

uncivil War Crimes

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.

Several examples of Yankee war crimes are included on the following posts. But first I will explain exactly what I mean by *war crime*.

Engagement of Rules: What is a *War Crime*?

The book *The Uncivil War: Union Army and Navy Excesses in the Official Records*, by Thomas Bland Keys, documents a few of the countless examples of Union military war crimes and violations of both international and Union standards of acceptable war conduct. These are official records of Union military officers, so they are considered entirely reliable. The men recording these events had no idea they would be read by anyone other than Union military personnel and high-ranking Republican elected officials, so they had no reason to lie. In fact they had every reason to conceal these truths if they had any suspicion that people like me or you would someday be gazing at their correspondence in disgust and disbelief.

On almost every page there are General Orders and Circulars written by anguished Union officers lamenting the level of depravity displayed by Union soldiers and officers, who either participated in events, or looked the other way, or found themselves unable to control the criminal conduct of the men under their command. It's difficult for me to imagine officers not being able to control their men, because during my brief military career, even low-ranking officers had all the authority they needed to make sure every trooper toed the line, with very punitive disincentives at their disposal, and a predisposition toward fully utilizing them.

Yet time after time, Union commanders reminded their troops and junior officers of the importance of following the Union's own military standard of conduct. The Northern military juggernaut could demolish and annihilate the entire Southern region of the nation, but they were simply helpless to keep their own men in line. That is apparently what we are to conclude from this book. But I draw an entirely different conclusion.

Although some Union officers were sincere in their efforts to control behavior, they were tacitly overruled by their superiors -- top-ranking generals, Abraham Lincoln, and his

cabinet. Oh, and by Northern newspapers and the Yankees who read them. They were all well aware of widespread Union atrocities, and that's exactly what they wanted. They didn't want to just win the war. They wanted revenge. They wanted to crush the South, and humiliate them. They wanted cultural genocide. Their goal was to cleanse the South of its culture, so Yankees could replace it with their own. It was a campaign of ethnic cleansing. After the Civil War, Yankees turned their wrath on Indians, and destroyed their cultures, also. They were driven by supreme Yankee arrogance and unrestrained aggression.

In order to understand how far Union troops strayed from established military standards of conduct, we need to take a look at exactly what those standards were. We learn that from *The Real Lincoln: A New Look at Abraham Lincoln, His Agenda, and an Unnecessary War*, by Thomas J DiLorenzo.

An international convention met in Geneva, Switzerland in 1863 to establish a written record of generally accepted rules of warfare, which had been in effect for over a century. But the Civil War had already been raging for two years by then. Furthermore, after 1863, the Union army abandoned all pretenses of following any accepted military rules of conduct, and they made up their own rules, just as Lincoln had been doing on the political front from the very beginning of his administration. So, the Geneva Convention had little or no impact on the Civil War.

Prior to the convention, nations worldwide were in general agreement that certain things were just wrong, and they were so obviously wrong that civilized people knew intuitively that they were wrong. For example, it was a war crime to: attack defenseless civilians, cities and towns; to plunder and wantonly destroy civilian property; or to take from civilians more than what was necessary to feed and sustain an occupying army. Violators were subject to imprisonment or death. It was also universally accepted that the only just war was a defensive war.

Clearly, on that last point alone, Abraham Lincoln, his cabinet, top Union elected officials, and top-ranking Union officers were war criminals. Lincoln had absolutely no constitutional, legal, or moral authority to invade the South. The entire war was criminal. The South did not want war, even though Lincoln manipulated them into firing on Ft

Sumter. That was a legitimate defensive act on the part of the Confederacy, and it was most certainly not intended as an offensive move. If it had been, it would have been the dumbest military tactic in world history. No one was killed or even injured in the Ft Sumter incident, and the South did not follow it up with further attacks. They just wanted to be left alone, and they knew they could not allow federal cannons at Ft Sumter to remain there, pointed directly at the Confederacy's capital city. That would have been entirely unacceptable to any country.

Another source of information about accepted rules of war was *The Law of Nations*, by Emmerich de Vattel, 1798. It was a collection of wisdom and customs that had been handed down from generation to generation from the classical era. American politicians and military officers relied on it, because its self-evident moral standards were considered worthy of respect by all civilized societies.

For example, women, children, feeble old men, the sick, and anyone offering no resistance are exempted from hostility. Citizens are not part of the battle, and they are to play no part in it, so they should have no fear of harm from military officers or soldiers -- the only legitimate participants in hostilities. Occupying soldiers who engage in pillaging, plundering, assault, or destruction of private civilian property are regarded as savage barbarians.

