

The War for Southern Independence

Part 7

Civil War

Shorts &
Briefs:

Northern Exposure

Introduction

In conclusion, I offer the following facts, observations, thoughts, and opinions related to the Civil War, the Union's conduct in the war, Abraham Lincoln, Reconstruction, and Lincoln's political and economic legacy.

A drop-cap like this
marks the beginning
of a new segment.

The Union military kept an official record of its activities during the Civil War. The *Official Records* does not include many of the horrific war crimes committed by Union officers and soldiers, for obvious reasons. But it does contain enough detail to paint a vivid picture of Yankee depravity, barbaric brutality, savage hostility, psychotic revenge, and criminal conduct. The officers who provided those details had no idea their words would eventually be recorded, published, and read by future generations.

Historian Dr Allan Nevins observed in 1962 that this systematic Yankee devastation had been mostly ignored by other historians. He concluded that there were probably three reasons for that. (1) So much relevant information had been omitted from the official reports. (2) The story of Yankee devastation in the South is so horrific that it is painful to write about, and most unpleasant to read about. (3) Trying to tell the full story soon becomes monotonous.

Maybe that's why no one had bothered (or dared, or even thought of) going through the *Official Records* and isolating the parts of it that present an accurate picture of Yankee conduct during the war. Until, that is, Thomas Bland Keys published his *The Uncivil War: Union Army and Navy Excesses in the Official Records*, 1991.

Mr Keys does not quote Southern sources, even though they could contribute a wealth of relevant information. That's because most people are not going to consider Southerners as credible witnesses or objective observers when it comes to describing events of the Civil War. Besides, bad things happen in all wars, so sad stories from sad Southerners is hardly considered significant. Keys quotes only Union sources, as documented in their own *Official Records*. The devastation revealed in his book is comparable, at least in terms of property, to the worst chapters of the two world wars, according to Dr Nevins. The devastation in terms of human slaughter and suffering at the hands of the American president-turned-

dictator is comparable to the most despicable behavior of the most notorious tyrants in world history.¹

Several examples of Yankee war crimes are included on the following pages. To find out more about what constituted a war crime, and what was considered appropriate standards of military conduct, see *Engagement of Rules* in Part 6.

General Order no 53, issued by Union Brigadier Gen William H Emory², June 3, 1864:³

Notwithstanding . . . orders . . . from these . . . headquarters against straggling and pillaging, the brigadier-general . . . regrets that the evil . . . is increasing . . . "Straggler" and "pillager" are identical terms; they are . . . cowards . . . and content themselves with the plunder of innocent women and children . . . Death would not atone for their crimes.

If we define slavery as simply one person owning another person, slavery is probably as old as the human race. Not much is known about slavery prior to the 1700s, because not much was written about it. Not much was written about it, most likely, because it was a well-established and accepted part of life. During that time, it seems that no one objected to slavery except slaves, and even they probably, in many cases, were quite tolerant of the practice. For many slaves, their harsh existence was preferable to the only alternative -- death.

¹ UWK, p xii

² Commander of Nineteenth Corps and US Forces, Morganza, Louisiana, 31 miles northwest of Baton Rouge.

³ UWK, p80

Slave masters did not think of themselves as evil or cruel. Slavery was considered just a fact of life, and those unfortunate enough to find themselves in bondage must have been placed there according to God's direction. The slave master, therefore, felt he had nothing to be ashamed of, and in fact could take pride in the fact that God had favored him. It became easy, then, to think of slaves as less than human.⁴

From Union Major Gen David Hunter⁵ to Union Major Gen Julius Stahel⁶, May 30, 1864:⁷

I desire to call your attention to the numerous grave complaints against soldiers of this command for unauthorized pillaging . . . Men sent out in regular foraging parties break away from their officers and straggle into houses, carrying off dresses, ornaments, books, money, and doing wanton injury to furniture, and . . . some not sent out nor with leave to be out, do also straggle beyond the camps in squads, and commit similar depredations . . . It is not alleged that the cavalry are more culpable than the infantry . . . There . . . seem to be bad and unsoldierly men in each command.

The same day, Gen Hunter issued these orders to Union Major Timothy Quinn⁸:

⁴ SLG, p3-4

⁵ In command of the Department of West Virginia and Army of the Shenandoah. Written at Rude's Hill, Virginia, during Gen Hunter's Lynchburg campaign, May 26 - June 29, 1864, advancing from Cedar Creek, Virginia, southward up the Shenandoah Valley to Lynchburg, then to Meadow Bluff, West Virginia.

⁶ Cavalry Division, Army of the Shenandoah.

⁷ UWK, p85-86

⁸ First New York (Lincoln) Cavalry of Stahel's Division.

You will detail . . . 200 men, with . . . officers, to proceed to Newton⁹ tomorrow . . . for the purpose of burning every house, store, and out-building in that place, except . . . churches and . . . houses and out-buildings of those . . . loyal . . . You will also burn . . . houses, etc of all rebels between Newton and Middletown.

Apparently Gen Hunter didn't consider burning houses a war crime as long as it was ordered by a Union officer. Unauthorized stealing and destroying property was terrible when done by soldiers, but destroying houses and everything in them was perfectly acceptable when ordered to do so by an officer. Such psychotic "reasoning" of Yankees was incomprehensible to Southerners.

From Union Lieutenant Commander Le Roy Fitch¹⁰ to Union Admiral D D Porter, June 11, 1864:¹¹

Gross outrages . . . [were] committed in that neighborhood [Uniontown, Kentucky]¹² by [Union] Colonel Cunningham¹³ . . . He went up in that section of country with a lot of negro soldiers and sent them on shore to conscript every negro they could find. These negroes . . . were sent on shore armed and without an officer with them, entered private houses, broke open the doors, and entered ladies' bedrooms before they were up, insulted women, and plundered and searched generally.

This is how Yankees "liberated" Southern slaves. They were kidnapped and forced into service in the Union army, where they were forced to commit Yankee war crimes for them. This helps explain why the South, which had not known racism

⁹ 7 miles southwest of Winchester.

¹⁰ USS *Moose*, Smithland, Kentucky.

¹¹ UWK, p86

¹² 56 miles northeast of Paducah.

¹³ Lieutenant Colonel Richard D Cunningham, Eighth US Colored Heavy Artillery.

before the war, became racially divided during and after Reconstruction. Yankees forced Southern whites and blacks to become bitterly divided. They used blacks as political pawns, and taught them Yankee racist attitudes and Yankee criminal conduct.

Can you imagine an America without the First Amendment? No freedom of speech. No freedom of the press. If you said or did anything that in any way might be interpreted as criticism of the government or any of its policies, or even if you were suspected of doing so, or even if someone didn't like you and started a rumor that you were critical of the government, you could be immediately thrown in jail and kept there indefinitely. No formal charges need ever be made against you. No writ of habeas corpus, and no right to counsel. No trial. No contact with family, ever. Chances are, your family would never find out where you were, what happened to you, or why you had abandoned them.

That could never happen in the US, could it? That kind of thing happened in Hitler's Germany, Stalin's Russia, and Mussolini's Italy, but not in America. Because we do have the First Amendment, and we do have habeas corpus rights, and the right to a speedy trial, and protection against cruel punishment without due process of law.

But just try to imagine what it would be like if suddenly America had its own Hitler, Stalin, or Mussolini, and America became a police state, with secret police, like the gestapo, and you lived in fear every single day that your neighbor might turn you in for some minor infraction, real or imagined, and that a family member might suddenly disappear, and you would have no way of finding out what happened to them, ever.

Millions of Americans didn't have to imagine such a scenario. They lived it. That's exactly the way things were in the North during Abraham Lincoln's reign of terror. If that's the way Lincoln treated his fellow Yankees, it is little wonder that he turned

loose his goons, like Sherman, Sheridan, and Grant, to rip the South apart, and do their level best to exterminate all remnants of Southern culture.

Lincoln was America's Hitler, Stalin, and Mussolini, all rolled into one mad tyrant. Yet we have been taught that he was a saint. We have been lied to all our lives about Lincoln and the Civil War. We worship Lincoln, because we don't know Lincoln. We think we do, because we have been brainwashed into accepting a fictitious Lincoln image that masks his true character and hides what he did to Americans.

Lincoln's Secretary of State, William Seward, established a secret police force, very similar to Hitler's gestapo. They were constantly on the search for anyone who failed to fully embrace Lincoln and his policies. At first, there was a lot of Yankee resistance to Lincoln and his war policies, but Lincoln eliminated all opposition in the North, very much like Hitler, Stalin, and Mussolini did in their countries during WWII. Here are some of the details.

Lincoln, like all dictators, viewed anyone who was suspected of being anything less than enthusiastic about his policies as a suspected traitor. While conducting his military invasion of the South, Lincoln unleashed Seward's gestapo to root out and eliminate all potential adversaries in the North. Once his unconstitutional, illegal, immoral, and unnecessary invasion of the South had begun, he used the war to justify any and all steps he took or might take to win it. That meant completely abandoning the Constitution, including the Bill of Rights, for as long as he felt like being a dictator instead of a president.

The gestapo's first priority was newspapers.¹⁴ Specifically, New York City newspapers, because they dominated the nation's news and views. The *New York Tribune* (Horace Greely) was in the tank for Lincoln. However, the *Journal of*

¹⁴ RLD, p145-148

Commerce and the *New York Daily News* were the heart of the opposition, because their articles were picked up by many other newspapers critical of Lincoln.

The *Journal*, in May 1861, published a list of over 100 Northern newspapers that expressed opposition to Lincoln's war. So, Dictator Lincoln ordered the Postmaster General to stop delivering those newspapers. That put every one of them out of circulation, because they had no other means of delivery. A few buckled under the pressure and promised to stop all criticism of Lincoln. Mail delivery resumed for them.

Gerard Hallock, founder of the *Journal*, had spent 30 years building his newspaper into one of America's most prominent. His paper had appealed for peace. Nothing treasonous or even in support of secession. Just calls for peace. But that was enough to incur Lincoln's wrath. He was forced to sell his shares of the paper and resign from management of it in order to get mail delivery resumed. The newspaper was censored from then on.

Daily News editor, Ben Wood¹⁵, didn't give in so easily. He hired private pony express couriers and delivery boys to get his paper delivered. But Wood was a particular pain in the . . . press to Lincoln, because he had called the dictator an **unscrupulous Chief magistrate**, whose recent message to Congress had been **an ocean of falsehood and deceit**. Lincoln retaliated by ordering federal marshals to confiscate all copies of the *Daily News* throughout the Northern states. That forced Wood into bankruptcy.

By Sep 1861, the Union military was censoring all NYC opposition press that hadn't been shut down.¹⁶ Ft Lafayette was full of newspaper editors from all over the North

¹⁵ Brother of New York City Mayor, Fernando Wood.

¹⁶ Among them were the: *Chicago Times*, *Dayton Empire*, *Louisville Courier*, *Maryland News Sheet*, *Baltimore Gazette*, *Daily Baltimore Republican*, *Baltimore Bulletin*, *Philadelphia Evening Journal*, *New Orleans Advocate*, *New Orleans Courier*, *Baltimore Transcript*, *Thibodeaux Sentinel* (Louisiana),

and Union-occupied areas of the South. By that time, all newspaper editors had gotten the message, and any of them who were inclined to criticize Lincoln kept their mouths and editorials shut. The North had become a police state, but the gestapo conveniently looked the other way as mobs, often consisting of Union soldiers, destroyed newspaper offices and property. One such victim was Washington, DC's *Democratic Standard*, which had dared editorialize about Union military blunders in the Battle of First Manassas.

But the gestapo's work was never done. As the war's fatality toll climbed, the peace movement flared up again, and the gestapo cracked down ever harder. Editors were threatened with hanging, they were tarred and feathered, they were intimidated and assaulted, they were arrested, and their newspapers were destroyed.¹⁷ All they had done was advocate ending all bloodshed and working to find a peaceful solution to the crisis. To Lincoln, that was treason. He couldn't be bothered with actually charging them with treason, or any other crime, so he just called in his military goons to solve the problem. Much like Hitler, Stalin, and Mussolini did in WWII.

Special Field Order no 88, issued by Union Gen Schofield, August 20, 1864:¹⁸

The Major-general . . . is pained to find it necessary again to call the attention of the officers and men of this command to the disgraceful practice of marauding and plundering which . . . is still prevalent in the command.

Cambridge Democrat (Maryland), *Wheeling Register*, *Memphis News*, *Baltimore Loyalist*, and *Louisville True Presbyterian*.

¹⁷ Among the victims were the: *Bangor Democrat*, *Essex County Democrat* (Haverhill, Massachusetts), *Sentinel* (Easton, Pennsylvania), *Jeffersonian* (West Chester, Pennsylvania), *Democrat* (Stark County, Ohio), and *Farmer* (Fairfield, Connecticut).

¹⁸ UWK, p89

Special Field Order no 113, issued by Union Major Gen Oliver O Howard¹⁹,
August 29, 1864:

There has been from this army today between 1500 or 2000 stragglers, a great many of them teamsters, and . . . numbers of them have been guilty of the vilest conduct, entering houses where there were women and little children, and utterly destroying everything, stealing knives, forks, and spoons, opening trunks, etc . . . conduct so shameful and so disgraceful to our army . . . [They are] the vilest miscreants.²⁰

From Union Brigadier Gen John M Corse²¹ to Union Colonel Robert N Adams²²,
September 5, 1864²³:

In riding through the camps this morning I was . . . grieved to find in the Twelfth Illinois Infantry (Lieutenant Colonel Henry Van Sellar), lying shamelessly exposed to the whole command, a lot of male and female clothing and wearing apparel, shirts, bed-quilts, etc . . . recently pillaged from some of the neighboring helpless citizens . . . Pillaging [is] at all times disgraceful and demoralizing.

¹⁹ Army of the Tennessee, near Shadna Church, on West Point Railroad, Georgia, near Jonesborough.

²⁰ UWK, p89

²¹ Second Division, Sixteenth Corps, under Brigadier Gen Thomas E G Ransom, Army of the Tennessee, near Lovejoy's Station, 13 miles south of Atlanta.

²² Eighty-First Ohio, commanding Second Brigade.

²³ UWK: p89

How much did the Civil War cost? There is no way to accurately answer that question. Far more than most Americans realize. That much is certain.

If we try to put a dollar value on the war, we can vaguely imagine the utter devastation of the Southern states. That alone must be into billions of dollars. Reconstruction further destroyed what was left of the South, as Yankee puppet military governments looted the Southern states, leaving them heavily in debt, enriching the Yankee scoundrels and thieves who supposedly were there to help heal the South.

But Lincoln badly damaged the North as well. Shutting down newspapers, throwing civilians into prison indefinitely, without trial or habeas corpus or access to counsel. In addition, destruction of the South eliminated much of the North's market for manufactured goods,²⁴ and shut off the North's supply of Southern cotton, needed for Yankee textile mills.

According to one estimate, the war eliminated five years worth of accumulated national wealth. That seems like a fairly conservative estimate, given that the war lasted four years, given the vast areas that were obliterated, and considering the immense manpower and natural resources that were necessarily diverted from peacetime pursuits to wartime death and destruction.

In terms of human life, I use the 650,000 figure. That includes about 620,000 military deaths and about 30,000 civilian deaths. But some historians put the civilian death total at 50,000. In any case, there is no doubt that thousands of slaves were killed by the North in the war. That doesn't even begin to deal with all the injuries, or all the other forms of pain and suffering inflicted directly or indirectly by the war. Many thousands of slaves were forced at gunpoint to join the Union army, where they continued to be slaves, forced to do the dirtiest jobs that Yankees did not want to

²⁴ RLD, p257-279

do, and without any pay, at least during the early years. Thousands of slave families were torn apart, crying and writhing on the ground in anguish as their fathers, husbands, brothers were taken away, leaving them with no means of support.

Some of the costs of Lincoln's war are difficult to quantify. The nature of both federal and state government experienced a radical fundamental transformation in terms of size, power, purpose, and cost. In 1860, the federal government barely existed, and most Americans had little or no contact with the federal government throughout their entire lifetime. By the end of Lincoln's reign of terror, the federal government was vast, powerful, intrusive, oppressive, corrupt, and expensive. State government had been eviscerated.

Prior to the war, the federal government had been severely restrained by the Constitution, held in check by robust states' rights, restricted by Southern statesmen, such as Jefferson, Madison, Monroe, Jackson, and Calhoun. That was replaced by the Hamilton / Clay / Whig / Republican agenda in which an all-powerful centralized government doled out taxpayer dollars in the form of corporate subsidies, paid for by protectionist tariffs, a nationalized banking system, and massive federal taxes. The antebellum federal government had been small and dedicated to a very few responsibilities, including national defense and protection of individual liberty. The postbellum federal government was bloated, oppressive, corrupt, tyrannical, and unresponsive to the needs of its exploited taxpaying citizens.

Is that your idea of *preserving the Union*? That's what Lincoln meant by the phrase. Thanks to Lincoln, America had become by 1865 what Americans had come here to escape a century earlier. That land of the free and home of the brave is what we lost in the Civil War.

Southern states -- \$billions.

Protectionist tariffs, income taxes, hundreds of other new taxes, corporate subsidies, corruption -- \$billions.

Freedom -- priceless.

From Union Gen William Tecumseh Sherman to Confederate Gen John B Hood²⁵, September 7, 1864.²⁶

I have deemed it to the interest of the United States that the citizens now residing in Atlanta should remove, those who prefer it to go South and the rest North.

Sherman *deemed* it. He had taken an oath to uphold, defend, protect, and preserve the Constitution of the United States. That oath meant absolutely nothing to Sherman, Lincoln, Grant, or any other top-ranking Union military officer or elected official. The Constitution had been shredded, rendered a dead letter. All that mattered now was what Yankees wanted, because they had the military power to force it down the nation's throat. Lincoln, Grant, Sherman, and Sheridan were the new law of the land.

²⁵ Army of Tennessee.

²⁶ UWK, p89

From Union Colonel Loren Kent²⁷ to Union Gen Mason Brayman, September 21, 1864:²⁸

But little was done in recruiting . . . the recruiting officers of the Seventieth²⁹ and Seventy-First Colored³⁰ Regiments showed much more zeal in rummaging houses . . . and such other unsoldierly acts than they did in carrying out their real object. The Seventy-First recruiting officers were known to enter a private house . . . and discharge a pistol . . . to the . . . terror of the . . . ladies . . . I have learned of one outrageous act of robbery and abuse of women and an old man.

Union Gen O O Howard³¹, addressing his command on October 16, 1864:³²

Soldiers of the Army of the Tennessee . . . Today soldiers of our army entered houses and opened trunks, drawers and boxes, utterly destroying everything they could lay their hands on. They took from women and children the last morsel of food. In some cases these things were done under the eyes of commissioned officers and in a manner as if it were a frolic . . . Put a stop to actions which are criminal, and must lower us in the estimation of all honorable men and have a tendency to undermine our Government. Pillaging is a crime by every law.

Well, not **every** law. Abraham Lincoln and his military goon squad were the law of the land now. They made up the rules as they went along. Whatever they wanted or

²⁷ Twenty-Ninth Illinois, at Natchez, Mississippi, reporting on his expedition from Natchez to Buck's Ferry, Mississippi, on the Homochitto River, 12 miles from Natchez, Sep 19-21.

²⁸ UWK, p90

²⁹ Under Colonel James T Organ.

³⁰ Under Colonel Willard C Earle.

³¹ Near Villanow, 55 miles north-northwest of Atlanta.

³² UWK, p90-91

deemed to be to their political or military advantage -- it was legal by their definition, and that's all that counted during Lincoln's reign of terror.

In ancient Egypt, slaves belonged to the Pharaoh. He decided where they would work. Some were assigned to nobility in their palaces. Others were assigned to priests in their temples. Many were used in the army, and some were given to soldiers as a reward for their service. But most of them worked as domestics, or in the fields, or in construction. The worst possible assignment was working in gold or copper mines. Those unfortunate slaves wore nothing except chains; they had very little food and water, and even less relaxation. There was no chance of escape; and their only hope of relief was death.³³

From Union Gen William Tecumseh Sherman to Union Army Chief of Staff Halleck, October 19, 1864.³⁴

They don't know what war means, but when the rich planters of the Oconee and Savannah see their fences and corn and hogs and sheep vanish before their eyes they will have something more than a mean opinion of the "Yanks". Even now our poor mules laugh at the fine corn fields, and our soldiers riot on chestnuts, sweet potatoes, pigs, chickens, etc. The poor people come to me and beg as for their lives . . . I will eat out this flank and along down the Coosa.

³³ SLG, p 5-6

³⁴ UWK, p91

General Order no 24, published by Union Gen G G Meade³⁵, June 27, 1864:³⁶

The . . . general regrets that he finds himself constrained to republish . . . extracts from the General Orders of the War Department, but he is compelled to conclude, from the many reports that have reached him, that in many cases these orders have been grossly violated . . . and he . . . calls the attention of . . . commanders to their requirements, in the . . . expectation that he will have the . . . cooperation of all officers . . . in maintaining the fair fame of this army, and in preventing a repetition of the lawless disgraceful acts that have recently been committed by persons connected with it.

Gen Meade went on to remind his soldiers and officers that violators were subject to the death penalty. However, it seems likely that everyone knew he was bluffing. If everyone guilty of pillaging or plundering, authorizing it, or condoning it were sentenced to death, that would have wiped out at least half the Union army.

From Union Brigadier Gen James H Wilson³⁷ to Union Gen G G Meade, July 5, 1864.³⁸

There exists in our cavalry service an organized band of thieves, who are under no restraint whatever . . .

Gen Wilson included with his own report this report from Union Captain Edwin W French³⁹:

³⁵ Army of the Potomac, during the siege of Richmond and Petersburg.

³⁶ UWK, p94

³⁷ Third Cavalry Division, Army of the Potomac, reporting from Light-House Point, Virginia, on his expedition, June 22-July 2, to destroy the Danville and Petersburg Railroad, the Norfolk and Weldon Railroads, telegraph, and all public buildings and property south of Petersburg.

³⁸ UWK, p94

... Some days, owing to the rapidity of the march and the giving out of horses, there was considerable straggling and plundering.

At the conclusion of the Revolutionary War, America wanted all British military personnel out of American territory. What sovereign nation in its right mind would tolerate hostile military troops within its borders? Well, as it turns out, the Confederate State of South Carolina did just that for an incredibly long time. They did it because they did not want war. But Abraham Lincoln did.

The Confederate states had negotiated agreements for almost all federal facilities within their borders. But there were two remaining forts for which the North refused to negotiate. One was in Florida, and the other was Ft Sumter in South Carolina. Lincoln refused to meet with Southern negotiators, who offered a very reasonable settlement for Ft Sumter, including payment of the South's portion of the federal debt. Lincoln, meanwhile, was busy with his own schemes.

The Union officer in charge of collecting tariffs at Charleston Harbor was Major Robert Anderson, stationed at Ft Moultrie with 100 soldiers on Sullivan Island. On Christmas night, 1860 (just five days after South Carolina's secession on December 20), Anderson and his troops secretly moved to Ft Sumter and destroyed Ft Moultrie behind them. They set about strengthening Ft Sumter with additional cannon and munitions, all of which was strictly for defensive purposes, according to Anderson.

There was no retaliation by state officials, although South Carolinians resented the North's act of hostility. Because they did not want war, some supplies for the fort were made available by the state government, and Anderson was allowed to

³⁹ Provost marshal, Third Cavalry Division, July 5.

purchase groceries from local merchants. Anderson didn't want war, either, so for months the two sides managed to make the best of a tense situation, without gunshot or bloodshed.

However, bloodshed is exactly what Abraham Lincoln wanted and was determined to instigate. As early as December 12, 1860 (almost three months before his inauguration, and more than a week before South Carolina seceded) Lincoln was secretly instructing Winfield Scott, his General of the Army, to be prepared to hold Ft Sumter (or retake it, if it were in Southern hands by inauguration day.)

While Buchanan was still in office, he and Gen Scott were presented with a proposal concocted by Gustavus V Fox, a retired Union Navy captain. It was a simple plan, consisting of sending three tugboats into Charleston Harbor at nighttime with reinforcements and provisions. The plan was rejected. Once Lincoln was in office, the scheme resurfaced, and it was again rejected. Members of Lincoln's cabinet, his military advisors, and the officers at Ft Sumter overwhelmingly voted against the plan because they realized that it would likely provoke war. The Secretary of War, Simon Cameron, said that if Lincoln wanted war, that was the way to get it. Although Cameron didn't realize it yet, war was exactly what Lincoln wanted, and Ft Sumter is exactly how he planned to get it.

The almost unanimous opinion of his advisors and military leaders wasn't good enough for Lincoln. That was not the answer he wanted to hear. So he said he wanted more information about Anderson's command, and he sent an observer to Charleston to get it for him. That observer was Gustavus V Fox. Needless to say, Fox was pleased to tell Lincoln what he wanted to hear, and the scheme was approved. Only Lincoln wasn't satisfied with three tugboats on a simple resupply mission. He sent a war fleet.

Anderson was not told about the mission. He was as surprised as anyone in Charleston Harbor. And he wasn't at all happy about having been kept in the dark. He expressed that sentiment, and he let it be known that his heart was not in the

war that was bound to follow, but of course as a Naval officer he had no choice but to make the best of it and follow orders.

The South was also forced to try to make the best of a very bad situation. As Lincoln's war fleet approached the harbor, Southerners opened fire on Ft Sumter on April 12, 1861. They knew they could not take on the fort's cannon fire and the fleet at the same time, so they decided to try to take out the fort first.

The war fleet did absolutely nothing to assist their besieged comrades in the fort. They, along with cannon fire from the fort, could easily have overpowered Southern forces at Charleston Bay, but they sat idly by and did nothing. Why? A newspaper article explains:

We have no doubt . . . that it was a cunningly devised scheme, contrived . . . to arouse, and, if possible, exasperate the northern people against the South . . . We venture to say a more gigantic conspiracy against the principles of human liberty and freedom has never been concocted. Who but a fiend could have thought of sacrificing the gallant Major Anderson and his little band in order to carry out a political game? Yet there he was compelled to stand for thirty six hours amid a torrent of fire and shell, while the fleet sent to assist him, coolly looked at his flag of distress and moved not to his assistance! Why did they not? . . . Pause then, and consider before you endorse these mad men who are now, under pretense of preserving the Union, doing the very thing that must forever divide it.

That article did not appear in a South Carolina newspaper, but in a Northern newspaper. It was articles like that which provoked Lincoln to tyrannical temper-tantrums. Northern newspapers were shut down and their editors were thrown in jail for not enthusiastically embracing Lincoln's evil schemes.

It's amazing that no one was killed in the brief battle. The only person in the nation who was disappointed with that was Abraham Lincoln. How much easier it would have been for him to whip Yankees into a frenzy if he could have declared in full

self-righteous indignation that the South had spilled Northern blood. Still, he got what he wanted -- an excuse for war, and he was quite pleased with himself and his sidekick, as expressed by Honest Abe in this note to Gustavus Fox on May 1, 1861:

You and I both anticipated that the cause of the country would be advanced by making the attempt to provision Fort Sumter, even if it should fail; and it is no small consolation now to feel that our anticipation is justified by the result.

It's easy to see why Yankees were driven to such lengths in manufacturing the CivilGate propaganda and mythology that is taught today in our public schools. No wonder they felt they had to concoct such fairytales as *Honest Abe*. They simply could not afford to have future generations of Americans know the truth of the character of Abraham Lincoln and the evil of his war. Ft Sumter is just one of countless dirty little secrets in the ugly truth of Lincoln's lies and his bloody war.⁴⁰

⁴⁰ SLG, p125-130

From Union Brigadier Gen Milo Smith Hascall⁴¹ to Union Gen J M Schofield⁴²,
May 23, 1864:⁴³

I consider it my duty to call the attention of the major-general commanding . . . to the terrible state of things that exists in different parts of the grand army under Major-General [William Tecumseh] Sherman, so far as the wanton destruction of private property and works of art is concerned.

It has not been my fortune to march a single day during the last week without being compelled to witness sights which are enough to disgrace and render worthy of defeat any army in the universe. I have seen at some times as many as half a dozen houses and barns on fire at a time, and in too many cases the wanton destruction of fine paintings and other works of art and culture has been reported to me, and also come under my own observation.

While I am pained to admit that the conduct of our own corps in this respect might be materially improved, yet I think it is respectable when compared with some other portions of the army with which we have come in contact. So far as I know in the Twenty-Third Corps nearly all the officers are trying their best to prevent these barbarous practices . . .

I have no desire to serve with an army where the fundamental principles of civilized warfare are so shockingly violated at every step of our progress. Should any untoward event happen to us, compelling us to retreat . . . I fear that those of our men that might fall into the enemy's hands would neither receive nor deserve any other than barbarous treatment in their hands.

⁴¹ Second Division, Twenty-Third Army Corps, Army of the Ohio, Division of the Mississippi (commanded by Gen William Tecumseh Sherman), near Etowah Cliffs, Georgia.

⁴² Army of the Ohio, near Cartersville.

⁴³ UWK, p847-85

As these facts may not have been brought to the knowledge of the major-general commanding Military Division of the Mississippi, I respectfully ask that this communication be forwarded to him.

One of the most astounding things about this letter is that almost all the officers in the Twenty-Third Corps were trying to impose discipline on their men, yet they were unable to control the behavior of these Yankee anarchists. If basic Yankee character and culture was so depraved, Yankees were certainly not fit to rule the nation, and the Confederacy was absolutely correct to attempt to secede from the corrupt, barbaric, oppressive Union.

Another point worth noting is that CivilGate propaganda focuses a great deal of attention on the terrible living conditions at the Andersonville prison. But there is never a mention of the numerous POW camps in the North that were just as bad. Nor is the barbaric behavior of Union soldiers ever acknowledged. These were war crimes, odious even to some of the more sane Union officers. By their own admission, such Union anarchists deserved no better than they received at Andersonville, especially since the Union itself was responsible for much of the suffering of their prisoners there.

From a citizens' committee⁴⁴ in Carroll County, Missouri, reporting from Carrollton⁴⁵, Missouri to Union Gen Clinton B Fisk, July 27, 1864:⁴⁶

The . . . committee . . . make the following report of the condition of things in this county: . . . [On July 23] a band of men, claiming to be Union soldiers, entered this county under . . . command of . . . [Union] Captain [Rezin A] De Bolt⁴⁷ and [Union] Major [Cyrus] Ramage, ostensibly to hunt bushwhackers (they were told by every one here that the bushwhackers had left the county), and commenced a system of indiscriminate plunder on the people of the county without regard to party, burning houses and finally murdering one of our oldest and best citizens, insulting and abusing all classes of citizens . . . At a low estimate they have plundered the county of \$40,000 or \$50,000 worth of property.

Even the Union soldiers tasked with imposing discipline and enforcing laws were among the most egregious war criminals. Did your history teacher ever mention that?

Nor was that an isolated incident. Here's another example of dirty Union cops. From William F Switzler⁴⁸ to Union Gen Fisk, August 1, 1864:⁴⁹

A serious disturbance is brewing in this county, growing out of the outrages against peaceable citizens by a force of Germans . . . One evening last week a report reached . . . O'Fallon . . . that Troy⁵⁰ had been captured by . . . bushwhackers,

⁴⁴ A committee appointed at a mass meeting of Carroll County citizens. Members were George Diegel, David Gilbert, John L Calvert, I H Graham, and Jonathan Hill.

⁴⁵ 50 miles east-northeast of Kansas City.

⁴⁶ UWK, p96

⁴⁷ Circuit judge and commander of an independent company of (Union) Missouri militia.

⁴⁸ Headquarters Ninth Congressional District, Saint Charles, Missouri, 11 miles northwest of St Louis.

⁴⁹ UWK, p96-97

⁵⁰ 30 miles northwest of St Louis.

whereupon many members of a militia company (Enrolled Missouri Militia) composed mostly of Germans, collected with the view of marching to its rescue.

Excited . . . and many of them drunk, they went through the neighborhood at night, pressing horses and guns, in doing which they . . . abused, cursed, and exasperated several quiet citizens and families, insulted one or more ladies, used personal violence against one, hurt with a gun very badly a Union man, . . . threatened to kill several, broke open houses, shot into one several times, greatly to the danger and terror of its inmates.

One of Abraham Lincoln's top priorities as president was to implement the dreams of his political idol and mentor, Henry Clay. Clay was the longtime leader of the Whig Party, which was the political descendant of big-government enthusiast Alexander Hamilton. The Whig Party eventually disappeared, because their platform had consistently been defeated by Southern members of Congress, by presidents who were either from the South or sympathetic to Southern interests, by state opposition, and by Constitutional restraints.

The new Republican Party adopted most of the old Whig platform and made it their own. Lincoln had seethed for 20 years because Whigs had never been able to implement their agenda in America. Now was his chance to finally turn things around and make the Whig / Republican dream a reality.

One plank in the Whig / Republican platform was protectionist tariffs. By 1860 tariff rates were at an all-time low for America.⁵¹ Most European countries had drastically reduced their tariff rates as well. As soon as it became apparent that Lincoln had a good chance of winning the 1860 election, his Republican allies in Congress got busy with legislation that increased tariff rates.

⁵¹ RLD, p233-251

Some Yankees opposed high tariffs. The *New Haven Daily Register*, for example, suggested that the North lower their tariff rate so that free trade could flourish in both the North and the South. Lincoln was having none of that. Why? For one thing, he was determined to keep right on plundering the South, only more effectively. For another thing, free trade would take away one of his most essential political weapons. As long as high tariffs were in place, Lincoln was in a position to grant special exemptions to his friends and supporters. Special privileges for Northern protectionist manufacturers had been the major base of support for the fledgling Republican Party. Free trade would have destroyed all that and possibly the Republican Party.

The Morrill Tariff, increasing tariff rates an average of 200%, was signed by President Buchanan just before he left office. That meant that one plank of the Whig / Republican platform had already been accomplished before Lincoln was even inaugurated.

That was a huge development. The North and South had battled over tariff rates for generations. Generally, high tariffs benefitted the North and hurt the South. It was used as a means of allowing the North to plunder the South, and Yankees admitted as much in this *Daily Chicago Times* editorial, Dec 10, 1860.

The South has furnished near three-fourths of the entire exports of the country. Last year she furnished seventy-two percent of the whole . . . We have a tariff that protects our manufacturers . . . and enables us to consume large quantities of Southern cotton, and to compete in our whole home market with the skilled labor of Europe. **This operates to compel the South to pay an indirect bounty to our skilled labor, of millions annually.** (Emphasis mine.)

When South Carolinians considered the political climate and evaluated their options in Dec 1860, they saw a future of drastically higher tariff rates, which was simply a form of punitive (for them) taxation. They were painfully aware that they (Southern

states) were the ones who ended up paying the vast majority of the tax revenue that the federal government relied on. They were painfully aware that once that tariff revenue reached Washington, most of it would stay in the North and be used by Yankees on projects that were of great benefit to the North, while they were of very little or no use to the South.

South Carolinians also saw a president who had been elected with no support from any Southern state. It was the first time that had ever happened, and it did not bode well for the South. They knew very well what kind of mercantilist state Lincoln had planned for America, because he had been a Whig all his political life. It was no secret what Republicans (and Whigs before them) stood for. South Carolinians wanted no part of it.

That is why they voted to secede from the Union. That's why several other Southern states soon followed South Carolina's lead. Several other Southern states weren't quite ready to secede until Lincoln sent federal troops to invade the South. That made their decision a no-brainer. Still other states decided they wanted to secede, but by that time it was too late. Lincoln had already sent in federal troops to put an end to any possibility of secession in those border states, and to imprison anyone who voiced any sort of opposition to Lincoln's policies.

The Confederate states knew that one of the primary purposes of those high tariff rates was for what had come to be known as *internal improvements*. Which meant using taxpayer dollars for government projects that were best left for the private sector to handle. States had learned the hard way that those internal improvement projects were almost always just a huge waste of tax dollars, and most states had therefore prohibited such internal improvements, either by state law or in their state constitution.

Lincoln, however, and his Republican Party had no such reservations. They absolutely loved internal improvement projects, and at the very top of their project list was an international railroad. That's not such a bad idea, but it's a project best

left to the private sector. The Confederate states didn't want their tax dollars being spent on that sort of thing, partly because railroads usually got built in the North, not in the South. Also because they knew how things had worked out for Illinois when Lincoln was responsible for massive state government spending on their internal improvement projects, with very little to show for it other than massive state debt.

Lincoln and Republicans insisted that such a railroad would never get built if left to the private sector. But that was not true, and the South knew it. England's railroads had all been privately financed. James J Hill built the Great Northern transcontinental railroad without government subsidies. His railroad was efficient and profitable. The government-subsidized Union Pacific and Central Pacific, on the other hand, were so corrupt and inefficient that they went bankrupt as soon as they were completed. The Great Northern was built 15 years later than the others, but it would have been completed much sooner if Republicans had butted out.

It's easy to see that the Confederate states had many legitimate, valid reasons for deciding to secede from the Union. In fact, their reasons were even more compelling than America's reasons for seceding from England. Although we are led to believe that King George imposed oppressive new taxes and restrictions on the American colonies, many of England's actions actually reduced tax rates, and many of the detested laws were not new restrictions so much as they were simply renewed enforcement of rules and taxes that had been in place for generations, but had not been strictly enforced.

That's not to say that the colonies should not have seceded. It is simply to say that if their reasons were valid in 1776, then the Confederacy's reasons were certainly valid as well. If the colonies had a natural right to secede from England, as the Declaration of Independence clearly states, then the Confederacy had just as much right to secede from the Union in 1860-1861. In fact, the Confederacy was on even more solid ground, because it had the 1776 precedent to point to.

This was an order from Union Major Gen Edward O C Ord⁵² to Union Major Gen Godfrey Weitzel⁵³, April 16, 1865 (during the Union occupation of Richmond and Petersburg, Virginia):⁵⁴

Many complaints have reached me of depredations committed, some of a desperate character, principally by black and white cavalry . . . outraging private houses . . . plundering persons . . . fences destroyed . . . horses, mules, etc . . . Keep your men and officers out of Petersburg.

From Acting Master Levi S Fickett, US Steamer *Glide* to Acting Volunteer Lieutenant Samuel B Washburne, commanding US Naval Forces, Berwick Bay, August 3, 1864:⁵⁵

A few of the Ninety-Third and a few . . . cavalry had proceeded toward Brashear with a drove of . . . fifty or sixty head of cattle, which they had taken from citizens in Pattersonville; and the remainder of both regiments were ransacking houses and back yards for such plunder as they could carry . . . I [later] passed several small squads of [Union] Colonel Jones' regiment at various distances from the main body. There was no officer with them, and they were pillaging in nearly every house on their way . . . The officers did not appear to exercise any command over them . . . The soldiers burned three or four buildings on their return.

⁵² Department of Virginia, Army of the James, Richmond.

⁵³ Twenty-Fifth Corps, at Poplar Grove Church, near Petersburg.

⁵⁴ UWK, p118

⁵⁵ UWK, p97

In spite of all the General Orders, threats, warnings, and other pleas, Union officers actually did very little to enforce laws or impose discipline among their soldiers. Had there been any genuine effort to enforce its own rules, Union troops would have stopped their campaign of war crimes throughout the South. This was in August, 1864, more than three years since the war had started. Just as Lincoln had done in his First Inaugural Address, Union officers said one thing but did another. That same Yankee character of dishonesty and hypocrisy lives on in today's northeastern establishment elite, Lincoln's political descendants.

From Union Gen C B Fisk⁵⁶ to Union Gen W S Rosecrans⁵⁷, August 3, 1864:⁵⁸

The Colorado and Kansas troops did commit many outrages.

The ancient Greeks needed lots of miners, and the slaves who drew that assignment were no better off than the miner slaves of Egypt.

Most Greek slaves were acquired as war captives. That meant that a person could be the master of an estate one day and a slave the next. A person could be a passenger on a ship one day, and find himself captured and sold into slavery by sundown.

Captured warriors were usually killed. Women and children performed domestic chores and personal services. For beautiful women and girls, those services became very personal.⁵⁹

⁵⁶ St Joseph, Missouri.

⁵⁷ St Louis, Missouri.

⁵⁸ UWK, p97

The following account of events is from a Louisiana lady, regarding Union Gen Nathaniel P Banks and his army.

I was watching from my window the apparently orderly march of the first Yankees that appeared in view and passed up the road, when, suddenly, as if by magic, the whole plantation was covered with men, like bees from an overthrown hive, and, as far as my vision extended, an inextricable medley of men and animals met my eye. In one place, excited troopers were firing into the flock of sheep; in another, officers and men were in pursuit of the boys' ponies, and in another, a crowd were in excited chase of the work animals. The kitchen was soon filled with some, carrying off the cooking utensils and the provisions of the day; the yard with others, pursuing the poultry . . . They penetrated under the house, into the outbuildings, and into the garden, stripping it in a moment of all its vegetables . . . This continued during the day . . . and amid a bewildering sound of oaths and imprecations . . . When the army had passed, we were left destitute.⁶⁰

⁵⁹ SLG, p7-8

⁶⁰ UWK, p xiii-xiv

From Union Colonel John H Shanklin⁶¹, to Union Gen C B Fisk, August 12, 1864:⁶²

A year ago . . . a quiet and peaceable citizen was shot dead in the street in Pleasant Plains⁶³, because he refused to halloo⁶⁴ for Jim [James H] Lane [US Senator from Kansas, and a former brigadier general] when ordered to do so. Many have been insulted, whipped, shot at, and abused because they refused to halloo when ordered to do so.⁶⁵

From Union Major Gen Francis J Hernon⁶⁶ to Union Brigadier Gen Albert L Lee⁶⁷, August 20, 1864:⁶⁸

There has been great complaint . . . from the plantations near our . . . line of pickets of the conduct of our soldiers, who . . . have been permitted to leave their posts . . . and helping themselves without stint [limitation or restraint] to whatever could be found. Many of the plantations . . . have . . . suffered severely . . . from these depredations . . . Officers in . . . charge of the picket-posts . . . countenance [sanction or tolerate] this system of plunder.

⁶¹ Thirtieth Enrolled Missouri Militia, Sub-District of Chillicothe, 69 miles east of St Joseph.

⁶² UWK, p97-98

⁶³ Just on the edge of Mercer County, on the Iowa State line.

⁶⁴ To yell or shout out (something), to catch someone's attention or to urge on.

⁶⁵ This report also included a letter of August 11 to Colonel Shanklin from Lieutenant William McIlwrath, assistant provost marshal, Chillicothe.

⁶⁶ Commanding District of Baton Rouge and Port Hudson.

⁶⁷ Cavalry Division.

⁶⁸ UWK, p98

One of the planks in the Alexander Hamilton / Henry Clay / Whig / Republican Party platform was a nationalized banking system. That had been one of America's first major political struggles, pitting Hamilton against Thomas Jefferson. Hamilton prevailed at first, but Jefferson's forces took control after George Washington and John Adams left Washington, DC. It became a tug-of-war over the decades, with a national bank coming and going, depending on who was in control of the White House and Congress.

In 1861 the nation's banking system was totally divorced from the federal government.⁶⁹ Gold and silver coins were the only legally recognized money. That didn't mean that everyone had heavy pockets. State-chartered banks issued notes redeemable in gold or silver coins on demand. Contrary to common belief, that was the most stable monetary system in American history. There were bankruptcies, but most of them resulted from ill-advised state government regulations.

That changed on Feb 25, 1862, when Lincoln signed the Legal Tender Act, which authorized Treasury Secretary, Salmon P Chase⁷⁰, to issue *greenbacks*.⁷¹ The difference between greenbacks and the bank notes that preceded them was that the holder of greenbacks was not promised immediate payment in gold or silver coins, but he was assured of the promise of such payment sometime in the future. That was the first step.

The next step was the National Currency Acts of 1863 and 1864. They created a system of nationally chartered banks that could issue bank notes, similar to greenbacks. Those bank notes, supplied by the newly created *comptroller of the currency*, were in competition with the bank notes issued by private state-chartered banks. To drive the competition out of business, Lincoln got financier Jay Cooke to

⁶⁹ RLD, p251-256

⁷⁰ After the war, Chase served as US Supreme Court Chief Justice. He ruled that greenbacks were unconstitutional.

⁷¹ Paper money printed in green ink.

pay for newspaper ads throughout the country praising the new Republican plan to nationalize the money supply, and condemning the old state-chartered banking system. Also, Republicans, using their usual heavy-handed approach, imposed a 10% tax on state bank notes.

The new federal bank notes flooded state-chartered banks, doubling the nation's money supply in a single year, causing severe inflation. By Jul 1864, federal bank notes were worth only 35 cents in gold. If Republican intent was to create a more stable monetary system, they had failed miserably.

But that was not their intent. Their goal was to help concentrate power in the federal government, which was the Republican Party. We know that because Ohio Senator John Sherman⁷², top cheerleader for nationalized banking, said so. He urged members of Congress to nationalize as much as possible . . . [and] make men love their country before their states. All private interests, all local interests, all banking interests, the interests of individuals, everything, should be subordinate now to the interest of the [federal] Government.

So much for the Constitution. So much for Lincoln's own lofty rhetoric from his Gettysburg Address:

...that these dead shall not have died in vain; that this nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom; and that government of the people, by the people, for the people, shall not perish from the earth.

