

The Great Eviscerator

Anyone who believes in the CivilGate myth of Abraham Lincoln as the Great Emancipator is in for some very inconvenient truths about their hero.

In the 1856 election, Lincoln campaigned for the very first Republican Party candidate, Gen John Fremont. Later, Fremont, in charge of Union military operations in Missouri, faced a very effective Confederate guerilla campaign, prompting Fremont to issue a proclamation on Aug 30, 1861. It announced that martial law was in effect throughout Missouri, and that any person(s) who resisted the occupying Union army would face confiscation of their property and emancipation of their slaves. (Unionists were allowed to keep their slaves.)

Lincoln, instead of welcoming an opportunity to free possibly thousands of slaves, nullified the emancipation part of Fremont's proclamation, and he relieved the general of his command on Nov 2, 1861, in spite of a personal plea from Fremont's wife. A similar scenario played out in May 1862, when Union Gen David Hunter tried to emancipate slaves in Union-held territories in Georgia, Florida, and South Carolina.

Congress passed a series of confiscation acts in the early years of the war, allowing Union troops to confiscate slaves and other property of Confederates in Union-occupied territories. They could have easily freed those slaves, but they did not. Some were returned to their owner, but most were simply used as Union slaves and forced to do the most unpleasant tasks in and around Union encampments. One Illinois lieutenant wrote: **I have 11 Negroes in my company now. They do every particle of the dirty work. Two women among them do the washing for the company.**

In response to angry reactions from abolitionists, Lincoln explained his position in a public letter to New York Tribune editor, Horace Greeley, in 1862:

My paramount object in this struggle is to save the Union, and is not either to save or to destroy slavery. If I could save the Union without freeing any slave I would do it; and if I could save it by freeing some and leaving others alone, I would also do that. What I do about slavery, and the colored race, I do because I believe it helps to save the Union.

Here is a prime example of Lincoln the pathological liar. In his First Inaugural Address he claimed that he had no interest at all in interfering with Southern slavery, and he had no constitutional authority to do so, even if he had wanted to. He said he wanted to prevent the spread of slavery into the territories, but that was as far as he was willing or allowed to go. Now, in this letter, he is no longer concerned in the slightest with constitutional or legal restraints. He was prepared to use the slavery issue, and emancipation, in any manner he felt would advance his agenda, the Constitution be damned. In his Second Inaugural Address, he claimed that the Civil War had always been about freeing the slaves. He always said what he thought his audience wanted to hear, whether it bore any resemblance to the truth or not.

We find further proof of Lincoln's pathology in his Emancipation Proclamation. He wanted, for military and political purposes, to start portraying the war as a noble campaign to free the slaves. That too, was a lie. The Proclamation did not free a single slave, nor did Lincoln really want it to. Otherwise, he could have quite easily freed the thousands of slaves then in the territories; in Union-occupied areas of the South, such as Louisiana, Virginia, and much of Tennessee; and in the Union-occupied states of Maryland, Kentucky, and West Virginia. The Proclamation purposefully did not apply to those slaves, and it had no legal effect in the Confederate states.

Lincoln wasn't fooling anybody. Almost everyone in the world recognized that it was a political gimmick and a military tactic, not a sincere effort to free slaves. This appeared in a New York World newspaper editorial:

The president has purposely made the proclamation inoperative in all places where we have gained a military footing which makes the slaves accessible. He has proclaimed emancipation only where

he has notoriously no power to execute it. The exemption of the accessible parts of Louisiana, Tennessee, and Virginia renders the proclamation not merely futile, but ridiculous.

Even Lincoln's own Secretary of State couldn't restrain his sarcasm: **We show our sympathy with slavery by emancipating slaves where we cannot reach them and holding them in bondage where we can set them free.**

From the London Spectator: **The principle [of the Proclamation] is not that a human being cannot justly own another, but that he cannot own him unless he is loyal to the United States.** Which is pretty much what Lincoln had himself said in his letter to Horace Greeley. All that mattered is what Abraham Lincoln, Dictator of the United States, wanted. The Constitution, civil laws, and the Supreme Court were now irrelevant under the Lincoln tyranny.