Gen Henry Halleck wrote *International Law*, and he used it as his textbook when he taught the subject at West Point. Halleck agreed with Vattel on almost every point. Non-combatants should be spared as much as possible. Civilians and their property were to be protected, with these exceptions: property may be confiscated as a penalty for committing some offense; the rule may be suspended if necessary to maintain civil order; and food may be taken if it is necessary to support an occupying or invading army. Otherwise, any property taken should be compensated.

Halleck departed from Vattel on these two principles: taking civilian hostages and burning private homes. Vattel had prohibited those acts, but Halleck's book did not. They were both practiced by Union forces throughout the South. Halleck was appointed general in chief of the Union armies in Jul 1862.

Lincoln himself weighed in on the subject in his General Order no 100, which became known as the *Lieber Code*, because Columbia University law professor Francis Lieber is the one who wrote it for Lincoln. It echoed the general principle that civilians were to be exempted from the war as much as possible, and it was widely considered a moral and humane code of conduct.

But that was because nobody bothered to read it closely. It contained, at the end, an escape clause, giving Union officers the option of totally disregarding the Code if they felt it was necessary. As it turns out, military commanders rarely failed to exercise that option, judging almost every situation they faced as "necessary" to ignore Lincoln's General Order no 100. It was a smokescreen, and it was typical Lincoln.

From the very beginning of the war, Vattel's and Halleck's works were completely ignored, and punishment for violating those principles was extremely rare. In fact, the most ruthless, barbaric commanders were often praised and promoted. Some Union generals were genuinely upset with this policy, but their protests accomplished nothing good. Many other generals issued frequent orders to refrain from violating what they considered the binding code of military conduct, and they sent letters of protest up the chain of command, but they did no good. Apparently they were unaware of Lincoln's escape clause, which essentially gave Yankees carte blanche authority to act as barbaric anarchists with impunity. Or maybe the officers were merely trying to cover their own asses. Just in case.

Lincoln had no use for any military code of conduct, any more than he had any use for the Constitution, civil law, the Supreme Court, public opinion, or anything else, other than his own supremely arrogant and despotic will. His plan from the very beginning was to wage total war against the South, including rampant pillaging, plundering, destruction of property, bombing and burning entire cities, murder, rape, taking civilian hostages, and starving women and children to death.

His goal, of course, was to preserve the Union. Which is like a man telling his wife that he will continue to beat her until she expresses her eternal love and devotion to him.

Unlike Lincoln, at least Sherman could be honest about it. He said in a letter to his wife that his ultimate purpose in the war was: extermination, not of soldiers alone, that is the least part of the trouble, but the people. And the lovely Mrs Sherman replied that she sincerely wished the war to be one of extermination and that all [Southerners] would be driven like the Swine into the sea. May we carry fire and sword into their states till not one habitation is left standing.

What a charming couple.

There are many recorded examples of Sherman intentionally ignoring the pillaging and plundering by his men. He didn't have to tell them it was okay. All he needed to do was stand silently by. When he did actually want them to stop, as when it was time to move on, he had no trouble getting their full and immediate cooperation.

Sherman was not a very good battlefield tactician, so he compensated for it by picking on defenseless women, children, old men, and blacks. That tells us all we need to know about the Northern part of the Union Lincoln was so determined to preserve, and about the South's decision to secede.

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

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.

From Union Major Gen David Hunter to Union Major Gen Julius Stahel , May 30, 1864:

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 Quinn:

You will detail . . . 200 men, with . . . officers, to proceed to Newton 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 Fitch to Union Admiral D D Porter, June 11, 1864:

Gross outrages . . . [were] committed in that neighborhood [Uniontown, Kentucky] by [Union] Colonel Cunningham . . . 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 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.

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

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.

Special Field Order no 113, issued by Union Major Gen Oliver O Howard, 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.

From Union Brigadier Gen John M Corse to Union Colonel Robert N Adams , September 5, 1864:

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.

From Union Gen William Tecumseh Sherman to Confederate Gen John B Hood, September 7, 1864:

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.

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

But little was done in recruiting . . . the recruiting officers of the Seventieth and Seventy-First Colored 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 Howard, addressing his command on October 16, 1864:

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 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.

From Union Gen William Tecumseh Sherman to Union Army Chief of Staff Halleck, October 19, 1864:

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.

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

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 Wilson to Union Gen G G Meade, July 5, 1864:

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 French:

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

From Union Brigadier Gen Milo Smith Hascall to Union Gen J M Schofield, May 23, 1864:

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.

