



YOUR KINDLE NOTES FOR:

The South Was Right!: A New Edition for the 21st Century

James Ronald Kennedy and Walter Donald Kennedy

Last accessed on Tuesday, July 2, 2024

71 Highlights | 0 Notes

Yellow highlight | Location: 186

Not since the end of the War for Southern Independence has such a dramatic challenge been issued to the American people. The struggle our Confederate forefathers made in the 1860s is not over. The principles of local self-government and State's Rights, to include the explicit rights of nullification and secession, are viable and necessary in today's otherwise impersonal world. The South has always been the enemy of big government. This is what motivated Southerners to take up arms in defense of Dixie in 1861. There must be a fundamental change in the current, overgrown, unresponsive, tax-and-spend supreme federal government. If the ruling elites in Washington reject the demands of the people for a government more respectful of our rights, then it will be faced with the prospect of the Southern people—as well as people in conservative “red counties” across America following the lead of Lithuania (1990) and England via Brexit (2016) as we demand the right of self-determination. Deo

Note:

Yellow highlight | Page: 7

As a result of his advocacy in favor of the Confederate monument, all the black representatives in the Mississippi legislature voted in favor of funding the erection of the Confederate monument. No, it was not and is not about racism or slavery as the South's enemies falsely and slanderously claim. Our leftist, postmodernists enemies make their claims, not in the service of truth, but in an intentional effort to slander and thereby silence (censor) Southerners who know the truth about why the North (under the leadership of Lincoln and the Republican Party) invaded the South. But the truth must be censored or else the invader's false narrative will not survive.¹⁴ Our enemies use slander in a successful effort to censor (hide or obscure) the truth about why Lincoln and the Republican Party initiated a war of conquest against their former countrymen.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Page: 8

In 1925 the United States mint issued a 50-cent coin with the images of Confederate Generals on Stone Mountain. No one accused the United States mint of being in favor

of slavery, promoting white supremacy or racial hatred. It was done to honor the men who wore the gray in the War for Southern Independence. It also recognized the inherited valor of the sons and grandsons of the men who wore the gray. Sons and grandsons who have served in the U.S. military since Appomattox—1865.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Page: 9

During World War II, the first American flag to fly over the captured Japanese fortress at Okinawa was a Confederate Battle Flag. A marine company put it there to honor their commander—who happened to be a South Carolinian—who suffered a paralyzing wound in the victorious assault.¹⁶ The proud tradition of military service by Southerners continues today. An article published in January, 2020 in the New York Times noted that Southerners are more likely to volunteer for the U.S. military than people from other sections of the U.S.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Page: 10

Today, neo-Marxist mobs are given virtually free reign to vandalize and destroy Confederate monuments. In modern America it is common for elected officials to ban the appearance of Confederate flags in public parades, while the monopolistic mainline media censors anything positive about the South. It has become apparent that national respect or at least tolerance for our Southern heritage no longer exists. This respect or toleration was supposedly purchased by the effusion of Southern blood in the defense of the United States of America since 1865. It is evident today that this assumed respect or tolerance no longer exists!¹⁸ The United States is losing more than it understands. Generations of left wing, neo-Marxist brainwashing in our taxpayer funded educational centers has created a dumbed-down, snowflake population unable to think rationally or discuss differing opinions while conducting themselves with decorum and civility. The sad fact is that “our” taxpayer funded universities have become neo-Marxist indoctrination centers.¹⁹ President Eisenhower was questioned why the President of the United States and former supreme commander of Allied forces in Western Europe during World War II would have a photograph of General Robert E. Lee in his presidential office? President Eisenhower wrote back:

Note:

Yellow highlight | Page: 10

President John F. Kennedy, a World War II veteran, added his words of praise for the honorable traditions of the South. No one could honestly accuse President Kennedy of being a racist. But today, any American President, or for that matter any public official who utters words of praise for our Confederate ancestors, will be immediately assaulted by the left-of-center mainline press— something Justice Clarence Thomas

referred to as a “high-tech lynch mob.”²¹ The leftwing media lynch mob and neo-Marxist storm-troopers falsely claim individuals daring to speak positively about the South are actually uttering code words or “dog whistles” favoring slavery and racism.²² President Kennedy’s words speak of tolerance, respect and civility. Such things are absent in “modern” America. Modern America is a postmodernist, secular humanist America that is dominated by the ideology of political correctness as espoused by neo-Marxist social justice warriors and neo-Marxist academicians who now control our universities. President Kennedy, a liberal Democrat, was willing to honor the noble heritage of the South: As a New Englander, I recognize that the South is still the land of Washington, who made our Nation, of Jefferson, who shaped its direction, and of Robert E. Lee who, after gallant failure, urged those who had followed him in bravery to reunite America in purpose and courage. ²³ The America that was willing to extend tolerance—let alone respect—toward the South and traditional Southerners who wish to honor the truth about our South; that America no longer exists! Is it an act of “extremism” to admit the obvious? Is it “un-American” to tell the truth about the way “our” current political system is treating “we the people” of Dixie? Is it “unpatriotic” to insist that the nation that alleges to be a nation “with liberty and justice for all” include Southerners? Where is the “justice” let alone the “liberty” for the traditional South?

Note:

Yellow highlight | Page: 20

BEFORE A TYRANNICAL GOVERNMENT can conduct a campaign of genocide against a defeated enemy, it must first convince its people and the people of the world that the targeted group is evil, dangerous, sub-human folks outside the norms of “politically correct” society. Once the targeted group is thus slandered and socially stigmatized, it becomes acceptable, even necessary, to rid society of such “evil” and “hateful” folks. The Southern people were the victim of Northern slander even before the war. Yankee pre-War anti-South propaganda set the stage for their aggressive war to exterminate, if not the Southern people, then at least to exterminate the South’s political influence in the national government. This Southern, conservative, Constitution affirming political influence had, until 1861, prevented the North from turning the original limited federal government into a Northern controlled supreme federal government. The North’s evil slander destroyed the South’s pre-1830s efforts to establish peaceful emancipation—it was the major pre-war cultural distortion of Southern society. The destruction of the South’s initial efforts to end slavery resulted in the South being accused of wanting to continue slavery forever. This slanderous accusation originated in Yankee cultural distortion of Southern society and would be used continually throughout the nineteenth, twentieth, and twenty-first centuries.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Page: 23

Regardless of how insidious a particular instance of persecution, destruction, theft of personal property, oppression of civil liberties, or destruction of constitutional safeguards may be, the Yankee invader justifies these measures as necessary to maintain the Union (a myth), to free the slaves (a myth), or to maintain the legitimate national government (a myth). Our acceptance of the Yankee myth relieves the aggressor of the necessity of defending his heinous crimes against the Southern people. Empires attempt to force their conquered population to accept the imperial myth.³ Once this has been accomplished, the population becomes pacified within a few short generations. Then the danger of an insurrection or challenge to the empire is reduced to almost zero. In spite of this diminished threat, truth has a mystical power of its own. Though crushed, like the conquered nation, truth still resides in the public memory and will inevitably re-assert itself with a vengeance.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Page: 27

Notice how Owsley complained about the North's insistence that Southerners accept what he called "the Northern legend." Owsley recognized that this Northern legend,¹³ or myth, was the vehicle the North used to condition (indoctrinate, brainwash) each generation of Southerners so that we would dutifully occupy our assigned position upon what he referred to as the "stools of everlasting repentance."¹⁴ Owsley recognized what Jennings, et al., in *The Gray Book* failed to see. Regardless of how loyal the South remained to what Jennings called "our reunited country," no matter how much Southern blood was spilled in foreign wars while fighting under the flag of our "reunited country," the Yankee Empire had no intention of ever allowing Southerners to climb down from their assigned place upon the "stools of everlasting repentance"!

Note:

Yellow highlight | Page: 28

As a Southerner, Owsley was able to evaluate our society using our own standards. He analyzed the pre-war South not from the point of view of economics but from the vantage point of culture. He discovered that the larger part of the "plain folk" (those white Southerners who were not a part of the plantation system) were not class conscious, and they were not in open competition with the larger planters for land or resources. The plain folk enjoyed political, social, and economic independence. But note the difference in his view of "money-grubbing." "Relatively few of the plain folk, however, seem to have had a desire to become wealthy."¹⁷ Their contempt for materialism was a natural part of the cultural heritage of the Celtic people from which the majority of them sprang. This contempt of wealth was a major factor in the true assessment of Southern society, a factor that the Yankee mind refused to understand and therefore would not include in its narrow, self-serving evaluation of Southern

society. Owsley noted further that very few of the plain folk were wealthy, and even fewer were poor enough to suffer want. They were a cordial and hospitable people who enjoyed life. They even had a system of social security whereby they shared work when a member of society became ill or injured. The conditional granting of land was one method used by Southern folk to provide for social security.¹⁸ Yankee myth-makers would have us believe that the South was a poor and backward area prior to the war. The facts tell a different story. For example, in 1860, if the South had been an independent nation her economy would have ranked as the third largest on the European and American continents.¹⁹ The purchase of advanced farming implements in the South was twenty-five percent higher than in the North²⁰. The South had thirty-three percent of the nation's railroad mileage plus navigable streams that did not freeze, and direct coastal access to the ocean in most of the Southern states.²¹ The South was behind the North in per capita railroad mileage but still ahead of every other nation in the world.²² According to the 1860 census, the South had a per capita income ten percent higher than all states west of New York and Pennsylvania.²³ (Could it be that the New England states were rich as a result of their illicit trade in human flesh—the slave trade?) The important point for Southerners to remember is that our history has been distorted (as in cultural distortion) by our enemies. Whether this was done deliberately (as claimed by Davis, Jennings, et al.) or as a natural result of strangers using their own standards to evaluate a different society, the point is made that Southern history has been perverted to injure us regardless of the motive or causative factors. But Southerners must never forget that cultural distortion is a major impact following the invasion, conquest and occupation of any free people.²⁴

