

Invaded by Satanists

The doctrine is simply this: that the Union soldiers who died at Gettysburg sacrificed their lives to the cause of self-determination—that government of the people, by the people, for the people, should not perish from the earth. It is difficult to imagine anything more untrue. The Union soldiers in the battle actually fought against self-determination; it was the Confederates who fought for the right of their people to govern themselves. — H. L. Mencken

If the Union was formed by the accession of States, then the Union may be dissolved by the secession of States. — Daniel Webster; U.S. Senate; February 15, 1833

When the Constitution was adopted by the votes of States at Philadelphia, and accepted by the votes of States in popular conventions, it is safe to say that there was not a man in the country from Washington and Hamilton on the one side, to George Clinton and George Mason on the other, who regarded the new system as anything but an experiment entered upon by the States and from which each and every State had the right peaceably to withdraw, a right which was very likely to be exercised. — Henry Cabot Lodge; *Daniel Webster* (1888); chap. VI

The first act of secession dates as far back as 1789, when eleven of the States, becoming dissatisfied with the old articles of confederation made in 1778, seceded and formed a second union. When in 1861 eleven of the States again seceded and united themselves under the style of the Confederate States of North America, they exercised a right which required no justification. . . . — Edward A. Pollard; *The Second Year of the War* (New York; 1864)

[T]he States of New York, Rhode Island, and Virginia, in their ratifications of the Constitution of the United States, expressly reserved the right “to reassume the powers delegated whenever they should be perverted to the injury of the people.” This is simply and clearly the right of secession, and as these States were admitted into the Union, partnership, or alliance, with this condition precedent annexed, such condition became, of course, a part of the contract, or Constitution itself. But, even without this condition, is it not obvious to common sense that sovereign States have the same right to withdraw from an alliance or partnership as they had to enter it, and by the same process, *viz.*: through their organic, government-making, Constitution-making Conventions, in which alone their sovereignty is embodied? How absurd it seems to admit, in the case of individuals, the right of withdrawing from a partnership, and yet to deny the same right to sovereign States. . . . — *The Old Guard*, September 1867, p. 710

[T]here is no such body politic known to the American system as the *National Government*, meaning a compound mass of the people. Ours is a *Confederation of States*, and not, therefore, the government of a single nation. Our system embraces more than thirty complete governments, confederated for general purposes only, leaving . . . the internal sovereignty of each as absolute as any other government on the face of the earth. The Constitution of the United States is nothing but a grant from these several sovereignties. The grant, we say, was made for the purpose of preserving and protecting, and not for the annihilating of these sovereignties. But some one exclaims, “Are we not a nation then? This is monstrous!” Those

who established the system did not think it monstrous. And how happy and prosperous were we under it, until a party came into power which conceived the stupendous treason of overthrowing it! All our present misfortunes and miseries spring, not from the system of sovereign confederated States, but from an attempt to destroy that system, by bruising the States into a fused mass, with a single overshadowing despotic government. — *The Old Guard*, May 1868, p. 327

To help the fainthearted a little, let us ask, *which State would have joined the Union had it supposed that, under no circumstances, of whatever oppression and wrong, could it ever resume its sovereign powers?* Does any man believe that a single State would have agreed to the compact with such an understanding of its nature? — *The Old Guard*, Feb. 1865, p. 51

[W]hen we were at war with Great Britain [the War of 1812], Massachusetts not only refused to obey the laws of the United States—refused to allow a single soldier to defend the government of the United States—but she tried to induce all the New England States to secede from the Union, and form a separate treaty of peace with our enemy in the very midst of the war. . . . Because the government of the United States would not permit England to seize our ships and destroy our commerce, the State of Massachusetts, rather than go to war with our enemy, proposed to destroy the Union. — *The Old Guard*, October 1863, p. 267–268

Did the people of New England, who threatened to withdraw from the Union in 1790, in 1794, in 1801, in 1811, in 1814, and three several times since, consider themselves as “rebels?” — *The Old Guard*, Feb. 1865, p. 54

But I cannot agree that this Union cannot be dissolved. Am I to understand that no degree of oppression, no outrage, no broken faith can produce the destruction of this Union? Why, sir, if that becomes a fixed fact, it will itself become the greatest instrument of producing oppression, outrage, and broken faith. No, sir! the Union can be broken. — John C. Calhoun; March 7, 1850

One of the most eminent of the early jurists of our country, Judge Rawle, in his Commentaries on the Federal Constitution, says:

“It depends on the State itself to *retain* or *abolish* the principle of representation, because *it depends on the State itself whether it will continue a member of the Union*. To deny this right would be inconsistent with the principle on which all our political systems are founded; which is, that in all cases the people have a right to determine how they will be governed.” — *The Old Guard*, Feb. 1865, p. 53

But the plain question occurs, what right has the North to constrain the association of a people who have no benefit to derive from the partnership, and who, by the laws of nature and society, are free to consult their own happiness? The North has territory and numbers and physical resources enough for a separate existence, and if she has not virtue enough to sustain a national organization, she has no right to seek it in a compulsory union with a people who, sensible of their superior endowments, have resolved to take their destinies in their own hands. — Edward A. Pollard; *The Second Year of the War* (1864); p. 305

If the Constitution be not observed in all its parts, the whole of it ceases to be binding. . . . A bargain cannot be broken on one side, and still be binding on the other side. — Daniel Webster (*The Old Guard*, Feb. 1865, p. 52)

We are dealing only with this senseless assertion . . . that, “*under no circumstances can a State withdraw from the Union.*” Such an assertion we hold to be not only senseless, but monstrous. Such a principle carried out in all the relations of life, would put a stop to all the movements of civilization. Who would enter into compacts, partnerships, or bargains of any kind, if by so doing they bound themselves, beyond the reach of reparation or retreat, to adhere to contracts after they were broken by the other parties to them? It is certain that if such were the character of the compact of the Union, not one State would ever have become a party to it. The effort to change the character of the compact into an involuntary Union, is revolutionary, and should be abhorred by every State alike; for the existence of every State is alike involved in the issue. — *The Old Guard*, Feb. 1865, p. 56

Now, if this doctrine of the right of States to withdraw from the Union has never been regarded as a crime by the North—if the Northern States have repeatedly affirmed this right, as we have shown—if our senators have presented petitions for the dissolution of the Union, and received the applause of a numerous and now dominant party for so doing; and if the leading statesmen of the South have always asserted the right, how are we to imagine that the Southern people supposed that they were committing the most horrible crime by withdrawing? The whole truth is that they did not imagine that they were committing a crime at all. They certainly could not have supposed that the party which elected Mr. Lincoln so regarded it, for its leading spirits had preached dissolution as a right and necessity, in order to get rid of contact with slavery, for a third of a century. Certainly these men could have had no idea that they were to be murdered for doing what Northern States had so often threatened to do. — *The Old Guard*, March 1863, p. 54

We feel that our cause is just and holy; we protest solemnly in the face of mankind that we desire peace at any sacrifice save that of honor and independence; we ask no conquest, no aggrandizement, no concession of any kind from the States with which we were lately confederated; all we ask is to be let alone; that those who never held power over us shall not now attempt our subjugation by arms. — President Jefferson Davis, 29 April, 1861

And some ten years ago a party was organized in the North for the sole purpose of getting possession of the common Government of the States, and perverting it . . . into a machine for completing the European scheme for the debauchment and destruction of Republican institutions. This party . . . elected Mr. Lincoln in 1860, according to the legal and outward form of the Constitution, though against the will and wishes of two-thirds of the American people. This combination of certain States against certain other States of the American Union . . . is the most astounding anomaly in the history of mankind, for, while preserving the *forms* of Union, it was in substance the most absolute *disunion* possible, and while acting within legal formulas, it aimed at a revolution, wider, deeper, and deadlier than any the world has ever yet witnessed. — *The Old Guard*, February 1864, pp. 32–33

A religious exchange attributes all the cruelties of this war to Adam’s fall. . . . We are more inclined to saddle *Father Abraham* with the whole thing. — *The Old Guard*, February 1865, p. 96

The ranting and lying of the Abolitionists made possible the formation of the Republican Party, which was dominated and largely financed by many Jews, of whom the most important

were the eight Seligman brothers. . . . — Revilo P. Oliver (*Liberty Bell*; November 1984; page 5)

The slave codes of New England not only divided negro families, but sent Indian women and boys to the West Indies, and sold them for slaves. They imported the product of slave labor, distilled the molasses into rum, exported the rum to Africa, purchased slaves with it, transported them to the West Indies, and to the Southern States, and sold them at private and public sale. By law they authorized in every place a public *whipper*, who received a salary of three shillings for every slave whipped. — *The Old Guard*, October 1864, p. 239

[T]he northern States got rid of their negroes, many of whom they sold to the South, when European emigration as well as the long winter, during which the agricultural negro laborer of the North had to be fed, doing comparatively nothing, rendered him an unprofitable investment. . . . But the “slave trade,” which, for the benefit of New England, was extended twenty years longer than it otherwise would have been, no sooner ceased than those whose votes in the Federal [constitutional] Convention prolonged the traffic, began to raise the cry that “*slavery is a sin*”. . . .