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' committee in Carroll County, Missouri, reporting from Carrollton, Missouri to Union Gen Clinton B Fisk, July 27, 1864:

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 Bolt 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 Switzler to Union Gen Fisk, August 1, 1864:*

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 Troy had been captured by . . . bushwhackers, 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.

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

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:

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.

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 Fisk to Union Gen W S Rosecrans,
August 3, 1864:*

The Colorado and Kansas troops did commit many outrages.

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.

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

A year ago . . . a quiet and peaceable citizen was shot dead in the street in Pleasant Plains, because he refused to halloo 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.

From Union Major Gen Francis J Heron to Union Brigadier Gen Albert L Lee, August 20, 1864:

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.

From Charles D Ludwig to Union Lieutenant Amos J Harding, September 2, 1864:

The men of Company L 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 Sykes, September 6, 1864:

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

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

Captain Howk , 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.

Missouri, November 26, 1861:

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.

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 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 Couch to Union Gen Schofield, March 27, 1865:

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

From Union Major James Ketner to Union Colonel Charles R Jennison, November 16, 1864:

The undersigned officers of this command . . . protest against the 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 Stotts to Union Brigadier Gen John B Sanborn, 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 Kansas 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 Blunt to Colonel Jennison, December 11, 1864:

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 Curtis, December, 1864:

Now the 125 men of the Fifteenth are held responsible for the acts of the entire brigade . . . My orders from the general commanding 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.

From Union Gen Rosecrans to Union Colonel David P Dyer, 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 Pike to Union Gen Thomas Ewing, Jr, October 20, 1864:

In the matter of depredations by my cavalry and artillery . . . a great deal of thieving was no doubt done between Saint Louis and Union 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.

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

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.

Instructions from Union Lieutenant Gen U S Grant to Union Major Gen David Hunter, August 5, 1864:

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.

From Union Surgeon C E H Campbell to Union Surgeon Josiah Simpson, October 14, 1864:

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.

From Medical Director Simpson to Union Colonel William Hoffman 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 Palmer to Union Gen B F Butler, September 1, 1864:

The negroes will not go voluntarily, 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.

From Union Brigadier Gen Horatio Van Cleve to Union Major Gen Robert H Milroy, January 6, 1865:

Complaints are almost daily brought to me of the conduct of certain men who style themselves "home-guards" . . . organized at Shelbyville 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:

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

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

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 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.**

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 mother 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 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.

Union Gen Phil Sheridan, at Woodstock, reported to Union Gen U S Grant, October 7, 1864:

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 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 Jr to Union Colonel George E Spencer, November 20, 1864:

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.

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

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

Special Field Order no 181 was issued by Gen Howard 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.

On December 7, 1864, Secretary of War Stanton received a report from Union Major Elisha H Ludington 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.

From Union Major Gen James H Wilson to Union Lieutenant Colonel George G Miner, January 2, 1865:

Frequent and bitter complaints are made by the people in the vicinity of Edgefield 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 Gamble to Union Gen C C Augur, March 19, 1865:

[There are] numerous complaints by the people in and about Warrenton 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] Russell. I propose . . . to stop . . . this beating and plundering of defenseless women by our scouting parties.

From Union Brevet Major Gen Orlando B Willcox to Union Major Gen John G Parke, April 9, 1865:

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 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 Meade to Union Gen U S Grant, April 17, 1865:

General Willcox, at Wilson's Station, hearing of marauders on the Nottoway River, 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 . . .

General Order no 11, published by Union Gen G L Hartsuff on April 24, 1865 (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 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.

From Union Lieutenant Colonel Theodore A Switzler to Union Brigadier Gen Egbert B Brown:

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] Foster . . . will be unable to correct the evil of these murders until his subordinates are held to personal responsibility for the actions of their men.

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.

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

Arrest all pillagers . . . The arrest of Colonel [Charles F] Adams [Jr] 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 Clark to Union Brevet Major Gen Edward Ferrero, April 23, 1865:

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.

From Union Lieutenant Colonel Madison M Cannon to Union Brevet Major Gen Francis C Barlow, April 24, 1865:

The country about New Store 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.

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

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 Sheridan on April 28, 1865:

Hereafter the seizure of animals or private property . . . is . . . forbidden . . . All commanding officers are charged to keep their commands from 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 Baker to Union Major Henry B Scott, May 3, 1865:

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.

From Union Gen Hartsuff, in Petersburg, to Union Gen Weitzell, May 13, 1865:

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.

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.

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

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.

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

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.

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

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.

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

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.

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

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 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?

Confederate troops captured the town of Plymouth, North Carolina on April 21, 1864, then moved toward the town of Washington. In response, the Union commanding officer at Washington 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 commander of the District of North Carolina, based in New Bern.

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.

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.

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

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, Jr to Union Gen W S Rosecrans, July 25, 1864:

I returned yesterday from Liberty 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 myrmidons 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 . . .

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.

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

Negro troops stationed at Greenville, Tennessee, 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.

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 Gillem to attend to and see that proper discipline and order are . . . restored and enforced?

From Union Brevet Major Gen John B Sanborn to Union Colonel J F McMahan, June 7, 1865:

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 the promiscuous firing so constantly indulged in . . . These complaints . . . are doubtless well

founded, . . . a condition of affairs . . . disgraceful to the command.

Union Gen Schofield reported to Union Gen Halleck on January 2, 1861, from Missouri:

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 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.

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

J W Smith, clerk in the Department of the Interior, in Washington, is just in from the neighborhood of Rose Hill, 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.

From Union Brigadier Gen Willis A Gorman to Union Major Gen Samuel R Curtis, January 3, 1863:

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:

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.

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.

[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.

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 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 1864 :

The [white] cavalry broke en masse in the camps of the colored women and are committing all sorts of outrage.

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:*

General Ord represents that want of discipline and good officers in the Twenty-Fifth Corps 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 Kinston and Goldsborough, North Carolina:

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

From Union Brigadier Gen Joseph R Hawley to Union Gen Schofield, April 1, 1865:

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.

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

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.

From Union Gen J A Logan 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 Stone 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 Corps, and some even from Gen Kilpatrick's 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:

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.

From Union Gen George H Hall to Union Gen Schofield, November 28, 1863:

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

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

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.

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

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 Rousseau to Union Gen G H Thomas, January 30, 1864:

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 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 Meredith to Union Colonel McFerran, January 22, 1864:

Some [citizens from Lexington to Wellington] had left their homes for fear of being killed . . . [Union] Lieutenant Ridgway, with from forty to sixty men, made a raid through this county 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.

Union Captain James D Thompson, on March 30, 1862, reported to Union Major William G Torrence, calling his attention to . . .

. . . 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 Warrensburg 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 Houts, 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.

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

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.

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.

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

Means' 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 Reavis to Union Gen Schofield, August 30, 1862:

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.

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

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.

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

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

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

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

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.

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

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.

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:

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.

From Missouri, January 1, 1862:

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.

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

From Union Gen Halleck, St Louis, to War Secretary Stanton, March 25, 1862:

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.

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.

General Order no 46, issued by Union Gen William Tecumseh Sherman, July 7, 1862:

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.

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.

From Union Captain Oliver D Greene to Union Gen Buell, June 20, 1862:

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 every 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.

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:

... depredations committed by Jennison's men in Western Missouri. Similar accounts are received of the conduct of the First Kansas . . . 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 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:

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:

The depredations of Jennison's men 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 report:*

[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*?

From Union Colonel George W Deitzler to Union Brigadier Gen Isaac F Quimby, June 26, 1862:

The people complain bitterly of the outrages committed by a portion of [Brigadier] General [Robert B] Mitchell's brigade; they are charged with jayhawking horses, negroes, etc . . . At Union City a foraging party under command of Captain [Marcus J] Parrott . . . 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.

From Union Colonel Frederick A Starring to Union Brigadier Gen Grenville M Dodge, October 6, 1862:

[Union] Captain Frank Moore's company . . . 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 . . .

From Union Major Gen H W Halleck to Secretary of War E M Stanton, July 7, 1862:

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] Anthony 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.

From Union Brigadier Gen Ebenezer Dumont to Union Major Gen Don Carlos Buell, October 16, 1862:

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 Kentucky in Louisville:

I have . . . been mortified and worried at the depredations which have been committed by a portion of our troops.

On January 17, 1863, Union Major Gen John A McClernand ordered Union Gen William Tecumseh Sherman to extinguish a fire in Napoleon, Arkansas and identify, if possible, the arsonist(s). This was Sherman's reply later that day:

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.

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.

The trains he referred to went between Chattanooga, Tennessee and Bridgeport, Alabama.

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 an excuse to show their savage nature.

From Union Brigadier Gen Thomas W Sweeny to Union Colonel Moses M Baine, November 23, 1863:

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 Iowa.

A Circular from Union Major Gen Oliver O Howard to the officers of his corps, December 8, 1863:

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.

From Union Provost Marshal General S P Carter to Union Major Gen John G Foster, Army of the Ohio, December 19, 1863:

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.