Note:

Yellow highlight | Page: 32

In 1988, The University of Alabama Press published *Cracker Culture: Celtic Ways in the Old South* by Dr. Grady McWhiney. Professor McWhiney again challenged the accepted Northern history of the Southern people. He demonstrated the importance of Celtic culture in Southern society. He noted that Southerners were different from their Yankee counterparts in that our society was leisure oriented and dominated by a system of open-range grazing with support from low-intensity crop cultivation. This stood in contrast to the money-grubbing Yankee culture that patterned its culture after the English (Anglo-Saxon) culture which insisted upon high intensity cultivation and valued hard work and economic profit.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Page: 32

The influence of the various cultures that populated Colonial America has been documented by David Hackett Fisher in his book *Albion's Seed*. Fisher, a Northerner, demonstrates the four primary emigration patterns originating in the British Isles. The

various cultural distinctions of these people influenced such social behavior as dietary preferences, mode of dress, and religious attitudes.³¹ The early emigration patterns to the South came principally from North Britain (Northern England and Scotland), Northern Ireland, and the Saxon areas of South England.³² The New England colonies received more emigrants from the traditionally English, East Anglia (Puritans),³³ and the middle colonies received the bulk of Quakers from the North Midlands of England.³⁴ Thus the cultural differences between the North and the South originated in the British Isles. The people who came to this continent did not forsake their ancient folkways, attitudes, and grudges, but adapted them to the new environment.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Page: 34

One of the great Yankee Myths of history is that they fought the War to end slavery. Nothing could be further from the truth, but when you control the flow of information in the country, you can establish your false narrative as the truth and censor efforts of the conquered and occupied people to tell their side of the story. Shortly after the South seceded the Republican controlled Congress submitted, and Lincoln supported, a Thirteenth Amendment that would guarantee the security of slavery if the South would re-join the Union. It was called the Corwin Amendment and several Union states ratified it but it soon became apparent that the South wanted independence and the amendment died. Had it passed slavery in the United States would have continued under Lincoln's administration and Republican Party rule. The North's motive for invading a sovereign nation, the Confederate States of America, was not to free their oppressed black brothers and sisters. Lincoln's and the Republican Party's primary aim was to secure the continuing flow of Southern wealth extracted via protective tariffs. But what about the claim that the North's aggression against the South was justified because it ended slavery? Before the War there were approximately 4.5 million chattel slaves in the South. After the War 8.5 million impoverished former chattel slaves and non-plantation whites were forced into a system of debt peonage called sharecropping.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Page: 34

Sharecropping was recognized as "a new form of slavery" by Southern religious leaders such as Louisiana's Bishop Anthony Durier. Social scientist and noted historians referred to sharecropping as debt peonage, while Southern politicians, such as Governor James of Louisiana and U.S. Senator Eastland from Mississippi labeled it a system worse than chattel slavery. Sharecropping was the only alternative left to over 8.5 million impoverished folks in the post-War South—over 60 per cent of sharecroppers were white. This new system of slavery lasted for almost a century after the end of the War for Southern Independence. The post War Yankee Empire saw no reason to initiate a struggle to end this new form of slavery—they no longer need slavery as an excuse for

empire building via aggressive war. Malnutrition and disease became common in the South during the almost century of Yankee imposed sharecropping slavery. Historians have estimated that millions of people died or became chronically ill across the South due to the unhealthy conditions imposed on the Southern people by our conquering masters. President Franklin D. Roosevelt's Administration recognized the oppressive conditions the South's sharecroppers were suffering under but did nothing to relieve the condition the government of the United States forced upon the South. A complete history of post War poverty and sharecropping is available in Punished With Poverty—the Suffering South by the Kennedy Twins. Myth:

Note:

Yellow highlight | Page: 37

In an 1858 debate Lincoln made the following statements: I will say, then, that I am not, nor ever have been, in favor of bringing about in anyway the social and political equality of the white and black races—that I am not, nor ever have been, in favor of making voters or jurors of negroes, nor of qualifying them to hold office, nor to intermarry with white people; and I will say in addition to this that there is a physical difference between the white and black races. I, as much as any other man, am in favor of having the superior position assigned to the white race. 41 Another sin for which the liberal press had no tolerance is support for apartheid. How shocking it is to learn that Lincoln was planning a system of geographical separation similar to that which was practiced in South Africa. Again, in a debate with Stephen A. Douglas, Lincoln made the following comments: Such separation if effected at all, must be effected by colonization: . . . what colonization most needs is a hearty will. . . . Let us be brought to believe that it is morally right, and at the same time favorable to, or at least not against, our interests to transfer the African to his native clime, and we shall find a way to do it, however great the task may be.42 Again, allow the authors to reiterate that we have quoted Lincoln's personal view on white supremacy and geographical separation not in an effort to encourage said views but to demonstrate the difference between Yankee myth and reality. Now let us look at the Yankee myth of Lincoln the protector of liberty. The dictatorial power of Lincoln is evidenced when he suspended the writ of habeas corpus and then moved to silence his critics in the North, not in the South. (At that time Southerners were governed by one who was governing with the consent of the governed—what a novel idea! Perhaps we should try it again.) Some writers place the number of Lincoln's political prisoners as high as forty thousand. They were held indefinitely, without knowing what, if any, charges were brought against them and without receiving bail or the services of an attorney. Indeed, many of their families did not even know where they were. More than three hundred newspapers and journals were shut down by Lincoln's executive order. A member of Lincoln's Cabinet had a bell on his desk about which the secretary would brag that he could send any American to prison just by ringing that bell! It was with no small amount of contempt that the Raleigh (NC) News and Observer wrote some time after the war that, even though the

Confederate government was new at the time and faced with invasion, "It is to the honor of the Confederate government that no Confederate secretary ever could touch a bell and send a citizen to prison."⁴³

Note:

Yellow highlight | Page: 39

The court-martial of a ranking officer was not done overnight or in secret. As we will demonstrate in a later chapter, the officials in Washington were aware of the crimes being committed by their military personnel in the name of the United States. Yet even though Colonel Turchin was under court-martial for horrible crimes against innocent civilians and subsequently found guilty, President Lincoln promoted Colonel Turchin to the rank of Brigadier General of the United States Volunteers on August 5, 1862!⁴⁸ Turchin accepted his gift from Lincoln on September 1, 1862, and continued his service to the United States in its war of aggression against the Southern nation. Yankee mythology portrays Lincoln as a compassionate fighter for human rights and liberty. It tells us that he was a man full of love and emotions of tender mercies directed toward the downtrodden, the enslaved, the weak and defenseless masses of mankind. Yet Lincoln, the Yankee Empire's first president, has the dubious distinction of being the only American president who personally ordered the mass execution of Americans whose guilt could not be positively determined! Not only did Lincoln order their execution but he personally participated in the selection of the victims!⁴⁹ In 1862 several tribes of Native Americans revolted against the cruel policies of the United States government. General John Pope was sent to Minnesota to put down the uprising. After the end of hostilities, Pope sent a message to Lincoln that, after a trial, he ordered more than three hundred warriors executed by hanging. The whites of Minnesota were clamoring for the execution of all Indian prisoners of war. Lincoln knew that the "trial" had been a sham, but he also knew that he needed the white votes from Minnesota. His "political" compromise was to make a blood offering to the whites in Minnesota. As a token to appease the whites, Lincoln selected thirty-nine Indian prisoners to be executed. Lincoln carried Minnesota in the next election, but the price was paid by Native Americans. Lincoln is America's only president to order a mass execution!

Note:

Yellow highlight | Page: 42

In the first chapter of his book, *Southern History of the War*, Edward A. Pollard explains the Yankee Empire's myth of the perpetual union. The concept of perpetual union does have an American historical precedent. The Articles of Confederation, the government that preceded the original Constitutional Republic, did have a clause in its preamble stating that the Articles of Confederation was establishing a perpetual union! What happened to this perpetual union? Well, believe it or not, each state seceded from it,

dissolved that union, and established a new union among only those states that subsequently ratified the Constitution. Unionists have never been able to discover similar language— perpetual union—in the United States Constitution. The guarantee of a perpetual union is conspicuous by its absence. The Founding Fathers made the mistake of guaranteeing one perpetual union that did not work out, and they were not going to make the same mistake again! So much for the myth of the necessity for a righteous crusade to save the Holy Union. The North fought the war to save its empire. The Yankee Empire was built upon the ashes of our Southern nation, our freedom, our economic security, and our well- being as a people.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Page: 43

Who in his right mind could honestly claim that Southern soldiers and sailors, the vast majority of whom were not slave owners, went to war against a numerically superior foe and endured four long years of hardships, all in order to allow a few rich men to keep their slaves? Yet, the slanderous Yankee myth of history is so pervasive that this is the message that our children receive from the educational system paid for with taxes extracted from conservative Southerners. Jefferson Davis wrote to his wife in February, 1861 that no matter what the result of the conflict was, the slave property of the South “will eventually be lost.”⁵² President Davis’ inaugural address did not mention slavery. (See Addendum II). A partial list of Southern leaders who were not slave owners includes such notables as: General Robert E. Lee, C.S.A. General Joseph Johnston, C.S.A. General A. P. Hill, C.S.A. General Fitzhugh Lee, C.S.A. General J. E. B. Stuart, C.S.A. Add to this evidence the testimony of a soldier who served in the Confederate army: I

Note:

Yellow highlight | Page: 47

From these few examples it can be seen that these men were fighting for the same principles their Colonial forefathers fought for in the War for American Independence—the right of self-government.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Page: 47

