and profit.

John Adams (of Massachusetts), while serving in the Continental Congress, expressed similar sentiments in letters to his wife, Abigail. He was concerned that the two sections were so different that it would be difficult to hold their political union together.

George Mason (of Virginia) also observed that Northerners and Southerners were very different in manners, habits, and customs.

Why were they so different? David Hacket Fisher in his book, *Albion's Seed*, shows that they were very different even before they arrived in America, because they came

primarily from different areas of Britain.<sup>15</sup> Their differences only increased in the New World.

Today, we focus almost exclusively on their different approaches to slavery, but it went much deeper than that. Most people in the South didn't think much about slavery. When they did think about it, their views were all over the map. (They were in the North, too.) One thing they agreed on, though, was that they had a right to own slaves. That didn't make it right, and even Southern slave owners for the most part knew that slavery wouldn't last forever. But, meanwhile, they considered it a necessary evil. And it was a right upheld by SCOTUS in the *Dred Scott* case of 1857.

What they thought about, though, more than slavery, was how much they didn't want some Yankee trying to push them around. They especially despised abolitionists, who they considered shrill, know-nothing busybodies who had no clue about life in the South. (Lots of people in the North hated abolitionists, too).

Even if there hadn't been an issue of slavery, the North and South still wouldn't have gotten along. They were different worlds, with different concepts of civilization. One nation, but totally different cultures, styles, manners, and philosophy of life. The North and South suffered from a major personality clash. As said by Mary Chestnut, wife of US Senator James Chestnut, South Carolina: **We separated from the North . . . because we have hated each other so.** It had been that way from colonial days.

The North considered the South backward, short-fused, aristocratic, cocky, and abusive toward slaves. They saw themselves as enlightened, practical, business-like (and therefore wealthy), visionary, and morally superior. Quite a contrast to the South's view of them: corrupt, greedy, self-righteous, and intolerant.

---

<sup>15</sup> SRK, p23-24

To Southerners, the South was utopia. They saw themselves as freedom-loving and gracious. They liked things down there just the way they were, and they saw absolutely no reason to go making changes, at least not quickly, and those troublemakers from the North were really getting on their nerves.

### The Final Straw

But, if they had always hated each other so much, what was it that finally motivated the Southern states to secede from the Union? It wasn't slavery. They already had slavery, and AL, contrary to CivilGate, was not threatening to abolish it. Much more important to the South was the fact that they had lost their control of the federal government.

When the Constitutional Convention at Philadelphia settled on the compromise that counted 3/5 of Southern slaves in the census, that gave the South enough clout to control the federal government for decades. That came to an end with the election of AL, who was the first POTUS to be elected without Southern support. For the first time in American history, someone could run for President and win, even without winning a single Southern state.

For some Southern states, the straw that broke the camel's back was a high tariff passed by Congress around the time AL took office. That tariff helped the North and hurt the South, because it forced the South to buy higher-priced Northern goods, and it put an end to the South's trade with Europe. The two sections had always been at odds over tariffs, but now the North was in a position to force whatever tariff policies they chose on the South. To the South, that was unacceptable, and secession seemed to be their only option to avoid the North's tyranny.

Here's how Confederate President Jefferson Davis described the situation in his Second Inaugural Address:<sup>16</sup>

---

<sup>16</sup> SRK, p328-329

The people of the States now confederated became convinced that the Government of the United States had fallen into the hands of a sectional majority, who would pervert that most sacred of all trusts to the destruction of the rights which it was pledged to protect. They believed that to remain longer in the Union would subject them to continuance of a disparaging discrimination, submission to which would be inconsistent with their welfare, and intolerable to a proud people. They therefore determined to sever its bounds and established a new Confederacy for themselves.

The experiment instituted by our revolutionary fathers, of a voluntary Union of sovereign States for purpose specified in a solemn compact, had been perverted by those who, feeling power and forgetting right, were determined to respect no law but their own will. The Government had ceased to answer the ends for which it was ordained and established. To save ourselves from a revolution which, in its silent but rapid progress, was about to place us under the despotism of numbers, and to preserve in spirit, as well as in form, a system of government we believed to be peculiarly fitted to our condition, and full of promise for mankind, we determined to make a new association, composed of States homogeneous in interest, in policy, and in feeling. True to our traditions of peace and our love of justice, we sent commissioners to the United States to propose a fair and amicable settlement of all questions of public debt or property which might be in dispute. But the Government at Washington, denying our right to self-government, refused even to listen to any proposals for peaceful separation. Nothing was then left to do but to prepare for war. . . .

Fellow-citizens, after the struggle of ages had consecrated the right of the Englishman to constitutional representative government, our colonial ancestors were forced to vindicate the birthright by an appeal to arms. Success crowned their efforts, and they provided for their posterity a peaceful remedy against future aggression.

The tyranny of the unbridled majority, the most odious and least responsible form of despotism, has denied us both the right and the remedy. Therefore we are in arms to renew such sacrifices as our fathers made to the holy cause of constitutional liberty. . . .

The South seceded because they felt the North had gained so much control over the federal government that the South would no longer be fairly and effectively represented within the Union. The North invaded the Confederacy because AL decided to prevent the South from exercising their Constitutional right of secession.

Because the North won the war, they wrote the history books. They had no motivation to tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth. Their version of the war leaves out a great deal of extremely important information that they would consider embarrassing to themselves, and it embellishes other parts. When necessary, they fabricated lies to enforce their version of events. The end result is the story we have been taught in school. Most of it is fantasy, distortion, obfuscation, and outright lies. This blogbook sets the record straight, tells you the true story, and exposes CivilGate for the Yankee propaganda that it is.

Just one example is the Yankee version of how the war started. We've been told that the South fired the first shot at Ft Sumter, and the North was simply defending itself against an aggressive Confederacy. The South did fire the first shot at Ft Sumter, but not as an act of aggression against the North. The South was simply protecting its territory against an aggressive Union. As Jefferson Davis explained, the South had offered to negotiate a fair and peaceful settlement with the North regarding any disputed territory or issue or debt. The only remaining Confederate forts under Union control were Ft Sumter and a fort in Florida. The North flatly refused to even consider any fair settlement, and they certainly weren't interesting in a peaceful resolution of the Ft Sumter issue.

Why? Because AL needed an excuse to launch the Civil War. He deliberately manipulated and provoked the South into firing first at Ft Sumter to give him political cover for his war. No one was killed in the brief battle at Ft Sumter, and the South was acting in self-defense. They did not want to control the Union, they simply wanted to be left alone. But those details are omitted from CivilGate. The South got Ft Sumter, and AL got his PR victory.

That is just one of many examples of Yankee mythology, an extensive propaganda campaign to sell America a fictional account of the Civil War and Reconstruction. CivilGate is an enormous and complex web of outright lies, distortion, deception, hyperbole, and obfuscation.

But to the soldiers on the battlefield, it was all very simple. They weren't really so concerned with details of COTUS. They were there because they were told to be there. Because they were expected by their peers to be there. Because they felt they were protecting their own and their neighbors' rights, property, and lives. Because they had been taught to disrespect and even hate the people from the other section of the country.

Yankees were sold on the myth that the North must preserve the Union. But to the Southern soldier it was even simpler. They fought because Yankees had invaded their land. When a Yankee asked a Rebel when the South was going to finally give up and stop fighting, the Rebel soldier replied that they would stop fighting when the Yankees stopped shooting at them.

It's important to understand that soldiers on both sides at the start of the war fought for reasons other than slavery. The idea that the North was on a noble crusade to free the Southern slaves is pure myth. One would think that the mythmeisters could come up with a story that isn't so blatantly false. AL himself disproves this myth, as quoted above. It shows how little regard Yankee propagandists have for facts or the truth, and

the shameless lengths they will go to in their desperate efforts to conceal their atrocities, no matter how much they insult the intelligence of the American people in the process. But the worst part of it is that it has worked so well for so long. The time has come to change that.

## Chapter 4: States' Rights

### The Beginning of COTUS

**D**uring the Philadelphia Convention in 1787, and during the ratification debates, there was a great deal of concern about the powers of the executive. There was wide agreement that POTUS had to be strong -- strong enough to steer the ship of state, but not strong enough to throw the passengers and crew overboard. How to get the balance just right was the tricky part.

One suggestion was to have three executives, not just one. That way, if one tried to take over the whole ship, the other two would be there to restrain him. The idea was for each to be the primary spokesman for a different region of the country, with the states being divided into northern, middle, and southern sections. That would also help solve another nagging problem throughout the convention and debates -- making sure the different regions of the country, with their disparate needs, interests, cultures, habits, products, etc, each got sufficient voice in the federal government.

Parallel to the fears of a power-hungry executive usurping states' powers, and a bullying North inflicting its will on the weaker South, was the tension between the combined power of the federal government and that of the states. Even if POTUS behaved himself, that didn't mean Congress wouldn't try to completely dominate the states. And they couldn't rule out the possibility that POTUS and Congress would join forces and gang up on the states.

Protecting States' Rights was the very heart of the matter from beginning to end. Remember, the Articles of Confederation (AOC) was a loose agreement of very strong states with a very weak federal government, which didn't even include a separate executive or judicial branch. But, the whole problem was that that loose confederation

was just too weak to be effective. It had to get bulked up. But they didn't want to jump from a federal wimp to a bully.

The whole business of coming up with a viable constitution was a matter of identifying all the competing interests, and structuring the new government in a way that provided sufficient "energy" (as they called it then), yet got all the tradeoffs balanced just right, so no part of the federal government could get too big for its britches.

That involved having the states play a very strong role in the process, and at all times making sure that final power rested with the people. They did that in part by sometimes having the people make choices directly, like voting for members of the House of Representatives, and at other times having the people choose representatives who would make the final decision for them, as with the Electoral College in presidential elections. At various points in COTUS, the states play a prominent role, and at other points, they are more in the background. It was a carefully choreographed arrangement, and changing any part of it would have unintended consequences.

Both sides in the ratification debates were eager to make sure they could convince the people that they had a better vision of the proper balance of power between states and federal government. Those who opposed the new COTUS on grounds that it gave too much power to the federal government and too little to the states planned to call themselves "Federalists", because everyone at that time understood that word to mean a coalition of states (similar to AOC). They planned to call the other side "Anti-Federalists" or maybe "Unionists" because they placed a stronger emphasis on the federal government than on the states.

That would have made perfect sense. Except to the other side. They realized early on that that would have given the "Federalists" a huge PR advantage, because federalism was what the people were familiar with and comfortable with, so they would have a natural resistance to change, which the "anti-federalists" supported. People were

naturally still very skittish about a strong central government, with visions of King George still dancing in their heads.

So the *unionists* simply beat the other side to the punch. They started calling themselves "Federalists" and the other side "Anti-Federalists". It was an extremely shrewd political maneuver, and a very effective one.

Maybe that's why both parties today are still so fond of political dirty tricks.

So maybe, in a way, some people were tricked into accepting the new COTUS, but most people caught on pretty quickly, and the Anti-Federalists were there to make sure they did. They continued to hammer home the point that States' Rights would soon be gone with the wind under the new form of government. They ended up losing the ratification debate, but Anti-Federalist fears never went away, and AL's election (close to a century later), proved that those fears had been well-founded all along.

### The End of COTUS

AL was not the first POTUS to prove that Anti-Federalist fears had been quite valid. On the opposite end of the spectrum from the Anti-Federalists, there had been a strong pro-monarchy influence in the Philadelphia Convention, and its leading spokesman was Alexander Hamilton. Hamilton's views fell on deaf ears at the Convention, but once installed as Treasury Secretary in George Washington's administration, he was able to establish policies that increased the powers of the federal government at the expense of the states.

Washington himself did not share Hamilton's affinity for the English monarchy, but he supported Hamilton's economic proposals and policies, moving the US closer to the English

Adams had grown quite fond of the English monarchy model during his service in Europe.

style of monarchical government. Few Americans seemed to notice or object at first, but Thomas Jefferson did. It did no good. When John Adams became POTUS he continued to support a much stronger federal government at the expense of the states. His Alien and Sedition Acts, for example, were clearly unconstitutional and served as a stark reminder of Anti-Federalist warnings during the ratification debates.

Jefferson started swinging the pendulum away from monarchy and back toward States' Rights when he became POTUS. There was some back and forth between Constitutional federalism and excessive federal power at the expense of the states over the years. But with AL's election, the pendulum stopped swinging. AL forced the pendulum about as far toward monarchy as it could possibly go in America, and the Republican Party made sure it stayed there. What had always gotten in the way of the monarchists was States' Rights. AL removed that obstacle.