[O]ur old enemy, England, seeing an opening for the wedge with which she is ever ready to divide and weaken, poured in gold from Exeter Hall, greasing the pockets of New England parsons and propagandists, who thundered forth the enormity of the sin of “slavery” with a vigor and industry which fanaticism and gold only can inspire. — *The Old Guard*, July 1868, p. 543

Slaves, obey your earthly masters, with anxious care. . . . — *Ephesians* 6:5 (Westcott translation)

You who are slaves must always obey your earthly masters. . . . — *Colossians* 3:22 (Goodspeed translation)

ONESIMUS . . . a slave of Philemon . . . , ran away from Colossae. . . . St. Paul . . . wrote the Epistle to Philemon, appealing to him to receive his slave, . . . and himself undertaking to refund any money which Philemon had lost through the action of Onesimus. . . . — James Hastings; *Dictionary of the Bible* (1898)

They, unless grotesquely ignorant and virtually illiterate, lied in their throats when they denied that the “New Testament,” and hence the religion that was explicitly based on it, specifically sanctioned and authorized the institution of slavery. There were honest clergymen who told the truth, but their voices were drowned out by the yelling of the rabble-rousers. — Revilo P. Oliver; “The Beginning of the End”

Among the negroes, no science has been developed, and few questions are ever discussed, except those which have an intimate connection with the wants of the stomach. — David Livingstone

A most inhuman practice also prevails among them, that when a mother dies, whose infant is not able to shift for itself, it is, without any ceremony, buried alive with the corpse of its mother. — Robert Moffat; *Missionary Labours and Scenes in Southern Africa*; p. 57

[I]t was tried to suppress the brutal system of burying twins alive and banishing the mother from all society, as well as the equally cruel one of burying a child, though living, with its mother, if she died during the period of suckling. — Thomas J. Hutchinson; *Impressions of Western Africa* (London, 1858); p. 165

Amarar, . . . seeing a child of his own, two years old, at hand, when the oracle announced the decree, snatched the infant from his mother's arms, threw it into a rice mortar, and, with a pestle, mashed it to death. — nationalvanguard.org/2014/12/savage-africa-part-1/

Liberia was established in 1821 . . . to provide a home for emancipated slaves from the United States. The effort was denounced and sabotaged by the sleazy gang of crazed fanatics and cunning thieves called "Abolitionists" before 1861 and "radical Republicans" thereafter. . . . Some idealists were surprised when the [Negroes], freed from slavery in the United States, promptly enslaved native [Negroes] after the Americans declared the country independent in 1847 and they were freed from White supervision. — Revalo P. Oliver; "Sporting Event"

Slavery is here so common, or the mind of slaves is so constituted, that they always appeared much happier than their masters; the women, especially, singing with the greatest glee all the time they are at work. — Denham, Clapperton, and Oudney; *Travels and Discoveries in Northern and Central Africa, in 1822, 1823, and 1824*; Vol. IV; p. 38

The liability to fall into a condition of servitude is not so frightful here, however, as it is where there is a higher appreciation of personal liberty. . . . The African sees very little difference between the authority exercised over him by one whom he acknowledges as his master and the petty tyranny which is exercised by most African chiefs over their subjects; and so long as he is worked moderately, and treated kindly, he has but little cause for dissatisfaction, and not infrequently by his own choice places himself in this condition. — Rev. J. Leighton Wilson; *Western Africa* (1856); p. 156

The only articles of export at present are slaves and ivory. . . . Slavery exists on an immense scale in this country [Adamawa]; and there are many private individuals who have more than a thousand slaves. — Henry Barth; *Travels and Discoveries in North and Central Africa* (1857); Vol. II; p. 502

[M]y observations apply chiefly to persons of free condition, who constitute, I suppose, not more than one-fourth part of the inhabitants at large; the other three-fourths are in a state of hopeless and hereditary slavery. . . . — Mungo Park; *Travels in the Interior Districts of Africa* (1799, London); p. 24

In times of necessity, however, a man will part with his parents, wives, and children, and when they fail, he will sell himself without shame. As has been observed, amongst many tribes the uncle has a right to dispose of his nephews and nieces. — Richard F. Burton; *The Lake Regions of Central Africa*; Vol. II

Not even the appearance of affection exists between husband and wife, or between parents and children. So little do they care for their offspring, that many offered to sell me any of their sons or daughters as slaves. They are, to speak the truth, in point of parental affection inferior to brutes. — John Duncan; *Travels in Western Africa, in 1845 & 1846*; Vol. I; p. 79

Under pressure, at first coercion and now bribery, from White nations, the Congoids have officially renounced slavery and practice it only when they are unobserved. In Africa today [they] quite commonly trade a wife or two for a goat, cow, or other more valuable animal. They often give away their children, sell them for a small fee, or use them in sport. I have a copy of a letter from a “Liberal” ignoramus who went to Africa in the “Peace Corpse,” and was astonished by the “culture” of the Balubas, who enjoy stringing a razor-sharp machete on a rope and whirling the rope. . . . The game is a competition to see which player can toss the greater number of babies through the path of the whirling machete without having them sliced up. . . . True to what he had been taught in his moron-mill, the “Liberal” nincompoop solemnly opined that we must not be so bigoted as to criticise adversely the Baluba culture, which is every bit as good as our own. — Revilo P. Oliver; “Divinest Poesy” (*Liberty Bell*; June 1993)

Mr. Baker, the latest traveler in Africa, . . . [writes] that the most interior tribes . . . are all cannibals, and are the only animals in Africa that eat their own kind. — *The Old Guard*, Oct. 1867, p. 726

One of the slave girls attempted to escape, and her proprietor immediately fired at her with his musket, and she fell wounded. . . . The girl was remarkably fat, and from the wound a large lump of yellow fat exuded. . . . [T]he Makkarikas rushed upon her in a crowd, and, seizing the fat, they tore it from the wound in handfuls. . . . Others killed her with a lance, and at once divided her by cutting off the head, and splitting the body with their lances, used as knives. . . . — Samuel White Baker; *The Albert N’Yanza, Great Basin of the Nile, and Explorations of the Nile Sources*; p. 201

When a guest is entertained of whom presents are expected, the host, in a quiet way, goes . . . into the fetich-house and scrapes a little bone-powder from a favorite skull, and puts it into the food which is being cooked as a present to the guest. The idea is, that, by consuming the scrapings of the skull, the blood of their ancestors enters into your body, and thus, becoming of one blood, you are naturally led to love them, and grant them what they wish. — Paul B. du Chaillu; *A Journey to Ashango-Land*; p. 200

In February 2014, a hotel in Anambra, Nigeria, was closed down after two human heads wrapped in cellophane were discovered at its restaurant that had been serving human flesh. — nationalvanguard.org/2015/05/cannibalism-still-stalks-african-conflicts

A king of Ashantee cut off the hands of a slave, and bade her search his head for vermin with the stumps. If any one had accused him of barbarity, he would not have understood the accusation. It was his idea of a good practical joke. — Winwood Reade; *Savage Africa* (1864); p. 420

The savages of Africa, who are now your masters in the sense that you have to work for them every day, find the spectacle of a human being under torture simply hilarious. And when they see a blinded captive with broken limbs squirm as they prod him with red-hot irons, they laugh with glee—with a merriment, a real merriment, that is greater than the funniest farce on the stage has ever excited in you. — Revilo P. Oliver; “What We Owe Our Parasites”

Thus it has been proved by measurements, by microscopes, by analyses, that the typical negro is something between a child, a dotard, and a beast. I can not struggle against these sacred facts of science. (At the last meeting of the British Association, . . . the president of the Anthropological Society ventured to quote them. His audience felt insulted when informed that they were more intellectual than the negro, and endeavored to prove the contrary by hisses!) — Winwood Reade; *Savage Africa* (1864); p. 399

The judge said that she had yet to meet a 12-year-old Black girl who hadn't been raped, often by her own father, and stated that, as a White woman judge, she was expected by her Black male colleagues to appear for sex at hotel rooms upon demand. —
nationalvanguard.org/2016/12/south-africa-white-woman-judge-tells-the-truth-about-blacks-and-rape

The *Chicago Tribune* and perhaps other newspapers reported on 7 June 1993 an event in Liberia. . . .

[A]n army . . . came upon a horde of [Negro] refugees, almost all women and children, and, since the refugees could offer no resistance, took time out for one of their favorite sports.

According to the report in the press, “They cut throats, they cut heads, threw out brains, opened stomachs and pulled out intestines, and broke legs, and shot, so many bullet wounds that you cannot understand why.” Although the pudic reporter did not say so, you may be sure that the black sportsmen did not overlook the genital organs. He added that it is generally assumed that parts of the bodies were saved and will be used for witchcraft, “which is common in West Africa.” — Revilo P. Oliver; “Sporting Event”

[Jesse Jackson] would spit into the food of white patrons he hated and then smilingly serve it to them. He did this, he said, “because it gave me psychological gratification.” — *Life Magazine*, 1969-11-29

[W]e had enough employees who made more than 85 to fill all the openings. The highest score that any of the blacks scored on the test was 11. The lowest score that any black made on the test was 4. All four of those blacks went into skilled-trades training. —
archive.org/download/TheOldmanArchives/oldman29-081003.mp3

In 1934 F. W. Vint of the Medical Research Laboratory, Kenya, Africa, published the results of a comparative study of Negro and European brains in which he found that the supragranular layer of the Negro cortex was about 15 per cent thinner than the White. . . .

The supragranular layers in the dog are one-half the thickness of those in the ape, and the thickness of the ape's only three-fourths the thickness in man. In the case of the Negro their relative thinness again suggested his position on the evolutionary scale.

— Carleton Putnam; *Race and Reality*; Chapter III

“Dr. King” witnessed—and encouraged—the rape of one of his female followers, and *laughed* while the rape was taking place in his presence. — Kevin Alfred Strom

From the *New York Times* of October 11, 1991, . . . we learn that . . . researchers at Boston University admitted that, “There is no question but that Dr. King plagiarized in the dissertation.” . . . “Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.” [Michael King] spent his last night on Earth having sexual intercourse with two women at the motel and physically beating and abusing a third. — www.revilo-oliver.com/Kevin-Strom-personal/Beast_as_Saint.html

Black Panther Quanell X . . . blamed the 11-year-old girl for her own rape [by 28 black males]. — davidduke.com/human-rights-racist-ant-racism-and-the-trayvon-martin-case

In the United States in 2005, 37,460 white females were sexually assaulted or raped by a black man, while between zero and ten black females were sexually assaulted or raped by a white man. What this means is that **every day in the United States, over one hundred white women are raped or sexually assaulted by a black man.** — archive.frontpagemag.com/readArticle.aspx?ARTID=26368

There are a quarter of a million of free negroes at the North, who are very generally stupid, ignorant, filthy paupers, and who, according to the census of 1840 and 1850, commit ten times as much crime, in proportion to numbers, as the whites. — *The Old Guard*, Oct. 1867, p. 726

Blacks are an estimated 39 times more likely to commit a violent crime against a white than vice versa, and 136 times more likely to commit robbery. — www.colorofcrime.com/2005/10/the-color-of-crime-2005

[A] 30-year-old White man . . . died in Tacoma . . . after being savagely beaten . . . by a gang of between 15 and 20 Blacks in what even the local newspapers described as a “thrill killing.” . . . [T]he local news media had carefully avoided reporting a dozen other . . . beatings of White men . . . during the previous month. — archive.org/details/PierceWilliamDr (CaseOfHendrikMoebus)

On Sunday, 9 August 2020, . . . a White boy, Cannon Hinnant, age 5, was murdered by a male Black neighbor, Darius Sessoms, age 25. Little Cannon was riding a bicycle in front of his father’s home. Sessoms approached the boy in order to shoot him in the head at close range. . . .

Other neighbors said that Darius Sessoms had been a dinner guest of the Hinnant family just the previous Friday evening. — David Sims; “Another Innocent Victim of Multiracialism” (nationalvanguard.org/2020/08/another-innocent-victim-of-multiracialism)

When the savage in them [Congoids] is aroused, they, unless supported by White renegades, do not attack White men who have treated them harshly or even cruelly—they are afraid of them—but attack instead men who have been kind to them, thinking kindness a weakness. (Hybrids are, of course, a different matter, and their conduct is less predictable. . . .) — Revilo P. Oliver; “Divinest Poesy” (*Liberty Bell*; June 1993)

[T]he [Negro] attackers tore off the woman’s clothes and raped her until five others arrived. . . . The new arrivals took turns having sex with her and then sodomized her. . . . At gunpoint, the assailants forced the mother and son to have sex. — www.sun-sentinel.com/local/palm-beach/sfl-flpdunbar0822nbaug22-story.html

What I would most desire would be the separation of the white and black races. — A. Lincoln; July 17, 1858

[T]he two races, equally free, cannot live under the same government. — Thomas Jefferson

For a third of a century an implacable warfare has been kept up here against the institutions of the South. But when did the South ever make war upon the institutions of the North?

When did she say to us, your domestic institutions must conform to ours? — *The Old Guard*, March 1864

Continuing efforts were made to negotiate a peaceful separation. Virginia sent three commissioners to meet with Lincoln shortly prior to Lincoln's attempt to resupply Fort Sumter, which led to the bombardment of Fort Sumter and the outbreak of the War. . . . Lincoln equivocated with the commissioners. However, his greatest concern voiced to them was, "What about my tariff?" This shows once again Lincoln's commitment to the huge vested industrial and financial interests of the North. The war in Lincoln's mind had to be fought to establish the supremacy of that financial oligarchy. The tariff under Lincoln was instated with a vigor and was raised to unparalleled heights. This economic policy of anti-Southern tariffs and economic exploitation of the South was to be continued for almost eighty years after the war and was only abandoned in the face of the crisis of World War II. — Sam Dickson, "Shattering the Icon of Abraham Lincoln"

The agricultural productions of the South were the basis of the foreign commerce of the United States. . . . The resources of this unhappy part of the country were taxed for the benefit of the Northern people, and for forty years every tax imposed by Congress was laid with a view of subserving the interests of the North. — Edward A. Pollard; *The Second Year of the War* (1864); p. 295

In 1828 the North put still heavier burdens upon the South, and proudly named its oppression "The American system," and plainly gave the South to understand that this system of southern *depletion* for northern *plethora* was one of the fixed institutions of the land. This system really divided the confederation into two sections—one of which was the recipient of constant increasing bounties from the government, and the other was compelled to pay them. It was a sharp financial war between the sections. . . .

The New England States bitterly opposed the conciliation. The obnoxious tariff was mainly for their benefit, and they would sooner have seen the Union lost than to lose the occasion for fleecing the great wealth-producing States of the South. . . .

After the settlement of the tariff agitation by this compromise of 1833, the northern malcontents pitched upon slavery as a new source of agitation and sectional conflict. The long tariff-war had begotten a spirit of hatred in a considerable portion of the northern mind towards the southern people; and anti-slavery, in one shape or another, was soon made to supply the space of sectional agitation made vacant by the settlement of the tariff question. In all these sectional conflicts the South has been the victim of northern agitation, of northern aggression. . . .

We had no right to expect that the Union would last, with one half making war upon the interests and institutions of the other half. . . .

[W]e [of the North] seek for conquest and plunder, and are willing to murder millions of men to satiate this unquenchable appetite.

— *The Old Guard*; April 1865; "History of the Northern War of Tariffs upon the South"

If these infernal fanatics and abolitionists ever get power in their hands, they will override the Constitution, set Supreme Court at defiance, change and make laws to suit themselves, lay violent hands on those who differ with them in their opinion, or dare question their

infallibility; and, finally, bankrupt the country, and deluge it with blood! — Daniel Webster (*The Old Guard*, September 1863)

The masses, North and South, have no quarrel with each other. It is Puritanism which is the common foe of all. Let the people of every section make common cause against this great enemy of liberty and self-government. — *The Old Guard*, March 1863, p. 62

They [the Puritans] bored holes through Quakers' tongues with red-hot irons at Boston, drowned the Baptists at Salem, stripped women and tied them to cart tails, and whipped them from Boston to Dedham. Governor John Endicott said to some harmless Quaker women who came from England to Boston: "Take heed that ye break not our ecclesiastical laws, for then ye are sure to stretch by the halter." Some of the laws of those early days of New England "civil and religious liberty," remind us of scenes that are passing now in our midst. . . .

December 22d, 1662, Ann Coleman, Mary Tomkins, and Alice Ambrose, for being Quakers, were sentenced to be tied to the cart-tail, and whipped on their naked backs, through eleven towns, a distance of nearly eighty miles. Whatever disagreed with the opinions of the Puritans, was held as a crime to be punished with imprisonment and death. That is the moral temper of Puritanism still. It never relents, never forgives, never loses its dictatorial and intolerant spirit. — *The Old Guard*, March 1863, p. 59

When the Puritans obtained the control of Parliament, almost the first act they passed was one which doomed to death every man and woman who dared to oppose their opinions. Wherever it obtained power it inaugurated a reign of terror. — *The Old Guard*, March 1863, p. 58

The learned and impartial Grosley says: "The Puritans, at the first appearance of persecution, proved from God's own Word that revolt became a necessary remedy to subjects whose consciences were forced;" and then again, whenever it suited their convenience, they would prove from the same Word that revolt is a most damnable sin and a crime. — *The Old Guard*, March 1863, p. 58

[T]he first step of the Administration was to see how many of the supposed Democratic leaders could be bought up or bought off by office, by contracts, or whatever else appealed to the selfishness and wickedness of man, and the rest it proposed to silence by intimidation. — *The Old Guard*, January 1864, p. 5

In Maryland, Kentucky, and Missouri, Northern troops fired on pro-Southern demonstrators, dispersed legislatures, expelled elected officials, and otherwise demonstrated that no respect for constitutional rights or liberties would be shown during the course of the war. — Sam Dickson, "Shattering the Icon of Abraham Lincoln"

But the ballot has not been left to the people of Maryland, Kentucky, Missouri, and Delaware. There the people have been forced to vote, if they voted at all, with thousands of gleaming bayonets pointed at their breasts. That is not voting according to either the letter or spirit of our laws. In New Hampshire and Connecticut the last elections were carried by federal soldiers, picked out and sent home for that purpose. In Wisconsin, after the election by legal voting had been carried against the usurpers at Washington, the results were reversed

by illegal and fraudulent votes returned from the federal army. The same thing is to be attempted in Ohio, to defeat the popular choice there. It is to be carried out in every State where there is a Republican government to aid the stupendous treason. — *The Old Guard*, August 1863, pp. 198–199

If the State of Delaware had power to execute its own laws, it could legally seize (if it could catch them,) the persons of General Schenck and Mr. Lincoln, and try and hang them for this crime of seizing the ballot of the State by military force. It is the subversion of the sovereign government of a State by military powers. The penalty is death. — *The Old Guard*, February 1864, p. 46

Mr. Lincoln has undertaken to use his provost-marshals as a local police all over the country, who have set aside the laws and officers of the States, even to the regulation of the kind of preaching to be had in the churches. These provost-marshals have imprisoned or banished ministers for refusing to pray for Lincoln. They have driven congregations out of their pews and closed the doors of the church, for the crime of keeping silence upon the question of the war. — *The Old Guard*, May 1864, p. 106

History has some instances of the servile and unnatural joys of a people in the surrender of their liberties; but none grosser than that in which has been inaugurated the throne of Abraham Lincoln at Washington. — Edward A. Pollard; *The Second Year of the War* (1864); p. 302

The Weapons of the Administration.

The Boston *Courier* thus paints the face of Lincolnism:

“The Administration has two methods of dealing with those who oppose its plans. The first is, if possible, to intimidate them into silence by threats, and, whenever they can, by the practice of illegal persecution and military terrorism. The second, applied to those who know their rights as citizens, and dare to assert them, is, to defame and abuse them through a subsidized press, to ruin them by false and malicious slanders, so cunningly worded as to be within the law, and so numerous as to defy contradiction.” — *The Old Guard*, September 1863, p. 239

Lincoln suspended the writ of *habeas corpus* throughout the nation. He assumed the power to close newspapers and in fact closed hundreds of them in the North which dared criticize his policies. He arrested elected officials, including former members of Congress, who opposed him. — Sam Dickson, “Shattering the Icon of Abraham Lincoln”

No people has ever established more decisively the fact of the worthlessness of what remains of “civilization,” when the principle of liberty is subtracted, or more forcibly illustrated how much of phosphorescent rottenness there is in such a condition. . . .

All vestiges of constitutional liberty have long ago been lost in the North. The very term of “State rights” is mentioned with derision. . . . The Constitution of the United States is but “the skin of the immolated victim,” and the forms and ceremonies of a republic are the disguises of a cruel and reckless despotism.

— Edward A. Pollard; *The Second Year of the War* (1864); pp. 303, 304

Dr. Olds' crime was for declaring, in a public speech, that, in a dream, he saw this land deluged in blood in defense of the ballot-box. . . . The following is Dr. Olds' description of the manner of his arrest:

"On the 12th of August last, after 10 o'clock at night, my house was forcibly entered by three government ruffians, who, with violence seized my person, and, holding a revolver at my head, demanded my surrender.

"During the time they were making their repeated and violent efforts to burst open my door, they gave me no intimation that they were government officers, or that they had any government authority for my arrest. . . .

"I have reflected much on the manner of my arrest, and have come calmly and deliberately to the conclusion that I should have been justified both by the laws of God and man, had I killed these ruffians whilst breaking into my room, . . . *as I most certainly would do had the act to be done over again.* It would have taught Mr. Lincoln and his minions that when they set aside the laws and the Constitution, the rifle, the revolver, and the bowie knife at once become the supreme law of the land." — *The Old Guard*, April 1864, pp. 91–92

A spiritual medium in the White House having rapped out from the spirit of Washington a warning that Mr. Vallandigham would create a counter-revolution to the one which was being conducted at Washington, Mr. Lincoln instantly issued an order for the arrest of that gentleman, and finally for his banishment from his country. — *The Old Guard*, September 1867, p. 649

In Mr. Lincoln's letter, attempting to vindicate his arrest of Mr. Vallandigham, he says:—"Arrests are made not so much for what has been done, as for what probably would be done." . . . The American people have made themselves the wonder and the laughingstock of all Europe that they have so tamely submitted to such an intolerable despotism. . . . [T]he people of Ohio . . . have despised and defied Mr. Lincoln by nominating the man whom he has banished for Governor of the State. — *The Old Guard*, June 1863, p. 142

[We give below Dr. Olds' statement of his arrest and incarceration in Fort Lafayette, as a fair and unexaggerated picture of the Bastiles into which American freeman, charged with no crime, have been plunged by the party now in power at Washington. . . .]

. . . Mr. Childs, one of my mess, informed me that at one time during the latter part of last winter, in consequence of the accumulation of ice in the gutters, all the washings and scourings from the soldiers' quarters ran into the cistern out of which the prisoners were compelled to draw the water which they used—that the water became so filthy that they had to boil it and skim off the filth before using it; and that notwithstanding they had three other cisterns inside the fort, full of comparatively clean water, yet the commanding officer compelled them to use this filthy washings from the soldiers' quarters. — *The Old Guard*, February 1863, p. 40–42

[T]he administration . . . has criminally refused any form of trial for months, while the accused were dying in prisons pleading to be tried, and demanding in vain to know what were the charges against them, and who were their accusers. And, whenever a trial did come, it was not by jury, but by a "military commission" appointed by the President, and which conducted its mockings of justice in secret, without allowing the accused to be present, or to call a single witness in his defence. My God! is this America? . . . In what part of the

Constitution does the President find his authority for appointing “commissioners” to try American freemen in secret? Is it that clause which declares that “the trial of *all crimes* shall be by jury”? or is it that other clause, which provides that every person accused “shall enjoy the right of a speedy and public trial, by a jury of the State and district wherein the crime shall have been committed”? This is the supreme law of our land, which has never, until now, been violated. — *The Old Guard*, January 1863, p. 16

A Paris paper says: “The Government of the United States is just now the wonder and horror of mankind.” Ah, sir, do not think that you are contemplating the *Government of the United States!* For the moment it has ceased to exist. It is under a black cloud. Africa has been rolled upon it. — *The Old Guard*, April 1864, p. 95

Lincoln’s instructions to his Provost Marshals.

1. As your office is one that is unknown to the Constitution of the United States and to the Constitution of the States, you must endeavor to impress the people as much as possible with the dignity and importance of your official position, by evincing as much contempt as you can for the foolish, old-fashioned laws of the States, which are now entirely obsolete, being unfitted for the exigencies of the times.

2. You are to speak continually and in all places of the “odious,” “infamous,” “execrable,” “infernal,” and “damnable” doctrines of State rights.

3. Never, under any circumstances, allude to the Constitution; and if you hear the word on any man’s lips, arrest him immediately.

4. It is a disloyal practice for any man to allude to the exploded mode of trial by jury. Arrest all such.

5. Accuse all democrats of every crime under heaven, and if the scoundrels presume to argue with you, arrest them.

6. All who talk about liberty of speech and the press are traitors—arrest all such.

7. All who prate about the *habeas corpus* are enemies to the Government—arrest them.

8. Studiously avoid using the word *freedom*, except as applied to negroes. Arrest all who are guilty of such disloyal practices.

9. Use, whenever you can, the ear-tickling words “loyal,” and “supporting the Government,” but always in such a way as to mean the subversion of the miserable old Government, and the support of my new system. If you hear any man use the words in any other connexion, arrest him.

10. It is opposing the Government, for any man to speak of restoring the Union as it was. Arrest such.

11. It is a disloyal practice for any man to speak of the size of my feet, or otherwise to allude to me, except in praise of my personal beauty, and of my emancipation policy. Arrest them.

12. If you hear any man say that I know better how to tell stories, than how to conduct the affairs of the nation, he is disloyal—arrest him.

13. If you hear any man allude with respect to the ridiculous article in the old Constitution, which protects citizens from unreasonable searches and seizures, arrest and search him instantly. If you find no contraband letters and documents about him, it will be proof that he has taken the precaution to destroy them, and will be a sufficient evidence of his guilt. Lock him up.

14. It is opposing the Government, for any man to say that the abolitionists ought to enlist to help do some of the fighting. Arrest all such traitors.

15. Arrest any body you please, and if any man complains, arrest him for he is disloyal, and an enemy of the Government.

16. If anybody should blow your brains out while attempting an “illegal arrest,” tell the devil that you died serving me. He will reward you accordingly. — *The Old Guard*, May 1863, p. 118

The most appalling stories, the most horrible lies, of “southern barbarity,” were invented, and published in a hundred newspapers, which were degraded to mere organs of the most profligate sensation and disgusting falsehood. The brutal acts of the Abolitionists were published as the deeds of Southerners, and an army of correspondents, of such wretches as will blaspheme for bread, kept busy at the vile work of manufacturing instances of southern cruelty. — *The Old Guard*, January 1864, p. 4

A Federal officer, corresponding for the *Chicago Times*, gives an account of Gen. Grant’s progress in Northern Mississippi, which shows that our soldiers under that command are horribly demoralized:

“Stragglers through the country, and stealing every thing that they can lay their hands on, (says the correspondent,) whether of use or not to them, goes on. Helpless women and children are robbed of their clothes and bedding, their provisions taken from them, and by men who have no earthly use for them whatever.”

[From another correspondent.]

“A private letter received here not long since, from a soldier in one of our western armies, states that their march South was characterized by acts of vandalism, and wanton outrage, and fiendish cruelty disgraceful to a civilized people. Burning houses, desolated fields, and homeless households marked their path; while unlicensed robbery, indiscriminate plunder, and, not unfrequently, assassination completed the woeful picture presented by an invading army, which appeared to be without restraint, and whose only purpose would seem to be . . . to burn, pillage, and destroy as it went.”

Men who behave in this manner are not soldiers, but brigands. . . . It is painful to publish such things; but the people ought to know them, in order that they may understand why it is that the Southern people fight with such unnatural desperation, and why they have come to entertain such a sincere horror of Northern people. Generals who allow these crimes on the part of their soldiers, it is certain, are not fighting to restore the Union. . . . — *The Old Guard*, September 1863, pp. 234–235

Not all deportations were tolerated by the White House during the war. Thus for instance when General Grant ordered Jewish speculators expelled from Tennessee, Lincoln quickly issued a peremptory order to Grant, rescinding his order and rebuking him for having deported the Jewish speculators. Like Wilson, F.D.R., and other ideological descendants of Lincoln, Lincoln knew where a democracy has to draw the line. After all, a distinction has to be made between Anglo-Saxon women and children, textile workers, and farmers, and Jewish speculators. — Sam Dickson, “Shattering the Icon of Abraham Lincoln”

During the year 1864, the Confederate authorities had . . . put forth every exertion to obtain an exchange of prisoners; but each exertion to this end was met by some new pretence of

the Yankees, who had resolved . . . to coin a certain advantage out of the sufferings of their own men in Southern prisons. . . .

But the Washington Government was not satisfied . . . to consign its soldiers to the extraordinary sufferings of imprisonment incident to the scant supplies in the South, which indeed it was daily endeavoring to diminish by blockade and devastation. It went a step further. It paraded these very sufferings, for which it was responsible, which indeed its own malignity had produced, to raise a clamor about the cruelty of the Confederates, and thus engage the sympathies of the world. . . .

[I]n the fall of 1864, the Yankees refused to exchange any prisoners but those who were *sick*, and then . . . the poor, wasted victims of prison diseases were paraded through the country, and had their photographs taken for pictorials, as fair specimens of the results of life in Confederate prisons. The calculation that could have prompted such an exhibition appears indeed to partake of an ingenuity of beings other than man. — Edward A. Pollard; *The Last Year of the War* (New York; 1866); chapter VIII.

Southern prisoners of war also seemed to have escaped Lincoln's much acclaimed magnanimity. The death rate of Southern prisoners in Northern prison camps was much higher than the rate of Northern prisoners in Southern P.O.W. camps. To this disparity must be added the fact that the North could not claim lack of food or medicine as a reason for the horrifying high death rate in the prisons. In fact, the North refused to permit the shipment of medicine or food to Union prisoners in Southern hands. Jefferson Davis offered to pay two or three times the market price for medicine in commodities such as cotton, tobacco, or even gold for the exclusive use of Northern prisoners, to be dispensed by Northern surgeons. This offer was ignored by Lincoln. Finally, the Confederates offered to release 13,000 of the most desperate cases without an equivalent exchange by the Lincoln government. The Lincoln administration waited from August to October to collect the prisoners. After they were released, atrocity photographs of the men were circulated in the North to show how the typical prisoner in Southern hands was supposedly treated. — Sam Dickson, "Shattering the Icon of Abraham Lincoln"

Sherman used Southern prisoners of war to clear mine fields by marching them back and forth across land outside Savannah where mines were suspected. Southern prisoners were also herded in front of Northern emplacements under Confederate artillery fire so as to force Southerners to fire on their own men. Thus in the siege of Charleston, 50 Confederate officers were placed in a holding pen in front of Fort Wagner on Morris Island, so as to expose them to the fire of Confederate batteries shelling the Northern positions. — Sam Dickson, "Shattering the Icon of Abraham Lincoln"

At Palmyra, in Missouri, General McNeil murdered, in cold blood, ten soldiers of the Confederacy.

. . . President Davis ordered by telegraph the execution in retaliation, of ten Yankee prisoners. . . .

. . . the telegraphic order was never executed; . . . and the Palmyra massacre was not only unavenged, but justice itself was cheated by a false and most unworthy show of compliance with its demands. — Edward A. Pollard; *The Third Year of the War* (1864); p. 199

Among things cited by Burke Davis in *The Long Surrender* was the fact that after the Battle

of Sharpsburg in Maryland, the Northerners announced that they would not permit anyone to accord Christian burials to the Southern soldiers of war—they ordered the bodies to be left out to rot and to decompose. Only after the rot had gotten to the point where the public's health was being endangered were the rotted remains scooped together and buried in unmarked common ground. — Sam Dickson, "Shattering the Icon of Abraham Lincoln"

Likewise, after the war . . . the North posted soldiers at military cemeteries to prevent Southern women from putting flowers on the graves of their deceased husbands, fathers, sons, and brothers. — Sam Dickson, "Shattering the Icon of Abraham Lincoln"

They [the abolitionists] hate the Constitution—they hate the Union—they hate every thing but the negro and themselves. — *The Old Guard*, October 1863, p. 286

The conscription bill which has passed the Senate, and, before the publication of this March number of *The Old Guard*, may pass the lower house of Congress, at once sweeps out of existence the State militia, and clothes the President with unlimited and unchecked military powers. It makes him, at one bound, as absolute a monarch as the Autocrat of all the Russias. It sweeps down the constitutions and laws of the States, and virtually obliterates State boundaries by mapping out the whole country into military districts, corresponding with the Congressional districts, over which the President sets his Provost-marshals, whose powers are absolute and to be exercised in defiance of the State Executives, and of all State laws. — *The Old Guard*, March 1863, p. 67

Mr. [Jeremiah] Mason is regarded, after Daniel Webster, as the ablest lawyer and statesman which New England has produced. In his great speech showing the unconstitutionality of *conscription*, he uttered the following defiant language:

"In my opinion, this system of military conscription, thus recommended by the Secretary of War, is not only inconsistent with the spirit and provisions of the Constitution, but also with all the principles of civil liberty.

"Such a measure cannot, it ought not to, be submitted to. *If it could in no other way be averted, I not only believe, but I hope, it would be resisted. The most odious and cruel slavery would be the inevitable consequence of submission.*" — *The Old Guard*, May 1864, p. 112

[You] can hardly walk a rod about this city or the surrounding country without being approached by some sad-looking individual, who will ask you, in a mysterious manner, if you can tell him what it will cost to get to Canada. You tell him. He then wants to know the best way to go there. And finally, it is ten to one he will wind up by asking you if a man can get into Canada now without a passport. Then the truth flashes over you that you have before you a poor wretch who has been, or expects to be, drafted. You will then survey your questioner a little, and will at once perceive that you are in the presence of a most miserable man. He is about to bid good bye to the land of his birth to seek liberty in a foreign land. — *The Old Guard*, September 1864, p. 216

Of forty-one men drafted in Clinton County, Michigan, thirty-two have escaped to Canada, which . . . is at least "the home of the free." — *The Old Guard*, May 1863, p. 117

Governor Brough, of Ohio, in his late message states that more than *twenty thousand men* have fled from Ohio to save themselves from the draft. He says in many places "there are

not men enough left to fill the quotas.” The same we know to be true of some townships in New Jersey. It is an awful sight to see men fleeing from their homes to avoid being seized by “the government,” and dragged away to be murdered for the benefit of negroes. A sight which ought to make the cheek of every American burn with shame! The man who can glory in such a state of things deserves a halter or a straight jacket. — *The Old Guard*, April 1865, p. 190

In a war of the Federal Government upon its sovereign makers and masters, the States, the pure Democracy was *peace*. The very moment it took a hand in such a war, it ceased to be *Democracy*. It went over to *Plutocracy*. — *The Old Guard*, February 1868, p. 87

Most Americans have no idea that Lincoln and [Karl] Marx corresponded. . . . When Lincoln was re-elected in 1864, Marx sent a congratulatory letter to Lincoln . . . and it basically says “We are fighting on the same side for the same thing.” — Dr. Michael Hill (archive.org/details/Duke.20180306)

Lincoln, who is reported to have said that he was bought and sold several times at the Republican convention that nominated him, came to Washington knowing that his function was to destroy the American Constitution, for which he had little respect, and to end the American Republic by attacking the South. — Revilo P. Oliver; “Killing Kennedy”