The enduring economic impact is demonstrated by the fact that it was not until 1911 that the taxable assets of the state of Georgia surpassed their value of 1860.⁶⁰ The state of Louisiana lost \$170,000,000 in slave property.⁶¹ Now remember, pious Yankee and Southern Scalawag, the Northern slave owner had been very careful to liquidate his investment in his slave property via his unique method of emancipation. Keep in mind that it was rich Northern merchants who still held the profits from the sale of these very same slaves! In Louisiana at the beginning of the war there were twelve hundred operating sugar mills. By the end of the war there were only 180 mills left. As

a result of the war, at least one-half of the cattle, pigs, sheep, mules, and horses had disappeared from the state of Louisiana alone.⁶² The percentage was even higher for other Southern states. Today's non-agricultural people may not realize that the destruction of livestock and draft animals meant that food production in the coming years would be drastically reduced. This set-in motion the starvation and malnutrition of successive generations of Southerners well after the Yankee Empire's glorious victory.⁶³

Note:

Yellow highlight | Page: 49

The bad news continues for the South. In addition to selling our birthright of virgin forest, the South, in more recent times, has attempted to gain economic ground by concentrating on industrial development. Southern governors make annual pilgrimages to the North to beg Northern industries to come down South and take advantage of our cheap labor supply. In addition to taking advantage of this labor supply, Northern industrialists have also been taking advantage of our environment. The Shreveport (LA) Times, April 12, 1990, page 12A, carried a news report of a recent study of the environment. The report concludes that the South has become America's cesspool! The South's economic condition relative to the rest of the United States has changed very little since 1994 when the second edition of this book was published. The South is still the poorest economic area of the United States—an ignoble position we have held since the unfortunate end of the war. In 2014 the median household income for the United States was \$50,502 whereas the South's median household income was \$40,252—approximately 22 percent lower than the national level.⁷⁰ An economy in ruins, a second-class economic status, the transformation of a people from self-sufficiency to dependency, the lowest personal income in America, the irreplaceable loss of our virgin forest, and the pollution of our environment. These effects and more have been the direct result of (1) Yankee conquest and (2) the inability of Southerners to control our economic destiny. We fail to see how losing our war for independence has made the Southern people "better off"; yet, duped Southerners still dutifully parrot this Yankee myth.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Page: 50

Yankee propagandists claim that General Lee was opposed to secession. While this is true, they fail to state that many, if not a majority of Southerners, were opposed to secession—opposed until Yankee aggression left no choice except secession. President Davis stated in his inaugural address that secession of the Southern states came "as a necessity, and not a choice." Opposition to secession, when other remedies still remain, does not make one less of a Southern Nationalist.

Note:

Yankee propagandists suggest that General Lee really was not committed so much to Southern Independence as he was to fighting to protect his native state of Virginia. General Lee's own words will put to rest this Yankee myth. In a letter to Lord Acton, dated December 15, 1866, General Lee described himself as "a citizen of the South."⁷¹ In the same letter General Lee stated that he believed that the maintenance of the reserved rights (State's Rights) under the Original Constitution was essential "to the continuance of a free government."⁷² He then emphasized what would happen if those reserved rights were concentrated into a central government; he believed this action would result in a nation that would be "aggressive abroad and despotic at home."⁷³ General Lee's letter continues with a strong statement regarding the right of state to ". . . prescribe for itself the qualifications of suffrage."⁷⁴ Hardly the words of a Union apologist! The Yankee Empire's propagandists have made much of General Lee's silence after the war. They infer by this that General Lee was satisfied with the outcome of the war and therefore was not a true Southern Nationalist. General Lee's letter to Lord Acton, as quoted above, demonstrates Lee's true attitude toward the war and the cause for which he so bravely fought. A little-known incident described in *Life and Letters of Robert Lewis Dabney* helps to clarify General Lee's silence as well as to reveal his true feelings about the South. The incident occurred in August 1870, when Lee and many distinguished ex-Confederates were meeting. The Union general William S. Rosecrans was there and asked General Lee to make a statement on behalf of the Southern people proclaiming that they were now glad to be back in the Union and loyal to the old flag. General Lee refused to make any statement but did agree to set up a meeting with the other ex-Confederates and to allow them to speak for themselves. General Lee met each man as he entered the room and then sat quietly as the conference progressed. At the beginning of the meeting Union general Rosecrans asked each of the ex-Confederates the same question he had posed to General Lee. Governor Fletcher S. Stockdale (former Confederate governor of Texas) stated to Dabney that he thought that many of the replies struck him as entirely too sycophantic and insincere. When the question came to Governor Stockdale, he made the following reply: The people of Texas will remain quiet, and not again resort to forceful resistance against the Federal Government, whatever may be the measures of that government. But, General Rosecrans, candor requires me to explain the attitude of my people. The people of Texas have made up their minds to remain quiet under all aggressions and to have peace; but they have none of the spaniel in their composition. No, sir, they are not in the least like the dog that seeks to lick the hand of the man that kicked him; but it is because they are a very sensible,...

Note:

The question still remains: Why did the North invade, conquer, and occupy an independent South? Imperialist powers usually attempt to hide their naked aggression

with high-sounding moral excuses which allow them to justify their armed aggression. Saddam Hussein's excuse for invading Kuwait was that Kuwait was really a part of Iraq that had illegally broken away; Joseph Stalin claimed that it was necessary to maintain the Soviet Union's military presence in post-war Eastern Europe to protect international socialism; Adolph Hitler claimed that his invasion of Czechoslovakia was only an attempt to protect German nationals and to give Greater Germany living space; and the British claimed that it was necessary to occupy India in order to preserve order and to prevent French domination. Thus, those who send armies off to foreign countries to deny people the right of self-determination can always find a high-sounding moral motive to justify their invasion. The excuses given by an invader should be viewed with great skepticism. We should always look beyond the aggressor's propaganda and attempt to determine if there are any underlying causes that motivated the invasion and occupation of an erstwhile free people. General Sir James Marshall-Cornwall, in the first chapter of his book *Grant as a Military Commander*, noted that the real issue between the North and the South was political and economic. He described the economic pressure on the North to protect its industrial expansion with high tariffs, whereas Southern agriculture needed free trade. Thus, the animosity and tension between the two sections were based upon different cultures with conflicting economic systems.⁸⁷ Senator William Grayson, one of Virginia's first United States Senators, expressed concern that the South would eventually become the "milch cow" of the Union!⁸⁸ Shortly after the American Revolution, the Northern states decided to transfer all state war debts to the federal government. This meant that the federal government would pay the war debts of the states. This would be a windfall for the North because the federal government would obtain the monies to pay the debt by raising tariffs. The result was that the Southern states were required to pay a disproportionate share of the debt. For example, the export of cotton alone from the South in 1859 was valued at \$161,434,923. The total export of all goods from the North in 1859 was a mere \$78,217,202.⁸⁹ This differential was in place at the beginning of our political union and continued up to the establishment of an independent South. The Virginia legislature reacted to the proposal to transfer state war debts to the newly created federal government by declaring that, if enacted it would cause "the prostration of agriculture at the feet of commerce, or a change of the present form of federal government, fatal to the existence of American liberty,"⁹⁰ Nevertheless the effort was successful, and thus began the systematic and "legalized"...

Note:

Yellow highlight | Page: 82

To the average American, the word "slavery" conjures up visions of antebellum homes, mint juleps, and the taskmaster's whip. All these visions can only be found in the South. Ask any American were slavery as an institution was practiced, and the answer most often heard is "in the South." Few, if any, will even stop to think of the North as the

cradle of slavery. All too often we are bombarded with stories of the righteous Yankee toiling to make a “free” land out of the United States. This righteous crusade for freedom, we are told, was constantly hampered by the South’s attempt to keep our country half free and half slave. Even when Northern slavery is mentioned, it is quickly claimed that the virtuous North freed its slaves because it was too humanitarian to suffer the existence of slavery within its boundaries (another Yankee myth). The existence of African slavery in America can be traced directly to the commercial interests of Europe.² The first English colony in America was founded in 1607 at Jamestown, Virginia. Approximately thirteen years after Jamestown was founded, a ship claiming to be Dutch brought twenty Africans to the colony.³ The slaves were not requested by the colony but were offered for sale and were subsequently purchased. Most people concentrate on the fact that this was the first time African slaves were brought to America. Another equally important point to realize is that property as well as commerce in slaves was considered legal by the European powers. The Spanish, Dutch, English, and eventually the Yankees would take part in this “legal” commerce. The slave trade and ownership of slaves was protected by international law. Indeed, the slave trade was introduced into the New World in 1503 by the Spanish and in 1562 by the English. Today we find it hard to understand this system of forced labor. However, two hundred years from now, future generations will probably find it hard to understand social conditions that we take for granted today—such as closing churches during a pandemic, while keeping abortions factories running. Slavery existed in other parts of the New World before it was introduced into the English colonies. So, the purchase of slaves in Jamestown was not an unusual transaction. The African slave trade was so lucrative that the English strove to gain the largest share of the trade, which they achieved with the signing of the Asiento Treaty with Spain in 1713.⁴ This near monopoly was to be held until the Crown opened it to all Englishmen in 1749. At that time the New England Yankee quickly joined the ranks of the most infamous traders in the world—the trans-Atlantic slave trader. The African slave trade has a long and bleak history, and, for the most part, Americans have very shallow knowledge of it. If anything is said about the slave trade, it is said only to implicate the South as the chief villain of that nefarious commerce. The forced movement of Africans to various parts of the world began in the ninth...