British writer Earl Russell put it this way: **The Proclamation . . . professes to emancipate all slaves in places where the United States authorities cannot exercise any jurisdiction . . . but it does not decree emancipation . . . There seems to be no declaration of a principle adverse to slavery in this proclamation.** Only one principle was important to Lincoln -- implementing the Alexander Hamilton / Henry Clay / Republican Party / Whig agenda. That's why he was so determined to preserve the Union. It had nothing directly to do with freeing slaves.

The American magazine, Saturday Review, denounced the Proclamation as **a crime [that will] precipitate the ruin of [Lincoln's] cause.** Unfortunately, they were wrong about that. It did have the effect of preventing England from entering the war and assisting the Confederacy. Almost all civilized nations had already done away with the institution of slavery. England didn't want the international stigma of fighting in support of slavery.

Even Lincoln himself had to admit, in a letter to his Treasury Secretary, Salmon P Chase, that the Proclamation had no legal basis, and he acknowledged that it was also unconstitutional, calling it a *war measure*. He might have also admitted that it was an act of desperation, because the Union had **reached the end of our rope on the [military] plan of operation**, after the Confederacy had racked up a series of smashing victories during the first two years of the war. If either England or France had offered assistance to the Confederacy at that point, or if they had offered to broker a peace agreement, Lincoln may well have been forced to compromise. He was not about to let that happen.

To help us understand just how grave the military situation looked for the Union at that point, let's briefly review the Battle of Fredericksburg in December 1862. The Union army had not achieved a decisive victory since the beginning of the war. But they believed they could turn things around at Fredericksburg, with 121,000 troops led by Gen Ambrose Burnside against only 80,000 Confederates. But the South had been carefully preparing its battle line for the past month, and not one Yankee got within 50 yards of it in any of the Union's 13 charges across an open plain. Again, Federal forces were forced to retreat, this time at night through a raging winter storm.

Union casualties were 12,653; Confederate casualties were 5309. Yankee morale was at an all-time low, for both soldiers and civilians. No one could understand how the great Army of the Potomac could have been so poorly managed. A sudden spike in the price of gold reflected evaporating public support for Lincoln's bloody war and eroding confidence in his ability to win it. Many Yankees were encouraging a reasonable peace agreement. If England or France decided to join that chorus, **Lincoln may have no choice but to sue for peace.**

That is the context of the Emancipation Proclamation, effective Jan 1863. It was Lincoln's last card. Englishmen saw it as a desperate attempt by Lincoln to spark a slave insurrection in the South. He believed that slaves would have little difficulty overpowering their masters, because they would be facing women and children, not men. Virtually all Southern men were away, fighting, leaving their families as easy targets for emboldened slaves. Lincoln was gambling that the Proclamation would be enough to push

Southern slaves into widespread revolt, allowing them to gain their freedom and then rush to help the Union cause against their former oppressors.

It didn't happen that way. Southern slaves did not revolt against their masters, although they could have done so easily enough. Lincoln, and Yankees in general, did not understand the South at all. Northern opinion of the South was based largely on the fiction of *Uncle Tom's Cabin*, which Yankees mistakenly considered an accurate portrayal of conditions in the South. When Union soldiers entered the South they were shocked to find that it was nothing like the Yankee propaganda they had been spoon-fed.

Most Southern slaves wanted nothing to do with Yankees or their army. Union troops resorted to taking slaves by force to use essentially as their own slaves. Slaves in the Union Army were not paid, at first at least, nor was there any assistance for their families they were forced to abandon. Slave families suffered tremendously at the hands of their Yankee "liberators". They had not suffered until the despised Yankees arrived. Blacks in the Union army were treated harshly, as well. Yankee racism was raging stronger than ever.

Initial reaction to the Proclamation in the North was violent. Freeing slaves was most certainly not what Yankees had been fighting for, and they were most disinclined to begin now. Even those who didn't particularly care for the peculiar institution didn't consider it worth risking their lives over. Quite the contrary. As long as blacks were mostly confined to the South, Yankees didn't have to worry about free blacks trying to take their jobs away from them.

White immigrant mobs had for decades been assaulting what few blacks there were in Northern cities. Race riots broke out in New York City, with whites attacking, and sometimes killing, all blacks they happened to encounter. They were protesting not only the Proclamation but also Lincoln's new conscription law that had gone into effect in March 1863. Lincoln's mandatory draft applied only to whites, and only to those whites who could not come up with the \$300 price of avoiding it. They are the ones who formed the hostile mobs. Lincoln's solution, as always, was to rely on federal troops to crush resistance to his will. Five regiments, fresh from Gettysburg, killed between 300 and 1000 citizens.

We have the following eyewitness account of the situation in New York City from Colonel Arthur Fremantle, British emissary to the Confederacy. He was just about to return to London after observing Robert E Lee's army in the Battle of Gettysburg.

The reports of outrages, hangings, and murder, were now most alarming, the terror and anxiety were universal. All shops were shut: all carriages and omnibuses had ceased running. No colored man or woman was visible or safe in the streets, or even in his own dwelling. Telegraphs were cut, and railroad tracks torn up. The draft was suspended, and the mob evidently had the upper hand.

The people who can't pay \$300 naturally hate being forced to fight in order to liberate the very race who they are most anxious should be slaves. It is their direct interest not only that all slaves should remain slaves, but that the free Northern Negroes who compete with them for labor should be sent to the South also.

Fremantle inquired of a bystander what the Negroes had done that they should want to kill them, and received this reply: **Oh sir, they hate them here; they are the innocent cause of all these troubles.**

Recall Lincoln's words from his First Inaugural Address: **Plainly the central idea of secession is the essence of anarchy.** It wasn't secession that sparked anarchy. It was Lincoln. Many Union troops were anarchists during the war, many Union representatives were anarchists during Reconstruction, and white Yankee citizens were anarchists as well in New York City in the summer of 1863.

But why at that particular time? The Proclamation had been issued in January and the conscription policy began in March. Why did whites wait until summer to exercise their hostility? Because prior to Jul 11 Yankees had been counting on Democrat Party officials to intervene for them and protect them from the

draft. Once it became clear that Democrats couldn't or wouldn't save them, Republicans became fair targets also.

Violent mobs attacked police and affluent Republicans as well as blacks. **Rioters tore through expensive Republican homes on Lexington Avenue and took -- or more often destroyed -- pictures with gilt frames, elegant pier glasses, sofas, chairs, clocks, furniture of every kind. They set fire to an orphanage for black children, and began attacking black men and boys in the tenement district along the downtown waterfront.**

Anti-Republicanism remained the refrain of the violence as crowds returned to [Horace] Greeley's Tribune office and set the building on fire. A mob hanged a black man named William Jones and burned his body. Racially inspired Yankee anarchists continued their campaign of violent murders for almost a week.

Some 120,000 whites managed to evade conscription by coming up with the \$300. Another 90,000 fled to Canada. Thousands more hid out in the mountains of Pennsylvania. At least 200,000 Union soldiers deserted. They believed that the Proclamation had changed the purpose of the war, they felt betrayed, and they were not willing to fight for emancipation of slaves.

Union officers were frequently heard saying things like: **If emancipation is to be the policy of this war . . . I do not care how quick the country goes to pot.** A Massachusetts sergeant wrote in a letter: **If anyone thinks that this army is fighting to free the Negro . . . they are terribly mistaken.** One officer said: **I don't want to fire another shot for the Negroes and I wish that all the abolitionists were in hell . . . I do not fight or want to fight for Lincoln's Negro proclamation one day longer.**

Enlistment rates took a dive, as did subscriptions to war bonds, even with sharply declining prices. Clearly, Yankees were not buying into the Great Emancipator hoax. And wisely so. While Lincoln was no emancipator at all, there were a number of worldwide great emancipators. After 3000 years of unchallenged slavery, abolitionist movements sprang up all over the world in the late 18th century. While the abolitionists in America represented only about 2% of the population, and were quite ineffective overall, the first substantial movement was organized in England just before the American Revolution. By 1888, Brazil had accomplished emancipation, thus effectively ending institutionalized slavery in the Americas.

Worldwide (with the exception of the US) emancipation was motivated by religion, philosophy, and economics. Quakers led the abolitionist charge, because they believed that slavery was offensive to God. The Enlightenment promoted individual rights and equality under the law. The Industrial Revolution exposed the inherent inefficiency of slave labor. Since slaves do not directly benefit from working more productively, improving efficiency, or acquiring new skills, they are not motivated to do any of those things. Free laborers are rewarded for such improvements, and thus they are motivated to become more productive and efficient. New and improved machines began to make slave labor unnecessary and undesirable. Economist Ludwig von Mises summarized the situation this way: **Servile labor disappeared because it could not stand the competition of free labor; its profitability sealed its doom in the market economy.**

Therefore, slave owners were increasingly motivated to free their slaves. Governments were increasingly motivated to find peaceful solutions to the slavery problem, and they were successful throughout the world, with the notable exception of the US. The only violent slave uprising occurred in Haiti, in 1794. There was violence associated with emancipation in a few countries, such as Columbia and Venezuela, but that was because revolutionaries used emancipation as a means of gaining power. In fact, that describes the situation in the US as well, only the violence here was several orders of magnitude greater than the skirmishes in those countries. Lincoln was conducting a revolution with the express purpose of gaining power for himself and for the federal government at the expense of the Constitution, states' rights, and individual liberties.

Only in the US was war closely aligned with the abolition movement, and even then emancipation was merely an afterthought, a military and political ploy. The Great Emancipator did not free a single slave. The

13th Amendment accomplished that, months after Lincoln's assassination. The Great Emancipator couldn't manage to accomplish what government leaders throughout the world had already achieved -- peaceful emancipation. The Great Emancipator myth is perhaps one of the most insidious lies ever sold to the American people.

The Lincoln Memorial in Washington, DC, and the Lincoln face in Mt Rushmore should be viewed as symbols of the everlasting shame and disgrace Lincoln inflicted on US citizens. Anyone who continues to blather about Lincoln, the Great Emancipator, the Gold Standard of American leadership, etc, is inexcusably ignorant of American history, or is unpardonably a despicable liar. Either way, historians who continue to revere Lincoln and make lame, bizarre, absurd excuses for his tyranny do America a great disservice. That includes you, Bill O'Reilly.

Why was Lincoln unable to follow the example of other national leaders? Why was he so unwilling to even try to emulate their success? How did they manage to pull it off in other countries? They had succeeded through either manumission (where slaveholders voluntarily free their slaves), or through a program of compensated emancipation. Typically, an emancipation law was legally enacted, providing for the freedom of children of slaves after a specified date. Usually that specified date was the child's 18th, 21st, or 28th birthday.

Under such arrangements, slaveholders suffered no loss on existing male slaves or on female slaves who were already past their childbearing years. Having control over the services of a newly-born child until his or her twenty-first or twenty-eighth birthday meant that most, if not all, of the costs of rearing such slaves would be covered by the income they earned between the onset of their productive years and the date of their emancipation . . . In other words, gradual abolition imposed an average cost on slaveholders . . . quite close to zero.

The English were a bit impatient, so they got-er-done in only six years. All slaves in the British Empire had been freed by 1840. How did they pull that off? They paid slave owners about 40% of the value of their slaves. That must have been a substantial chunk of change, but the Brits felt it was worth it.

This is a list of countries that achieved peaceful emancipation between 1813 and 1886:

- 1813 Argentina
- 1814 Columbia
- 1823 Chile
- 1824 Central America
- 1829 Mexico
- 1831 Bolivia
- 1842 Uruguay
- 1848 French and Danish Colonies
- 1851 Ecuador
- 1854 Peru and Venezuela
- 1863 Dutch colonies
- 1873 Puerto Rico
- 1878 Brazil
- 1886 Cuba

Why didn't Lincoln at least consider a program similar to that used by the British? Chances are great that some sort of reasonable deal could have been negotiated between the North and the South to bring slavery to a rapid and peaceful conclusion in America. Sure, it would have cost a lot of money. But so did the Civil War. The North's share of the cost of the war was about \$3.3 billion, according to one estimate. For that, the North could have easily compensated every slaveholder, and provided each freed slave with 40 acres of land and a mule.

That's strictly the money cost of the war. In addition, 650,000 Americans would not have been slaughtered if Lincoln had been anywhere near the great statesman for which he gets credit. The Constitution would still be the foundation of our American democratic republic. Individual liberties would have been preserved, and states' rights would still be a fundamental element of our form of government.

There are lots of other approaches Lincoln could have tried. He could have allowed the South to freely exercise their constitutional and natural right of secession. While it would have doubtlessly imposed some short-term inconveniences on both sections, it also would have achieved some very substantial benefits to the North. For one thing, the issue of extending slavery into the territories would have been solved. The South no longer had any interest in that.

For another, with no Southern states left in the US Congress to block legislation or Constitutional amendments, the North could have quickly and easily achieved total emancipation throughout the Union. That wouldn't have included Southern slaves, but it would have freed the thousands of slaves in border states and the territories. And it would have clearly placed the North on the moral high road in the eyes of the rest of the world.

Slavery was already breaking down in the border states, primarily for economic reasons, but also because of growing political support for peaceful emancipation. If Lincoln had supported those efforts, it would have easily been accomplished in no time. He at times paid lip service to those efforts, but his heart wasn't in it. The Confederacy made several peace proposals during the war, but Lincoln refused to even consider them.

The North could have opened their states up to newly freed slaves and escaped slaves from the South. Instead of enforcing their Black Codes, they could have shed their racist policies and attitudes and welcomed free blacks with open arms. They could have covertly (or maybe even overtly) worked to extend and expand the reach and effectiveness of reasonable abolitionists in the South. One way of doing that would have been by vigorously supporting the Underground Railroad.

The North could have brought tremendous international pressure to bear on the Confederate states to quickly end slavery there, just as the rest of the world had done. No major country would have wanted to trade with the Confederacy, because they did not want to be perceived as the nation willing to support institutionalized slavery. Diplomatic pressure and economic sanctions could have had a significant impact on the South.

The North and South would still have cooperated on strategic matters that were in both their best interests, including national defense and trade. The North would have been in a much stronger position economically, and they could have used trade agreements as both positive and negative incentives for the South to abandon slavery and rejoin the Union. Had Yankees conducted themselves according to constitutional principles, the South would soon enough have wanted to rejoin the Union and the North would have been worthy of a reunited nation.

Lincoln was unwilling to pursue peaceful emancipation in America, because he did not want peaceful emancipation in America. Neither did his Yankee constituents. As Lincoln himself often confessed, his goal was to preserve the Union, which was nothing more than a euphemism for consolidating power in the federal government, while destroying the Constitution, states' rights, individual liberties, and 650,000 lives in the process. He was perfectly willing to try to use the abolition movement to his political and military advantage, but he refused to align himself with abolitionists, because abolition was the last thing he and all Yankees wanted, with the possible exception of a small minority of dedicated abolitionists.

That's the true story of the Great Emancipator. He was neither great, nor was he an emancipator. He was a ruthless tyrant hell-bent on amassing power for himself and the federal government, regardless of the cost in terms of money, morals, laws, the Constitution, individual liberties, or American lives. He was just another of the bloodthirsty dictators that has always littered world history. We know such evil men have consistently inflicted their will on the victims of other countries throughout history. But it wasn't supposed to

happen here. The Constitution was designed to avoid that very thing. Thanks to Lincoln, the power of military force prevailed over the rule of law in America. We will never again be a constitutional democratic republic.

Abraham Lincoln was not the Great Emancipator. He was the Great Eviscerator.