At face value, that was just another Lincoln lie. Actually, it was more of an inside joke. What *people* was he referring to? A government of the people, meaning Republican operatives. By the people, meaning Republican bureaucrats and political appointees, and the gullible taxpayers who provided the funding. For the people, meaning Republican elected officials and power brokers.

⁷² Union Gen William Tecumseh Sherman's brother.

Unable to resist bragging that another plank of the Whig / Republican platform was now securely in place, the *New York Times* said on Mar 9, 1863:

The legal tender act and the national currency bill crystallized . . . a centralization of power, such as Hamilton might have eulogized as magnificent.

Kentucky Democrat Lazarus Powell explained it this way:

The result of this course of legislation is utterly to destroy all the rights of the States. It is asserting a power which if carried out to its logical result would enable the national Congress to destroy every institution of the States and cause all power to be consolidated and concentrated here.

Lincoln would have heartily agreed. And he was determined to make sure his system would be carried out to its logical result.

To that end, Lincoln had signed a massive tax bill on Jul 1, 1862. Its 119 sections imposed stamp taxes; inheritance taxes; gross receipts taxes; license taxes for all occupations, services, and commodities; and excise taxes. It was sold as a necessary measure to fund the war and replace lost tariff revenue from the South. But it was far more than that.

The North was also hit with the nation's first federal income tax. It was unconstitutional at that time, but that had never stopped Lincoln before. The top rate was 10% on incomes over \$10K. Along with it came the nation's first internal revenue bureaucracy under the Treasury Department.

It was the most massive and oppressive tax system America had ever seen. Most of the taxes and the bureaucracy continued intact after the war ended. Lincoln's income tax would be

A great centralizing force
had been set in motion.
-- Leonard Curry

eliminated in 1872, but the precedent had been established, and it was only a matter of time before the income tax and revenue bureaucracy would come roaring back, bigger and more oppressive than ever. America would never again return the low taxes of 1861. Nor would it ever return to the small federal antebellum government.

According to one Democrat senator:

The [federal] Government is everything; it has become the end; and the people, and all their property, labor, efforts, and gains . . . are merely the means by which the Government is to continue . . . and its powers progressively augmented.

That was the whole point of the Hamilton / Clay / Whig / Republican agenda. That is the Lincoln legacy. That is why Lincoln launched the Civil War. It was all in place by 1865. The worst fears of the anti-federalists during the ratification debates had become a reality. Lincoln's American System of protectionist tariffs, nationalized banking, and oppressive taxation resulted in concentrated power in Washington, DC, and the constitutional democratic republic of the Founders was dead.

The American public was subjected to relentless propaganda, brainwashing them into accepting that the federal government was the solution to their every problem. All future generations would be that much easier to further brainwash into accepting unceasing expansion of federal power and restrictions on personal liberty.

Remember that the next time a pundit, politician, or historian tells you that Lincoln was the gold standard of American leadership, or the next time you see Lincoln's hideous face on Mt Rushmore, or see his despotic image in Washington, DC, or celebrate his birthday.

From Charles D Ludwig⁷³ to Union Lieutenant Amos J Harding⁷⁴, September 2, 1864:⁷⁵

The men of Company L⁷⁶ are dreaded even by loyal men nearly as much as bushwhackers, as their officers . . . exercise but little control over them. They have a very loose discipline . . . Complaints are coming in nearly every day of depredations committed by these men.

General Order no 27, published by Union Major Gen George Sykes⁷⁷ September 6, 1864:⁷⁸

On the [Kansas - Missouri] border . . . disreputable persons have organized a system of plunder which . . . bids fair . . . to inaugurate a border war . . . Frequent complaints [are] made against the conduct of the troops . . . Repeated violations of private rights have occurred. Among the soldiers might and right seem to go together. The forces of the Government are for the protection of the inhabitants, not instruments for their spoliation [plunder] and oppression.

Might and right seem to go together? Where would Union troops get a crazy notion like that? From their dictator in chief, Abraham Lincoln. Neither he nor William Tecumseh Sherman agreed that *the forces of government are for the protection of the inhabitants*. They and most other Union leaders thought that the force of the federal government was there for them to use (and abuse) in any way they wanted

⁷³ Assistant Union provost marshal, Eighth Sub-District of North Missouri, Fulton, 23 miles north-northeast of Jefferson City.

⁷⁴ Acting provost marshal, District of North Missouri, St Joseph.

⁷⁵ UWK, p98

⁷⁶ Under command of Captain Thomas L Campbell, Ninth Missouri State Militia Cavalry.

⁷⁷ District of South Kansas, Peola.

⁷⁸ UWK, p98-99

to. Absolutely no legal limitations or constitutional restraints. No wonder the troops felt they had unlimited latitude also.

From Union Major John H Clybourn⁷⁹ to Union Gen R A Cameron, September 30, 1864:⁸⁰

Captain Hawk⁸¹, while marching through Bayou Goula with his command, did allow his command to break open houses and commit depredations . . . and the citizens . . . informed me that he allowed his men to take money and clothing from their persons.

⁷⁹ Twelfth Illinois Cavalry, reporting from Napoleonville. Clybourn commanded 6 companies on an expedition from Napoleonville to Grand River and Bayou Pigeon, Louisiana, Sep 26-30.

⁸⁰ UWK, p99

⁸¹ Captain Richard A Hawk, Company L, with 2 companies, was sent on a mission Sep 29 to Myers' Mill, in the rear of Bayou Goula, 18 miles north of Napoleonville.

Rome had no shortage of slaves, and they were the workforce. Julius Caesar obtained a million slaves in Gaul alone (one-third of its population). Rome had an early form of the Fugitive Slave Law, and many enterprising Romans made a nice living by searching for runaways and returning them to their master, or to the nearest law enforcement officer.

The status of a Roman slave may be described as the lowest form of human life, or maybe the highest form of animal life. A slave had absolutely no rights, and slave owners had absolutely no restrictions on slave treatment. If a slave killed his master, all the master's slaves were killed in retaliation. They could be replaced easily enough.

Slave revolts were common, but successful slave revolts were rare. One of the few success stories was that of Spartacus -- a story we are quite familiar with, thanks to the movie. But even that success became a failure eventually. Spartacus and his army of gladiators could have secured their freedom had they gone north to the Alps, but they stayed in the south and faced the Roman wrath they inspired.⁸²

Missouri, November 26, 1861:⁸³ Numerous cases have been brought to the attention of the . . . general of alleged seizure and destruction of private property in this department, showing an outrageous abuse of power and a violation of the laws of war.⁸⁴

Uh oh. Isn't that exactly what Sherman did during his *march to the sea*? Gen Halleck, who literally wrote the book on acceptable rules of military conduct, here

⁸² SLG, p9-11

⁸³ UWK, p12

⁸⁴ From General Orders no 8, issued by Major Gen Henry W Halleck, Department of the Missouri.

seems to be awfully confused. Apparently he didn't realize that the laws of war didn't apply to Yankees, because they were just so gosh-darn special. Nor did the accepted standards of human decency, or even the most basic conformance with civilized human behavior. Nor did the Constitution apply to Abraham Lincoln. He made up his own style of (tyrannical) government as he went along. He did whatever the hell he felt like doing, and he defied anyone to do anything about it. Southerners tried to do something about it, but the North had more men, weapons, money, and supplies. Might makes right.

From Union Major Gen Darius N Couch⁸⁵ to Union Gen Schofield, March 27, 1865:⁸⁶

[Union] Captain [John W] Horn⁸⁷ . . . brought in thirteen Federal stragglers whom he found within seven miles of Greenville⁸⁸, plundering houses [and] tearing the rings from women's fingers.

From Union Major James Ketner⁸⁹ to Union Colonel Charles R Jennison⁹⁰, November 16, 1864:⁹¹

The undersigned officers of this command . . . protest against the

⁸⁵ Commanding First and Second Divisions, Twenty-Third Corps, at Mosely Hall, North Carolina.

⁸⁶ UWK, p129

⁸⁷ Twelfth New York Cavalry.

⁸⁸ North Carolina, 36 miles east-northeast of Goldsborough.

⁸⁹ Commander of Sixteenth Kansas Cavalry, Pea Ridge, northwest corner of Arkansas.

⁹⁰ First Cavalry Brigade of the First Kansas Cavalry Division, under Major Gen James G Blunt, Army of the Border.

⁹¹ UWK, p100-101

indiscriminate pilfering and robbing of private citizens [by Jennison's men], and especially of defenseless women and children, that has marked the line of march of this division of the Army of the Border from the Arkansas River to this point . . . If soldiers are permitted to rob and plunder . . . the result must be demoralization of the men and disgrace to the officers and the service, in which we are unwilling to share.

Further light is shed on the conduct of Colonel Jennison and his men by this report from Union Captain Green C Stotts⁹² to Union Brigadier Gen John B Sanborn⁹³, November 22, 1864:

Jennison has just passed through this vicinity on his return from Arkansas River. The night of the 19th he stayed at Newtonia, the 20th at Sarcoxie, and the 21st at Dry Fork. Where he passed the people are almost ruined, as their houses were robbed of the beds and bedding. In many cases every blanket and quilt were taken; also their clothing and every valuable that could be found . . .

All the horses, stock, cattle, sheep, oxen, and wagons were driven off . . . The Fifteenth Kansas⁹⁴ had nearly all this property, and the men said they had taken it in Missouri. There are some cases where the men tore the clothing off of women in search of money, and threatening to burn houses in order to get money is the common practice. They acted worse than guerrillas.

And there is this rebuke from Union Major Gen James G Blunt⁹⁵ to Colonel Jennison⁹⁶, December 11, 1864:

⁹² Company C, Seventh Enrolled Missouri Militia, Cave Spring, Missouri.

⁹³ District of Southwest Missouri, Springfield.

⁹⁴ Cavalry, under Union Lieutenant Colonel George H Hoyt.

⁹⁵ District of South Kansas, Paola.

⁹⁶ Fifteenth Kansas Cavalry, commanding First Sub-District of South Kansas, Mound City.

You [were] in command of the forces that were directed to return from the Arkansas River after the pursuit of [Confederate Major Gen Sterling] Price had been abandoned . . . Your orders directed . . . that you would move through Washington and Benton Counties, [northwest] Arkansas . . . and then proceed through Southwest Missouri . . . to Fort Scott [Kansas].

The most outrageous acts of vandalism were perpetrated while on your return march that have occurred anywhere during the war; and . . . these acts were done by your direction . . . The disrepute and disgrace, your conduct has brought upon the First Division of the Army of the Border.

Which prompted this response from Colonel Jennison to Union Gen S R Curtis⁹⁷, December, 1864:

Now the 125 men of the Fifteenth⁹⁸ are held responsible for the acts of the entire brigade . . . My orders from the general commanding⁹⁹ the First Division, Army of the Border, through his regular staff officer, in presence of at least ten officers of my brigade, was to desolate the country from the Arkansas River to Fort Scott, and burn every house on the route.

It is apparent that either Colonel Jennison or Gen Blunt was not being honest. But then, that's no surprise, given the fact that their commander in chief Abraham Lincoln was a pathological liar.

⁹⁷ Leavenworth, Kansas.

⁹⁸ Kansas Cavalry.

⁹⁹ Union Major Gen James G Blunt.

t is a curious fact that Lincoln didn't bother to say in his Second Inaugural Address that he thought it would be a great idea for the states to ratify the 13th Amendment. If, as he asserts, **All knew that this interest [slavery] was somehow the cause of the war**, it seems he would have wanted to do everything in his power to get that Amendment ratified as quickly as possible. But he doesn't even bother to mention it. He had mentioned the Corwin amendment in his First Inaugural, but there's no mention of the 13th Amendment in this speech.

The 13th Amendment had cleared the Senate on Apr 8, 1864, and the House on Jan 31, 1865. His Second Inaugural Address, on Mar 4, 1865, would have been an ideal occasion to urge the nation to let their representatives know just how badly they wanted to get the 13th Amendment passed and slaves freed. Not a word about that from Lincoln.

He seems to be blaming God in that speech for slavery and for the war. That is also very curious. Did God cause slavery -- in the US or any other country? Christians apparently thought so. But if that is the case, why would Lincoln start a war over slavery? That would be like going to war against God, wouldn't it? If, on the other hand, God did not sanction slavery, as most reasonable, rational Americans well understood, then blaming slavery and the war on God was an incredibly wretched excuse for Lincoln's own sins.

All knew that this interest [slavery] was somehow the cause of the war. Really? Very curious indeed. Because that is not what Lincoln said in his First Inaugural Address, which he sanctimoniously delivered just before he sent federal troops to invade the South. *Somehow?* Lincoln had slaughtered 650,000 Americans, destroyed half the country, terrorized the North, abandoned the Constitution, and imposed oppressive taxes -- all for some vague slavery-related cause that he couldn't quite articulate?

Not likely. Lincoln was never at a loss for words. They usually had no basis in fact or reason, but he always had some lofty rhetoric to camouflage, confuse, and obfuscate. Yet the best he could come up with on Mar 4, 1865 is *somehow*?

On Mar 4, 1861, Lincoln had said that the only issue dividing the country was the matter of taking slaves into the territories. The South wanted to do that, and the North wanted to stop them from doing that. But that issue had already been resolved. When the Southern states seceded, they conceded that point to the North. They were no longer interested in taking slaves into the territories, because they were no longer interested in going into the territories themselves. There was absolutely no reason to go to war over that issue.

Yet the war had *somehow* always been about slavery? If Lincoln was fighting to free the slaves, why did he try to get the Corwin Amendment ratified? Why did he not free all the thousands of slaves within his jurisdiction?¹⁰⁰ When Lincoln started his war in 1861, there were more slaves in the Union than out of it.¹⁰¹ Why did he not try to get a Constitutional Amendment freeing slaves from his very first day in office? Why wait until Jan 1, 1863 to implement his Emancipation Proclamation, which didn't free a single slave? Why did his top general in the war, Ulysses S Grant, still own slaves? Why did Northern states, including his home state of Illinois, have so few black residents, treat them as second-class citizens, and prohibit blacks from settling there, instead of welcoming freed slaves and escapees? Why had Lincoln, even well into his presidency, been so active in the Colonization movement? Did he really want to free slaves only to ship them all out of the US immediately? He didn't mention that in either of his inaugural speeches, either.

Why would Lincoln be so desperate to have people believe that the war had always been about slavery, when it was obviously a lie? Because he did not want people to understand what the war had really been about. Money and power.

¹⁰⁰ In the border states, the territories, and Union-occupied areas of the South.

¹⁰¹ RLD, p209

From Union Gen Rosecrans to Union Colonel David P Dyer¹⁰², September 30, 1864:

I am pained to learn that the guards sent on the railroad are in the habit of behaving in a most disorderly manner, firing from the cars at animals and persons. Such behavior is worse than savage.

From Union Brigadier Gen Edward C Pike¹⁰³ to Union Gen Thomas Ewing, Jr, October 20, 1864:¹⁰⁴

In the matter of depredations by my cavalry and artillery . . . a great deal of thieving was no doubt done between Saint Louis and Union¹⁰⁵ by different commands, each one striving by deception and otherwise, to place the stigma on others . . . The incompetency of officers in my command is the great evil that I have had to contend with . . . My command is made up largely of Germans, and it has been very hard to restrain them from depredations on people known as Southern sympathizers.

¹⁰² Forty-Ninth Missouri, Warrenton.

¹⁰³ First Division, Enrolled Missouri Militia, Washington, 42 miles west-southwest of St Louis.

¹⁰⁴ UWK, p100

¹⁰⁵ 6 miles south of Washington.

Special Order no 103, Issued November 20, 1864, by Union Colonel David Moore¹⁰⁶:

The troops of this command are committing nearly every species of crime, including murder, robbery, assault and battery, destruction of private property of peaceful citizens, together with other offenses.¹⁰⁷

Instructions from Union Lieutenant Gen U S Grant¹⁰⁸ to Union Major Gen David Hunter¹⁰⁹, August 5, 1864:¹¹⁰

In pushing up the Shenandoah Valley . . . it is desirable that nothing should be left to invite the enemy to return. Take all provisions, forage, and stock wanted for the use of your command; such as cannot be consumed destroy. It is not desirable that buildings should be destroyed; they should rather be protected, but the people should be informed that so long as any army can subsist among them recurrences of these raids must be expected, and we are determined to stop them at all hazards.

Late in the 3rd century, the Roman Empire split. The eastern half, known as the Byzantine Empire lived for a thousand more years. The Western Empire lasted only about 200 more years. The supply of fresh slaves declined dramatically after that, because there was much less war, and therefore fewer war captives to enslave.

¹⁰⁶ Twenty-First Missouri, commander of Third Division, Sixteenth Corps, St Louis.

¹⁰⁷ UWK, p102

¹⁰⁸ Headquartered in the field, Monacacy Bridge, Maryland.

¹⁰⁹ Department of West Virginia.

¹¹⁰ UWK, p104

Western and central Europe became dominated by large estates or manors, with peasants, serfs, servants, and slaves doing all the dirty work. Those classes had slightly different degrees of freedom and responsibility, but basically they were all slaves, and they were all treated cruelly. They fared much the same as slaves in Egypt, Greece, and Rome.¹¹¹

From Union Surgeon C E H Campbell¹¹² to Union Surgeon Josiah Simpson¹¹³, October 14, 1864:¹¹⁴

I yesterday proceeded to inspect the physical condition of the rebel prisoners then in transit through this city from Elmira, New York, to City Point, Virginia, for exchange. The train was composed of over 1200 men, from which number I selected sixty men as totally unfit to travel and sent to general hospital. These men were debilitated from long sickness to such a degree that it was necessary to carry them in the arms of attendants from the cars to the ambulances, and one man died in the act of being thus transferred.

Such men should not have been sent from Elmira. If They were inspected before leaving that place in accordance with orders, it was most carelessly done, reflecting severely on the medical officers engaged in that duty and is alike disgraceful to all concerned. The effect produced on the public by such marked displays of inefficiency or neglect of duty cannot fail to be most injurious to our cause both at home and abroad. Five men had died on the train on the road to this city from utter prostration and debility.

¹¹¹ SLG, p13-14

¹¹² Assistant medical inspector, medical director's office, Baltimore.

¹¹³ Medical director, Middle Department, Eighth Corps, Baltimore.

¹¹⁴ UWK, p105-106

From Medical Director Simpson to Union Colonel William Hoffman¹¹⁵ through Union Surgeon General Joseph K Barnes, the same day, sent along with Dr Campbell's report:

From personal inspection I know the facts as stated by Surgeon Campbell to be correct. The condition of these men was pitiable in the extreme and evinces criminal neglect and inhumanity on the part of the medical officers in making the selection of men to be transferred.

From Union Gen Innis N Palmer¹¹⁶ to Union Gen B F Butler¹¹⁷, September 1, 1864.¹¹⁸

The negroes¹¹⁹ will not go voluntarily¹²⁰, so I am obliged to force them. I have sent 71 and will send this afternoon about 150. I expect to get a large lot tomorrow . . . The matter of collecting the colored men for laborers has been one of some difficulty, but I hope to send up a respectable force . . . They will not go willingly . . . They must be forced to go, and I propose to . . . send them up. I am aware that this may be considered a harsh measure, but . . . we must not stop at trifles.

Lincoln did not emancipate the slaves. He stole them and used them as his own slaves. There was no Yankee compassion for Southern slaves. Blacks were used as pawns by the North during the war and during Reconstruction.

¹¹⁵ Commissary general of prisoners, Washington.

¹¹⁶ New Bern.

¹¹⁷ Ft Monroe.

¹¹⁸ UWK, p106

¹¹⁹ On Roanoke Island.

¹²⁰ To Ft Monroe.

The following article was published in the March 7, 1906 issue of the Orangeburg, South Carolina newspaper, *The State*. The author, Mrs Augustus Jennings, was recounting the story her mother¹²¹ had told her many times over the years. These events took place in 1865, when Mrs Jennings, then a young college student, had been sent, along with her sisters and other students, upstate for their safety. Her father was away from home, serving in the military. Her mother and a friend were eating breakfast . . .

While seated at breakfast they saw a squad of Union cavalry coming from the direction of Orangeburg. They came yelling and screaming in the yard and house, frightening the ladies. In a short time they came in immense crowds, overturning the yard and house, and terror broke loose. Those soldiers acted like maniacs, yelling and hurrahing, breaking open doors, emptying the provision houses, running down all the poultry and at last building a bonfire, burned everything they could not carry off. Some of the negroes were screaming with fright and some were exultant. One faithful house servant was whipped until she disclosed the hiding place of the silver and other family treasures.

Great hulking boors of Yankees with their soiled and dirty boots jumped in the lard troughs, pouring in syrup and vinegar, trampled it to a slush and then pouring syrup over the floors of the residence, emptied barrels of flour over it, trampled it with their feet. Numbers of bales of cotton were burned, which my father had removed from near his buildings, hoping to save it.

Everything of value was stolen or burned, including the clothing. When my mother attempted to remonstrate with those wrecking the dwelling, she was approached by an officer from Ohio, advising her to say nothing for if the soldiers were enraged, he could not answer for her life. A squad of the marauders in the promiscuous

¹²¹ Mrs Sarah A Moorer, who died in 1903 at age 83.

destruction of property seized upon the old family horse, which we kept from sympathy, hitched him to an old buggy loaded with chickens, turkeys and geese and left the yard with the load. The horse reluctantly left with his load, but when they attempted to drive him past the lot gate refused to go whereupon he was beaten unmercifully.

Such meager supplies as could be raked together after the wreckage was all the provisions left on this once prosperous plantation with its bounteous stores for numerous slaves. The sun that day arose on a scene of plenty and contentment to set on a field of want and despair. This is just one of the many homes upon which fell this blackness of darkness of vandal warfare.¹²²

Union Gen Phil Sheridan, at Woodstock, reported to Union Gen U S Grant, October 7, 1864.¹²³

I commenced moving back from Port Republic, Mount Crawford, Bridgewater, and Harrisonburg yesterday . . . The grain and forage in advance of these points up to Staunton had previously been destroyed. In moving back to this point the whole country from the Blue Ridge to the North Mountains has been made untenable for a rebel army. I have destroyed over 2000 barns, filled with wheat, hay, and farming implements; over 70 mills, filled with flour and wheat; have driven in front of the army over 4000 head of stock, and have killed and issued to the troops not less than 3000 sheep. This destruction embraces the Luray Valley and Little Fort Valley, as well as the main valley. A large number of horses have been obtained . . .

Lieutenant John R Meigs, my engineer officer, was murdered beyond Harrisonburg, near Dayton. For this atrocious act all the houses within an area of 5 miles were

¹²² UWK, p xiv-xv

¹²³ UWK, p107

burned . . . Tomorrow I will continue the destruction of wheat, forage, etc, down to Fisher's Hill. When this is completed the Valley, from Winchester up to Staunton, 92 miles, will have but little in it for man or beast.

Lincoln preserved the Union like Hitler preserved the Jews.

From Union Major Gen Frank P Blair Jr¹²⁴ to Union Colonel George E Spencer¹²⁵, November 20, 1864:¹²⁶

The outrages committed by your command during the march are . . . common, and . . . of . . . an aggravated nature -- the pillaging of houses and wanton destruction of property by your regiment.

¹²⁴ Seventeenth Corps, in the field, Georgia.

¹²⁵ First Alabama Cavalry.

¹²⁶ UWK, p110

Special Field Order no 175, issued by Union Gen O O Howard¹²⁷, November 22, 1864:¹²⁸

The crime of arson and robbery have become frequent throughout this army.

Special Field Order no 181 was issued by Gen Howard¹²⁹ on November 30:

Many men not belonging to proper foraging parties are allowed to straggle . . . and forage for themselves without . . . authority . . . It is by such men the greater part of the pillaging is done and depredations committed.

The constitution of the Confederate States was patterned after the US Constitution. But the role of the central government was vastly different in the two countries. The Confederate constitution carefully carved out some of the most troublesome parts of the US Constitution, such as the general welfare clause and the commerce clause. The Confederacy also prohibited protectionist tariffs and internal improvement subsidies.

That made the Confederate constitution much closer to the original intent of the Framers. Meanwhile, in Lincoln's America, the Constitution was abandoned. The role of the federal government underwent a radical transformation under Lincoln's reign of terror. Jeffersonian democracy was banished, while the big-government dreams of Alexander Hamilton, Henry Clay, the Whigs, and Abraham Lincoln

¹²⁷ Army of the Tennessee, at Gordon, Georgia, 14 miles south southwest of Milledgeville.

¹²⁸ UWK, p110-111

¹²⁹ At Station no 9-1/2, Georgia.

flourished. The new American System under Republican monopoly, was thoroughly corrupt.¹³⁰

The Union Pacific and Central Pacific Railroads are remarkable demonstrations of just how Lincoln's corrupt American System worked. Those railroads received, compliments of American taxpayers, sections of land and low-interest loans for each completed mile of track. They got \$16K for each mile of flat land, twice that for hilly terrain, and three times that for mountains.

Charles Durant, president of the Union Pacific, worked with Grenville Dodge, chief engineer of the Union Pacific and close friend of Lincoln and Sherman. Together they found clever ways to cheat the American taxpayer out of every dollar possible. They chose circuitous routes to maximize the per-mile subsidy. They saved money by using the cheapest possible construction materials and workmanship that stressed speed over quality. If an Indian or farmer got in their way, they just forced them off their property at gunpoint. They laid track on ice and snow, knowing full well that it would have to be redone after spring thaws. They got paid both times.

Officers of both railroad companies set up their own supply companies. Using taxpayer dollars, they bought supplies from their own companies at inflated prices, making a nice profit on the side. (It worked so well that it evolved into the Credit Mobilier scandal under Grant.) Republicans in Congress sold railroad commissioner jobs. No experience necessary.

No one was surprised that both railroad companies were bankrupt by the time they were completed in May 1869. No one should have been surprised that Lincoln's new American (Alexander Hamilton / Whig / Henry Clay / Republican) system established an unprecedented level of corruption in the federal government. It dragged the US economy down for decades, beginning with Grant's scandal-ridden administration.

¹³⁰ RLD, p245-251

Leonard Curry sums it up quite nicely:

Throughout the remainder of the nineteenth century and beyond, corporate interests -- apparently insatiable -- returned again and again to demand direct and indirect federal subsidies. To insure preferential treatment and noninterference, national legislative and executive offices were corrupted and representative government made a mockery . . . the corruption of the Grant era was sparked by . . . the activities of those two companies and individuals connected to Pacific railway scheme.

The man at the center of it all was Abraham Lincoln.

The transcontinental railroad industry finally became more efficient around the end of the 19th century. That just happened to be when funds from federal subsidies evaporated.

There can be no reasonable doubt that the North would have been much better off following the economic and constitutional model of the Confederacy. There can be no reasonable doubt that the entire nation would have been better off if Lincoln's system of tyranny and corruption had not been forced upon America in the 1860s. That federal corruption, waste, arrogance, and tyranny thrives even today, particularly in what we now refer to as the northeastern establishment elite. That is Lincoln's legacy.

From Union Brigadier Gen Horatio Van Cleve¹³¹ to Union Major Gen Robert H Milroy¹³², January 6, 1865:¹³³

Complaints are almost daily brought to me of the conduct of certain men who style themselves "home-guards" . . . organized at Shelbyville¹³⁴ by . . . [Union] Captain Worthman. These men go about the country and . . . take from the citizens horses and mules and forage . . . enter houses, order their meals, search trunks and bureau drawers all . . . in the name of the Government of the United States . . . A perfect reign of terror exists at and in the vicinity of Shelbyville.

From Union Gen William Tecumseh Sherman to Union Gen Halleck, December 24, 1864:¹³⁵

The truth is the whole army is burning with an insatiable desire to wreak vengeance upon South Carolina.

¹³¹ Commander of Post of Murfreesborough, 28 miles southeast of Nashville.

¹³² Commanding Defense of the Nashville and Chattanooga Railroad, Tullahoma.

¹³³ UWK, p116

¹³⁴ 23 miles south of Murfreesborough.

¹³⁵ UWK, p112

From Union Brigadier Gen Rufus Saxton¹³⁶ to Secretary of War Stanton, December 30, 1864:¹³⁷

I . . . report my doings for the current year . . . The recruiting [of slaves into the Union army] went on slowly, when the major-general commanding, (General [John G] Foster) ordered an indiscriminate conscription of every able-bodied colored man in the department . . . The order spread universal confusion and terror. The negroes fled to the woods and swamps . . . They were hunted to their hiding places . . . Men have been seized and forced to enlist who had large families of young children dependent upon them for support.

Three boys, one only fourteen years of age, were seized in a field where they were at work and sent to a regiment in a distant part of the department without the knowledge or consent of their parents. A man on his way to enlist as a volunteer was stopped by a recruiting party. He told them where he was going and was passing on when he was again ordered to halt. He did not stop, and was shot dead, and was left where he fell . . . The soldiers desired to bring him in and get the bounty offered for bringing in recruits . . .

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 . . . Licentiousness was widespread . . . The influences of too many [Union officers and soldiers] was demoralizing to the negro, and has greatly hindered the effort for their improvement and elevation. There was a general disposition among the soldiers and civilian

¹³⁶ Military Governor, US Forces at Beaufort, South Carolina.

¹³⁷ UWK, p112-113

speculators here to defraud the negroes in their private traffic, to take the commodities which they offered for sale by force, or to pay for them in worthless money.

Contrary to what we may think we know about Christianity, Christians did not stand up for the freedom or fair treatment of slaves in medieval Europe. In defiance of our widely-embraced American concepts of virtue, morality, love, compassion, fairness, freedom, racial and social equity, human dignity, and even basic human decency, Christians eagerly embraced slavery.

Christian churches owned hundreds of slaves. Bishops, popes, and monasteries kept them busy working the land for profit.

Not that Christians were completely heartless. They drew the line at enslaving fellow Christians. But their limits had limits. Catholics had no problem with Eastern Orthodox Christians being enslaved.¹³⁸

On December 7, 1864, Secretary of War Stanton received a report from Union Major Elisha H Ludington¹³⁹ regarding the Union Kentucky regiments, which were raised for one year's service. He stated that they . . .

are generally distributed in . . . small detachments . . . There is neither drill nor discipline among the men; they are merely a uniformed mob . . . They . . . show their zeal in seizing unarmed people. They plunder largely at their own discretion.¹⁴⁰

¹³⁸ SLG, p15

¹³⁹ Assistant inspector general, Louisville, Kentucky.

¹⁴⁰ UWK, p115

From Union Major Gen James H Wilson¹⁴¹ to Union Lieutenant Colonel George G Miner¹⁴², January 2, 1865:¹⁴³

Frequent and bitter complaints are made by the people in the vicinity of Edgefield¹⁴⁴ in regard to depredations that are being made by the cavalry command . . . These offenders . . . are the cause of . . . much trouble to peaceful citizens and of . . . much disgrace to the cavalry command.

From Union Colonel William Gamble¹⁴⁵ to Union Gen C C Augur, March 19, 1865:¹⁴⁶

[There are] numerous complaints by the people in and about Warrenton¹⁴⁷ in regard to the beating of women and pillaging and robbing of houses in and about that locality by the late scout under [Union] Captain [Edward] Russell¹⁴⁸. I propose . . . to stop . . . this beating and plundering of defenseless women by our scouting parties.

¹⁴¹ Cavalry Corps, Military Division of the Mississippi, Nashville, Tennessee.

¹⁴² Commandant of Dismounted Cavalry Camp.

¹⁴³ UWK, p115

¹⁴⁴ 10 miles east-northeast of Nashville.

¹⁴⁵ Eighth Illinois Cavalry, commanding First Separate Brigade, Fairfax Courthouse, Virginia.

¹⁴⁶ UWK, p117-118

¹⁴⁷ 44 miles southwest of Washington.

¹⁴⁸ Eighth Illinois Cavalry.

There were 14 states admitted into the Union from 1819 to 1864. How many of them allowed free blacks to vote? Approximately . . . none. Blacks were not allowed to vote in 90% of the states where blacks were supposedly free.

Interestingly, in those states, where a very low percentage of the population was black, a very high percentage of the black population was in prison. Blacks were arrested for the slightest infraction, real or perceived. All it took was a white allegation for a black conviction.

Not that life in the South was a bed of roses for blacks. But the point is this. Life for blacks in the North was nowhere near as good as CivilGate mythology portrays it to be. And life for blacks in the South was nowhere near as bad as CivilGate propaganda claims it was. Southerners weren't as evil, and Northerners weren't as pure of thought and motive as we have been led to believe.¹⁴⁹

From Union Brevet Major Gen Orlando B Willcox¹⁵⁰ to Union Major Gen John G Parke¹⁵¹, April 9, 1865:¹⁵²

There should be some uniform rule on taking property of inhabitants. One corps commander is reported to allow his soldiers to take horses and mules and kill sheep and chickens promiscuously, saying they were all contraband.

This was right at the end of the war, during the Appomattox campaign. The problem had existed from the very beginning of the war, and the North still had not bothered

¹⁴⁹ SLG, p72

¹⁵⁰ First Division, Ninth Corps, Army of the Potomac, at Beasley's House.

¹⁵¹ Ninth Corps, Burke's Station, Virginia, 35 miles east-southeast of Appomattox Courthouse.

¹⁵² UWK, p118

to establish uniform rules of conduct for its soldiers. This is glaring proof of the incompetence of Union military leaders, their feckless, half-hearted attempts at maintaining discipline among the ranks, and the indifference or encouragement from top officials in the Lincoln administration, including Abe himself.

These are the buffoons who were then placed in charge of Reconstruction, and who were running the country. It's the same astounding incompetence and arrogance on full display today by the northeastern establishment elite, whose ancestors brought us the Civil War and CivilGate.

Secession anyone?

From Union Gen G G Meade¹⁵³ to Union Gen U S Grant, April 17, 1865:¹⁵⁴

General Willcox, at Wilson's Station¹⁵⁵, hearing of marauders on the Nottoway River¹⁵⁶, sent a detachment in that direction, who succeeded in capturing a camp with several wagons loaded with plunder. The party consisted of negroes, mostly belonging to this [Union] army.

The North was already teaching blacks their Yankee bad habits. The process would be accelerated during Reconstruction. Here's another example of how the North was already in the process of replacing Southern culture with Yankee depravity:

¹⁵³ Army of the Potomac, at Burkeville, Virginia.

¹⁵⁴ UWK, p118

¹⁵⁵ 20 miles west-southwest of Petersburg.

¹⁵⁶ 10 miles south of Wilson's.

General Order no 11, published by Union Gen G L Hartstuff¹⁵⁷ on April 24, 1865¹⁵⁸ (shortly after the end of the war):

[In regard to] the delusion which many colored persons, formerly slaves, are laboring under concerning their rights and privileges . . . Their error consists mainly in the belief that with their liberty they acquire individual rights in the property of their former masters, and that they are entitled to live with and be subsisted by them without being obliged to labor or give any remuneration for their support. Many even believe that the entire property of their former owners belongs now to themselves, and that the owner remains with them only by their sufferance. This mistake has been originated, and sustained in many instances, by thoughtless, ignorant, or mischievous soldiers . . .

The operation of existing laws is to make them free, but not to give them any claim whatever upon, or rights in connection with, the property of their former owners . . . The fact must in time be learned by all negroes . . . that they must work for their support now the same as before they were free . . . The destitute ration will not hereafter be issued to any persons whatever who are able to labor.

Emancipation from institutionalized slavery did not mean blacks were free. Without preparation for their release from slavery, the sudden change left most slaves worse off than they had been before the war, and the Civil War, far from liberating slaves as CivilGate propaganda would have us believe, was a cruel injustice to them. Had Lincoln obeyed his oath to uphold and defend the Constitution, the South would have freed the slaves in a way that made them truly free.

Thanks to Yankees, slaves now faced a cruel world in which they were forced to labor just as hard as ever, but with no master to provide food, shelter, clothing, and medical care. Yankees were much less kind to blacks than their Southern masters

¹⁵⁷ In Petersburg.

¹⁵⁸ UWK, p119

had been. Sure, they were now free to go wherever they wanted, but where were they going to go, and how were they going to get there with no money? Yankees certainly did not want them in their Northern states, so they had already passed laws prohibiting blacks from settling there.

April 9, 1865: Lee surrenders to Grant. April 14, 1865: Lincoln is shot by John Wilkes Booth. April 15, 1865: Lincoln dies. Today: most people believe that Lincoln's assassination was revenge for the South's defeat. But that doesn't make much sense, for at least a couple of reasons.

For one thing, why would the conspiracy involve killing others besides Lincoln, such as Secretary of State Seward, who had little to do with the South's defeat? This was Lincoln's war -- no one else's.

More importantly, Lincoln had given every indication that he would take a decidedly conciliatory approach toward the South now that the war was over. Of course, Lincoln had proven throughout the war that he was a pathological liar, and his promises meant absolutely nothing except likely betrayal. Still, surely John Wilkes Booth and his fellow conspirators must have realized that they were unlikely to be treated any more fairly with someone else in the Oval Office.¹⁵⁹

That assumes that Booth and buddies were reasonable, clear-thinking men, which itself is not a theory that makes much sense. Maybe those guys were so full of hatred and so determined to get some measure of revenge that they weren't about to let facts or reason get in their way. Anyone crazy enough to conspire to put a bullet through a sitting president's head is not the most rational of men.

¹⁵⁹ SLG, p177-178

The most tragic part of Lincoln's assassination is not that the tyrant was killed, but when he was killed. Why should we feel any more sorry for Lincoln than any of the other 650,000 Americans who died in Lincoln's illegal, unconstitutional, immoral, unnecessary war? He was just the final casualty of the war. (Or the semi-finalist, if you count John Wilkes Booth).

The tragedy is that he wasn't killed a few years earlier. Say mid-to-late 1861, after he had proven himself to be a ruthless tyrant, and after he had done so much harm to not only the South, but also to thousands of Yankees who dared disagree with their dictator. By April 1865, the damage had been done, and it could not be undone by killing Lincoln, no matter how much he deserved to die.

If the tyrant from Illinois had been allowed to live, at least a while longer, and given a chance to show how he would deal with the post-war process of reuniting and restoring the nation, much of the damage inflicted on the South through Reconstruction may have been avoided. There is good reason to believe it would have worked out that way. All Lincoln ever really wanted, from the very beginning of his administration, was for the South to rejoin the Union. He promised over and over, throughout the war, right up to early 1865, that the South could keep their slaves if they would just come back into the Union and play nice.

Why was that so important to Lincoln? Because Lincoln was a big-government guy. He always had been. He had always wanted power, and when he finally got it, he was not about to let the South screw that up for him. And secession screwed up his plans, big time. Primarily because they would no longer be collecting tariff revenue in the South and sending it to the North for Yankees to spend as they saw fit. That's the way it had worked for decades, and Lincoln was going to do everything in his power to stop secession from happening, to keep the tariff revenue flowing. Now that he was in the oval office, he had the full power of the federal government to impose his will on the South, and he wasted no time putting it to use.

Now that he had successfully imposed his will, he had nothing to gain by a South struggling with economic, political, social, and cultural chaos, upheaval, and resentment. He wanted a contented South, willing to put the war behind them as quickly as possible, eager to get their infrastructure rebuilt, their society restored, their energy renewed, and their economy humming. That's the South Lincoln wanted, because that's the South that would produce the maximum tariff revenue for the North and for Lincoln's big-government plans.

What Booth did was to turn the post-war decisions over to people who were driven by different motivations. The North's policies were then dictated by men whose lust for Southern cultural genocide had not been sated, and whose thirst for revenge had not yet been satisfied. Sure, they wanted the money, too, but they were more inclined to beat the South into submission rather than give Lincoln's approach a try. They were Radical Republican extremists, and they may very well have been responsible for Lincoln's assassination, because they had the most to gain by it. They likely used Booth to give the appearance of revenge by angry Southerners. (It was no challenge finding one of those). But why would they include Seward in their plot? Because he was the only other prominent Republican who embraced Lincoln's conciliatory approach toward the post-war South.¹⁶⁰

¹⁶⁰ SLG, p182

From Union Lieutenant Colonel Theodore A Switzler¹⁶¹ to Union Brigadier Gen Egbert B Brown¹⁶²:

I send this that . . . the general . . . may apply remedy . . . to the shame incident to the murders committed by the troops in their scouts. Since Saturday morning last there has been as many as four murders committed by our soldiers . . . The men murdered were [John B] Wright, two Bunches [John and William], and [Port] Thornton, which, added to [Joseph] Harvey, and [James] Scuggs, makes the number six within the last ten or twelve days . . .

There is no discipline whatever exercised over the soldiers here, which, added to the indiscriminate sale of liquor, renders the soldiers fiends rather than soldiers . . . The officer commanding Captain [Emory S] Foster¹⁶³ . . . will be unable to correct the evil of these murders until his subordinates are held to personal responsibility for the actions of their men.¹⁶⁴

No discipline whatever. Despite repeated threats, warnings, general orders, etc, many Union officers didn't even try to control their men. Their words meant nothing to the *fiends*, because it was well understood that they were just for show.

¹⁶¹ Provost marshal, Warsaw, Missouri, 67 miles west-southwest of Jefferson City.

¹⁶² District of Central Missouri, Jefferson City.

¹⁶³ Seventh Missouri State Militia Cavalry.

¹⁶⁴ UWK, p50-51

An order from Union Major Gen George L Hartstuff¹⁶⁵ to the commander of the Fifth Massachusetts Cavalry, April 18, 1865:¹⁶⁶

Arrest all pillagers . . . The arrest of Colonel [Charles F] Adams [Jr]¹⁶⁷ had been ordered from department headquarters, in consequence of the very numerous complaints against the regiment . . . outrages on person and property.

From Union Captain Hiram E W Clark¹⁶⁸ to Union Brevet Major Gen Edward Ferrero¹⁶⁹, April 23, 1865:¹⁷⁰

I . . . report . . . a scout made on the north side of the Appomattox River by my command April 22 . . . I found that about two weeks ago there had been soldiers at houses some six miles from the city, taking horses and arms, searching trunks, taking jewelry, etc . . . These depredations are not committed by stragglers, but by men coming across the river from their respective [Union] camps.

¹⁶⁵ Commanding US Federal Forces at Petersburg.

¹⁶⁶ UWK, p118

¹⁶⁷ Fifth Massachusetts Colored Cavalry.

¹⁶⁸ Company G, Fifth Massachusetts Colored Cavalry, near Petersburg.

¹⁶⁹ Commanding Defenses of Petersburg.

¹⁷⁰ UWK, p119

From Union Lieutenant Colonel Madison M Cannon¹⁷¹ to Union Brevet Major Gen Francis C Barlow¹⁷², April 24, 1865:¹⁷³

The country about New Store¹⁷⁴ is filled with stragglers from our army, who are committing depredations upon the property of the citizens . . . They are going in the direction of the James River.

To help compensate for the sudden sharp decline in tariff revenue, the North imposed a system of massive excise taxation on Yankees during the Civil War.¹⁷⁵ After the war, much of the excise tax structure remained intact, including a large number of revenue agents. Like the remaining tariff inspectors, revenue agents were political appointees. Men who participated in the patronage system were necessarily men who were easily bribed, since the patronage system itself was a form of bribery. A man got a political appointment so he could feed his family. In return, he always did exactly as instructed by his political masters. Naturally, that included obligatory campaign contributions, and voting for Republicans in every election. Republicans harvested not only the vote of the political appointee, but the votes of all his family members, and most of his friends and acquaintances, many of which were in pursuit of their own political appointment.

In addition to the obvious benefits to Republican Party operatives, there were indirect benefits to their friends and relatives. High excise and tariff taxes tempted

¹⁷¹ Fortieth New York, commanding at Farmville, Virginia, 23 miles east-southeast of Appomattox Court House.

¹⁷² Second Corps, Army of the Potomac.

¹⁷³ UWK, p119

¹⁷⁴ 16 miles east-northeast of Appomattox Court House.

¹⁷⁵ RLD, p225-229

many Republican businessmen to pay tariff inspectors and revenue agents to look the other way. That sort of benefit was available only for businessmen willing to make generous contributions to Republican candidates and to vote for them at every opportunity. In the late 1860s, the New York State Supervisor of Internal Revenue earned \$500K a year in bribes.

The population of the North's 13 largest cities grew by 70% from 1860 to 1874. Taxes in those cities during that time period shot up by 363% -- five times the population growth. While we cannot rule out the possibility that some of that additional tax revenue was actually applied to increased government services, most of it undoubtedly was used to expand the number of political patronage positions, which helped the Republican Party much more than taxpaying city citizens.

Congressional nominating conventions were ideal for patronage networking. Political appointees pledged their support for the candidates who promised to continue the patronage system with all its direct and indirect benefits. Aspiring political appointees pledged their support to the candidate who promised them a job. Candidates could afford to be generous with taxpayers' money.

Ulysses S Grant took full advantage of this corrupt system, finding government jobs for almost all members of his extended family. He also found a nice government job for his buddy Confederate Gen James Longstreet. Their longtime friendship had been suspended temporarily during the war, but it was quickly rekindled after Lee's surrender. Longstreet's resume listed two job qualifications. He had introduced his cousin to Grant. They got married. (It is not clear whether that helped or hindered Longstreet's aspirations.) Also, Longstreet liked to ride on trains. That made Longstreet grossly overqualified. Just being Grant's longtime friend was good enough.