Note:

Yellow highlight | Page: 84

These two great waves of slave migration are very similar. Each wave, lasting around five hundred years, was responsible for approximately ten million Negroes being taken from Africa. Both were carried on by religious people, one Moslem, one Christian. Both were sanctioned by international law. There are also some differences between the two great waves. The earlier wave followed a land route across the Sahara. The other was an ocean route, across the Atlantic. Nevertheless, Arabs and Berbers were the first to become involved in the slave trade, and they influenced the Europeans who became

involved several hundred years later. Those who place the burden of guilt upon the Europeans for slavery will not find the previous paragraph to their liking. But even more shocking is the fact that, within many African societies, slavery was an accepted way of life. In his book, *Prince Among Slaves*, Terry Alford chronicles the life of a young black warrior who was sold into slavery by his fellow black Africans.¹¹ Abd Rahman Ibrahima was the son of a great warrior chief and king of the Timbo Nation, now part of Guinea. These people were fierce fighters and made slaves of many of their prisoners of war. These black Africans owned and sold other blacks.¹² They had no more qualms about this practice than any of the Arab or European slave traders had. Unfortunately for Prince Ibrahima, the system of slave trading worked as well for his enemies as it did for the people of Timbo. When captured in a battle, he was sold to a Spanish slaver, and ended up as a slave in Natchez, Mississippi. Ibrahima became overseer of his master's plantation during the next forty years, before gaining his freedom and returning to his homeland. This most unusual story is instructive because an African tells how slavery was a part of his life while in Africa. African slavery was not an invention of the European. As we have just seen, this institution existed and was practiced by both the black African and by the Arab long before the European became involved. As shocking as the fact that black men owned other blacks in Africa is to some people, the fact that black Americans owned other blacks is even more shocking. Larry Roger, in his book *Black Slaveowners*,¹³ has documented the account of blacks owning other blacks in America. According to the 1830 census record, more than ten thousand slaves were owned by free men of color.¹⁴ In Sumter, South Carolina, in 1860, William Ellison, a free man of color, had seventy slaves working his plantation.¹⁵ In Louisiana, in St. Landry Parish, a free man of color, Auguste Donatto, held seventy slaves to work his five-hundred-acre plantation.¹⁶ Even in New York City, eight free men of color owned seventeen slaves in 1830!¹⁷ When these facts are brought to light, most black and left-of-center "leaders" will tell us that these black slave holders were only doing this for benevolent or kinship reasons. According to Roger's study, "the local documents could...

Note:

Yellow highlight | Page: 89

In his message to Congress on December 4, 1849 (just eleven years before South Carolina seceded from the Union), President Taylor made the following statement: "Your Attention is earnestly invited to an amendment of our existing laws relating to the African slave trade with a view to the effectual suppression of that barbarous traffic. It is not to be denied that this trade is still in part carried on by means of vessels built in the United States and owned or navigated by some of our citizens."³⁶ It is of interest to note that Henry Wise's observation about the slave trade was made in a South American port. In studying the slave trade, we note that only six percent of all the Africans taken from Africa were brought to the United States. A full ninety-four percent of them were sold into slavery in the Caribbean and in South American

countries. Those who would try to defend the North for its involvement in the illegal slave trade often attempt to shift the blame upon Southerners by saying, "If you Southerners had not provided the market for our slaves, we would never have been in the slave trade." The truth is that after 1800 the South was never a viable market for the African slave traders. But the fact that the South was not a major market for the North's black cargo never kept the profit-mindful Yankee peddlers from doing business in African slaves. Some of the more prominent families of New England were engaged in the slave trade and built huge fortunes in the process. The deWolf family, one of the more prominent

Note:

Yellow highlight | Page: 92

The Yankee myth of history conveniently chooses to ignore Northern crimes against blacks while concentrating upon the supposed crimes of the evil and vile Southern slave owners. Yet, can anyone imagine a Southern slave owner treating his slaves as cruelly as the Yankee merchants treated their captives? Any good farmer knows that he cannot stay in business if he allows half of his stock to die each year. If not for humanitarian reasons, then for simple economic reasons, the Southern slave owner treated the Negro better than the Yankee did. After all, Southerners had to pay hard cash to the Yankee for their slaves. Southern slave owners could not buy Negroes with cheap rum the way the Yankee slave traders did.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Page: 92

The people of Massachusetts were so eager to get into the slave business that they began to enslave Native Americans before they entered into the African slave business!⁴⁵ When the Indian War began, the colony of Massachusetts began to capture and enslave the Indian population within its domain. In 1646, the colony passed a law by which Indians could be seized, held as slaves, and exported for sale. Major Richard Waldron (acting on behalf of the general court of the territory, which now is part of the state of Maine) in the winter of 1676 issued an order for the enslavement and export of any Indian "known to be a manslayer, traitor, or conspirator."⁴⁶ Now who do you think would decide if an accused Native American met these criteria? We can only speculate, but we are sure that these poor, hapless Indians received no better treatment at the hands of their Yankee conquerors than the Southern people received some two hundred years later! These Massachusetts Yankees enslaved not only Indians who went to war against them, but also those who came voluntarily to them under their offer of amnesty.⁴⁷ So many Native Americans were enslaved that the thrifty, righteous men of Yankeedom shipped Indian slaves to Bermuda, Barbados, and other islands of the Caribbean for a neat little profit.⁴⁸ The trading of Native Americans was the beginning of the Yankee slave trade. This Yankee slave commerce was to continue legally until

1808 and illegally until the War for Southern Independence. The contrast between the way the New England Yankee colony of Massachusetts dealt with its native population and the way the Southern colony of Virginia dealt with its native population is worthy of note. Virginia passed a law that made it illegal to enslave or deport a Native American under any circumstances.⁴⁹ While Massachusetts was still busy kidnapping and enslaving the American Indian, Virginia was busy passing laws to protect its Native American population. Yet, Virginia and the rest of the South are held up for ridicule, scorn, and derision by the self-righteous Yankee. At the same time the liberal media eagerly awaits another opportunity to spread the gospel of South-bashing, it totally ignores the fact that the Yankee colony of Massachusetts was the first to engage in the slave trade. Also hidden from public view is the fact that the industrial and commercial strength of the North is based upon the profits made by kidnapping, enslaving, and selling human beings—both Native Americans and Africans. The Yankee Empire's false historical narrative turned Southerners into the villain, Yankees into the hero, and the truth became the victim. If the Yankee state of Massachusetts was the first to use the force of its government to protect slavery, then the second question to ask is:

Note:

When the abolition of slavery is mentioned, most people think of Lincoln, the Republican Party, and the terrorist John Brown. But long before these extremists spoke, the state of Virginia had already gone on record as opposing the African slave trade. By an act of the General Assembly of the state of Virginia, while Patrick Henry was governor, the state outlawed the slave trade in Virginia.⁵⁰ This was done on October 5, 1778, ten years before Massachusetts and thirty years before the British parliament acted on the vile trade. The law was entitled "An act for preventing the further importation of slaves." This law not only prevented the importation of slaves, but also stipulated that any slave brought into the state contrary to the law would be then and forever more free.⁵¹ Virginia's action was the first taken in the civilized world prohibiting the slave trade. But even this was not the first time Virginia had attempted to stop the slave trade. Notice that the law was passed after Virginia had declared itself independent (i.e., had seceded) from Great Britain. The House of Burgesses had many times before attempted to stop the slave trade only to have its laws overruled by the royal governor.⁵² The royal governor, who was appointed by the king, was acting on behalf of the king and parliament. In the months before he wrote the Declaration of Independence, Thomas Jefferson, a Southerner from Virginia, stated that one of the reasons the people of Virginia felt compelled to secede from the established British government was that the British had forced the state to endure the slave trade. Jefferson stated that the king had "refused us permission to exclude by law" the slave trade. James Madison of Virginia spoke of the slave trade: "The British Government constantly checked the attempts of Virginia to put a stop to this infernal traffick."⁵³

Note:

Yellow highlight | Page: 97

The system of African slavery was never very profitable in the North. If the Yankees have an eye for anything, they have an eye for profits. Soon after the end of the American War for Independence, the Northern states began a gradual removal of their slave population. Modern Yankees would have us believe that their ancestors were acting upon principles of morality in decreasing their slave population. The truth is that the only thing that motivated the Yankee was the principle of profit and no small amount of anti-black bias. This is clearly seen by the way in which the North granted freedom to its slave population. No law was ever passed in the North that granted freedom to a person already in slavery. In other words, the property rights (investment capital) of the Northern slave holders were always protected by the Northern states (something they must have forgotten to do when they came down South). After a certain date and after a child reached a given age, he or she would be free. All people who were slaves when the law was passed would remain slaves. For a slave to become free, in New Jersey, for example, he or she would have to be born after 1804 and have reached the age of twenty-one years. A slave woman who was fifteen in 1804 would remain a slave for life. If, at the age thirty (the year then being 1829), she gave birth to a child, that child had to live in bondage until the age of twenty-one years (in 1850)

before the child would be free. Now remember that the mother was still a slave in the good ole land of Lincoln. As a matter of fact, just ten years before the War for Southern Independence there were 236 slaves for life in New Jersey.⁵⁵

Note:

Yellow highlight | Page: 97

If the North was indeed the land of equality and freedom that it claims to have been, why did it not just do away with slavery in one quick step? Surely, if slavery was wrong in the South, it was just as wrong in the North. Or did Northerners think that a little evil was acceptable, and not as evil as slavery down South? Why didn't they use the same method to reduce the Southern slave population to a number equal to that in the North? The answer to these questions is both simple and sobering. The North used the method of granting gradual freedom to the unborn for two reasons. One motive was greed, and the other was racism. By only freeing the people born into slavery after a certain time and age, the Yankee protected and thereby recognized the master's right in his property—their aim was to secure a profitable return on the dollars invested by the Yankee in his slave(s). No Northerners were deprived of their slave property that they owned at the time the law was passed. Also, the law did not prohibit the slave owners from removing their property from the state to be sold in other parts of the country. Even if the children of a slave mother were nineteen or twenty years old, just a few years before the law granted them freedom, their master could remove them from the Northern state and sell them in a Southern state where they would remain slaves. Shocking as it may seem, under the Yankee system there could have been slaves in the North until 1873. With only one exception, every Northern state of the original thirteen states abolished slavery in this manner. The state of Massachusetts never repealed its law on slavery.⁵⁶ One can only speculate as to how many slaves were actually allowed to obtain freedom under this arrangement, but it was a profitable way to emancipate slave property. If the Yankees are nothing else, they are profit-minded.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Page: 98

In 1788, eight years after the state of Massachusetts started its judicial emancipation of its slave population, it passed a law ordering every black, mulatto, or Indian who came into the state and remained two months to be whipped (flogged) publicly.⁵⁷ This punishment was to be repeated if the black, mulatto, or Indian did not leave. This law remained in effect until 1834, by which time it had done its work of purging Massachusetts of "undesirables." While this law was in force the people of Massachusetts were hard at work in the slave trade, from which the state collected large tax revenues. It should now be easy to understand that the people of the North were not driven by humanitarian or...

Note:

Surely if the evil South was as bad and the North was as wonderful as the Yankee Empire's propagandists would have us believe, then the percentage increase of the black population in the North would be greater than in the South. According to the 1860 census records, the percentage of increase in the black population in the South was twenty-three percent. The increase in the North was a bleak 1.7 percent.⁵⁹ A race of people whose numbers greatly increased under slavery and the present-day welfare system were nearly annihilated in the North by Yankee emancipation! The 1850 census show that of white Northerners and Southerners, one person in every thousand was either deaf, dumb, blind, insane, or idiotic. For the free blacks of Yankeedom, one in every 506 was afflicted with one of these conditions.⁶⁰ If the North was such a better place for blacks, then it would be natural to assume that the Southern blacks would be in worse condition. Not according to the 1850 census records. It demonstrates that only one in 1,464 had a condition as previously described.⁶¹ To put it bluntly, according the United States census records, the Negro slave in the South was in a better mental and physical condition than his "free" black brother in the North. Let us look at the numbers once again: Ratio of persons with disability (deaf, dumb, blind, insane, or idiotic): White Northerner and Southerner 1 out of every 1000 Free Northern black 1 out of every 506 Southern slave 1 out of every 1464 From the facts presented here, it is clear that the Southern people do not deserve the burden of guilt they have been forced to bear. There is guilt enough to go around. Blacks in Africa who kidnapped and sold their own kind into slavery and the Yankee merchants who traded rum and guns for black slaves in North and South America all deserve—yet do not receive—the larger portion of the guilt.

Note:

A perfect example of how complex the problem of ending the slavery issue was is seen in how John Quincy Adams dealt with the question of British naval vessels attempting to search for slave traders on the high seas. He would not allow the British to stop American slave vessels, even though that would result in many slave traders being protected by the United States flag.⁶³ Remember that the United States had just fought a war with the British over the very question of British naval power as it related to the sovereign rights of America. The United States had made its point that, as a sovereign nation, its commerce was secure on the high seas. Because Adams would not allow the British Navy to stop vessels flying the United States flag, many slavers were allowed to carry on this trade. This does not mean that Adams was in favor of that trade, only that he held the view that, unless both nations had a treaty to police each other's vessels, one nation could not force its right of search upon the other. According to international law, one cannot break one good law in order to pursue a pre-eminent good. Now when the people of the South make the statement that they were against slavery, but that they could not end the system unless it could be done in such a way as

to safeguard the rights of all Southerners, Northerners become incredulous. They arrogantly denounce Southerners, claiming that the South is using lies to protect slavery. It seemed natural and right for the Yankee (future President) Adams to say the same thing in relation to the slave trade, but never would the North allow Southerners to act in a similar manner. The issue of how to end slavery and the slave trade needed time and cool heads more than anything else. Unfortunately, the Yankee Abolitionists and their Republican co-conspirators would allow neither. Those in the North who sought political gain saw in this issue a weak point.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Page: 118

There is one misconception we would like to clarify. In looking at the participants in the slave system of the Old South, we are looking at very few members of Southern society. In 1860, there were 5.3 million white people in the South. Of that number, approximately three hundred thousand (six percent) were slave holders.¹ The number of slaveholders who could be classified as aristocratic planters was only 150,000 (three percent). The rest of the slaveholders owned five or fewer slaves and worked beside their slaves in order to make a living. The vast majority of Southerners owned no slaves, and from these people were drawn the vast numbers of soldiers of the Confederacy. Also let us state here that we are not defending the system of slavery, but rather seeking the truth about the history of that institution and of life in the Old South. If nothing else, the War proved beyond a doubt that while the slaves did not like slavery, they did not hate their white neighbors and friends. In the Old South, there were at least three different views of slavery ranging from those who wished the quick abolition of slavery, such as Robert E. Lee, to those like Jefferson Davis who sought to uplift and educate the slaves to make them ready for freedom, to others who believed that black people could never be made ready for freedom. It should be noted that each view of slavery had its followers both in the North as in the South. Nevertheless, all honorable people regardless of how they felt about the institution of slavery believed that the black people should be accorded the respect due them as taught in the Bible in regard to slaves. The biblical foundation for the slave-master relationship was deeply rooted in America, being practiced by both Southerners and Northerners. The first defense of slavery in America was made by the Puritan Fathers of Massachusetts, and that defense was based on principles founded in both the Old and the New Testament of the Holy Bible. Such notables as Cotton Mather and Judge John Saffin voiced their approval of the institution of slavery in Massachusetts, basing their arguments on the Bible.² The idea that slavery was a moral system based upon biblical standards was held by Americans from Georgia to Maine. Today, of course, we do not see slavery in that light, but it was held so by Americans both North and South during the early part of our history.

Note:

If the relationship between the slave and master was not predicated solely on brute force, what was the nature of the relationship? The Yankee historian Frederick Law Olmsted noted the closeness of the relationship between slave and master when he visited Virginia in the early part of the 1800s. Olmsted observed a white woman and a black woman seated together on a train (this was before the Federal Courts had instituted nation-wide Jim Crow laws). Both ladies had their children with them, and the children were eating candy from a common container. Of this incident one writer states, “. . . the girls munched candy out of the same bag ‘with a familiarity and closeness’ which would have astonished and displeased most Northerners.”⁵ This close relationship may have been unheard of in the North, but it was a common sight in the South. Even in Mississippi, a warm relationship existed between the two races. In his work, *The Peculiar Institution: Slavery in the Antebellum South*, Kenneth Stampp stated, “Visitors often registered surprise at the social intimacy that existed between masters and slaves in certain situations. A Northerner saw a group of Mississippi farmers encamped with their slaves near Natchez after hauling their cotton to market. Here they assumed a ‘cheek by jowl’ familiarity with perfect good will and a mutual contempt for the nicer distinctions of color.”⁶ This type of relationship could not be enforced with a whip, but it existed and was based on respect and love. Not only Northern historians but also Yankee soldiers spoke with contempt about the closeness of the relationship between slave and master. In his diary Pvt. John Haley of Maine had this to say about the slave/master relationship:

Note:

the last battle of the War of 1812, the Battle of New Orleans, free men of color were a part of the American army that defeated the British. When the Northern armies came down South offering “freedom” to the slaves of Dixie, the words were not new to the slaves—same song, different verse; but the slaves had heard it before. Yet, the arrogant Yankee blindly ignored history and put his trust in a war against the South that, in their estimation, would only last ninety days. This would have been the case, if black Southerners hated their white neighbors, friends, and fellow countrymen.

Note:

The contributions of black Southerners to the war effort between 1861 and 1865 fall into two major categories: (1) civilian support, and (2) military support. Black support of the civilian effort has often been overlooked or belittled by the detractors of the South. Any modern war, and it has often been said that this war was the first really modern war, cannot be carried on without proper support from the home front.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Page: 130

It is embarrassing for those who claim that the North was fighting to free the downtrodden Southern slaves to note that two African-Americans were taken prisoner from the Southern army at the Battle of Gettysburg—one from Virginia and one from Louisiana.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Page: 130

Dick Poplar was well known in Petersburg before the war as a cook. He took that specialty with him when he entered the Confederate army. However, being a cook did not prevent him from being taken prisoner by the Yanks. At Point Lookout Prison, the Negro guards tried their best to make this black man turn against his people. Dick Poplar maintained during this time that he was a loyal "Jeff Davis man." He stayed in this hellish POW camp for twenty months. A word from him at any time would have set him free, but he never turned his back on the South. Charles F. Lutz, enlisted in Company F, Eighth Louisiana Volunteer Infantry, on June 23, 1861. Lutz was from St. Landry Parish in Louisiana. He was a free man of color and of mixed ancestry. He could easily pass for either a creole of color or a white man. Early in the war his regiment was sent to Virginia, where it became part of General Richard Taylor's brigade of General Jackson's Valley Army. He participated in all of Jackson's astounding battles during the Valley Campaign. While fighting at Fredericksburg on Marye's Heights during the Battle of Chancellorsville, Lutz was taken prisoner along with two hundred of his fellow Southerners. He remained a POW for two weeks until exchanged. A few weeks later he was wounded and taken prisoner at the Battle of Gettysburg. After he was paroled and furloughed, he went home to recuperate. In 1900 he was awarded a Confederate pension from the state of Louisiana. One

Note:

Yellow highlight | Page: 137

would always tell them the truth."⁵⁷ The statements of these former slaves clearly show that many slaves actively supported the Southern cause during the war. The modest statements of these people speak volumes about how they felt about their position in life at that time. Elija Hopkins of Little Rock made the statement that "In slavery times, a poor white man was worse off than a nigger." It is clear from this statement that this slave did not feel as if he were at the bottom of Southern society. One song that slave children sang stated "I'd rather be a nigger than a poor white man."⁵⁸ The Abolitionist concept of Southern society placed the master on top and the black on the bottom of society. In reality, the structure of Southern society was not vertical, but rather circular. Each person could feel as if he or she were a little ahead of

someone else in society. The white master felt better off than the white middle class, the slave felt better off than the poor white, and the white felt better off than the slave. Each group sensed that there was a group ahead and behind him in society as if they were standing in a circle. This allowed each group to respect another group without the fear of losing its place in society. Thus, arose the closeness between the races that has been reported by the Yankee about antebellum Southern society—their reports demonstrate the Yankees revulsion not admiration for this close relation between black and white Southerners.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Page: 140

Jefferson Davis was influenced early in his life by his older brother, Joseph, who desired to improve the lot of man. Joseph was inspired by the writings of an English industrialist and social reformer, Robert Owen, the author of the book, *A New View of Society*.⁶⁹ Owen's conception of a new society was based upon fair and generous treatment of all people. This in itself was a revolutionary idea, with great potential for improving the lot of downtrodden industrial workers of the world. Joseph Davis met and talked with Owens, and he made a determination to use Owens' approach on his Mississippi plantation. Joseph established as rules for the running of his plantation some of the most liberal regulations known to slavery. "The slave quarters exceeded what was considered ideal by the agricultural journals of the period. A variety of food was made available; in some cases, with unlimited quantities. Davis even established a court system where a slave was not punished except upon conviction by a jury of his peers."⁷⁰ Jefferson Davis patterned the conduct of his plantation after that of his older brother Joseph.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Page: 140

In the South at that time, there were several different views of slavery. From the extreme "Fire Eaters" who desired the continuation and extension of slavery, to those who, like Robert E. Lee, desired a quick end to the system. Like all other philosophies, the "peculiar institution" of slavery had a middle ground. It was here that men such as the Davis brothers stood. In Jefferson Davis' view the system of slavery would have a natural end. For it to arrive at that natural end, the enlightened slave master had to prepare his "people" for freedom. Davis stated, "The slave must be made fit for his freedom by education and discipline and thus be made unfit for slavery."⁷¹ For this reason, he attempted to "educate" his slaves in the ways of civilized society. On his plantation, Jefferson Davis instituted a system of slave laws, courts, and juries in an effort to improve the understanding of his slaves for what life under "freedom" would be like. It is worthy of note that, under Davis' slave legal system, he could pardon a convicted person but not increase the punishment administered by the slave jury. In

view of how Davis' slaves were treated on his plantation, is it any wonder that so many blacks had such respect for Davis? When asked by a Yankee how he felt about Jefferson Davis, an elderly slave replied, "I loved him, and I can say that every colored man he ever owned loved him."⁷² The deep respect and love that President and Mrs. Davis had for people is clearly shown in the story of little Jim Limber "Davis."

Note:

Yellow highlight | Page: 143

After Davis' death, on the last trip the body of the beloved president was accompanied by his last body servant, Robert Brown. Brown was seen weeping uncontrollably at the outpouring of love that was displayed for his former master. Yes, the life and death of President Jefferson Davis displays to all who are open-minded enough to look how different the relationship between slave and master actually was as opposed to the way in which it is far too often depicted. But yet, the neo-Marxist cult still refuses to admit that they could be wrong about the South. To admit their error would mean giving up the very source of the power they use to brow-beat gullible Americans into adopting the neo-Marxist false narrative. Therefore, they will continue their vicious attacks against anything Southern. Neo-Marxists and their lackeys are quick to tell Americans that these blacks, who displayed love for Davis or for anything Southern, were only lying about their true feelings in order to get ahead or to keep from being brutalized by the "rednecks." For example, the Yankee Empire's sycophants will claim that the only reason that Robert Brown cried for Jefferson Davis was because as a black man he had to do so to keep from being abused by white Southerners. What they conveniently overlook is the fact that Brown could have just disappeared after Yankee-induced freedom. He did not have to maintain a relationship with the Davis family. Look at the warm letter of condolence from Thornton Montgomery, a black man from North Dakota. Does anyone think that a black man living in North Dakota would fear white Southerners? North Dakota is not exactly a Southern state. If anything, Montgomery would have incurred the wrath of the white community of that Northern state by saying positive things about Confederate President Jefferson Davis. Yet, leftists still tell us that these blacks were not sincere in their display of affection for Jefferson Davis or for the South. For those foolish enough to fall for that line, let us consider the life and actions of two black men who were part of the Reconstruction government of the South.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Page: 153

When the previous paragraph was written in 1994, neo-Marxists had just begun their attacks upon Confederate monuments and Southern history. At that time the nation was warned by so-called "neo-Confederates" that one day all Traditional American Values and heroes would come under assault—that day surely arrived in 2020. Rather

than joining with the defenders of the South's history, neo-conservative, such as, Rush Limbaugh, Sean Hannity, Tucker Carlson, and many others assisted the neo-Marxists in their efforts to denigrate and destroy the South's heritage and history. Neo-conservatives did this by agreeing with the neo-Marxist's narrative of the South fighting to preserve and promote slavery (something that came right out of the mouth of Karl Marx, see Benson and Kennedy, Lincoln's Marxists, Chapter 2) and promoting secession as treason. By not allowing the Southern narrative about these issues to be heard, censorship by exclusion, the neo-Marxists were given all the cover and encouragement needed to advance their attack upon ALL Traditional American Values. The slogan of being "Fair and Balanced" seems to not apply when dealing with the people of the defeated Confederate States of America. In reality, conservative Southerners are the only minority in the United States that can be discriminated against and reviled at will without fear of reprisal. Southerners are also the only minority that has their history and philosophy defined and broadcast by their enemies!

Note:

Yellow highlight | Page: 167

As has been demonstrated, the relation between the races in the old South was much different than that which is constantly offered to the general public. Men such as Alex de Tocqueville of France (chapter 2), James Buckingham of England, Fredrick Olmsted of Connecticut, and Joseph H. Ingraham, New York (chapter 4) among many others all admitted that racial prejudice was much greater in the North than in the South. Without exception, Tocqueville, Buckingham, Olmsted, and Ingraham all noted that a much closer and almost family-like relationship existed among Black and White Southerners—something that shocked and appalled Northerners of that day and is passionately denied as ever having existed by radical leftists today. Just as shocking are the words of Northern abolitionists such as Thomas Branagan who sought to establish a Black colony in the Louisiana Territory in order to save white society from association with the Africans. Branagan's own words speak volumes about how African Americans were viewed by Northerners: "The sons of Africa in America, are the inveterate enemies of America."¹

Note:

Yellow highlight | Page: 179

In the town of Roswell, over four hundred young women and children were kept in the open town square for nearly a week. Imagine the suffering of those who were cramped in that hot (remember this was July in Georgia), dirty place. As if that were not bad enough, the whiskey stores found their way into the hands of the guards. From that time on, the young girls of Roswell lived a continual nightmare.⁹ All the factory workers of New Manchester were taken off in the same manner as the other towns. So complete was the destruction that the town never recovered from the raid and soon

passed from existence. New Manchester became a martyr for the cause of Southern independence. The following comment appeared in a Louisville, Kentucky, newspaper concerning the women and children whom Sherman had shipped north: "The train which arrived from Nashville last evening brought up from the South 249 women and children, who are sent here by orders of General Sherman to be transferred north of the Ohio river. These people are mostly in a destitute condition, having no means to provide for themselves a support."¹⁰ These people were hired out to perform work at a price that was at no more than a subsistence level, making them virtual white slaves for the Yankees. More than two thousand women and children were sent into the North in this manner. The papers in the area advertised them as if they were any other commodity for sale. And so the Yankees maintained their illicit trade in human flesh even as they were singing glory, glory, hallelujah. Lynching

Note:

Yellow highlight | Page: 193

Approximately the same time Hussein was setting up his human shield, the Yankee myth-makers were hard at work making a "documentary" entitled "The Civil War." As we have noted, this propaganda series was produced by a prejudiced man from the North—the place where so many slaves were brought into this country after the Yankee flesh merchants, working with local Africans, kidnapped them from their homes in Africa. The Northern myth-makers seem to have trouble remembering such facts that are not in keeping with the official Yankee myth of history. Now let's see if our Southern history will help us determine where Hussein may have gotten this idea about using humans as a shield to protect military installations. In the summer of 1864, the South was pressed on all fronts. The city of Charleston, South Carolina, was under a Yankee blockade. The combined guns of the Yankee forts and the Union navy were shelling the city. The Confederates were answering the Yankees shot for shot—resulting in a stalemate, something had to be done. The Yankee government took six hundred Southern POWs and sent them to Charleston. The Yankee invader had hit upon a great idea—"Why not put Southern POWs in front of our position and make the Confederates fire on their own men?" By this method the Yankees hoped to prevent further shelling of the Yankee position by the Confederates.⁴⁶ Captain Walter MacRae of the Seventh North Carolina was one of the six hundred hostages used by the United States government as a part of its human shield. He gives a vivid account of life under the guns and the resultant horrors visited upon these innocent Southern POWs. The prisoners were placed in a stockade less than two acres square. They were beneath the guns of the Yankee fort and situated so that every shot from the Confederate forts "must either pass over our heads or right through the pen [stockade]. Any which fell short or exploded a tenth of a second too soon, must strike death and destruction through our crowded ranks."⁴⁷

Note:

The key word is “consent.” This great Southerner knew that the only legitimate use of governmental power is through the free and unfettered consent of the people governed. Without this consent the government has no moral right to exist—it would be an illegitimate government. The governed, according to Jefferson, have a right to a government that disciplines itself to the will of the people. Furthermore, it can be seen that the failure of the British Crown and Parliament to so discipline themselves was the very justification for the call sent forth through the colonies to secede from the established central government in London!

Note:

Patrick Henry demonstrated great political insight when he identified the fatal flaw in the proposed government—the new federal government would be controlled by a Northern majority that did not understand or respect Southern society.¹¹ Thomas Jefferson warned that, if the federal

Note:

On March 2, 1867, Congress passed the Reconstruction Act. This act abolished civil government in the Southern states. It divided the South into five military districts with a commander the rank of brigadier general or higher over each district. The army re-invaded the South, abolished all semblance of civil government, and set up military rule. An example of the dictatorial rule imposed on the South is seen in the manner in which the chief executive of the state of Mississippi was treated. Governor Benjamin G. Humphreys was the duly elected governor of the state, when Major General Edward O. C. Ord was put in command of the Fourth Military District, which comprised the states of Mississippi and Arkansas. General Ord was a commander under General Grant. Ord was given complete authority over the affairs of these states. The governors of Mississippi and Arkansas were without any power to act for their states. All gubernatorial appointments were subject to military veto, and all offenses against “freedmen” were made subject to military courts, as well as many other offenses as determined by the occupying forces. This scenario was played out throughout the South, as military rule was established as a result of the Republican Party’s instating Reconstruction in the occupied South. The Reconstruction Act disfranchised all voters and directed the army to set up registration of its own. The effect was to disfranchise a large portion of white Southerners and to extend the franchise to illiterates, Scalawags, and Carpetbaggers. The Reconstruction Act of 1867 declared that the Southern states were not part of the Union. Remember, this was the same Union from which the North, under the control of the Republican Party, had previously said that these states could not withdraw! From 1866 to March 2, 1867, the Southern states were accorded the

privilege of statehood in the Republican Party's Union. They participated in the ratification of the Thirteenth Amendment and in the initial rejection of the Fourteenth Amendment. The rejection of the Fourteenth Amendment posed a major roadblock to the revolutionary schemes of the Republicans in Congress. They knew that, even after their successful military conquest of the Southern people, they could not complete their evil designs as long as the South retained even this slight amount of political power. To add even greater alarm to Republicans in Congress was the fact that after the passage of the Thirteenth Amendment, blacks would now be counted, not as 3/5 of a person as during the days of slavery, but now they would count as a full person. This meant a greater population for the South which would translate into more representatives in Congress! Something had to be done to prevent the growth of Southern power. After all, they initiated a war to exterminate Southern political power—not to increase it! To further their evil schemes the radicals decided to eject their conquered foe from Congress and then complete their...

Note:

Yellow highlight | Page: 237

Thus, the Republican controlled Congress recognized the legality of the Southern states as long as their actions did not conflict with the Republican Party's radical plans. When the South legally rejected the Fourteenth Amendment and thereby refused to acquiesce to the Republican Party's demand to change the letter of duly established constitutional law, Republicans in Congress took action to deny the legal existence of the Southern states. Even though the spirit of the Constitution was destroyed by the Republican Party's aggressive war, the South still refused to voluntarily allow the destruction of the letter of legally enacted constitutional law. The Southern states recognized the Fourteenth Amendment as an attempt by the Republican-controlled Congress to transfer all reserved power to a newly created centralistic, supreme federal government and therefore the South rejected the proposed Fourteenth Amendment. Republicans in Congress knew that, to advance their revolutionary scheme, something else had to be done. Political expediency in the North produced Reconstruction in the South. (See Addendum V "Plunder of Eleven States," by U.S. Rep. Dan Vorhees of Indiana, March 23, 1872.) The treatment afforded the Southern people at the hands of Congress controlled by the Republican Party during Reconstruction stands as historical proof of the extent to which the Yankee Empire and its sycophants are willing to go to destroy those who dare oppose it. The right to vote was denied to a large portion of white citizens, and new elections were ordered with illiterates enfranchised regardless of their lack of education or other normal qualifications that were currently being used in the North. New legislatures composed of illiterates and others who had little or no governmental experience were elected to carry out the demands of the Republican controlled Congress. The United States government (Congress, the president, and the Supreme Court) had no constitutional authority to interfere with the right of the people of the states to form their own governments. Yet, in defiance of the letter and

spirit of the Original Constitution, the new puppet legislatures, controlled by the Republicans in Congress and enforced by Northern bayonets, promptly proceeded to ratify the proposed Fourteenth Amendment. This was done even though the Secretary of State in Washington had in hand from the legitimate Southern legislatures previously enacted resolutions rejecting the proposed amendment.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Page: 260

American conservatives and self-proclaimed patriots are shocked when they discover that one of the first champions of an “indivisible” union was Karl Marx’s partner and co-author of the Communist Manifesto, Fredrick Engels! In a letter to future Union Army General Joseph Weydemeyer, Engels wrote, “The preliminaries of the proletarian revolution, the measures that prepare the battleground and clear the way for us, such as a single and indivisible republic...”¹ Even communist Fredrick Engels understood the importance of an empire being “indivisible.” That being the case, why then have Americans been taught to faithfully proclaim, in hypnotic unison, that these United States are “one nation indivisible?”

Note:

Yellow highlight | Page: 262

The Pledge of Allegiance was written in 1892 by the socialist and defrocked Baptist minister Francis Bellamy (1855-1931). It was originally published in *The Youth’s Companion* and received enthusiastic support from the Woman’s Relief Corps on Patriotic Teaching. The Woman’s Relief Corps on Patriotic Teaching was the women’s auxiliary of the Union veteran’s political organization of the Grand Army of the Republic. Eventually Bellamy’s pledge was adopted by American public schools. Bellamy believed that defining event in American history was the so-called “Civil War.” He admitted that he desired that his pledge would reinforce everything that the “Civil War” had accomplished. Bellamy’s pledge was the ultimate social victory for centralized, supreme, federalism because it trained, from early childhood, generations of Americans in the socialist model of unquestioned allegiance to an indivisible, supreme federal government. Bellamy’s pledge accomplished (and continues to accomplish) on a social level what Lincoln accomplished via aggressive war and what the Republican Party accomplished via unconstitutional post-War amendments. Even contemporary, liberal Constitutional scholars admit that the post-War amendments “consolidated the North’s victory.”²

Note:

Yellow highlight | Page: 269

As he notes, when the people of a nation become “hopelessly divided,” the nation tends to split apart. Unfortunately, as Lincoln and the Republican Party proved, the

invasion, conquest and forceful re-incorporation of dissatisfied citizens back into the nation is always an option. When the option of coercion, force, and violence is used, the American principle of free government— government by the consent of the governed—is abandoned and replaced by aggressive tyranny. The invaded and oppressed people will then be reduced to a system of political slavery.¹ This is the condition the people of the defeated and occupied Confederate States of America find themselves in today. As sad as the condition of the people of the conquered and subjugated South may be, the reality is that today every citizen of these United States is under the same system of political slavery as the defeated South. A founding father of this country, St. George

Note:

Yellow highlight | Page: 270

In the following chapter we will look at some of the illogical arguments used by those who do not believe that the South, or any other state or group of states, has or ever had the right to withdraw peacefully from the Union. What irony! Americans who oppose secession for Dixie find themselves in bed with the Communist Party of China which proclaims the right to invade its secessionist province of Taiwan. China's Minister of Defense, Wei Fenghe, noted that "Abraham Lincoln is America's greatest president. The United States is indivisible, so is China."³ The Communist leader of China pointed out that Communist China would only be doing what Lincoln did in 1861. Of special interest is the use of the word "indivisible" by this communist leader. An early advocate of the United States being transformed into an "indivisible" nation was Fredrick Engels, the co-founder along with Karl Marx of modern- day communism. In a letter to a communist Union General, Joseph Weydemeyer, Engels praised the action of the North in subduing the South because it would advance the world-wide communist effort. Weydemeyer was a close friend of Karl Marx and responsible for the publication of the first copies of Marx's Communist Manifesto in the United States.⁴ Engels was not shy in declaring why he desired nations to be "indivisible": "The preliminaries of the proletarian [communist] revolution, the measures that prepare the battleground and clear the way for us, such as a single and indivisible republic...are all now convenu" [taken for granted].⁵ It should be noted that General Weydemeyer was one of many communist and socialists who joined in the effort of conquering the Confederate States of America and thereby forcefully transforming the United States into an indivisible nation. The transformed United States is more similar to an empire than the republic of sovereign states created by American patriots of 1776.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Page: 287

The term "perpetual union" is misleading. In contract law a contract is considered perpetual if it does not have a specific termination date or does not require renewing each year or some specific point in time. The contract is perpetual—it continues in force

—as long as the parties to the contract agree to its continuation. The idea that it is a perpetual contract does not mean that the contract will continue forever regardless of the desires of the parties to the contract. The union achieved under the Articles of Confederation was declared to be perpetual six times in the text of the Articles of Confederation. What it meant was that as long as the parties (sovereign states) to the union agreed to it, continuation of the union would be perpetual. The notion of a perpetual union is conspicuous by its absence in the Constitution of 1787.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Page: 289

Yes, as early as 1825 the right of secession was being taught as a nationally recognized right of the states. But even more shocking is the fact that the federal government itself was paying for that teaching. From 1825 to 1826, the United States Military Academy at West Point, New York, used William Rawle's *Views of the Constitution* as its textbook on constitutional law. Men such as Confederate general Albert Sidney Johnston were taught constitutional law from this book.⁴⁶ Rawle, born in 1759, was thirty years old when the United States Constitution was adopted. His book was warmly received when published. The *North American Review*, a journal of Boston political orthodoxy, blessed Rawle's book as, ". . . a safe and intelligent guide."⁴⁷ Here is what Rawle had to say about state sovereignty and secession:

Note:

Yellow highlight | Page: 295

When discussing the Fugitive Slave Law, Southerners are met by self-righteous Yankees and "hung-head" Southern Scalawags telling us how virtuous Northerners were for not sending the poor downtrodden slaves back into bondage. In Chapter 3 we proved that Yankees were not driven by their love of liberty in freeing their slaves, but rather they primarily wanted rid themselves of people with whom they did not want to associate, and make a little profit in the process. Note that, while the people of the Northern states were refusing to follow the law of the land as far as the Fugitive Slave Law was concerned, they were also passing laws to prevent free Negroes from settling in their states. In 1853 the state of Illinois passed a law to prevent free Negroes from, "coming into this State and remaining ten days, with the evident intention of residing in the same."⁵⁸ This law remained in effect until sometime after the War for Southern Independence began. How odd is the workings of Yankee justice. If slaves escaped into Massachusetts or Vermont, they could not be restored to their masters even though the Constitution, acts of Congress, and rulings of the federal Supreme Court declared that they had to be so returned. But if free Negroes moved up North into Illinois, they would be arrested and thrown into jail just for being there! After the state of Kansas was admitted into the Union as a "free" state, a member of that state's legislature stated that Kansas "was and will forever be a white man's State."⁵⁹ Yet, Southerners are

repetitively told that the North would not keep its part of the bargain by obeying the law of the land and returning runaway slaves because it was a friend of freedom and the Negro. As we have proven, the North was not the champion of the black race and freedom, but only used the slave issue as it used many other issues, as a weapon against the people of the South.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Page: 339

Senator John C. Calhoun (1782-1850) warned conservatives of his day that the Constitution was not self-enforcing and that the limitations declared in the Constitution could not be enforced without some political mechanism in the hands of the people of the states to compel the federal government to comply with the Constitution. Calhoun plainly stated, "...the constitution of the United States is a written instrument; for this, of itself, cannot possibly enforce the limitations and restrictions which it imposes." ³ Calhoun understood that, "Power can only be resisted by power— and tendency by tendency."⁴ To protect the interests of the various parties within the Constitutional Union he proposed what he termed the "concurrent majority" which was in effect the right of state nullification.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Page: 379

The story of the holocaust experienced by the Southern people is little known and almost never told by "politically correct" historians. Dr. Allen Nevins notes that the "organized devastation" experienced by the South was similar to the property loss of "the worst chapters of the two world wars." He explains that this tale of horror is untold because the "recounting of the devastation quickly becomes monotonous."¹³ Can you imagine what would happen if someone suggested that the story of the World War II Holocaust should not be retold because it has become "too monotonous?" Although the Southern holocaust is little known today, there were many who knew of its horrors during the war.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Page: 383

Often, while reading the official records, you will notice in one place, such as the one quoted above, that the commander is issuing harsh and cruel orders; then in another place he appears to be attempting to control the excesses of the troops under his command. Regardless of the reasons for these inconsistencies, perhaps in an attempt to cover their backsides or out of a genuine sense of guilt, the officers unintentionally documented the fact that they were aware of the excesses of the United States military forces early in the war. On June 18, 1862, Major General W. T. Sherman issued his General Order Number 44: Too much looseness exists on the subject of foraging. The

articles of war make it almost a capital offense for an officer or soldier to pillage, which means taking private property for his own use. 26 Sherman's General Order Number 2, dated December 6, 1862, stated that The indiscriminate and extensive plundering by our men calls for a summary and speedy change.²⁷ His General Order Number 3, dated January 12, 1863, states: Ignorance of the rules of war as to pillage and plunder can no longer be pleaded.²⁸ In his General Order Number 49, Sherman declared that Stealing, robbery, and pillage has become so common in this army that it is a disgrace to any civilized people.²⁹ General Sherman wrote to General Grant at Vicksburg on August 4, 1863: . . . we are drifting to the worst sort of vandalism. . . You and I and every commander must go through the war justly chargeable with crimes at which we blush.³⁰ General Sherman reported to General Grant regarding his destruction of Meridian, Mississippi: 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

Note:

Yellow highlight | Page: 387

United States Secretary of War Edwin M. Stanton received a report in January of 1862 describing the crimes committed by military personnel in Western Missouri: They are no better than a band of robbers: they cross the line, rob, steal, plunder, and burn whatever they can lay their hands upon.³⁷ In February of the same year, the Yankee secretary of war received a personal report, in Washington, DC, from a Unionist who told Stanton of the "lawless action of U.S. military forces in Jefferson County, Missouri."³⁸ On May 19, 1862, Major General Ormsby M. Mitchell wrote to the Yankee secretary of war to inform him that:

Note:

Yellow highlight | Page: 387

Secretary of the Treasury Salmon P. Chase forwarded to Stanton the following report of forced conscription of slaves into the Federal army: The negroes were sad. . . Sometimes whole plantations, learning what was going on, ran off to the woods for refuge. This mode of [enlistment by] violent seizure ... is repugnant. . .⁴⁰ The tale of Union captain Harry Truman will leave the reader assured of the guilt of Secretary Stanton. Union general Clinton B. Fisk stated on June 8, 1864, that Captain Truman was "plundering the best men in North Missouri, insults and abuses women. . . ." ⁴¹ Union judge William A. Hall wrote that Truman "killed a number of citizens who were not taken with arms. . . ." ⁴² In the summer of 1864, Truman was found guilty of murder, arson, and larceny, and sentenced to be hanged. After his trial, the informants against Truman were either burned out or murdered, and Captain Truman was once again in the service of the United States military. It seems that Captain Truman was indeed tried

by a military commission convened by General William S. Rosecrans and was sentenced to be hanged. General Rosecrans disapproved of the findings, stayed the execution, and ordered Truman to be held in Alton Military Prison until further orders were issued. The record of the case was then sent to none other than Secretary of War Stanton. The secretary of war ordered Truman released from confinement and reassigned to Washington, DC He was not heard of again until he reappeared in Northern Missouri practicing his old tricks of war crimes!⁴³ From this record it seems obvious that Secretary of War Stanton knew and approved of the crimes his military forces were committing against innocent Southern civilians!

Note:

Yellow highlight | Page: 387

The saga of Brigadier General J.B. Turchin has already been discussed in Chapter 2. This evidence alone provides ample support to our claim that Abraham Lincoln knew about the terrorist activities of his officers and men. Add to this evidence the experience of Brigadier General John McNeil who received his promotion from Lincoln after he had executed ten Southern POWs. Lincoln was fully aware of these executions prior to promoting (rewarding) McNeil. Add to this list the story of Brigadier General James H. Lane. Captain W. E. Prince, on September 9, 1861, sent word to Lane informing him of “atrocities” being committed by troops claiming to be part of Lane’s command. On September 24, 1861, Lane reported a skirmish at Osceola, Missouri, that required him to reduce the town to “ashes.” On October 9, 1861, Lane, who was a Republican United States senator from Kansas, sent a telegram to his friend, Abraham Lincoln, complaining that “Governor Robinson . . . has constantly . . . vilified myself, and abused the men under my command as marauders and thieves.”⁴⁴ Major General Henry W. Halleck, commander of the Department of the Missouri, on December 19, 1861, sent a letter to Major General George B. McClellan, general in chief of the army in Washington, describing some of Lane’s activities: The conduct of the forces under Lane . . . has done more for the enemy in this State than could have been accomplished by 20,000 of his own army. ... I receive almost daily complaints of outrages committed by these men in the name of the United States, and the evidence is so conclusive as to leave no doubt of their correctness. It is rumored that Lane has been made a brigadier-general. I cannot conceive of a more...

Note:

Yellow highlight | Page: 388

An excellent letter, though I am sorry General Halleck is so unfavorably impressed with General Lane.⁴⁶ Lincoln’s friend, Lane, did receive his promotion—a reward for conducting his campaign of terrorism against the Southern people! From this account we know President Lincoln was aware of the terrorist campaign being conducted by officers and men of the...

Note:

Yellow highlight | Page: 389

Thousands of non-combatant Southerners died as a result of the deliberate shelling of civilian occupied towns and cities, the blockade of civilian medical supplies, the burning of civilian homes, the forced displacement of the civilian population, and the starvation that resulted from the deliberate destruction of civilian food supplies and the implements and draft animals necessary to grow future crops. The question remains whether this was done as a deliberate policy to destroy the Southern population or simply as a result of senseless, unrestrained hatred and violence against the Southern people by military forces of the United States. One point should be made clear; if you are killed by someone, the motive for the murder makes little difference to you, the victim. The result is the same—you are dead! The effect of the vicious and unconstitutional invasion of the Confederate States of America was the extermination of large numbers of its population—both black and white. Look again at some examples of the thinking that guided those who were responsible for the conduct of the Yankee Empire's aggression against the democratically elected, peaceful nation—the Confederate States of America.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Page: 392

Yankees who for generations had been raised to believe that Southerners were lazy, indolent, and cruel slave masters were now making war upon these "Southern barbarians." Is there any wonder that the invading Yankee troops chose to treat Southern civilians as less than civilized—subhuman people deserving none of the rights and respect due civilized folk, such as themselves?

Note:

Yellow highlight | Page: 392

General U. S. Grant on April 11, 1863, wrote the following: Rebellion has assumed that shape now that it can only terminate by the complete subjugation of the South. ... It is our duty to weaken the enemy, by destroying their means of subsistence, withdrawing their means of cultivating their fields, and in every other way possible. 52 Where is the "malice toward none, . . . charity for all" spokesperson? What is meant by the plain words of Grant when he states that all means of production must be destroyed? How does he propose to feed the starving multitudes if all means of cultivation are removed—let them eat cake?

Note:

Yellow highlight | Page: 397

Throughout this chapter we have documented the cruel and evil attitude of United States leaders during their conduct of the war. This evil attitude or mind set is not pleasant to look upon and serves as a source of national embarrassment for patriotic Americans.* This may be one of the reasons why the crimes committed by the Yankee military tend to be ignored. Most authors find it unpleasant and therefore prefer to pretend that the entire episode of Yankee criminal conduct never occurred. The cruel fact is that these events did happen, and it was the Southern people who suffered at the hands of the United States government! Lyon G. Tyler of Virginia addressed the question of the United States' willingness to use cruel methods to further its aggressive intent:

Note:
