



YOUR KINDLE NOTES FOR:

Lincoln, Marx, and the GOP

Walter Kennedy and Al Benson

Last accessed on Tuesday, May 7, 2024

44 Highlights | 0 Notes

Yellow highlight | Location: 100

As shocking as it may sound to most Americans, it is nevertheless true that within fifty years of the adoption of the U.S. Constitution, there were numerous communistic and socialistic communities in the United States. The obvious question is, "Where did they come from?" With the failure of various European socialist revolutions in 1848, the United States became the place of asylum for an increasing number of radical socialists. However, most of these radicals did not leave their proclivity for revolutionary politics in Europe. These radical European socialists may have changed their abode but not their socialist political dogma. Their new beginning in America included many old European habits. Yet there is more shock in store! Shock number one—the growth of the Republican Party was enhanced by this growing number of European socialist and communist emigrants who made the United States their new home. Shock number two—as will be demonstrated in the succeeding chapters, these radical socialists played prominent roles in Abraham Lincoln's nomination and election as president. Shock number three—when Lincoln's policies inaugurated war, these same radical socialists were eager to join the Union Army's attack upon the Southern states. For example, August Willich became a major general in the Union Army. Before coming to the United States, Willich had been a member of the London Communist League with Karl Marx and Fredrick Engels.³ Robert Rosa and Louis Blenker are two more examples of communists in the Union Army; Maj. Robert Rosa of the Forty-fifth New York Infantry was a proud member of the New York Communist Club;⁴ and, Brig. Gen. Louis Blenker of New York was said to be "a convinced Marxist."⁵ These are but a few examples of communists, socialists, and other Red Republicans who gleefully waged war upon the South. In 1861, Germans, Frenchmen, Italians, and Hungarians rushed to assist the North in the struggle against the South. One historian, W. E. Dodd, pointed out, "The election of Lincoln and, as it turned out, the fate of the Union was thus determined not by native Americans but by voters who knew least of American history and institutions."⁶ What a shocking revelation: The election of Lincoln and the destruction of thirteen sovereign states of these United States were accomplished with the assistance of European communists and socialists who "knew least of American history and institutions."

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 124

Historians have labeled these socialist revolutionaries as “Forty-Eighters” because of the time frame for the bulk of European revolts. As many historians have noted, the Forty-Eighters came to the United States with a set of political, religious, and cultural values far removed from the average 19th century American. One historian noted that Forty-Eighters came to America with a “cultural mission” to remake America into their socialist’s world view. This included their disdain for commonly held religious views because “They hated American Sabbatarianism, blue laws...and the more radical ridiculed what they called the religious superstitions of the American people”⁷ [emphasis added]. Another historian noted that it was not love for the enslaved population nor love of the American Union as it existed at that time which incited Forty-Eighters to join in the War against Southern independence. According to this historian, Forty-Eighters were motivated by their socialist revolutionary zeal: “Their motive in the civil war and reconstruction sprang from the international mind of social democracy.”⁸ Carl Wittke, a respected observer of the times noted that the Forty-Eighters, “Actually dreamed of an intellectual conquest of the United States which would become the fulcrum for world revolution.” As can be seen, the Forty-Eighters had goals far removed from the intentions of America’s Founding Fathers.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 140

According to Theodore Draper in his book *The Roots of American Communism*, the first Marxist socialists in the United States were refugees of the 1848 German revolution.⁹ As soon as these radical socialists established a home in the New World, they began practicing their Old-World political habits.¹⁰ The newly arriving socialists were coming to a nation that was not devoid of socialist and communist societies. The philosophy of social reform already had a rather large following in the United States although for the most part it was in the North and not the South. For this and other reasons, the Northern states from Massachusetts to Wisconsin became the primary home of the newly arriving European socialists. As the reader progresses through this work,

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 204

While acknowledging the profound influence of the socialist/ communist immigration to the United States in the post-1848 revolution, one must not forget that communism has a history in the United States that predates these “Red” European immigrants. Any society that holds all property in common and rejects the concept of private ownership of property is a communistic society. This does not mean that such societies are typical of the twentieth-century communist model. The first Europeans to settle in what would become the United States in Virginia and Massachusetts established communistic societies. This was true of the English who settled Virginia as well as the Pilgrims who settled Massachusetts. For the first year all property and profits were held in common

by the Virginians in 1607 and by the Massachusetts Pilgrims in 1622, much as was done by early Christians in the first century. To the credit of both groups, our founding fathers soon realized that this “communal” concept looked good on paper but was a dismal failure in practice. After having to face down starvation, the concept of communal ownership and common reward for unequal work was abandoned and replaced with a free market society. It was after the establishment of free market principles of private ownership and rewards for personal efforts that the colonies began to prosper. In reality the first Thanksgiving by the Pilgrims took place after the abandonment of the communal system. The Pilgrim Fathers, like all those who embrace a collectivist society, discovered that socialism promises but cannot produce. Indeed, collectivism, socialism, and communism are idealistic social economic theories often driven by altruistic desires but ultimately tending only to make the rich poor and the poor poorer.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 232

Regardless of what “flavor” of socialism one considers, national socialist as in Nazism and Fascism, or Marxist communist governments, all tend to destroy local government and centralize power in the national government. Socialists and communists seem to have a natural affinity for national movements and national governments. General Louis Blenker, a radical socialist from Germany, wrote to the United States War Department that he could raise German troops who had “seen service and actual war abroad” and that he was seeking the national government’s approval to enlist “thousands of Germans ready to fight for the preservation of the Union.”¹⁷ What was missing from General Blenker’s request was a declaration of his support of the Constitution of the United States with its checks and limits on the growth of big (national) government. Nor do we find in his letter to the War Department any expression of affinity for the defense of American liberty—only a defense of American Union. Here we must contrast the philosophy of Louis Blenker to that of Patrick Henry who stated, “The first thing I have at heart is American liberty, the second thing is American union.”¹⁸ Obviously Patrick Henry, the American patriot from Virginia, and Louis Blenker, the socialist Union general from Germany, had two different views on how free men should order their society. For Patrick Henry liberty was the sine qua non (something indispensable or essential) of American government. Without the essential element of liberty, union or government is worst than useless, it is tyrannical. This difference in opinion on the nature of the Federal government was the core issue driving secession and the War for Southern Independence. It must be pointed out once again that it was the South, i.e., the Confederate States of America, that was fighting for limited government, while Lincoln and the North were fighting to extend the power of the national government. Is it any wonder that European communists, including Karl Marx, and socialists, like Louis Blenker, would find Lincoln’s view of government more to their liking?