Grant had not invented bribery, but he coined the term *lobbyists*, referring to men who lingered in Washington hotel lobbies, waiting for an opportunity to bribe senators and representatives. As the size of the federal government exploded, so did

the opportunities for bribery and other forms of corruption. Republican Party operatives found themselves with access to unprecedented discretionary taxpayer funds. Lobbyists found themselves with unprecedented motivation to hang around hotel lobbies, eager to make generous special-interest contributions to the personal welfare of prominent politicians. Railroad, banking, and protectionist manufacturing company lobbyists were particularly influential in shaping government policy. And why not? They had been the core support group for the Republican Party since its very beginning. Republican political operatives found themselves with more spending money than they had ever imagined.

Lobbyists got special favors from the government; Republicans got generous funding from willing lobbyists and unwilling taxpayers; unscrupulous Yankees got cushy government jobs; taxpayers got screwed. That was the new American system. The constitutional democratic republic constructed by America's founders was a thing of the past, replaced by a mercantilist state. The federal government barely existed in 1861. After the Civil War, the Republican Party **was** the federal government, and it existed primarily for benefit of the Northern industrial and financial interests that funded the Republican Party. It was a cozy system in which everybody was a winner. Except taxpayers.

Reconstruction ended in 1877. In the 1880s, Southern Democrats began to regain some influence in Congress. Taxpayers once again became tax protesters. The relentless Republican march toward concentrated central power was temporarily held in check. Grover Cleveland fought back against Republican usurpation of power, vetoing hundreds of unconstitutional and unconscionable Republican bills. Cleveland was the last American president to wage such principled battles.

A decade later, William McKinley unleashed American imperialism, declaring war on Spain, harvesting Puerto Rico, Guam, and the Philippines, setting the stage for America's role in World War I. Then Franklin Roosevelt gave us increased federal election abuses, new unconstitutional federal programs, and an expanded patronage system beyond even Henry Clay's wildest dreams. Roosevelt's Democrat Party was

Lincoln's Republican Party on steroids. Roosevelt put the rat in Democrat. Corruption squared. As always, it was the honest, hardworking American taxpayer that paid for it all, and suffered.

Lincoln made it all possible. America can never recover what we (North and South) lost in the Civil War.

General Order no 9, issued by Union Major Gen Horatio G Wright¹⁷⁶, April 27, 1865:¹⁷⁷

The general . . . cannot conceal his regret and mortification at the conduct of those men . . . who . . . have by their ruthless plundering and marauding among peaceful citizens, shown themselves utterly unworthy the name of soldiers.

The following day, Gen Wright got this message from Union Gen G G Meade of Sixth Corps:

Many complaints have been received here of the depredations committed by stragglers from Sixth Corps.

A Circular issued by Union Gen Philip H Sheridan¹⁷⁸ on April 28, 1865:¹⁷⁹

Hereafter the seizure of animals or private property . . . is . . . forbidden . . .

All commanding officers are charged to keep their commands from

¹⁷⁶ Sixth Corps, Army of the Potomac, at Danville, Virginia, 77 miles southwest of Burkeville. This order relates to the 4-day march from Burkeville Junction to Danville.

¹⁷⁷ UWK, p119-120

¹⁷⁸ Cavalry Headquarters, South Boston, Virginia.

¹⁷⁹ UWK, p120

straggling and pillaging.

Apparently, prior to this date, Sheridan had no problem with his men straggling and pillaging. Why would he decide to take a tough stand against it now? Maybe because the war had been over for more than two weeks.

From Union Captain Joseph J Baker¹⁸⁰ to Union Major Henry B Scott, May 3, 1865.¹⁸¹

I proceeded . . . to Hanover County, and have carefully scouted through that portion said to be infested by guerrillas, and have ascertained, after close and particular inquiry, that no such bands exist. The depredations complained of by Miss Goodwin, as well as many others reported by the inhabitants, who appear quiet and peaceably disposed, were committed by three stragglers from the US Army , and I have heard of no outrages other than those perpetrated by them . . . I further . . . report that stragglers from the US Army are wandering through the county exciting some alarm in the minds of the inhabitants.

This is what the South had to look forward to, now that Lincoln and his goons had *preserved the Union*. How wonderful for the nation that Yankee culture was now being inflicted on the rest of the country. These *better angels* of Yankee nature would not stop until the South had been thoroughly indoctrinated with Yankee greed, arrogance, and depravity, under Republican tyranny.

¹⁸⁰ Commanding a detachment of Fourth Massachusetts Cavalry, in Richmond, Virginia.

¹⁸¹ UWK, p120

While Christians embraced slavery, Muslims thrived on it. Muslims were a dominant force in the Eastern world for at least a thousand years, and they were at war throughout the millennium. As always, war captives were enslaved, and most of their war captives were white Europeans. Men were worked to death, while women, girls, and boys were used as prostitutes. Some caliphs, or sultans, had hundreds of slaves in their harems. One caliph had a harem with over 6000 slaves.

Some boys were immediately castrated (without anesthetic). These eunuchs were used as harem guards or teachers, or they were marched to slave ports, sold, and shipped to a thriving market.¹⁸²

From Union Gen Hartsuff, in Petersburg, to Union Gen Weitzell, May 13, 1865.¹⁸³

Many complaints are made at this headquarters of depredations committed by soldiers of the Twenty-Fifth Army Corps, consists principally in the destruction of buildings and the exciting of the colored people to acts of outrage against the persons and property of white citizens. It is asserted that the buildings are destroyed that the boards and timbers may be used to build huts and quarters for the soldiers, and the bricks of chimneys are carried off, probably for the same purpose. Colored soldiers are represented as having straggled about advising negroes not to work on the farms, where they are employed, and been told by the soldiers that if they had not arms to use against their former masters, that they (the soldiers) would furnish them.

¹⁸² SLG, p17-19

¹⁸³ UWK, p120-121

More than a month had passed since Lee surrendered to Grant. This was the beginning of racism in the South. It had not existed to any significant degree prior to the war. Yankees brought their racist attitudes with them, pitted blacks against whites, used blacks as political pawns. It's important to understand that Southern racism was created by Yankee occupation of the South.

Maryland's governor had refused to call a special session of the state legislature to address the issue of secession or allegiance to the Union, opting instead to wait and see what decision Virginia came to. When

Virginia seceded, it was too late for Maryland to do anything except experience the boot of Lincoln's heel on her throat. By May 13, 1861, Maryland was fully occupied by Union troops, and that remained unchanged throughout the war.

A Circular issued by Union Brevet Major Gen Alpheus S Williams¹⁸⁴, January 11, 1865:¹⁸⁵

The indiscriminate pillage of houses is disgraceful and demoralizing to this army. The houses in this vicinity, of free negroes even, have been stripped of the necessary bedclothes and of family apparel. These infamous practices . . . [are] disgraceful to our arms and shocking to humanity.

The city of Atlanta had no military significance to the North. By the time Sherman was poised to show what a big man he was, the city's defenders had already left. As it turned out, the women, children, slaves, old men, and

¹⁸⁴ Twentieth Corps, at Robertsville, 34 miles north of Savannah, Georgia.

¹⁸⁵ UWK, p123

wounded soldiers of Atlanta were no match for the mighty Sherman, who shelled the city for days, anyway, just for the Yankee fun of it. The North was mighty proud of their brave, valiant hero. Sherman wasn't so good in battles with Southern soldiers, but he could sure beat up on innocent defenseless civilians.

After several days of relentless bombardment, the surviving civilians were ordered evacuated. They were left homeless just before the onset of winter. There was no empathy or compassion for them as they starved to death, because in the perverted, psychotic mind of Sherman, his victims were really the ones to blame. All they had wanted was to be left alone, to stay out of the reach of Lincoln's insanity. For that, they deserved the cruel fate they now suffered.

How could Southerners ever have wanted to leave a Union like that?

From there, Sherman cut a swath of pillage, plunder, destruction, and death 60 miles wide all the way to Savannah, Georgia. Then, it was on to Columbia, South Carolina, which was burned by Sherman's bummers¹⁸⁶. The bloodthirsty Union general bragged about his bummers' handiwork to Lincoln, deriving immense delight from terrorizing his innocent defenseless Southern victims. Next was the Shenandoah Valley of Virginia, with the help of Sheridan, Grant, Custer, Hunter, and Merritt.

As though they needed further incentive, the barbaric Union generals wanted to impress Yankees, who would soon be voting in a presidential election. Even a minor Union defeat could destroy any chance Lincoln had of being reelected. Abe's generals were not about to let that happen. The entire civilized world (which excluded the American North) was shocked by what Lincoln was doing. They were witnessing the Western world's first ethnic cleansing, and they were appalled by it.

¹⁸⁶ The name Sherman gave to his looting, pillaging, plundering, raping, murdering, destructive Union soldiers.

But that didn't faze those Yankee generals, who went on to wage a similar campaign of genocide against the Plains Indians. What was **their** great crime against the almighty Union? They had the audacity to own the land that was needed by Yankees for their transcontinental railroad. Bummers.¹⁸⁷

It's interesting that Americans no longer are shocked or appalled by such Yankee conduct in the Civil War. These days, Abraham Lincoln is widely considered one of this nation's greatest presidents, the gold standard of American leadership, a hero worthy of the Lincoln Memorial and a face on Mt Rushmore. We celebrate his birthday every year.

Lincoln was personally and intimately involved with the conduct of the war. All his major generals knew full well what was happening, and most were eager or at least willing to participate in the slaughter and genocide. Those Union generals who objected were quickly silenced or ignored, while the most egregious war criminals were promoted, not punished. The people of the North were also fully aware, thanks to newspaper articles which called for retaliation against those generals who were not brutal enough.

Is it because Americans have grown fond of war crimes and genocide? No, it's because they don't know the real Abraham Lincoln or what really happened in the Civil War. Yankees won the war, so they wrote the history of it. They had absolutely no incentive to give a fair, accurate, truthful account of events, and they had extremely powerful motives to rewrite the narrative, cover up their crimes, and avoid the embarrassment the truth exposes. This massive cover-up of the Civil War is what I call CivilGate.

¹⁸⁷ SLG, p151-157

General Field Order no 9 issued by Union Gen O O Howard¹⁸⁸, February 9, 1865:¹⁸⁹

The attention of the general . . . has been called by officers of our own army to the wanton and indiscriminate destruction of private property, burning of dwelling houses, plundering and pillaging the houses of the few poor people who have remained at home, etc.

Some Americans were fighting a deadly war against terrorism generations before the 9/11/2001 attack on New York and the Pentagon. Union military forces inflicted terrorism on Southern civilians throughout the Civil War and Reconstruction. Savage Union militants unleashed their evil outrage on innocent defenseless women, children, old men, and blacks with impunity. It wasn't just a few unruly soldiers who got carried away once in a while. It was a systematic campaign of Southern cultural genocide, orchestrated by Lincoln and his top generals, conducted by officers and men in the field, celebrated in Northern newspapers, and demanded by virtually all Yankees.

Many commanders issued numerous orders against such atrocities, but they usually did so just to protect themselves from possible charges of war crimes. Few officers ever offered any real objection to this illegal conduct, and fewer still made any serious attempt to prevent it, put an end to it, or punish the perpetrators. Those who did complain or try to do something about Union war crimes were ignored, marginalized, or punished themselves, while the worst offenders were very rarely punished, and were often promoted.

¹⁸⁸ Army of the Tennessee, Binnaker's Bridge, South Carolina.

¹⁸⁹ UWK, p124

On April 24, 1863, War Secretary Edwin M Stanton published General Order no 100, supposedly setting forth instructions for appropriate military conduct in the field. Most of the provisions had a convenient escape clause, allowing the field commander to disregard the rules if he considered it necessary. It also offered this note of caution to field commanders: **Military necessity does not admit . . . of the wanton devastation of a district.** It appears that Union officers missed that part.

Here is what the Confederacy's Secretary of War¹⁹⁰ had to say about the Union's General Order no 100:

Order no 100 is a confused . . . compilation . . . some . . . obsolete, others repudiated; and a military commander under this code may pursue a line of conduct in accordance with principles of justice, . . . or he may justify conduct correspondent with the warfare of the barbarous hordes who overran the Roman Empire . . .

The war that the United States is carrying on against the Confederate States is . . . opposed to the fundamental principle of their own Constitution . . . -self government . . .

To accomplish . . . [subjugation of the Confederate States, our enemies] have adopted a barbarous system of warfare . . . It is in this code of military necessity that the acts of atrocity and violence . . . have been committed by the officers of the United States and have shocked the moral sense of civilized nations . . . The country that adopts as allies murder, rapine, cruelty, incendiarism, and revenge is condemned by the voice of the civilized world.

Well, not exactly. Union Civil War crimes aren't condemned by Americans, because they are not aware of them. The ugly truth of the Civil War has been omitted from classrooms and textbooks, replaced by a fairy-tale version of events portraying Abraham Lincoln and the North as marvelous American heroes. But the truth cannot

¹⁹⁰ James A Seddon.

be buried forever. All Americans need to know the truth, and today's Northerners need to acknowledge what their ancestors did.¹⁹¹

General Order no 158, published by Union Rear Admiral David D Porter¹⁹², January 18, 1864:¹⁹³

During . . . [this] war . . . unbridled license . . . [has] had too much sway, and . . . the honor of the flag has been sullied . . . by the conduct of unprincipled persons. If I should shut my eyes and ears to the fact that some of my command are rioting in excesses disgraceful to humanity, I should be as culpable as the offenders . . . Acts [have been] committed contrary to the rules of civilized warfare and the laws of humanity . . .

I have been . . . mortified . . . by the conduct of persons in charge of some of the gunboats, the most prominent of whom are Acting Master F [Ferdinand] T Coleman and Acting Ensign S [Silas] B Coleman of the *Mound City*. These two officers, in the absence of their . . . commander . . . have committed offenses against the laws of justice and humanity . . . They have both indulged in a system of petty pillaging and outrages on unarmed individuals, and have converted the vessel . . . into an instrument of tyranny and aversion to the people.

¹⁹¹ UWK, p1-2

¹⁹² Mississippi Squadron, Flagship *Black Hawk*, Cairo, Illinois.

¹⁹³ UWK, p70-71

During Reconstruction, Republican Party operatives and military puppet government leaders plundered the Southern states, plunging them deeply into debt while Yankees lined their pockets with Southern taxpayer funds.

Here are some of the clever schemes Yankees devised for robbing and cheating Southern taxpayers.¹⁹⁴

- ◆ Florida legislators sold more than a million acres of public land to themselves and their friends at 5 cents per acre.
- ◆ Florida legislators paid exorbitant prices for printing work done by their friends. The cost of printing in 1870 exceeded the entire 1860 state budget.
- ◆ The federal government was scheduled to take a national census in 1870, with a cost of \$43,000 to the state of South Carolina. In 1869, state legislators hired their friends to conduct a state census (duplicating the work of the federal government a year later), paying them \$75,000.
- ◆ The South Carolina state House Speaker (a good Republican, of course) lost \$1000 on a horse race. The state legislature paid him an extra \$1000 in compensation to help ease his pain.
- ◆ Prior to the war, Louisiana spent about \$100K in expenses for a state legislative session. During Reconstruction the cost soared to over \$1 million. The additional cost was to cover lavish spending for lunches, alcohol, female attire, and coffins. (It is not clear why Republican men were wearing women's clothing.)
- ◆ The Louisiana legislature bought a hotel for \$250K. It is clear why the state legislature would buy a hotel, and why they would be willing to pay so much

¹⁹⁴ RLD, p215-216

for a hotel that had just sold for \$84K. Obviously, it was strictly to line the pockets of themselves and their friends at Southern taxpayer expense.

- ◆ The Louisiana legislature chartered a navigation company and bought \$100K in stock in the new company. It never opened for business.
- ◆ The Louisiana legislature spent more than \$2 million on a railroad. They then sold it to the chief justice of the state supreme court for \$50K.
- ◆ Southern states increased their property tax rates to amounts few citizens could afford. This was done deliberately so that state government agents could seize the property for unpaid taxes. One South Carolina Republican Party operative bragged that **Land in South Carolina is cheap! We like to put on the taxes so as to make it cheap!** About one-fifth of the state of Mississippi was for sale at one point. In Arkansas, the book used for advertising the state's tax-delinquent sales was 228 pages. By 1872, the South's average property tax was 400% of its 1860 rate. In South Carolina, it was 39 times higher.

Needless to say, this Republican Party plunder policy devastated the Southern economy. During the war, the crime of rape was committed upon Southern women, especially black women, by uniformed Union anarchists. Now the crime of rape was being committed by Republican Party operatives, which is to say by the federal government, since the Republican Party had a monopoly on federal politics.

As an example of how efficient Republicans had become in the plunder industry, the Republican governor of Louisiana¹⁹⁵ turned his \$8K annual salary into over \$1 million in four years.

¹⁹⁵ Henry Clay Warmoth.

By the mid 1870s, even Republican newspapers in the North were crying foul. For example, the *New York Times* called the South Carolina Republican puppet government **a gang of thieves**. That probably left Yankees feeling quite content, knowing that their fellow Republicans in the South were doing their job well.

As the modern era dawned, most of the world was abandoning slavery. But two large parts of the globe embraced it -- Africa and the New World. Up until that time, almost all races and nations had seen some, if not all, their people enslaved. But in the modern world, Africa would provide most of the victims, and the Western World would provide the buyers.

War continued to be the primary source for slave inventory, with African inter-tribal warfare never ceasing. Africans sold Africans for Western manufactured goods -- guns, rum, and materials. Certain crimes in Africa, especially murder, could also result in a cruise on the USS Slavery. Then, as chiefs saw the enormous profit potential, the list of potential slaves grew to include the mentally ill, those in debt, adulterers, and even some political opponents.

An African kingdom called Dahomey¹⁹⁶ had a ritual called Annual Customs, in which certain humans were entrusted with a special message. They were then killed, with the expectation that the message would be delivered to the king's ancestors. Someone eventually got the bright idea of selling these thousands of human sacrifices into slavery instead of cutting their throats or throwing them off a cliff. Selling fellow Africans became the backbone of the Dahomey economy, although sadly we are left to wonder if the king's ancestors ever became aware of this newfound source of wealth.¹⁹⁷

¹⁹⁶ Now known as Benin, just west of Nigeria.

¹⁹⁷ SLG, p21-23

On September 11, 1861, Secretary of War Simon Cameron sent these instructions to the Union commanding officer near Darnestown, Maryland: **Passage of any act of secession by the legislature of Maryland must be prevented. If necessary, all or any part of the members must be arrested.** Maryland state legislators were to be closely guarded, and they were not allowed to communicate with anyone. Lincoln had already suspended habeas corpus, so arrest meant indefinite detention, with no access to counsel, and no formal charges necessary. Political prisoners often were never allowed visits by family members, who most likely had no idea where their loved one was being held, for what reason, or even **if** he was being held.

Dozens of Maryland citizens were arrested, including the mayor of Baltimore, newly elected members of the state legislature, and all the members of the legislature meeting at Frederick City on September 17 who did not fully support the Union, or who were suspected of such.¹⁹⁸

This is just one small slice of overwhelming proof that Lincoln was no longer acting as a president, but as a tyrant, a dictator. He had immediately taken military control of the border states, Kansas, Missouri, and Maryland, all of which would have voted to join the Confederacy as Lincoln's true nature and intentions became apparent.

was hungry most of the time and had to keep fighting off the Yankee men. The Yankees were mean folks.¹⁹⁹

Sarah Debro, a 90-year-old former slave, 1937.

¹⁹⁸ UWK, p8-9

¹⁹⁹ SLG, p160

Far from being the Great Emancipator of CivilGate mythology, Abraham Lincoln supported slavery, stating:

When they remind us of their constitutional rights [to own slaves], I acknowledge them, not grudgingly but fully and fairly; and I would give them any legislation for the claiming of their fugitives.

He was referring to his support for the Fugitive Slave Act of 1850, even though almost all Northerners hated the law.

But what about the Emancipation Proclamation? Doesn't that prove he was fighting to free the slaves? Not at all. The Proclamation did not free a single slave, because it had no legal basis. Freeing the slaves was a matter for Congress and the Supreme Court. Furthermore, it specifically excluded the thousands of slaves in the Union. In early 1861 there were more slaves in the Union than in the Confederacy²⁰⁰. Lincoln could have fought to free those slaves, but he did not do so.

Lincoln supported Southern slavery throughout the Civil War, and his Proclamation did not contradict that. It was never intended to free any slaves, and Lincoln admitted as much in a letter he wrote to Salmon P Chase, his Treasury Secretary: **The original proclamation has no . . . legal justification, except as a military measure.**²⁰¹

²⁰⁰ RLD

²⁰¹ RLD, px

Special Field Order no 20, issued by Union Brevet Major Gen James H Wilson²⁰² on Apr 11, 1865:²⁰³

The evil [of pillaging] has increased to such an extent as to call for . . . decided measures . . . to aid in suppressing a practice dishonorable and unbecoming a Christian soldiery.

A *Christian* soldiery? I seriously doubt that Christ appreciated having his name associated with Yankee soldiers.

The Santee Sioux Indians in Minnesota sold 24 million acres of land to the US federal government for \$1.41 million in 1851.²⁰⁴ White settlers took possession of the land, but the Sioux received very little of that money from the corrupt American government. The Sioux were starving in 1862, because of a crop failure, but the federal government refused to keep their end of the agreement. As always. The Sioux revolted.

Lincoln assigned the task of dealing with the Indian uprising to Gen John Pope, who told one of his officers that: **It is my purpose to utterly exterminate the Sioux . . . They are to be treated as maniacs or wild beasts, and by no means as people with whom treaties or compromises can be made.**

That word *exterminate* was used quite often by Union military officers when talking about Southerners during the war and during Reconstruction. The Yankee approach

²⁰² Cavalry Corps, Military Division of the Mississippi, Lowndesborough, Alabama, 12 miles south-southwest of Montgomery.

²⁰³ UWK, p137

²⁰⁴ RLD, p157-170

was the same toward both Native American and Southern cultures. The military and political objective was not simply to put down a rebellion, but to eradicate all remnants of those offensive cultures, and to exterminate the people themselves. It's impossible to miss the resemblance to Hitler's attitude toward the Jews in WWII. Both dictators had a great deal of success in their campaigns of cultural genocide and ethnic cleansing.

The Union army had no trouble putting down the Sioux rebellion by Oct 1862. Pope controlled thousands of prisoners of war, many of them women and children. They were herded into military forts, and each prisoner was placed on trial, each typically lasting 10 to 15 minutes. Most males were found guilty, despite the almost total lack of hard evidence against any of them, and many of them were sentenced to death just because they were present at a battle.

There were a total of 303 death sentences, and Minnesota's political leaders were eager to execute every one of them. Lincoln, however, was concerned that such brutality might be enough to bring one or more European powers into the war on the side of the Confederacy. That had been a worry from the beginning of the war, and Lincoln could not afford to risk it. On the other hand, he couldn't afford to disappoint his Minnesota political supporters and possibly risk losing their vote in the 1864 election.

So Lincoln and Minnesota politicians made a deal. Abe promised to deposit \$2 million into the state's treasury. He would execute only 39 of the prisoners on death row. That should keep the European powers at bay, while satisfying (temporarily) the bloodlust of Minnesotans. Lincoln also promised to eventually either kill the rest of the convicts or chase them out of the state. In fact he promised to make sure there were no Indians at all left in Minnesota.

On Dec 26, 1862, Lincoln ordered the mass execution -- the largest in American history. That was the same Lincoln whose Mt Rushmore face we revere, whose Washington, DC likeness we adore, and whose birthday is cause for celebration

every year. If Americans knew the truth about Lincoln's character and about his countless war crimes, most would feel very differently about the man they regard as one of the greatest American leaders.

Some Americans do know the truth about Lincoln, and that's exactly why they love him. Those people are all for the all-powerful central government Lincoln gave them, and they don't care what he did to accomplish it. Those people go to great lengths to make sure the rest of us never know the truth about Lincoln and his Civil War. When criticism of Lincoln is presented, his apologists perform amazing fêtes of mental gymnastics to minimize, marginalize, deny, or rationalize his gross misconduct.

One of their favorite sophisms is that Lincoln had to defy the normal Constitutional, legal, and moral restraints in order to preserve America's Constitution, our rule of law, and our high moral standing. Only in the bizarre world of Yankee doodle logic can that remotely escape the obvious label of insanity. Imagine this courtroom scenario. Yes, your Honor, I was compelled to rob the bank and kill the guard because I have so much respect for life and law. Honestly, your Honor, I did it for the bank's own good.

If Thomas Jefferson or Andrew Jackson had employed Lincolnian tactics to preserve an America of small central government, sovereign states, and strict construction of the Constitution, we can be absolutely certain that those same apologists would be screaming for Tom or Andy's scalp.

I wonder if Minnesotans were smart enough to get that \$2 million up front.

Portuguese people loved the sea. They, along with the Spanish, were the adventurers who set out across the Atlantic, discovering and exploring the New World. Those two countries wisely came to an agreement²⁰⁵ on how they would avoid stepping on each other's toes in the process. Spain claimed as its domain everything west of a vertical line, determined with the help of the pope. That gave them most of North America, Central America, and South America. Portugal took everything east of the imaginary line, which gave them access to Africa and a number of islands. They had already done quite a bit of exploring along the African coast, and they found it quite profitable, so they saw no reason to sail off across the Atlantic on missions that were much more uncertain and risky. Both countries were happy with the arrangement.

As it turned out, that imaginary line ran through part of South America, which meant that Brazil belonged to Portugal, while the rest of the continent was Spain's. Brazil produced abundant coffee, tobacco, cocoa, corn, fruits, vegetables, and sugar for export. Growing sugar required a lot of land, and a lot of laborers to work it. The natives refused to provide that labor, so the Portuguese turned to African slaves. They had already established a huge African slave trade along the African western coast, and they already were using huge numbers of African slaves on their Atlantic island plantations.

The journey across the Atlantic was unimaginably cruel, the work in Brazil was incredibly harsh, and the life expectancy of an African slave in Brazil was very short. But the supply of slaves was endless, the price was cheap, and they were quite expendable. Even if they died after only one year, the Portuguese landowners still made a profit, and that's all that mattered to them. They had no concern at all for their slave workers. Like 9-volt batteries, they were used up, then thrown away.

²⁰⁵ The Treaty of Tordesillas, 1494.

Slavery in Brazil ended on May 13, 1888, after almost 400 years. It took a series of laws and reforms before it could be finally be stopped. It also took the cooperation of military and police, who refused to take action against escaped slaves. And it took compassionate citizens who were willing to provide safe haven for slaves who had managed to escape from the plantations. What it did not take was war. Nor did it take war to end slavery in most of the Spanish empire.

Contrast Brazil's experience with that of the United States. Here, most Yankees refused to allow blacks to settle in their states. Here, escaped slaves were punished and returned to their masters. Here, instead of pursuing laws and reform measures to end slavery peacefully, Abraham Lincoln rushed to war within weeks of his inauguration, without exploring or even considering peaceful options. Here, 650,000 Americans were slaughtered, including thousands of innocent, defenseless women and children, many of whom were deliberately starved to death. Here, such barbaric oppression is considered heroic.²⁰⁶

We Americans like to think we are a unique culture, more civilized and humane than other parts of the world. We certainly distinguished ourselves on the slavery issue. While almost the entire rest of the world managed to end slavery peacefully, without causing social or economic upheaval, we Americans killed 650,000 of our own citizens, created racial strife in the part of our nation where it had not existed before, totally destroyed almost half the country, abandoned our republican form of government, and created social, political, and economic chaos that lasted for generations. We still have ugly scars from the Civil War, and they will never go away.

We have Abraham Lincoln to thank for much of that.

²⁰⁶ SLG, p25-28

How did Union Gen William Tecumseh Sherman feel about blacks? Who better to tell us than Sherman himself?

I won't trust niggers to fight yet, but don't object to the Government taking them from the enemy, & making use of them as experience may suggest.

Making use of their experience meant forcing them to dig ditches, plow crops, drive wagons, wash uniforms, and serve as prostitutes. In other words, they were still slaves, but now they were Union slaves. That made it just fine in the wacky world of Yankee logic and reason.

I like niggers well enough as niggers, but only fools and idiots promoted their advancement.

Wow. Doesn't sound like Sherman was fighting for racial equality and social justice.

When Sherman's army came to a swollen stream in his brutal march across the South, they built a temporary bridge and crossed. Then they removed the pontoons, leaving the thousands of freed blacks who had been following the army stranded. Feeling terrified and betrayed, many of them plunged into the water and drowned.²⁰⁷

That's how Sherman felt about blacks. That's how the vast majority of Yankees felt about blacks. That is not how Southerners felt about blacks. But very few Americans know that today, because we have been lied to all our lives about the Civil War.

²⁰⁷ SLG, p161-162

When the Yankees came, what did they do? They did things they ought not to have done, and they left undone the things they ought to have done. Yes, that just about tells it . . . all the money, silver, gold, jewelry, rings, knives and forks . . . was carried away by an army that seemed more concerned about stealing, than they were about the Holy War for the liberation of the poor African slave people. They took off all the horses, sheep, cows, chickens, and geese, took the seine [large fishing net] and the fish they caught, corn in crib, meat in smokehouse, and everything. Marse General Sherman said war was hell. It sure was. Maybe it was hell for some of them Yankees when they come to die and give account of the deeds they did in Sumter and Richland Counties.²⁰⁸

These are the words of Henry D Jenkins, former slave, owner of a 480-acre farm, respectable citizen, church member, taxpayer, resident of Winnsboro, South

Both Ulysses S Grant and William Tecumseh Sherman got their military career off to a rocky beginning. Grant was known to have a drinking problem, and Sherman was strongly suspected of having severe mental health issues. Later, Sherman summarized their relationship this way: He [Grant] stood by me when I was crazy and I stood by him when he was a drunk, and now sir, we stand by each other always.²⁰⁹

²⁰⁸ SLG, p162

²⁰⁹ CWC, p133

Columbia minister Peter Shand's black servant was raped by seven Union soldiers, then they held her face under water in a shallow ditch until she drowned.²¹⁰

There were 620,000 battlefield-related deaths in the Civil War. That was the equivalent of about 5 million battlefield deaths today²¹¹. In addition, there were about 30,000 Southern civilian war deaths, due to murder committed by Yankee soldiers, intentional starvation, widespread burning of homes and whole towns, bombardment of Southern cities under siege, etc.

The blood of every single war-related death is on the hands of Abraham Lincoln, because he alone was responsible for the Civil War. Think about that when we celebrate his birthday, see his face on Mt Rushmore, or view his memorial in Washington, DC. Remember the number -- 650,000 unnecessary deaths -- the next time some politician tries to tell you what a great leader Lincoln was.

Remember that his war was unconstitutional, illegal, immoral, and unnecessary. Which ranks Lincoln among the world's top mass murderers and most brutal tyrants.

From Union Gen Howard²¹² to Union Gen Blair and Union Gen Logan, February 20, 1865:²¹³

Some of our soldiers have been committing the most outrageous robberies . . . A watch and . . . jewelry were stolen by a foraging party under the eye of the

²¹⁰ SLG, p160

²¹¹ RLD, px

²¹² At Rice Creek Springs.

²¹³ UWK, p125-126

commissioned officer in charge. Another, where a brute had violently assaulted a lady by striking her, and had then robbed her . . . In one instance money was stolen . . . and of another, where an officer with a foraging party had allowed his men to take rings off the fingers of ladies.

What if this sort of military conduct had been committed routinely throughout the Iraq and Afghanistan wars? Would it be considered necessary to win the war? Would Americans shrug it off, claiming that there are always a few bad soldiers in every war. Oh well. Would we see it as an appropriate method of winning the hearts and minds of the Iraqi and Afghan people? Would we erect memorials to the presidents who presided over those wars? Would the US military robbery, rape, and assault of Iraqi and Afghan people be celebrated or condemned by Americans?

Would we be upset if the US military leaders in those countries rounded up locals at gunpoint and forced them to serve in the US military, with no pay, and no support at all for the families left behind? Would we be offended by our soldiers indiscriminately shooting innocent peaceable citizens? Would it bother us if our soldiers in those countries were free to go into any private residence at any time, steal whatever they want, including all the clothing, destroy everything else, and then burn the house, even with mothers and children, or old or disabled people still inside it? What would we think of our president if his conduct of the wars resulted in ten times the current number of US deaths?

Why, then, do we revere Abraham Lincoln?

There was one Yankee who saw Lincoln for exactly who and what he was, and understood perfectly what he was trying to do. This Yankee had the courage to say so, even in the face of Lincoln's tyranny. In fact it was that blatant tyranny which compelled this Yankee to speak out, and it was that tyranny that compelled Lincoln to crush all criticism of himself or his policies.

The Yankee was Clement L Vallandigham, a member of the US House of Representatives, living in Dayton, Ohio.²¹⁴ He spoke on the House floor, criticizing Lincoln's First Inaugural Address. Although he expressed his devotion to both the Union and the Constitution, he accused Lincoln of being not in the least devoted to the Constitution, but in contempt of it. He said that Lincoln's inaugural address was spoken with the forked tongue and crooked counsel of the New York politician, leaving thirty millions of people in doubt whether it meant peace or war. He also denounced the Republican's prized Morrill tariff as obscure, ill-considered, ill-digested, and unstatesmanlike.

Vallandigham generally took Lincoln to task for his many usurpations of power, his disregard for the Constitution, and for acting more like a dictator than a president -- actions which were wicked, cunning, and constituted a dangerous violation of that very Constitution which this civil war is professedly waged to support. The Representative went through a long list of specific examples, including usurping Congress' responsibility to borrow money when necessary, suppression of the press and free speech, suspension of habeas corpus, his blockade of Southern ports, starting a war without consent of Congress, quartering soldiers in private homes without owner consent, interfering with the internal affairs of state governments, censorship of telegraph communications, violations of some people's right to bear arms, and other Constitutional infractions.

²¹⁴ RLD, p154-157

The Representative pointed out that even European monarchs would likely lose their crown (and probably their head), for many of the same sorts of tyrannical actions Lincoln had taken. And Abe had done those things, not to free slaves or preserve the Union, but **to overthrow the present form of Federal-republican government, and to establish a strong centralized Government in its stead**. Lincoln's real purpose, stated Vallandigham, was to finally implement the Whig mercantilist economic agenda, with its national banks, huge permanent public debt, high tariffs, heavy direct taxes, vast government spending and misappropriation of funds, etc. In short, Lincoln and his Republican cronies were trying to establish in the US the world's largest political patronage system.

In order to achieve that, Lincoln had to destroy the Constitution, and with it all states' rights, and eventually all states, leaving only an all-powerful federal government, unrestrained, unrestricted, unaccountable. Just what Alexander Hamilton had always longed for and worked for.

In a constitutional democratic republic, that speech would have been just another day of political wrangling on the House floor. It would have been countered by someone with opposing views, and the Representatives would have been doing just what they were hired to do. But under the despotic Lincolnstitutional nation of the Civil War and Reconstruction, Vallandigham's speech was *treason*, and the Representative was a *traitor*. Lincoln simply could not allow that sort of free speech, because he knew that Vallandigham was absolutely right.

Union soldiers arrived at a private residence in Dayton, Ohio, on May 4, 1863, at 2:30am. They knocked down the door, without a warrant, took Representative Vallandigham to a military prison in Cincinnati, then later deported him to the South. From there, he moved to Canada. Lincoln's response to Vallandigham proved that everything the Representative had said was true.

Lincoln didn't have to go to such extremes in the case of everyone who criticized him. He simply had his gestapo make an example of a few people he considered

traitors. Most people took the hint and kept their mouths shut, or they said what they knew Lincoln wanted to hear. But by May, 1863, most people had already learned that lesson, and there were already thousands of political prisoners rotting in prisons. Vallandigham was luckier than most.

Why? Because there were too many Vallandigham supporters in Ohio. They were outraged by Lincoln's heavy-handed response, even if they didn't particularly agree with Vallandigham. They defiantly nominated him for the office of governor, even though he had already been deported. Lincoln and his gestapo knew just how far they could push the people without triggering a severe backlash. Most dictators have a pretty good sense of how much they can get away with. With the US army and navy at his disposal, Lincoln got away with an entire country.

It has not yet been returned to its rightful owners. It probably never will be. Because most of the victims are oblivious to the hideous nature of the crime committed. The accomplices are determined to keep it that way.

Confederate troops captured the town of Plymouth, North Carolina on April 21, 1864, then moved toward the town of Washington²¹⁵. In response, the Union commanding officer at Washington²¹⁶ was ordered to evacuate his occupation garrison and the town, which was completed on April 30. But word of the evacuation got around quickly, and the trouble began on April 27. We learn what happened, in part, from General Order no 5, issued on May 3 by the Union commander²¹⁷ of the District of North Carolina, based in New Bern.

²¹⁵ 30 miles north of New Bern, North Carolina.

²¹⁶ Brigadier Gen Edward Harland.

²¹⁷ Brigadier Gen Innis N Palmer.

A portion . . . [of the troops of this command] have within a few days been guilty of an outrage against humanity, which brings the blush of shame to the cheek of every true man and soldier. It is well known that during the late evacuation of Washington, North Carolina, that town was fired [burned], and nearly, if not entirely, consumed, thus wantonly rendering useless and homeless hundreds of poor women and children, many of them the families of soldiers in our own army . . . And this was done by men in the military service of the United States . . .

The army vandals did not even respect the charitable institutions, but bursting open the doors of the Masonic and Odd Fellows' lodges, pillaged them both, and hawked about the streets the regalia and jewels . . . Both public and private stores were entered and plundered, and . . . devastation and destruction ruled the hour . . . The ranks [of the Army of North Carolina] are disgraced by men who are not soldiers, but thieves and scoundrels, dead to all sense of honor and humanity, for whom no punishment can be too severe.

On May 30, the same general published a Circular Order, which stated in part:

During the afternoon of that day [April 27] there appears to have been instances of theft, and before morning of Thursday [April 28] pillaging commenced, at first in the quartermaster's store of the First North Carolina (Union) Volunteers . . . , which during the day became general.

Government stores, sutlers' [civilian merchants] establishments, dwelling-houses, private shops, and stables, suffered alike. Gangs of men patrolled the city, breaking into houses and wantonly destroying such goods as they could not carry away. The occupants and owners were insulted and defied in their feeble endeavors to protect their property . . . The sack was checked only by the lack of material to pillage, and ceased only with the final abandonment of the town . . .

None of the troops in Washington on . . . [April 28] can reasonably claim to escape a share of the shame and odium which the history of those few days has . . . caused.²¹⁸

Remember that Yankees had always considered Southerners to be barbarians. Yankee behavior throughout the war was far more depraved and despicable than the ancient barbarians. Vikings, Goths, Mongols, and Huns had been motivated primarily by hunger and the need for land to raise their families and live in peace. Yankees were motivated by pure evil, a total lack of self-respect, respect for others, or any sense of basic human decency or dignity. They were animals, although that is an insult to animals, because wild animals are not expected to have a moral awareness.

These are the feral animals that controlled the North and invaded the South. These are the ancestors of tyrannical, despotic, arrogant politicians who still largely control America from the northeast. Let us all acknowledge the proud heritage of today's northeastern establishment elite. Today they are not as feral, but they retain the genetic potential.

For 50 years, England dominated the worldwide slave trade, transporting over half of all African slaves, making an enormous profit. In 1811 England made the slave trade illegal worldwide, and her ships suddenly shifted roles from transporting slaves to searching for ships transporting slaves, and punishing violators.

On what authority was England now the world's slave-trade policeman? Apparently, her power, wealth, and vast navy provided all the international legal authority required. For all, that is, except the United States. American ships refused to allow the Brits to stop and inspect them on the seas, because the New England states

²¹⁸ UWK, p77-79

were still making a very handsome profit in the slave trade, and they had no intention of giving that up any time soon. (In spite of the fact that it was illegal in the US, also.) So other countries made a point of having at least one American on board each slave-trade vessel, and if approached by a British ship, the American flag would be hoisted temporarily, or the ship would be very quickly sold to the American on board.

Note that it was New England ships that were engaged in the slave trade, not Southern ships. The South embraced laws against the slave trade long before New England finally was brought into compliance, about the time of the Civil War. Note also that it was the American flag that flew on those vessels. The Confederate flag never flew on a slave ship, and the Confederate constitution specifically prohibited the slave trade.

Even though England may have overstepped her rightful international legal authority in assuming the role as the world's slave-trade policeman, it is still encouraging to see that she had finally come to her senses and tried to make amends for all those years of slave-trade profiteering. Finally, compassion triumphed over greed.

Well, not really. You see, Haiti was quite a thorn in Britain's side, because that little French island was the chief competitor for England in the Caribbean area. Since Haiti's economy was totally dependent on slave labor, England hoped to put Haiti out of business along with slave-traders. Still, Britain gained the reputation as champions of the world's most oppressed people. Which shows that rewriting history is one of the world's favorite and most entertaining sports.²¹⁹

²¹⁹ SLG, p37-40

General Order no 3, published by Union Major Gen Stephen G Burbridge²²⁰, September 13, 1864:²²¹

The general . . . is pained to hear that, in various portions of his command, squads of Federal soldiers and companies of men styling themselves "State Guards", "Home Guards", "Independent Companies", etc are roving over the country committing outrages on peaceable citizens, seizing without authority their horses and other property, insulting and otherwise maltreating them.

From Union Major Austin A King, Jr²²² to Union Gen W S Rosecrans²²³, July 25, 1864.²²⁴

I returned yesterday from Liberty²²⁵ where on Saturday I met at least 1500 of the citizens . . . The rebels in a body have passed from among us . . . The misfortune is that those who came as our defenders . . . damaged the people ten times as much . . . as did these rebels . . . The officers said they could not restrain the men . . .

Garrison and his myrmidons²²⁶ have been let loose among us, and it may be that they have done the chief work; such is the common opinion . . . General Curtis . . . followed them . . . and put Garrison and his crew under arrest, and ordered them back to Kansas; but they cleaned up all movable property in their way as they returned . . .

²²⁰ Military district of Kentucky, Lexington.

²²¹ UWK, p89-90

²²² Richmond, Missouri, 34 miles northeast of Kansas City.

²²³ In St Louis.

²²⁴ UWK, p95-96

²²⁵ 12 miles northeast of Kansas City.

²²⁶ Faithful followers who carry out orders without question, protest, or pity.

An inquiry made by an honest military court into these things will develop the enormity of crimes of the most startling character. Robbery, murder, arson, and rapes will figure largely in the catalogue.

How was it possible that the North, determined to *preserve the Union*, could believe that the way to do that was to annihilate half the country? How is it that the Union army, powerful enough to demolish the South, was not powerful enough to control the criminal behavior of its own men and officers? Even on the rare occasion when their war criminals were arrested, they still managed to continue pillaging and plundering, even while under arrest! How could Union officers allow that to happen?

These are the criminals who won the war. They are the ancestors of the people running the country today. America is still suffering the consequences of the Civil War, and the character of the nation has been forever soiled.

You will rarely find accurate information, if any at all, about the rape of Southern women by Union soldiers. Which is no surprise, since you rarely get accurate information about any aspect of Lincoln or his war, except detailed analysis of specific battles. Details are not easy to come by, in large part because the names of rape victims are not published, and in larger part because Yankees have always suppressed the truth of their hideous war crimes.

But the truth always comes out eventually. There are numerous reports of eyewitness accounts of such rapes. And they often emphasize that it was black women, slaves, who were most often brutally raped, and that as a result, black men became just as strongly opposed to the Union as any Confederate.

The University of South Carolina library²²⁷, for example, has a large collection of letters and diaries with detailed accounts of the experiences of South Carolina's rape victims during the war and Reconstruction, including hundreds of rapes committed by Sherman's army.²²⁸

In the 1980s, Fidel Castro took advantage of America's generosity by opening his prisons and allowing Cuba's worst criminals to emigrate to the US. A similar scenario had played out in the early 1860s with European governments.²²⁹

Abraham Lincoln, ever the opportunist, recruited those European felons, offering them land grants in return for military service. The Union's New York regiments were full of the dregs of American society and the worst men Europe could offer. These men were then turned loose to prey upon peaceful citizens of the South. They pillaged, plundered, raped, burned, and destroyed with Lincoln's appreciation and gratitude. They were just as brutal with slaves as they were with whites. Sometimes, even Unionists were victimized by Lincoln's goon squads.

Then the European felons were used as fodder in Grant's numerous frontal assaults that got so many thousands of his men killed. Lincoln knew that few would survive to collect on that land grant offer.

That is the real Abraham Lincoln.

²²⁷ In Columbia, South Carolina.

²²⁸ RLD, p188

²²⁹ RLD, p188-189

In the Declaration of Independence (DOI), Thomas Jefferson listed a long series of grievances (or train of abuses, as TJ called them) against England's King George III. These were the collective reason for declaring American independence from England. They were considered such severe breaches of what the Founders considered their rights as Englishmen, and George was seen as so unwilling to listen to reason, that secession was the only reasonable option left for America. That being the case, war was fully justified, if that's what it took to enforce that secession and secure the natural rights of all Americans.