From Union Gen E B Brown, in Warrensburg, Missouri, to Union Colonel George H Hall, March 29, 1864:

Negro soldiers on furlough from Saint Louis with the assistance of squads of men belonging to the command stationed at Boonville 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.

From Union Gen N P Banks, Alexandria, Louisiana, to Union Major Gen James B McPherson, March 29, 1864:

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.

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:

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:

[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 Hall 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 Dodge, 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. 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 Meredith . . . 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 Keytesville . . . yesterday, all drunk and committing the worst excesses. Truman swore he was there by your order to raise hell in North Missouri.

From Gen Dodge to Union Major Gen John Pope, 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 [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-marshal-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-marshal-general.

From Union Captain Elijah D Johnson to Union Major Gen Andrew J Smith, June 27, 1865, regarding robberies and depredations in the vicinity of Elba:

More than fifty men, mostly deserters from the First Florida Cavalry, 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 Logan, July 14, 1865:

Many wanton depredations are being committed by the soldiers of this command upon both white and colored citizens in the vicinity of the camps.

From Union Brevet Brigadier Gen William J Palmer to Union Major Gen George Stoneman, May 6, 1865:

The reason I recommend that Brown's and Miller's brigades be immediately recalled to East Tennessee is because their officers for the most part have lost all control over their men.

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 Monks to Union Colonel John Morrill, June 6, 1865:

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] Turner . . . A lady . . . 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".

From Union Gen Clinton B Fish to Union Brigadier Gen Daniel M Draper, Apr 13, 1865:

Troops now stationed at Sturgeon . . . are committing all kinds of depredations in the vicinity of that post (burning houses and stealing money).

From Union Colonel Lewis Merrill to Union Gen George H Thomas, May 4, 1865:

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 Cleveland, and claiming to be acting under Federal authority . . . had committed many outrages upon peaceable citizens in that vicinity.

From Union Captain John D Meredith to Union Gen Clinton B Fisk, in Macon, Missouri, Mar 24, 1865, regarding a scout from Glasgow to the Perche Hills, Mar 7-15:

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.

From Union Major Gen Stephen A Hurlbut to Union Major Gen Edward R S Canby, March 16, 1865:

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.

From Union Brigadier Gen Cyrus Bussey to Union Colonel M LaRue Harrison, February 28, 1865:

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 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.

From Union Gen Reynolds in Little Rock, Arkansas, to Union Gen Bussey, March 10, 1865:

Some companies, said to be organized by authority from [Union] Colonel LaRue Harrison, are committing outrageous depredations in the vicinity of Fayetteville.

From Union Brevet Major Gen Stephen G Burbridge to Secretary of War Stanton, Feb 8, 1865:

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 Piland to Union Gen J B Sanborn, 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.

*General Order no 3, issued by Union Colonel Eli H Murray,
March 4, 1865:*

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.

From Abraham Lincoln to Union Lieutenant Colonel John Glenn, 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.

From Union Brevet Brigadier Gen Edward L Molineaux to Union Gen Q A Gillmore, June 26, 1865:

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.

From Union Colonel John F Philips to Union Major Gen Grenville M Dodge, January 25, 1865:

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 Sanborn to M H Ritchey of Jefferson City, January 28, 1865:

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.

From Union Brigadier Gen John M Oliver to Union Major Gen William B Hazen, March 28, 1865:

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.

Special Field Order no 97, issued by Union Gen O O Howard, April 22, 1865:

Crimes of the most heinous character are being committed north of Neuse River as far as Franklinton and beyond, by men purporting to be US soldiers . . . These marauders and stragglers . . . are a disgrace to our army and . . . country.

From Union Gen H Judson Kilpatrick, in Greensborough, North Carolina, to Union Gen Schofield, in Raleigh, May 9, 1865:

A soldier of my command killed an old man today, a citizen, because he would not give up his money.

From Union Major Gen Quincy A Gillmore to Union Brigadier Gen John F Hatch, March 1, 1865:

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 . . .

*From Union Gen O O Howard to Union Gen J A Logan,
March 7, 1865:*

[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 Davis:

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 outhouses . . . 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.

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?

From Union Gen William Jackson Palmer, New Bern, to the commanding officer of Confederate forces in Little Washington, June 2, 1864:

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.

General Order no 43, issued by Union Major Gen William B Franklin, in Alexandria, April 27, 1864:

The advance of the army in its march from Grand Ecore to this place . . . [has] been accompanied by indiscriminate marauding and incendiaryism, disgraceful to the army of a civilized nation.

From Union Colonel Christopher Carson to Union Brigadier Gen Clinton B Fisk, June 11, 1864:

There is a company of [Union] militia commanded by one Captain Fish. 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.