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 329

In one small paragraph James Madison destroyed the socialists'/liberals' philosophical keystone, i.e., their faith in equality and democracy. As Madison demonstrated, the American idea of equality is not the same idea that is held by socialists and communists. Nevertheless, it was the socialists' concept of democracy and equality that the European radicals of 1848 brought to the United States, to the Republican Party, and ultimately to Abraham Lincoln.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 381

The first and most prominent of the sectarian (Christian) socialists were the Shakers. Ann Lee, referred to as "Mother" Ann Lee by her followers, immigrated to America in 1774. Shakers rejected all privately owned property, living in a communal (communistic) community with perfect equality between men and women. Shakers prohibited marriage and any sexual activity among members. This group grew to around 5,000 members before beginning a decline. Around 1910 there were only 500 members, today they no longer exist. In their religious meetings Shakers would dance over long periods of time until they began a shaking and wild contorting of their bodies in which time, they were said to commune with the spirit world—thus obtaining their name, "Shakers." Another group of Christian socialists were members of the Oneida Community, founded in 1811 by John H. Noyes of Vermont. Socialist historian Morris Hillquit, referring to Noyes, stated "The first historian of communism in the United States was himself the founder of one of the most noteworthy of communistic societies."²⁹ The bulk of members of this communistic society were from New England. The Oneida Society was started as a "Christian" community. They rejected the divinity of Jesus, believing him to be a good man. They did believe that the teaching of Jesus as a man could help them perfect society. After being influenced by other socialist groups, by 1848 Noyes' group had become an openly communistic society.³⁰ More information about these "Christian socialists" will be found in Addendum I.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 393

Another group of early American communists were the secular socialists. Unlike their fellow socialists known as Christian socialists, the secular socialists rejected religion as the foundation for their attachment to socialist ideas. They held firm to the idea that man had within himself the means of securing the formation of a perfect society. They advanced the notion that the evils of society were due to the environment of man and not man's innate nature—bad people were bad because of the situation they found themselves in and not because of some inward moral defect. One of the leading men in

this secular socialist movement was Robert Owen, the founder of the Owenite Communities. According to Robert Owen, "Man becomes a wild, ferocious savage, according to the circumstances in which he may be placed from his birth."³¹ Hillquit praised Robert Owen's work, especially Owen's "personal propaganda for the theories of communism, [which] has been too often overlooked. That propaganda has, however, had a powerful influence on many of his contemporaries."³² Equally as important in promoting radical socialism in the United States was Robert Owen's son, Robert Dale Owen. Robert Dale Owen immigrated to the United States with his father and was "steeped in his father's socialist philosophy."³³ Robert Dale Owen assisted his father in establishing the New Harmony communistic community in Indiana and served three terms as a Representative in the Indiana legislature as well as two terms in the United States House of Representatives from Indiana.³⁴ Long before AOC and the Squad were promoting their socialist views in the U. S. House of Representatives, Robert Dale Owens, a free thinker (secular humanist) who opposed evangelical religion, who advocated for liberal divorce laws, and who promoted the equal distribution of wealth, was pushing these ideas onto the American scene. Another secular socialist group, although not as well-known as the Owenite community, is the Fourierist society. This group was established as a communal community in France by Charles Fourier. Albert Brisbane of New York brought Fourierism to the United States after an extended stay in Europe. Brisbane wrote and published *Social Destiny of Man* in 1840. Brisbane's book became a best-selling book on how to build a utopian society. It was Brisbane's book which was responsible for recruiting Horace Greeley to the communistic Fourier movement. Greeley, the editor of the *Tribune*, soon invited Karl Marx to be a contributing editor of his paper. The ardent "social reformers" from Massachusetts known as the "Transcendentalists" from Brook Farm fame were also soon avid supporters of the Fourier movement. The

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 459

According to Theodore Draper by 1923 most communists in America could be found in cities such as New York, Chicago, Boston, Minneapolis, Cleveland, and Detroit.³⁹ Note that we do not see Charleston, New Orleans, or any Southern city mentioned in the above listed cities. Socialist-historian Morris Hillquit stated that by 1910, the electoral victories by American socialists were in the states of Wisconsin, Massachusetts, Montana, Ohio, Illinois, Colorado, and Pennsylvania.⁴⁰ Once again we see that it is the North and not the South where we find electoral victories for the Socialist Party in America. The history of socialism and communism in America is a long and curious story extending from pious religious orders, New England Transcendentalists, European radical socialists, the Republican Party, Abraham Lincoln, a defrocked Baptist minister, and the author of a utopian novel that sold more than three million copies in America. Ultimately, all Americans have felt the influence of these socialist utopian dreamers. The thought of Lincoln as the first American president to have had a communist

sympathizer working in a key part of his administration is and should be shocking to all Americans. Charles Dana, who visited Karl Marx in 1848, was an associate of Horace Greeley and an early convert to the communistic Fourierist movement. Dana served as assistant secretary of war under Edwin Stanton during the Lincoln administration, thus becoming the first communist, or at least the first communist sympathizer, to serve in a high position within the government of the United States.⁴¹ Be that as it may, the result of Lincoln's victory over the South was to give the utopian dreamers a victory for big government. Lincoln and the Republican Party's victory assured that the first demand of the Communist Party for a "one nation indivisible" was not only made possible, it was made unavoidable. As a result, all Americans today are living in a nation far removed from that envisioned by America's Founding Fathers. At this juncture there is one question that stands begging to be asked: "Can the adverse effects of the socialists' victory at Appomattox be removed from this nation?" In a nutshell, will we Americans one day be as free as the founding fathers intended for us to be?

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 509

KARL MARX'S COMMENT about the so-called American Civil War could just have easily been drawn from the proceedings of the NAACP or any politically correct liberal society of this age. Even more shocking is the fact that most conservatives hold very similar views of the cause of the War for Southern Independence, as do their liberal nemeses and Karl Marx. It is not uncommon to hear neo-conservative talk-radio show hosts promoting the idea that "the Civil War was fought to free the slaves," or that "the South fought to promote the cause of slavery in America." Having liberals and conservatives agreeing with Karl Marx and Fredrick Engels on the causes of the so-called Civil War should raise the proverbial "red flag" in the minds of rational Americans. The events surrounding the War Between the States were closely watched and commented on by both Karl Marx and Fredrick Engels. There were no less than sixty-one letters between Marx and Engels touching upon the war; at least two memorials by Marx, one to President Abraham Lincoln, and one to his successor President Andrew Johnson; and a host of letters from Marx to his socialist allies in the United States including several to an officer in the Union Army. In many ways Marx and Engels participated in the "Civil War" by serving as propaganda agents for the Northern cause in Europe. Not only did Karl Marx serve as a contributor to the American newspaper, the New York Tribune, but also, he and Fredrick Engels were contributors to several European newspapers. In November 1861, Marx wrote an article for Die Presse in Vienna titled, "The Civil War in the United States." In his introductory note to Marx's article the editor of Die Presse stated: "We have received from our London correspondent a fresh communication on the events in North America, in which the motives by which the secessionist South is guided are represented in an entirely new light. We will let our informant speak for himself."⁴³ In his article Marx condemned elements within the British government and press that were in sympathy with the right

of the Southern states to withdraw from the Union. Marx proceeded to attack the idea that Southerners were fighting for independence just as their forefathers had done in 1776. He then attempted to place upon the South the entire burden of slavery in America. By doing so, Marx was attempting to fan the antislavery views of most Europeans. In this manner, Marx hoped the masses would oppose recognition of the Confederate States of America. Attempting to ignite the flames of European abolitionist passion against the South, Marx even claimed, "What the slaveholders, therefore, call the South, embraces more than three-quarters of the territory hitherto comprised by the Union"⁴⁴ [emphasis added]. It is obvious from this citation that not only did Marx not understand the history of events leading to the War for Southern Independence, he also did not have a good grasp of American geography. In today's...