There is a remarkable correlation between the acts of King George III and those of Abraham Lincoln less than a century later. Every one of TJ's grievances could just as well apply to the tyranny of Lincoln during his administration, which continued even after his assassination. Here are a few examples.²³⁰

DOI: **He has erected a multitude of New Offices, and sent hither swarms of Officers to harass our people, and eat out their substance.**

Lincoln created a number of new bureaucracies and assumed a number of extra-constitutional rights of the federal government during his reign of terror, and during Reconstruction. He sent his army throughout the South, under the leadership of generals like Sherman and Sheridan, to pillage, plunder, vandalize, steal, and burn or otherwise destroy Southern homes, businesses, schools, churches, hospitals, graveyards, and even entire cities.

That was not the handiwork of a few loose cannons in the Union military. Lincoln purposefully recruited the most ruthless criminals from European prisons to carry out his dirty work for him. Then his bands of uniformed anarchists were used as cannon fodder in Grants deadly frontal assaults. That was deliberate as well, because Lincoln had promised them land grants in return for their military service.

²³⁰ RLD, p149-153

Grant did a superb job of guaranteeing that few survived his assaults to collect on Lincoln's promise.

And it wasn't just Southern civilians who were terrorized by Lincoln's goon squads. His Secretary of State created a gestapo-like secret police force to crush all First Amendment rights (among others) throughout the North. All opposition to Lincoln's policies was eliminated by intimidation, indiscriminate arrests, destruction of property (especially of opposition newspapers), and incarceration of thousands of political prisoners, without any of the rights normally guaranteed by the Bill of Rights.

The Confederate states during Reconstruction were controlled by Republicans, who acted as military dictators, leaving those states with no right of self-determination. Lincoln's tyrannical infractions were far more extensive, and far more egregious than anything King George had done.

DOI: **For cutting off our Trade with all parts of the world.**

Lincoln ordered a naval blockade of all Southern ports, depriving them of the trade on which they were totally dependent. The Union prohibited import into the South of even medicines and medical supplies. One implication of that was that the South could no longer adequately provide the medical care needed by prisoners of war. Yet, after the war, Yankees were seething with self-righteous indignation over the (lack of) treatment of their prisoners at Andersonville prison. Hypocritical Yankees were outraged at prison conditions they themselves had caused.

The Constitution provides for such blockades only in times of war, and only with a foreign power. Lincoln had not declared war. He never even consulted Congress over his invasion of the Confederacy. Nor did he consider it a foreign country. Lincoln's whole premise (phony though it was) for the invasion was based on the false assertion that the South had never and could never secede from the Union -- which was impossible, according to the Lincolnstitution. The South's action

amounted to nothing but a rebellion, Lincoln claimed. Naval blockades are not warranted, Constitutionally, for crushing a rebellion.

Again, Lincoln out-Georged King George.

DOI: **For depriving us in many cases, of the right of Trial by jury.**

Lincoln suspended habeas corpus. Thousands of political prisoners were held indefinitely with no formal charges ever being filed against them, no access to counsel or family, and little hope of ever being free again. A mere suspicion or rumor was enough in the North to be immediately thrown in jail. All it took was advocating an end to the war, and the pursuit of a peaceful conclusion to the crisis. In the South, men were executed for refusing to take a Lincoln loyalty oath.

King George never treated Americans so harshly. That's the kind of ruthless, barbaric tyranny we expect from kings, despots, and dictators. But not at the hands of a US president.

DOI: **For taking away our Charters, abolishing our most valuable Laws and altering fundamentally our own legislatures, and declaring themselves invested with power to legislate for us in all cases whatsoever.**

That is an astonishingly accurate portrait of how Southerners were treated in Union-occupied areas of the South during the war, and of the entire South during Reconstruction.

DOI: **He has abdicated Government here, by declaring us out of his Protection and waging War against us. He has plundered our seas, ravaged our coast, burnt our towns, and destroyed the lives of our people. He is at this time transporting large armies, of foreign Mercenaries to compleat the works of death, desolation and tyranny.**

Lincoln declared that all Southern secessionists and all Northern peace advocates were traitors, no longer worthy of the protection of federal laws or Constitutional rights. Lincoln recruited large numbers of European criminals to serve in the Union army. Their primary responsibility was pillaging, plundering, vandalizing, burning and otherwise destroying all types of buildings and entire Southern cities.

Innocent Southern peaceful citizens were used for target practice by Union soldiers firing out the windows of a passing train. Southern women were raped, and black women were victimized more than white women. Slaves were treated as harshly as anyone else in the South. In some cases they were treated even more harshly, as Union officers kidnapped healthy slave men for coerced service in the Union military. Families were split apart, wives and children were callously left behind in agony, with no means of support. (Most Union army blacks were still slaves, with treatment more harsh than they had experienced in the South, and with no Union pay.)

Dictator Lincoln made King George look like a saint.

From President Andrew Johnson, Washington, DC, to Union Major Gen George H Thomas²³¹, Sep 4, 1865:²³²

Negro troops stationed at Greenville, Tennessee²³³, are under little or no restraint, and are committing depredations throughout the country, domineering over, and in fact running the white people out of the neighborhood. Much of this is said to be attributable to the officers, who countenance and rather encourage the negroes in their insolence and in their disorderly conduct.

²³¹ Military Division of the Tennessee, Nashville.

²³² UWK, p141

²³³ 58 miles east-northeast of Knoxville.

The negro soldiery take possession of and occupy property in the town at discretion, and have even gone so far as to have taken my own house and converted it into a rendezvous for male and female negroes, who have been congregated there, in fact making it a common negro brothel.

It was bad enough to be taken by traitors and converted into a rebel hospital, but a negro whore house is infinitely worse. As to the value of the property, I care nothing for that, but the reflection that it has been converted into a sink of pollution, and that by our own forces, is, I confess, humiliating in the extreme . . . Cannot instructions be given General Gillem²³⁴ to attend to and see that proper discipline and order are . . . restored and enforced?

From Union Brevet Major Gen John B Sanborn²³⁵ to Union Colonel J F McMahan²³⁶, June 7, 1865.²³⁷

Complaints are constantly being made by citizens of this county of lawless and disorderly conduct on the part of the soldiers presumed to belong to the garrison at this post. A system of petty plundering and pilfering is carried on throughout the town and the adjoining country, and citizens are threatened and even fired at if they attempt to protect their property.

Within the limits of this town . . . citizens are insulted and threatened by soldiers every night. Ladies are grossly insulted, and the safety of every one endangered by

²³⁴ Union Brevet Major Gen Alvan C Gillem, District of East Tennessee, Chattanooga.

²³⁵ District of Southwest Missouri, Springfield.

²³⁶ Sixteenth Missouri Cavalry, commanding Post of Springfield.

²³⁷ UWK, p140

the promiscuous firing so constantly indulged in . . . These complaints . . . are doubtless well founded, . . . a condition of affairs . . . disgraceful to the command.

In Haiti in 1791 there were half a million slaves, most of whom were African-born. That's the year that France granted freedom to all Haitians except slaves. That's the year that slaves there decided they had finally had enough. They burned plantations and massacred whites in retaliation for centuries of rape, murder, torture, and oppression. They fought for a dozen years against French and British troops. By the end of 1803, the slaves had secured their freedom. No one did it for them.²³⁸

Union Gen Schofield²³⁹ reported to Union Gen Halleck²⁴⁰ on January 2, 1861, from Missouri:²⁴¹

Upon my arrival at Warrenton I found . . . [the First Missouri Reserve Corps Cavalry Battalion, known as Hollan Horse] . . . These men had preceded me only a few days but they had already murdered one of the best Union men in that vicinity and committed numerous depredations upon the property of peaceful citizens.

Since that time their conduct has been absolutely barbarous -- a burning disgrace to the Army and the Union cause . . . They have plundered and destroyed the property of citizens . . . to the amount of many thousands of dollars. Their officers either

²³⁸ SLG, p34-35

²³⁹ Brigadier Gen John M Schofield, Missouri.

²⁴⁰ Major Gen Henry W Halleck, Department of the Missouri.

²⁴¹ UWK, p13

connive at it or else have no power to restrain their men . . . I will . . . forward charges against Major Hollan, Captain [John C] Wenkel and the men I have arrested.

William Wilberforce and John Henry Newton drove the first abolition movement in England in the early 1780s. Prior to that, it is doubtful that anyone, anywhere gave a second thought to the evils of slavery, or to the wellbeing or worthiness of slaves. Newton, a former slave ship captain, became a priest in the Church of England. Wilberforce became an evangelical Christian and a member of Parliament. Their combined efforts culminated, after 26 years, in the Slave Trade Act of Great Britain, which ended the British slave trade effective May 1, 1807.

Newton died shortly after that, but Wilberforce went on, fighting for the full emancipation of all slaves in the British Empire. The House of Lords passed the Slavery Abolition Act on July 29, 1833, effective the following year for most of the Empire. Wilberforce had died one month earlier.

The government gave 20 million pounds to hundreds of families. Slave children less than age six were freed immediately. Others saw a change in status from slave to apprentice, for four to six years. With the exception of territories in the East India Company, Sri Lanka, and the island of St Helena, all British slaves were freed by August 1, 1840.²⁴²

²⁴² SLG, p77-79

A report from Union Colonel Frederick Steele to Union Gen Halleck, from Sedalia, Missouri, January 14, 1862:²⁴³

J W Smith, clerk in the Department of the Interior, in Washington, is just in from the neighborhood of Rose Hill²⁴⁴, and reports that Jennison's men under . . . Anthony, are there, committing depredations upon Union men and secessionists indiscriminately. They have burned forty-two houses in that vicinity and robbed others of valuables and driven off stock.

Mr Smith says they took his wife's silverware, furs, etc. He estimates the value of property taken from loyal citizens at \$7000; and, to cap the climax, they shot to death Mr Richards, a good Union man, without cause or provocation.

John T K Hayward was a general agent of the Hannibal and St Joseph Railroad, in St Louis, Missouri. On August 10, 1861, he wrote a letter to Union Maj Gen John C Fremont in St Louis, complaining of Union soldier conduct in that area.

For reasons not at all difficult to understand, citizens tended to run away from approaching Union soldiers. Mr Hayward's complaint was that soldiers frequently fired on the fleeing civilians, not knowing or caring that a good many of them couldn't even understand the order to stop. Soldiers also had a nasty habit of firing at peaceful citizens from passing trains. Those people were of no threat to the soldiers, and they were of no military significance. Yankee soldiers were simply taking target practice at civilians, enjoying the sport of indiscriminate murder.

Mr Hayward wrote another letter on August 13, this one to J W Brooks in Boston, who forwarded the following extracts of the letter to War Secretary Simon Cameron.

²⁴³ UWK, p13-14

²⁴⁴ 60 miles south-southeast of Kansas City.

[In northern Missouri] the irregularities of the [Union] soldiery -- such as taking poultry, pigs, milk, butter, preserves, potatoes, horses, and in fact everything they want; entering and searching houses, and stealing in many cases; committing rapes on the negroes and such like things -- the effect has been to make a great many Union men inveterate enemies.

These things are not exaggerated by me, and, though they do not characterize all the troops, several regiments have conducted in this way . . . and no punishment, or none of any account, has been meted out to them.²⁴⁵

The North wanted the entire nation and the world to believe that they were compelled to fight in order to *preserve the Union*. Then they proceeded to prove themselves such depraved, despicable, lawless beasts that even many Yankees were repulsed and ashamed. It wasn't a matter of being forced to use extreme measures to win the war. They often victimized other Yankees as well as Southerners, and their behavior was in no way necessary militarily, or allowed, according to accepted (by the North) military standards of conduct.

Union officers often issued orders condemning this illegal activity, but they more often condoned it, excused it, ignored it, participated in it, and encouraged it (unofficially). Are we to believe that the mighty Union army that defeated the South couldn't control the conduct of its own soldiers? Are we to believe that Confederate states could reasonably be expected to willingly continue to be a part of such a barbaric, ruthless, lawless, evil Union?

The North also wanted to convince the world that their illegal, unconstitutional, immoral, and unnecessary war was a noble campaign to free blacks in the South from the savage bonds of slavery, motivated by a deep moral compassion for blacks, and righteous concern for their welfare. There is a wealth of proof that all that is

²⁴⁵ UWK, p4-5

utter nonsense. Hayward's letter provides one more small bit of evidence, exposing the hypocrisy and brutality of Yankees. . . . committing rapes on the negroes . . .

Nor was that an isolated incident. This from Tennessee in 1864²⁴⁶: The [white] cavalry broke en masse in the camps of the colored women and are committing all sorts of outrage.²⁴⁷

Yes, those Yankees sure did have a lot of compassion for blacks, didn't they? Both their words and their deeds prove at every turn that Yankees were the blacks' worst nightmare. Much worse than Southern slavery.

Nor did it end when the war ended. From Union Gen H W Halleck, commanding Richmond, to Union Gen U S Grant, in Washington, DC, April 29, 1865, almost three weeks after Confederate Gen Lee had surrendered at Appomattox:²⁴⁸

General Ord represents that want of discipline and good officers in the Twenty-Fifth Corps²⁴⁹ renders it a very improper force for the preservation of order in this department. A number of cases of atrocious rape by these men have already occurred. Their influence on the colored population is also reported to be bad.

From Union Major Gen Darius N Couch to Union Gen Schofield, March 28, 1865, in reference to the area between Kinston²⁵⁰ and Goldsborough, North Carolina:²⁵¹

Women are ravished and robbed by stragglers all over the country.

²⁴⁶ UWK, p72-73

²⁴⁷ Reported to Brigadier Gen Ralph P Buckland, District of Memphis, by Colonel Ignatz G Kappner, Second US Heavy Artillary (colored), commanding Ft Pickering, near Memphis, April 7, 1864.

²⁴⁸ UWK, p120

²⁴⁹ Under command of Gen G Weitzel.

²⁵⁰ 23 miles east-southeast of Goldsborough.

²⁵¹ UWK, p129

From Union Brigadier Gen Joseph R Hawley²⁵² to Union Gen Schofield²⁵³, April 1, 1865:²⁵⁴

The country over which I . . . exercise . . . control extends on radii of from ten to forty miles. The authority of the Government is weakened . . . by the impunity with which stragglers, deserters from either army, marauders, bummers, and strolling vagabonds, negroes and whites, commit outrages upon the inhabitants. To say nothing of insults and plundering, there have been three cases of rape and one of murder.

The Union Secretary of War received this report from Beaufort, South Carolina:

The recruiting (of former slaves) went on slowly when the commanding officer ordered an indiscriminate conscription of every able-bodied colored man in the department. . . . The order spread universal confusion and terror. The negroes fled to the woods and swamps . . . They were hunted . . . Men have been seized and forced to enlist who had large families . . . Three boys, one only fourteen years of age, were seized in a field where they were at work and sent to a regiment . . . without knowledge of their parents . . .²⁵⁵

Contrary to CivilGate propaganda, the North did not liberate Southern slaves. Yankees love to brag about the thousands of blacks who served in the Union army against the South. What they don't tell you, and hope you'll never discover, is that most of those unfortunate soldiers were forced into service at gunpoint by ruthless

²⁵² District of Wilmington, North Carolina.

²⁵³ Department of North Carolina, Army of the Ohio, in Goldsborough.

²⁵⁴ UWK, p129-130

²⁵⁵ SLG, p161

Yankee officers. They had no desire to liberate blacks from slavery. They simply wanted to steal Southern slaves for their own use. Yankee slave masters were much more harsh, cruel, demanding, and abusive than their Southern slave masters had been.

Most people have been taught that Reconstruction (1865-1877) was a time of rebuilding and restoring the South. A time of healing and reuniting the divided country. It is one of the many lies of CivilGate.

The Republican Party during those years established puppet governments, giving Yankees total control over the Southern states.²⁵⁶ They did not use that power to help blacks become assimilated into society, to pass laws providing for educating blacks and helping them find jobs, or to make sure blacks were guaranteed their full measure of civil rights. They could easily have done that, but that was not the Republican agenda. They didn't care about blacks. They simply used them as political pawns.

The widespread rampant plundering done during the war by Union soldiers and officers continued during Reconstruction. Taxes were consistently being raised with no corresponding increase in benefits or services for Southern civilians. A great deal of the South's money was stolen by Yankees. Republican puppet governments were notoriously corrupt, lining the pockets of Yankees and leaving the Southern states deep in debt.

Adult black males were immediately given the right to vote, even though they didn't understand what they were voting for. At the same time, Southern whites were disenfranchised. Blacks were told how to vote, and Republicans used coercive tactics if necessary to guarantee the desired election results. Race relations were so

²⁵⁶ RLD, p7

poisoned by Yankees that they would not be repaired for decades. Yankees simply brought their racist attitudes with them into the South and ignited racial strife where it had not existed before the war. Yankees did not end Southern racism -- they caused it.

From Union Major Gen Oliver O Howard²⁵⁷ to Union Gen William Tecumseh Sherman, February 17, 1865, regarding the Union occupation of South Carolina's capital, Columbia:²⁵⁸

I noticed a few men under the influence of liquor . . . Then followed one of the most terrific scenes that I ever witnessed . . . It was hardly dark before a fire broke out in the vicinity of Main street, and spread rapidly . . . Many of our men and some of our officers were too much under the influence of drink to allow them to properly discharge their duty . . . Some . . . army followers, and drunken soldiers ran through house after house, and were doubtless guilty of all manner of villanies, and it is these men that I presume set new fires farther and farther to the windward in the northern part of the city. Old men, women, and children with everything they could get out, were herded together in the streets.

At some places we found officers and kind-hearted soldiers protecting families from the insults and roughness of the careless. Meanwhile the flames made fearful ravages, and magnificent residences and churches were consumed in a very few minutes. After about two-thirds of the city, all the business part of the town, including the old State House, had been destroyed, the wind shifted to the east, and the fire was stayed. The next morning showed very little of Columbia except a blackened surface peopled with numerous chimneys and an occasional house that had been spared as if by a miracle.

²⁵⁷ Army of the Tennessee, Right Wing.

²⁵⁸ UWK, p124-125

From Union Gen J A Logan²⁵⁹ to Union Gen Howard, regarding the destruction of Columbia, South Carolina on the night of February 17:

For a while all control was lost over the disorganized mass . . . It was almost impossible to control [the rioters] . . . The scenes in Columbia that night were terrible. Some fiend first applied the torch and the wild flames leaped from house to house and street to street until the lower and business part of the city was wrapped in flames. Frightened citizens rushed in every direction, and the reeling incendiaries dashed, torch in hand, from street to street , spreading dismay wherever they went.

Union Colonel George A Stone²⁶⁰ described the same incident to Union Brevet Major Gen Charles R Woods:

A great many drunken men were now showing themselves in the streets from, I should think, every regiment of our corps, the Seventeenth Corps²⁶¹, and some even from Gen Kilpatrick's²⁶² cavalry.

But the depraved, drunken Yankees were still not satisfied. Their hatred and contempt, their utter lack of even the most basic human dignity or decency continued to drive them to evil. Their lust for revenge against South Carolina, the first state to secede, knew no bounds.

This from Union Gen Howard's Special Field Order no 42, February 18, in Columbia:

²⁵⁹ Fifteenth Corps.

²⁶⁰ Twenty-Fifth Iowa, commanding Third Brigade, First Division, Fifteenth Corps.

²⁶¹ Under Major Gen Frank P Blair.

²⁶² Brevet Major Gen H Judson Kilpatrick.

It having been brought to the attention of the . . . general that certain lawless and evil-disposed soldiers of the command have threatened to destroy the remainder of this city with fire, . . . prevent . . . the horrors of last night.

The Dutch, Portuguese, Spanish, French, and British were responsible for the transport and sale of at least 10 million African slaves in the Caribbean islands, North America, Central America, and South America. How many of those ended up in British North America? About 500,000. How many of those were transported and sold by New England slave traders? About 300,000, over a period of about 200 years²⁶³. How much could they get for a healthy young black slave? Up to 150 gallons of rum.²⁶⁴

²⁶³ That includes time when the slave trade was illegal.

²⁶⁴ SLG, p48-50

From Union Brigadier Gen Willis A Gorman²⁶⁵ to Union Major Gen Samuel R Curtis²⁶⁶, January 3, 1863:²⁶⁷

General [William Tecumseh] Sherman's troops, on the way down the Mississippi, wantonly burned much property. The general arrested the guilty parties, had them tried promptly, and seven of them shot . . . This is the first execution for plundering, marauding, or burning property that has occurred in our army during the war . . . This army has acquired an unenviable reputation for plundering, robbing and burning property . . . The political demagogues among the line officers are enough to damn the best army of God's footstool.

The war had been going on for almost two years, and so had Yankee atrocities. Yet this is the first death sentence imposed on the criminals, even though it had been threatened many times. Why did Sherman actually punish the Yankee thugs at this place, at this time? He was worried about the army's reputation. He didn't care about the victims. He was simply trying to do some damage control to the Union's badly tarnished public image, and he was trying to prevent Southern retaliation.

Later (March, 1865), when he entered North Carolina, he effectively controlled, temporarily, Yankee barbaric behavior, strictly for political purposes. Which proves that he could have imposed discipline all along if he had wanted to. Eventually, Union military personnel abandoned all pretense of trying to impose discipline, and Sherman not only condoned such war crimes, he ordered them.

An example is his destruction of Meridian, Mississippi, in 1864, which he described to Gen Grant this way:

²⁶⁵ District of Eastern Arkansas, Helena.

²⁶⁶ Department of the Missouri, St Louis.

²⁶⁷ UWK, p48

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.

The concept of *voter* changed radically in the South during Reconstruction. 85% of white males lost their right to vote. No one who had served the Confederacy in any capacity was eligible to vote. Yankees eager to move to the South to make a quick profit in any way possible (known as *carpetbaggers*), were allowed to vote. Union soldiers and former Union soldiers were allowed to vote in the South. Freed Southern slaves were allowed to vote in the South (although blacks were not allowed to vote in most Northern states).

This meant that freed blacks would return to the South, or stay in the South, because they could vote there. This meant that Radical Republican extremists could easily manipulate and control elections in the South, guaranteeing Republican control of the region indefinitely. This meant that Radical Republican extremists were making progress in their goal of eradicating Southern culture (and people, as much as possible) in the South, and replacing it with Yankees and Yankee culture.

Reconstruction, to Yankees, did not mean restoring and rebuilding the South. It meant finishing the job of totally destroying what was left of Southern culture (and population, as much as possible), so that Yankees could completely build the South from scratch, in their own image, in their own way.

Preserving the Union meant destroying the Southern half of the nation, which Yankees despised, and extending the Northern half into the South, so that the Union would be one big Yankee family, free of Southerners. It meant keeping blacks in the South, where they belonged, by bribing them with voting rights which were not

available to them in the rest of the country. That was important because Yankees despised blacks as well as Southerners, and they hated the idea of blacks in the North competing for jobs and driving down wages.²⁶⁸

From Union Gen George H Hall²⁶⁹ to Union Gen Schofield, November 28, 1863.²⁷⁰

On or about . . . [November 13, 1863] a detachment of troops . . . commanded by . . . Captain Duff²⁷¹ entered Johnson and Henry Counties, and robbed and plundered indiscriminately almost every citizen in their line of march.

During Reconstruction, all Southern white citizens were disarmed by carpetbagger (Yankee opportunist) governments. Ex-Union soldiers were fully armed, however, as were ex-slaves. Together, they formed militia units, called the Union Leagues, the primary purpose of which was to guarantee the continued elections of Republican carpetbaggers. They did that, in part, by bullying and beating blacks who seemed reluctant to vote Republican. If necessary, uncooperative blacks were flogged, and in some cases they were lynched. Blacks were also used by Republicans to seek revenge on all Southern whites, 95% of which had never been slave owners.

Ten Southern states were home to 250,000 Union League men, 80,000 of which were in North Carolina. However, other than the Union Leagues, hundreds of

²⁶⁸ SLG, p184

²⁶⁹ Fourth Missouri State Militia Cavalry, District of Central Missouri, Jefferson City.

²⁷⁰ UWK, p53

²⁷¹ Union Captain John W Duff, Company M, Sixth Kansas Cavalry.

thousands of freed black men did not know what to do. They had no food, money, land, skills, or education, and within a year the chaos resulting from their sudden emancipation began to demonstrate the racist North's disastrous failure to anticipate and plan for the needs of former Southern slaves.

Soon, after Lincoln's four-year bloodbath aimed at keeping the South in the Union, Yankees kicked the South out of the Union. The South was subjected to military rule and martial law. Courts were closed to whites. Blacks were promised land (which would be stolen by carpetbagger governments from whites), and blacks were promised a mule to go along with their 40 acres. In short, blacks were told that they would rule over whites, if they would just do as they were told by Radical Republican extremists and carpetbaggers. Yankees, as always, failed to keep their promises.

Everything changed when Rutherford B Hayes moved to the White House in 1877. That marked the end of Southern military rule, martial law, Union Leagues, carpetbaggers, and ex-Union army soldiers. Reconstruction was over, and the tables were turned on the South's long-time oppressors. It had done nothing to help the South, but it had proved of great value to carpetbaggers, Yankee thieves, and corrupt Republican politicians.²⁷²

²⁷² SLG, p184-185

From A T Bowie, Natchez, Mississippi, to Union Brigadier Gen Thomas E G Ransom, in command at Natchez, August 4, 1863:²⁷³

Dr J Y Hollingsworth, from Hard Times Landing, Louisiana, . . . brought the following information here . . . That . . . about . . . [July 21] a company of marine cavalry (styling themselves "Ellet's marines") . . . landed at Judge Perkins' or Ashwood Landing, Louisiana, dashed around Lake Saint Joseph, inquiring for Mr John Routh.

On reaching his plantation, demanded from him, first his arms, which were given to them. Then they burst open a barrel of whiskey, made all the negroes drunk, and in that way learned where his valuables were, consisting of silver-ware, liquors, meats, clothes, table and house linen, and even scuffled with him for his purse. They took the amount of \$25,000 worth of property -- \$15,000 of silver-ware . . . Mr Routh is an old man of nearly seventy years, had his house, gin, barn, stables, and everything burned last spring at the [time the] others on the lake had lost their property.

On August 14, Gen Grant forwarded this report to Brigadier Gen Lorenzo Thomas, adjutant general in Washington, DC. Grant added this note:

This is but one of numerous complaints made of the conduct of the Marine Brigade under General Ellet . . . [The brigade's] conduct is bad.

Whatever happened to Jefferson Davis, the Confederate President? His first priority after the war was to avoid being lynched. He was captured on May 10, 1865, then imprisoned at Ft Henry for two years in a dank and deadly cell, where many fully expected him to politely die. But

²⁷³ UWK, p61-62

others were much more interested in seeing him placed on trial for treason. No one was looking forward to that trial more than Jefferson Davis, who was supremely confident that he could prove his innocence.

At first, Davis' conviction was considered a slam dunk by Radical Republicans. But a couple of interesting things happened during Davis' incarceration. For one, Yankees began wondering why he had been held for so long, in such barbaric conditions, which definitely offended their concept of cruel and unusual punishment. (It's a mystery where their sense of justice or compassion had been during the war, but apparently it was beginning to return in Yankeedom.) And public perception of Davis changed from traitor to leader of a lost cause. (Yankee sympathy for Jefferson Davis? Hard to imagine.)

Another development, less surprising, is that Yankees gradually began to rediscover the joys of *freedom of speech*, which had long been denied by Lincoln and his administration. Hundreds of thousands of Yankees had been imprisoned by Lincoln for simply exercising their right of free speech, so Yankees learned to keep their mouths shut. But now that Lincoln was gone, and his goons were no longer in control, lawyers once again found their voice. And they had plenty to say about Lincoln's misconduct.

An independent counsel²⁷⁴ was hired in 1866 to prosecute Davis. But after reviewing the facts, he realized that the federal government's case stunk on ice, so he withdrew. After dragging their feet for another year, the feds hired a second lawyer²⁷⁵ to prosecute Davis, but he withdrew also, after reaching the same conclusion as the first attorney. He cautioned the feds that such a trial would reveal a lot of very embarrassing, incriminating evidence against the Lincoln administration, and that they would be well advised to leave bad enough alone.

²⁷⁴ John J Clifford.

²⁷⁵ Richard Dana.

The feds wisely accepted that advice and released Davis on a \$100K bond. The most astonishing part of the story is that his bond was paid by three of the most unlikely Yankees. One was Horace Greeley, the most vitriolic abolitionist, anti-secessionist Southern-hater ever spawned by the North. Then there was Cornelius Vanderbilt, a wealthy railroad man, and Gerritt Smith, who had helped bankroll John Brown.²⁷⁶

Nothing was heard from Davis for years. Many Yankees assumed that meant that Davis had finally seen the error of his ways, or that his heart had never been in the fight, or maybe that he knew the North had been right all along, but he was just too ashamed to admit it. Eventually, Davis assured the world that none of that was any more than Yankee imagination. He had a conversation with the governor of Texas in which he stated that he had remained silent because he knew full well that Yankees would carefully overanalyze every word, twisting it to fit their own narrative, and he was not inclined to give them the satisfaction. The South had accepted the outcome of the war, and they were determined to do the best they could, and there was no point in dwelling on the past or talking about it.

For Yankees who set about writing their fictional version of the war, Southern silence was much appreciated. The generation who saw what happened soon faded away, replaced by generations who would be taught the CivilGate version of the war, and who would believe it, because they had no reason not to. Until now.

²⁷⁶ SLG, p193-195

There was a mutiny of black soldiers in the Union army at Ft Jackson, Louisiana, on December 9, 1863. Lieutenant Colonel Augustus W Benedict²⁷⁷ was charged with cruelty to Negro soldiers under his command during a period of over four months at Ft St Philip, Baton Rouge, and at Ft Jackson. A military commission convened at Ft Jackson on December 12, 1863. Here is some of the evidence against Benedict:²⁷⁸

From Union Major William E Nye²⁷⁹:

[The soldiers whipped on December 9 were] the two drummer boys, named Harry Williams and Monroe Miller . . . with . . . a mule whip, such as used on carts; a whip with a stock and lash.

From Union Captain James Miller²⁸⁰:

I have seen . . . [Benedict], in . . . August, at Fort St Philip, spread a man out on his back, drive stakes down, and spread out his hands and legs, take off his shoes, and take molasses and spread it over his face, hands, and feet . . . Benedict ordered this punishment, and was present part of the time. The man lay there a whole day, and was put out again the next day . . . I have seen him strike men on other occasions. I have seen him strike men on parade without any cause . . . It was a common thing.

From Union First Lieutenant George H Kimball²⁸¹:

On . . . [August 7] at Baton Rouge, when officer of the guard, I was ordered by . . . Benedict to take two men, have their shoes and stockings taken off, and to lay them

²⁷⁷ Fourth Infantry, Corps d'Afrique.

²⁷⁸ UWK, p62-63

²⁷⁹ Fourth Infantry, Corps d'Afrique.

²⁸⁰ Fourth Infantry, Corps d'Afrique.

²⁸¹ Regimental adjutant, Fourth Infantry, Corps d'Afrique.

on the ground, . . . and stake them . . . and cover their faces, feet, and hands with molasses.²⁸² He told me to keep them there during the day and night, and said he did not care if I kept them there until they died. They belonged to Company B . . . I understood him at the time that the men had been stealing some corn to roast.

From Union Captain William H Knapp²⁸³:

On . . . [October 19, 1863] I was officer of the day . . . and . . . Private [Joseph L] Francis of my company did not dress properly, and . . . Benedict took the sergeant's sword and struck him in the face. I have frequently seen him at Fort St Philip, at guard-mounting, strike men in the face with his fist and kick them because their brasses were not bright or their boots not polished.

Another military commission found that during the Ft Jackson mutiny, one man proposed to "kill all the damned Yankees".

A general court-martial, December 17-19, found Benedict guilty of inflicting cruel and unusual punishment, [and Benedict was] to be dismissed [from] the service.

²⁸² The purpose of molasses seems to have been to attract insects to the helpless victim.

²⁸³ Company A, Fourth Infantry, Corps d'Afrique.

A Circular issued by Union Brigadier Gen Samuel D Sturgis²⁸⁴, January 4, 1864:²⁸⁵

The general . . . is forced to listen hourly to the complaints of loyal citizens of the cruel treatment they receive at the hands of many of the troops of this command. Soldiers . . . are permitted to wander away from their camps alone or in squads, with no intent but to plunder and rob helpless families.

From Union Major Gen Lovell H Rousseau²⁸⁶ to Union Gen G H Thomas, January 30, 1864:²⁸⁷

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

This was a year after the Emancipation Proclamation had been issued. Lincoln had falsely assumed that slaves would rise up in revolt against their masters, and flood to the aid of the Union military. That did not happen. Most of the blacks who ended up in the Union army went kicking and screaming, were treated harshly by their commanders, and were still slaves in every sense.

According to CivilGate propaganda, blacks were supremely grateful to their Yankee "liberators". It is a myth. Slaves and free blacks, for the most part, despised Yankees, and they never would have joined the Union army if they had not been forced to do so. Once enslaved by their new Yankee masters, blacks longed for the

²⁸⁴ Cavalry Corps, Army of the Ohio, Mossy Creek, Tennessee.

²⁸⁵ UWK, p70

²⁸⁶ District of Nashville.

²⁸⁷ UWK, p71

good old days of Southern slavery, where their masters had, for the most part, cared for them and treated them well.

From Union Captain William Meredith²⁸⁸ to Union Colonel McFerran²⁸⁹,
January 22, 1864:²⁹⁰

Some [citizens from Lexington to Wellington]²⁹¹ had left their homes for fear of being killed . . . [Union] Lieutenant Ridgway, with from forty to sixty men, made a raid through this county²⁹² for no other purpose than to rob and plunder. They commenced their hellish work in the vicinity of Greenton, robbed quite a number of men . . . They then proceeded to the neighborhood of Renick's, near the Jackson County line.

One of Lincoln's acts as Dictator of the United States was to create a brand new state.²⁹³ Way back in pre-Lincoln days when the nation was governed as a republic, with a Constitution and a real president, such a thing had been impossible. It had never been tried, or even seriously contemplated. But then, Dictator Lincoln established a number of extra-Constitutional precedents. Under the Lincolnstitution, he could do any damn thing he pleased.

²⁸⁸ Commanding Post, Lexington, Missouri, 39 miles east northeast of Kansas City.

²⁸⁹ First Cavalry Missouri State Militia, commander of Third Sub-District, Central District of Missouri, Warrensburg.

²⁹⁰ UWK, p74-75

²⁹¹ 14 miles southwest of Lexington.

²⁹² La Fayette.

²⁹³ RLD, p148-149

Who was going to stop him? The Confederacy tried, and they were crushed. Congress wasn't going to stop him, because they were in the tank for Dictator Lincoln. The Supreme Court couldn't stop him, and Lincoln knew that, so he just ignored them.

Yankee citizens for the most part had no interest in stopping him, because they had voted him into office in the first place. Many of them were all in favor of everything Lincoln was doing. They knew he was a dictator, but that was fine with them, because he was doing what they wanted done. Most Yankees didn't understand what was going on, and they didn't particularly care. They cared about money, not politics. They were ignorant, gullible, and easily manipulated. Just the kind of useful idiots Lincoln loved.

Quite a few Yankees knew what Lincoln was up to, and they didn't like it at all. A few of them even had the courage to say so. But Lincoln had his Secretary of State form a secret police force to deal with those malcontents, trouble-makers, traitors. Dare write an editorial in the newspaper calling for peace, not war? You were soon dealing with the gestapo, and they always won. Soon nobody in the North dared criticize Lincoln or any of his policies.

In this fascist environment, Lincoln looked out his Washington, DC window across the Potomac and saw Alexandria, Virginia. That was not a comforting sight, because Virginia was a Confederate state. Now he knew how South Carolinians had felt looking out at the little island that was home of Ft Sumter, with its Union cannons aimed right at the Confederacy's capital city.

Of course, Lincoln knew his military would whip Virginia into submission, but that would take a while. Dictator Lincoln was not a patient man. So he simply created the state of West Virginia, installed a puppet government in Alexandria, and got himself a little breathing space from Confederates across the Potomac. He also got himself some more Congressional support, and a few more electoral votes for the 1864 election.

His own Attorney General, Edward Bates, pointed out to Lincoln that a state had to exist before it could become part of the Union. And it had to be approved by a majority of the voters in that state before they could form a new state out of their territory. Apparently Ed was not aware that he was working for a dictator, not a president. Silly Eddie.

Union Captain James D Thompson²⁹⁴, on March 30, 1862, reported to Union Major William G Torrence²⁹⁵, calling his attention to . . .²⁹⁶

... the wanton destruction of life and property of citizens of that section by the [Missouri] State Militia [Union]. A few nights before my arrival at Warrensburg²⁹⁷ they set fire to Colonel McCowan's residence in Warrensburg, and entirely destroyed the house, furniture, etc, leaving the family, consisting of his wife and some four or five children, without anything to support or protect them.

About the same time a body of them proceeded, as I am informed by the Union men of Warrensburg, to the house of one Mr Burgess, and shot him and his brother and burned the house over the heads of his family.

Again on Sunday, the 30th, [Union] Captain Thomas W Houts²⁹⁸, while out with a party of some fifty men, killed one Mr Piper, and burned five dwellings, turning the families out of doors and destroying everything in the houses. I learn this from [Union] Lieutenant Ceathe, who was with him, and who positively refused to permit his men to engage in the nefarious business.

²⁹⁴ First Iowa Cavalry.

²⁹⁵ Commanding Post, Sedalia, Missouri.

²⁹⁶ UWK, p15-16

²⁹⁷ 50 miles southeast of Kansas City.

²⁹⁸ Missouri State Militia, commanding Post, Warrensburg.

Just prior to the Civil War, there was some talk of forming a Middle Atlantic Confederacy, which would have consisted of New York, New Jersey, Delaware, Pennsylvania, and Maryland. Most citizens of those states weren't crazy about the idea of secession, but they were even less thrilled about the prospect of war to prevent it, especially since their states would no doubt become a battleground. New Jersey was home to the largest Middle Confederacy movement.

Maryland was a slave state, and like all other states, it had both secession and Union supporters. Thomas Hicks, the governor, was a slaveholder from the South, but he did not favor an alliance with the South. He knew the state legislature would vote for secession if given a chance, so Hicks refused to call a special session to consider the matter. His *wait-and-see* approach meant that Abraham Lincoln decided Maryland's fate for it.

The governor of Delaware also took a *wait-and-see* approach, hoping the North and South would somehow reconcile, avoiding both secession and war. He called for a state convention in which the citizens of that small state could decide their course, but they ran out of time.

The people of New York were also divided. The upstate areas (with citizens of primarily New England descent) favored unionism and war, while people in the Hudson Valley preferred secession and no war. There was talk of New York City seceding from both the state of New York and from the Union, because New York City citizens felt the state legislature was sapping their money and strength.

Pennsylvanian President Buchanan, in office 1857-1861, did not believe the federal government had the right to keep a state in the Union by force. He was absolutely correct. He did nothing to fan the flames of war against his fellow Americans. Unfortunately, his successor didn't much care what Buchanan thought, what the majority of Americans thought, what Congress wanted, what Supreme Court Justices thought, or what the Constitution said.

Had each state called a convention to determine the wishes of their citizens, it is doubtful there would have been a war. Had the US Congress been called into session to debate, deliberate, and decide the matter, there most likely would have been no war. Had the Supreme Court been brought in to help reach a peaceful resolution, there surely would have been no war. Had Lincoln called for a nationwide popular vote, there undoubtedly would have been no war. Lincoln did none of those things. He rushed to war within weeks of his inauguration.

The Middle Atlantic Confederacy never had a chance to get up and running. Lincoln decided, with federal force and martial law, the fate of those states. There was no national consensus for war. The South certainly did not want war, and they did nothing to provoke it, even though Lincoln carefully staged the Ft Sumter incident as his excuse for invading the South.

The Civil War is not the correct label for this dark chapter in America's history. The War of Northern Aggression, or the War for Southern Independence are better. But the most correct and appropriate name for it is Lincoln's War. The blood of 650,000 Americans is on his hands.²⁹⁹

²⁹⁹ SLG, p115-119

War Secretary Stanton received this letter from Union Major Gen Ornsby M Mitchell³⁰⁰:

The most terrible outrages -- robberies, rapes, arsons, and plundering are being committed by lawless brigands and vagabonds connected with the [Union] army, and I desire authority to punish all those found guilty of perpetrating these crimes with death by hanging . . . In some instances, in regiments remote from headquarters, I hear the most deplorable accounts of excesses committed by soldiers.³⁰¹

It appears that the requested authority was never granted. But even in cases where death by hanging was authorized, it had no effect. Before the perpetrators could be identified, rounded up, charged, and tried by military tribunal, they were out of the army and no longer subject to military justice. But above and beyond that, the Lincoln administration, his highest military commanders, and Yankee civilians had no desire to punish those lawless brigands and vagabonds. They were delighted that Southerners were suffering from Yankee revenge. Any Yankee public outrage was directed toward a few Union generals who were not brutal enough.

When Southern states seceded, they considered it their right and their duty to reclaim land and facilities that had been ceded to the authority and control of the federal government. This included post offices, customs houses, minor military facilities and installations, and major military forts, some currently occupied by Union troops, including Ft Pickens, Pensacola, Florida.

³⁰⁰ Third Division, Army of the Ohio, Camp Taylor, near Huntsville, Alabama.

³⁰¹ UWK, p18

Desiring to increase their manpower at Ft Pickens, in case war erupted, Union warship *Brooklyn* was sent to the port with reinforcements, munitions, and supplies in January 1861. It sailed under a British flag -- a deception the South did not forget.

Neither side in Florida wanted war, so a Florida US Senator³⁰² worked with federal officials to negotiate an armistice, which provided that the Union would not reinforce the fort, and Southerners would not attack it. It was signed on January 20, 1861 by the proper Southern authorities and by the US Secretary of War³⁰³ and the US Secretary of the Navy³⁰⁴. Both sides considered it a valid peace agreement.

When Lincoln was inaugurated on March 4, 1861, he was not pleased to find that the war department either was unaware of his intent to strengthen Ft Pickens, or they just didn't care. He sent a personal order on March 12 to the officer aboard the *Brooklyn*, instructing him to reinforce the fort, but the order did not reach the ship until March 31. On April 1, Lincoln signed six executive orders, all sealed and very secretive, disregarding the chain of command and the Constitution.

The commander of Union naval forces in the area of Ft Pickens was Capt H A Adams, who received Lincoln's order to reinforce the fort, and who was also in possession of the peace armistice. That placed Adams in a very serious predicament. On the one hand, being an honorable man, and considering the armistice in full force and effect, Adams believed that landing troops at the fort would be a gross violation of the armistice, his own personal honor, and the honor of the US military and government. On the other hand, he was bound as a naval officer to follow orders, especially when given by the president himself.

Adams petitioned his superiors for clarification of the orders, stating that: **the department should not issue such instructions without full appreciation of what to**

³⁰² Stephen R Mallory.

³⁰³ J Holt.

³⁰⁴ I Toucey.

me appears the bad faith involved in such conduct. He was again instructed to land the troops, which he did on April 12, 1861, in the dark of night, unseen.

This is typical of Lincoln "leadership". He was a tyrant from the very beginning, not a president.³⁰⁵

From Union Colonel Dixon S Miles, Harper's Ferry, Virginia, to Union Major Gen John E Wool, Eighth Army Corps, Baltimore:³⁰⁶

Means³⁰⁷ company, lately raised, without discipline, has committed all kinds of depredations on the inhabitants, living on them, raking what he pleased and when it suited him, until the arrival of his men in any vicinity was a dread and terror.

From Union Captain Reavis³⁰⁸ to Union Gen Schofield³⁰⁹, August 30, 1862:³¹⁰

300 rebels, under . . . [Confederate] Colonel Robert R Lawther . . . were making their [way] to North Missouri . . . [Sigel captured two] young men . . . They surrendered . . . and [were] placed . . . in the guard-house . . . The next night they were by the order of [Union] Colonel Sigel taken . . . and escorted to the woods where they were most inhumanly murdered and butchered, and half covered up and left to the mercy of the brute creation.

³⁰⁵ SLG, p121-124

³⁰⁶ UWK, p19

³⁰⁷ Union Captain Samuel C Means.

³⁰⁸ Provost Marshal, Post of Waynesville, North Carolina.

³⁰⁹ Gen John M Schofield, District of Missouri, St Louis.

³¹⁰ UWK, p24

Having secured considerable public support for military action against the South by means of his charade at Ft Sumter, Lincoln called for 75,000 volunteers to join the army and suppress the Southern "rebellion". It was not a "war", because that would have required Congressional action, which would have diminished Lincoln's assumed role as dictator, and would have been a tacit acknowledgment of the Confederacy's status as an independent, sovereign nation.

But the public support Lincoln gained in the North was offset by the opposite response from some border states and Southern states. Four more states³¹¹ joined the Confederacy's current seven states³¹². Most people in those border states were Union supporters, and they did not want to secede. It was Lincoln's dog-and-pony show at Ft Sumter that finally pushed them into the Confederacy.

The governors of Kentucky and Missouri notified Lincoln of their intent regarding Lincoln's request for volunteers to invade the South.

Kentucky Governor Magoffin: **I say emphatically that Kentucky will furnish no troops for the wicked purpose of subduing her sister Southern states.**

Missouri Governor Jackson: **Your requisition, in my judgment, is illegal, unconstitutional, and revolutionary in its objects, inhuman and diabolical, and cannot be complied with. Not one man will the State of Missouri furnish to carry on such an unholy crusade.**

³¹¹ Virginia, Arkansas, North Carolina, and Tennessee seceded from Apr 17 to Jun 8, 1861.

³¹² South Carolina, Mississippi, Florida, Alabama, Georgia, Louisiana, and Texas had seceded from Dec 20, 1860 to Feb 1, 1861.

Shocked by their responses, and sensing impending further secessions, dictator Lincoln immediately sent federal troops to occupy Kentucky, Missouri, and Maryland. Those slave states no longer had the opportunity to decide for themselves. Therefore, they all became Union states (and they were all excluded from the provisions of the Emancipation Proclamation).

Lincoln's most enthusiastic support came from the New England states. The states that had refused to aid the US in the War of 1812 now were quite eager to participate in Lincoln's campaign of cultural genocide against their long-time rivals (in both England and America) -- the Cavaliers.³¹³

A Circular letter to all Union commanding officers, issued on September 27, 1862, by Union Brigadier Gen Lewis Merrill, Northeast Missouri District, Macon City³¹⁴:

The general has learned . . . of many instances in which houses have been burned and other property wantonly destroyed by the troops in this division . . . In at least several of the cases . . . the grossest injustice was committed upon innocent persons, and several poor families have been left houseless and dependent . . .

The practice is becoming common to burn and destroy without limitation . . . In many cases private houses have been entered by soldiers not acting under authority of an officer and articles taken . . . Such conduct is the direct result of officers permitting a violation of the order against straggling and entering private houses.³¹⁵

³¹³ SLG, p131-134

³¹⁴ 56 miles west of Hannibal, on the Hannibal and St Joseph Railroad.

³¹⁵ UWK, p24

In Baltimore, as throughout the state, citizens were divided on the secession issue, but when Union troops from other states passed through the city³¹⁶, they were overwhelmingly opposed by Baltimore residents. Soldiers and citizens exchanged gunfire in what is known as the Pratt Street Riots. The first blood of Lincoln's War was spilled in Maryland, not at Ft Sumter.

Unwilling to tolerate any expression of preference for peace, Lincoln suspended the right of habeas corpus, resulting in the arrest³¹⁷ and indefinite imprisonment of thousands of citizens throughout the North. Simply disagreeing with any of Lincoln's opinions or policies was enough for any citizen to be stripped of all his / her Constitutional rights. Those jailed without trial included a mayor, about 24 state legislators, a member of the US Congress³¹⁸, and a federal US Circuit Court judge. It is said that Lincoln even issued a warrant for the arrest of the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, but apparently it was never served.

That particular Lincoln hissyfit was triggered by the case of *Ex Parte Merryman*, in which Merryman, a Baltimore Guards officer, had been ordered by Governor Hicks to destroy certain railroad bridges to prevent more Union troops from marching through town, and inciting riots similar to the

Ft McHenry is where Francis Scott Key wrote our National Anthem in the War of 1812.

Another of Lincoln's political prisoners, Key's grandson, was also imprisoned at Ft McHenry.

America, under Lincoln's tyranny, was no longer the *land of the free*.

Pratt Street Riots. Before he could carry out those orders, he was arrested by Union troops in his home in the middle of the night and thrown into prison at Ft McHenry.

³¹⁶ Baltimore was a Northeastern central railroad hub, and troops headed for the South had to pass through the city.

³¹⁷ The arresting officers were military personnel armed with guns and bayonets.

³¹⁸ Representative Clement Vallandigham.

Merryman petitioned for a writ of habeas corpus, granted by Chief Justice Roger B Taney in his capacity as Circuit Court judge in Maryland. Taney's court brief advised that only Congress was authorized by the Constitution to suspend habeas corpus. Lincoln was not impressed, and Merryman was not released.³¹⁹

General Order no 11, announced on November 12, 1862, by Union Colonel John M Glover³²⁰:

Disgraceful depredations are continually being made on public and private property by the [Union] teamsters and troops of this district.³²¹

In the CivilGate version of the war, Yankees point with pride to the thousands of blacks who served in the Union army. What they never admit, and desperately don't want you to find out, is how most of those soldiers got there, and how they were treated by their Yankee "liberators".

On May 8, 1862, Union military officials in South Carolina authorized the *recruitment* of black *volunteers* into the army. Military and Treasury Department officials worked together to carry out those orders. This is among the memos written by special agent Edward L Pierce, this on May 12, to his boss³²².

This has been a sad day on these islands . . . The scenes of today . . . have been distressing . . . Some 500 men were hurried . . . from Ladies and Saint Helena to

³¹⁹ SLG, p135-138

³²⁰ At Rolla, 95 miles southwest of St Louis.

³²¹ UWK, p24-25

³²² Secretary of the Treasury, Salmon P Chase.

Beaufort, . . . and then carried to Hilton Head . . . The negroes were sad . . . The superintendents . . . aided the military in the disagreeable affair, disavowing the act. Sometimes whole plantations, learning what was going on, ran off to the woods for refuge. Others, with no means of escape, submitted passively to the inevitable decree . . . This mode of [enlistment by] violent seizure and transportation . . . spreading dismay and fright, is repugnant.

On May 13, Pierce wrote this³²³:

Scenes transpiring yesterday in the execution of your order . . . The colored people became suspicious of the presence of the companies of soldiers detailed for the service, who were marching through the islands during the night . . . They were taken from the fields without being allowed to go to their houses even to get a jacket . . .

There was sadness in all. As those on this plantation were called in from the fields, the soldiers, under orders, and while on the steps of my headquarters, loaded their guns, so that the negroes might see what would take place in case they attempted to get away . . .

On some plantations the wailing and screaming were loud and the 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.

Agent Pierce received this correspondence from a superintendent of one of the affected plantations:

This conscription, together with the manner of its execution, has created a suspicion that the Government has not the interest in the negroes that it has professed, and

³²³ To Union Major Gen David Hunter, Department of the South, Hilton Head, South Carolina.

many of them sighed yesterday for the "old fetters" as being better than the new liberty.

Pierce also received this letter on May 13³²⁴:

The whole village, old men, women, and boys, in tears, [were] following at our heels. The wives and mothers of the conscripts, giving way to their feelings, break into the loudest lamentations and rush upon the men, clinging to them with the agony of separation . . . Some of them, setting up such a shrieking as only this people could, throw themselves on the ground and abandon themselves to the wildest expressions of grief . . .

The old foreman [at Indian Hill] . . . said it reminded him of what his master said we should do . . . I have heard several contrast the present state of things with their former condition to our disadvantage.

This rude separation of husband and wife, children and parents, must needs remind them of what we have always stigmatized as the worst feature of slavery . . . Never, in my judgment, did major-general fall into a sadder blunder and rarely has humanity been outraged by an act of more unfeeling barbarity.

On October 29, War Secretary Stanton received this message.³²⁵

When the colored regiment was first organized by Gen Hunter, no provision was made for its payment, and the men were discharged after several months' service, receiving nothing for it. In the meantime their families suffered . . . This failure to pay them for their service has weakened their confidence in our promises for the future and makes them slow to enlist.

³²⁴ From L D Phillips at Dr Pope's Plantation.

³²⁵ From Brigadier Gen Rufus Saxton in Beaufort, South Carolina.

The North's conscription policy amounted to Union slavery. Black soldiers in the Union army were slaves in all but name. Yankees did not *liberate* slaves, they simply imposed themselves as their new slave *masters*, kidnapping them, and forcing them to work in the army or on Union-operated plantations. Blacks longed for the good old days of Southern slavery.³²⁶

Union conscription of blacks was hardly confined to South Carolina. This comes from Alabama: **A major of colored troops is here with his party capturing negroes, with or without their consent . . . They are being conscripted.**³²⁷

This is from New Orleans, 1863:³²⁸

I . . . call your attention to . . . letters received from . . . overseers on the Payne and Taylor plantations worked by this department; nor are these acts confined to these places alone -- the Le Blane, Hermitage, Ashland, Point Houmas, and other Government places have suffered severely from having the able-bodied hands forced at the point of the bayonet from the plantations for conscription.³²⁹

As this and other letters made their way through the chain of command, one military official added that . . . **These cases of cruelty are reported daily.**³³⁰

³²⁶ UWK, p21-23

³²⁷ A message sent to U S Grant in Nashville from Major Gen John A Logan, Fifteenth Corps, Army of the Tennessee, Huntsville, Alabama, Feb 26, 1864.

³²⁸ UWK, p64

³²⁹ Written on Sep 26, 1863, to Benjamin F Flanders, Supervising Special Agent, Treasury Department, New Orleans, from G W Cozzens, Superintendent of Plantations, Office Supervising Special Agent, Treasury Department, Plantation Bureau, New Orleans.

³³⁰ UWK, p64

Vermont comes off squeaky clean as far as slavery and the slave trade are concerned. Their first state constitution banned slavery on July 8, 1777, which gives it the distinction of the first state to abolish slavery. Not to diminish the significance of that, but it really wasn't a major sacrifice, considering the most black residents Vermont ever had at one time was somewhere in the 15 to 21 range.

It's interesting that the state of Vermont was a product of secession. Vermont seceded from New Hampshire and New York. Apparently, secessionist fever still runs hot in that tiny state, however, even after all these years. Only this time they are flirting with the idea of seceding from the Union. No kidding.³³¹

This was written on March 6, 1863, during the Union's Yazoo River, Mississippi, Expedition:³³²

I . . . witness the pillaging, plundering . . . of some of the commands of this expedition. This morning . . . we came up with the *Ida May*, the men from which steamer were on shore shooting cattle, and many of them rushing pell-mell through and around the house on the plantation, catching chickens, turkeys, geese, pigs, etc. The women at the house were greatly frightened, and fearful that they were to be slaughtered . . .

It is impossible to keep [my men] . . . within proper limits when they discover men from the steamers of the other brigades on shore capturing the delicacies of poultry-yards and pantries . . . We cannot make good soldiers of thieves and

³³¹ SLG, p63

³³² UWK, p55-56

robbers, neither can we expect success to follow us if we thus outrage every principle of truth and justice.³³³

While some Union officers well understood the potential unintended consequences of and were appalled by the barbaric behavior of Union troops, their complaints were seldom acted upon with any effect. Abraham Lincoln, his cabinet, and his top generals were waging a campaign of Southern cultural genocide against the Confederacy, and they were delighted with the war crimes being perpetrated on the South. They couldn't very well openly acknowledge it, but Northern newspapers showed little restraint, acting as cheerleaders for the most brutal and ruthless Union generals, and rebuking those who did not wholeheartedly embrace Lincoln's ethnic cleansing project.

Yankees during the Civil War were much like the Romans who were addicted to the brutality of gladiators and other bloody Roman games. Romans found death, suffering, and animal savagery great entertainment. So did Yankees. Yet they considered themselves vastly superior to Southern "barbarians" who would never have engaged in such war crimes, or condoned them, or allowed them to continue year after year, while pretending to be shocked and appalled. Yankee hypocrisy is evident in the fact that such behavior was rarely punished or effectively controlled. In fact, the worst offenders were often promoted and considered heroes.

³³³ From Union Brigadier Gen Clinton B Fisk, Second Brigade, Thirteenth Division, aboard Steamer *Lebanon No 2*, to Union Brigadier Gen Leonard F Ross, Thirteenth Division, Thirteenth Army Corps.

The current black population of Maine, Vermont, and New Hampshire is less than 1% each.

If a large corporation today had a total workforce comprised of less than 1% blacks, that company would be sued by the federal government for racial discrimination. Maybe Maine, Vermont, and New Hampshire need an affirmative action program.³³⁴

Union Gen William Tecumseh Sherman³³⁵ said this on April 19, 1863:³³⁶

War at best is barbarism, but to involve all -- children, women, old and helpless -- is more than can be justified. Our men all become absolutely lawless unless this can be checked . . . I think it injures our men to allow them to plunder indiscriminately the inhabitants of the Country.³³⁷

Those are strange words coming from the very same man who said this on January 31, 1864:

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.

³³⁴ SLG, p63

³³⁵ Fifteenth Army Corps, Army of the Tennessee.

³³⁶ UWK, p56

³³⁷ Written to Union Major Gen Frederick Steele, First Division.

Did the most barbaric, bloodthirsty, brutal, lethal general of the Civil War have a change of heart and mind between April 1863 and January 1864? Or was he lying on one of those occasions? His 1864 remarks are certainly much more consistent with his actions throughout the war than the hollow words of 1863. Why "hollow"? Because he made statement after statement, issued order after order, warning after warning against the illegal conduct of Union troops, but it continued to get worse, because while he said much, he did little.

Sherman was a big man when it came to bullying and killing innocent defenseless Southern women, children, old men, and blacks. But he wasn't such a big shot when faced with real Southern soldiers. He couldn't even maintain discipline within his own command. Sherman was a pathetic coward and loser, who picked on women and children because they were the only ones he could defeat.

But it's hard to believe he was lying in the earlier statement. Sherman was known to be a brutally honest man, not the type of chronic liar typical of politicians, for example. A more likely explanation is that he was the product of an intense internal turmoil, a conflict which he could not resolve, simply because so many of his underlying assumptions and conclusions were tragically flawed, although he never would have admitted it. He was, to put it bluntly, a mentally unstable man.

At one point in his career, a doctor examined Sherman and concluded that he was of **such nervousness that he was unfit for command.**³³⁸ He was sent home for three weeks to pull himself together. Doubts and rumors about his mental fitness dogged him throughout his career. His pictures seem to portray someone who is just a bit crazy. His insatiable appetite for slaughtering and starving innocent civilians certainly suggests mental instability.

So, Sherman may very well have had severe mental health issues. What was Lincoln's excuse?

³³⁸ CWC, p143

We all learn about the Underground Railroad in school. It was a system organized by anti-slavery people in the South, helping slaves escape and find safety in the free states of the North, where the compassionate, black-loving Yankees lived. Only, not really. Yes, Harriet Tubman and others did work hard to assist escaped slaves and usher them to safety. But blacks did not find that safety in the Northern US. They had to keep going all the way to Canada before they could stop running.

Why? Because Yankees would most likely turn them in to the authorities, who would make sure they were ushered right back down to their master in the South. Why would Yankees do that? Well, sometimes it was for the reward. But it was also the law, at times and in places. According to the Fugitive Slave Act of 1850, any Yankee could be forced by any law enforcement officer to assist in the capture and return of runaway slaves. Yankees really hated that law. Not because they felt sorry for the slaves, but because they felt sorry for themselves. Being compelled to help enforce that law was quite inconvenient, and it could also be unbelievably expensive. The City of Boston spent \$5000 trying to capture just one runaway.

But more than that, Yankees didn't much care for the idea of being bossed around like that. They much preferred being the boss rather than the bossed. They really got a kick, for example, out of telling Southerners what to do. Of course, Southerners didn't care much for being bossed around by Yankees. But that didn't matter to Yankees, because they knew themselves to be far superior to Southerners, and they were, therefore, divinely and supremely entitled to be the boss. Also, because they had the Union army to back them up.

But more than that, Yankees didn't care much for blacks. They went to great lengths to keep blacks out of their states. They weren't crazy about Southern slavery, but that didn't mean they wanted blacks flowing up from the South and settling in their

neck of the woods. Nope, just keep moving along, there, black persons. For example, a Virginia man decided to free over 500 of his slaves, and he planned to get them settled in Ohio. Those compassionate, black-loving Ohio folks said they did not want the freed blacks in their state, and they were ready to grab their guns, stand at the border, and shoot any black person who tried to cross the state line.

The Underground Railroad did not stop in the Northern states. Violators would likely find themselves six feet Underground. Slave states were the ones where blacks lived and worked. Northern states were the ones where blacks lived only if all attempts to keep them out had failed.³³⁹ They rarely failed.

This episode of Yankees behaving badly comes from Springfield, Missouri, July 26, 1861:³⁴⁰

The cases of plundering, wanton destruction of property, and disregard of personal rights, of which the general commanding has heard with pain, have been disgraceful to our troops.³⁴¹

³³⁹ SLG, p69-72

³⁴⁰ UWK, p4

³⁴¹ An order issued by Union Brigadier Gen Nathaniel Lyon, commanding the Army of the West in Springfield, Mo.

What happened to slaves in New England when they got too old or sick to be productive? Was there a gold watch and a retirement party? Was there a pension, or severance pay? Was there even a handshake, or a thank-you card? Nope, they were just cordially invited to hit the road. When they did that, they were vagrants and vagabonds, subject to arrest or deportation to . . . well, maybe Canada, or more likely the South, since no Northern state wanted them. Yankees certainly didn't want to be financially responsible for them, so they usually passed a law requiring the master to post some sort of bond for each slave he freed.

Boston threatened to deport more than 200 blacks just because they were not Massachusetts citizens. Illinois (the land of Lincoln) threatened to kill any blacks that came into their state. An Indiana citizen said it would be better for his state to kill all blacks there, just as the Puritans had killed the Pequot Indians. Most Northern states had laws prohibiting new black settlers, and three states made it part of their constitution.³⁴² Blacks weren't welcome in the western territories, either.

They were welcome in the South. And not all blacks in the South were slaves. Many Southern blacks were, in fact, slave owners themselves. Many black slaveholders were quite successful and wealthy. You just didn't see successful blacks in the North. Very few blacks, period, and that's just the way racist Yankees up there wanted it.

Union Gen Halleck received this memo from Union Gen William Tecumseh Sherman (written in 1864), who quite nicely summarizes the supreme arrogance of the Union cause and rationalizes the utter depravity of Yankee conduct:

³⁴² Illinois, Indiana, and Oregon.

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.

That oath of office all Union generals had taken, promising to uphold, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States . . . they were just kidding about that.

Blacks were beaten, clubbed, and stoned. They were driven from their homes and churches by angry mobs. You probably assume I'm describing a scene involving the KKK, somewhere in the deep South. No, this happened in Philadelphia and Cincinnati.

The 1800s saw several race riots in the North. The worst of them was the New York Draft riots of 1863. Blacks there were attacked, beaten, and sometimes killed. Some were hung from lamp posts. An orphanage for black children was attacked by a mob, which was held back just long enough for the kids to escape. What was it that had white New Yorkers' knickers in a crack? They blamed blacks for Lincoln's draft. They blamed blacks for Lincoln's war.

Did it occur to any of those Yankees to blame . . . oh, I don't know . . . let's see now . . . maybe . . . Lincoln? There's no record of it. But then, there wouldn't be, would there? Since it was Yankees who wrote the history of the Civil War. Also, any Yankee who didn't enthusiastically embrace Lincoln's way of doing things suffered from acute death or chronic imprisonment. Poor Yankees had to take their frustrations out on somebody, though, and blacks were often quite convenient for that purpose. It didn't quite square with the modern portrait of Yankees as tolerant, black-loving, compassionate soldiers in the fight for racial equality, freedom, and social justice. But, . . .

Did I mention that it was Yankees who wrote the history of the Civil War?³⁴³

From Missouri, January 1, 1862:³⁴⁴

The practice of plundering and robbing peaceable citizens and of wantonly destroying private property has become so prevalent in some portions of this command as to require the most vigorous measures for its suppression.³⁴⁵

Those vigorous measures never materialized. Quite the contrary. Yankees dropped all pretense of trying to abide by accepted standards of military conduct.

The Revolutionary War helped end slavery in the North. Thousands of blacks were promised freedom by both sides for their assistance in the war, and thousands of blacks accepted the offers. When the British finally accepted defeat, they took 3000 former slaves with them to Sierra Leone, where they joined other blacks who were poor but free. The British also, reportedly, compensated Northern slave owners for the loss of their property.

Blacks who fought for the colonies were freed, but not exactly free. They were never recognized for their contribution to the war effort; they were never accepted into Northern White society; and many were chased away by Yankee mobs for the sin of trying to participate in celebrating the war they had helped win. The Northern states

³⁴³ SLG, p72

³⁴⁴ UWK, p12

³⁴⁵ From General Order no 2, issued by Union Brigadier Gen John M Schofield at his headquarters on the North Missouri Railroad at Wellsville, 70 miles from St Louis.

did pay a significant sum of money and many acres of land for their contribution and service. However it was paid to their former masters, not to the former slaves themselves.

How's that for Yankee compassion?³⁴⁶

This is part of a letter written by Union Gen Halleck on January 18, 1862, to Union Brigadier Gen Lorenzo Thomas, adjutant general, who brought this and similar communications to the attention of Edwin M Stanton, Secretary of War:³⁴⁷

... depredations committed by Jennison's men in Western Missouri. Similar accounts are received of the conduct of the First Kansas³⁴⁸ ... along the Missouri River, in the counties of La Fayette and Jackson ... They [Union soldiers] are no better than a band of robbers; they cross the line, rob, steal, plunder, and burn whatever they can lay their hands upon.

They disgrace the name and uniform of American soldiers ... If the Government countenances such acts by screening the perpetrators from justice and by rewarding with office their leaders ... it may resign all hopes of a pacification of Missouri ... The bitter animosity against these troops is naturally transferred to the Government which supports them and in whose name they ... act.

The government, in whose name they act, disgraced the name and uniform of American soldiers from the day Abraham Lincoln sent Union troops to invade the South. Union soldiers revealed their true character in the Civil War, and forever

³⁴⁶ SLG, p74-75

³⁴⁷ UWK, p14

³⁴⁸ Cavalry, under the command of Union Colonel George W Deitzler.

disgraced their nation. But they were simply a reflection of virtually all Yankees under the control of Abraham Lincoln. Did Lincoln ever speak out against Union war crimes? Did he ever attempt to take strong action against the barbaric behavior of his soldiers? I'm not aware of it.

These barbaric Yankees are the animals who took over the South during the war and Reconstruction. Is that cause for celebration? Is that why we hold Abraham Lincoln in such high esteem? Is this what America should be?

America has no moral authority to lecture other countries about civil rights. Lincoln's government was as brutal and bloody as any tyrannical reign in world history. Gen Halleck suggests that such Yankee misbehavior may cause a backlash against the North.

Ya think?

On January 27, 1862, Union Gen Halleck replied to a letter he had received from Confederate Major Gen Sterling Price, the commanding officer at Springfield, Missouri:³⁴⁹

You call my attention to the fact that a band of men are "firing [burning] private houses, barns, mills, etc". I presume you refer to a band of outlaws on the Kansas frontier. They do not belong to my command and they entered this department without my authority. As soon as I heard of their depredations I ordered Gen Pope to either drive them out of the State or to disarm and confine them.

Two days later, Gen Halleck sent a wire to Union Gen David Hunter, Department of Kansas:

³⁴⁹ UWK, p14-15

The depredations of Jennison's men³⁵⁰ in Jackson, Cass, and Johnson Counties are doing us immense injury in this State by making secessionists of large numbers of Union men. They do more harm than Price's whole army.

So, what was done about it? On February 26, 1862, Secretary of War Stanton received this report³⁵¹:

[Regarding the] lawless action of US military forces in Jefferson County, Missouri, . . . Although the Kansas . . . troops, in obedience to orders, did leave . . . Missouri, the substituted US forces in that county have made no change in their mode of warfare . . . the same wanton and lawless violence on the rights of private property have continued.

This was Lincoln's idea of *preserving the Union*?

The Union was all in favor of secession -- when it happened to conform to Uncle Sam's wishes and goals. Here are a few examples.

Texas seceded from Mexico in 1835-36, forming the Republic of Texas, which soon became the 28th state. (New Englanders bitched and moaned about it, but then that's just what New Englanders do. Or did.)

In the wee years of the 20th century, the Union was chomping at the bit to build a certain canal, but the land we needed just happened to be owned by Columbia, and those uncooperative Columbians refused to sell at a reasonable (according to the

³⁵⁰ Seventh Kansas Cavalry.

³⁵¹ From O G Cates, a Unionist civilian from St Louis, in Washington to advise Stanton.

Union) price. So Uncle Sam offered them a secession they couldn't refuse, and the Panama Canal was built.

Scandinavian countries were quite fond of secession, and the Union saw no problem with that. Norway seceded from Denmark in 1905, after a vote of 300,000 to less than 200. No war, no objection by Uncle Sam. Czechoslovakia split into the Czech Republic and Slovakia in 1918. Uncle Sam heartily supported this secession on the grounds that Czechoslovakia was too hard to spell.

Uncle Sam strongly supported the breaking up of the Soviet Union into small Asian and European nations in the 1990s.

Uncle Sam has long supported the independence of Taiwan. Red China claims they have the right to reclaim Taiwan any time they want to, by force if necessary. How do they know they have that right? Because of the precedent set by Abraham Lincoln.

What gives the Union the right to arbitrarily decide which secessions to bless and which ones to blast? The biggest military in the world. Unfair? Unjust? Hypocritical? Capricious?

What are you going to do about it?³⁵²

³⁵² SLG, p105-107

From Union Gen Halleck, St Louis, to War Secretary Stanton, March 25, 1862.³⁵³

That many and in some cases horrible outrages have been committed in this State I do not doubt. They have been committed by three classes of persons.

First. The enemy's guerrilla bands . . . They are rapidly diminishing . . .

Second. The Kansas jayhawkers, or robbers, who were organized under the auspices of Senator Lane. They wear the uniform of and it is believed receive pay from the United States. Their principal occupation for the last six months seems to have been the stealing of negroes, the robbing of houses, and the burning of barns, grain, and forage. The evidence of their crimes is unquestionable.

Third. Our own volunteer troops. It cannot be denied that some of our volunteer regiments have behaved very badly, plundering to an enormous extent . . . Many of the regimental officers are very bad men and participate in this plunder.

Under the auspices of Senator Lane? Rampant, widespread war crimes were being inflicted upon the South at the direction of Congress? And this was supposed to encourage the Confederate states to rejoin the Union? This is how Yankees wanted to *preserve the Union*?

The only reason more states (like Kansas, Missouri, and Maryland, for example) didn't leave the Union is because Lincoln rushed troops into those states to prevent them from voting for secession. Only in the psychotic, demented Yankee mind could the Union be preserved by force, violence, and the most depraved, barbaric, brutal, savage, inhumane oppression of half the nation.

³⁵³ UWK, p15

Descendants of these Yankees need to take a good hard look at the legacy of their ancestors. Current political beliefs and policies of today's northeastern establishment elite leave little doubt that they retain the basic character of their Civil War Yankee forefathers. That is reason for grave concern.

There are six distinct groups of people who migrated into the British North American colonies between Jamestown (1607) and the Revolutionary War (1776). There were about one million immigrants total, almost all of them from the British Isles and Africa.

- (1) African slaves: 500,000, from the early 1600s to 1808.
- (2) Scots-Irish: 250,000 to 400,000, from the early 1700s to 1775, from all over the British Isles, but primarily from the Ulster Plantation of Northern Ireland.
- (3) Indentured servants: at least tens of thousands, in the 1600s, from the south and west of England, mostly with the Cavaliers.
- (4) Quakers: 20,000-30,000, from the early to mid-1600s, mostly from England.
- (5) Cavaliers: 20,000-30,000, in the mid-1600s.
- (6) Puritans: 20,000-30,000, in the early 1600s.

Very little is written about the Scots-Irish and indentured servants, even though it was the first three groups that made up 90% of the original colonial population. The primary characteristic they had in common was poverty. It's important to remember that they were not the first Americans; they were the first Europeans in colonial America. Native Americans were the original Americans.

Quakers settled mainly in New Jersey, the Delaware Valley, and Pennsylvania. Most were of the middle- to upper-class; many were very successful and wealthy businessmen. Much Quaker wealth derived from the slave trade in Britain, which

included two Quaker slave ships.³⁵⁴ American Quakers eventually became strong abolitionists, but, as was the case with Yankees, they came to discover the evils of slavery only after securing the profits of slavery.

Cavaliers were English supporters of the king, royalty, members of the court, wealthy aristocrats. They were the losers in the English Civil Wars, and they came to America to help ease the pain of their loss. Not surprisingly, they enjoyed a laid-back, leisurely lifestyle, letting others do the work for them, while they reaped the profits. In England they had been members of the Anglican Church of England, but in America they were decidedly impious. In other words, they were the polar opposites of Yankees.

The people who won the English Civil Wars were known in England as Roundheads, Parliamentarians, or Puritans. They are the ones who beheaded King Charles I and assumed control of the English government under the leadership of Oliver Cromwell. They were financially secure and fanatically fundamentalist in their Protestant faith. They were ruled by their clergy, and they were extremely intolerant of anyone who was not a Puritan. Sometimes they couldn't tolerate even fellow Puritans, as in the case of the Salem Witch Trials. They especially despised their Cavalier neighbors to the South.

So, in a sense, America became an extension of an English family feud, with Puritans in the North, Cavaliers in the South, and neutral Quakers in the middle (in more ways than one). They were in the middle geographically, but they were also the peacemakers, mediators, and non-combatants.

Puritans moved across upper New York into the Great Lakes area, Michigan, Wisconsin, Ohio, Illinois, Indiana. Quakers fanned out west of Pennsylvania. Cavaliers themselves weren't big on migration westward, but the poor people who served them and the Scots-Irish moved from Philadelphia to Pittsburgh, through the

³⁵⁴ *The Willing Quaker* and *The Society*.

Appalachians of Virginia, down through the Shenandoah Valley, into the Carolinas, and on to the western states.

This set the stage for the Civil War. There were the rich white Puritans in the North, the rich white Cavaliers in the South, and a few border states in between that had roots in both cultures. It was the 90% of Americans caught in the crossfire that paid the heaviest price for what may be described as the American front in the English Civil Wars.³⁵⁵

Realizing that the Emancipation Proclamation was a sham, Secretary of State William Seward summed it up this way: *We show our sympathy with slavery by emancipating slaves where we cannot reach them, and holding them in bondage where we can set them free.*³⁵⁶

General Order no 46, issued by Union Gen William Tecumseh Sherman³⁵⁷, July 7, 1862:³⁵⁸

Stealing, robbery, and pillage has become so common in this army that it is a disgrace to any civilized people . . . This demoralizing and disgraceful practice of pillage must cease, else the country will rise on us and justly shoot us down like dogs and wild beasts.

³⁵⁵ SLG, p109-113

³⁵⁶ SLG, p140

³⁵⁷ Fifth Division, Army of the Tennessee (under the command of Gen U S Grant), in Moscow, Tennessee, 30 miles east of Memphis.

³⁵⁸ UWK, p34-35

Sherman frequently issued orders and warnings similar to this, proving that he fully understood what was happening, and the consequences of it, but he did nothing to effectively stop such atrocious war crimes from happening. Instead, he enthusiastically embraced the barbaric behavior he pretends to condemn here, and he vigorously participated in it himself, arrogantly claiming that the Union troops and government had the right to do whatever they felt like doing, without Constitutional restraint.

Sherman, who had a long-standing reputation as being a bit crazy, a man of considerable mental health issues, may well have been schizophrenic. I believe the Yankee technical term for such a condition was: *normal*.

These were words of Abraham Lincoln in his First Inaugural Address:

The power confided to me will be used to hold, occupy, and possess the property and places belonging to the Government and to collect the duties and imposts; but beyond what may be necessary for these objects, there will be no invasion, no using of force against or among the people anywhere.

Lincoln's political career was based on saying one thing, then doing another. After studying Lincoln closely, however, it wasn't always that simple. He had a natural gift for speaking esoterically, so that only his inner circle would understand what he was really saying, which was quite different from the apparent meaning of his lofty rhetoric. This paragraph is a perfect example of that.

He seems to be saying that he did not plan to go to war, unless provoked by the South. Clearly, the South did not want war, and Confederate leaders went to extraordinary measures to fairly negotiate all disputed or potentially disputed matters of conflict. All the South wanted was to be left alone. They just wanted to secede in peace and form their own government, just as the Founders did in the

Revolutionary War, and just as Lincoln himself had forcefully stated they had a right to do.

So, if neither side wanted war, this paragraph in Lincoln's First Inaugural seemed to be reassuring. But that is not what Lincoln was really saying, and far from being reassuring, it was a threat of war. Here's why.

possess the property and places belonging to the Government

He was already planning his dog-and-pony show at Ft Sumter. This was just setting the stage for that event, which only Lincoln and his closest military advisors clearly understood. He had already decided to go to war, and he had already decided how he would provoke the South into firing the first shot.

to collect the duties and imposts

The absolute top priority for Lincoln was to keep Southern tariff revenue flowing to the North. Secession made that impossible. That's why Lincoln was not interested in considering peaceful solutions to the secession crisis, because he knew the South was never going to concede that issue. He tried to lure the South back into the Union with the Corwin amendment, but the South wasn't having any of that. The Morrill Tariff was the main reason they had seceded in the first place, not slavery. That being the case, there was no point in Lincoln trying to negotiate on anything else. If the South was determined to institute a free-trade policy in the Confederacy, and they were, then Lincoln's only option was to invade the South in an attempt to force them to keep collecting tariffs according to the North's rules.

That meant, for one thing, blockading Southern ports (especially New Orleans), cutting off Southern trade. But Lincoln had no right to do that unless he declared war. He couldn't declare war, because that would mean sharing power with Congress. It would also mean he was tacitly acknowledging the Confederacy as a sovereign nation. Lincoln was certainly not willing to do that. So, he just pretended

secession was nothing more than a common rebellion, and he ignored Congress' constitutional role in declaring war. In fact, he knew he was going to get bogged down in all sorts of constitutional issues and potential clashes with Congress and the Supreme Court if he tried to be a real president. So, he just became a dictator, instead. He started his illegal, unconstitutional, immoral, and unnecessary war. Then he used the war as an excuse to use tyrannical power, the parameters of which he alone would determine.

In other words, this paragraph from Lincoln's First Inaugural, while appearing on the surface to be an assurance of peace, was really a declaration of war. In fact, almost every paragraph of that speech seems to be saying one thing, while Lincoln is really saying or intending something quite different. He tries to portray himself as the nation's humble servant, caught up in a difficult situation, just trying to do the right thing, according to the Constitution, the law, the will of the people, and the basic goodness of a simple, humble Christian man.

He was none of that. He was a power-hungry tyrant who had worked for years for his opportunity to implement what he called the American System (protectionist tariffs, corporate subsidies, national control of the money supply), and he was not about to stand by while secession destroyed all his big-government dreams. He was in no position as "president" to be honest about his true character or intentions, but some of his myrmidons were surprisingly candid at times.

In stark contrast to Lincoln's lofty rhetoric, note the following observations about Yankee intentions and actions during the war.³⁵⁹

The United States has the right, and . . . the . . . power, to penetrate every part of the national domain . . . We will remove and destroy every obstacle -- if need be, take every life, every acre of land, every particle of property, everything that to us seems proper.

³⁵⁹ SLG, p147-150

-- Union Gen William Tecumseh Sherman

If I had the power I would arm . . . every Negro in the Southern Confederacy . . . and turn them on the rebels in the South, if it exterminated every rebel from the face of God's green earth -- every man, woman and child south of Mason and Dixon's line. I would like to see Richmond and Charleston captured by negro troops commanded by Butler the Beast. We will crowd the Rebels into the Gulf of Mexico and drown the entire race as the devil did the hogs in the Sea of Galilee.

-- Parson Brownlow³⁶⁰

Those same two men had this to say after the war was over.

Look to the South and you who went with us through that land can best say if they have not been fearfully punished. Mourning is in every household, desolation written in broad characters across the whole face of their country, cities in ashes and fields laid waste, their commerce gone, their system of labor annihilated and destroyed. Ruin and poverty and distress everywhere, and now pestilence adding to the very cap sheaf of their stock of misery.

-- Union Gen William Tecumseh Sherman

I am one of those who believe the war has ended too soon. We have whipped the rebels, but not enough . . . The second army of invasion [Reconstruction] will, as they ought to, make the entire South as God found the earth, without form and void. They will not, and ought not to, leave one rebel fence-rail, out house, one dwelling, in the eleven seceded states. As for the Rebel population, let them be exterminated.

³⁶⁰ William Gannaway "Parson" Brownlow (8/29/1805 – 4/29/1877) was a newspaper editor, minister, and politician who served as Tennessee's Carpetbagger governor from 1865 to 1869. Brownlow was well known for his uncompromising and radical viewpoints and his relentless invectives against his opponents.

When the second war [Reconstruction] is wound up, let the land be surveyed and sold out to pay expenses.

-- Parson Brownlow

When Lincoln claimed to be trying to *preserve the Union*, he meant the Northern half of the Union, not the South. He and his minions were on a mission of Southern cultural genocide, as clearly shown by Northern words and actions. Note that winning the war was not enough for bloodthirsty Yankees. They wanted revenge, and they wanted the Southern population *exterminated* to make room for Yankees and Northern culture. They achieved much of that in the war, thanks in large part to Sherman, and they achieved much more of it in Reconstruction, thanks in large part to men like Brownlow.

Since Parson Brownlow was a man of God, and since his vision of Southern annihilation was largely achieved, it would seem that God was on the side of the North and their campaign of Southern cultural genocide. Which means that God was delighted with the slaughter and starvation of thousands of innocent defenseless Southern women, children, old men, and blacks.

Is that Christianity? If so, what part of the New Testament encourages or condones such cruelty and barbarity? If that is not really what Christianity is supposed to be about, where was the all-loving omnipotent, omniscient Christian God during the North's annihilation of the South? Or during the entire war, for that matter? What was God's role in the cruel, evil enslavement of millions of Native Americans and black Africans through the centuries? Much of that enslavement was done in the very name of Christianity, and by the Catholic church itself. Where was the Christian God while that was going on?

Lincoln refers to God a great deal in his speeches and documents. In his Second Inaugural Address, Abe seems to blame the entire war on God. The South was convinced that God was on **their** side. Ministers from both the North and the South taught for generations that slavery was ordained by God and sanctioned by the

Bible. How could God's very own devoted followers and spokesmen have been so wrong? Where was God when that was going on?

American black slaves turned to God for comfort, inspiration, and hope during their darkest hours of despair. But it seems that the Christian God consistently turned His back on slaves throughout centuries of death, suffering, and bondage until the 1800s.

From Union Captain Oliver D Greene³⁶¹ to Union Gen Buell, June 20, 1862:³⁶²

I . . . call the attention of the general to the outrageous proceedings of the recent expedition to Chattanooga. I have reports from several reliable officers with the expedition that outrages of very sort were perpetrated on friend and foe alike. The line of march is one scene of pillage and robbery. Officers have aided and encouraged and benefited by the pillage.

[Brigadier] General [James S] Negley laughed at and did not attempt to prevent the outrages which came under his notice . . . I am reliably assured that, all reports official or otherwise notwithstanding, the troops in Negley's and [Major General Ornsby M] Mitchell's commands, with few exceptions, have become bands of robbers and thieves.

³⁶¹ Assistant adjutant general in Nashville, Tennessee.

³⁶² UWK, p33

The New England states refused to take part in the War of 1812, declaring it unconstitutional. It clearly was not unconstitutional, and New Englanders knew it. The problem was that we were fighting the British, who just happened to be New England's major trading partner. Those Yankees didn't care about the rest of the country; they were only concerned with their own economic welfare. (They were certainly consistent in that regard).

They convened a convention in Hartford in 1814 to consider all their options, one of which was secession. They kept no records of the convention, but they concluded that:

New England states had the right to avow their own sovereignty against any federal infringement on said sovereignty.

Apparently, they did not believe that the Southern states had the same rights or sovereignty. How could the Southern states have ever considered parting company with such civic-minded Yankees?³⁶³

From Union Colonel George W Deitzler³⁶⁴ to Union Brigadier Gen Isaac F Quimby³⁶⁵, June 26, 1862:³⁶⁶

The people complain bitterly of the outrages committed by a portion of [Brigadier] General [Robert B] Mitchell's brigade; they are charged with jayhawking³⁶⁷ horses, negroes, etc . . . At Union City³⁶⁸ a foraging party under

³⁶³ SLG, p101-102

³⁶⁴ First Kansas Infantry, commanding Second Brigade, First Division, Central Army of the Mississippi, at Trenton, Tennessee, 80 miles northeast of Memphis.

³⁶⁵ District of the Mississippi, Columbus, Kentucky.

³⁶⁶ UWK, p33-34

command of Captain [Marcus J] Parrott³⁶⁹ . . . arrested Rev Mr Koyle . . . and were about to rob him . . . when he told them that he was then in charge of a funeral. They abused him very much, called him a damned liar and broke open the coffin, and on discovering that it contained a corpse they told Mr Koyle to go to hell with his damned secession corpse . . . [Captain Parrott] reported the facts to General Mitchell, who declined to take any notice of the case. I have heard of other outrages equally atrocious perpetrated by these wretches.

When Thomas Jefferson doubled the land size of the US by purchasing the Louisiana Territory from France in 1803, the New England states were jealous. Similar to sibling rivalry, they were afraid that they would lose their economic and political domination. They didn't care at all that the deal would be great for the country. They were just concerned with how it affected them personally, or how it might affect them. They were so miffed that they threatened to secede from the Union.

Unlike Abraham Lincoln, Jefferson did not even consider using force or coercion. His response was:

Let them part by all means if it is for their happiness to do so. It is but the elder and the younger son differing. God bless them both, and keep them in Union if it be for their good, but separate them if better.

Abraham Lincoln agreed with him on Jan 12, 1848:

³⁶⁷ Jayhawkers is a term that came to prominence just before the American Civil War in Bleeding Kansas, where it was adopted by militant bands affiliated with the free-state cause. These bands, known as "Jayhawkers", were guerrilla fighters who often clashed with pro-slavery groups from Missouri known at the time as "Border Ruffians".

³⁶⁸ 30 miles north of Trenton.

³⁶⁹ Assistant adjutant general, Seventh Kansas Cavalry; formerly a member of Congress from Kansas.

Any people, anywhere, being inclined and having the power, have the right to rise up and shake off the existing government, and form a new one that suits them better. This is a most valuable, a most sacred right, a right which we hope and believe is to liberate the world.

Thomas Jefferson was an honest man. What Lincoln said and what he did rarely converged. That is why Thomas Jefferson was a great President, and Abraham Lincoln was a disastrous dictator.³⁷⁰

From Union Colonel Frederick A Starring³⁷¹ to Union Brigadier Gen Grenville M Dodge³⁷², October 6, 1862:³⁷³

[Union] Captain Frank Moore's company³⁷⁴ . . . Some of the men . . . behaved more like brigands than soldiers. They robbed an old negro man . . . of . . . nineteen dollars . . . Eight of them robbed an old widow woman, about ten miles from Fort Pillow, of thirteen dollars in silver -- all she had. Some of them stole a coat and bridle from an old man near Gayoso Landing . . .

³⁷⁰ SLG, p100-103

³⁷¹ Seventy-Second Illinois.

³⁷² Fourth Division, Columbus, Kentucky.

³⁷³ UWK, p36

³⁷⁴ D, Second Illinois Cavalry.

Northern abolitionists were widely despised, in both the South and the North. It isn't difficult to see why. Most were fanatical; they didn't know anything about the South, nor did they know much about slavery; and they were considered busybodies, do-gooders, and nuisances. But many of them were far worse than that. Some were so extreme as to test the limits of reason and sanity. Some clearly failed the test. For example, those who advocated slaughtering every person in the South, in order to get rid of slavery. Okay, that may not be the best example, since that was very similar to the goal of Abraham Lincoln, his cabinet members, and his war generals.

Abolitionist tracts smuggled into the South suggested slaves slit the throats of their masters, as well as other acts of violence. Apparently they didn't realize that it was illegal to teach slaves to read or write, so slaves weren't likely to be able to read the tracts. They also didn't realize that the vast majority of Southern slaves had absolutely no desire to harm their masters, and even if they did wish their master ill, they hardly needed a Yankee abolitionist to tell them that. (Did I mention that abolitionists tended to be quite ignorant?)

One abolitionist expressed it this way:

I affirm that it is better, far better, that every man, woman, and child in every rebel State should perish in one widespread, bloody, and indiscriminate slaughter, better that the land should be a Sahara, be as when God destroyed the Canaanites, or overthrew Sodom and Gomorrah, than that this rebellion should successful.

That from W J Sloane, pastor of the Third Reformed Presbyterian Church in New York, and possibly a newspaper editor. Yes, the Christian God of love and mercy clearly inspired that divine hissyfit. Unfortunately, many Yankee preachers shared Sloane's misguided sentiments.³⁷⁵

³⁷⁵ SLG, p81-82

From Union Major Gen H W Halleck³⁷⁶ to Secretary of War E M Stanton, July 7, 1862:³⁷⁷

Since the Kansas troops entered this department their march has been marked by robbers, theft, pillage, and outrages upon the peaceful inhabitants . . . [Union Brigadier] General [Robert B] Mitchell took no measures whatever to restrain his men from robbery and plunder, while [Union Lieutenant] Colonel [Daniel R] Anthony³⁷⁸ actually encouraged his men in committing outrages along the road, on the ground that they were "slaveholders" who were plundered . . . [I] am very doubtful of success [in disciplining them], so long as bad officers, **supported as they allege by political influence at Washington**, encourage them in violating laws.

(Emphasis mine.)

No Northern slave was ever freed by an emancipation law. Slavery in the North was gradually phased out, over a period of 70 years, in a way that did not result in social upheaval or economic distress. (That is what the South was trying to do). But it also did not result in true freedom for former slaves, or any other blacks in the North.

Even after decades of struggling to be accepted in Northern society, to attain some level of equality, blacks were still assigned to the ghettos. Yankee segregation was rampant -- in transportation, in education, in housing, in employment, and in all public places. Even abolitionists had no concern for blacks. Yes, they wanted them

³⁷⁶ Department of the Mississippi, Corinth.

³⁷⁷ UWK, p38

³⁷⁸ Seventh Kansas Cavalry.

free, but they wanted them free somewhere else.³⁷⁹ Like maybe . . . Africa, some island, or if all Colonization projects failed, the South.

They took everything I had. I never knew a Yankee that wasn't mean as dirt. They would skin a flea for his hide and tallow. Everybody says the Yankees going to free us. Like a fool I believed them, and now this is what they do. I might have known it. What can you expect from a hog but a grunt.³⁸⁰

From a black nurse on a plantation near Kingston, Georgia. Her purse had been stolen, and her animals had been killed by Union soldiers.

That very first ship that docked at an American port carrying a cargo of African laborers was owned by the Dutch. And so was the colony that became New York when it was stolen by the British. So, the state of New York was a key player in the slave trade right from America's beginning. It not only had a hundred miles of Atlantic coastline, it also had plenty of ports, coves, rivers, and streams that allowed slaves to be smuggled into the American economy.

Why smuggle slaves, when it was perfectly legal? To avoid taxes. The Dutch had come to their American colony to gain wealth through business ventures, and they knew how to figure all the angles. That strong profit motive has always been the primary characteristic of New Yorkers and New Englanders.

³⁷⁹ SLG, p81-82

³⁸⁰ SLG, p160

Business required labor. Unlike today, there was a chronic shortage of labor in early America. Immigration helped alleviate the problem to some extent, but there were never enough immigrants to fill all the job openings, especially for those jobs that required lots of hard physical labor. Most jobs were of that variety. Some of them were so harsh and brutal that Americans and Native Americans refused to do the work. It was probably inevitable that early Americans would turn to the same solution that had been used successfully since the beginning of man.

Thousands of African slaves were imported (legally or not so much) into New York alone. That slowed down considerably when the slave trade was outlawed in 1808, but profit-minded Yankees knew just how to turn that to their advantage. They built huge slave ships, and got them good to go, right there in New York. Then enterprising Yankees set out to participate in the international slave trade. A few bribes, a few kickbacks -- it was just part of doing business. Only one American slave captain sailing out of New York was prosecuted and punished.³⁸¹

With a low risk of being caught, and with unbelievable profit potential, the slave trade was irresistible to New Yorkers and New Englanders. Slave ships could hold 1000 Africans, bought for \$50 each in Africa and sold for \$1000 each in Cuba or Brazil. Factor in the cost of the ship, pay for the crew and captain, a 10%-20% death rate, bribes (a few hundred dollars per slave), and there was still a boatload of money left over for the slaver. The ship was usually burned after a successful trip, because it was cheaper than cleaning it, and it destroyed incriminating evidence.

In 1843, the African Squadron was formed. It was a group of American ships tasked with stopping the slave trade along the African coast. Enforcement was slow and mostly ineffective, at least until just prior to the Civil War, which was the peak period for New York and New England slave traders. In 1860, three New York slave

³⁸¹ Nathaniel Gordon, of Portland, Maine, was hung on Feb 21, 1862.

ships were stopped by the Squadron.³⁸² There were a total of 2200 Africans, half of which were children.

The North relied on slavery just as much as the South did prior to the Civil War. It's just that their slice of the slavery action was less visible, not to mention less legal. It's one of those dirty little secrets locked up tight in the CivilGate cellar.

Here's another one. New York hosted two major slave revolts in the 18th century. That in itself is a bit surprising in view of the fact that slave revolts were extremely rare in the South, where the concentration of slaves was much higher. But more surprising is the gruesome nature of their punishment at the hands of **supposedly** kinder, gentler, more compassionate (especially toward slaves) Yankees. Trials took just a few hours, or only a few days at the most. Sentencing and punishment took place the same day.

Some were strung up in chains, without food or water until death did them part. Their rotting bodies were left to be consumed by scavenger birds. Some were burned alive at the stake, using intentionally slow fires. Some were subjected to the breaking wheel, a Middle-Ages form of torture and execution in which the criminal is clubbed until every bone in his body is broken as he slowly revolves on a large wagon wheel.

There's never a Harriet Beecher Stowe around when you need one.³⁸³

³⁸² The *Erie* and the *Storm King* on Aug 8, 1860, and the *Cara* one month later. The captain of the *Erie* was Nathaniel Gordon.

³⁸³ SLG, p65-68

From Union Brigadier Gen Ebenezer Dumont³⁸⁴ to Union Major Gen Don Carlos Buell, October 16, 1862:³⁸⁵

Excesses were committed upon the first arrival of the troops . . . All the troops were new and wholly undisciplined, and one of the brigade commanders I found encouraging his men to depredate, and stealing and shipping off horses himself.

The following day, Gen Buell admitted to the Union Governor of Kentucky³⁸⁶ in Louisville:

I have . . . been mortified and worried at the depredations which have been committed by a portion of our troops.

Most runaway slaves were quickly captured and returned to their master. Others weren't as fortunate. This report was from near Brashear, Louisiana:

Scores of dead and dying runaway slaves were found huddled in a thicket. Decomposing bodies were all around, while survivors were crouched to the earth with their heads sunk between their knees, or lying with upturned faces and gazing vacantly at the air.³⁸⁷

³⁸⁴ Twelfth Division, Third Corps, under the command of Major Gen Charles C Gilbert, in Buell's Army of the Ohio, written at Frankfort, Kentucky.

³⁸⁵ UWK, p39

³⁸⁶ James F Robinson.

³⁸⁷ SLG, p160

On January 17, 1863, Union Major Gen John A McClernand³⁸⁸ ordered Union Gen William Tecumseh Sherman to extinguish a fire in Napoleon, Arkansas³⁸⁹ and identify, if possible, the arsonist(s). This was Sherman's reply later that day.³⁹⁰

Pursuant to your orders, this four pm I went in person to direct the extinguishment of the fire in Napoleon. It was impossible to extinguish it. I first tried to limit it to the middle of the block but failed, but by the destruction of a store and barn at the end of the block limited the fire to one block. It is impossible to find out the incendiary . . . No man in the army has labored harder than I have to check this spirit in our soldiers, and am free to admit **we all deserve to be killed** unless we can produce a state of discipline when such disgraceful acts cannot be committed unpunished.
(Emphasis mine.)

Several Lincoln scholars have concluded that Lincoln became a dictator. For such constitutional violations as:

- ◆ Starting a war without the consent of Congress;
- ◆ Suspending habeas corpus (which was up to Congress);
- ◆ Incarcerating thousands of Northern citizens indefinitely without trial or right of counsel just for failing to fully support Lincoln's agenda;
- ◆ Censoring telegraph communications;
- ◆ Shutting down dozens of newspapers and imprisoning their publishers;
- ◆ Nationalizing the railroads;

³⁸⁸ Army of the Mississippi, aboard the steamer *Tigress*.

³⁸⁹ 20 miles southeast of Arkansas Post, where the Arkansas and Mississippi rivers converge, on the northwest bank.

³⁹⁰ UWK, p40

- ◆ Interfering with elections, using federal troops;
- ◆ Confiscating firearms (a blatant violation of Second Amendment rights);
- ◆ Deporting Clement L Vallandigham, a member of Congress, for opposing Lincoln's policies.³⁹¹

Many Lincoln apologists do not deny that Lincoln was a dictator, but to them, that was a good thing. That's what they admire most about him. Woodrow Wilson, for one, was a big Lincoln fan, because Abe had destroyed the Constitution. Dictators in other countries often point to Abraham Lincoln as justification for their tyranny.

Reported in the December 15, 1862, issue of the *New York World*, referring to the Antietam campaign in September:³⁹²

The ragged, half-starved rebels passed through Maryland without disorder or marauding, without injury to the country, showing their excellent discipline. The well-fed, well-clothed Union soldiers [of McClellan's Army of the Potomac] laid waste everything before them, plundering houses, hen-roosts, and hog-pens, showing an utter want of discipline.

That succinctly illustrates the difference between North and South. It clearly demonstrates why the South seceded, why other states would have seceded if allowed, and why the North launched their illegal, unconstitutional, immoral invasion of the South. Yankees were even more barbaric than they claimed Southerners to be.

³⁹¹ RLD, p6

³⁹² UWK, p45

This is a brief account of Union military conduct in Tennessee on October 12, 1863: **Gross outrages have been committed by our men on the inhabitants of the country through which our trains pass . . . Men [have been] caught marauding.**³⁹³ The trains he referred to went between Chattanooga, Tennessee and Bridgeport, Alabama.³⁹⁴

New Hampshire had more than 8000 slaves at one time. That number dwindled over the years, to: 158 in 1790, less than 10 in 1800, and less than 2 blacks per 1000 whites on the eve of the Civil War. You'd think a small Yankee state like that, with such a small percentage of black residents, wouldn't have any racial problems.

But nooooooh! In 1835, a group of outraged white citizens and a cooperative group of 100 oxen managed to pull a private school off its foundation in Canaan and park it in the town square, where it could no longer be used. The problem? It had been a school for both blacks and whites. A few years later it was destroyed by fire, just to eliminate any possibility that a black citizen and a white citizen might someday, somehow, for some reason rendezvous in the empty building.³⁹⁵

³⁹³ Written to Colonel John Tillson, Tenth Illinois, commander of Union Forces at Anderson's Cross-Roads, Tennessee, from Union Gen Rosecrans, Chattanooga.

³⁹⁴ UWK, p65

³⁹⁵ SLG, p62

The first thing that comes to most minds at the mention of Civil War prisoner-of-war camps is Andersonville, known officially as Camp Sumter. In fact, that is probably the only thing that comes to most minds, because it receives almost all the attention of historians. It was a horrible place, no doubt. All Civil War prison camps were. It should come as no surprise that prisoners were not well fed and clothed and housed when soldiers were not well fed and clothed and housed.

New York was home to the Elmira camp during its brief existence from the summer of 1864 to the spring of 1865. Of the 12,000 Confederate prisoners who landed there, 3000 died -- twice the death rate of any other Northern prison, and only slightly lower than that of Andersonville. *Hellmira* (as the prisoners called it) was characterized by mistreatment at the hands of Union officers and guards; starvation; denial of medical care or medications; lack of clothing, due in part to the camp commander's refusal to allow prisoners to use most clothing sent to them by relatives; lack of heat and exposure to the elements, due in part to terrible barracks construction and very small, low-quality tents; lack of blankets, even though the winter of 1864-65 was one of the worst on record; pathetic sanitary conditions; scurvy, diarrhea, pneumonia, and smallpox, due primarily to months of bread-and-water diet³⁹⁶.

Camp Douglas was built on Chicago's south side as a Union recruitment camp, with space and facilities for 8000 men. But far greater numbers of Confederate POWs ended up there when the North took an unexpected number of prisoners in early battles of 1862. The land was a swamp, unsafe to walk on, with overflowing toilet trenches, and no humane sanitary conditions. Torture, beatings, sitting naked in the snow, and being hung by the thumbs while on tiptoes -- these were the favorite punishments used by camp officers and guards, who often earned cash rewards for murdering Confederate prisoners. More than 6000 Confederate soldiers died at

³⁹⁶ Imposed as retaliation for the Andersonville prison, not because of a food shortage.

Camp Douglas from diseases, starvation, cold, torture, brutality, and murder. The History Channel aired a documentary on Camp Douglas called *Eighty Acres of Hell*.

Point Lookout was established after the battle of Gettysburg in the south of Maryland, surrounded on three sides by water, with nearby Union forts and ships making it one of the most secure of all POW camps. Its 52,000 Confederate prisoners faced icy winter wind and blistering summer heat; malaria, typhoid fever, and smallpox; scurvy and malnutrition due to less than minimal rations; inadequate clothing, shoes, and blankets. Union officials refused aid from compassionate citizens, while prisoners ate rats, soap skim, and trash peelings, if they were lucky enough to find them. The camp provost³⁹⁷ made a tidy profit of over \$1 million by pilfering clothing and supplies meant for prisoners.

Union blockades of Southern ports, along with the destruction inflicted by Sherman and others, made it impossible to adequately care for Union POWs in Southern camps. From early 1861 throughout the war, medications and medical supplies were kept from the South as much as possible, and they were destroyed when found in the possession of private Southern physicians.³⁹⁸ The idea, of course, was to maximize the suffering of wounded Confederate soldiers, but the policy also kept needed medicine and supplies from reaching Union POWs. So much of the well-publicized Southern cruelty was caused by Yankees themselves. In contrast, Yankee cruelty toward Southern POWs in the North (which had plenty of food, medicine, clothing, and other provisions) was caused primarily by Yankee hatred.

Furthermore, it was pure Yankee cruelty that kept the North from sending badly-needed supplies to their Union POWs in the South, as requested by Southerners. And it was pure Yankee cruelty that prevented prisoner exchanges, as requested by the South. Lincoln, Grant, and Stanton refused the South's repeated exchange offers. The Union commander at a base in Jacksonville, Florida even refused to

³⁹⁷ Union Major Brady.

³⁹⁸ UWK, p xiii

accept 3000 Union prisoners released from Andersonville in February, 1865. Another 30,000 prisoners were left by Grant to die at Andersonville, even though the South wanted to release them unconditionally if the North would just send ships to pick them up at Southern ports.

Why would Lincoln, Grant, and others stoop to such loathsome, disgraceful, inhumane, barbaric, and unforgivable behavior? Why would they refuse to help even their own Yankee brothers? Because they didn't care about their POWs at all. They meant nothing. They wanted them to stay in the South so Southerners would have to deal with them. The North could well afford to lose those tens of thousands of men, but the South couldn't afford to care for them, and Yankees knew it.³⁹⁹

So, the next time you hear about the inhumane Southern treatment of Union POWs at Andersonville, remember that it was Yankees themselves who were primarily responsible for the conditions there, and the fate of those men.

From Union Military Governor Edward Stanly of North Carolina to Union Gen Fraser, March 28, 1863:

... Complaints of the outrages of our forces in the last expedition to Hyde County. In numerous instances, well authenticated, they entered and robbed the houses of loyal men, destroyed furniture, insulted women.

"Loyal men"! Unionists. Such Union soldiers were not soldiers at all. They were simply thugs in uniform. Little wonder that the North and South never got along very well. Yankee character was barbaric, and the Civil War gave the barbarians a chance to show their savage nature.

³⁹⁹ SGL, p163-167

When Congress first convened after the start of the Civil War (on July 26, 1861), they issued a joint resolution which said, in part:⁴⁰⁰

The war is not waged in any spirit of oppression, or for any purpose of conquest or subjugation, or the overthrowing or interfering with the rights or established institutions of those (Southern) States, but to defend and maintain the supremacy of the Constitution, and to preserve the Union with all the dignity, equality and rights of the several states unimpaired . . . as soon as these objects are accomplished, the war ought to cease.

Nice words, much like Lincoln's Inaugural Address. And much like most of Lincoln's words, they were 100% meaningless. They have about the same historical value of a Hitler speech declaring that Auschwitz was being established for the benefit of the Jewish people, for the advancement of their health and welfare.

Oppression, conquest, subjugation and genocide were precisely the **spirit** and **purpose** of the war, and Congress knew it. Overthrowing or interfering with the rights or established institutions of those Southern states was precisely the intent and purpose of both the war and Reconstruction. Defending and maintaining the **supremacy of the Constitution**? What a joke. Had those clowns ever bothered reading the Constitution? If so, they would have known (and maybe even cared) that secession was not only a Constitutional right, it was a natural right set forth in the Declaration of Independence, and demonstrated by the Revolutionary War. The only **supremacy** they were trying to **defend and maintain** was the unconstitutional **supremacy** assumed by the federal government under the tyrannical domination of Lincoln's dictatorship.

⁴⁰⁰ SLG, p170

Preserving the Union with all the dignity, equality and rights of the several states unimpaired? Sure. If slaughtering and starving 650,000 Americans, including thousands of innocent defenseless women, children, old men, and blacks is your idea of dignity and equality, I suppose the Civil War was a smashing success. If the 14th Amendment, which was never even legally submitted to the states or ratified, is your idea of the rights of the several states, then I can see why we celebrate Lincoln's birthday every year.

As soon as these objects are accomplished, the war ought to cease. Of course. As soon as the North has shredded the Constitution, annihilated the South, finished its campaign of Southern cultural genocide, replaced Southern culture with Yankee culture (complete with Yankee racism), rammed through the 14th Amendment (never legally ratified), slaughtered and starved 650,000 Americans, and destroyed states' rights forever, then the war will be over.

That's an accurate translation of Congress' Unionese. And note that it makes absolutely no mention of freeing the slaves. That idea came much later, well into the war, only as an afterthought, a political gimmick, when things were not going well for the North. Even then, their attitude was that if slaves happened to gain their freedom somehow, somewhere along the line, well, Yankees might just have to live with that, although they were hoping they could ship blacks off to some other country or island so the North didn't have to be bothered with Africans any longer.

From Union Brigadier Gen Thomas W Sweeny⁴⁰¹ to Union Colonel Moses M Baine⁴⁰², November 23, 1863:⁴⁰³

Frequent and serious complaints by citizens are made . . . in reference to pillaging and outrages committed by the troops of your command, and especially by the officers and men of the Thirty-Ninth Iowa⁴⁰⁴.

After crushing the Confederacy with overwhelming military force, Lincoln's myrmidons, including Grant, Sherman, and Sheridan, turned their tyrannical attention to the Plains Indians.⁴⁰⁵ They were determined to eradicate those Native Americans, just as they had tried (and largely succeeded) to eradicate Southern culture and as many Southerners as possible. Having enjoyed so much their campaign of Southern ethnic genocide, Yankees were now eager to launch a campaign of ethnic cleansing against the Plains Indians.

What had those Native Americans done to incur so much Yankee hatred and hostility? They were most reluctant to relinquish their claim to their ancestral land. They felt that they were there long before the white man arrived, and that meant the land belonged to them, and Americans had no moral or legal basis for forcing them off their land. But Yankees saw things a bit differently. As far as they were concerned, they needed that land to make room for their (federal government subsidized) transcontinental railroads.

⁴⁰¹ Second Division, Sixteenth Corps, Pulaski.

⁴⁰² Fiftieth Illinois, commanding Third Brigade.

⁴⁰³ UWK, p69

⁴⁰⁴ Commanded by Colonel Henry J B Cummings.

⁴⁰⁵ RLD, p7

Whatever Yankees wanted was vastly more important than anything else, simply because they wanted it, and they had the military force to make it happen, regardless of legal or moral considerations. They weren't bound by the same rules that apply to other peoples and cultures. Yankees were far superior to anyone else on earth. Therefore, if they said it was right, it was by definition right. And anyone who dared challenge their supreme authority to make up the rules as they went along was likely to suffer an acute case of prolonged imprisonment or premature death.

Like the vast, seemingly unending grassy plains Indians called home, the arrogance of Yankee imperialists knew no bounds.

A Circular from Union Major Gen Oliver O Howard⁴⁰⁶ to the officers of his corps, December 8, 1863:⁴⁰⁷

During this . . . campaign . . . acts are done and allowed to be done which are a burning shame . . . From Union men, women, and children articles of every description have been stolen, and the thieves not brought to punishment. Piteous cries and complaints come to me every day of this dreadful misconduct.

⁴⁰⁶ Eleventh Corps, Army of the Cumberland, in Sweet Water, Tennessee, 39 miles southwest of Knoxville.

⁴⁰⁷ UWK, p69-70

Why should anyone care about the Civil War today? Because . . . Abraham Lincoln destroyed the Constitution. As a result of his unconstitutional, illegal, immoral, unnecessary war, the Ninth and Tenth Amendments have been effectively repealed.

Because of that, America is no longer governed as a constitutional democratic republic, but as a centralized authoritarian oligarchy, controlled by the northeastern establishment elite, who are the political descendants of Lincoln.

States are no longer sovereign, and there are no states' rights other than those granted by the federal government. Therefore, American citizens also have only those rights granted by the federal government. The feds grant only those rights which happen to conform to their statist agenda, or those which are deemed necessary to avoid public revolt. Those rights are constantly being eroded by the all-powerful central government, which considers the Constitution obsolete, null and void. They still pay lip service to it, however, because it is in their best interest to have the people still believe that they are protected by it. The American people, ignorant of their history and the Constitution, are easily duped and manipulated. So the authoritarians in Washington, DC, flourish, constantly striving to gain more and more control over their subjects.

We are still a government of the people, by the people, and for the people. The only difference is that the "people" are now the authoritarian statists, not the citizens.

From Union Provost Marshal General S P Carter to Union Major Gen John G Foster, Army of the Ohio, December 19, 1863:⁴⁰⁸

I . . . call . . . the attention of the major-general . . . to the frequent complaints . . . of citizens of the lawless conduct of troops . . . in this department. Horses, forage, provisions, and . . . household effects are taken . . . In some cases [citizens] . . . have been stripped of their all by . . . Federal soldiers . . . More serious complaints are . . . made against wagoners . . . Robbery, theft, fraud, and open outrageous violation of all law seems to characterize their conduct in every part of the country.

Connecticut didn't play a prominent role in New England's slave trade, as far as we know. But part of their economy was based on slavery.

Deep River and Essex were two small Connecticut towns whose economy was totally dependent on ivory, from the mid-1800s to the early 1900s. They produced piano keys, combs, billiard balls, pipes, and other ivory products. Harvesting ivory depended on the slave trade.

George Read and Julius Pratt were prominent citizens in those towns, and leaders in the ivory industry. They were both Christians, family men, abolitionists, and participants in the Underground Railroad. They wanted nothing to do with slavery in the US, but apparently they had no problem profiting indirectly from the slave trade, and from slavery in other countries. According to some estimates, up to two million Africans died in supplying the raw material for Connecticut's ivory industry.⁴⁰⁹

⁴⁰⁸ UWK, p70

⁴⁰⁹ SLG, p61-62

From Union Gen E B Brown, in Warrensburg, Missouri, to Union Colonel George H Hall⁴¹⁰, March 29, 1864.⁴¹¹

Negro soldiers on furlough from Saint Louis with the assistance of squads of men belonging to the command stationed at Boonville⁴¹² have repeatedly crossed into Howard County, and seizing upon wagons and teams, have loaded the same with furniture, tobacco, and such other property as they desired, and . . . recrossed to this side. The commanding officer at Boonville is said to rather encourage this unlawful proceeding, as he is charged with leaving it optional with the men of his command whether they shall accompany the negroes in their raids or not. Three such raids . . . occurred during the first week of this month.

Their Union army masters were teaching these blacks to become good Yankees.

We don't tend to associate the tiny state of Rhode Island with slavery. It's about as far away from the South as you can get, and everybody knows the South is where the slaves were. But Rhode Island played a starring role in the slave industry. Here's what your teachers didn't tell you.

Between 1709 and 1807 Rhode Island merchants brought an estimated 106,544 slaves to the New World. After the Revolutionary War, Rhode Island merchants controlled 60% to 90% of the African slave trade in America. They were also very active in the rum trade, which was an integral part of the international slave trade. The finest families in the state derived their immense wealth from the slave trade.

⁴¹⁰ Fourth Missouri State Militia Cavalry, commanding at Jefferson City.

⁴¹¹ UWK, p77

⁴¹² 40 miles northwest of Jefferson City.

John Brown (the one your teachers did not tell you about) served in the US Congress. That was after being indicted for violating the Slave Trade Act of 1794. There are conflicting stories about whether he was convicted or acquitted, but there is no doubt that he derived huge profits from the slave trade. He and his brothers played a big role in getting Rhode Island College founded and built. It appears that school officials were so grateful for those slave-trade profit donations that they changed the name to Brown University.

James DeWolf was another Rhode Island slave-trader held in high esteem because of his substantial donations to very worthy causes. Like John Brown, DeWolf had encountered some legal problems, this time because of alleged cruelty to slaves. But that barely slowed him down. Besides, the people of the state didn't much care how he got his money. What was important was that he was a philanthropist.

He served in the US Senate, where he managed to get a treaty amended. His amendment prevented the British from searching any ship for slaves if it flew the American flag. From then on, slave ships carried two crews and two flags, so that all they had to do to avoid a search was hoist the American flag and maybe even immediately "sell" the ship to an American on board. Before that, England had been trying very hard to end the international slave trade, and that posed a major threat to the slave-trade industry in the American Northeast. DeWolf's amendment allowed the slave trade to continue right up to the Civil War.⁴¹³

⁴¹³ SLG, p57-60

From Union Gen N P Banks, Alexandria, Louisiana, to Union Major Gen James B McPherson⁴¹⁴, March 29, 1864:⁴¹⁵

The Marine Brigade [of Union General A W Ellet] is reported . . . to have stopped at every landing thus far on its way out of Red River, solely for the purpose of pillaging and the destruction of private property.

An entire tribe of Indians was destroyed by Americans from Massachusetts and Connecticut in the Pequot Indian Wars.⁴¹⁶ Women and children became slaves for the Puritans. Surviving Pequot warriors were sent to sugar plantations in the West Indies in exchange for African slaves. This arrangement was necessary for two reasons: (1) Pequot males were considered too fierce and dangerous to keep around; (2) The African slaves had worked on Caribbean plantations for several years, which meant they were relatively safe, experienced, and acclimated to European and English ways.

This probably marked the beginning of the New England slave trade. The first North American slave ship, the *Desire*, left Salem in the 1630s. The first American colony to legalize slavery was Massachusetts, in the 1640s. The Puritans didn't lose any sleep over such evil treatment of their fellow human beings, though, in spite of their strong religious beliefs. In large part, that's because they had a Puritan cleric named Cotton Mather to help them rationalize it.

According to Mather, Africans were descendants of Ham, one of Noah's three sons. Africans were subject to paying the price for the sins of Ham, and therefore African

⁴¹⁴ Department of the Tennessee.

⁴¹⁵ UWK, p77

⁴¹⁶ 1634-1638.

slavery was just fine with God. Mather customized the Ten Commandments just for this occasion, changing the part about **honor thy father and mother** to something like **honor thy master and serve him well**. On the outside chance that some Puritans still felt squeamish about the whole thing, Mather assured them that slaves (at least the good ones) would go to heaven right along with Puritans, and that's where slaves would find the freedom and equality that eluded them on earth (thanks to the sins of Ham, you see).

Apparently no one thought to consider that Puritans might also make excellent slave candidates, since they were descendants of Adam, who also sinned, as I recall. Surely, following Mather's "logic", God would have placed his Good Heavenkeeping seal of approval on Puritan slaves, as well. As a matter of fact, come to think of it, every single human being supposedly descended from the fallen Adam, so we are all potential slave inventory.

Armed with such impeccable theology, those pious Puritans proceeded to prohibit slaves and free blacks from shopping at common markets, or buying anything, in fact; carrying weapons; owning livestock; purchasing land; or walking the streets at night. The biggest holy no-no of all was blacks and whites mixing it up, whether it was a black man getting it on with a white woman, or vice versa. That would bring on such things as banishment, flogging, fines, and enslavement, if that punishment hadn't already been imposed. The theological logic behind it seems clear enough. Miscegenation might well result in some of that Ham sin rubbing off on Puritans. Not good.⁴¹⁷

⁴¹⁷ SLG, p53-56

From Major Gen William F Smith, commander of Union troops at Gloucester Point and Yorktown, Virginia, to Union Gen B F Butler, at Ft Monroe, April 23, 1864:⁴¹⁸

Send me the best regiment of colored troops you have to guard the contraband camps in this vicinity, as the white soldiers have been committing all sorts of depredations.

How ironic that blacks, considered by Yankees to be an inferior race, were trusted more than Yankees.

This is the story of Capt Harry Truman, one of the most notorious of all the Union war criminals. In spite of the best efforts of some officers, Truman was allowed to continue his war crimes against the South. Even after being convicted of murder, arson, and larceny, his death sentence was overridden by the highest-ranking Union officials, and Truman was released again to continue his criminal conduct. Orders to keep an eye on Truman and keep him in line were ignored.

This dark episode proves that the Lincoln regime was never serious about maintaining discipline in the Union military or preventing rampant, widespread Yankee war crimes.

From Union Brigadier Gen Clinton B Fisk to Union Major Gen William S Rosecrans, June 8, 1864:⁴¹⁹

⁴¹⁸ UWK, p77

⁴¹⁹ UWK, p80-82

[Captain Harry Truman] goes about with his most villainous conduct . . . He is plundering the best men in North Missouri, insults and abuses women, travels . . . in a state of beastly intoxication, with a notorious prostitute . . . and this rascal parades Gen Rosecrans' telegrams before the people as his authority to scout the country.

From Judge William A Hall⁴²⁰ to Gen Fisk, June 11, 1864:

A company of soldiers under . . . Captain [Harry] Truman have been in . . . [Charlton County, adjoining Randolph County] a week . . . His men have killed a number of citizens who were not taken with arms, and taken much valuable property . . . These soldiers have done more mischief in one week . . . than the rebels have done in that county since the war broke out . . . None of the men executed were bushwhackers, and . . . some were old men.

From Judge Hall to Gen Rosecrans, June 12, 1864:

[Truman and his men] have killed . . . certainly as many as five, and reported to be as many as twelve . . . They claim, and exercise, the authority of putting men to death and taking property at their discretion. This . . . has excited a reign of terror throughout . . . [Charlton] county and is extending to the adjoining counties.

From Gen Fisk, Macon, Missouri, to Union Major Gen Grenville Dodge⁴²¹, March 31, 1865:

In the spring and summer of 1864 . . . Truman killed several citizens, burned homes, and sequestered much property. He was arrested, imprisoned, tried by military commission, found guilty of murder, arson, and larceny, and sentenced to be hung.

⁴²⁰ Brother of Union Governor of Missouri, Willard P Hall; Huntsville, (Randolph County), 110 miles east northeast of Kansas City.

⁴²¹ Department of the Missouri.

He is now at large. Most of the witnesses and informants against Truman have been murdered and burned out by parties as yet unknown.

Special Order no 102, issued by Gen Fisk, Macon Missouri, May 19, 1865:

In compliance with instructions from Major General Dodge . . . Captain John D Meredith⁴²² . . . will proceed with twenty . . . men . . . in company with Harry Truman, who is authorized to obtain the surrender and parole of the guerilla bands . . . Exercise . . . strictest military discipline . . . during the expedition.

From Gen Fisk to Gen Dodge, May 24, 1865:

Colonel [Alexander F] Denny reports to Gen Fisk that it is Truman instead of Jim Anderson who is committing the outrages north of the [Missouri] river. Truman and his party were at Keytesville⁴²³ . . . yesterday, all drunk and committing the worst excesses. Truman swore he as there by your order to raise hell in North Missouri.

From Gen Dodge⁴²⁴ to Union Major Gen John Pope⁴²⁵, June 4, 1865:

Harry Truman was tried in November, 1864, by military commission convened by Gen Rosecrans . . . and was sentenced to be hung. General Rosecrans disapproved the proceedings of the commission . . . but ordered him (Truman) confined in Alton Military Prison until further orders. The record in the case was forwarded to the Secretary of War . . .

The Secretary of War [Stanton] ordered Truman released from confinement . . . in March last, and on his release he was ordered to Washington, DC . . . by Colonel

⁴²² Company D, Thirty-Ninth Missouri (Union).

⁴²³ 20 miles west of Huntsville.

⁴²⁴ Department of the Missouri, Ft Leavenworth.

⁴²⁵ Military Division of the Missouri, St Louis.

[Lafayette C] Baker, United States detective at Washington, and we heard nothing further of him until a few days prior to my departure from Saint Louis to this place, when I was telegraphed from Macon, Missouri, that Truman was up there . . . After consultation with my provost-marshall-general . . . I gave orders to the commanding officer at Macon to furnish him an escort . . . to allow no outrages . . . After my arrival here I was informed that my instructions were being disregarded, [and I had him arrested] . . . He is now in Saint Louis in the custody of . . . provost-marshall-general.

In the 1860s, bombardment of a besieged city was universally considered a violation of international rules of military conduct, and grossly immoral.

Everywhere, that is, except in the Union, ruled by Dictator Lincoln and his top military minions, like Grant, Sheridan, and Sherman. Those guys were special, and normal rules of human decency did not apply to them. They were not above the law. They **were** the law. They made up their own laws, rules, and moral code as they went along.

So it was that Sherman had no qualms about bombarding the city of Atlanta day and night. By the time he was finished, only about 400 houses were still standing -- 10% of Atlanta's antebellum homes. The few thousand residents who had survived were ordered to leave the city immediately with only the property they could carry with them. Sherman had already obliterated Georgia, so the refugees faced a barren desert just as winter was approaching. They faced certain death by starvation and / or exposure.

Sherman's chief engineer, O M Poe, was repulsed and appalled at the sight of so many corpses of women and children lying in Atlanta streets. When he expressed his feelings to Sherman, the bloodthirsty general casually responded that those dead Southern bodies were **a beautiful sight**.

Poe pointed out that the bombardment had no military purpose whatsoever, and it did not allow Union soldiers to enter the city one second sooner than they could have otherwise. But that was not the point to Sherman. It was pure revenge, hatred, unrestrained Yankee arrogance and imperialism. Sherman was sick and tired of getting his butt stomped by Confederate soldiers, so he had to find someone his own size to pick on. Nor did it bother Sherman in the least that many of his victims were the slaves he was supposedly trying to liberate.

Since there was very little left in Atlanta for the Union punks to pillage, plunder, vandalize, or destroy, they soon turned their attention to nearby cemeteries. They dug up graves, desecrated carcasses, and stripped them of jewelry.⁴²⁶

Sherman accepted no responsibility for his war crimes, nor did he acknowledge them as war crimes at all. He blamed everything on his Southern civilian victims. It was all their fault simply because they had the unmitigated gall to exercise their natural and constitutional right of secession, in defiance of the Almighty Lincoln and his mighty Union army. Nor did Lincoln accept responsibility for demolishing the South, shredding the Constitution, committing thousands of war crimes, and causing the death of 650,000 Americans. As far as he was concerned, it was God's fault. That's right. The Devil didn't make him do it. God made him do it.

No wonder Yankees have taken such extraordinary precautions to conceal and distort the truth of the Civil War and their unforgivable role in our nation's worst man-made disaster. The truth will set you free, but it will also make you sick to your stomach, and your heart. No pagan mob has ever surpassed Yankees in barbarism, savagery, and depravity. Such was the Union to which defeated Southerners were forced to return. Yet we worship Lincoln.

Is *worship* too strong a term? Consider this. I have seen documentaries that actually compare Lincoln's assassination to Christ's crucifixion. Lincoln gave his life in

⁴²⁶ RLD, p186-187

Christlike fashion for the nation's sin of slavery. That is roughly equivalent to telling Jews they should pray to Hitler, who gave his life for the sins of Germany.

That may be judging him a bit too harshly. Hitler, that is.

An editorial titled *The Torture of Jefferson Davis*, appearing in the May 26, 1866 issue of *New York World*.⁴²⁷

It is no longer a matter of newspaper rumor that the treatment which Jefferson Davis has received during his incarceration in Fortress Monroe has been such as to break down his constitution and to put him, after twelve months of protracted suffering, in imminent peril of death.

The president of the United States recently ordered the post surgeon at Fortress Monroe⁴²⁸ to make a . . . thorough report upon the condition of Mr Davis' health. That report . . . cannot be read by any honorable and right-minded American, no matter what his sectional feelings or his political opinions may be, without a sickening sensation of shame for his country and a burning flush of indignation against the persons who have prostituted their official position to inflict upon the American name an ineffaceable brand of disgrace by the wanton and wicked torture of an invalid lying a helpless prisoner in the strongest fortress of the Union.

Incredible. After killing 650,000 Americans in an illegal, unconstitutional, immoral, unnecessary war; after destroying half the country; after starving thousands of Southern innocent defenseless women, children, old men, and blacks; after committing thousands of war crimes against the South; after shredding the Constitution and doing irreparable damage to our republican form of government . . .

⁴²⁷ UWK, p141-142

⁴²⁸ Union Brevet Colonel George E Cooper.

now, finally, after four years of brutal slaughter, Yankees found themselves a conscience! How touching.

From Colonel Levi C Turner, judge advocate, War Department, Judge Advocate's Office, Washington, DC, to the Judiciary Committee of the House of Representatives, June 2, 1866, regarding witnesses who had sworn falsely concerning the complicity of Jefferson Davis and others in the assassination of Abraham Lincoln:⁴²⁹

I talked with . . . [William Campbell]⁴³⁰ and asked questions, and he was a good deal embarrassed. He finally asserted, "This is all false; I must make a clean breast of it; I can't stand it any longer." He then made a full disclosure, giving a history of himself, of [Joseph] Snel⁴³¹, and [Sanford] Conover⁴³², and others as far as he knew; the deceptions, fraud, and injury, and perjury that had been practiced and perpetrated . . . I had ascertained unmistakably that the names of the eight witnesses were all fictitious.

Deceptions, fraud, and injury? Big deal. Abraham Lincoln had done that for four years, and he's an American hero. Lincoln would have applauded their personal initiative. Deception, fraud, and injury are reflections of Yankee character and culture. That's what Yankees did. Here's more proof.

From Brigadier Gen Joseph Holt, judge advocate general, War Department, Bureau of Military Justice, Washington, to Secretary of War Edwin M Stanton, Sep 11, 1866:

⁴²⁹ UWK, p142

⁴³⁰ Whose real name is Joseph A Hoare.

⁴³¹ Real name William H Roberts.

⁴³² Real name Dunham.

Recently charges of the utmost gravity, affecting my official integrity and conduct, have been preferred against me before the country, to the effect that while acting as Judge-Advocate General and a judge-advocate of the military commission which tried the assassins of the late President, I suborned testimony which was used upon that trial and secured the conviction of Mrs [Mary E] Surratt, one of the prisoners, against whom, as is alleged by the accusation, there was no testimony whatever; and further, that in the depositions of certain witnesses produced by Sanford Conover and examined before the Bureau of Military Justice I united with said Conover, or had knowledge of the crime which he committed, in the fabrication of the evidence which they thus gave, such evidence having reference to the complicity of Jefferson Davis and Clement C Clay in the assassination of President Lincoln . . .

These accusations [are] utterly false and groundless.

It seems that the only honest, decent, courageous Yankee civilians with integrity were quickly killed by Lincoln's goon squad or incarcerated indefinitely by Lincoln's gestapo. Men of honor in the Union military were ignored, punished, outmaneuvered, or outvoted and outnumbered. Unfortunately, today's Yankees, the northeastern establishment elite, are no more honest than their Civil War ancestors were. It's easy to tell that, because they have never come clean about the Civil War, like Bill Campbell and Joe Holt finally came clean.

That's why I am writing this.

What happened to all that booty collected by Union thugs (sometimes generously referred to as soldiers)? Union uniformed anarchists would swoop down on a Southern town, help themselves to whatever they wanted, assault and abuse the citizens, or kill them if they wanted to, burn or otherwise destroy everything else, then move on to the next town.

But when it was time to move to the next town, what did they do with all their booty? Sometimes, they had a wagon standing by to haul it all to a central location to be divvied up or distributed or sent on to the North. But most often they had no such wagon, and they couldn't carry it all, and the army couldn't allow itself to be slowed down by hauling tons of stolen property. So they just left it all in a pile at the Union campsite.⁴³³

It wasn't a matter of taking food and supplies needed by the Union army. They didn't need most of it, or even particularly want most of it. It was simply a matter of pure Yankee hatred, evil, and revenge. It was a matter of ethnic genocide. It was a war crime.

Some of it did, however, make its way to Northern States -- New York and Massachusetts in particular. Yankees considered Southerners as *swine*, yet Yankee women didn't hesitate to wear "swine" dresses, shoes, and jewelry. Much of it came from Sherman's march.⁴³⁴

Just how much pillaging and plundering did Sherman's army indulge in? One of his soldiers wrote in his diary: **Never before have I witnessed so much wanton destruction as on this march. The soldiers are perfectly abandoned.** One of his officers⁴³⁵ described it as an orgy of **robbing and plundering** and prayed that he would never witness anything like it ever again.

One Sherman biographer⁴³⁶ tried to excuse, minimize, or marginalize Sherman's war crimes by stating that they were no worse in 1864, during Sherman's march, than they had been in 1863 or 1862. That's probably true. Such war crimes had been

⁴³³ RLD, p189

⁴³⁴ RLD, p190

⁴³⁵ Captain Poe.

⁴³⁶ Lee Kennett.

rampant since the very beginning of the war. Not much of a defense. But then no sympathetic Sherman biographer has much to work with.

From Union Captain Elijah D Johnson⁴³⁷ to Union Major Gen Andrew J Smith⁴³⁸, June 27, 1865, regarding robberies and depredations in the vicinity of Elba⁴³⁹:

More than fifty men, mostly deserters from the First Florida Cavalry⁴⁴⁰, are engaged in robbing, plundering, and committing acts of violence. The country is very poor in Coffee County, . . . and those parts . . . contiguous to it, and these men . . . have been operating over a large territory.

Circular no 11, issued by Union Gen John A Logan⁴⁴¹, July 14, 1865:⁴⁴²

Many wanton depredations are being committed by the soldiers of this command upon both white and colored citizens in the vicinity of the camps.

⁴³⁷ Company C, Second Maine Cavalry, at Montgomery, Alabama.

⁴³⁸ Sixteenth Corps, Montgomery.

⁴³⁹ Coffee County, 68 miles south of Montgomery.

⁴⁴⁰ Under command of US Army Lieutenant Colonel Eugene von Kielmansegge.

⁴⁴¹ Army of the Tennessee, in Louisville, Kentucky.

⁴⁴² UWK, p140-141

Union cavalry officers often had five or six horses. How could the Union army afford to be so generous? They weren't issued by the Union army. They were stolen from Southern citizens.⁴⁴³

When Yankees entered a Southern town, every horse would be stolen, and other animals would be killed. Cattle, hogs, and dogs were slaughtered by the thousands. The best horses would be selected for Union use, then the rest of the horses would also be killed.

In the rest of the world, that would be considered a war crime. In Lincoln's army, that was considered a responsibility. In Sherman's army, that was considered all in a day's work.

From Union Brevet Brigadier Gen William J Palmer⁴⁴⁴ to Union Major Gen George Stoneman⁴⁴⁵, May 6, 1865:⁴⁴⁶

The reason I recommend that Brown's⁴⁴⁷ and Miller's⁴⁴⁸ brigades be immediately recalled to East Tennessee is because their officers for the most part have lost all control over their men.

⁴⁴³ RLD, p189

⁴⁴⁴ Fifteenth Pennsylvania Cavalry, commanding Cavalry Division, District of East Tennessee, at Athens, Georgia.

⁴⁴⁵ District of East Tennessee, Knoxville.

⁴⁴⁶ UWK, p138

⁴⁴⁷ Union Brevet Brigadier Gen Simeon B Brown, Eleventh Michigan Cavalry, commanding Second Brigade.

⁴⁴⁸ Union Colonel John K Miller, Thirteenth Tennessee Cavalry, commanding Third Brigade.

A large number of the men and some of the officers devote themselves exclusively to pillaging and destroying property. General Brown appears to have given them carte blanche in South Carolina, and they are now so entirely destitute of discipline that it cannot be restored in the field and while the command is living on the country.

From Union Captain William Monks⁴⁴⁹ to Union Colonel John Morrill⁴⁵⁰, June 6, 1865.⁴⁵¹

A scout of soldiers came in on the head of Big Piney, Texas County . . . and committed a great many depredations upon the citizens, pillaged and robbed several houses, and killed one man . . . They told that they belonged to [Union] Captain [Samuel] Turner⁴⁵² . . . A lady⁴⁵³ . . . was insulted and her house pillaged by those men. [Mrs Smyer reported]: "One man . . . stated that his name was Lieutenant [Thomas G] Smith, from Hartsville, of Company G, Sixteenth Cavalry, Missouri".

Prisoner exchanges are a normal part of warfare. Both sides gain in the arrangement, because they not only get their comrades back, but they also have fewer hostile mouths to feed.

⁴⁴⁹ Company K, Sixteenth Missouri Cavalry (Union), commanding Post of Licking, Texas County, Missouri.

⁴⁵⁰ District of Rolla.

⁴⁵¹ UWK, p139-140

⁴⁵² Of the Sixteenth Cavalry Missouri.

⁴⁵³ Mrs Margaret Smyer, who lived on Hamilton Creek, on the waters of Big Piney.

The Union army had a nasty habit of kidnapping Southern civilians to use as hostages. They would be the ones who gained their freedom in prisoner exchanges, not legitimate war prisoners.⁴⁵⁴

The Confederate army did not do that. To them, and to the rest of the world, that was a war crime. But Lincoln didn't give a rat's boohiney about that. He was above the law and international rules of acceptable military conduct. Lincoln decided what was legal and what was acceptable. That is not the role of an American president. That is the role of an American tyrant. Lincoln was behaving just as ruthless dictators throughout history have behaved.

That was the real Lincoln.

From Union Gen Clinton B Fish to Union Brigadier Gen Daniel M Draper⁴⁵⁵,
Apr 13, 1865:⁴⁵⁶

Troops⁴⁵⁷ now stationed at Sturgeon⁴⁵⁸ . . . are committing all kinds of depredations in the vicinity of that post (burning houses and stealing money).

⁴⁵⁴ RLD, p188

⁴⁵⁵ Commanding at Mexico, Missouri.

⁴⁵⁶ UWK, p137

⁴⁵⁷ Ninth Missouri State Cavalry (Union), three companies under Lieutenant Luther T Hayman.

⁴⁵⁸ 47 miles north of Jefferson City.

Was slavery unconstitutional prior to the 13th Amendment?⁴⁵⁹

The Constitution (COTUS) doesn't mention slavery per se. Therefore, it apparently is not within the specified powers of the federal government, and it is apparently not specifically prohibited by the states. Therefore, it would seem that slavery was indeed constitutional prior to 1865.

However, slavery is clearly a violation of the principles set forth by the Declaration of Independence (DOI). Those two documents, COTUS and DOI, are not mutually exclusive, but are considered together by scholars and historians. Anything that is a clear violation of the spirit of DOI either: (a) is a violation of COTUS, or (b) should be a violation of COTUS.

It certainly would have made things a lot easier on everyone (except slave owners) if the Framers had stated categorically in COTUS that slavery is unconstitutional, illegal, and prohibited in any form, in any part of the United States or its territories. Did the issue of slavery just slip their minds in the 1787 Philadelphia summer heat? Hardly. Debate over slavery contributed significantly to the heat, at least within the rooms where the Framers met and forged our new form of government.

Many of those delegates insisted on maintaining the right of slavery within their states. Without an agreement on that, there could have been no COTUS. But how could they possibly justify allowing the institution of slavery to continue in view of DOI principles? Anyone could clearly see that slavery was diametrically opposed to the natural rights so eloquently described by Thomas Jefferson. Yes, slavery by that time was a well-entrenched fact of American life, and immediate abolition would have created social, cultural, and economic chaos. But allowing slavery to continue indefinitely also caused social, cultural, and economic chaos. Not to mention

⁴⁵⁹ LUD, p52-61

political chaos, untold human suffering, and hundreds of thousands of unnecessary deaths.

What if someone had stood up prior to 1860 and boldly asserted that slavery was indeed unconstitutional? What if he made a compelling case, and put it in writing for others to consider? And what if his essay were so powerful that even a pro-slavery Southern Senator would have to agree with it?

Someone did. Lysander Spooner was an abolitionist, a legal scholar, and a philosopher. He made his case in the 1845 book, *The Unconstitutionality of Slavery*. No one ever refuted it. Mississippi Senator Brown publicly acknowledged that Spooner's arguments were irrefutable. To libertarians and New England abolitionists Spooner was a hero. So, one might think he also was a hero to Abraham Lincoln and other prominent Republicans. After all, they were perceived as the anti-slavery party. But that was not the case.

Those New England abolitionists despised Republicans and opposed them politically. Why? Because they saw Republicans for the hypocrites they were. Republicans talked about being anti-slavery, but it was just talk. Their words did not match their actions. There is no more compelling proof of that than the Corwin Amendment.

Even before his inauguration, Lincoln had a meeting with William Seward, a New York Senator who would become Lincoln's Secretary of State. Lincoln instructed Seward to get a constitutional amendment passed by the Senate. The purpose of the amendment was to prohibit the federal government from ever interfering with the institution of slavery in the US. No legislation and no future constitutional amendment could ever interfere with slavery in the US! It was passed by the Senate, and by the House, and it was ratified by several states.

Lincoln casually mentioned the Corwin Amendment (but not by name) in his First Inaugural Address, but in his typically duplicitous style, he didn't mention that it had

been **his** idea. (Modesty, no doubt). But he did indicate that he had no problem with it if the people chose to ratify it. (Which was mighty cooperative of him, since a constitutional amendment does not need presidential approval, anyway).

We are left, then, with a number of serious questions.

Why on earth would Abraham Lincoln, the “Great Emancipator”, try so hard, even before he took the oath of office, to **preserve** slavery instead of abolish it? Not even Southern states had ever proposed (or even considered) such an evil, outrageous scheme.

How can one reconcile Lincoln’s Second Inaugural Address with the Corwin Amendment (or his First Inaugural Address)? Since Lincoln frequently contradicted himself, he clearly had some sort of mental problem. All politicians lie, but they don’t usually do so as often or as passionately or as skillfully as Lincoln did. Apparently Honest Abe was a pathological liar.

Why, if the Confederate states were fighting for slavery, didn’t they immediately ratify the Corwin Amendment? Three Union states quickly ratified it, but not one single Southern state did. Isn’t that supposedly what the South had always dreamed of? Why would Southerners be willing to die by the hundreds of thousands for something they could have easily had with a simple vote?

Why didn’t Lincoln, if the Civil War was all about slavery, talk about Spooner’s book, just as soon as he was inaugurated (or even before)? Why didn’t he point to that as proof that slavery was unconstitutional? Why didn’t he insist that the time was way overdue to put an end to slavery in America, immediately and permanently? Why didn’t he advocate the 13th Amendment we have today (abolishing slavery), instead of the Corwin Amendment, which could have become the 13th Amendment (preserving and perpetuating slavery permanently)?

Why didn't Lincoln at least try to get a Supreme Court ruling supporting Spooner's argument? Then the pro-slavery forces would have had absolutely no legal, moral, or political authority. President Buchanan had tried that approach, but ran out of time. Why didn't Lincoln get behind that effort?

Spooner summarized the dilemma in a letter to Massachusetts Republican Senator Charles Sumner (who had also publicly acknowledged that Spooner was right about the unconstitutionality of slavery):

Had all those men at the North, who believed these ideas [the unconstitutionality of slavery] to be true, promulgated them as was their plain and obvious duty to do, it is reasonable to suppose that we should long since have had freedom, without shedding one drop of blood . . . the South could, consistently with honor, and probably would, long before this time, and without a conflict, have surrendered their slavery to the demand of the Constitution . . . and to the moral sentiment of the world . . . you, and others like you have done more, according to your abilities, to **prevent the peaceful abolition of slavery**, than any other men in the nation.

(Emphasis mine.)

There is only one explanation that makes any sense at all. It is obvious to anyone who knows American history. The Civil War was not about slavery. Lincoln was not about slavery. The Emancipation Proclamation wasn't about slavery.

According to Spooner, the Civil War **erupted for a purely pecuniary consideration**. It was not for any moral reasons. Lincoln's rhetoric about abolishing slavery and preserving the Union was all a sham. The war was about money. Tariff revenue.

Spooner was right about the unconstitutionality of slavery. And he was right about Lincoln and his Republican pawns. Lincoln was a pathological liar and a bloody tyrant. Republicans were hypocrites and accomplices in Lincoln's slaughter of 650,000 Americans.

If Lincoln had been a tiny fraction of the great leader we give him credit for, he would have, as soon as he was inaugurated, used Spooner's work as a basis for a crusade against slavery in the US. Even if he had been successful, that still wouldn't necessarily have prevented secession by the Confederate states, because slavery was not their reason for seceding. But it certainly would have placed Yankees on the moral high road, and it would have placed the Confederacy in a very awkward position in terms of the international community.

From Union Colonel Lewis Merrill⁴⁶⁰ to Union Gen George H Thomas⁴⁶¹, May 4, 1865:⁴⁶²

The men who are employed about Chattanooga as scouts, guides, and spies are, as a rule, thieves, and accompany troops who go out from there simply for the chance to plunder . . . The conduct of these men serves . . . to . . . prolong the continuance of guerrilla practices . . . [Union] Colonel Woody and [Union] Captain Lillard at or near Cleveland⁴⁶³, and claiming to be acting under Federal authority . . . had committed many outrages upon peaceable citizens in that vicinity.

⁴⁶⁰ Second Missouri Cavalry (Union), at Nashville, Tennessee.

⁴⁶¹ Department of the Cumberland, Nashville, Tennessee.

⁴⁶² UWK, p137-138

⁴⁶³ 25 miles east-northeast of Chattanooga.

While many cities in the South, especially in Mississippi and Georgia, suffered their full measure of Yankee rage, hatred, and revenge at the hands of Sherman's army, nowhere was Sherman's wrath more intense than in South Carolina, where the secessionist movement had begun.⁴⁶⁴ According to one Union officer:⁴⁶⁵ **The [Union] army burned everything it came near in the State of South Carolina.** Another officer said:⁴⁶⁶ **A majority of the cities, towns, villages and county houses have been burnt to the ground.**

Two-thirds of the state's capital, Columbia, was burned to the ground. But, of course, none of it was Sherman's fault. Who did he blame this time? Confederates for starting the fire, and God for sending the winds that fanned the flames. He specifically blamed Confederate Gen Wade Hampton, born in Columbia, South Carolina, for setting fire to his home town. That's just the kind of bizarre thinking that makes perfect sense only in Yankee logic. What's really quite interesting is the fact that, apparently, God in his infinite Yankee wisdom, saw fit to spare two buildings in the midst of the conflagration. One was the house of the French consulate. The other was being used as a Union military headquarters.

After years had passed, Sherman confessed in his memoirs that he had lied about Wade Hampton starting the fire. (No!) He lied because he wanted to ruin Hampton's reputation in his home town. (Oh, well as long as it was for a worthy cause.) So why did Sherman finally come clean? Because he felt guilty? Heck no. It was because he just couldn't refrain from bragging that **he** set the fire that **utterly ruined Columbia.** (What a guy! And to think Sherman's own people had once thought he was insane.)

⁴⁶⁴ RLD, p190

⁴⁶⁵ Major Connolly, in a letter to his wife.

⁴⁶⁶ James Stillwell, one of Sherman's chaplains.

From Major George Rex, US Volunteers, surgeon in charge⁴⁶⁷, to Union Major Gen Grenville M Dodge⁴⁶⁸, Mar 10, 1868:⁴⁶⁹

During the months of November and December, 1864, we have had 818 sick in the hospital of this prison, and the number of deaths during that period 134, showing the fearful mortality at the rate of nearly fifty percent, for the year . . .

The quality and insufficient quantity of their food . . . and still more grave cause, of confining and massing a large number of prisoners in quarters insufficiently ventilated and totally inadequate in capacity. In one of the rooms in this prison, with a cubic area of 70,380 feet, . . . were confined in November over 500 prisoners, affording breathing space to each prisoner less than 140 cubic feet, . . . the minimum [space allowed in US Army general hospitals being] 800 cubic feet. As an excuse for this excessive crowding of prisoners at the time, the inability of the provost-marshal to remove them or find other accommodations was urged as the reason.

At this date there are now confined in the same room 154 prisoners, with a breathing space to each of less than 450 feet, being a small proportion more than half the space considered necessary and essential to health. This unnecessary crowding of these prisoners at this time is not the result or for the want of room in the prison, there being another room with a cubic area of 45,488 feet, and in which no prisoners are kept, or used for any other purpose. Notwithstanding repeated attention of the prison authorities has been called to this grave and prolific cause of disease, the evil still continues unabated, and consequently no hopes of the decrease of the ration of deaths . . .

⁴⁶⁷ US Military Prison, Gratiot Street, Hospital Department, St Louis, Missouri.

⁴⁶⁸ Department of the Missouri, St Louis.

⁴⁶⁹ UWK, p135-136

Among these prisoners undergoing the confinement in these crowded and insufficiently ventilated quarters are many citizen prisoners, against whom the charges pending are of a very trivial character, or perhaps upon investigation by courts-martial no charges at all are sustained.

The most infamous Civil War prison was Andersonville, located in the village of Andersonville, Sumter County, Georgia. It became notorious for its overcrowding, starvation, disease, and cruelty. It was in operation from February 1864 to April 1865.

Its story is raw meat for CivilGate propagandists, who gleefully point to it as an example of Southern barbaric behavior. It was indisputably a horrific place, but all Civil War prisoner camps were. What you generally do not hear about are the numerous prisons in the North that were almost as bad.

Nor do the propagandists bother to mention this bit of key information. Union Gen William Tecumseh Sherman had, in late 1864, fulfilled his promise to *make Georgia howl*, as part of his famous *march to the sea*. Whole towns were burned, everything was destroyed, leaving the citizens with no food, very little clothing, no place to live, no way of supporting themselves, helpless and destitute. Thanks to Sherman, Southerners couldn't even take care of themselves, much less thousands of Yankee prisoners. In addition, the North had blockaded Southern ports, so medicine and medical supplies could not be obtained for citizens or prisoners.

So, conditions at Andersonville were, for the most part, created by Yankees themselves. Southerners had no choice. How could they adequately care for Yankee prisoners when Sherman had destroyed everything needed to improve conditions at Andersonville?

Contrast that with conditions at the Gratiot Street prison. Food was available, but it was willfully withheld. More space was available, but hospital administrators were not allowed to use it. Many of the inmates at the prison were political prisoners, not

prisoners of war. They were illegally detained indefinitely on flimsy charges, or no charges at all, with no habeas corpus rights, with no access to counsel, and no communication with family.

Horrific conditions at Andersonville were mostly a product of Southern necessity and Northern savagery. Horrific conditions at Northern prisons were mostly a product of Yankee hatred and revenge. It is a prime example of the difference in culture and character between the North and the South.

One would logically assume, if the CivilGate version of events had any credibility at all, that Sherman's army, during his infamous march, took great precautions to protect slaves and free blacks, their families, and their property. Surely, Sherman was eager to see that those unfortunate souls were liberated from Southern oppression and assured their freedom and safety as they rushed into the open arms of their compassionate Yankee saviors.

Only in movies, documentaries, textbooks, classrooms, and history books. (In other words, in CivilGate propaganda.) Reality was radically different. Slaves suffered as much as whites at the bloody hands of Sherman's rampaging anarchists. Sometimes they suffered even more. For example, slave women were favored targets of barbaric Union soldiers bent on rape.

But black men were easy targets as well, because they had been taught from birth to be obedient and subservient to white men. They were not, by nature, violent people. Quite the contrary. It took a lot to provoke slaves to violence. If they had been prone to violence, slave men could easily have overpowered their masters and escaped, because virtually all white men were away fighting in the war. Only women, children, and old men stood between them and freedom. So why did they not revolt en masse? Why did they not simply run away? They easily could have. There were typically no guards holding them at gunpoint.

Probably because most of them had a genuine, deep affection for their white families, and the feelings were mutual. They were slaves, and they weren't allowed to leave, but the vast majority of them didn't want to leave. Where would they go? What would they do? Slavery was the only life they had ever known, and most of them realized that things could be a lot worse. They were well aware of lots of poor white folks who had nothing, no job prospects, and no one to care for them. At least slaves had food, shelter, clothing, each other, and their faith.

Sure, some Southern slaves were abused, but not many. It made no sense. Slaves were valuable property, to be well cared for. It was the moral thing to do, it was a Christian obligation, and it was the practical thing to do. But Yankees didn't see it that way. Yankees were as racist as one can get, and they loathed blacks even more than they hated Southern whites. They didn't see blacks as people, but as potential competition for **white** jobs. (All jobs other than slavery were white jobs in Yankee logic.)

Yankee's words back that up, and so do their deeds. One of the first things Yankee soldiers did when they entered a Southern home was to find a slave or two and threaten to kill them if they didn't reveal where the master's valuables were hidden.⁴⁷⁰ Isn't that interesting? According to CivilGate myth and Harriet Beecher Stowe, slaves were treated very harshly, subject to frequent beatings, and always looking for an escape hatch. Why then, would their white masters tell them where the valuables were hidden? If CivilGate propaganda had a shred of credibility, slaves would be the primary reason for hiding their valuables in the first place.

In another example, a group of Union soldiers were hanging out at a railroad station when a black man walked by. One of the soldiers grabbed the black man's hat, and the black man tried to get it back. Soon the black man was attacked by a mob of white Union soldiers, and by the time law enforcement personnel could get there,

⁴⁷⁰ RLD, p191-192

the black man had been beaten to death. This was not an unusual incident. The same scenario, with minor differences in the details, played out thousands of times in Union-occupied areas of the South during the war and throughout the South during Reconstruction.

You are probably quite familiar with this story already. Hundreds of starving blacks tagged along behind Sherman's army, hoping for something to eat and an opportunity for a brighter future. When the soldiers crossed a stream, they removed the pontoons behind them, leaving the wretched blacks writhing in disbelief, feeling betrayed, helpless, and hopeless. Many of them drowned, no doubt having simply given up.

The blacks who did manage to survive Yankee liberation and compassion were typically made personal servants of Union officers. They were still slaves. They just had a different (Yankee) master. Those were the lucky ones. Thousands of other blacks looking to Union soldiers for help were instead abandoned, left to starve or die from exposure. At times, these most unfortunate victims of Yankee compassion were found by Southern soldiers as they reentered an area. It was not uncommon to find hundreds of starving blacks, so weak they could not move, having been simply abandoned by Yankees. Some were being eaten by worms, even before they were dead. (How's that for a mystic chord of memory?) White soldiers, who had precious little for themselves, gave food to the blacks, in stark contrast to Union soldiers, who had plenty of food, but would give none to the blacks.

That's the real Abraham Lincoln. That's the North. That's Sherman. Yet incredibly, we continue to revere Lincoln (and Yankees in general) as the Great Liberator(s). How blind to reality can Americans possibly be?

From Union Captain John D Meredith⁴⁷¹ to Union Gen Clinton B Fisk, in Macon, Missouri, Mar 24, 1865, regarding a scout from Glasgow to the Perche Hills, Mar 7-15:⁴⁷²

I . . . detailed a corporal and two men to set fire to the premises [of Anthony Drane], which was done . . . [Joseph] Graves [of Boone County] I retained, and . . . ordered his execution . . . I burned the house [owned by lady friend of Miss Hines, sister of Bill Hines] . . . I burned the house [of a family in vicinity of the Brick Chapel] . . . The other squad of my command [scouting the Franklin Hills] burned the residence of Bas Maxwell, and ordered him to leave that part of the country.

In 1860 only a small minority of whites owned slaves.⁴⁷³ According to the US census report for that year, there were nearly 27 million whites in the country. About eight million of them lived in slaveholding states. The census also determined that there were fewer than 385,000 individuals who owned slaves. If all slaveholders had been white, that would amount to 1.4 percent of whites in the country (4.8 percent of southern whites) who owned one or more slaves.

However, not all slaveholders were white in 1860. Blacks owned black slaves in numbers disproportionate to their representation in society at large.

Ownership of slaves by free blacks is rarely acknowledged in history books. Even then, it is usually justified by the assertion that black slave masters were simply individuals who had purchased the freedom of a spouse or child from a white

⁴⁷¹ Company D, Thirty-Ninth Missouri, commanded by Colonel Edward A Kutzner, Glasgow, Howard County, Missouri.

⁴⁷² UWK, p135

⁴⁷³ Based in part on the article, *Dixie's Censored Subject: Black Slaveowners*, by Robert M Grooms, 1997.

slaveholder and had been unable to legally free them. Although this did happen, it was the exception, rather than the norm.

This is proven by records of blacks who owned slaves, such as Justus Angel and Mistress L Horry, of Colleton District, South Carolina, who each owned 84 slaves in 1830. In that year, one-fourth of the free black slave masters in South Carolina owned 10 or more slaves. Eight owned 30 or more.

According to federal census reports, on June 1, 1860 there were nearly 4.5 million blacks in the United States, fewer than four million of which lived in the southern slaveholding states. Of those, 261,988 were not slaves, and 10,689 of those lived in New Orleans. Over 3,000 of those owned slaves.⁴⁷⁴

That means that 28 percent of free blacks living in New Orleans in 1860 owned slaves. Which is quite remarkable compared to the less than 1.4 percent of all whites and less than 4.8 percent of Southern whites who owned slaves. In other words, once blacks became free, they disproportionately became slave masters.

The majority of slaveholders, white and black, owned one to five slaves. Most of those owners, black and white, worked and ate alongside their slaves. Only about one percent of slaveholders owned 50 or more slaves.⁴⁷⁵

In 1860, Louisiana was home to at least six blacks who owned at least 65 slaves each. C Richards, a widow, and her son, P C Richards, owned a large sugar cane plantation and 152 slaves. Antoine Dubuclet, a sugar planter, owned more than 100 slaves and an estate worth \$264,000. (The mean wealth of a Southern white man that year was \$3978).

⁴⁷⁴ According to the country's leading African American historian, Duke University professor John Hope Franklin.

⁴⁷⁵ They were known as slave magnates.

In North Carolina, 69 free blacks owned slaves, and there were 125 free black slaveholders in Charleston, South Carolina in 1860. Six of them owned 10 or more slaves. Free blacks in that city owned \$1.5 million in taxable property, and slave holdings accounted for \$300,000 of that total. The largest black slaveholder in South Carolina was William Ellison.

Ellison had built a small empire between 1822 and the mid 1840s, building cotton gins in South Carolina and selling them throughout the South, especially in Mississippi. He was so successful, because of his use of slave labor, that many of his white competitors were forced out of business.

How can we explain the fact that so many free blacks became slave owners themselves? And the fact that so many black slave owners were so successful and wealthy? It certainly defies many of the stereotypes and misconceptions we have long accepted about life in the South.

One of those deeply ingrained myths is that racism was rampant in the antebellum South -- a condition which was finally remedied by the Great Emancipator himself, along with his army of noble, slave-liberating, black-loving, compassionate Yankees. This article is but one small piece of the overwhelming evidence which thoroughly debunks that slice of CivilGate propaganda.

The explanation for black ownership of black slaves is very simple. Greed. Love of money. It is a universal human attribute, and it is far stronger than any racial preferences or prejudices. People were more concerned about making money than they were about race. It was that universal greed that had allowed the African slave trade to get started in the first place. African slaves didn't get sold throughout the world because evil white men stormed into Africa and stole slaves to sell in other countries. They didn't need to. It was Africans who discovered a way to make lots of money -- by selling their war captives to white slave traders.

A large number of successful black slaveholders, however, were not to be found in the North. For two reasons. One is that agricultural slave labor was not viable in the North. But that isn't why William Ellison couldn't have built his cotton gins in the North. The second reason is racism. Yankees were racists. Southerners were not. (Not until Yankees exported their racism into the South during Reconstruction). Yankees did not like blacks, and they did not want them in their neighborhoods, schools, churches, or factories. They did not want them in their states. Period. They passed state laws forbidding blacks to settle there.

By contrast, blacks and whites grew up together in the South. They lived and worked comfortably together. They simply did not have the racial tension that plagued the North. Yes, blacks were usually slaves, but they were also considered friends and even family. Slaves were property, but they were valuable property. For both economic and moral (or religious) reasons, slaves were to be well cared for, and treated with respect. That's the way it was in the South, contrary to CivilGate mythology and propaganda. Sure, there were a few racists and cruel slave masters in the South, but they were the rare exception, not the norm. One of those cruel slave masters was William Ellison.

Not that Southern slavery was something any person in his right mind would have aspired to.

Well, on second thought, I'm not so sure about that. There were plenty of poor whites in the North who had it worse than slaves in the South. There were poor whites in the South who were worse off than slaves. There were many free blacks in the North who were treated much worse (by racist Yankees) than Southern slaves. Most Southern slaves were well cared for by their masters, and while they were forced to work hard, and although they could not quit their job and move away whenever the boss said or did something they didn't like, they had food, clothing, medical care, and shelter, and they didn't have to worry about those basic life necessities. There were many free blacks and whites who did not have that much.

Free blacks in Virginia sometimes petitioned to be allowed to become slaves, because they were unable to support themselves.

One of the more curious aspects of the free black existence in Virginia was their ownership of slaves. Black slave masters owned members of their family and freed them in their wills. Free blacks were encouraged to sell themselves into slavery and had the right to choose their owner through a lengthy court procedure.⁴⁷⁶

Have you ever, out of economic necessity, been forced to continue working at a job which you absolutely hated, and which didn't even pay enough to make ends meet? Did you feel like a slave? Were you one of the lucky guys who was drafted into the Viet Nam war? Did you feel like a slave? Our concept of slavery is not necessarily all that black and white, even in our own personal experiences. It was not all that black and white in 19th-century America. Not even for free blacks. Not even for slaves.

⁴⁷⁶ *Black Confederates and Afro-Yankees in Civil War Virginia* (University Press of Virginia-1995), written by Ervin L Jordan Jr, an African-American and assistant professor and associate curator of the Special Collections Department, University of Virginia library.

From Union Major Gen Stephen A Hurlbut⁴⁷⁷ to Union Major Gen Edward R S Canby⁴⁷⁸, March 16, 1865:⁴⁷⁹

The wretched waste and destruction by the troops at Kenner and Chalmette [Louisiana] . . . the most utter recklessness, both of public and private rights, has characterized the troops which have occupied Chalmette especially. Plunder, pilfering, and robbery [have been] committed by them.

Anyone who still entertains any doubts whatsoever about Abraham Lincoln's personal involvement in the details of Union war crimes and the Yankee campaign of Southern cultural genocide should read the diary of Emma LeConte.⁴⁸⁰ Emma was an 18-year-old resident of Columbia, South Carolina, and she witnessed the unfolding terror the day Sherman destroyed the city. Not given to hysteria or hyperbole, Emma describes in graphic detail the events of the day.

She explains that before entering the city, Sherman had promised **not to disturb private property**. But she noticed as they entered Columbia that they were well equipped with matches, crowbars, etc. Then **as soon as the bulk of the army entered, the work of pillage began. What a scene of pillage and terror was being enacted.**

She calmly describes how Sherman's army methodically destroyed the city, with their campaign of pillage, plunder, and arson. When women and old men tried to put

⁴⁷⁷ Department of the Gulf, New Orleans.

⁴⁷⁸ Army and Division of West Mississippi, Ft Gaines, Alabama.

⁴⁷⁹ UWK, p136

⁴⁸⁰ RLD, p192-194

out fires, Union soldiers cut the fire hoses with their bayonets. She suggests that the soldiers didn't hesitate to burn Southern women and children alive in their own homes. She says the soldiers were **infuriated, cursing, screaming, exulting in their work**, while the city's women, children, and old men helplessly watched in terror.

After the soldiers had finished their destructive work and left the city, Emma reports that **there is not a house, I believe, in Columbia, that has not been pillaged -- those that the flames spared were entered by brutal soldiery and everything wantonly destroyed.**

Sherman had a meeting on Mar 27, 1865, with Lincoln and Grant at City Point, on the James River. Lincoln profusely thanked and congratulated the generals for their excellent work. Lincoln pushed them for details as he gleefully listened to their stories of pillage, plunder, and arson. They had done what their commander in chief had required of them. Now it was Miller time.

That's the real Abraham Lincoln.

Here are excerpts from Emma's diary.

The fire on Main Street was now raging, and we anxiously watched its progress from the upper front windows. In a little while, however, the flames broke forth in every direction. The drunken devils roamed about, setting fire to every house the flames seemed likely to spare. They were fully equipped for the noble work they had in hand. Each soldier was furnished with combustibles compactly put up. They would enter houses and in the presence of helpless women and children, pour turpentine on the beds and set them on fire. Guards were rarely of any assistance -- most generally they assisted in the pillaging and firing.

Long after the soldiers had gone . . .

Imagine night turned into noonday, only with a blazing, scorching glare that was horrible -- a copper colored sky across which swept columns of black, rolling smoke glittering with sparks and flying embers, while all around us were falling thickly showers of burning flakes. Everywhere the palpitating blaze walling the streets with solid masses of flames as far as the eye could reach, filling the air with its horrible roar. On every side the crackling and devouring fire, while every instant came the crashing of timbers and the thunder of falling buildings. A quivering molten ocean seemed to fill the air and sky. The library building opposite us seemed framed by the gushing flames and smoke, while through the window gleamed the liquid fire.

From Union Brigadier Gen Cyrus Bussey⁴⁸¹ to Union Colonel M LaRue Harrison⁴⁸², February 28, 1865:⁴⁸³

Portions of your command have been committing the most outrageous excesses, robbing and burning houses indiscriminately . . . Let war be made on guerillas and not women and children. Madison and Carroll Counties are specially named as the scene of these outrages.

Apparently, Gen Bussey was one of the few Union officers who thought Southern women and children were not fair military targets.

On Mar 8, 1865, he sent this message to Union Major Gen Joseph J Reynolds, Department of Arkansas:

There are several thousand families within the limits of this command who are related to and dependent on the Arkansas soldiers in our service. These people have

⁴⁸¹ Third Division, Seventh Corps, Ft Smith, Arkansas.

⁴⁸² First Arkansas Cavalry (Union), at Fayetteville, Arkansas.

⁴⁸³ UWK, p134-135

nearly all been robbed of everything they had by the troops of this command, and are now left destitute and compelled to leave their homes to avoid starvation . . . In most instances everything has been taken and no receipts given, the people turned out to starve, and their effects loaded into trains and sent to Kansas.

On January 8, 1861, a small group of Confederate sympathizers attacked Ft Barrancas, a Union fort, now known as Pensacola Naval Air Station. About 50 federal troops were under the command of Lt. Adam J. Slemmer at Ft Barrancas, with its arched brick passageways and tunnels overlooking the turquoise waters and white-sand beaches of Pensacola Bay, Florida.⁴⁸⁴

The Union was falling apart. South Carolina had seceded on Dec. 20, and other states were about to, including Florida. Tension was high.

On the night of Jan 8, Union soldiers had raised a drawbridge around the fort (which dated to when Spain controlled Florida). Just after midnight, guards heard footsteps outside and challenged the intruders, but they heard no response. No shots were fired, or at least there was no mention of it by Lt Slemmer.

However, after the war ended (in 1865), one of the would-be intruders, R L Sweetman, wrote a letter to Lt Slemmer, and he later wrote to Slemmer's widow. Sweetman made reference to the blank shot fired at Ft Barrancas, which Sweetman considered the war's beginning. His words were something like: **Your husband can claim that he commanded the post where the first shot was fired.**

This shot was fired three months before the April 12, 1861, battle at South Carolina's Ft Sumter, which most people regard as the start of the Civil War. Like so many other Civil War "facts", the status of Ft Sumter is not likely to be dislodged,

⁴⁸⁴ Based on an April 13, 2011, AP article by Jonathon M. Seidl.

even by irrefutable other facts. The shot fired at Ft Barrancas falls far short of "irrefutable", so Ft Barrancas is no serious threat to Ft Sumter.

But that leaves many residents of Florida feeling a bit cheated. One of them is Dale Cox, the unofficial historian for the Florida Panhandle chapter of the Sons of the Confederate Veterans. He considers the Pensacola shot the first shot of the Civil War, telling The Associated Press that **It is an interesting bit of history and I'd like to see Pensacola get more recognition for all of its Civil War history.**

It may very well be true that the raid was nothing more than an ill-planned drunken misadventure, and it was just a warning shot, probably a blank. The drunken Confederate-sympathizing local rowdies skedaddled as soon as the (blank) shot was fired (if it was fired at all). All of which makes Pensacola's claim to fame a very tough sell. Still, it marked the first time federal troops fired toward Confederate agitators. At least, that's the way Pensacola residents see it. It is the stuff of legend in that military town. After all, no one was killed at Ft Sumter, either.

This isn't the only reason Pensacola residents feel cheated by history. St Augustine is considered the oldest city in North America, established by the Spanish in 1565. But Pensacola was established in 1559. It loses its first-city status because the original city was destroyed by a hurricane in 1561, and it was not rebuilt until much later, making St Augustine the oldest **continually-existing** city in North America.

Some folks at The Citadel military academy in South Carolina also feel a bit cheated by history. Their claim to fame came just hours after the incident at Pensacola. The Union steamship *Star of the West* was attempting to resupply 200 federal troops at Ft Sumter. Cadets from the academy, manning a battery on Morris Island, fired on the *Star of the West*, forcing it to turn back. Some folks consider that the first shots fired in the Civil War.

The truth of the matter is that the incident at Ft Barrancas did not mark the beginning of the Civil War. Neither did firing on the *Star of the West*. Nor did the

short battle at Ft Sumter. It is very important to understand when, where, and why the war began. The Civil War began on Apr 15, 1861, when Abraham Lincoln ordered 75,000 volunteers to invade the South.

As a result of Lincoln's unconstitutional, illegal, immoral, and unnecessary attack on the Confederacy, 650,000 Americans were slaughtered, including thousands of innocent, defenseless women, children, old men, and blacks. They are the ones who were *cheated by history*.

From Union Gen Reynolds in Little Rock, Arkansas, to Union Gen Bussey, March 10, 1865:⁴⁸⁵

Some companies, said to be organized by authority from [Union] Colonel LaRue Harrison, are committing outrageous depredations in the vicinity of Fayetteville.

What Sherman was to the deep South, Sheridan was to the Shenandoah Valley⁴⁸⁶. Here is how one of Sheridan's officers described their handiwork:

The atmosphere, from horizon to horizon, has been black with the smoke of a hundred conflagrations . . . and at night a gleam brighter and more lurid than sunset has shot from every verge . . . The completeness of the devastation is awful. Hundreds of nearly starving people are going north. Our trains are crowded with

⁴⁸⁵ UWK, p135

⁴⁸⁶ RLD, p195-199

them. They line the wayside. Hundreds more are coming . . . so stripped of food that I cannot imagine how they escaped starvation.

The stakes of the Sheridan campaign couldn't have been higher. If the Confederates had somehow managed to gain the upper hand, that would likely have ended all hope of Lincoln's reelection. That was the Union's greatest fear, because they knew that the Democrat Party would work toward a peace agreement and end the war. They had to prevent that from happening, at all cost. Sheridan summed it up this way: **The defeat of my army might be followed by the overthrow of the party in power [and lead] to the complete abandonment of all coercive measures.**

That prospect had Lincoln wetting his pants. He knew very well that he and his myrmidons had committed too many war crimes to count. Every other nation in the world would have condemned Lincoln and his conduct of the war, and he would likely have been hanged. He knew he had no defense against such charges, and if he lost the 1864 election, he would no doubt end up dangling from a rope. His only hope was winning the election, and that meant winning in the Shenandoah Valley.

He didn't have to worry about being charged with war crimes as long as he won the election and the war, because the victors are never charged with war crimes. Might makes right, and as long as he held the upper hand militarily and politically, he was safe from prosecution.

Because Lincoln won the war, anything he did to achieve victory was by (his) definition legal, just, and fully acceptable. Because he was assassinated soon afterward, he became a saint in America. Because Yankees were the victors, they wrote that chapter of history just the way they wanted everyone else to see it, not as it actually happened.

Lincoln became a hero and idol to every tyrant, despot, and dictator that followed him. He certainly was a hero to Woodrow Wilson, father of the American progressive movement. America's critics often refer to Americans as imperialists. Critics of the

Republican Party brand it as the party of the rich. All that has a factual foundation, and it all stems from Abraham Lincoln.

As a noted sports personality once observed, winning is the **only** thing. It's the difference between Lincoln the saint and Lincoln the executed war criminal.

From Union Brevet Major Gen Stephen G Burbridge⁴⁸⁷ to Secretary of War Stanton, Feb 8, 1865:⁴⁸⁸

I left Washington believing . . . that you desired . . . the [Union] State corps disbanded. They are worse than useless, with the exception of three companies, . . . [and] are . . . more or less disposed to marauding and plundering.

From Union Captain William J Piland⁴⁸⁹ to Union Gen J B Sanborn⁴⁹⁰, Feb ?, 1865:

There is living . . . in this vicinity . . . a band of lawless men who are roaming through the country, making expeditions into Arkansas and the southern parts of this county, taking the property of individuals . . . They also destroy the property of women and orphan children. They report to me that they have verbal orders to do these things.

⁴⁸⁷ Commanding Post at Lexington, Kentucky.

⁴⁸⁸ UWK, p134

⁴⁸⁹ Company I, Forty-Sixth Missouri (Union), Davis' Mill, Ozark County, Missouri.

⁴⁹⁰ In Springfield, Missouri.

General Order no 3, issued by Union Colonel Eli H Murray⁴⁹¹, March 4, 1865:⁴⁹²

In many cases the actions of Federal officers here have been disgraceful, bringing discredit not only upon themselves and the regiments to which they belong, but also unnecessary seizure of horses and property of all kinds, and by the unwarranted abuse of good citizens.

James Ostrowski, a legal scholar, helps us understand the absurdity of Lincoln's First Inaugural Address sophistry.⁴⁹³ In that speech, Lincoln claimed that the Union pre-dated and created the states, and that Southern secession (but not all secession) was constitutionally impossible. He was, therefore, fully justified in using military force to quell the Southern "rebellion". The 1787 Constitutional Convention delegates and the states, according to Ostrowski, would have had to agree with the following during their ratification process:

(1) No state may ever secede from the Union for any reason. (2) If any state attempts to secede, the federal government shall invade such a state with sufficient military force to suppress that secession. (3) The federal government may require all states to raise militias to be used to suppress the seceding state(s). (4) After suppressing the secession, the federal government may rule by martial law until such time as the state accepts permanent federal supremacy (as occurred during Reconstruction). (5) After the secession is suppressed, the federal government may force the states to adopt new state constitutions imposed upon them by federal

⁴⁹¹ Third Cavalry, commanding Second Military District of Kentucky, Russellville, 23 miles southwest of Bowling Green.

⁴⁹² UWK, p135

⁴⁹³ RLD, p115-116

military authorities (as occurred during Reconstruction). (6) The president may, on his own authority and without consulting any other branch of government, suspend the Bill of Rights and the writ of habeas corpus (as Lincoln did in the first months of his presidency).

Ostrowski's summary is a fair and accurate summary of Lincoln's interpretation of the Constitution. The new Constitution was barely ratified. It had absolutely no chance of ratification if the people had anticipated Lincoln's interpretation of it. No citizen would have voted for it, no state would have ratified it, and no Convention delegate would have signed it in 1787. Nothing in any of the Federalist Papers even hints at Lincoln's chimerical analysis.

Fortunately for Lincoln (and most unfortunately for the South), Yankees were not exactly deep thinkers.

A Circular issued by Union Major Gen David S Stanley⁴⁹⁴ on Feb 3, 1865:⁴⁹⁵

Owing to the vast amount of thieving, pillaging, and robbing committed by the troops while out, no more forage trains will be sent out from this command . . . No more [fence] rails will be burned.

Well, wasn't that a brave and noble stand against Yankee anarchy. Of course, Union generals had been saying that sort of thing since the beginning of the war. With only two months left in the war, I'm sure this circular had a profound influence on those out-of-control Yankees.

⁴⁹⁴ Fourth Corps, at Huntsville, Alabama.

⁴⁹⁵ UWK, p114

From Abraham Lincoln to Union Lieutenant Colonel John Glenn⁴⁹⁶, Feb 7, 1865:

Complaint is made to me that you are forcing negroes into the military service, and even torturing them -- riding them on rails, and the like -- to extort their consent.

Surely Lincoln was aware that forced conscription of blacks was a widespread and common Union practice throughout the South. There is no indication that he wrote to any of the other units involved in the practice. Why single out Glenn?

But the more obvious question is, why didn't Lincoln order him to cut it out immediately? Why didn't he issue a Proclamation or something to put an end to it throughout the Union army?

Based on all I know about the Civil War, and Abraham Lincoln, I suspect this message was carefully worded to achieve two goals: (1) Fulfill a promise to the complainant that he would write to the officer; (2) Tacitly congratulate Glenn for the fine work he was doing. Lincoln was certainly aware of many Union war crimes, and he openly supported the officers who committed them. This would have been a classic case of Lincoln duplicity -- appearing to the complainant to be caring, concerned, sympathetic, and engaged, while esoterically congratulating Glenn, and encouraging his officers to keep right on keeping on with their war crimes.

In addition to Lincoln's laughable legal arguments against secession, he offered a couple of specious political arguments.⁴⁹⁷ One was that it would violate the majority-rule principle. But the opposite is true. Majority rule works more

⁴⁹⁶ 120th Colored Infantry, commanding Post at Henderson, Kentucky, 75 miles northeast of Paducah.

⁴⁹⁷ RLD, p117-118

efficiently in smaller units, in part because people have the choice of moving away from a state with objectionable laws to a state where the laws are more to their liking. We cannot do that in one vast centralized state. That was a key factor in the thinking of the Constitutional Convention delegates, who carefully crafted the Constitution to preserve the majority-rule principle in a way that also prevented the tyranny of the majority. Lincoln understood that very well as a lawyer. But he also understood that Yankees were gullible and easily manipulated into believing whatever sophistry he tossed out to them.

The other political argument was that secession would inevitably lead to anarchy. In a way, he was absolutely right about that, but not in the sense he intended. He was trying to paint a portrait of a secessionist South in anarchy. But it was Yankees who turned out to be the anarchists. The Union army was full of anarchists who defied their own officers, the Union's own standards of military conduct, and any shred of basic human decency. Those anarchists-in-uniform pillaged, plundered, raped, vandalized, destroyed, and terrorized the South with impunity throughout the war. Then Union anarchy ruled during Reconstruction -- without doubt the worst display of anarchy in American history.

Lincoln's legal and political arguments against secession were bogus, and that fact was obvious to any objective observer. Yankees were not at all objective. They were panic-stricken at the prospect of the South cutting off their generous flow of tariff revenue, which the South had been dutifully delivering to the North for decades. That alone was enough to make Yankees forget that secession was a natural right. Then when Lincoln managed to manipulate the South into firing on Ft Sumter, Yankees were whipped into a frenzy of retaliation and revenge.

Did I mention that Yankees were easily misled and manipulated?

From Union Brevet Brigadier Gen Edward L Molineaux⁴⁹⁸ to Union Gen Q A Gillmore⁴⁹⁹, June 26, 1865:⁵⁰⁰

The colored citizens wander around at all hours of the night, and many in consequence have been robbed and abused by . . . US Soldiers . . . The conduct of the Fourth Iowa Cavalry in passing through this district was such as reflects disgrace on both officers and men, discharging their firearms, etc . . . Firing so as to cause a colored woman to lose her arm; likewise committing robberies, etc.

You probably learned in school that the first slaves in the American colonies arrived on a Dutch ship in 1619. Although many ended up as slaves, they all started out as indentured servants. Indentures, theoretically, contracted to work for a certain number of years in exchange for transportation to the New World. At the end of their contract, the indentures were free to go their own way, often, we are led to believe, with some cash, clothes, maybe a plow and a mule, and maybe even some land to help them get started on their own. But it rarely worked that way. Some did achieve freedom, but they rarely left with anything other than what they were wearing.

They suffered during the voyage across the Atlantic, much as African slaves did during their *middle passage*. So, the distinction between slave and indentured servant was not terribly significant for most of the participants. But, come to think of it, neither was there any real difference between African slaves in America and the serfs and peasants in England. Technically they were free, but that “freedom” didn’t amount to much.

⁴⁹⁸ District of Northern Georgia.

⁴⁹⁹ Department of the South, Hilton Head, South Carolina.

⁵⁰⁰ UWK, p131

Many of the **white** people who came to the colonies in the 1600s and 1700s did not come voluntarily. Often they were victimized by British recruiters (also known as press gangs, drums, crimps, or spirits) who talked them into signing up for a seven-year indenture agreement. A reluctant bloke was often persuaded by a blow to the back of the head or a mickey in his ale. Those who survived the voyage were sold to the highest bidder, with terms negotiated on the spot, invariably much more favorable to the recruiter than to the recruited. Those who were not healthy, or couldn't be made to appear so within a few days, were quickly relieved of all earthly worries. They were slaves in all but name. Their seven-year sentence was extended at will.

It wasn't just adults who were "recruited". Adolescents and teens could perform hard labor, too. According to British law, police were free to arrest orphans, homeless, vagabonds, panhandlers, debtors, and street urchins, and put them on the next ship bound for the "land of opportunity".

There were attempted escapes, but very few succeeded. The penalty was usually extended (often indefinite) indentured service, and / or harsh punishment, like flogging or torture. If a white slave got a female pregnant, or married without his master's permission, he got an extended sentence. If a female slave was so insubordinate as to get pregnant just because her master raped her, she got an extended sentence, and the child was automatically a slave for at least 30 years.

What happened to the few who managed to escape and remain free? You may very well know (or be) one of their descendants. We call them hillbillies, rednecks, or crackers. They are also occasionally referred to as *Americans*.

When we think of slavery in America, we automatically think of black slaves in the South. But they were not the first slaves in North America. Neither were the indentured servants I just mentioned. Before that, Native Americans were enslaved by the thousands by Spanish conquistadors. And before that, Indians enslaved other Indians taken as war captives. To them, it was not an industry, but a way of

replacing members of their own group who had been lost to wars or diseases. Different motives, but similar results for the victims.

So, the slavery issue isn't always as black and white as it appears. Nor is it as simple as CivilGate propagandists would have you believe. They like to perpetuate the myth that slavery was something cooked up and practiced by a bunch of greedy, ruthless whites in the Southern states of North America. But before that Dutch ship arrived in 1619, up to one million Africans had been enslaved, tortured, starved, or worked to death in Central and South America, and on Caribbean islands.

It was **blacks** in Africa who made the African slave industry possible. They enslaved blacks themselves. They eagerly sold blacks taken captive in war to the highest bidder. Without their role in the process, there would have been no African slave trade. Later, blacks frequently became slave-masters in the American South. William Ellison, a former slave, owned hundreds of slaves, was a cruel slave-master, and even got into the slave-breeding business, even though it was illegal and loathsome to Southern whites.

Even though slavery was not practical in the North, that didn't stop Yankees from taking full advantage of the slave industry. They benefitted economically from Southern slave-labor, and they reaped enormous profits from the slave trade, even when it was illegal.

Slavery is a much more complex subject than we are told about in American schools and most books. Much of what is taught is not true, and much that is true is not taught.

From Union Colonel John F Philips⁵⁰¹ to Union Major Gen Grenville M Dodge⁵⁰², January 25, 1865:⁵⁰³

There is a source of trouble existing in some parts of the district . . . Self-constituted organizations of men, claiming to be Union men, many of them discharged soldiers or disbanded Enrolled Missouri Militia, are committing most diabolical outrages on peaceable and unarmed citizens.

Often they assume the guise and deportment of bushwhackers and go around at night robbing and pillaging, and again, assuming the character of soldiers, they exercise the right of search, seizure, and arrest . . . A few nights ago a party of these brigands . . . made a descent on the western border of Henry County, pillaged the neighborhood, and hung one man till dead to extort from him the knowledge of the hiding place of his money.

From Union Brigadier Gen John B Sanborn⁵⁰⁴ to M H Ritchey of Jefferson City, January 28, 1865:⁵⁰⁵

I am and . . . for a long time have been fully aware of the irregularities and crimes committed by some of our troops . . . The people . . . suffer from constant depredations [and] . . . existing evils . . . Complaint has been made of two soldiers killing the Bell boy.

⁵⁰¹ Seventh Cavalry Missouri State Militia, District of Central Missouri, at Warrensburg.

⁵⁰² Department of the Missouri, St Louis.

⁵⁰³ UWK, p133

⁵⁰⁴ District of Southwest Missouri, Springfield.

⁵⁰⁵ UWK, p133

Lincoln promised repeatedly in early 1861 that he did not plan to resupply Ft Sumter, even knowing full well that they were almost out of food and supplies.⁵⁰⁶ He was lying, as always. He had been warned by his military advisers that if he sent a ship to resupply the fort, it would most certainly be fired upon. And that is exactly what he was counting on. That's why he sent additional troops and war ships as well as food.

He had no intention of actually using those soldiers or war ships. They were there simply to make sure the South was sufficiently provoked into firing the first shot. They were under strict orders to not fire the first shot. That would have spoiled Lincoln's carefully spun web. He wanted to make sure the world perceived the event as heartless Southerners firing on food intended for hungry Union soldiers.

Bruce Catton, historian, explains that: **If there was going to be a war it would begin over a boat load of salt pork and crackers . . . It seemed very important to Lincoln that South Carolina should stand before the civilized world as having fired upon bread.**

The Civil War author, Shelby Foote, said: **That first shot would be fired for the immediate purpose of keeping food from hungry men.**

Lincoln was the consummate con artist. Confederates fired upon the fort for 36 hours, damaging only the fort. No men on either side were killed or even wounded. Lincoln's war ships didn't return fire even once. They easily could have, but there was no need for that. The fort was soon abandoned by the Union, but they had already achieved victory. The sole purpose of the charade was to provoke the South into firing the first shot. Mission accomplished.

Lincoln would much prefer to have had at least one casualty, because there's nothing like spilled blood to get Yankees frothing at the mouth. But he got his PR

⁵⁰⁶ RLD, p119-122

victory, and that was enough to provide a pretext for the war he had already decided to wage. The South got the fort, and Lincoln got his excuse for invading the Confederacy.

Not that he fooled anyone, though. Even Yankees, gullible though they were, had sense enough to smell the rat that Lincoln was.

From an editorial in the *Buffalo Daily Courier*, Apr 18, 1861: **The affair at Fort Sumter . . . has been planned as a means by which the war feeling at the North should be intensified.**

From the *New York Evening Day Book*, Apr 17, 1861: **[The event at Fort Sumter was] a cunningly devised scheme [contrived] to arouse, and , if possible, exasperate the northern people against the South.**

From the *Providence Daily Post*, Apr 13, 1861: **Look at the facts. For three weeks the administration newspapers have been assuring us that Fort Sumter would be abandoned, [but] Mr Lincoln saw an opportunity to inaugurate civil war without appearing in the character of an aggressor.**

The *Jersey City American Standard*, Apr 12, 1861: **There is a madness and ruthlessness [in Lincoln's behavior] which is astounding . . . this unarmed vessel . . . is a mere decoy to draw the first fire from the people of the South, which act by the pre-determination of the government is to be the pretext for letting loose the horrors of war.**

Lincoln, expert politician, lawyer, and debater, had a very convincing rebuttal to the sentiments expressed in newspapers, however. He simply sent in his goons to shut down newspapers he didn't like, and throw their editors in jail. Soon, as if by magic, all newspapers (that were left) were in full agreement with all of Lincoln's policies. So were all free citizens, since dissenters had all been rounded up and put behind bars indefinitely, without counsel, without habeas corpus, without contact with

family, and without any formal charges ever being filed against them. Citizens were guaranteed their First-Amendment rights, just as long as their opinions weren't offensive to Lincoln's fragile sensitivities.

All remnants of pro-secessionist dialogue also disappeared at this same time. Coincidence? What else could it be?

From Union Brigadier Gen John M Oliver⁵⁰⁷ to Union Major Gen William B Hazen, March 28, 1865:⁵⁰⁸

There are still a large number of mounted men from this corps . . . stripping the people of everything that can sustain life. I saw families of women, children, and negroes who had absolutely nothing to eat, and their houses and quarters stripped of everything -- cooking utensils, bedding, crockery, etc. Some rascals are beginning to set fire to the deserted houses of those who have fled to Goldsborough -- also burning fences.

Gen Hazen forwarded the message on to Union Gen Logan the following day, adding this comment:

This is the second time these outrages have been officially reported to me by officers of rank.

⁵⁰⁷ Third Brigade, Second Division, commanded by Gen Hazen.

⁵⁰⁸ UWK, p 129

Abraham Lincoln had been a member of the Whig Party, which favored high tariffs, a new BUS (Bank of the United States), federal funding for internal improvements, and a government staffed by elites.⁵⁰⁹ As a member of the Illinois legislature in the 1830s he helped appropriate \$12 million for subsidies to corporations that built roads, canals, and railroads. None of the projects were ever completed. All of that taxpayer money was wasted or stolen. Lincoln's "leadership" was disastrous for Illinois, but not for Lincoln. The heads of those corporations admired and appreciated Lincoln's "leadership", and Abe's legal career took off. So did his career as railroad *lobbyist*, long before the word existed.

In the 1860 election, Republicans were looking for someone who would accomplish four things for them: (1) Keep blacks (slave or free) out of the territories, to preserve those jobs for whites. (2) Get high protectionist tariffs passed in Congress, to benefit Northern manufacturers at the expense of farmers and consumers, especially in the South. (3) Use the Homestead Act to give away land in the largest political patronage program ever. (4) Subsidize railroad companies with taxpayer funds.

Lincoln's proven "leadership" in Illinois made him an attractive candidate for the job. Republicans were not looking for a poor, country, rail-splitting political outsider. Lincoln was not that man. They were looking for a slick lawyer / lobbyist / politician. That was Lincoln. Abe represented the largest railroads of the time, including the Illinois Central, the Chicago and Alton, the Ohio and Mississippi, the Rock Island, and the Chicago and Mississippi. By 1860 he had become the biggest railroad attorney in America.

Lincoln's connections and wealth allowed him to speculate in real estate. He bought several lots in Council Bluffs, Iowa, for example. He was certainly more familiar with Chicago and Springfield, Illinois, and they were growing more rapidly. So why

⁵⁰⁹ LUD, p107-114

Council Bluffs? He had been told by one of his railroad buddies that the federal government would most likely subsidize a transcontinental railroad, and that Council Bluffs would be an excellent starting point.

Once in the oval office, Lincoln called a special session of Congress in July, 1861. He wanted Congress to enact emergency legislation creating the tax-subsidized Union Pacific Railroad. What was the emergency? He wanted to make sure it was a done deal before Democrats had a chance to take control of Congress in the 1862 elections. The bill passed in 1862. It authorized Lincoln to appoint all the railroad's directors and commissioners, and to decide exactly where the railroad would start.

Lincoln selected Council Bluffs, Iowa as the eastern terminus. The guy who became the chief engineer, Grenville Dodge, just happened to be the buddy who had tipped Lincoln off about Council Bluffs. Those railroad executives and Republican Party principles who got Lincoln elected were very pleased with Abe's "leadership" once more. In fact, Lincoln had just made a lot of men very wealthy. And it is safe to assume that Abe made a nice profit on those Council Bluff lots.

But this was not the first time Lincoln had played that role. In 1857 a group of very powerful New England, New York, and Chicago businessmen had hired Lincoln as the Rock Island and Pacific Railroad's top lawyer. Those men became the infamous "robber barons" in the government-subsidized railroad industry.

In fact, all the movers and shakers in the Republican Party got a ride on the tax-subsidized railroad. So did many of Lincoln's generals, including Sherman, who was given the opportunity to buy land along the railroad at below-market prices.

In another astonishing coincidence, some people were somehow not invited to the party. Southerners were left to ponder why their tax dollars were being used to build railroads exclusively in the North. Although they probably didn't realize it at the time, they were witnessing the first phase of the largest political patronage program in

world history. It's what the Whigs had dreamed of, and it's what the Republican Party made a reality.

Abraham Lincoln played the starring role. But that whole secession thing was really throwing a monkey-wrench into Lincoln's big Whig plans. That was ruining the Republicans' Party. Abe could not allow that. And that is why Lincoln rushed to invade the South. It was all about money and power.

Did your school teachers or textbooks mention that? Do historians or politicians talk about that these days? Aren't you tired of being treated like a mushroom?

Special Field Order no 97, issued by Union Gen O O Howard⁵¹⁰, April 22, 1865.⁵¹¹

Crimes of the most heinous character are being committed north of Neuse River as far as Franklinton⁵¹² and beyond, by men purporting to be US soldiers . . . These marauders and stragglers . . . are a disgrace to our army and . . . country.

⁵¹⁰ Army of the Tennessee, in Raleigh, North Carolina.

⁵¹¹ UWK, p130

⁵¹² 23 miles north-northeast of Raleigh.

From Union Gen H Judson Kilpatrick, in Greensborough, North Carolina, to Union Gen Schofield, in Raleigh, May 9, 1865:⁵¹³

A soldier of my command killed an old man today, a citizen, because he would not give up his money.

Why did the Southern states secede? There were many reasons.⁵¹⁴ Some were worried that Northern abolitionists, although a very small group, were vocal enough to spark a slave rebellion throughout the South. The John Brown and Nat Turner episodes were still fresh in Southern minds. It wasn't just the incidents themselves, but Yankee reaction to them that had Southerners concerned. But that alone was not enough to cause a state to secede.

The basic causes were economic and political. It was the culmination of the old constitutional struggle between state sovereignty and an all-powerful centralized federal government. It was Hamilton vs Jefferson. It was Whigs vs Andrew Jackson. It was mercantilism, crony capitalism, protectionist tariffs vs free enterprise without government interference.

The South widely believed that the federal government had been violating constitutional principles for decades, especially in their fiscal and trade policies. Those policies had been developed to benefit the Northern states tremendously, to the South's great disadvantage. With the election of Lincoln, who had won without the electoral vote of a single Southern state, those economic disadvantages promised to become much worse.

⁵¹³ UWK, p130

⁵¹⁴ RLD, p122-129

The vast majority of federal revenue derived from tariffs. The South had a very small manufacturing base. Therefore, it had to rely heavily on imports for its supply of manufactured goods. It was those imported goods on which tariffs were collected, significantly increasing costs to Southern consumers. The higher the tariff rates, the higher the Southern cost of living.

The same tariff laws had a minimal impact on the Northern states, however. For one thing, the North had a very vigorous manufacturing base, which meant Yankees didn't need to rely heavily on imported goods. Therefore, they didn't have to pay those tariffs like Southerners did. For another thing, they produced and sold many of the goods that were sold in Southern ports. So, they made a nice profit on the products, plus they got to keep the tariff revenues which Southerners had to pay. It was a very cushy deal for Yankees, and they just couldn't resist hiking those tariff rates to the max, so they could get even richer. It certainly didn't bother them that their wealth came at the expense of their Southern brothers. (Or ugly redhaired distant cousins.)

The North had developed other ways of exploiting the South, too. They passed laws barring foreign shippers (Europeans, mostly) from selling at lower prices than Americans. Other laws prohibited the sale of foreign-made ships in the US, giving Yankees a monopoly in shipbuilding. That meant that the prices Southerners had to pay for imported products was hiked even higher. Special taxes were imposed on citizens of Southern coastal areas to pay for lighthouses and harbors. That helped New England fishermen much more than it did the South. Furthermore, virtually every craft and trade in the North benefitted from the protection of tariffs and import quotas. The South picked up most of the tab.

As if the economic situation wasn't already bad enough in the South, the proposed Morrill Tariff was about to hike some tariff rates by as much as 250%. For some Southern states, that was the straw that broke the camel's back. The South had argued that the current tariff policy was unconstitutional, because the constitution requires that all taxes be uniform throughout the nation. The North countered that

the same tariff rates applied to every US citizen, so that was not a violation of the Constitution, even if the uniform rates did happen to impact one region much more negatively. The South knew they were being pillaged, plundered, and exploited by the North, and there was nothing they could do about it, especially with the election of a president who owed full allegiance to the North, with no regard for Southern interests.

Well, there was one thing they could do about it. And they did it. Starting with South Carolina in Dec 1860. Several other Southern states joined them in Dec and into Jan 1861. Several other states joined them after Lincoln invaded the South. Several more states would have joined them if Lincoln had not used military force to prevent that from happening.

Secession changed everything. The South prohibited protectionist tariffs in their constitution, and they became a free trade zone. Suddenly, Yankees no longer had their boot on the throat of the South. Suddenly, Yankee exploitation of the South had come to an end, and so had most of the North's tariff revenue. Not only would that beautiful flow of tariff money from the South end, but so would all that international trade at their Northern ports. International shippers would be crazy to dock at New York and pay those high tariffs when they could go to New Orleans and save a lot of money.

Suddenly, Yankees woke up to the economic reality of secession. They began to read horror stories in their Northern newspapers. Suddenly, they were no longer willing to let the South go peacefully. Suddenly, secession was no longer a constitutional or natural right. It had just become the most vile and evil thing any state could do, and it had to be stopped at any cost. *Preserve the Union* fever swept through the North. Which really meant, preserve that flow of tariff revenue from the South. That's what Yankees cared about most passionately. They were ready to fight for that cause. In fact, they were so riled up now, especially after the Ft Sumter charade, that they were frothing at the mouth to teach those rebels some Yankee manners.

That's why the South seceded. And that's why Lincoln slaughtered 650,000 Americans. He had no idea it would be that bloody or take so long. As the death toll mounted, he realized he had to come up with some moral cover for his unconstitutional, illegal, immoral, unnecessary war. Freeing the slaves. He didn't really want to free the slaves, he just wanted the world to think that's what he was fighting for.

Now you know the truth. The war wasn't about slavery. It was about money. And political power. It was about concentration of power in Washington, DC, and destruction of states' rights. It was about big government, corporate subsidies, and national control of the money supply. Lincoln got everything he wanted. But before he had a chance to enjoy it, he got what he deserved.

From Union Major Gen Quincy A Gillmore⁵¹⁵ to Union Brigadier Gen John F Hatch⁵¹⁶, March 1, 1865:⁵¹⁷

I hear from all sides very discouraging accounts of the state of affairs in Charleston; that no restraint is put upon the [Union] soldiers; that they pilfer and rob houses at pleasure, that large quantities of valuable furniture, pictures, statuary, mirrors, etc, have mysteriously disappeared . . .

⁵¹⁵ Department of the South, Hilton Head, South Carolina.

⁵¹⁶ Northern District, Department of the South, Charleston.

⁵¹⁷ UWK, p127

From Union Gen O O Howard⁵¹⁸ to Union Gen J A Logan, March 7, 1865:⁵¹⁹

[Union] General Blair reports that every house on his line of march today was pillaged, trunks broken open, jewelry, silver, etc, taken.

From Union Gen J D Morgan to Union Gen Jefferson C Davis⁵²⁰:

I have some men in my command -- and I am sorry to say, if not assisted, at least encouraged, by a few officers . . . -- who have mistaken the name and meaning of the term foragers, and have become under that name highwaymen, with all their cruelty and ferocity . . . ; their victims are usually old men, women, and children, and negroes, whom they rob and maltreat without mercy, firing [burning] dwellings and outhouses⁵²¹ . . . and . . . the universal firing of fences. These men are a disgrace to the name of soldier and the country.

So much for the CivilGate myth that Yankees were compassionate liberators of Southern slaves. Who was there to liberate them from their liberators?

Yes indeed, those men were a disgrace to the country. But then, why wouldn't they be? So was their commander in chief. So was Lincoln's cabinet. So were most of the North's military leaders. They were simply a reflection of basic Yankee culture and character. That culture and character thrives even today, especially in the northeastern establishment elite who control our country.

⁵¹⁸ At Brightsville, South Carolina.

⁵¹⁹ UWK, p128

⁵²⁰ Fourteenth Corps. Not related to Confederate President Jefferson Finis Davis.

⁵²¹ The term "outhouse" may be used for any small building away from a main building, used for a variety of purposes, but mainly for activities not wanted in the main house. For example outhouses may be used for storage, animals, and cooking.

It was inevitable that the South would secede from the Union controlled by such evil men. Who can blame them today, knowing what we know now about the truth of the Civil War?

Was Abraham Lincoln really a dictator?⁵²² Isn't that a gross exaggeration? Isn't that just hyperbole spewing from Southerners who are still bitter about losing the war?

What's amazing is that many Lincoln fans don't deny that Lincoln was a dictator. They just happen to think that was a good thing. Hamilton's political descendants desperately wanted an all-powerful federal government, and an end to all that states' rights nonsense. They were all for ditching that annoying Constitution, because it kept getting in their way. So, yes, Lincoln was a dictator. So what? What are going to do about it? The ends justify the means. Might makes right. Lincoln got 'r done, and that's all that matters.

Today, those people are known as progressives, liberals, or Democrats. Their power base is sometimes referred to as the northeastern establishment elite. They control the media, the education system, and most of the political power in Washington, DC. They are the political descendants of Alexander Hamilton, Henry Clay, Abraham Lincoln, Woodrow Wilson, Franklin Roosevelt, Lyndon Johnson, and they now have Barack Obama as their talking head.

Let's review some of Lincoln's presidential actions, and see if they sound like he was upholding and defending the Constitution, or if he was a one-man government who made up his own rules and placed himself so far above the law that he **was** the law. He:

⁵²² RLD, p130-170

- ◆ Invaded the South with no Constitutional authority and without consulting Congress.
- ◆ Declared martial law.
- ◆ Blockaded Southern ports.
- ◆ Suspended habeas corpus, which was a power granted to Congress, not to the executive.
- ◆ Arrested and imprisoned indefinitely thousands of Northern citizens, with no trial, no formal charges, no access to council, and no contact with family.
- ◆ Censored all telegraph communication.
- ◆ Nationalized the railroads.
- ◆ Created the state of West Virginia without the consent of the citizens of Virginia.
- ◆ Intimidated Northern Democrat voters, interfering with the free election process.
- ◆ Deported a member of Congress, Clement L Vallandigham of Ohio, for disagreeing with Republican (Lincoln) policies.
- ◆ Confiscated private property.
- ◆ Confiscated firearms, in violation of the Second Amendment.

No one believed his actions were constitutional. But few dared say so after they saw that anyone could be imprisoned just based on rumors of dissent. Lincoln's Secretary of State, William Seward, established a secret police force that arrested thousands of citizens on suspicion of disloyalty, which meant whatever the secret police wanted it to mean, but was generally interpreted as any disagreement with Lincoln. Seward bragged to the British Ambassador⁵²³ that all he had to do was ring the bell on his desk, and he could have anyone arrested in any state. In his power-drunk euphoria, he boasted that he had more power over the American people than the Queen of England had over Brits.

⁵²³ Lord Lyons.

People were arrested for such things as being a noisy secessionist, selling Confederate trinkets, cheering for Jefferson Davis, discouraging voluntary enlistments in the Union army, wishing for peace instead of war, or failing to say a prayer for Lincoln in church services (a federal requirement). Seward's gestapo was particularly harsh with New Yorkers, including Wall Street bankers, priests, merchants, and policemen. Most New Yorkers weren't pleased with Lincoln's war, because they had done a lot of business with Southerners. When the mayor⁵²⁴ suggested the city of New York secede from the Union and from the state in order to become a free-trade zone (like the Confederacy), he barely escaped arrest and imprisonment.

Ft Lafayette in New York Harbor became known as the American Bastille, because it held so many political prisoners. The cells were crowded. Iron beds had mattresses of straw. Breakfast consisted of "some discolored beverage" called coffee, a piece of raw or half-cooked fat pork, and coarse bread. Water often contained tadpoles up to one-half inch long. The guards were "insolent". Most of Maryland's legislators and many of her prominent businessmen called Ft Lafayette home for the rest of the war. There were an estimated 13,000 political prisoners in military prisons in the North.

Maryland's House of Delegates held a special election in May 1861 to fill ten vacancies. They elected upstanding citizens, including leading industrialists, doctors, judges, and Baltimore attorneys. A few escaped, but most were arrested by the gestapo and sent to military prisons. Their crime, although they were never charged with one, was sympathy with secessionists. They never expressed any such sympathies, but mere suspicion was enough to land them behind bars. There they were joined by such fellow Marylanders as the mayor of Baltimore, newspaper editors and publishers, several state legislators, and a member of US Congress.

⁵²⁴ Fernando Wood.

Overall, there were 21 men unjustly imprisoned from Maryland. Perhaps that is a surprisingly low number, given the fact that the entire town of Frederick was sealed off by the military, acting on Lincoln's direct orders. The gestapo searched house by house for legislators who were suspected of being less than enthusiastically loyal to Lincoln.

The normal election process scheduled for Nov 1861 was controlled by the gestapo. Any votes for any candidate that opposed (or was believed to oppose) Lincoln's war were disallowed by election Judges, again, under Lincoln's orders. The people who cast those disallowed ballots were cordially invited to become Lincoln's guests until after the election, compliments of the Gestapo Hilton. It was an offer they couldn't refuse. They were joined by at least one of the offending candidates.

The gestapo placed federal posters at polling booths, instructing everyone to rat out their peace-activist neighbors. Ballots were made of different colored paper, making it easy to spot Peace Party voters. They were arrested for "polluting the ballot box". Some good Yankee citizens were only too eager to finger their neighbors, hoping to earn brownie points from the gestapo.

Similar gestapo tactics were employed in other Northern states as well. Republican candidates always managed to squeak out a near-unanimous cliffhanger of a vote every time. The sight of those gestapo bayonets, and the threat of immediate incarceration were not material factors. Really. The gestapo was simply there to prevent unsightly ballot-box pollution. Nobody wanted that.

Such oppression was meant to send a clear message to all Yankees. Give Lincoln your full support and allegiance, or give up your freedom. Yet, incredibly, some Yankees just refused to be intimidated. The Maryland legislature's House Committee on Federal Relations in Nov 1861 issued a courageous (meaning *up yours, Lincoln*) proclamation, saying:

The war now waged by the government of the United States upon the people of the Confederate States is unconstitutional in its origin, purposes, and conduct; repugnant to civilization and sound policy; subversive of the free principles upon which the Federal Union was founded, and certain to result in the hopeless and bloody overthrow of our existing institutions.

It went on to defend the South's right to the great American principle of self-government, voice its desire to avoid wanton bloodshed, and support the principle of **voluntary** Union. It proclaimed that **the State of Maryland earnestly and anxiously desires the restoration of peace**. It declared Maryland's status as a loyal member of the Union, but it then implored Lincoln to consider immediate recognition of the independence of the Confederate States.

Lincoln was so moved by the eloquence of the proclamation, and so impressed with the courage of Maryland's legislative leaders, that he vowed to begin taking measures to restore peace and release Maryland's political prisoners.

Just kidding.

The proclamation was totally ignored by Lincoln. He continued to use Maryland as his staging area for his invasion of the South.

Dictator, or president? You make the call.

From Union Gen William Jackson Palmer, New Bern, to the commanding officer of Confederate forces in Little Washington⁵²⁵, June 2, 1864:⁵²⁶

Sir: I have been informed that many persons, principally women and children in and about Little Washington, are in a suffering and destitute condition, owing principally to the burning of their houses and property in the recent . . . conflagration. If these people are permitted to come here they will be provided for, and I send a steamer for the purpose of bringing all who desire to come.

Was that an act of treason or compassion? It was an astonishing act of compassion by a courageous Union general. Northern military prisons were full of civilians who were guilty of much less (or nothing). But Palmer was no traitor. He vigorously pursued Confederate forces and distinguished himself in battle. He was awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor in 1894.

Late in the 18th century a plan was hatched for dealing, in part, with slavery. It seemed simple enough.⁵²⁷ Just return American blacks to Africa. No blacks, no slavery, no problem. Its advocates claimed to simply be humanitarians, trying to deal with the evils and injustices of slavery. But most folks suspected there was a bit more to it than that, and they were right. Many of those colonists were racists. So, the idea didn't quite catch on at first.

But in 1815, Paul Cuffe, a black ship-owner, transported 35 black Americans to Africa. Then in 1816, Robert Finley, a New Jersey Presbyterian minister, organized a group that became the American Colonization Society (ACS). With those two

⁵²⁵ Little Washington is a town in Virginia, 70 miles west of Washington, DC.

⁵²⁶ UWK, p79

⁵²⁷ LUD, p48-51

developments, the idea began to attract a significant number of advocates. One of them was Henry Clay of Kentucky, one of ACS's co-founders, who would later become a president of the society.

Clay would also become Abraham Lincoln's role model. In fact, Lincoln idolized Clay, and Abe used this Clay quote in a 7/6/1852 eulogy of the Great Compromiser:

There is a moral fitness in the idea of returning to Africa her children . . . a signal blessing to that most unfortunate region.

Americans have been brainwashed into believing that Lincoln was the Great Emancipator. Reality is quite different. He wasn't interested in emancipating blacks from slavery. He was interested in emancipating Yankees from blacks. While most Americans were content with dreaming of a white Christmas, the visionary Great Emancipator was dreaming of a white country.

In 1854, Lincoln first proposed deporting blacks to Liberia. That West African country was created by ACS in 1816 explicitly for the colonization of black Americans. Liberia was Lincoln's first choice, but he also recommended other places, like Haiti and Central America. And it wasn't something Lincoln mentioned casually in passing – he was committed to the concept. He was appointed as one of the (eleven) managers of the Illinois Colonization Society.

Nor did his passion for the project wane during his presidency. In 1862 he invited a group of free black men to the White House. At that meeting, Lincoln cordially invited those men to leave America. He explained to them that Congress had (at his request) appropriated money for the express purpose of re-colonizing American blacks. And he pointed out that they would be doing America a great service as they *led by example*. But it was also for their own good.

You and we are different races. We have between us a broader difference than exists between almost any other two races. . . . This physical difference is a great

disadvantage to us both [and] affords a reason at least why we should be separated. . . . It is better for us both, therefore, to be separate.

The colony of Liberia has been in existence a long time. In a certain sense it is a success. The old president of Liberia, Roberts, has just been with me – the first time I ever saw him. He says they have within the bounds of that colony between 300,000 and 400,000 people. . . . They are not all American [black] colonists, or their descendants. Something less than 12,000 have been sent hither from this country. Many of the original settlers have died, yet like people elsewhere, their offspring outnumber those deceased.

In other words, Lincoln was telling the group of black men there in the Oval Office with him that if they moved to Liberia, they would most likely not survive long. But, if they got busy and had lots of kids there, chances were they would have plenty of offspring who would survive longer.

It was an offer the group of black men could not refuse. At least not to Lincoln's face. After all, people who didn't enthusiastically agree with Lincoln had a nasty habit of getting dead. Or jailed indefinitely without counsel or habeas corpus. But it was also an offer they could not accept. The group leader, E M Thomas promised the president a response, but there is no record of a response. They were apparently much smarter than Lincoln gave them credit for.

Lincoln also allocated federal funds to relocate American blacks to Haiti, but the man in charge of that project stole the money. Lincoln allocated federal funds for a similar project in Panama. Large coal deposits had been discovered there. Lincoln figured he could get rid of American blacks, manipulate them into mining that Panamanian coal, and then use that coal as fuel for the planned transcontinental railroad. Killing 3 birds with one stone! But when Lincoln had pitched that idea to the group of black men he met with in the Oval Office, they weren't terribly enthused about that option, either. Maybe it was, in part, because they knew Panama offered certain death by malaria.

So, we see that, long before Dr Martin Luther King Jr, Abraham Lincoln had a dream. He never stopped dreaming of an all-white America. Why? Lincoln explains:

There is a natural disgust in the minds of nearly all white people, to the idea of an indiscriminate amalgamation of the white and black races

Yankees agreed. There was a natural disgust in the minds of nearly all white Yankees to the idea of free blacks competing for *white jobs* in Northern states and in the territories. (All jobs were white jobs in Yankeedom. All jobs, that is, except slavery.) That's why virtually all Northern states passed laws barring new black settlers. That's why Yankees were so opposed to the prospect of allowing Southerners to take their existing slaves with them into the territories. While Yankees weren't necessarily crazy about the idea of slavery, they were perfectly willing to live with it as long as slaves, and free blacks, stayed in the South, where they belonged (as long as they were in America).

When we think of abolitionists, we assume they all wanted equal rights and racial equality for freed slaves. But not all abolitionists had the best interest of slaves at heart. Many of them were involved in colonization efforts and schemes. Yes, they opposed slavery in the US, but they were perfectly willing to accomplish abolition by deporting blacks to another country, no matter what the conditions would be like there. Many others simply used the threat of abolition as a political weapon to force the South to go along with Northern policies. When deporting blacks had not proved physically possible, and nationwide abolition had not proved politically possible, keeping slavery in the South was the next best option for them.

But slavery was not Lincoln's top priority as president. He had a much more urgent crisis to deal with. When the Southern states seceded, that stopped the flow of tariff revenue from the South to the North. Yankees had been addicted to that generous money source for a long time, and they were not about to go cold turkey. They were already going through withdrawal, so they had to act quickly. That meant invading

the South to force them to keep collecting Morrill Tariff revenues and sending the money North for Yankees to spend on themselves, as they had been doing for decades.

But, of course, they had to come up with some sort of noble-sounding reason for ignoring the Constitution, the Declaration of Independence, Congress, the Supreme Court, and civil law. They decided to label it *preserving the Union*.

That worked for a while. But as the war dragged on and the death rate soared, even Yankees knew their *preserve the Union* war cry failed to pass the smell test. So, Lincoln issued the Emancipation Proclamation (EP) to rebrand his unconstitutional, illegal, immoral, and unnecessary war. Suddenly, he wanted people to start pretending the war was about slavery. Yankees hated that idea at first, because they knew the war had never been about slavery, and they had absolutely no interest in seeing a bunch of freed slaves flocking into the North.

Gradually, however, they realized that EP didn't really free any slaves, so they went along with it. It succeeded in preventing England from joining the Southern cause. After all, Brits didn't want to be seen by the international community as the only country fighting on the side of slavery.

After Jan 1, 1863, Lincoln had to keep pretending that the war was about slavery, so he said in his Second Inaugural Address that the war had really been about slavery all along. But the only way he could sell that whopper was to make people forget about what he had said in his First Inaugural Address, which directly contradicted his Second Inaugural Address. He had to make them forget about his colonization schemes, and the American Colonization Society. He couldn't afford to let people remember all his racist statements and policies in Illinois and in Washington, DC.

That got a lot easier to do after he was assassinated, with all the sympathy that flows to a fallen leader, no matter what evil things he had done or said. It got even easier when Yankees wrote the history books and controlled Southern schools.

It took a lot of work, but it was extremely successful. Yankees completely rewrote the history of the Civil War, gave Abraham Lincoln a thorough makeover, and brainwashed generations of Americans with a fairy-tale version of events, heroic fictional Yankee characters, and demonized Southern villains.

Problem is, there was just too much history that Yankees could not erase. They couldn't fool all the people all the time. More books are being written, exposing the ugly truth of Abraham Lincoln and his bloody Civil War. More people are reading the truth, and talking about it. After 150 years of Yankee propaganda, the true story is beginning to emerge. Ignorance is no longer an excuse.

I have a dream, too. I dream of a time when Americans are willing to face the truth about Abraham Lincoln and confront the truth of the Civil War.

General Order no 43, issued by Union Major Gen William B Franklin⁵²⁸, in Alexandria, April 27, 1864:⁵²⁹

The advance of the army in its march from Grand Ecore⁵³⁰ to this place . . . [has] been accompanied by indiscriminate marauding and incendiaryism, disgraceful to the army of a civilized nation.

⁵²⁸ Commanding officer of Nineteenth Corps and Union forces in West Louisiana, issued during the retreat in the Red River campaign of Gen N P Banks, Department of the Gulf.

⁵²⁹ UWK, p79

⁵³⁰ 60 miles northwest of Alexandria.

Abraham Lincoln had a dream. He believed that America was not big enough for blacks and whites to coexist peacefully. Like Dr Martin Luther King Jr, Lincoln had a dream for the future of blacks. But Lincoln's *dream* would have been more like a nightmare to MLK Jr. Lincoln promoted the idea of colonization -- resettling blacks in foreign countries.⁵³¹ Originally, the colonization concept revolved around returning blacks (forcefully, if necessary) to Africa. But several other countries and islands were suggested over the years.

According to the "Great Emancipator":

Racial separation must be effected by colonization of the country's blacks to foreign land. The enterprise is a difficult one, but where there is a will there is a way . . . Let us be brought to believe it is morally right and, at the same time, favorable to, or, at least, not against, our interests, to transfer the African to his native clime, and we shall find a way to do it, however great the task may be.

In 1862, Lincoln made this remark to a group of free blacks, trying to convince them to voluntarily relocate to Central America. For the sake of your race, you should sacrifice something of your present comfort for the purpose of being as grand in that respect as the white people.

He pointed out that the climate in Central America was similar to that of Africa, so they should feel right at home in their new digs. And he expressed the opinion that free blacks who insisted on remaining permanently in the US were just being downright selfish.

Historians have always been very familiar with Lincoln's views about colonization, but they don't bother to mention it in schoolbooks, just as they don't bother mentioning many other facts about Lincoln and the Civil War that do not conform to the well-established Civil War mythology and propaganda (CivilGate). They often

⁵³¹ Based on an article by Matthew Barakat, Associated Press, Mar 4, 2011, McLean, VA.

attempt to give Lincoln a pass for his racism, of which colonization is only a part, by claiming that he abandoned the colonization idea after he issued the Emancipation Proclamation (EP).

Even if that were true, it hardly excused Lincoln's well-documented antebellum racism. Even if he did eventually abandon his colonization quest, it wasn't because he had abandoned his racist attitudes and beliefs. It was simply for political reasons (which was also the sole motivation behind EP itself). Lincoln, most likely, had finally faced the fact that colonization was impractical, and almost certainly impossible at that point. Colonization efforts had become bogged down in scandal and controversy, and they were criticized by many abolitionists. They had also been stymied by the insurmountable costs and logistical challenges.

But there was an even more compelling reason for Lincoln to abandon all overt colonization efforts after EP. Although EP did not free a single slave, and was not even designed to free any slaves, it marked the point at which the Civil War was rebranded. Prior to EP, the war had been sold to Yankees as a noble quest to preserve the Union. It had nothing to do with slavery directly. When EP was first issued, Yankees were very upset, because they had never bought into the war to free slaves, and they never would have agreed to such a thing.

Why? Because they were racists, just like Lincoln was. They didn't like blacks, they didn't want them living in their neighborhoods, going to their schools, and competing for jobs. Prior to the war, they didn't have to worry much about all that, because the South was conveniently keeping the blacks, most of them, in the South, which is just where they belonged, according to Yankees. They didn't particularly like the idea of slavery, but they were quite comfortable with the current arrangement, primarily because they didn't have to compete with blacks for Yankee jobs.

Yankees strongly objected to slaves going into the territories or new states, again because of their racist attitudes. Not because they felt sorry for slaves, but because Yankees believed that the territories and new states should be for whites only.

When Lincoln issued EP, that changed the whole game plan, and Yankees did not like it one bit. They gradually came to accept and embrace EP only as they became aware that it was their only hope of winning the war. But they certainly did not like the idea of free blacks flooding into Yankee states. So, they made sure they had state laws (black codes) which prevented that from happening.

Winning the war was the only reason for EP being issued, and it was a compelling one. Lincoln needed to keep England from entering the war to help the South, he wanted Southern slaves to revolt against their masters, and he needed a new noble-sounding slogan to rally public support. By that time, the war had already dragged on much longer than the North had expected, and the loss of life had been staggering. The idea of *preserving the Union* was no longer sufficient justification for the slaughter. *Freeing the slaves* sounded much more noble, and that became the new excuse for Lincoln's illegal and unnecessary war.

With that in mind, Lincoln couldn't very well keep trying to sell the country on the idea of colonization. That would have been totally inconsistent with his phony new noble quest to free the slaves. But, that didn't necessarily mean he abandoned his colonization dream. He just pursued colonization **covertly** from then on.

Recently discovered historical evidence⁵³² indicates that Lincoln established a secret diplomatic mission to Britain in an effort to establish a colony in British Honduras.⁵³³ In 1863 Lincoln issued an executive order giving a British agent authorization to recruit American black volunteers for a Belize colony. Even after Lincoln's colonization commissioner⁵³⁴ had been fired by Congress, Lincoln still sought

⁵³² According to a new book by a researcher at George Mason University in Fairfax. *Colonization After Emancipation* is based in part on newly uncovered documents that authors Philip Magness and Sebastian Page found at the British National Archives outside London and in the U.S. National Archives.

⁵³³ Now known as Belize.

⁵³⁴ James Mitchell.

counsel from him⁵³⁵.

We have long honored Lincoln because we have not known him. Now you do. Honoring Lincoln dishonors MLK Jr. Their dreams were diametrically opposed, and their character was nothing alike. How much better this country would be if blacks had shipped Lincoln off to Africa.

From Union Colonel Christopher Carson⁵³⁶ to Union Brigadier Gen Clinton B Fisk, June 11, 1864:⁵³⁷

There is a company of [Union] militia commanded by one Captain Fish⁵³⁸. I will say with all candor they are the worst set of men I have ever seen . . . Most of them are drunkards, gamblers, whore-house pimps, thieves, murderers, house-burners, and Captain Fish is as mean a man as I ever knew.

Even before being sworn in, Lincoln was busy with executive duties. One of the first things he did was meet with a Senator from New York. He instructed William Seward to get a couple of pieces of legislation through the Senate right away. One was a Constitutional amendment preventing the federal government from ever abolishing slavery. The other was a law nullifying several New England state laws which defied the Fugitive Slave Act.⁵³⁹

⁵³⁵ As late as 1864.

⁵³⁶ Known as Kit Carson, First New Mexico Cavalry.

⁵³⁷ UWK, p80

⁵³⁸ Captain Irvin Fish, Enrolled Missouri Militia (Union), commanding a company of two officers and 50 enlisted men, stationed in Buchanan County, District of North Missouri.

⁵³⁹ LFD

Seward came through with the Constitutional amendment. The Corwin amendment was passed in both houses of Congress, ratified by three states, and signed by Buchanan just before leaving the White House. (His signature had no legal significance, but Buchanan wanted to show that he supported the measure).

Lincoln mentioned it (though not by name) in his First Inaugural Address, saying that if that's what the people wanted, that was okay with him. It was as though Lincoln was merely an observer, not the instigator of the scheme. (Just one of countless bits of dishonesty in that address, and throughout Lincoln's political career). The Corwin amendment would have prohibited even a future Constitutional Amendment from abolishing slavery. It was on track to become the Thirteenth Amendment, instead of the one we have today.

In February, 1865, Union and Confederate negotiators met at Hampton Roads, Virginia, to discuss a possible compromise that would have ended the war. Lincoln assured Confederate Vice-President Alexander Stephens that the Emancipation Proclamation had been strictly a war measure, and that it would have no authority after the war was over. He also pointed out that the 13th Amendment (the one abolishing slavery, not the Corwin amendment) which was still being considered by Congress, could easily be defeated (by only 10 states). In other words, Lincoln was once again emphasizing to the South that they could keep their slaves, if they would just rejoin the Union.

That disproves the CivilGate myth that the war was about abolishing slavery. It also disproves the myth that Lincoln really wanted to issue the Emancipation Proclamation right at the beginning of his administration, but he didn't feel he had the political support at that time, so he decided to wait until he had a significant military victory. Just as Lincoln said in his First Inaugural Address, the only sense in which the war was about slavery was that he did not want Southerners to be allowed to take their slaves into the territories.

Why? Not because he cared about the slaves. It was because he wanted to keep the territories (and Northern states) an all-white section of the country. Jobs there were intended for whites, not blacks, as far as Yankees were concerned. If that was the key issue at the beginning of his administration, Lincoln had no reason to invade the South. Several states had already seceded, and others soon followed. So, the Confederate states had already conceded the point. They were no longer actively trying to take their slaves into the territories, and, in fact, were no longer even interested in doing so. The South just wanted to be left alone. So Lincoln had already won, and there was no reason to invade the South or fire a single shot. All he had to do was declare victory.

Clearly, slavery was not the reason Lincoln started the Civil War. Neither was it a matter of some Constitutional obligation to *preserve the Union*. Lincoln knew full well that states had a Constitutional right to secede (and an even greater natural right to secede from the Union based on the principles set forth in the Declaration of Independence). He and any clear-thinking American also knew that he could not preserve the Union by force, any more than a man can preserve his marriage by chaining his wife to the bedpost or threatening her with a gun.

Lincoln was not a defender of freedom. He assumed the role of a dictator. In that capacity he:

- ◆ Illegally suspended habeas corpus. Congress can do that, but Lincoln had no authority to do so. (Congress did legally suspend habeas corpus, but not until much later).
- ◆ Imprisoned 15,000 – 30,000 Northern political opponents. These civilians were guilty of no crime other than opposing Lincoln’s policies and politics. They were, ironically, perhaps the only Northerners who could actually exercise their freedom-of-speech rights, simply because they had nothing else to lose after being locked up. Among these political prisoners were prominent, well-

respected citizens and elected officials. Lincoln even issued an arrest warrant for Supreme Court Chief Justice Roger Taney.

- ◆ Shut down more than 300 newspapers. Many of the editors and owners were jailed. Some of the printing presses were destroyed. Just because they didn't agree with Lincoln.
- ◆ Started a war without Constitutional authority or Congressional approval.
- ◆ Confiscated firearms in border states, in violation of the Second Amendment.
- ◆ Micromanaged a campaign of cultural genocide against Southern civilians throughout the Civil War.
- ◆ Censored all telegraph communication.
- ◆ Confiscated private property of Northern civilians who were critical of Lincoln's policies.
- ◆ Rigged Northern elections and interfered with state governments. For example, West Virginia's secession from Virginia was not handled legally.

Lincoln opposed economic freedom. He supported protectionism, corporate welfare, inflation, and a central bank. His economic policies were closely aligned with those of Alexander Hamilton, and his political philosophy was the opposite of Thomas Jefferson's. Lincoln favored big government.

He wanted blacks to return to Africa or move to some other country or island. He did not want blacks to remain on American soil. In Illinois, he opposed blacks' right to vote or testify in court. In Washington, DC, he opposed abolishing the slave trade. In Congress and in the White House he supported the Fugitive Slave Act.

Most Yankees hated the Fugitive Slave Act with a passion. What they resented most was that they could be legally compelled to help enforce it, no matter how they felt about it or about slavery. Why, then, would Lincoln support the law, and why did he instruct Seward to quash state laws that defied it? Because he wanted to keep blacks in the South, where they belonged, and the Fugitive Slave Act helped accomplish that goal. He did not want blacks in the Northern states or the territories, which might become new states. Yankees felt the same way, but they drew the line at being forced to participate in law enforcement. Lincoln didn't have a problem with that, especially since it didn't directly affect him. No wonder he had some political opposition in the North. And no wonder he had a reputation as a two-faced liar.

Here's another notable example of Lincoln's credibility problems. In his Gettysburg Address, Lincoln used this quote from the Declaration of Independence: **All men are created equal**. But the Gettysburg Address was poetry, not policy. It was just one of countless demonstrations of this indisputable fact: what Lincoln said and what he did rarely converged. He most certainly did not consider blacks equal to whites, as proven by both his words and his actions. Like his support for the Fugitive Slave Act and the Corwin Amendment.

Many people today, even historians who know or should know the facts, consider Lincoln a national hero and one of our greatest American presidents. Does the Lincoln just described sound like a friend of freedom? When the lies, distortion, and propaganda are stripped away, Lincoln was just another bloody, ruthless tyrant of which world history is full. He was responsible for 650,000 American deaths, many thousands of which were innocent, defenseless women, children, old men, and blacks. The Civil War was unconstitutional, illegal, immoral, and unnecessary.

Abraham Lincoln destroyed the Constitution and the country. He was American's worst nightmare. Having the Lincoln Memorial in Washington, DC, is worse than having an Osama bin Laden memorial in New York City or a Hitler memorial in Jerusalem.