Prior to AL, the South, even with fewer people and a smaller economy, had managed to keep its interests from being ignored in Washington. It had done so for many years by getting a man in the White House who was either from the South or sympathetic to it, and was therefore highly motivated to protect Southern interests. That all changed in the election of 1860, or at least that's the way the South interpreted the results of the election. They didn't necessarily think AL was going to send troops down there as soon as the inauguration was over, but they saw the writing on the wall. And it was looking awfully bleak for them politically in the coming months. They felt they had to do something, right away.

AL soon confirmed that, as far as he was concerned, those States' Rights had indeed all but disappeared. The federal government called almost all the shots now, and AL had the full might of the federal government to back him up. That's exactly what the Anti-Federalists had warned of, what the Southern states had continued to fear, and what was now playing out before their eyes.

That was the message in AL's First Inaugural Address. He told the states that they were free to do what they wanted, as long as it happened to agree with what he wanted. Sure, he believed in States' Rights, just so their exercise of it didn't conflict too much with the federal government's wishes. Secession definitely didn't meet that requirement, so he considered it his job to bring the old Union hammer down on that notion. Uncle Sam wore the pants in this country, and those impudent Confederate states were just going to have to get over themselves. Or else! (Many even today say that AL was absolutely right. But very few Founders would agree).

When the Confederacy talked about States' Rights, this is what they were talking about. Far from being used as a euphemism for the perpetuation of Southern slavery, States' Rights was an integral part of the Constitutional structure, and the very basis of federalism. What did the South mean by state sovereignty? A state is nothing more than an administrative tool established by and for the people who live there. A state is simply people. A state is the collective voice of the citizens who reside there. Since, according to COTUS, final power in our republican form of government always rests in the hands of the people, and the people organize themselves as states, States' Rights is just another way of saying *people's rights*. State sovereignty is simply the sovereignty of the people. Of the people, by the people, and for the people. States helped make that a reality.

According to CivilGate, wording in the Constitution's preamble proves that the federal government was always superior to the states. It says "We the People" not "we the states". Therefore, COTUS was ratified by the people, not by the states. That bit of sophistry demonstrates a profound ignorance of COTUS. The Constitutional provision for ratification did not provide for a national popular vote. It provided for ratification or rejection on a state-by-state basis, under procedures established and carried out by each individual state. Anyone who attempts to base an argument on the people, not the states, as though they are mutually exclusive, is extremely ignorant or deliberately using

obfuscation. The states are simply one form used by people to express their will and handle their administrative interests.

Of course, CivilGate doesn't mention any of this. This is one of many inconvenient truths that Yankees love to ignore, because it doesn't fit into their mythology. They have managed to convince (almost) everyone that when the South talked about States' Rights they were just using that as an excuse for slavery. They don't want people to look beyond the Civil War myths with an open mind and understand that States' Rights is another term for federalism. Federalism is a carefully crafted Constitutional structure which effectively divides power between the federal government and the states. COTUS is designed to grant only those powers to the federal government which are absolutely necessary for the preservation, protection, and promotion of our national interests. Everything else is expressly and purposely left to the states, because they are much better equipped to handle most matters of government. States are essential in the never-ending battle against a power-hungry federal government.

What AL did in the Civil War, among other tragedies, was to end our republican form of government. Salmon P Chase, SCOTUS Chief Justice 1864-1873, for one, said that state sovereignty ended at Appomattox.<sup>17</sup> Chase considered that a reason to celebrate. But, by taking away the essential element of States' Rights, the entire Constitution is destroyed. It didn't all happen suddenly with the Civil War, but that was the beginning of the end for COTUS.

AL got it off to a good start, then Woodrow Wilson (WW) advanced the cause with his doctrine of Progressivism. WW praised AL for destroying COTUS. He realized what AL had done, and he was ecstatic about it, because as far as WW was concerned COTUS was obsolete, and no longer effective or relevant.

---

<sup>17</sup> SRK, p219-220

Well, it wasn't entirely irrelevant. It was still useful for propaganda purposes, because WW knew that most people did not realize that COTUS was effectively dead. The mass of Americans held to the illusion that they still actually had a Constitution as the basis for their form of government. Far from understanding that AL had destroyed COTUS, most Americans were practically worshipping AL for *preserving the Union*. WW was more than happy to exploit that illusion, because it was a means of manipulating the people and persuading them to do whatever he wanted. If he could gain support for one of his programs by using patriotic-sounding references to COTUS, he would do so. But as far as actually abiding by COTUS, that was simply out of the question, unless it just happened to coincide with his plans. That's precisely what progressivism is all about – progressing beyond the confines and restrictions of an obsolete relic (COTUS) to the enlightened guidance of an omniscient and omnipotent federal government (progressivism). COTUS had been fine for its time, but America had long outgrown it and Thomas Jefferson's silly notion of natural rights.

If COTUS is dead, and if we are no longer a constitutional republic, what form of government do we have? Progressivism. That is a system in which the federal (central) government is in charge – not the states, not the people, not

Internationally, *progressivism* is known as *statism*.

COTUS. The federal

government is rightfully in charge, according to progressivism, because the federal government knows what's best for the country and for each of us as individuals. The feds know what's best for us even better than we know what's good for ourselves, and so they are in full control, or very close to it. And the federal government must step in at times and exercise strong paternalistic authority over us, its sometimes unruly children, for our own good -- even if we don't realize it at the time.

But isn't that the same rationale King George used in attempting to preserve the British Union? Isn't it the same excuse used by all dictators throughout history? Adolph Hitler wasn't doing anything "wrong", he was just doing what he felt was best for the German

people. Saddam Hussein wasn't doing anything "wrong" by invading Kuwait, he was just acting in what he considered the best interest of Iraq. Despots are never "evil" if we could simply understand and appreciate the "good" they are attempting to achieve.

WW played a big role, then FDR played an even bigger role in advancing progressivism, and then LBJ did his part. But it was AL who got progressivism rolling across the country, even before it was called *progressivism*. If you want to understand what is wrong with our government today, you can't ignore the starring role AL played.

## Chapter 5: All Is Fair in War<sup>18</sup>

### Advantage North

All is fair in love and war. It's one of our most popular aphorisms. But is all fair in war? If so, there would be no need for the Geneva Conventions. There would be no such thing as *war crimes*. The Holocaust would be just an unfortunate (for the Jews) part of World War II. Bummer. People would not get upset about the Mi Lai massacre in Vietnam or the prisoner abuse at Abu Ghraib in Iraq, or *waterboarding*, or *collateral damage* in Afghanistan.

Since such things tend to cause us angst and anger, it's no wonder Yankees were desperate and determined to keep us from finding out about how the Civil War was conducted. We're familiar with Sherman's *march to the sea*. We have marginalized that with the rationalization that it was necessary to win the war. Really?

Hardly anyone would dispute that the South never really had a chance of winning the Civil War, especially after Gettysburg. The North had four times as many white males to fight. Massachusetts alone produced 60% more manufactured goods than the entire Confederacy. New York and Pennsylvania produced twice as much. The North had three times as much banking and capital as the South. The North held 90% of the South's savings. The North had 22,000 miles of railroad. The South had 9,000, much of it using different gauges. The South had 3,000 miles of coastline, but the North dominated shipping and shipbuilding. The deep South had no factories and few pharmacies. The only Southern foundry was in Virginia.

What did the South have going for it? They produced 90% of the world's cotton supply.

---

<sup>18</sup> SRK, p271-303

The North had the industry, the finances, and the men. Why, then, with a larger army and the economic might to back them up, was it necessary for the Union to kill so many defenseless Southern women and children, to employ a *scorched-earth* policy, to utterly demolish the South and starve its citizens?

On the other hand, if you can somehow convince yourself that, unfortunately, the Union was indeed forced to go to such lengths to win the war, you face an even more challenging fete of rationalization. If that was indeed the unfortunate cost of *preserving the Union*, how could anyone reasonably believe that it was worth it? The war was unconstitutional, immoral, and unnecessary, as this blogbook proves. But even if you are unwilling, yet, to accept that, ask yourself this question. Was it really such a good idea to employ some of the most barbaric warfare tactics ever used against fellow Americans (including innocent, defenseless women, children, old men, and the very blacks the Yankees were supposedly there to liberate)? That was the Yankees' superior moral position? Preserve the Union by destroying it?

Jefferson Davis and Robert E Lee refused to employ such tactics. Some say that's why they lost the war. I doubt that. But that's why they fought the war. The North and South were worlds apart in terms of culture, principles, and values. The Union's war crimes only helped prove that the South had been right to secede and fight to defend themselves. The South utterly rejected such war tactics. The North passionately embraced them. The Union's POTUS, their generals, their politicians and government officials, their newspapers, and the Northern public all were well aware of Yankee war crimes, condoned them, encouraged them, supported them, promoted them, rewarded them, and demanded them. They would accept nothing less.

The following proclamation clearly demonstrates the stark contrast between the North and the South. As Gen Lee took his army into Maryland, where AL had suspended

habeas corpus and established martial law, Lee issued this proclamation to the people of Maryland:<sup>19</sup>

No constraint upon your free will is intended: no intimidation will be allowed within the limits of this army, at least. Marylanders shall once more enjoy their ancient freedom of thought and speech. We know of no enemies among you, and will protect all, of every opinion. It is for you to decide your destiny freely and without constraint. This army will respect your choice, whatever it may be; and while the Southern people will rejoice to welcome you to your natural position among them, they will only welcome you when you come of your own free will.

### A Campaign of Cultural Genocide

The horrible truth is that the North was driven by more than a determination to win the war. They were compelled by hatred and cultural bigotry, and they were determined to eradicate all remnants of Southern culture. That meant a campaign of cultural genocide. No one was allowed to stand in their way – not defenseless women and children, and not the blacks they were supposedly there to liberate. The North did not just want victory, they wanted revenge. They were determined to utterly eradicate Southern culture and replace it with their own.

Given Sherman's utilitarian philosophy of war, it is no surprise that he so utterly annihilated the South. And given the persistent rumors of his questionable mental stability, it is maybe not too surprising that he suggested (and got approval for) a bizarre scheme of deporting Confederates. It didn't matter much where they went, although Madagascar and French Guiana were suggested. Just so they got out and made room for Yankees to move down and take over the South.

---

<sup>19</sup> CWC, p55-56

AL had once advocated a similar approach to dealing with slaves, and even free blacks. He thought it would be a great idea to round up every black person in America and ship them off to an island, maybe, or back to Africa. That turned out to be impossible. But maybe he would have better luck now getting rid of Southerners.

As it turned out,  
America would have been much better off  
keeping the blacks  
and shipping Lincoln to Africa or an island.

During the war, Sherman evacuated Atlanta. Grant tried to drive Virginians out of the Shenandoah Valley. About 20,000 suspected Confederates were driven from their homes (which were burned) in Missouri.<sup>20</sup> But the war itself was just the first phase. After the shooting stopped, the North sent Yankees into Southern states to control their governments, their politics, their schools, and their lives. And of course, to write the history of the Civil War, so that none of this would become well known.

### Crimes Against Humanity

Here's more proof of the Yankee crusade of Southern cultural genocide. Read it and weep.

This is part of a letter from a Unionist to Maj Gen John C Fremont in St Louis, Aug 10, 1861:<sup>21</sup>

Many [citizens] . . . were fired upon not by single shots but volleys, in the presence but without the command of the officers. . . . [Union] soldiers have repeatedly fired from trains at quiet, peaceful [Southern] citizens.

---

<sup>20</sup> CWC, p151

<sup>21</sup> SRK, p278

One Lt William C Kerr incurred the wrath of his superior Union officers for failing to kill enough Southerners. Col John M Glover explains to Col Albert Sigel, Sep 16, 1862, that Kerr was reprimanded for . . .:<sup>22</sup>

*... not having obeyed my orders and yours . . . which were . . . to bring in no prisoners.*

This according to Union Brig Gen Thomas Williams, Baton Rouge, LA, May 27, 1862:<sup>23</sup>

These [Union] regiments, officers and men, with rare exceptions, appear to be wholly destitute of the moral sense, . . . they regard pillaging not only right in itself but a soldierly accomplishment.

This from Union Col George W Deitzler to Union Brig Gen Isaac F Quinby, Columbus, Kentucky, Jun 26, 1862:<sup>24</sup>

The people complain bitterly of the outrages committed by a portion of [Union] Gen Mitchell's brigade.

How did said Gen Mitchell react to complaints of one specific example of said outrages?<sup>25</sup>

[He] . . . declined to take any notice of the case.

---

<sup>22</sup> SRK, p279

<sup>23</sup> SRK, p279

<sup>24</sup> SRK, p279

<sup>25</sup> SRK, p279

This is a wire from Union Gen John A Dix to Union Gen John J Peck, Suffolk, VA, Feb 19, 1863:<sup>26</sup>

[Union] Col Dodge . . . has allowed his men to plunder the country.

This is a circular published by Union Maj Gen John M Palmer, near Chattanooga, TN:<sup>27</sup>

Pillaging by soldiers, and in some degree by the officers of this command . . . are chargeable to the negligence or collusion of the [Union] officers.

Rear Admiral David D Porter was moved to publish General Order Number 158, declaring in part:<sup>28</sup>

I have been . . . mortified by the conduct of persons in charge of some of the gunboats. These two [Union] officers . . . have committed offenses against the laws of justice and humanity. . . . They have . . . converted the vessel . . . into an instrument of tyranny.

Union Brig Gen William H Emory, Morganza, LA, Jun 3, 1864, said this in General Order Number 53 regarding the conduct of his own troops.<sup>29</sup>

[Due to] the plunder of innocent women and children . . . death would not atone for their [his troops'] crimes.

This is the last letter written by Asey Ladd, a Confederate POW held in a Yankee prison camp. Several Yankee soldiers had been killed in a Confederate raid. Ladd clearly had nothing to do with the raid, since he was in prison. But he was killed for it anyway, just

---

<sup>26</sup> SRK, p279

<sup>27</sup> SRK, p279

<sup>28</sup> SRK, p279-280

<sup>29</sup> SRK, p280

as the North made a habit of killing innocent, defenseless women and children in retaliation for Confederate war activities. It was written to Ladd's father on Oct 29, 1864, from Gratiot Street Prison, St Louis, Mo.<sup>30</sup>

I am condemned to be shot today between the hours of two and four o'clock PM, in retaliation for some men shot by Reeves (Major Wilson and six men.) I am an innocent man and it is hard to die for another's sins. You can imagine my feelings when I think of you, my wife and children. . . .

You can imagine my feelings when I discover the truth of Yankee atrocities and the lies of CivilGate. Were these isolated incidents, simply examples (common to all wars) of a few wayward soldiers and negligent officers? No.

Maj Gen William Tecumseh Sherman wrote this on Oct 19, 1862, regarding the appropriate Union response to a Southern attack on a Yankee gunboat:<sup>31</sup>

I hope . . . you will proceed to Bledsoe's Landing and then destroy all the houses and cornfields for miles along the river on that side. . . . You should shell the whole river whenever one of these raids occurs.

Similarly, Sherman said in General Order Number 127, Nov 23, 1864.<sup>32</sup>

In case of . . . destruction [of bridges] by the enemy, . . . the commanding officer . . . on the spot will deal harshly with the inhabitants nearby.

---

<sup>30</sup> SRK, p381-382

<sup>31</sup> SRK, p280-281

<sup>32</sup> SRK, p282

Sherman's report of his destruction of Meridian, MS, to Gen Grant included this:<sup>33</sup>

I . . . began systematic and thorough destruction. . . . For five days 10,000 men worked hard and with a will . . . with axes, crowbars, sledges, clawbars, and with fire, and I have no hesitation in pronouncing the work as well done. Meridian, with its depots, store-houses, arsenal, hospitals, offices, hotels, and cantonments no longer exists.

Hospitals, offices, and hotels? Are those legitimate military targets? Or does that sound more like revenge, and cultural genocide? Does that sound like legitimate and legal military strategy, or does it sound more like a Yankee temper tantrum? Does that sound like a general who is in the least concerned about collateral damage, or is it an angry Yankee who takes great delight in inflicting as much pain and devastation as possible, unbounded by any regard for accepted principles of warfare or even human decency?

Not that Sherman's communications were always filled with such venom. His General Order Number 44, Jun 18, 1862, says in part:<sup>34</sup>

Too much looseness exists on the subject of foraging. The articles of war make it almost a capital offense for an officer or soldier to pillage, which means taking private property for his own use.

In his General Order Number 2, Dec 6, 1862, he said:

The indiscriminate and extensive plundering by our men calls for a summary and speedy change.

It's interesting that these sentiments are so totally inconsistent with his remarks and actions described above. What might have caused such a discrepancy? His GON2

---

<sup>33</sup> SRK, p281-282

<sup>34</sup> SRK, p281

sounds perfunctory, doesn't it? It's almost like he's just phoning it in, and that only to cover his own Yankee butt. What it tells us for certain is that Sherman was well aware of the suffering inflicted upon Southern civilians by Union forces, that such conduct was strictly against official military laws, regulations, and policies, and that his troops were well aware of it.

What the following quotes from Sherman also clearly show is that there was no *summary and speedy change*, and that Gen Grant was also well aware of the Yankee abuses inflicted on the South. Sherman was, more than any other single Union officer, responsible for the annihilation of the South. Are we to believe that he was unable to control his own troops? Gen Robert E Lee had no such trouble with his troops.

Sherman's General Order Number 3, Jan 12, 1863:

**Ignorance of the rules of war as to pillage and plunder can no longer be pleaded.**

His General Order Number 49:<sup>35</sup>

**Stealing, robbery, and pillage has become so common in this army that it is a disgrace to any civilized people.**

So much for the *summary and speedy change* he had ordered back in GON2. I guess his men just didn't think he was serious. Imagine that. Sherman was great at terrorizing and killing defenseless Southern women and children, but he couldn't maintain discipline among his own troops. No wonder Yankees were so desperate to keep the truth of the Civil War out of view. How embarrassing it is for them!

---

<sup>35</sup> SRK, p281

Sherman wrote this to Grant at Vicksburg, Aug 4, 1863:<sup>36</sup>

We are drifting to the worst sort of vandalism. . . . You and I and every commander must go through the war justly chargeable with crimes at which we blush.

Frankly, it's very difficult to imagine Sherman's face red with anything but rage directed at the South. Generally speaking (pun not unintended), Sherman was an honest man, and entirely disinterested in political correctness. But in this particular case what he was determined to do and what official military rules of conduct permitted were diametrically opposed and mutually exclusive. He had to say certain things as CYA measures, but he made no real effort to enforce them. To suggest that Sherman may have had rather extensive credibility issues in this area is like suggesting that Hitler may not have been terribly fond of Jews. Here is part of what Sherman had to say to Gen H W Slocum on Mar 6, 1865:<sup>37</sup>

We are now out of South Carolina and . . . a little moderation may be of political consequence to us in North Carolina.

Now that has a ring of genuine sincerity. That earlier stuff had been said with a wink and a nod. But here Sherman was serious. But he wasn't at all concerned about Southern civilians or even military law. It's just that now that they were in North Carolina, it was politically expedient to exercise a little self-restraint for a change, temporarily. And with political consequences at stake – by golly, he really meant it that time! Typical Yankee hypocrisy.

The ugly truth is that in 1864 Sherman abandoned even the pretence (except for political reasons in North Carolina) of trying to enforce Union prohibition against pillaging and plundering. He did so in part because he had noticed that when Union

---

<sup>36</sup> SRK, p281

<sup>37</sup> SRK, p282

troops helped themselves to whatever they wanted, it deprived the locals of all provisions that could make their way into the hands of Confederate troops. He rationalized that all Southern residents were potential guerilla fighters against Union troops, and therefore they were fair game. So he simply abandoned Union military policy and made up his own rules.<sup>38</sup>

He determined to create a large area of total devastation, and that also became the policy of Grant, AL, Congress, and the entire Northern population. It had actually been policy all along, but now they were being open and honest about it. If military rules of conduct proved inconvenient, they just ignored them and did things their own way. Just as AL had done with COTUS.

What else did Grant know about it, other than Sherman's damning admission of guilt on Aug 4, 1863? He had received this report from Gen S A Hurlbut a few months earlier (Mar 1863):<sup>39</sup>

The amount of plundering and bribery that is going on in and about . . . Memphis is beyond all calculation. . . . Soldiers are bribed, officers are bribed, and the accursed system is destroying the army.

Apparently not all Union officers were on board with the Southern cultural genocide project, but they could do little to stop it. That sounds like a general in distress, crying out for help, feeling overwhelmed by the lack of Union discipline. How did Grant respond to those officers? Here are instructions Grant issued to Maj Gen David Hunter on Aug 5, 1864:<sup>40</sup>

---

<sup>38</sup> CWC, p150

<sup>39</sup> SRK, p283

<sup>40</sup> SRK, p283

In pushing up the Shenandoah Valley . . . it is desirable that nothing should be left to invite the enemy to return. . . . Such as cannot be consumed destroy . . .

In other words, starve the Southern civilians to death. Grant knew what was going on, and he was very much a part of it. The same is true of War Secretary Edwin M Stanton, who received this report in Jan, 1862, from western Missouri:<sup>41</sup>

They [Union military personnel] are no better than a band of robbers; they cross the line, rob, steal, plunder, and burn whatever they can lay their hands upon.

There were other similar reports from Missouri. And Stanton received this May 19, 1862, report from Maj Gen Ormsby M Mitchell:<sup>42</sup>

The most terrible outrages, robberies, rapes, arsons, and plundering are being committed by lawless brigands and vagabonds connected with the [Union] army . . .

Naturally, Stanton immediately took decisive action to stop such abuses. Just kidding! He did get actively involved, though, in a way. Harry Truman (not that one) was a Capt in the Union army. Truman was a very bad boy, even by lowly Union military standards. He was so bad, in fact, that he was convicted by a military commission of murder, arson, and larceny. He was sentenced to be hanged, but that sentence was never carried out. Gen William Rosecrans, who had presided over the military commission, disagreed with the findings and ordered Truman held at Alton Military Prison pending further orders. The case made its way to

Stanton, who ordered Truman reassigned to Washington, DC. He resurfaced later in northern Missouri, where he was happily once again committing war crimes. Which is

Instead of punishing war criminals, the Union punished those who testified against them.

<sup>41</sup> SRK, p283

<sup>42</sup> SRK, p283

not to say that no punishment resulted from the military proceedings. All the informants against Truman had been burned out or murdered. That's Yankee discipline. That's Yankee justice. That's War Secretary Stanton. And, as it turns out, that was also AL.

The true picture of AL's character is exposed throughout this blogbook. It doesn't seem

See *Myth: Lincoln was a compassionate man* in *Civil War Myths and Mythconceptions*.

possible that any American could read the proof and still believe that AL was a great POTUS, or that he deserves to be honored with a monument in Washington, DC. Any recognition of AL should be an occasion for mourning, and a solemn reminder of the unimaginable horror that results when America abandons its Constitutional principles, even in the face of a crisis as big as secession. Especially then. That's when we need COTUS most, to protect us from tyrants like AL. Even one of AL's top generals recognized AL for the tyrant he was.

See *Gen George B McClellan* in *Civil War Movers and Shakers*.

Here's more proof of AL's real character. We'll start with the story of Gen James H Lane.<sup>43</sup> The following was in a letter from Maj Gen Henry W Halleck to Maj Gen George B McClellan regarding Gen Lane:

The conduct of the forces under Lane . . . has done more for the enemy in this State than could have been accomplished by 20,000 of his own army. . . . I receive almost daily complaints of outrages committed by these men in the name of the United States, and the evidence is so conclusive as to leave no doubt of their correctness. It is rumored that Lane has been made a brigadier-general. I cannot conceive of a more injudicious appointment. . . . Its effect . . . is offering a premium for rascality and robbing generally.

---

<sup>43</sup> SRK, p285

McClellan delivered the letter to AL, who read it in McClellan's presence. AL turned the letter over and wrote:

An excellent letter, though I am sorry General Halleck is so unfavorably impressed with General Lane.

Lane was indeed promoted and Halleck's warning was ignored. Once again, what AL did exposed his true character. What AL said exposed his infinite capacity for deception. Recall AL's words from his First Inaugural Address.

We are not enemies, but friends. We must not be enemies. . . . The mystic chords of memory . . . will yet swell the chorus of the Union, when again touched, as surely they will be, by the better angels of our nature.

The story of Gen Lane clearly shows the better nature of some Union generals who understood that Yankee atrocities were truly evil and unjustifiable. But those generals were powerless to stop the so-called *better angels* of AL's nature. Not enemies? With friends like AL, the South could scarcely have imagined an enemy. For generations, CivilGate has tried, and largely succeeded, to *swell the chorus of the Union* by quelling the voice of the South -- those who know what really happened. But the most massive cover-up in American history is coming to light. The truth is slowly, at last, emerging. Americans are beginning to see the ugly truth that AL was a brutal dictator and a pathological liar. He and most of his generals are as guilty of war crimes as anyone convicted at the Nuremberg trials. The federal government's own official records prove it.

Gen Rosecrans, in 1863, informed War Secretary Stanton of numerous crimes committed by US military forces in his area, including murder, arson, and rape. And he said this:

The power to check them by inflicting the penalty of death is a nullity, for the delays necessary to get them a regular trial by general court-martial, and then holding them until the matter is reviewed and approved by the President, such a time elapses that the troops are relieved and the culprit escapes.

Union Gen Innis N Palmer, on May 30, 1864, issued a circular detailing many cases of plundering, insults, and arson that his troops had committed at Washington, NC.<sup>44</sup> He later complained of the reception his circular had received in Washington, DC.

*My order, No 5, . . . concerning the outrages committed at Little Washington has been severely commented upon in high places; not by my military superiors, but by Senators of the United States and others . . .*

War crimes and atrocities were not isolated incidents. They were rampant. The highest elected officials in Washington, DC, knew about them, condoned them, even encouraged and rewarded such activity and the military commanders who enabled or forced them to continue. Those who tried to intervene were ignored, marginalized, or punished. But what about the public in the North? Did they know what was going on? And if so, how did they react to it?

Union Gen Carlos Buell had tried to control the behavior of some of his officers. This is Col Marcellus Mundy's description of how Chicago newspapers in early 1863 handled the story:<sup>45</sup>

Papers . . . condemned . . . [Buell] very bitterly for his punishment of Colonel Turchin. The burden of the complaint in the papers was this: that General Buell was protecting

---

<sup>44</sup> SRK, p286

<sup>45</sup> SRK, p287

the [Southern] people, rather than punishing them. . . . They seemed to advocate what they called a “vigorous war policy,” by which they seemed to mean general devastation.

Admiral Raphael Semmes, CSS Alabama, said this about the war coverage of Northern newspapers:<sup>46</sup>

The war had been a god-send for newspaperdom. The more extraordinary were the stories that were told by the venal and corrupt newspapers, the more greedily were they devoured by the craving and prurient multitude . . . without the least regard for the truth. . . . Such is the stuff of which a good deal of the Yankee histories of the late war will be made.

How true that last sentence turned out to be! The good citizens of the North were well aware of how the war was being conducted. And they were solidly behind the Union campaign of Southern cultural genocide. Why wouldn't they be? Yankees had been taught from birth that Southerners were ignorant, lazy, cruel slave masters, barbarians, racists. They had been brainwashed for generations into believing that Southerners did not deserve to be treated like civilized human beings, because they were not civilized human beings, and they therefore had no rights and deserved no respect. So whatever happened to Southerners was what they deserved, as far as Yankees were concerned.

AL, Grant, and other Yankee political and military leaders were all too happy to fulfill the belligerent wishes of their constituency. Gen Grant wrote this on Apr 11, 1863:<sup>47</sup>

Rebellion has assumed that shape now that it can only terminate by the complete subjugation of the South. . . . It is our duty to weaken the enemy, by destroying their means of subsistence, withdrawing their means of cultivating their fields, and in every other way possible.

---

<sup>46</sup> SRK, p287

<sup>47</sup> SRK, p287-288

*In every . . . way possible!* All is fair in war. No such thing as war crimes or rules of engagement or acceptable military conduct. Gen Sherman was even more blunt about it on Jan 31, 1864:<sup>48</sup>

The Government of the United States has . . . any and all rights which they choose to enforce in war – to take their lives, their homes, their lands, their everything. . . . War is simply power unrestrained by constitution. . . . To the persistent secessionist, why, death is mercy, and the quicker he or she is disposed of the better.

Nothing ambiguous about that! *Power unrestrained by constitution!* Power unrestrained by even the Union's own military standards of appropriate and acceptable conduct. Power unrestrained. Period. There was no longer even a facade of legitimacy. AL, from the very beginning, had no use for COTUS, and Sherman had no use for the internationally recognized rules of military conduct. That hadn't changed. What's surprising about Sherman's remarks is that he finally so freely admitted it.

The Union simply had no use for COTUS at all! All that mumbo-jumbo in AL's First Inaugural Address about contracts, perpetual Union, and a POTUS's solemn duty to preserve the Union as required by COTUS – the North was dumb, arrogant, and greedy enough to fall for it, but anyone who bothered actually reading COTUS would have seen immediately that AL was just blowing smoke up their Yankee skirts.

---

<sup>48</sup> SRK, p288

Also, recall these words from that First Inaugural:

Apprehension seems to exist among the people of the Southern States that by the accession of a Republican Administration their property and their peace and personal security are to be endangered. There has never been any reasonable cause for such apprehension.

Only the hideous face of AL could remain straight while uttering those words. No reasonable cause for apprehension? I believe the German Jews received similar assurances. And AL went on with:

I only press upon the public attention the most conclusive evidence of which the case is susceptible that the property, peace, and security of no section are to be in any wise endangered by the now incoming Administration. I add, too, that all the protection which, consistently with the Constitution and the laws, can be given will be cheerfully given to all the States when lawfully demanded, for whatever cause—as cheerfully to one section as to another.

There is a staggering dichotomy between what AL said and what AL did. And the North had the audacity to perpetuate the myth of *Honest Abe*?

On Jun 21, 1864, Sherman wrote this in a letter to War Secretary Stanton:<sup>49</sup>

There is a class of people [Southern] men, women, and children, who must be killed or banished before you can hope for peace and order.

---

<sup>49</sup> SRK, p288-289

Stanton replied:

Your letter of the 21<sup>st</sup> of June has just reached me and meets my approval.

Would that strategy be approved today, in say Iraq or Afghanistan? Just kill off the entire population and replace them with Americans? Of course not. But when AL's army employed it, he became a national hero. I guess it's not acceptable in other countries, but as long as it's only our own fellow Southern Americans that are being slaughtered and starved to death, it's okay. Even children, according to Sherman. Imagine that. Sherman was even afraid of little Southern children. What a brave Yankee general he was. The North must have been so proud!

Of course, it was only Southerners who were being slaughtered. They had no rights and deserved no respect. No big deal. Yankees had to get rid of even those little Southern kids before they had a chance to grow up. Just kill off as many Southerners as possible to make room for Yankees and Yankee culture.

Gen Halleck relayed these instructions from Gen Grant:

General Grant . . . directs that . . . you . . . make all the valleys south of the Baltimore and Ohio road a desert.

Of course those compassionate Yankees were kind enough to warn the citizens to move out of the way first. But move to where? If they managed to find a place that had not already been turned into desert, their presence in the new area simply included their new residence in the target zone. So the warnings weren't for the benefit of defenseless civilians, they were simply given to broaden the Yankee excuse for more destruction and starvation. Clever, those Yankees! Aren't you glad those brave, compassionate, enlightened Yanks were willing to subdue those evil, barbaric Southern women and children? Can you imagine what might have happened if the South had won the war?

One shudders to contemplate what may have become of the South, and America. Thank, you AL, for sending your brave warriors into the South to slaughter and starve those evil Southern women and children!

One Union officer sent this report from northern Louisiana:

No squad of men . . . can live anywhere we have been. The people have neither seed, corn, nor bread, or mills to grind the corn in if they had it, as I burned them wherever found. . . . I have taken from these people the mules with which they would raise a crop the coming year, and burned every surplus grain of corn.

Do I detect a note of pride in his work? Was that officer maybe bragging just a bit? Is it just me, or does he sound a touch giddy at the prospect of starving Southern civilians to death?

On Oct 9, 1864 Sherman wrote to Grant:<sup>50</sup>

Until we can repopulate Georgia, it is useless to occupy it, but the utter destruction of its roads, houses, and people will cripple their military resources.

*Repopulate*? What did he mean by that? Repopulate with Southerners? What Southerners? From where? If Sherman had his way, and he did to a great extent, there would be very few, if any, Southerners left in the South. Anywhere. He wasn't talking about repopulating with Southerners, he was talking about repopulating with Yankees. This was not just about winning the war, this was about cultural genocide. It was a very determined and deliberate effort to exterminate the Southern population and culture and replace it with Yankee citizens, Yankee culture, Yankee institutions, and Yankee rule.

---

<sup>50</sup> SRK, p290

*Extermination.* Where have we heard about that war tactic before? Let's see, now. Oh yes, I remember. World War II. The Holocaust. Union efforts to *exterminate* the Southern population and culture was eerily similar to Nazi efforts to *exterminate* the Jews. They went about it differently, but the goals were similar. Is *exterminate* too harsh a word for what the Union was doing?

Apparently Union Gen Philip Sheridan didn't think so. He said this to Gen Grant on Oct 11, 1864:<sup>51</sup>

Guerrilla parties . . . are becoming very formidable. . . . I know of no way to exterminate them except to burn out the whole country.

Exterminate. Burn out the whole country. Wow. American troops faced formidable guerrilla warfare in South Viet Nam. Did they respond by attempting to exterminate the entire South Viet Nam population, burn the entire country, and repopulate it with Americans? I don't recall hearing about that. I'm pretty sure that such a strategy would have brought the strongest condemnation upon the American military by the American public and by the international community. But in AL's war, that was not only acceptable, it was expected by the Northern citizens and demanded by Union officers. Once again, as long as it was just those lazy, ignorant, barbaric Southerners who were getting exterminated, the Union exterminators were heroes. Wasn't AL a great guy, and a truly great POTUS? AL – the Exterminator! He was sort of like a 19<sup>th</sup>-century Arnold Schwarzenegger movie hero.

AL said this in an Oct 27, 1864, letter to Sheridan:<sup>52</sup>

. . . My own personal admiration and gratitude for the month's operations in the Shenandoah Valley.

---

<sup>51</sup> SRK, p290

<sup>52</sup> SRK, p290

What Yankee POTUS wouldn't be proud of a Union general who is so darn good at killing defenseless Southern old men, women, children, and blacks, or at least driving them from their homes (and then burning them)?

But the North couldn't afford to rest on their laurels. As Gen Sherman said to Gen Sheridan:<sup>53</sup>

I am satisfied . . . that the problem of this war consists in the awful fact that the present class of men who rule the South must be killed outright rather than in the conquest of territory. . . . A great deal of it, yet remains to be done. . . . Therefore, I shall expect you on any and all occasions to make bloody results.

And on Jan 21, 1865 Sherman said:<sup>54</sup>

The people of the South . . . see . . . the sure and inevitable destruction of all their property. . . . They see in the repetition of such raids the inevitable result of starvation and misery.

It wasn't just about winning the war. It was about revenge. The Union was determined to not just subdue the Southern "rebellion", but to punish everyone in the Confederacy, or anyone sympathetic to it, or anyone suspected of being a Confederate sympathizer, and to eradicate Southern culture. They were quite successful. And we worship AL for doing it. Doesn't that seem odd? The only way the North could pull that off was to launch a massive propaganda campaign, designed to convince Americans and the world that the North had really acted out of compassion for the Southern slaves. It had all been about slavery, the propaganda would claim. And how did they get the ball rolling? With AL's Emancipation Proclamation. Even at that point, AL knew he had lost the Northern public

---

<sup>53</sup> SRK, p290

<sup>54</sup> SRK, p291

perception of having the moral high ground in his bloody, costly war, and he desperately needed EP to restore public support.

The North succeeded there, too. They successfully suppressed the truth and sold the world on a mythological story of the Civil War. But now they have a problem. They simply couldn't entirely erase history. They couldn't stop forever the truth from being exposed. And it is starting to come out. All we have to do is read what Yankees themselves said. Here's Gen Sherman again:<sup>55</sup>

I have [your] telegram saying the President had read my letter and thought it should be published. . . . [I] profess . . . to fight for but one single purpose, *viz*, to sustain a Government capable of vindicating its just and rightful authority, independent of niggers, cotton, money, or any earthly interest.

Oops. That doesn't sound like compassion for the Southern slaves, does it? By the way, what, exactly, was that *just and rightful authority*? I believe that was the Union. But hold on a minute. Didn't DOI say something about the *consent of the governed*? Aw heck, who cares about DOI? Or COTUS? No, don't you worry your pretty little head about all that stuff, according to CivilGate. The North won the Civil War, so Honest Abe and his merry band of Yankees were running the country, and the South was just going to have to get used to it. COTUS? Inalienable rights? States' Rights? Get over it, already! Uncle Sam wore the pants in this country after the war, and the states would follow orders – or else. Washington DC was running the show from there on out, and Uncle Sam didn't need no stinkin' Constitution to tell him how to do his job!