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 555

continue. When the U.S. Constitution was adopted, the African slave trade was given a twenty-year grace period before Congress was allowed to outlaw the trade. In 1808 when Congress was authorized to legislate against the African slave trade, that nefarious trade was outlawed in the United States. When the vote was taken, 95 percent of all representatives both North and South voted to eliminate the African slave trade. Representatives from four states voted to maintain the African slave trade, two from the South and two from the North. Surely if the South was seeking the "extension" of slavery it would not have voted to end the African slave trade. Some of the most noted Southerners in American history were slaveholders and advocates for ending the "peculiar institution." America's first president was himself a slaveholder as well as Thomas Jefferson, Patrick Henry, and most of the signers of the Declaration of Independence who were from the South. Were these men engaged in a Southern conspiracy to extend and perpetuate slavery? The answer is seen in their actions. Most of these men voiced strong opinions against the institution of slavery, and many, at their own personal expense, manumitted (liberated) their slaves.⁴⁸ Even one of the most notable Southern nationalists, John Randolph of Roanoke, expressed his disdain for slavery by manumitting more than four hundred slaves. Not only did Randolph free his slaves, but he also provided homes and land for each family he liberated; all of this was done at great personal expense to the slave master.⁴⁹ When the freed slaves went to Ohio to claim their land, however, they were driven out of town by German immigrants. Many did settle in nearby counties, but were not compensated for the lost land. By the time of the War for Southern Independence more slaves had been freed and established in their own homes by the South than anyplace where slavery had existed. Yet, Marx and Lincoln stated that the South sought the "extension" of slavery.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 620

While most Americans think of the abolition of slavery as an end in itself, communists had a completely different view of abolition. As noted by the editor of Marx and Engels' collected letters on the American Civil War, *The Civil War in the United States*, Marx understood that the proletarian revolution in America could not take place until after the emancipation of the slaves. Marx stated, "Labor cannot emancipate itself in the white skin where in the black it is branded."⁵⁵ In an article titled, "Address of the International Workingmen's Association to the National Labor Union," written by Marx, he set forth his view of the consequence of the American Civil War: "And the successful close of the war against slavery has indeed inaugurated a new era in the annals of the working class.... Still the Civil War offered a compensation in the liberation of the slaves and the impulse which it thereby gave to your own class movement."⁵⁶ Engels in a letter to General Weydemeyer stated his belief that the war would "doubtless determine the future of America for hundreds of years to come."⁵⁷ Note that the noble objective of ending slavery, an end viewed with equal admiration by most Southerners⁵⁸ from Thomas Jefferson to Robert E. Lee, was viewed by communists as a means of advancing the communist revolution, the ultimate objective of all communists.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 632

As can be seen by these citations, Marx and Engels viewed the abolition of slavery in the United States in a totally different light from most Americans. First, Marx and Engels saw in Lincoln's war against the South the establishment of a "single and indivisible" nation. As has been pointed out in previous chapters, socialists love big (indivisible and perpetual) government. Engels unequivocally announced this fact to a fellow communist who would soon become one of Lincoln's generals waging war upon the South. Second, Marx and Engels viewed the liberation of the slaves as a means to advance the proletarian revolution. For Marx and Engels, the positive aspect of ending slavery was a mere side effect of the "preliminaries of the proletarian revolution."⁵⁹ As has been stated, the history of communism during the past eighty years demonstrates that communists do not highly regard human freedom. These men (Marx and Engels, communists and socialists) should not be viewed as great "freedom fighters"; rather, they should be viewed as evil proponents of big government who would willingly sacrifice human liberty and freedom to advance their concept of a "just" society.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 646

Even in defeat, Weydemeyer was still dedicated to the communist cause. His friend Karl Marx wrote to him as he was departing Europe for America in 1851. Marx wrote: "I have just received your letter from Engels and hasten to reply. I should, of course, have very much liked to see you and talk with you before your departure— since it was

impossible to keep you here. But once you are going to America, you can't be doing so at a more opportune moment, both to find a means of existence over there as well as to be useful to our party."⁶¹ Note that Marx viewed the dispersal of his followers not as a negative event but as one fraught with revolutionary possibilities. Marx then gave Weydemeyer the following advice: "When you are in New York, go to A. Dana [Marx was referring to Charles A. Dana, with whom he had a friendly relationship; this is the same Charles A. Dana who later served as assistant secretary of war in the Lincoln administration.] of the New York Tribune and give him my regards and regards from Freiligrath. Perhaps he may be of some use to you."⁶² Marx felt close enough to Dana that he wrote a personal letter to him and recommended Weydemeyer to Dana. In his letter to Weydemeyer, Marx stated: "I wrote to A. Charles Dana [Charles A. Dana], one of the editors of the New York Tribune, and also enclosed a letter from Freiligrath, in which he recommends you. Hence, all you have to do is to go to him and mention our names."⁶³ The man Marx was referring to here as "Freiligrath" was Ferdinand Freiligrath, a German revolutionary poet and editor of *Neue Rheinische Zeitung*. He was a member of the Communist League and a friend of Marx and Engels.⁶⁴ From the tone and substance of Marx's letter it appears that this communist poet was also an acquaintance of Charles A. Dana. In 1851, Marx commissioned Weydemeyer to publish one of the first editions of the Communist Manifesto in the United States. In his October 16, 1851, letter Marx directed Weydemeyer to "see whether it [the Communist Manifesto] cannot be issued as a pamphlet—in other words, printed, distributed, and sold. It stands to reason that the profits, if any, belong to you; all I want is 20-50 copies for my own use. I trust you have taken the ocean voyage well and your affairs in the United States will prosper."⁶⁵ Two points jump out at the astute reader of these lines: (1) A future general of Lincoln's Union Army was an agent of Karl Marx as they attempted to have published and distributed in America the first copies of the Communist Manifesto; (2) "It stands to reason that the profits... belong to you." It is somewhat ironic to read the words of the father of modern communism admitting that anyone deserved to receive the profits of his labor. Discovering that Adolf Hitler was Jewish or that Abraham Lincoln owned slaves could not be any less shocking than to read the pronouncement from the father of communism that a man deserves to keep his well-earned profits. Not only did Marx and Engels have...