The Fourth of March (inauguration day), was the bleakest, the wettest, and altogether the most disagreeable day of the whole year. As if nature shuddered at the calamity of a second inauguration of Abraham Lincoln, the heavens above wept, and the earth beneath groaned under depths of filth. For a short time towards noon, the clouds lifted a little, but, at the precise hour of the inauguration, they settled down again with a density and blackness truly terrible. It would seem that God’s own hand had drawn a wet pall over the face of the land, at the moment when the perjured usurper was to go through the daring mockery of again taking an oath to support a constitution he is striving to destroy. — *The Old Guard*, April 1865, p. 189

In these disgraceful tricks, Lincoln has imitated those great masters of the art of destroying liberty. Even before he reaches the Capital, he pretends to discover a plot to destroy him on his way by rail at night from Harrisburgh. That was when he made his grand entrance into Washington like a thief, disguised in a Scotch cap and cloak. . . . But the trick was so bunglingly played that everybody saw through the disguises, and laughed at the too palpable fraud; for he sent his wife and children on the doomed train that was to be thrown off the track for the purpose of dashing him to pieces. — *The Old Guard*, March 1864, p. 63

The depravity of manners, the scandalous indecency and obscenity of Lincoln’s own daily conversation, seems to have fallen like a fatal epidemic upon the people. He has Sodomized the nation. . . . By the investigations of one of the Congressional Committees, it accidentally came to light that each Republican member of Congress was allowed to bring a woman to Washington and place her in an official position in the Treasury Department. The scandal that followed this “little arrangement,” at any other time, would have shocked the whole community; but now it passed off as the careless gossip of an hour, and found apologists even among the clergy. — *The Old Guard*, September 1864, p. 199

It is amazing that the Lincoln cultists have been able to shield Lincoln from the Northern atrocities committed during the war under his tenure as Commander-in-Chief of its armies. The standard line on this point, usually implied rather than stated, is that Lincoln sat in the White House exuding love for Southerners, in blissful ignorance of what Sherman, Ewing, Pope, Butler, and others were doing. This, of course, is unworthy of belief and is an impossibility, given the widespread jubilant publicity in the North over the depredations of the Northern armies against the Southern people. — Sam Dickson, “Shattering the Icon of Abraham Lincoln”

When Mr. Lincoln . . . was told of the starvation and horrible suffering of women and children in some parts where the Abolition commanders have burned the wheat fields, and destroyed every pound of provision they could not carry off, he coolly replied, “yes, it is always the way in war.” — *The Old Guard*, August 1864, p. 169

By supporting the war, the Democratic party supported all its parts, and all its illegal objects. It suffered itself to be used as the ally of the most stupendous despotism, of the most abominable frauds, of the most disgusting immoralities, that ever stained the pages of civilized history. It is true that the party made ugly faces at Mr. Lincoln for all those outrages; but what cared he for all your ugly faces, so long as you gave him your blood and treasure to carry on his work? A Democratic member of Congress said to Mr. Lincoln, “I shall vote you all the men and money you want, and then I mean to hold you responsible for the use you make of them.” “Well,” replied the mountebank wit, “you give me all the men and all the money I want, and I will whip the rebels and you, too.” — *The Old Guard*, Feb. 1868, p. 82

Mr. Lincoln has no right to crush out a so-called rebellion in the South in such a manner or by such agencies as to crush out freedom in the North. The Constitution and the laws are the only powers he can employ without subjecting himself to the just penalty of a felon’s death. If he uses the military to crush the civil powers—if by force of arms, he suspends the Constitution and the laws, he is guilty of the crime of high treason. For this crime Mr. Lincoln, and his confederates in guilt, will surely one day be tried. If found guilty, **they will be condemned to hang by the neck until they are dead.** And may God have mercy on their souls. — *The Old Guard*, July 1863, p. 151

Mr. Lincoln may call upon the mountains to fall upon him, but he must not rely upon *ex post facto* laws, or any other laws, passed in violation of the statute and common law of the land, to shield him from deserved punishment. There is not a county, from Washington to Sangamon county, in Illinois, in which he is not liable to arrest, both in a *civil* and *criminal* suit. It is not in the power of Congress to save him. **Nothing but death can save him**—and that will, we fear, send him to a more inexorable bar than that of the offended justice of his country. — *The Old Guard*, October 1863, p. 271

[T]he Secretary of War . . . seems to have been the principal manager of the assassination by which Lincoln was removed after he had served the purposes of his masters and could be killed to excite rancors that would cover their further crimes. — Revilo P. Oliver; “The Beginning of the End”

The Secretary of the Lincoln Monument Association of Illinois sent a circular to every Justice of the Peace in that State, begging funds. To one of these the following answer was returned:

“To the Lincoln Monument Association:

“GENTLEMEN: When I get in the notion of contributing anything for the support of your project to commemorate the life of the blackest villain and traitor that ever held an office of trust tendered by the American people, you will very likely hear from me. Yours in hope,

“J. M. Springer.”

— *The Old Guard*, May 1868, p. 399

And if the Government of the “United States,” created in 1788, was a delegated Government, with no powers whatever save those delegated to it by the States, then it is equally obvious that we are living under a monstrous usurpation, and all, or nearly all, that Mr. Lincoln has done since he entered Washington was, and is, in direct hostility to the true Government of the United States. — *The Old Guard*, February 1864, p. 36

We have received a letter from a Democratic ex-Governor of one of the largest of the northern States. . . . The author of this letter is a gentleman who stands among the most exalted of his countrymen as a man of honor, ability, and wealth, and who has ever been regarded as one of the most devoted friends of the Democracy. He says:

“ . . . Four years ago we were warning our section that if the spirit of Abolitionism and sectionalism succeeded, the South would have no alternative left them but a cowardly surrender of their Constitutional rights, and equality in the Union, or withdrawal from it; and now we are hounding on this fiendish war of extermination against them, for doing precisely what we said only four years ago they had a right to do, would do, and ought to do. . . . Having lost all faith in the Democratic party, I have lost all hope for the country and its institutions, whether united or divided, and I am intending to abandon it . . . , to spend the remainder of my days in a foreign land.” — *The Old Guard*, July 1864, p. 163

In Jackson county, Mo., the abolitionists recently shot seven unarmed men who were suspected of being secessionists, and burnt twenty-seven houses of poor people, upon whom the same suspicion rested. — *The Old Guard*, May 1863, p. 117

The Anglo-Saxon population of the whole western tier of counties in Missouri were deported from their homes by General Ewing’s General Order Number 11, which depopulated the region by forcibly evacuating the women and children on the shortest of notice, along with burning their houses and stealing their property. — Sam Dickson, “Shattering the Icon of Abraham Lincoln”

The despatches found on the body of Col. Dahlgren, who was killed near Richmond, will be quoted in disgrace of the name of the United States as long as our name shall last. They prove that the object of the last “raid on Richmond” was to set fire to the city, full of women and children, without notice, and to murder its inhabitants. . . . This is not *warfare*; it is *assassination*. By the laws of war all who were taken in the act of attempting to execute such a plot were liable to be treated, not as prisoners of war, but as spies and assassins. Their lives were forfeited, if the Confederates had chosen to adhere strictly to the laws of war. — *The Old Guard*, April 1864, p. 95

A leading organ of public opinion—of Northern, or New England public opinion—says: “We have the power to subjugate, or to annihilate, the South, and one or the other we are going to do.” This programme is plainly announced. No robber ever stated his point more boldly; and we suppose we must take it as a correct declaration of New England morality. The principle, though shocking, has the merit of simplicity. Let us test it in another relation. A man may say, “I have the power to whip my father and to beat my mother, and I am going to do it.” This may suit New England politics, and New England *Christianity*, but can it pass for an enlightened public morality? The question is not what we have the power to do, but what we have the *right to do*. — *The Old Guard*, Feb. 1865, p. 49

[The Northerners] have actually debated in their State Legislatures the policy of paying negroes premiums for the murder of white families in the South. — Edward A. Pollard; *The Second Year of the War* (1864); p. 306

The city of Atlanta, after its surrender, was burned to the ground, and only a handful of churches and a few outlying residences escaped the holocaust. . . . Captain Daniel Oakey of the Second Massachusetts Volunteers recounted the burning of Atlanta as follows: “Sixty thousand of us witnessed the destruction of Atlanta, while our post band and that of the 33rd Massachusetts played martial airs and operatic selections.” — Sam Dickson, “Shattering the Icon of Abraham Lincoln”

The following description of civilized warfare, under Gen. Banks, is taken from a late letter from the army correspondent of the *Missouri Republican*:

“ . . . some of our soldiers, both white and black, as if by general understanding, set fire to the city (Alexandria) in nearly every part, almost simultaneously. The flames spread rapidly, increased by a heavy wind. Most of the houses were of wooden construction, and were soon devoured by the flames. Alexandria was a town of between four and five thousand inhabitants. All that part of the city north of the railroad was swept from the face of the earth in a few hours, not a building being left. About nine-tenths of the town was consumed. . . .”

The scenes which transpired at this act of barbarity are well called “appalling.” Feeble old men, sick women, and almost naked children, were seen rushing frantically out of the burning dwellings, nearly suffocated with smoke and flame, and filling the air with cries and moans of despair, which were enough to break any heart except that of the demoralized and vandalized soldiers under Banks. A French journalist, a few months since said: “We judge from the manner in which the Federals make war that they are totally demoralized as a people.” If it does not turn out that we are demonized, we shall, for one, thank God. And we have no higher ambition than to place our name on record as abhorring and denouncing the war, not only in its aims, but in the manner of its conduction. We would as soon go down to posterity as one of a banditti as a supporter of such a war. We have taught our soul to despise every man who approves of it. — *The Old Guard*, August 1864, pp. 173–174

Considering what the country and homes of the Confederacy had suffered from the ferocity of the enemy, it might have been supposed that Lee’s army would have improved their grand opportunity in Pennsylvania, not indeed by an imitation of the enemy’s outrages in the South, but by that eminently justifiable retaliation which, while it scorns to mete out in kind the enemy’s crime, in arson, pillage, and innocent blood, insists upon doing him some commensurate injury by severe acts of war, done with deliberation and under the authority

of superiors. Such expectations were disappointed. . . . Lee gave a protection to the citizens of Pennsylvania which had never been accorded to our own people. . . .

General Lee attempted conciliation of a people who were little capable of it. . . .

— Edward A. Pollard; *The Third Year of the War* (1864); p. 22

“I went to a Lieut.-Colonel . . . and asked him what he expected me to do; they had left me no provisions at all, and I had a large family, and my husband was away from home. His reply was short and pointed—‘Starve, and be damned, madam.’ . . . They hunted for whisky and money—their search proving fruitless, they loaded themselves with our clothing, bedding, &c.; broke my dishes; stole my knives and forks; broke open my trunks and chests, and took everything they could lay their hands on. . . . Then they came with their torches to burn our house, the last remaining building they had left. That was too much; all my pride . . . forsook me at the awful thought of my home in ruins. . . . I looked over the crowd, as they huddled together to give orders about the burning, for one face that showed a trace of feeling, or an eye that beamed with a spark of humanity, but finding none, I approached the nearest group, and, pointing to the children, I said, ‘you will not burn the house, will you? You drove these little children from one home and took possession of it, and this is the only remaining sheltering place they have.’ ‘You may thank your God, madam,’ said one of the ruffians, ‘that we have left you and your d—d brats with heads to be sheltered.’” — Mrs. Ricks (*The Old Guard*, August 1864, p. 171)

Lincoln’s ghastly war against the South . . . startled Europe by its bloody barbarity, so outrageous that Lord Palmerston for some time refused to believe the news from the United States, saying that such savagery was impossible for civilized men. — Revilo P. Oliver; “The Beginning of the End”

“[W]hen any female shall by word, gesture, or movement insult or show contempt for any officer or soldier of the United States she shall be regarded and held liable to be treated as a woman of the town plying her avocation.”

This in essence was a “right to rape” order which he [General Butler] issued to his troops. . . . Palmerston, the British Prime Minister, wrote to Charles Francis Adams, the U.S. Minister in London the following concerning Butler’s order:

“I will venture to say that no example can be found in the history of civilized nations till the publication of this order of a general guilty in cold blood of so infamous an act as deliberately to hand over the female inhabitants of a conquered city to the unbridled license of an unrestrained soldiery.” — Sam Dickson, “Shattering the Icon of Abraham Lincoln”

Before the eyes of Europe the mask of civilization had been taken from the Yankee war; it degenerated into unbridled butchery and robbery. But the nations of Europe, which boasted themselves as humane and civilized, had yet no interference to offer in a war which shocked the senses. . . . It is to be observed, that during the entire continuance of the war up to this time, the British government had acted with reference to it in a spirit of selfish and inhuman calculation; and there is, indeed, but little doubt that an early recognition of the Confederacy by France was thwarted by the interference of that cold and sinister government, that ever pursues its ends by indirection, and perfects its hypocrisy under the specious cloak of extreme conscientiousness. — Edward A. Pollard; *The Second Year of the War* (1864); p. 88

Japan was not really “opened” to foreign commerce until after a British fleet had bombarded the city of Kagoshima and reduced it to rubble, and another British fleet, with a few American . . . vessels added to make it seem international, levelled Shimonoseki in 1864. . . — Revilo P. Oliver; “The Yellow Peril”

On July 8, the entire town, including the homes of the workers, was burned to the ground. Having destroyed the entire town, only the population remained, most of them women and children with a few men. The women and children were separated from the men and herded into wagons. The wagon train then set off for Marietta, Georgia, some 16 miles away. During the journey the women were forced to endure the sexual advances of the Union soldiers. In Marietta the group was joined by a similar group of deported women from Roswell, Georgia. On July 20, the entire group of women and children were shipped by train from Georgia to Louisville, Kentucky. Not one woman or child is known to have returned to New Manchester. — Sam Dickson, “Shattering the Icon of Abraham Lincoln”

The Yankee—who has followed up an extravagance of bluster by the vilest exhibitions of cowardice—who has falsified his prate of humanity by the deeds of a savage—who, in the South, has been in this war a robber, an assassin, a thief in the night, and at home a slave fawning on the hand that manacles him—has secured for himself the everlasting contempt of the world. — Edward A. Pollard; *The Second Year of the War* (1864); p. 303

“In pursuance of said order, the Second Massachusetts negro infantry, 700 strong, Col. Draper, a white man, commanding, with one hundred white cavalry, . . . started for the Northern Neck. . . . Four hundred negroes (with white commissioned officers) and fifty white cavalry, proceeded to devastate Westmoreland County, destroying everything in their line of march.

“ . . . *And, more horrible, . . . twenty-five or thirty ladies were violated by this party of negroes. I could give names, but deem it not best. Neither age nor color was spared by these demons, who were encouraged by their white officers.*

“The rest of the regiment, 300 strong, with 50 white cavalry, under the immediate command of Col. Draper, marched to Richmond County. *On the route six negroes violated the person of Mrs. G. eleven times, she being the wife of a soldier of the Ninth Virginia cavalry, being also sick at the time, with an infant six months old at her breast.* This is only one instance out of twenty others of a like outrage.

“In their march, no age nor condition was exempt from their desolating hand. Plunder and lust stimulated and marked all their movements. No appeal nor supplication could turn them from their beastly purposes and brutal excesses.

“ . . . Where they went they were led by their officers and told, ‘You can go loose and do as you please.’ . . . ”

This . . . has been widely circulated in the North; but, in the Lincoln press, as a simple item of war news, without calling forth an exclamation of horror, or even so much as a rebuke from “the supporters of the Administration.” — *The Old Guard*, September 1864, p. 200

This malevolent and venomous spirit . . . pervaded . . . Northern society. It was not only the utterance of such mobs as, in New York city, adopted as their war-cry against the South, “kill all the inhabitants,” it found expression in the political measures, military orders, and laws of the government; it invaded polite society, and was taught not only as an element of

patriotism, but as a virtue of religion. The characteristic religion of New England, composed of about equal quantities of blasphemy and balderdash, went hand in hand with the war. Some of these pious demonstrations . . . bring to remembrance the fanaticism and rhapsodies of the old Puritans. — Edward A. Pollard; *The Second Year of the War* (1864); p. 88

Since these are the latest recognized rules of civilized warfare, can we wonder that all Europe agree in expressions of surprise and horror at the barbarities we have perpetrated upon the people of the South, from the very commencement of this war? Our army correspondents, who have written for the New York *Times*, *Tribune*, and *Herald*, have spread a knowledge of our brutality and barbarism broadcast over the whole world. A correspondent in Grant's army, for the New York *Tribune*, in a letter published June 20th, gives the following between Gen. Butler's Chief of Staff and a negro sergeant:

"Well," said Gen. Butler's Chief of Staff to a tall sergeant, "you had a pretty tough fight there on the left." "Yes, sir; and we lost a good many good officers and men." "How many prisoners did you take, sergeant?" "Not any alive, sir," was the significant response. Gen. Smith says, "They don't give my Provost Marshal the least trouble, and I don't believe they contribute toward filling any of the hospitals with Rebel wounded."

The amount of all this is that Butler's Chief of Staff and the New York *Tribune* chuckle over the account the ebony devil gives of murdering wounded soldiers. It is a source of delight to them that these negroes take no prisoners, but assassinate their victims in cold blood. In any other country such acts would be punished with death; here, in this land demonized with the implacable, the hellish spirit of Abolitionism, they are sources of delight to all who keep company with the Republican party. — *The Old Guard*, August 1864, pp. 172–173

The following resolution, read by a leading clergyman of the Methodist Church, at the late annual session of that body, is a fair specimen of the intelligence of the now dominant political party of our country:

"*Resolved*, That all government is based upon the religious ideas of those who carry it on, and that the Northern Methodists have acquired by conquest the right to *control the religion of the South*. That it is just as wrong to allow the Southern Methodists to meet and worship in their way as it would be to allow Lee and Johnston to call together and drill their armies again. They will soon be prohibited from so doing. The religion of the North is bound to rule this continent, and it proposes to make a proper application of our Bible to all the Southern States and people. A subjugated people have no more right to apply their own peculiar moral ideas, than to use their physical implements of war." — *The Old Guard*, August 1868, p. 561

The London *Telegraph*, writing of this country, says: "The government has been changed from its very foundations. America is divided into a dominant nation and subject provinces." No intelligent foreigner, and no intelligent man at home, can possibly view this country in any other light at the present time. If any man believes that the war has not overthrown the government that was established by our fathers, he is, to use a soft word, simply a fool. — *The Old Guard*, Jan. 1867, p. 78

This new government, complete in all its parts, went smoothly and successfully into operation. The people were happy, justice was regularly administered, enterprise was stimulated, trade would have flourished, and prosperity overspread the land, but the people were early

called away from these peaceful and profitable pursuits to employ their resources and energies in resisting a hostile invasion.

Stupendous efforts were promptly made to provide the means of self-defence; wonderful ingenuity supplied the want of facilities; material of war was obtained as if by magic; leaders were chosen, armies organized, and a contest inaugurated, which for the masterly genius and lofty heroism it elicited, has scarcely a parallel in the history of mankind.

The war opened auspiciously for the South, and so continued through a brilliant but measured period. But at last, with failing resources, disasters followed; yet the people persevered, still relying on the scanty means that were at hand. Neither hunger, nakedness, nor death itself, could turn them from their high but desperate purpose, and if the world at first admired their dashing valor, it was now called upon to wonder at their marvellous fortitude and firmness.

Surely, if success was ever earned without being actually won, we have an instance of it here. No people ever struggled more earnestly or nobly for a cherished object, and their enormous sacrifices prove the depth of their sincerity. But the North triumphed because she was stronger; the South fell because she was exhausted, and to assert the contrary, would be but base hypocrisy or falsehood. . . .

[W]e do know *one* individual, weakened by toil and hunger, whatever his courage or the justice of his cause may be, has little prospect of succeeding against *twenty* strong men resolved on his destruction. Verily, the South may claim the sympathies of all mankind.

— *The Old Guard*, Dec. 1867, p. 947

From this moment began the struggle between the adversaries which was to continue, day and night, without intermission, for the next four days. The phenomenon was here presented of an army, reduced to less than twenty thousand men, holding at arm's-length an enemy numbering about one hundred and fifty thousand, and very nearly defeating every effort of the larger force to arrest their march. . . .

Corn there was none, or if a little was discovered, the starving troops clutched it—struggled for the ears; crushed the grains between their teeth like horses, and swallowed it half masticated. . . .

[Grant to Lee, April 7, 1865: I ask] of you the surrender of that portion of the Confederate Southern Army known as the Army of Northern Virginia.

[Lee to Grant, April 8, 1865:] To be frank, I do not think the emergency has arisen to call for the surrender.

— John Esten Cooke (*A Life of General Robert E. Lee* and *The Battles of Virginia*)

I saw in State Rights the only availing check upon the absolutism of the sovereign will, and secession filled me with hope, not as the destruction but as the redemption of Democracy. . . . Therefore I deemed that you were fighting the battles of our liberty, our progress, and our civilization; and I mourn for the stake which was lost at Richmond more deeply than I rejoice over that which was saved at Waterloo. — Lord Acton to Robert E. Lee, November 4, 1866

Old Thad. Stevens, who has more logic than the majority of his party, boldly admits that they are under the absolute necessity of “*repudiating the Constitution.*” — *The Old Guard*, Dec. 1867, p. 883

[T]he original aim of the 14th Amendment was to ensure the political and economic hegemony of the Northern states over the South. This was why Lincoln and Northern business interests waged total war against the South for four years: to transform the United States from a constitutional republic into a continental empire. . . .

Section Four protected Northern politicians, military leaders, and businessmen who perpetrated financial fraud in the course of the war from future prosecution and ensured that the North would never have to pay reparations for the theft and destruction it committed against the South. . . .

[T]he Radical Republicans who controlled Congress unilaterally changed the composition of Congress in order to procure the needed majorities. In violation of the Constitution's Article I, Sections 2, 3, and 5, and in particular Article V ("that no State, without its Consent, shall be deprived of its equal Suffrage in the Senate"), they unlawfully excluded the 61 representatives and 22 senators from the Southern states. Moreover, they counted the votes of West Virginia and Nevada—both unconstitutional entities created by Lincoln as part of his war measures.

Even after taking these steps, however, the proposed amendment still faced defeat in the Senate by one vote if the vote of Sen. John P. Stockton of New Jersey, an outspoken critic of the 14th Amendment, was counted. So the Radical Republicans unlawfully expelled him from the Senate as well.

The votes in both the House and Senate approving the proposed 14th Amendment were, therefore, fraudulent. . . .

By March 1, 1867, 12 States had rejected the 14th Amendment. This left only 25 states, three fewer than the U.S. Constitution required for adoption. Later, Maryland and California both voted to reject the amendment, while three states that had ratified it—New Jersey, Ohio, and Oregon—rescinded their respective ratifications, citing voter fraud. While Congress rejected these rescissions, the damage had been done. The 14th Amendment had been constitutionally defeated. . . .

With the Reconstruction Acts, Congress declared "no legal state governments" existed in ten Southern states, even though Congress had officially recognized these state governments as legitimate since 1865. The adoption of the 13th Amendment abolishing slavery depended upon ratification by seven of these states—Alabama, Arkansas, Georgia, Louisiana, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Virginia—for the required three-fourths majority. Branding them "rebel" states, Congress proceeded to abolish their governments. The South was divided into five military districts and, in blatant violation of both Article I, Section 9, of the U.S. Constitution and the U.S. Supreme Court's decision in *Ex parte Milligan* three months earlier, was placed under martial law. . . .

Through violence, intimidation, coercion, and fraud, through martial law, through congressional threats to confiscate and redistribute all the property of Southern whites, through removal of Southern governors and judges, and through congressional repeal of state laws requiring a majority of registered voters for the adoption of a new state constitution, Congress successfully created "provisional governments." By 1868, these provisional governments had duly ratified the 14th Amendment (Congress having made ratification a requirement for readmission into the Union). However, under Article V of the U.S. Constitution, only states in the Union can ratify an amendment. Since Congress declared that these provisional

governments were not states in the Union and, thus, had denied them representation in Congress, the provisional governments could not ratify this amendment. Therefore, the 14th Amendment remains unratified. . . .

The government of the United States, as established by the U.S. Constitution in 1789, was effectively abolished by the 14th Amendment. In its place was substituted a regime that resembles the absolutist centralized state envisioned by Thomas Hobbes in *Leviathan*. . . .

Thanks to folly, hubris, and the 14th Amendment, the government of the United States is faithfully following in the footsteps of ancient Rome—from republic to empire to oblivion.

— Joseph E. Fallon; “Law, Power, Legitimacy, and the 14th Amendment”

And a proposition to acquiesce in such a usurpation, in such a “repudiation of the Constitution,” in such a destruction of our system of government, is one that ought to come only from a fool, a coward, or a villain. To proclaim that “State sovereignty is dead,” is to declare that the right of self-government, of liberty, is dead. — *The Old Guard*, Dec. 1867, p. 885

The Union of Sovereign States, each state deriving its powers from its own people, and the federal government having only those powers granted it by the states, ended when Lincoln was allowed to eviscerate the Constitution. Lincoln did not save the Union, the Union that the delegates founded in 1788. A new Union was created in the 1860s with power over the states, power usurped by deception and maintained by force. — Francis W. Springer; *War for What?*

Kings, or any other kind of leaders, who attempt to govern a people against their own consent, so far from being the servants of God, are precisely servants of the devil, who deserve hanging, or killing by any means which the oppressed people may be able to employ. When we say this, we wish especially to be understood as making no exception in favor of the military governors which a satanic Congress has set up over the southern people. Every man has lived too long when he consents to be even the tool of despotism. He is the devil’s own servant, and it is a crime not to send him straight to his master. — *The Old Guard*, June 1867, p. 480

In one word, the work of this war must be cancelled, must be wiped out, must be repented of and repudiated, or the Union and the Government of our fathers must be acknowledged as gone forever. — *The Old Guard*, February 1868, p. 87

[T]he consolidation of the states into one vast republic, sure to be aggressive abroad and despotic at home, will be the certain precursor of that ruin which has overwhelmed all those that have preceded it. — Robert E. Lee

I would hesitate to describe America as a nation at all in 1997, because it is something very different: a polyethnic federation administered by a single ruling class. . . . [T]he accumulated rot in America has now reached a point where the pillars of society itself are failing. — Ambrose Evans-Pritchard

The report card by the American Society of Civil Engineers showed the national infrastructure a single grade above failure, a step from declining to the point where everyday things simply stop working the way people expect them to. —

washingtonpost.com/local/trafficandcommuting/us-infrastructure-gets-d-in-annual-report/2013/03/19/c48cb010-900b-11e2-9cfd-36d6c9b5d7ad_story.html