Just and rightful authority? The federal government decides what is just and rightful now, because they have full authority. Not based on some silly old obsolete COTUS, but based on the barrel of a Yankee gun. Throughout history, force had always been the most compelling argument. AL just needed to remind us of that most basic principle of

---

<sup>55</sup> SRK, p291

government. Thomas Jefferson told us about inalienable rights. AL showed us that even here in the land of the free and the home of the brave, rights are only as inalienable as our military might to enforce them. Might makes right. Then right makes more might. And it's always a *just and rightful authority*, no matter what they do, because the authority with the biggest guns gets to define *just and rightful*. Still, conquerors love to put a nice moral spin on things. For AL, it was the Emancipation Proclamation and the myth that the war had been about slavery after all, from the very beginning. (Never mind what he said in his First Inaugural Address).

If the Union had slaughtered and starved a few thousand innocent, defenseless Southern women and children in their great “moral” crusade, well that was just part of the Yankee job. But even after the guns had stopped exterminating Southerners, and the North had won the war, they still weren’t satisfied with their handiwork. Their cultural genocide project still had not gone far enough. This is the response of a carpetbagger to a man’s attempt in Vicksburg, MS, to recover his land:<sup>56</sup>

Instead of temporizing and arguing with traitors, I would urge the most prompt and effective measures of force to quell and exterminate them.

There’s that word *exterminate* again! This sentiment pleased the local federal official and his bosses in Washington, DC. There were still too many Southerners in the South as far as Yankees were concerned. Their hatred for the South knew no bounds. Their determination to complete the job of Southern genocide was as strong as ever. Their methods changed, but their mission remained the same: Southern cultural genocide.

---

<sup>56</sup> SRK, p291

Yankees used the same approach, cultural genocide, with Indians. Native Americans were much too laid-back for Yankees' taste. They weren't materialistic enough. They weren't mercenary or greedy enough. They were barbarians. That was unacceptable. So the North undertook the noble task of Native American cultural genocide, too. Indians were to be either killed or forced to be satisfactory Yankees.

To the North, cultural diversity was anathema. Southerners and Indians were both bête noire. It's hard to avoid the parallels between this Yankee arrogance and Hitler's vision of a superior Arian race. What's the difference between Hitler and Lincoln? Yankee propaganda. CivilGate.

Consider this analysis by Lyon G Tyler of Virginia:<sup>57</sup>

During the war for Southern independence the Northern generals everywhere disregarded the international law. The policy everywhere was cruel imprisonment, waste and destruction. Unlike General Lee, Lincoln revelled in using hard language – “Rebels”, “Insurgents”, etc, occur everywhere in his speeches, letters and messages. Because these terms are recognized as insulting, . . . such words were greatly objected to by our Revolutionary fathers, and a committee of the Continental Congress imputed to this habit of the British the licentious conduct of the British soldiers. They were taught by these words to look down upon the Americans, to despise them as inferior creatures. And the same influences operated upon the Northern soldiers, who plundered the South. Lincoln taught them. The North having no just cause for the invasion and destruction of the South, which only asked to be let alone, has ceaselessly tried to hide its crime by talking “slavery”. But logically flowing from this attitude is the idea that slavery deprived the South of every right whatever, which was the doctrine of the assassin, John Brown. General Sheridan's philosophy of war was “to leave to the

---

<sup>57</sup> SRK, p292-293

people nothing but their eyes to weep with over the war.” General Sherman’s, “to destroy the roads, houses, people, and repopulate the country”. General Grant’s to leave the Valley “a barren waste” and shoot “guerrillas without trial”; and President Lincoln’s the adoption of “emancipation and every other policy calculated to weaken the moral and physical forces of the rebellion”.

Yankee hatred extended even to dead Southerners. Yankees prevented Southern ladies from leaving flowers on the graves of their loved ones buried at Arlington Cemetery. Union forces at Antietam were finally forced to give Confederate soldiers a proper burial only when hogs began rooting their remains and stinking up the adjacent area where Union soldiers were buried.

There are some  
mystic chords of memory  
for you.

Even long after the last shots were fired and all the bodies had been buried, the campaign of Southern cultural genocide continued. When Reconstruction ended, the South was allowed to pretend that it had a free government. The North was confident that their domination and control of Dixie had been thorough and effective, and their goal of cultural genocide had been successful. They knew that if they ever needed to, they could reinstate Reconstruction at any time. And that’s just what happened. Textbooks used in Southern schools were just a little too historically accurate to be politically correct by CivilGate standards. So Yankees stepped in again to tighten their grip on Southern education, politics, and the media.

### We Don't Know What We Don't Know

In compliance with Machiavellian principles, the South is still allowed to pretend it is free, just as the Union is allowed to pretend it is still a constitutional republic. So we all still celebrate the Fourth of July and give lip service to DOI and COTUS. But very few Americans ever bother to read those documents any more, and very few of those who

read them understand them. Who cares? They are not relevant to the modern world, progressives tell us.

Americans don't learn the truth about American history in school. We think we do. We think we know everything we need to know. But, without doing any research on our own, how would we know what we don't know? That's exactly what our federal government is counting on. Because an ignorant electorate is an easily manipulated electorate. And the most ignorant citizens tend to howl the loudest about how easily led astray are those who happen to disagree with them. They close their minds and become useful idiots.

That is America today. That is the legacy of Lincoln. That is CivilGate.

## Chapter 6: We Are Not Enemies

We are not enemies, but friends. We must not be enemies. Though passion may have strained it must not break our bonds of affection. The mystic chords of memory, stretching from every battlefield and patriot grave to every living heart and hearthstone all over this broad land, will yet swell the chorus of the Union, when again touched, as surely they will be, by the better angels of our nature.

Those are the closing words of AL's First Inaugural Address. Let's take a look at how he put those words into action. This is how the better angels of the North's nature created some brand new mystic chords of memory. Let them now swell the chorus of the Union. This is how the North treated their friends, leaving one to ponder how they might have behaved had the South been their enemies.

### With Friends Like These

The South never had a chance. The North had the industry, and they had the men. Yet, in spite of all that, the South inflicted embarrassing and humiliating defeat on the North, time and time again. How could those Rebels do that, when they were clearly outnumbered, and when the North had God on their side? It just wasn't supposed to work that way, and Gen William Tecumseh Sherman, for one, was sick and tired of it. So he turned his wrath on the women and children of the South. Finally he found an enemy he could beat.

But just winning wasn't enough for Sherman. He wanted to prove what a big man he was. So he decided he would **make Georgia howl**. He decided he needed to exterminate large parts of the Southern population. And that's just what he did. Turns out, those Southern women, children, and a few old men were no match for Sherman and his army. The North must have been so proud of Sherman.

The Yankees took whatever food they could eat. They destroyed the rest. They also destroyed anything the South might be able to use to grow more food. Starvation was a key part of Sherman's battle plan, and it was very effective.

He also destroyed their factories. More than 2000 women, children, and old men who had worked there were shipped out of the South. Children were separated from their mothers, families were divided, and very few of them were ever heard from again. We have this from the newspaper in Louisville, Kentucky:

The train which arrived from Nashville last evening brought up from the South 249 women and children, who are sent here by orders of Gen Sherman to be transferred north of the Ohio River. These people are mostly in a destitute condition, having no means to provide for themselves a support.

They were advertised in newspapers like any other commodity. They were forced to work for subsistence wages. They became white slaves in all but name. Yet they were better off than the families they left behind in the South. Homes were destroyed. Survivors were mercifully allowed (sometimes) to keep the clothes they were wearing, but that did not include their jewelry. Sherman's army helped themselves to the jewelry Southern people were wearing. They had no means of production, no way of feeding themselves, and no possibility of working even for subsistence wages, because there was no place left for them to work. Everything had been burned or otherwise destroyed.

In one town, young women and children were kept in the town square for almost a week.

There they suffered in the July Georgia heat and dirt. Once their Yankee guards found the whiskey supply, the young women lived in constant terror.

Good thing Abe's goons were *friends* of the South.

Otherwise, things could have gotten ugly.

When Missouri wanted to join the Confederacy, AL reacted quickly, sending in troops to deal with Southern sympathizers there. In one little town, Palmyra, a Union informer went missing. The Yankee authorities assumed he had been taken by Southern military forces. Yankees demanded the informer be returned, and threatened to kill ten Southerners being held in jail.

Those ten prisoners had no connection at all with the Southern military, and their only crime had been expressing pro-Southern opinions. Those poor ignorant, misguided Southerners may have somehow held on to the silly notion that that was free speech protected by COTUS. Not in AL's government. Had Abe been the least bit concerned with Constitutional rights, he would never have invaded the South in the first place. Free speech was the first right to go.

When the informer did not return, Yankee Gen McNeil ordered the execution of the 10 men in jail. They were mostly family men, active in church, ranging in age from 19 to 60. Both pro-Southern and pro-Northern citizens protested, but the order was backed at the highest levels of the Union government, and Yankees were not at all interested in listening to reason.

Thirty Union troops fired at the men. They were extremely poor shots. Only three men were killed instantly, and one was not hit at all. So the 30 reserve troops standing by were called on to finish the job. Walking among the condemned men, the Yankees found they were better able to hit a target at point-blank range.

There's a mystic chord of memory for you.

Decent people in the North protested loudly. The stench reached all the way to London. The issue came up a couple times in AL's cabinet meetings, as they tried to find some way to spin the atrocity into a happy Yankee face. But, they ended up just ignoring it, and it eventually went away. The South was certainly in no position to pursue the matter, and the North was much too busy committing other atrocities. To that end, Gen

McNeil was quickly promoted to Brigadier General of United States Volunteers. So all over this broad land swelled the bloody chorus of the Union. The North must have been so proud.

Good thing Abe's goons were *friends* of the South.

Otherwise, things could have gotten ugly.

Sam Davis was a young Confederate soldier who, as a member of a an elite group, entered Yankee-controlled territory to gather information. During a visit to his home, he was captured while wearing his uniform, but he was condemned to death as a spy, not held as a prisoner of war. He was offered his freedom many times, and tempted with rewards if he would betray the members of his unit. The Yankees did not know that Davis' commander was being held in the cell right next door, and Davis never pointed the finger at him, even though it would have made little difference to the Confederate cause, and it would have saved Davis' life. How many Yankee soldiers showed that kind of courage and devotion? Not that a Yankee soldier captured in uniform would have been put in that position in the first place. In the South that was considered a war crime. In the North it was considered business as usual. But that didn't mean Yankees considered the South enemies or anything. Honest Abe, after all, said they were *friends*.

Good thing Abe's goons were *friends* of the South.

Otherwise, things could have gotten ugly.

## The Conduct of Federal Troops

While Sam Davis suffered the fatal consequences of Yankee friendship in Tennessee, Louisiana's Governor, Henry Watkins Allen, was so appalled by Yankee atrocities in his state that he ordered commissioners to gather eyewitness testimony and make a written record. The result of that effort was *The Conduct of Federal Troops in Louisiana*, and from it we learn the following.

It shows, among other things, that Yankee contempt for Southerners was so strong that not even churches or tombs of the recent dead were spared. So it is no surprise that Southern life meant nothing, either. Louisiana was comprised of a northern section, and the southern section which included New Orleans. That city, having been lightly defended and easily accessible by the Mississippi River, was captured quickly and easily. Yankee soldiers moved into the city, hoisted the US flag over the Mint Building, then returned to their ship for the night. A patriotic young Southerner climbed to the roof and removed the flag. The 21-year-old was arrested, thrown in jail, and sentenced to death by hanging. Pleas for mercy were useless.

Good thing the North and South were not *enemies*.

Gen Benjamin Butler was responsible for that execution. Like Sherman, Butler loved to prove what a big man he was by picking on women and children. He ordered that Union troops were to consider all women of New Orleans as prostitutes and treat them as such. "Beast" Butler closed churches and newspapers if they did not affirm loyalty to the Union to his satisfaction. Women and members of the clergy were imprisoned without indictment or trial for not openly embracing the Union cause. Like AL, "Spoons" Butler<sup>58</sup> had absolutely no regard for Constitutional rights or even the most basic human decency.

Butler had a reputation for stealing silverware.

From New Orleans Butler spread his brand of tyranny and terror westward, ransacking homes and stealing valuables all along the way. But he wasn't content with taking things like food and jewelry; he took even the clothing people were wearing, and the bed clothes from invalids.

Such good *friends*, those Yankees.

At Fausse Pointe, Yankees  
bit a woman's finger, causing

Good thing the North and South were not *enemies*.

---

<sup>58</sup> CWC, p50

it to bleed profusely, to get her ring. They ripped the earrings from her ears. Her husband, hearing her cries for help, went to her aid. He was shot twice.

In Morgan City, Yankee soldiers broke into a tomb, tossed out the remains of Dr Brashear, and stole the metal coffin.

Good thing Abe's goons were *friends* of the South. Otherwise, things could have gotten ugly.

In New Iberia, Yankees used materials from graves for their hearthstones and chimneys. The cemetery became a Yankee horse corral. They ransacked burial vaults and scattered the remains.

Such good *friends*, those Yankees.

Churches all along the way were ransacked and pillaged. The materials and buildings were used for whatever vile purposes suited the depraved Yankees' fancy.

So much for the *better angels of their nature*.

When the Confederate soldiers arrived, they sent the Yankees in retreat back toward New Orleans. It must have been extremely embarrassing and humiliating for the Yankees to have to face the fact that the only army they could defeat was one of defenseless women, children, and old men. But they had no shame, because they had no pride.

Confederates chased the Yankees into Alexandria, Louisiana. Once again, the Yankees took out their frustrations on the defenseless civilians. The town was burned to the ground. No warning was given, so women and children were forced to flee to the river to escape the flames. A St Louis Republican (Yankee) reporter described the scene this way:

Women gathering their helpless babes in their arms, rushing frantically through the streets with screams and cries that would have melted the hardest hearts to tears; little boys and girls running hither and thither crying for their mothers and fathers; old men leaning on a staff for support to their trembling limbs, hurrying away from the suffocating heat of their burning dwellings and homes.

Good thing Abe's goons were *friends* of the South.  
Otherwise, things could have gotten ugly.

It wasn't only white civilians in the South who were victimized by Yankee arrogance, ignorance, and bigotry. At Vermilion, in southern Louisiana, Yankees set fire to a man's house. He managed to get his children and sick wife to safety, then begged the Yanks to help him put out the fire before it destroyed everything he owned. They refused to help, but a slave from the neighboring plantation offered assistance. Their efforts were in vain, but the Yankees were furious because the slave's behavior simply did not fit with their preconceived prejudices about the South. They accused the slave, Benjamin George, of being there only to rob his neighbor, or maybe he had been paid to help. He explained that he had helped his neighbor simply because of their friendship. When he couldn't turn over the fictitious money he had supposedly been paid, the Yankees shot him in the leg, leaving him an invalid for life. One can only imagine the evil that may have befallen blacks like Benjamin George at the hands of those savage, racist white Southerners had not the compassionate Yankee liberators come along and rescued them.

Good thing Abe's goons were *friends* of the South.  
Otherwise, things could have gotten ugly.

Here's another example. In Alexandria Yankees stopped at a small, well-furnished house and asked the black lady there where her master was. She explained that she had no master, that she was a free black woman, but the Yankees called her a liar,

because they knew, in their words, that **niggers could not own property in this state.** They stole everything they wanted and destroyed everything else, including her house. Apparently the Yankee concept of freeing the slaves meant freeing them from all their worldly possessions. The North must have been so proud.

So much for the *better angels of their nature.*

In the summer of 1864, Yankees invented the Human Shield policy, used so effectively by Saddam Hussein much later. The city of Charleston, South Carolina, was under heavy attack from Union forts and navy, which had formed a blockade. Still, the Confederates were holding their own. So the Yankees placed 600 Confederate POWs in front of the Union position, holding them in a stockade of less than two acres. They were placed so that any shot that the Confederates did not aim very carefully would kill the Confederate POWs, not Yankees.

There were no sanitary facilities in the stockade. Their only supply of water was from holes they dug in the sand, but that water was quickly contaminated with salt water, garbage, and sewage. They ate food that had been condemned by the Union as unfit for Yankee soldiers. Their rations were worm- and insect-infested hardtack, and eight ounces of sour corn meal.

Hardtack is a tiny piece of pork, one inch square by one-half inch thick.

Some have tried to justify this behavior on the grounds that Union POWS were treated just as badly. But that is disproven, in part, by Yankee testimony. Many Charleston residents gave clothing and as much food as they could spare to Yankee POWs. They received about five times as much food as their Confederate counterparts. Imagine that. The residents of Charleston were willing to give of their scarce food and clothing to the very men who were determined to exterminate them, the men who had destroyed the South's schools, libraries, courthouses and records, railroads and bridges, and any means of production.

The huge difference in treatment of prisoners by the two sides is also demonstrated by the fact that many more Yankee POWs (around 65%) changed their allegiance to the Southern cause, while very few (about 1%) of Confederate POWs joined the Union ranks.

Perhaps that stark contrast was due also to the fact that the Human Shield policy did not work, and once again the depravity of the North was exposed so clearly that even Yankees couldn't ignore it. After a few months, the POWs were moved to another prison. The treatment there was no better, but at least they were no longer being used as human shields.

POWs on both sides suffered badly. There was no possibility of them being well-fed when the soldiers themselves didn't have enough to eat. POWs in every war have it rough, and that's part of the hell of war. But the atrocities inflicted on Southern civilians was unjustifiable and inexcusable. That is particularly true when we look at how Yankees treated blacks in the South. After all, according to CivilGate, it was the benevolent Yankees who were fighting to liberate the oppressed slaves. Yet by late in the war, even Union officials had to admit that the US Army's conduct toward the black Southern population had undesirable effects. Here are just a few more examples of the countless Yankee atrocities.

On August 13, 1861, War Secretary Simon Cameron received a letter confirming rapes against blacks committed by Union military forces. Records of the Third Ohio Cavalry include this August, 1862 entry: **negro women are debauched**. According to an April 7, 1864, report from Memphis: **The [white] cavalry broke en masse in the camps of the colored women and are committing all sorts of outrage.**

There's a mystic chord of memory for you.

In a report to War Secretary Edwin Stanton, Union Gen Rufus A Saxton said:

I found the prejudice of color and race here in full force, and the general feeling of the army of occupation was unfriendly to the blacks. It was manifested in various forms of personal insult and abuse, in depredations on their plantations, stealing and destroying their crops and domestic animals, and robbing them of their money. . . . The women were held as the legitimate prey of lust.

Such good *friends*, those Yankees.

When the Sixteenth Indiana Mounted Infantry invaded Bayou Grande Cailou, Louisiana, things did not go well on one plantation. According to one account:

Mr Pelton . . . reported that a soldier had shot and killed a little girl and had fired at a negro man on his plantation. I . . . proceeded to the place, where I found a mulatto girl, about twelve or thirteen years old, lying dead in a field. I learned from the negro man . . . that the girl had been shot by a drunken soldier, who had first fired at one of the men . . . [who] had witnessed the killing. . . .

Good thing Abe's goons were *friends* of the South.

Otherwise, things could have gotten ugly.

Gen Robert A Cameron reported the same incident on November 20:

I heard by rumor . . . one of [Union Capt Columbus Moore's] men had attempted to rape a mulatto girl and had shot and killed her for resisting.

So much for the *better angels of their nature*.

### Compassion, Yankee Style

When Yankees invaded the Cajun area of Bisland, Louisiana, they enticed or forced slaves away from their plantation homes. Many of them ended up serving in the Union army or on a government plantation. When Confederate forces recaptured the area, they discovered that some 2000 of the former slaves had died while following the retreating Union forces. They found others in a small house filled with dead and dying Negroes, some being eaten by worms even before they died. Roads were lined with blacks who were starving, sick, unable to help themselves, wearing very little clothing. After two months of Yankee freedom, their only question was whether their master was coming back to take care of them.

There's a mystic chord of memory for you.

The Union had plenty of food, but didn't feed the freed slaves. The Confederacy, which had very little of any necessity, gave the blacks food, medicine, and transportation. It was the South that saved them. It was the North that almost killed them, and did in fact kill thousands of their brothers and sisters.

Once again we see the true angels of their nature on both sides, and the truth is far different from the CivilGate narrative. It is also vastly different from AL's words and speeches. Little wonder Yankees went to such great lengths to keep the truth hidden.

Those *mystic chords of memory* have become mythical chords of propaganda. It's time to set the record straight.

## Chapter 7: Reconstruction and the 14th Amendment<sup>59</sup>

### The South Must Be Punished

In the Civil War, the North was determined to punish the South. In Reconstruction, the North was determined to transform the South into the Yankee image. They tried to eradicate Southern culture and duplicate the North in the South. Thaddeus Stevens, a Radical Republican, knew just how to get started:

Hang the leaders – crush the South – arm the Negroes – confiscate the land. . . . Our generals have a sword in one hand and shackles in the other. . . . The South must be punished under the rules of war, its land confiscated. . . . These offending States were out of the Union and in the role of a belligerent nation to be dealt with by the laws of war and conquest.

*Out of the Union?* How could that be? AL's rationale for the Civil War was that secession was impossible, and that therefore the South had simply started a rebellion. *A belligerent nation?* All the South had wanted was to be left alone as an independent nation, and the North had refused to accept that. The South became "belligerent" only when the North invaded them. Nations tend to get "belligerent" when they are forced to defend themselves. But fact, reason, and reality were not important to the North. They hadn't been important when the North decided to invade the South, and they weren't important now that the North was beginning to occupy the South. Why worry about the truth when propaganda is so much more convenient and effective? Sure, AL had said in his First Inaugural Address that:

We are not enemies, but friends. We must not be enemies. Though passion may have strained it must not break our bonds of affection. The mystic chords of memory,

---

<sup>59</sup> SRK, p167-183

stretching from every battlefield and patriot grave to every living heart and hearthstone all over this broad land, will yet swell the chorus of the Union, when again touched, as surely they will be, by the better angels of our nature.

Ah, yes, can't you just feel the love in Thaddeus Stevens' plans for the South? Was he one of those *better angels* of the North's nature? What fond *mystic chords of memory* linger today in the hearts and minds of Southerners. Don't you just get all choked up when you read AL's lofty rhetoric?

### Reconstruction

The Reconstruction Act was enacted by Congress on March 2, 1867. The South was divided into five districts, each under military rule and commanded by a brigadier general (or higher rank). It was, essentially, a reinvasion of the South, and civil government there was abolished. The governors of Southern states lost their power. The military dictator of each district made up new rules governing voter registration, and under their rules many Southerners lost the right to vote, while illiterates, Scalawags, and Carpetbaggers gained the right to vote.

According to CivilGate, Reconstruction was a time of rebuilding and restoration of the South, physically, politically, and culturally. But one member of the House of Representatives painted quite a different picture on Mar 23, 1872:<sup>60</sup>

From turret to foundation you tore down the government of eleven States. You left not one stone upon another. You not only destroyed their local laws, but you trampled upon their ruins. You called conventions to frame new Constitutions for those old States. You not only said who should be elected to rule over these States, but you said who should elect them. You fixed the quality and the color of the voters. You purged the ballot box

---

<sup>60</sup> SRK, p365-367

of intelligence and virtue, and in their stead you placed the most ignorant and unqualified race in the world to rule over these people.

Let the great State of Georgia speak first. You permitted her to stand up and start in her new career, but seeing some flaw in your handiwork, you again destroyed and again reconstructed her State government. You clung to her throat; you battered her features out of shape and recognition, determined that your party should have undisputed possession and enjoyment of her offices, her honors, and her substance. Then bound hand and foot you handed her over to the rapacity of robbers. Her prolific and unbounded resources inflamed their desires.

In 1861 Georgia was free from debt. Taxes were light as air. The burdens of government were easy upon her citizens. Her credit stood high, and when the war closed she was still free from indebtedness. After six years of Republican rule you present her, to the horror of the world, loaded with a debt of \$50,000,000, and the crime against Georgia is the crime this same party has committed against the other Southern States. Your work of destruction was more fatal than a scourge of pestilence, war or famine.

Rufus B Bullock, Governor of Georgia, dictated the legislation of Congress, and the great commonwealth of Georgia was cursed by his presence. With such a Governor, and such a legislature in perfect harmony, morally and politically, their career will go down to posterity without a rival for infamous administrations of the world. That Governor served three years and then absconded with all of the gains. The legislature of two years spent \$100,000 more than had been spent during any eight previous years. They even put the children's money, laid aside for education of white and black, into their own pockets.

There is no form of ruin to which she has not fallen a prey, no curse with which she has not been baptized, no cup of humiliation and suffering her people have not drained to

the dregs. There she stands the result of your handiwork, bankrupt in money, ruined in credit, her bonds hawked about the streets at ten cents on the dollar, her prosperity blighted at home and abroad, without peace, happiness, or hope. There she stands with her skeleton frame admonishing all the world of the loathsome consequences of a government fashioned in hate and fanaticism, and founded upon the ignorant and vicious classes of manhood. Her sins may have been many and deep, and the color of scarlet, yet they will become as white as snow in comparison with those you have committed against her in the hour of her helplessness and distress.

I challenge the darkest annals of the human race for a parallel to the robberies which have been perpetrated on these eleven American States. Had you sown seeds of kindness and good will they would long ere this have blossomed into prosperity and peace. Had you sown seeds of honor, you would have reaped a golden harvest of contentment and obedience. Had you extended your charities and your justice to a distressed people you would have awakened a grateful affection in return. But as you planted in hate and nurtured in corruption so have been the fruits which you have gathered.

It's not surprising that someone from Georgia would feel that way. We can hardly consider that an objective analysis coming from a Georgian, or any Southerner, for that matter. What's surprising about it is that those are the words of Dan Vorhees, from Indiana. So much for rebuilding, restoring, and reconstructing the South. So much for preserving the Union. If that was the North's idea of preserving the Union, is it any wonder that the South seceded? They didn't know exactly how events would play out, or the depths of Yankee depravity, but the South was absolutely right to fight for their freedom and independence. The North destroyed the South during the war and during Reconstruction, and they destroyed the Union in the process. Even worse, they guaranteed that the Union would never be able to recover. That guarantee is known as the 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment.

## The 14th Amendment

We've seen that the North had launched a successful military invasion of the South on the grounds that Southern states had not seceded, and could not secede, because it was impossible to do so. The North had utterly demolished most of the South, and committed genocide to subdue the rebels. Civil government there had been replaced by Northern military dictators. But still the North had a problem. They still could not control the South.

Between the end of the war and the beginning of Reconstruction, the Southern states had retained their rights as states. They helped ratify the 13<sup>th</sup> Amendment (abolishing slavery), but they rejected the 14<sup>th</sup>. That, of course, was unacceptable to the North, and they realized that their tyrannical domination of the South still had not gone far enough. So they suddenly reversed course and took the position that the Confederate states were not part of the Union after all.

It was a stunning rejection of the very core of their justification for invading the South in the first place. Yet it should not have been surprising, since the North had often switched sides of an issue, depending on which side worked to their political advantage at the moment. This was just another example of the North's supreme arrogance, tyranny, and hypocrisy. The South was part of the Union when they voted to abolish slavery, but when they rejected the 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment, they were magically excluded from the Union, and therefore from Congress. Without Southern votes in Congress, the North had the votes to pass any legislation they supported. When President Andrew Johnson vetoed it, they had no trouble immediately overriding his veto. The North had total power and control, and the South was as defenseless politically during Reconstruction as they had been militarily during the war.

With new state legislatures in place, puppets of the five Northern military dictators, the South "ratified" the 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment. Ratification was the price each Southern state was

required to pay to get back into the Union. So, here we clearly see the depths of Northern hypocrisy in action. The Confederate states, which had not wanted to be part of the Union, were denied the right to secede. But now the North had arbitrarily reversed course and decided to exclude them from the Union until they ratified the 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment. Yet, ratifying that Amendment was something only a state in the Union could do, and the South no longer consisted of Union states. The North had no regard for COTUS, the law, or even logic or reason. The North had, starting with AL, assumed dictatorial powers, and Yankee will had replaced COTUS as the supreme law of the land.

This ratification vote was entirely illegal and unconstitutional, but Congress simply ignored the previous legal vote in which the South had rejected the amendment. The 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment was never legally ratified. It was *legislation without representation*.<sup>61</sup> And it wasn't only the South that was denied Constitutional representation. The state of New Jersey realized the tyranny of the North's conduct, and drew attention to it in a scathing resolution. They, among other actions, withdrew their support for the 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment, but the Northern Congress simply ignored them and counted New Jersey as a vote for ratification. Ohio and Oregon also repealed their ratifications.

*Ex post facto* laws, such as the 14th Amendment, are prohibited by the Constitution. But then nothing about the 14th Amendment was legal. It was never properly submitted to the states, and it was never legally ratified.

The 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment defined (for the first time) US citizenship. There had never before been any such thing as an American citizen. We had all been citizens of a state. The amendment's prohibitions are all directed at states, not at the federal government. It bars from public office any person who had taken an oath of office, then later

---

<sup>61</sup> SRK, p175

participated in the Confederacy. It gives the federal government all the power it needs to completely take over the internal affairs of a state.

## Life After COTUS

Any lingering signs of life left in COTUS after the Civil War were snuffed out by the 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment. As Benjamin Franklin famously said, **A republic if you can keep it.** We couldn't even keep it a full century. COTUS was dead, and with it the republic. Any hope of returning America to a Constitutional democratic republic must begin by learning and accepting the truth of the Civil War and Reconstruction. The 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment, even though upheld by all three branches of government, is not legally the law of the land, and it never will be. The time has come for freedom-loving Americans to stand up and say so.

What difference does it make now? What's done is done, and it's too late to change it, right? No, it isn't. All we need to do is decide to return to COTUS, and face the truth about how we have strayed so far from it in the first place. It started with the Civil War and Reconstruction. After that, the federal government was in complete control of the country, and the states remained in name only. Prior to the war, it was a very different form of government. Article I, Section 10 of the antebellum Constitution is the only part of that document that places restrictions on states.<sup>62</sup> Every other part of the original Constitution was about restraining the federal government, not states. After Reconstruction, those federal restraints had been removed, and the federal government's power was limited only by its desire to avoid a national rebellion. The federal government is now free to do whatever it believes it can get away with. Unfortunately, we have been willing to let it get away with tyranny. But it doesn't have to be that way.

---

<sup>62</sup> SRK, p177

Once the total power of the North had been firmly established in the South, relations between the two sections of the country settled into an unwritten truce. The South quietly accepted total domination by the North, and in return the North allowed the South to pretend they still had a bit of self-government. This era of “peace” lasted from the end of Reconstruction to the mid-1940s.<sup>63</sup> At that point, Southern states successfully dislodged the Scalawags and Carpetbaggers. But by then, it didn’t matter at all to the North. The damage had been done. It was a badly needed psychological victory for the South, but the federal government still illegitimately rules the South, and in fact, all the states.

It will continue to do so as long as it can perpetuate its lies about the Civil War. Once Americans begin to see their history as it actually happened, they will begin to understand that our current form of government was **established by fraud, corruption, political coercion, and blatant military aggression.**<sup>64</sup> We still love to quote the words **of the people, by the people, and for the people**, but that is merely an illusion. Not just for the South, but for the entire country. To make it a reality again, we must either restore COTUS in the United States, or form a separate Constitutional republic. Neither option seems practical or even remotely possible now. That’s exactly what the North had in mind. That’s exactly what the South was trying to prevent. That’s what the Framers had tried to prevent.

---

<sup>63</sup> SRK, p179

<sup>64</sup> SRK, p182

## Chapter 8: Summary and Conclusions

### The Cost of War

Around 650,000 Americans lost their lives because of the Civil War, according to some estimates. If you add together all the US military deaths from World War I, World War II, the Korean War, and the Vietnam War, that still doesn't equal the slaughter of the Civil War. By 1865, 25% of all Southern white draft-age men were dead. Approximately 6,000 American troops have lost their lives in the Afghanistan and Iraq wars. At least 100 times that number of Americans lost their lives during the 4-year War for Southern Independence.

Including 364,000 Union troops and 260,000 Confederate troops.

The rest (up to 26,000) were Southern civilian casualties.

The South lost two-thirds of its wealth. More than half of its farm machinery, 40% of its livestock, most of its infrastructure, and many entire cities were gone.<sup>65</sup> Prior to the war, Louisiana and South Carolina were the wealthiest states in the Union. Mississippi had more millionaires per capita than New York.<sup>66</sup>

AL didn't expect the country to have to pay such a tragic price in terms of human life, and I suspect that if he had realized that at the time of his inauguration, he would have approached things differently. But he made the decision to invade the South and ignore COTUS. The blood of the Civil War is on Lincoln's hands.

The Civil War was unjustifiable, and unnecessary. It destroyed States' Rights, and therefore COTUS. Or to state it another way, AL destroyed COTUS, and therefore States' Rights. AL did not preserve the Union, he killed it, and as a result we no longer

---

<sup>65</sup> CWC, p77-78

<sup>66</sup> SRK, p145

have a Constitutional republic. Perhaps, in his own misguided, despotic way, AL loved his country. He loved it to death.

### Why?

Why did AL rush into the Civil War? To preserve the Union? You can't preserve the Union by destroying the Union. To free the slaves? I have shown that Southern slavery was not AL's motivation for invading the South, but even if abolition had been AL's goal, war was not the solution. Constitutionally, politically, economically, morally, pragmatically, there were much better ways of accomplishing the same thing.

The South had the Constitutional and moral right to secede from the Union. It was a natural right that superseded even COTUS. The North prevented by force the South's exercise of that natural right. Their invasion of the Confederate States was not only illegal and immoral, it was blatantly hypocritical. It clearly contradicted the principles of DOI and our own Revolutionary War. It was inconsistent with US encouragement and recognition of the Republic of Texas's secession from Mexico. The US assisted in Panama's secession from Columbia. The obvious truth is that the Union did not act based on some legal or moral objection to secession, it acted based on their own economic self-interest. It was about money and power, not some Constitutional obligation to preserve the Union, or some moral compassion for blacks. The US is for secession when it suits their purposes, and it is against secession when they do not perceive it to be in their best interest.

Clearly, freeing the Southern slaves was not the reason for the war, as AL stated in his First Inaugural Address and on several other occasions. But even if AL had been determined to eliminate slavery immediately throughout the country, which would have been a noble endeavor, was war the only option? Was war the best option? Absolutely not. One alternative was to simply pay Southern slave owners to free their slaves. That's the approach England ended up using, successfully and peacefully. Would that

have worked in America? I don't know, but the idea was already out there. Why didn't AL at least try to make it work? How much would that have cost? I don't know. How much did the war cost?

Many countries had ended slavery peacefully by the end of the Civil War, including England. The Dutch colonies, Puerto Rico, Brazil, and Cuba also ended slavery during or shortly after the war. In fact, every Western Christian slave-holding society had peacefully abandoned slavery.<sup>67</sup> The same would have happened in the South. The Civil War was not necessary. Slavery was already dying in the South, and even if it took longer than in the North, everyone understood that it was coming to an end. The Southern labor shortage would have ended naturally, just as it had in the North, and Southern white men did not want to compete with slave labor any more than Yankees did.

Why do we think AL was such a great leader, when he failed to accomplish what the leaders of all those other nations had achieved? They all managed to end slavery peacefully. AL slaughtered 650,000 Americans. And he didn't do it trying to end slavery. He did it trying to preserve the North's cash flow. Those other countries found reasonable, legal solutions to the slavery problem. AL broke every law in the book and destroyed our Constitutional democratic republican form of government in a despotic temper tantrum against the South. Since when does America treat war criminals as national heroes?

EP did not free the slaves. AL did not free the slaves. The Civil War did not free the slaves. The 13<sup>th</sup> Amendment freed the slaves. And since the South helped ratify the 13<sup>th</sup> Amendment, the South did more to free the slaves than AL did. But not even that made blacks truly free.

---

<sup>67</sup> CWC, p98

The Civil War was America at its worst. It was a long, lethal case study in how a democratic constitutional republic is not supposed to work. Plenty of other POTUSSs have ignored COTUS, but no other POTUS wasted so many lives in the process, and did so much irreparable damage to the country.

The Civil War was not the work of a great leader. It was the work of a tyrant. AL took us back to the pre-Constitution primitive world of might-makes-right. He was motivated by money and power, not compassion for slaves, high moral values, or devotion to Constitutional principles. He was exactly the kind of man COTUS was designed to protect us against. Yet we honor him. That's because we don't know him. That's because of CivilGate.

### What If?

Things could have and should have worked out very differently. What would have happened if Lincoln had said this in his First Inaugural Address:

We part as friends. We hope to reunite as friends. There will be no coercion of the Southern states by the people of the North. No state shall be kept in the Union against its will. Such a turn of events would be contrary to every principle of free government that we cherish. But we ask the Southern states, to which we are bound by mystic chords of memory and affection, that they reconsider their action. If not now, then later, when the heat of anger has subsided, when they have seen the actions of this administration work only for the good of the whole and not for the partisan designs of a few; when this administration shows by word and deed that it is happy to live within the confines of the Constitution, that we will admit of no interference in the established institutions of the several states. I trust that by our demeanor, by our character, by our actions, by our prosperity and our progress we will prove to our separated brethren that we should again be more than neighbors, we should be more than friends, we should in fact be united states, for a house united is far stronger, will be far more prosperous, and

will be far happier, than a house divided, a house rent asunder by rancor, a house that undermines its very foundations by separation.

To the people of Maryland, Virginia, Delaware, Kentucky, Missouri, Tennessee, and Arkansas, I have a special message. I tell you that this government will raise no arms against the states of the Southern Confederacy. We will wage no war of subjugation against those states. And I confirm, yet again, that I have neither the right, nor the power, nor the desire to abolish slavery within these states or any other where it is lawfully established. What I do desire, as do all the Northern states, is that we be once again a nation united in peace, amity, and common government. Let us through prayer and good graces work to achieve that end. I ask that all good men of the United States, and those now separated from us, work peacefully to achieve the reconciliation that is our destiny and our hope. Four score years ago we created a new nation, united in principle. I pray that sharing the same God, the same continent, and the same destiny, we might unite again in common principle and common government.<sup>68</sup>

But wouldn't secession have destroyed the nation? No. The South would have faced enormous pressure from the international community to join them in recognizing the unjustifiable evils of slavery. Most people in the South already well understood that slavery was wrong, and they accepted that it would go away at some point. The only question was when and how. No one knew the answer, but no one expected slavery to continue in the South indefinitely. It was impossible, and the South understood that. Most Southerners were eager for slavery to end.

Furthermore, it would have been increasingly apparent to the Confederacy how much they were sacrificing as a separate nation. They needed the North, and the North needed the South. As great as their cultural and political differences were, both sides knew that it was in their best interest to be united as a nation, so they would have found a way to make it happen and make it work.

---

<sup>68</sup> CWC, p331-332

Had this process been allowed to play out, it would have presented a number of problems in the short term. But there is good reason to believe that true freedom and equality for blacks would have been achieved much sooner if it had not been for the Civil War and Reconstruction. There is good reason to believe that most of the lingering racism and racial tension today would have been avoided if the South had been allowed to come to terms with slavery on its own.

### What Should Lincoln and the North Have Done?

They should have passed the 13<sup>th</sup> Amendment immediately. If the North and AL were in fact the noble slave liberators of CivilGate myth, abolishing slavery immediately should have been very easy. It wouldn't have affected slavery in the Confederacy, but that wasn't AL's goal in the beginning, anyway. And the South would soon have felt isolated and increasingly embarrassed as the world's last slave country.

The North should have lowered their tariff rate to be competitive with the South's rate, or even eliminated the tariff, at least temporarily, if necessary. Then international commercial interests would have had no financial incentive to reroute their ships to New Orleans.

The North should have launched a worldwide public relations campaign against Southern slavery. By using all available political and diplomatic means to focus international attention on the evils of slavery in the South, the Confederacy would have faced increasing pressure to abandon slavery and join the rest of the civilized world in recognizing slavery as the evil it was. The North should have formed alliances with countries who were willing to place diplomatic, political, and economic pressure on the South. Then the North would have flourished while the South withered. Soon the South would have wanted to rejoin the Union, and there would have been no reason to try to force them to do so.

The North should have sent abolitionists into the South to covertly encourage and assist slaves to escape into the North. The Underground Railroad should have extended its operations throughout the South, and the North should have welcomed freed blacks into Yankee society, culture, and commerce. That would have required repealing state laws discriminating against blacks. It would not have been a violation of the Confederacy's sovereignty, but it would have been very effective in reducing or eliminating slavery in the South. Slavery was already dying there; the North could have simply been speeding up the process. Peacefully.

They should have at all times encouraged the Confederacy to rejoin the Union. They should have acknowledged their right to secede and the sovereignty of the Confederacy, but encouraged the South to regain all the advantages and benefits they had given up when they seceded. They should have done everything possible to help find an acceptable way to end slavery in the South without massive sudden economic, social, and cultural upheaval. That was important for the slaves as well as their owners. It wouldn't have been that difficult, because workers in the South didn't want to have to compete with slave labor any more than Yankees did. Offering carrots instead of just a massive federal stick would have been much more effective, humane, legal, and Constitutional. The North should have strived to always make themselves the sort of Union that the South would want to return to.

That Lincoln would have been a great leader.

## Why Should We Worry About the Civil War Today?

According to CivilGate, we shouldn't. AL preserved the Union and freed the slaves. Case closed. End of story. Since you have read this far, you have seen that CivilGate is a lie. But so what? Governments lie. Not exactly front-page news. The Civil War is ancient history. Today, who cares? That too, is part of the CivilGate con.

Most Americans today refuse to accept or even consider the truth about the Civil War. Why do we refuse to acknowledge that we are no longer a Constitutional republic? Why do we pretend to have a government bound by COTUS? Why do we cling to the illusion that AL preserved the Union and freed the slaves? Niccolo Machiavelli explains it well in his advice to the new rulers of a conquered nation accustomed to liberty:

[The new rulers] must at least retain the semblance of the old forms; so that it may seem to the people that there has been no change in the institutions, even though in fact they are entirely different from the old ones. For the great majority of mankind are satisfied with appearances, as though they were realities, and are often even more influenced by the things that seem than by those that are. . . . [The new rulers should] not wish that the people . . . should have occasion to regret the loss of any of their old customs. . . .<sup>69</sup>

We cling to those illusions and lies because that is exactly what the federal government needs us to do. It's part of the CivilGate propaganda. We still pay lip service to COTUS, but the federal government complies with it only when it happens to coincide with their goals. We still have states, but they have very little power now. They are almost entirely controlled by the federal government, primarily by controlling the flow of funds to the states and by abusing parts of COTUS, especially the 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment, which was never even legally ratified. If a state doesn't want to comply with federal demands, the

---

<sup>69</sup> SRK, p277

feds threaten to cut off their funding, and the state meekly obeys its federal masters. Or the feds challenge the states in SCOTUS, and the Supremes usually give the feds what they want. (After all, many SCOTUS justices have no use for COTUS, either, except for manipulation and propaganda purposes).

Federal money is also used to control and manipulate individual citizens. Roughly half the households in America now pay no federal income tax. Those people are not likely to vote for any candidate who advocates fiscal responsibility or fidelity to COTUS. They will vote for the candidate that promises them the most federal money.

A government which robs Peter to pay Paul can always depend on the support of Paul.

-- George Bernard Shaw

Even citizens who try to hold federal power in check have no chance of success. Our federal government relies increasingly on bureaucrats who have the power to make laws, but are not subject to public scrutiny or accountability. They never have to stand for election, and they are all but impossible to fire. Most voters have no idea who these bureaucrats are, or how to contact them. Doing so would be pointless, anyway.

The elaborate network of federal bureaucracies and entitlement programs is so intricate and extensive that most people are dependent by retirement age on federal government programs. And that's just the way the feds want it. They want Americans dependent on them, because that gives them complete control. The power of the federal government is no longer restricted by anything in COTUS or by any state. The feds are free to do whatever they want, as long as they can find a way to keep the masses compliant. So they lie, distort, obfuscate, and confuse when necessary, or when convenient. They wrap every program in the flag, COTUS, patriotism, and noble-sounding crusades for fairness, equality, and justice. We the people fall for it every time. So their power increases steadily each year.

Before AL, it was *of the people, by the people, and for the people*. Now it is *of the federal government, by the bureaucrats, and for the politicians*. Before AL, people said the United States are. Now we say the United States is. It was never intended to be that way. This is what the Framers and the South were trying to prevent.

That's why we need to understand and accept the truth of the Civil War. It is the only way we will ever have any chance of recovering the Constitutional republic we lost in the Civil War. We have no chance of finding our way again if we don't even realize we are lost. As a Constitutional republic, states should have responsibility for most of the programs that have been taken over by the feds. Until and unless we find a way to restore states to their rightful place in the original structure of COTUS, America will continue to flail and ultimately fail.

History, despite its wrenching pain,  
cannot be unlived, but if faced with courage,  
need not be lived again.

– Maya Angelou

## The Way Forward

When Lee surrendered to Grant at Appomattox, that did not mark the end of the South's natural or moral rights. It marked an end to the military conflict, and the South has struggled to make the most of their plight since then. But the South did not and could not give up their natural right to choose their own form of government. Lee's surrender did not make the North's conquest legitimate; it only meant that the South was no longer capable of doing anything about Northern aggression. At least for a long time.

Even if you realize we have lost our way, and that it started with the Civil War, you may be feeling that it's hopeless to even try to do anything about it now. No it isn't. Americans have faced impossible odds before. We have survived many hopeless situations. We can do it now.

It's going to require a few Constitutional amendments. The very idea frightens most Constitutionalists to death. The prospect of calling for another Constitutional Convention to deal with several fundamental issues is totally out of the question for most patriots, simply because there is too great a risk that the result would be even worse than the situation we face now. No doubt there are tremendous risks. But we know for certain that if we do nothing, our liberties, explained to us and preserved for us by the Founding Fathers, are lost forever. Bold action is essential. There is no easy solution.

But it isn't impossible. We could call a new Constitutional Convention and effectively deal with those pesky parts of the original document that have caused so many problems. Like the Commerce Clause and the General Welfare Clause. And the phony 14th Amendment. Before you dismiss the possibility as chimerical, consider this. The hardest part has already been done. And it really wasn't so difficult. A much improved COTUS has already been written. It does a remarkable job of dealing with the most troublesome parts of COTUS. It was written and implemented with very little controversy, and many members of Congress today look to it for guidance. Where can you find a copy of such a document? Easy. Just search the internet for the Constitution of the Confederate States of America. In fact, you don't even need to do that. I have prepared a copy of it for you.

Parts of it would certainly no longer be appropriate or applicable, but it would serve as an excellent starting point for a series of Constitutional Amendments to restore States' Rights and reign in the current FranConstitutionStein destroying our nation.

### [A Harebrained Idea](#)

You are probably thinking that the Confederate Constitution, whatever its merits, has nothing to do with us today, because it was possible only after secession. Secession is no longer possible, and the Civil War proved that point once and for all.

No it didn't.

Take a look at what one of my favorite columnists had to say recently.

Walter E Williams:

[Dr Thomas] Sowell says that the New Deal and an expansive interpretation of the Constitution's "commerce clause" by the US Supreme Court has turned the Tenth Amendment into a dead letter. Here, I think my colleague is only partially correct. The groundwork that made the Tenth Amendment a dead letter came much earlier -- in 1865, at the end of the "War between the States", popularly known as the Civil War.

The War between the States settled, by force, that states did not have the right to secede, nor could they nullify unconstitutional acts by the federal government. Once these states' response to a heavy-handed government were ruled out, it became possible for the federal government to escape its status as the agent and creation of the states.

The original purpose of the Constitution has been reversed: States have become creatures of the federal government, and the federal government has assumed supremacy. . . . What needs to be done to recapture our liberties or preserve what is left? . . .

There is another possible solution that I have been thinking about lately. It might be a harebrained idea. But I think liberty-minded people ought to populate several contiguous states in large numbers and then secede from the Union. I think secession has a greater potential for peace than the alternative. That alternative being one group of Americans attempting to forcibly impose their will on another group, and that group attempting to resist as much as possible. Why not simply part company? The first

secession was a success (that from England) and the second a failure (the War between the States). I say why not break the tie?

Was Walter E Williams kidding? I suspect his article was tongue-in-cheek. To some extent. But it is an idea worthy of serious consideration. The Civil War did not end the right of a group of Americans to secede from the Union. According to DOI, that right cannot ever be taken away by any one or any group, no matter how much military might they may have. AL denied the South the opportunity to exercise that right, but he did not and could not extinguish the right itself.

The Confederate states were required to revise their state constitutions to include a clause that prohibited any future attempts at secession. But that didn't extinguish their right to secession, either. It just pacified the despotic Yankees. We still have the right to secede. And it seems the time is rapidly approaching when we must be willing and ready to assert that right yet again. In both prior attempts, it was the last resort. All other reasonable solutions had been tried. That seems to be the situation we are facing now.

It wouldn't be easy. It wasn't easy in 1776, either. Or in 1860-1861. We may have to fight for that right once again. It's not an attractive option. But it appears the only other alternative is tyranny. How attractive is that?