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 679

The following is an address written by Marx for the International Workingmen's Association congratulating Lincoln on his second presidential victory. To Abraham Lincoln, President of the United States of America. Sir: We congratulate the American people upon your re-election by a large majority. If resistance to the Slave Power was the reserved watchword of your first election, the triumphant war-cry of your re-election is, Death to Slavery. From the commencement of the titanic American strife the workingmen of Europe felt instinctively that the star-spangled banner carried the

destiny of their class. The contest for the territories which opened the dire epopee, was it not to decide whether the virgin soil of immense tracts should be wedded to the labor of the emigrant or prostituted by the tramp of the slave driver? When an oligarchy of 300,000 slaveholders dared to inscribe, for the first time in the annals of the world, "slavery" on the banner of armed revolt; when on the very spots where hardly a century ago the idea of one great democratic republic had first sprung up, whence the first declaration of the Rights of Man was issued, with systematic thoroughness, gloried in rescinding "the ideas entertained at the time of the formation of the Old Constitution," and maintained "slavery to be a beneficent institution, indeed the only solution of the great problem of the relation of labor to capital," and cynically proclaimed property in man "the cornerstone of the new edifice"; then the working classes of Europe understood at once, even before the fanatic partisanship of the upper classes for the Confederate gentry had given its dismal warning, that the slaveholders' rebellion was to sound the tocsin [wakeup call or alarm bell] for a general holy crusade of property against labor, and that for the men of labor, with their hopes for the future, even their past conquests were at stake in that tremendous conflict on the other side of the Atlantic. Everywhere they bore therefore patiently the hardships imposed upon them by the cotton crisis, opposed enthusiastically the pro-slavery intervention, importunities of their "betters," and from most parts of Europe contributed their quota of blood to the good cause. While the workingmen, the true political power of the North, allowed slavery to defile their own republic; while before the Negro, mastered and sold without his concurrence, they boasted it the highest prerogative of the white-skinned laborer to sell himself and choose his own master; they were unable to attain the true freedom of labor or to support their European brethren in their struggle for emancipation, but this barrier to progress has been swept off by the red sea of civil war. [From the time of the socialist revolts of 1848, the color red has been inevitably linked with left-wing, socialist, or communist causes.]

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 700

The workingmen of Europe feel sure that as the American War of Independence initiated a new era of ascendancy for the middle class, so the American anti-slavery War will do for the working classes. They consider it an earnest of the epoch to come, that it fell to the lot of Abraham Lincoln, the single-minded son of the working class, to lead his country through the matchless struggle for the rescue of an enchained race and the reconstruction of a social world.⁶⁷ Note that in the third paragraph Marx referred to the formation of the United States as the "idea of one great democratic republic." These are virtually the same words as those spoken by Lincoln himself. After all, it was Lincoln who was proclaiming that the United States was one indivisible and perpetual republic—Marx was just echoing Lincoln's ideas. In the same paragraph Marx proclaimed that the "slaveholders' rebellion" (Marxist euphemism for the War for Southern Independence) was to sound a warning bell for a crusade of property against

labor. In other words, the South, i.e., property, was fighting against everything that communism, i.e., labor, held dear. In the fourth paragraph Marx informed his readers that the barrier of progress for the communist revolution had been “swept off by the red sea of civil war.” In conclusion Marx reminded the world that it had fallen to the lot of Abraham Lincoln to do those things necessary to insure the “reconstruction of a social world.” After eighty years of communism, it is not necessary to speculate too hard to discover what type of world Marx and his friends sought to establish. In the closing lines of his work, the Communist Manifesto, Marx proclaimed, “Workers of the world, unite; you have nothing to lose but your chains.” After eighty years of communism that line should be rewritten to state, “Workers of the world, beware; you have everything to lose—your property, your freedom, your life.” Upon the death of Abraham Lincoln, Marx addressed a letter to President Andrew Johnson in which he railed against the defeated South and encouraged Johnson to punish and reconstruct the South. Marx’s vitriolic hatred for the South was clearly displayed in the first paragraph: “The demon of the ‘peculiar institution,’ for the supremacy of which the South rose in arms, would not allow his worshipers to honorably succumb on the open field. What he had begun in treason, he must end in infamy. [Here Marx was referring to the assassination of Abraham Lincoln by John Wilkes Booth, which he viewed as just one more plot by evil Southern slaveholders.] As Philip II’s war for the Inquisition bred a Gerard, thus Jefferson Davis’s pro-slavery war a Booth.”⁶⁸ Marx continued in his address to President Johnson pleading with the president to use his newfound powers to “uproot by the law what has been felled by the sword, to preside over the arduous work of political reconstruction and social regeneration.... [T]o initiate the new era of the emancipation of labor, the...

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 747

I. The South prepared years ahead of time for eventual secession. From the beginning of the war to the end, one thing is for sure, the South was never well prepared for war. As has been borne out by history, the South had only the advantage of a large group of very good officers who were willing to follow their respective states in secession, and nothing else. There is no proof of large movements of military supplies into the South other than that which was necessary to provide for arming and maintenance of the state militia. As each state seceded from the Union, the military forces of that state took control of any military supplies within the limits of that state. Each state in the Union, North or South, had the right to request supplies from the Federal government; Mississippi was no different from New York in this respect. With the election of Lincoln, for the first time in American history a political party controlled the White House with both the President and the Vice President from only one section of the country. Lincoln from Illinois and Hamblin from Maine were both from the North, leaving the South completely closed off from the Executive Branch of government. Having become a minority in the House of Representatives, having lost any influence in the Executive

Branch, and seeing itself becoming a minority in the Senate, the South which had rejected the idea of secession many times, now sought safety in the act of secession.⁷⁴ Just ten years before the secession crisis, a convention of Southerners was held in Nashville, Tennessee. Many people thought this meeting would lead to disunion at that time, but as it turned out, “the convention showed the loyalty of the South to the Union and the willingness of southerners to compromise to preserve national unity.”⁷⁵ Most Southerners viewed secession as a last-ditch measure, not something one would plan for years ahead—unfortunately, this attitude may have cost the South its independence. 2. Jefferson Davis was a dictator. One has to think that Marx was exercising his right as an author to use hyperbole to get his point across because nothing in recorded history indicates that President Davis had any such dictatorial powers as described by Marx. As any good socialist knows, and surely Marx was a good socialist, a federal republic composed of several sovereign states cannot be ruled by a dictator. If the Confederate States of America was anything, it was a federal republic of sovereign states. From one end of the Confederate Constitution to the other it dripped with States’ Rights language. Jefferson Davis’s authority ranged somewhere between that of the president of the United States under the Articles of Confederation and that of George Washington under the new Federal government after the adoption of the U.S. Constitution. In no way could this power be logically called dictatorial. One thing Marx completely overlooked when accusing President Davis of being a “dictator,” is that any state...

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 788

In Article I, Section 2, we read slaves would be counted as three-fifths of a person for establishing congressional districts. Misunderstanding this section has caused many detractors of the South to accuse the South of viewing a slave as only three-fifths human. When this portion of the Constitution was being debated, Northerners did not want to count slaves as human at all, while Southerners desired to count slaves as any other human. A compromise was reached in which slaves were counted as three-fifths of a person when establishing congressional districts. (3) In Article I, Section 9, the United States Constitution gave the African slave trade a twenty-year grace period in which Congress was not allowed to legislate against the nefarious trade. In three important areas the Constitution dealt with slavery. In the entire document not one negative word was placed in the Constitution about the subject of slavery. Every state that adopted this Constitution understood full well the meaning of each article, section, and paragraph of the document. There was no Southern conspiracy to use the United States Constitution to promote slavery.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 833

Because Taney was a Marylander, he was denoted by Marx as part of the Southern slaveholder power structure on the Supreme Court. Yet, Taney, like so many other men of the Old South, was a practicing abolitionist. Taney's brother-in-law, Francis Scott Key (of "Star-spangled Banner" fame), was a leading member of the American Colonization Society, organized to establish a home in Africa for freed slaves. Taney was an officer in the local chapter of this society. In 1818 at great expense to himself Taney freed seven of his slaves and an eighth slave in 1821. Each slave was not only given freedom, but was also established in a profession and housing before being freed. Taney and his brother freed two slaves they had inherited from their father at his death. The only slaves owned by Taney that he did not free were two elderly slaves too old to support themselves; Taney supported them until their death. While radical abolitionists were fanning the flames of hatred for Southerners, men such as Justice Taney were busy, quietly and at their own expense, liberating enslaved people. It is somewhat ironic that with money jingling in their pockets that was made from the selling of slaves, both their own and those sold as a result of the African slave trade, Northerners condemned Southerners who were in the process of freeing at their own expense slaves bought from Northerners or freeing slaves inherited from their families who had been bought from Northerners. Marx and the radical abolitionists unreservedly condemned Taney and the Supreme Court for the Dred Scott decision. This decision was the focal point of Marx's charge that the Federal Supreme Court was a "willing tool of the South." Yet, as has been pointed out, even staunch antislavery judges from the North felt compelled to rule as the Constitution was written and not as they would have liked to rule vis-à-vis slavery. Marx was correct when he stated that five of the nine judges of the Supreme Court were from the South, which left four from the North. If as Marx contended the Supreme Court was the "willing tool of the South," why was the vote on the Dred Scott decision not along sectional lines, i.e., five to four? The final vote by the justices was seven to two, not five to four. Moreover, at least two of the five Southern justices voting for the Dred Scott decision were practicing abolitionists, having freed their slaves many years earlier: Taney of Maryland and Campbell of Alabama. Responding to the Supreme Court's Dred Scott decision, Horace Greeley's (remember that Greeley and Dana were both on very friendly terms with Karl Marx) abolition newspaper, the New York Tribune, opined: "You may 'cheerfully submit,' of course you will, to whatever the five slaveholders and two or three doughfaces on the bench of the Supreme Court may be ready to utter on this subject. But not one man who really desires the triumph of Freedom over Slavery in the Territories will do so."⁸⁰ Note how wrong the Tribune was...

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 870

LIKE OUR ANCESTORS—WE WILL BE FREE. No, these words were not the words of Abraham Lincoln, Karl Marx, or the radical abolitionists. These words were taken from the Confederate battle flag of the Fifth South Carolina Volunteer Infantry, C. S. A., of

King's Mountain, South Carolina. It was during the War for American Independence that a group of Southern militias defeated the British at the Battle of King's Mountain. This defeat was a major factor in the eventual British retreat to Yorktown, Virginia, where the War for American Independence was won. Seventy-five years later, the sons and grandsons of these patriots reminded the world what the War for Southern Independence was all about. Regardless of what Lincoln, Marx, radical abolitionists, or modern politically correct liberals and neo-conservatives declare, the South was fighting for freedom, not slavery. The

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 989

There are three points that Lincoln made in these sentences: (1) Perpetuity is a vital element in the government of the United States; (2) the Union is less perfect than before the adoption of the Constitution if secession is permissible; and, (3) no state can upon its "mere motion" get out of the Union. Let us consider Lincoln's three points.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 993

Adolf Hitler believed his Reich would last at least one thousand years, whereas Abraham Lincoln went much further; he believed government should have everlasting life! According to Lincoln, this everlasting and therefore perpetual nature of American government was so essential he referred to it as "vital." Surely, any political principle this important would show itself in one of the major documents of American history—say, the Declaration of Independence or the United States Constitution.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 1,081

Only if one accepts Lincoln's High Federalist view of the government of the United States under its Constitution can one justify Lincoln's statement on a "more perfect" Union. But early American history demonstrates that this view was rejected in favor of Jeffersonian republicanism. The rejection of the High Federalist view was so complete that it caused the demise of the first American political party, the Federalist Party. Although the ideas of the High Federalists never completely vanished, as demonstrated by the ascension of Lincoln, they never had the backing of the American people in general. Remember, Lincoln was elected by only 39 percent of the American voters; 61 percent of American voters cast votes for other candidates for president rather than voting for Lincoln. Lincoln was a minority president espousing a minority view on the formation of the Union. This minority view of the Constitution stands the Constitution on its head and makes it a document that defends government and not liberty. Most constitutional scholars would agree with the statement that the people of the states

would have never ratified the Constitution if those delegates had thought that this Constitution would serve the interests of government over the liberties of the people.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 1,145

Advocates of Higher Law believe that no law that is made by a government can be enforced if it runs contrary to their belief in some unwritten spiritual wisdom. Therefore, radical abolitionists did not believe that the constitutional guarantee of returning runaway slaves had to be enforced. Instead of amending the Constitution and removing the fugitive slave section, Higher Law advocates believed that they had the right (a power given to them from a "Higher" source) to ignore that part of the Constitution.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 1,272

What could fly in the face of Lincoln and Hitler's philosophy more than the notion that the states are not subject to unlimited submission to the Federal government? Not only did Thomas Jefferson state that the states are so constituted as not to be subject to an unlimited submission to the Federal government, but he also stated that the people of the states are the proper judge of "infraction" and "mode and measures of redress."

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 1,281

Note that Madison asserted that the states are the parties of the "compact," i.e., the Constitution and the Union so formed, and not "we the people in general" as Lincoln believed. Also, Madison as well as Jefferson pointed out that it is within the power and rights of the states to "judge of infraction," determine "mode and measures of redress," and to "interpose" the power of the state to thwart the abuse of power by the Federal government. Every point that Jefferson and Madison were making in the Kentucky and Virginia Resolves vis-à-vis States' Rights, state sovereignty, and secession were rejected and excoriated by both Lincoln and Hitler.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 1,315

Advocates of big government always clothe their grab for power in high and praiseworthy rhetoric: Socialists are struggling to uplift the workers; Communists are bringing economic freedom to the masses; Nazis are trying to free the workers from the parasitic influence of an alien culture; and Lincoln was saving the Union and freeing the slaves. As was pointed out in chapter one, socialism cannot economically uplift anyone because socialism (and therefore communism and Nazism) only makes the rich

poor and the poor poorer. Likewise, Lincoln did not save the Union if that term is used to refer to the Union as described by Thomas Jefferson and James Madison among many others. Lincoln completely destroyed that Union and replaced it with something more akin to an empire. Julius Caesar took the Roman Republic and in the process of creating the Roman Empire destroyed the Republic; likewise, Hitler destroyed the Federal Republic of Germany and created the Nazi Empire. In both cases liberty and freedom were exchanged for the exercise of power and trappings of glory. Lincoln's effort at "saving the Union" had the same deleterious result. The Union of free men in free states federated with like-minded free men in free states was destroyed, and in its place now stands an all-powerful Federal empire, an empire that is the sole judge of its powers. Just as shocking as the fact that Lincoln did not save the Union is the fact that Lincoln did not free the slaves; rather, he enslaved free men.¹¹⁷

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 1,835

Lincoln's socialist proclivities are reflected in the fact that he adopted many of the ideas promoted by Karl Marx in the Communist Manifesto and in The Demands of the Communist Party of Germany. Few Americans think of Lincoln or Marx when they get a letter from the IRS. Yet Marx advocated ideas later embraced by Lincoln. Marx advocated: "The introduction of severely progressive taxation"¹⁶⁹ and today we call this "progressive taxation" the income tax. The first progressive income tax and Federal income tax collectors were established during Lincoln's administration. Marx and Engels advocated, "One state bank shall replace all private banks and its notes shall be legal tender."¹⁷⁰ Marx and Engels also advocated "Universal and free education for the people."¹⁷¹ Most important of all the Demands of Marx and Engels is the first demand, "The Whole of Germany shall be declared a single and indivisible republic."¹⁷² Does this sound like a pledge all "patriotic" Americans are supposed to say, "one nation indivisible"? All these measures were, to one degree or another, made a part of Lincoln's program. By embracing Henry Clay's "American System," Lincoln became the foremost advocate of national banking, a similar system to that advocated by Marx. Lincoln went so far as to pronounce President Andrew Jackson's attack upon the High Federalist national banking scheme as unconstitutional.¹⁷³ This being Lincoln's position (as well as that of Marx and Engels), when Lincoln was elected president, he signed the Legal Tender Act into law in February of 1862, as well as the National Currency Acts of 1863 and 1864. These acts resulted in the creation of a system of nationally chartered banks, something both the High Federalists and Karl Marx desired. This act had the effect of creating a near monopoly on all bank notes in the United States. As part of the Republican Party's plan for creating a national banking monopoly, the Federal government obtained the assistance of financier Jay Cook to demonize state banking systems while making flattering statements about the national bank. This was not the first time that big government has had a working relationship with rich and powerful people—Hitler was a master at this method of increasing his

power. One of the leading supporters of nationalized banking was Sen. John Sherman of Ohio. Senator Sherman did not hide the reasons why he sought to nationalize and centralize every center of power in Washington. Senator Sherman stated: “Nationalize as much as possible [and thereby] make men love their country before their states.”¹⁷⁴

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 1,856

Lincoln and the Republican Party soon enacted Marx’s “Heavy, progressive or graduated income tax,” when in 1862 Lincoln signed America’s first income tax into law. This was one of the largest tax systems ever enacted in the history of the United States up until that time. The following is an overview of Lincoln’s tax: (1) The bill consisted of seventeen pages, tripled columns; (2) With more than 119 sections it imposed taxes upon inheritance and gross receipts as well as a license tax for many occupations, stamp taxes, and a tax on many items in common commerce of that day; and, (3) It created the first embryonic IRS service. All of the above-mentioned items and more began the process of centralizing all power into the hands of the government in Washington. From that day to the present the Federal government has grown in power and influence—no one appears capable of controlling its lust for power and taxes.¹⁷⁵ Marx’s idea of public education financed by the government also became a central part of Lincoln’s agenda. Writing in *Chronicles* magazine for March 1989, author and playwright John Chodes revealed that “Washington jumped squarely into education in 1862. The Civil War was raging. The Union Army had been suffering major reverses. Robert E. Lee maneuvered to bring the war to the North, and the Union was not sure it would win. In such an atmosphere the Morrill Act passes Congress. Its stated objective was to fund colleges that teach agriculture and mechanical arts, via money raised through federal land-grant sales. The true objective was to bring the Northern perspective to the re-conquered areas of the South, to teach the rebel’s children ‘respect for national authority’—to break their rebellious spirit forever. The three Rs had absolutely nothing to do with this landmark bill.”¹⁷⁶ Karl Marx must have been deliriously happy with America adopting his ideas.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 1,874

Morrill’s comment about the role of the national government portrays the socialist mind-set this man possessed in the 1860s. John Sherman’s comment about “nationalizing” as much as possible also betrays his collectivist mentality. Willingly signing these measures into law clearly demonstrates that Lincoln was more than ready in 1860 to implement in the United States what Marx had given his blessing to in Europe in 1848; that is, centralism, collectivism, and socialism. This adoption of socialist schemes has had an impact on this country from the 1860s down to present-day America. As Americans, we...

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 2,059

After the war ended, Schurz once again took up the practice of law, this time in Washington, D.C. He also served as a correspondent for the New York Tribune. The Tribune, it should be remembered, was the paper that Karl Marx served as a contributor; it was the Tribune that the radical "socialist for life" Horace Greeley owned; and it was the Tribune that Marx and Engels' good friend Charles A. Dana served as associate editor. It is no surprise that radical socialists and friends of Karl Marx, and former Union general Carl Schurz, should find a home at the Tribune! In 1866, Schurz was sent on an investigative tour of the defeated South, ostensibly to report on conditions in the region, particularly on the work of the Freedmen's Bureau, America's first full-blown welfare scheme. By 1867, Schurz was a successful newspaper editor in Detroit and then in St. Louis, Missouri. Schurz, the Radical Republican, was launched into national politics in 1869, when chosen as a United States senator from Missouri. During the term of President Rutherford B. Hayes, Schurz served as the 13th United States Secretary of the Interior (1877-81). He ended his public career in 1901 serving as president of the National Civil Service Reform League. What a spectacular career for a man who began his life as a radical socialist revolutionary and admirer of Karl Marx's theories. One can only speculate at just how much socialist influence these radicals had in "their" day as well as the influence they are still having. When considering the influence these radicals had on the founding of the Republican Party, the election of Lincoln, and the war against the South, one should keep in mind these statements by Heinrich H. Maurer. He noted that "the fate of the Republican Party" and the election of Lincoln in 1860 were due to the support of the "German element in the Northwest." Maurer states that the election of "Mr. Lincoln would not have been possible" without the assistance of these German Forty-Eighters.¹⁹⁹

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 2,296

THE AVERAGE AMERICAN VIEWS the Republican Party as the party of small government, low taxes, and a bulwark against communism and socialism. Yet, until the mid-twentieth century, the red roots of the Republican Party held sway over the actions of the GOP. What most Americans do not realize is that radical socialists, Marxists, and other big government advocates were crucial in the founding of the GOP, Lincoln's 1860 GOP nomination, Lincoln's election as president, and the support for Lincoln's war against the South and, therefore, real States' Rights.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 2,301

The Republican Party, organized in 1854-55, was supposedly created to prevent the spread of slavery. It must be pointed out that neither Lincoln nor the Republican Party opposed slavery “where it exists” but only the movement of slaves into the territory of the United States. In his first Inaugural Address in 1861 Lincoln stated: “I have no purpose, directly or indirectly, to interfere with the institution of slavery in the states where it exists.”²¹³ A fact that most GOP advocates ignore is that the fourth plank of the 1860 Republican Party platform guaranteed protection for each State to “order and control its own domestic institutions.”²¹⁴ Domestic institutions are a euphemism, i.e., code-word, for slavery. The Republican Party was the successor to the Whig Party, whose champion was Henry Clay. Clay and the Whig Party were advocates of the “American System” which promoted every big government scheme that Jefferson, Madison, Jackson and other Democrats opposed. The first time Lincoln ran for a public office and the first time he was elected to a public office, Lincoln was a big government Whig.²¹⁵ In the announcement of his first political campaign, Lincoln stated that he was a “Henry Clay Whig.” The Whig Party was the descendant of and inheritor of the principles of America’s first big government party, the Federalist Party. Like Clay, the Republican Party advocated internal improvements (little more than another method of redistributing the wealth), protective tariffs, and a strong central government. The central thread connecting all three parties, Federalist, Whig, and Republican, was their desire for a government strong (big) enough to advance the above-mentioned measures. By embracing these big government measures, the Republican Party endeared itself to newly arriving radical socialists.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 2,315

It should be noted that the first Republican convention, held in Philadelphia in June of 1856, had nineteen German American delegates, most of whom were either Forty-Eighters or their sycophants. John C. Fremont became the first GOP presidential nominee at the Republican Party’s first National Convention. As previously noted, Fremont was supported by the Forty-Eighters in 1856 and when war broke out, these same radicals flocked to now General Fremont’s camp, filling every rank from private to general. Before the election of 1860 many Forty-Eighters had attained positions of influence in the German-American community. Among those influential German Forty-Eighters were Frederick Hassaurek, August Willich, and Carl Schurz. In *Ethnic Voters and the Election of Lincoln*, we are informed: “In Ohio, Colonel Willich called a meeting of German voters which resolved to issue a manifesto, setting forth the principles of the German Republicans against discrimination between native and naturalized citizens. Prominent among the out-of-state leaders at this meeting were [Carl] Schurz of Wisconsin, Nicholas J. Rusch of Iowa, George Schneider, editor of the *Illinois Staats Zeitung*, [Gustave] Koerner of Illinois, and Frederick Kapp of New York.”²¹⁶ As previously noted, Schurz and Willich were Forty-Eighters, as was Kapp from New York. The 1860 Republican Convention for nominating the GOP’s candidate for president was

held in Chicago. Since this area was a Forty-Eighter stronghold, this choice increased the radical socialist's influence on the Party's platform and nominee. Many Midwestern German socialists were there as delegates, credentialed from their states of residence. Johann Bernhard Stallo from Ohio was present at the GOP convention. Although he was not technically a Forty-Eighter, he was definitely one of their sympathizers. Stallo was a close friend of August Willich, an avowed communist and friend of Karl Marx and Fredrick Engels. Also attending were Frederick Hassaurek from Cincinnati and Henry (Heinrich) Bornstein from Missouri. Bornstein was another "American" friend of Karl Marx and Fredrick Engels. Bornstein's radical politics extended from socialism of the Marxist persuasion to a strongly held anti-Catholic philosophy. No lists of early Republican socialists would be complete without the name of the ever-present Carl Schurz from Wisconsin, also a delegate...

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 2,365

In his murderous activities in Kansas, John Brown had the support of a group of wealthy and influential Northerners known as the Secret Six. Assisting Brown in his terrorist activities in Kansas were two radical socialist revolutionaries from Europe, August Bondi and Charles Kaiser. Without question, John Brown was a murdering terrorist. One is led to wonder why so many Germans in Iowa were disturbed at the execution of this terrorist. Were Brown's fanatical and bloody methods of dealing with Southerners so justifiable in their minds that these Germans felt compelled to mourn Brown's execution? If so, what does this tell us about the "freedom" and "democracy" these same men had supposedly been fighting for in Europe? More to the point, what does this tell us about the "freedom" and "democracy" Forty-Eighters, Lincoln, and the Republican Party were fighting to force upon the South and ultimately America? Rather than freeing the enslaved, Lincoln and the Republican Party enslaved the free by forcing the shackles of big, indivisible and all-powerful government upon all Americans. To reiterate, socialists and communists never mean the same things by their use of such terms as "freedom" and "democracy" as ordinary Americans. In our understanding of their revolutionary intentions, in the nineteenth, twentieth, and twenty-first centuries, we need to keep this fact firmly fixed in our minds. For these people, language was, and still is, a tool of propaganda.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 2,453

A somewhat different group of socialist revolutionaries appeared in the United States during the 1830s and 1840s, known as "Chartists." The Chartists were a radical group in Britain which began a push for radical social reform along the lines of socialism. The Chartist Movement in England has been called "the first proletarian protest of the Industrial Revolution." It was a movement that started with a "people's charter" drawn

up in 1836. As with most such movements in Europe at that time, what started as a mild reform movement with support from people across the cultural spectrum, soon morphed into a radical socialist revolution. Once the “reform” movement turned into a socialist revolution, more and more people turned against the revolt, and it failed. Even in failure, some needed reforms were instituted but unfortunately, the seeds of socialism were planted. Richard Hinton was another English radical who was gently persuaded to leave England in 1848. He embraced the dogmas of Radical Republicanism and abolitionism and became an associate of the terrorist, John Brown. During the war he rose to the rank of colonel. After the war, he became a correspondent for a Boston newspaper and was said to be a “confirmed socialist.”²³² Without a doubt, the most famous of the Chartists who sought refuge in America was Allan Pinkerton, the founder of the Pinkerton Detective Agency. In his book *Desperate Men*, James D. Horan noted that Allan Pinkerton came to the United States as a result of his flight from British agents who were seeking to arrest radicals of the Chartist Movement.²³³ Pinkerton settled in Dundee, Illinois, where he ran a station on the controversial “Underground Railroad” helping escaped slaves to flee to Canada. The question that begs to be asked but too often overlooked is, “Why Canada”? The reason these slaves had to go to Canada was because the people of Illinois (and most Northern States) refused to allow free people of color to move into their state. Pennsylvania Congressman David Wilmot, author of the Wilmot Proviso which would have prevented the movement of slaves into the Western territories, announced that he had, “no squeamish sensitiveness upon the subject of slavery, no morbid sympathy for the slave.”²³⁴ In 1860 Senator James Harlan of Iowa noted the feelings of the people of the Northwest when he said, “This prejudice exists in my own state. It would be impossible to carry a proposition in Iowa to educate the few colored children that now live in that State in the same schools with the white children. It would be impossible, I think, in any one of the States of the Northwest.”²³⁵ This is not to detract from people seeking to assist those desiring to be free nor those attempting to help but it is eye-opening to understand that the North was not a “safe-place” for escaped slaves or freed African Americans. During this time, Pinkerton established a friendship with John Brown. Pinkerton assisted the terrorist John Brown by giving...

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 2,480

book on Pinkerton, MacKay explains that Pinkerton was a devoted reader of Harney's essays. It should be pointed out that Harney was described as a man fanatically committed to advancing the socialist cause. Harney's enthusiasm for the socialist cause was one reason that Pinkerton's biographer gave for Pinkerton's admiration for Harney (remember that Harney was a friend of Marx and Engels).²³⁷

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 2,490

From radical socialist refugee, radical abolitionist, Republican stalwart, and presidential confidant, Allan Pinkerton for better or worse had a great impact on American history. He established his detective agency in Chicago, which carries his name to this day. He got an early start by providing detective services to the Illinois Central Railroad at about the same time Abraham Lincoln was providing the railroad legal services. When Lincoln went to Washington to be inaugurated after his election, Pinkerton went along, and as we are told exposed a plot to assassinate the newly elected president in Baltimore. It has been asserted by some historians that the plot was invented by Pinkerton to boost his agency's status.²³⁹ As the war began, Pinkerton served under General George B. McClellan, in the Department of the Ohio, as the chief of that department's secret service.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 2,586

Another close associate of Marx who found Abraham Lincoln and the Republican Party worthy of their support was Joseph Weydemeyer. Joseph Sullivan, in the spring 1997 issue of Columbia Magazine, noted that Weydemeyer was: "A refugee from the 1848 Revolt, and a particularly close associate of Marx... and tireless advocate of communism."²⁴³ Sullivan also notes that Weydemeyer immigrated to the United States and established New York as his residence in 1851. Some of Weydemeyer's more notable accomplishments in New York were the publication of Marx's Communist Manifesto, assisting in organizing the New York Communist Club, and publishing a German-language newspaper, Die Revolution. Moving to St. Louis, Missouri, in 1860, at the out-break of war, Weydemeyer offered his service to the darling of the Forty-Eighters, Major General John C. Fremont.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 2,593

As was pointed out in Chapter 3, Carl Wittke confirmed that Weydemeyer was a close friend of both Marx and Engels and is lauded by America's communists as a pioneer of modern-day American communism. It is interesting to note that Weydemeyer's adoption of communism was made possible by his association with Anneke and Willich. Before being expelled from his homeland, Weydemeyer served as editor of several communist and socialist journals and newspapers in Germany. After the failure of the socialist revolution, he remained in Germany but was eventually expelled; consequently, he made his way to the United States. He arrived in New York with a letter of introduction to Charles A. Dana, the editor of Horace Greeley's New York Tribune, from his friend Karl Marx, and began his new life in America.²⁴⁴ With the blessing of the London Marxists, Weydemeyer formed the first Marxist organization, the Proletarian League of New York, in the United States in June of 1852.²⁴⁵ Communist support for Lincoln and the Republican Party cannot be hidden. Author

Carl Wittke mentioned Weydemeyer's passionate support for Lincoln in his book, *Refugees of Revolution*.²⁴⁶ With the assistance of Dr. Grottfried T. Kellner, Weydemeyer started yet another radical newspaper in 1853. A failure in the newspaper business, Weydemeyer turned to writing and speaking about the efforts of the English Chartist. Eventually, Weydemeyer returned to New York, where he helped Frederick L. Olmstead survey Central Park. Weydemeyer's passionate support for Lincoln and the Republican Party was noted by author Carl Wittke, in his book, *Refugees of Revolution*.²⁴⁷

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 2,818

Eighter Friedrich Kapp. Cecilia's cousin, Friedrich, was a Forty-Eighter with a bent toward writing. He earned a law degree at the University of Berlin. However, when the '48 revolution broke out, he was engaged as a newspaper correspondent. Not satisfied with reporting the events of the revolution, within a year, he traded the power of the pen for the power of the gun and was manning the barricades. Exiled to Switzerland when the revolution was crushed, he, along with most of his comrades, sought refuge in America, arriving in the United States in 1850 with two dollars in his pocket. Although he got back into the practice of law again, he still had some printer's ink in his veins as well as a love for socialist politics. Within a year of establishing residence in New York, Kapp was writing for several newspapers and journals. As editor of the *New Yorker-Abendzeitung*, he became a propaganda agent for the new Republican Party and was largely responsible for swinging the German-American vote to the Republican Party and Abraham Lincoln.²⁷⁷ It should come as no surprise then that Kapp, along with the other Forty-Eighters, was a presidential elector for Lincoln in 1860. This is just one more piece of evidence of the radical socialists' love for the Republican Party. No matter how it is viewed, Abraham Lincoln had the Forty-Eighters in his corner.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 2,844

By 1854 Kapp established his home in Chicago. He became active in local and state politics as well as in writing for the *Staatszeitung*. As a radical abolitionist, he showered John Brown with praise and after Brown's death wrote a poem eulogizing Brown. Kapp remained active in politics as a Radical Republican and helped to swing the Chicago German vote for the Republican Party and Abraham Lincoln.²⁷⁹ As a point of clarification, it must be stressed once again that condemning radical abolitionists does not indicate a dislike for all Americans struggling for the elimination of slavery. There is a great difference between the radical bomb-throwing, saber-thrusting, murdering fanatics of the Radical Abolitionist Party and men such as George Washington, Patrick Henry, and Robert E. Lee (just to name a few) who sought a peaceful means of

eliminating the institution of slavery. Opposing radical abolitionists is not equivalent to defending slavery, regardless of what neo-Marxist proclaim.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 3,008

Early in the war, Fremont was commissioned a major general, and Lincoln appointed him to be commander of the Western Department. Outside of St. Louis, the Union Army was not overly popular in Missouri. The majority of people, even if they were not thrilled about the idea of secession, were quite unsympathetic to the Northern attempt to forcibly coerce Missouri and other Southern states to stay in the Union. When Northern armies, commanded by people associated with radical abolitionists and foreign extremists, began to occupy Missouri, many Missourians felt they were being invaded. This was particularly true for the majority of Missourians who had duly elected a Pro-Southern governor. With no appreciable Confederate military to aid them, Missourians took to defending their state and they formed regular troops and partisan groups to resist the Union invasion wherever possible.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 3,747

Karl Marx and Fredrick Engels admired Abraham Lincoln and did all within their power to assist Lincoln during the War for Southern Independence. In a congratulatory address to President Lincoln on his reelection, Marx made the following statement: “[I]t fell to the lot of Abraham Lincoln, the single-minded son of the working class, to lead his country through the matchless struggle for the rescue of an enchained race and the reconstruction of a social world.”³⁵⁷ [Emphasis added]. Marx, speaking of Lincoln as the “single-minded son of the working class” and champion of “the reconstruction of a social world,” points out what Marx desired for America. For Marx, every twist and turn in history was viewed as one more step toward the successful conclusion of the communist or proletarian revolution. The building of a new social world had to begin somewhere and somehow, and a good Marxist would do anything to advance the communist cause. As Fredrick Engels pointed out to future Lincoln supporter and Yankee general, Joseph Weydemeyer, the forging of a strong indivisible republic would lay the groundwork for the advancement of communism (see Chapter 2). From the beginning of these United States, utopian dreamers sought to build a social world in America. Surely, they all did not have the same idea of a social world like the one envisioned by Marx and Engels. Still, they all did have a few things in common: (1) They believed that man was capable of creating a “brave new world” free of injustice; (2) They believed that by cooperative labor man could fulfill every need for himself and his fellow man; (3) Slowly as time passed, these homegrown American utopian dreamers began to believe that in the pursuit of their social world they were justified in the use of whatever force deemed necessary to achieve their objective. These utopian dreamers

demonstrated this determination first and foremost in the form of radical abolitionism. When John Brown murdered non-slaveholding Southerners in Kansas, radical abolitionists excused his exuberance because, after all, he was fighting slavery. When John Brown raided Harper's Ferry, killing a free man of color and inciting a slave insurrection, an act which if successful would have led to the murder of innocent men, women, and children; his acts were excused because, after all, he was fighting slavery. Thus, man freed from the moral limitations of Christianity is allowed to "make up the rules as he goes," which is the benchmark of freethinking philosophy. A quick look at the record of violence of men such as Stalin and Hitler demonstrate the deleterious results of following such a philosophy.

Note:
