

# Lincoln's Band of Tyrants

By Walter Donald Kennedy

The opening words of one of the most popular songs of the Confederate South, *The Bonnie Blue Flag*, declare, "We are a Band of Brothers." Legend has it Harry McCarthy, an Irish-born entertainer, wrote this song while visiting Jackson, Mississippi, during that state's secession convention. Indeed, the War for Southern Independence produced many "Bands of Brothers." In the South these "Bands" fought for their rights as Americans; that is, the right to govern themselves as they saw fit — in the Declaration of Independence this concept is called "government by the consent of the governed." The Northern version of this "Band of Brothers" was

also contending for what most Northerners considered a noble purpose; that is, maintaining the Union and defending the national honor of the United States. While not agreeing with the North's version, recognizing the courage and dedication of the men in blue is possible without sacrificing the principles of our Confederate forefathers. Nevertheless, there was another "Band of Brothers" whose purpose and intentions were more sinister and in no wise noble or praiseworthy. As shall be demonstrated, this other Band of Northern Brothers had a much more ominous motive in waging war upon the South.

Chief among these agents of

tyranny was non other than Abraham Lincoln. Unfortunately, after 150 years of the victor's propaganda, most Americans view Lincoln as the consummate defender of the United States. While listening to any right-wing talking head on radio or TV, it will become painfully clear they view Lincoln as America's martyred saint. "Saint" Lincoln is said to have done two wonderful things for America: (1) Freed the slaves and (2) Saved the Union. These same talking heads will excoriate their liberal opponents for advocating big government, high taxes, and ignoring the limits of the Consti-

Walter Donald (Donnie) Kennedy was born and reared in Mississippi. He received his bachelor's degree from the University of Louisiana, Monroe, LA and graduated Charlotte Memorial Medical Center School of Anesthesia, Charlotte, NC.

Donnie and his twin brother, Ron, are best known for their bestselling book *The South Was Right!* which has sold more than 125,000 copies as of 2012. Following the success of *The South Was Right!*, the Kennedy Twins have written six other books and edited, annotated, and republished an 1825 textbook on the United States Constitution by William Rawle.

Both have served as commander of the Louisiana Division, Sons of Confederate Veterans. They have received special recognition awards from the Commander-in-Chief of the Sons of Confederate Veterans, state and local United Daughters of the Confederacy chapters and many other Southern Heritage organizations.

For more information on the Communist and radical Socialist influence on Lincoln, the Republican Party, and the war upon the South, see, *Lincoln's Marxists*.



tution. Yet if one will look at American history with an open mind, it is obvious not only did Lincoln make an all-powerful big government possible, he made it inevitable. Second only to conservative talking heads in their devotion to Lincoln as a defender of the United States and the Constitution are the Tea Party patriots.

Upon hearing the Tea Party patriots extolling and praising the virtues of Lincoln, one is reminded of the play *Antigone*, in which a messenger has to give the King a horrific message. After hearing the dreadful news the King orders the messenger to be executed. Upon learning his fate, the messenger remarks, "How dreadful it is when the right judge, judges wrong." Likewise, when one observes Tea Party patriots who are dedicated to strict construction of the Constitution and limited government praising Lincoln, one concedes that yes, indeed, "It is a grievous thing when the right judge, judges wrong."


Who were these "Band of Brothers" who assisted Lincoln in overturning this Compound Republic<sup>1</sup> as given to us by our founding fathers of these United States? Lincoln did not stand alone in the effort to transform this nation into a single, indivisible and all-powerful Federal government. The agents of Federal supremacy; i.e., an all-powerful, supreme, indivisible, big government-centered in Washington, DC, had been active from the beginning of this nation. Until Lincoln's revolution these big-government types were kept in check by the advocates of *REAL* State's Rights. With the advent of the Republican Party most American advocates of

an *energetic* Federal government, a Federal government capable of doing things not granted to it by the Constitution, rallied to the Republican cause. Not only did America's home-grown, big-government types find a home in the Republican Party, but a whole legion of European radical Socialists, Communists and Marxists flocked to the cause of Lincoln and the newly formed Republican Party. These European radical socialists and communists were collectively known as Forty-Eighters. This label was given them because many of them had been expelled from various European nations after their Socialist revolution had been defeated in or around the year 1848.<sup>2</sup>

Karl Marx and Frederick Engels are two of the 19th-century's most notorious Communists who were joined by Adolph Hitler, the 20th-century's most notorious fascist, in their praise of Lincoln's attack upon State's Rights and the South. The fact America's most iconic president, who is praised and virtually worshiped by both liberals and conservatives, was viewed as an ally by both the Communist and the Fascist establishment should raise the proverbial "Red Flag" in the thoughts of any open-minded American. The flag being raised, now let us examine Lincoln as architect of modern big government (hereafter referred to as *Federal supremacy*) and Lincoln's odious Band of Brothers.

### **Lincoln: Architect of Modern Federal Supremacy**

"The Union is older than the States and, in fact, created them as States. The Union, and not them-



*Karl Marx: Marx served as the unofficial propaganda agent for the Lincoln government during the War for Southern Independence. Not only did he write articles promoting the myth that the South was fighting to "defend and extend" slavery but he also led rallies promoting the Northern effort and wrote a memorial celebrating Lincoln's second election victory.*

selves separately, procured their independence and their liberty. [T]he Union threw off their old dependency for them and made them States, such as they are."<sup>3</sup> [Emphasis added] The notion the Union created the States makes as much sense as saying the members of the Sons of Confederate Veterans begot their Confederate ancestors! Yet, the concept of the Union as some type of supernatural force which predates the founding of the thirteen original states and acted as the new states' midwife as they were *born* into the Federal Union is the very foundation upon which the war against the South was based. According to Lincoln, before South Carolina or Massachusetts could

act in its own benefit, the Union, like a mystical force, took them by their juvenile hand and assisted them into the safety of the arms of a benevolent supreme and indivisible Federal Union. It is on this point Lincoln makes his claim that the states of the American Union were never sovereign. According to Lincoln, the Union had existed before the states and therefore the Union is sovereign not the individual states.

Here is Lincoln's view of state sovereignty: "Having never been States, either in substance, or in name, outside of the Union, whence this magical omnipotence of 'State rights,' asserting a claim of power to lawfully destroy the Union itself? Much is said about the 'sovereignty' of the States; but the word, even, is not in the national Constitution; nor, as is believed, in any of the State constitutions."<sup>4</sup> Notice here that Lincoln is pushing again the idea these "states such as they are," only exist because of the efforts of the Union. Lincoln goes on to make two rather odd statements about sovereignty: (1) "... the word, even, is not in the national Constitution;" and (2)," nor ... in any of the State constitution."<sup>5</sup>

According to Lincoln's logic, if a word or idea does not exist in the "national Constitution," it does not exist in the governmental relationships within these United States. Lincoln is correct when he states the word *sovereignty* does not exist in the Constitution. But does that mean sovereignty cannot belong to "we the people" of the states? The word *marriage* cannot be found in the Constitution, but does that mean marriages do not exist in these United States?

A quick reflection upon what is said in the Constitution will destroy Mr. Lincoln's premise. The Ninth Amendment of the Constitution informs us that, "The enumeration in the constitution of certain rights, shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people." The Ninth Amendment tells us that just because some rights are named in the Constitution that does not mean that other *UN-NAMED* rights or ideas do not reside with the people of the states. Furthermore, the Tenth Amendment proclaims, "The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people." If sovereignty has not been delegated to the United States nor prohibited to the states by the Constitution, where does it reside? The Tenth Amendment of the Constitution makes it clear sovereignty belongs to "we the people" of the sovereign states. In his second attack upon the principle of state sovereignty, Lincoln states that sovereignty does not exist "... in any of the State constitution."

Was Mr. Lincoln correct in asserting the word 'sovereignty' does not exist in any state constitution? Unfortunately for Lincoln (and the nearly one million Americans who died as a result of Lincoln's war), the answer to his statement is "No, he is not correct." Just three years after the adoption of the Federal Constitution, the State of New Hampshire adopted her Constitution. Notice the strong language the people of New Hampshire placed in their Constitution: "The people of this

Commonwealth have the sole and exclusive right of governing themselves as a free, sovereign, and independent State; and do and forever hereafter shall exercise and enjoy every power, jurisdiction, and right which is not, or may not hereafter be, by them expressly delegated to the United States."<sup>6</sup>

When petitioning Congress for admission to the Union, Louisiana's Constitution stated Louisiana would be "a free and independent state."<sup>7</sup> A sovereign state is "free and independent" and a "free and independent" state is sovereign. The state constitutions of both New Hampshire and Louisiana were recognized as valid for people of a republic, and both states were admitted into the Federal Union, proclaiming their independent status. Pointing once again to the Ninth and Tenth Amendments, these two state constitutions clearly demonstrate the people of these United States believed themselves to be members of sovereign states. The people were right; Lincoln was wrong.

As just demonstrated, Lincoln's contention is states cannot be sovereign because the word "sovereignty" is not found in the Constitution. The notion states cannot be sovereign because the word "sovereignty" is not in the Constitution is absurd. Using Lincoln's logic, if states cannot be sovereign because the word "sovereignty" does not appear in the "national Constitution," what does that say about Federal sovereignty? Since this is the Federal Constitution we are discussing and the word "sovereignty" does not exist in this Federal docu-



ment, can we therefore say that the Federal government is not a sovereign government? Mr. Lincoln's logic would leave us with a nation where no sovereignty can be found, state or federal! Such a *nation* has never and will never exist.

The discussion of state sovereignty verses Federal sovereignty is not just an exercise in academic Constitutional theory. The concept of "we the people" of the states being sovereign — as opposed to the Federal government (Union) being sovereign — points to where the ultimate power to govern belongs in these United States. If the ultimate power of government belongs to "we the people" of the states and *NOT* the Federal government, then the Federal government cannot be the final or exclusive judge of how much power it has been delegated. If the states are sovereign, then the states must judge if and when the Federal government is acting incorrectly and rebuke, chastise, or (in the words of the Declaration of Independence) alter or abolish the offending government. Under the system of *REAL* State's Rights, the Federal government is under the control of "we the people" whereas, under the system of Federal sovereignty (Federal supremacy) the people of the states are under the control of an all-powerful, indivisible, Federal government.

Lincoln also stated the Union created the states. Is there evidence to prove the states existed before the Union? Here, according to James Kent of New York, are the basic functions of a sovereign state: (1) Conducts war or pursues peace, (2) Makes laws to regulate society, (3) Taxes and spends tax



*Charles A. Dana: Dana, a friend of Karl Marx, Fredrick Engels and Joseph Weydemeyer, rose to the level of assistant secretary of war in Lincoln's administration. Lincoln spoke of Dana as "the eyes of the Army." No other nineteenth century individual did more to promote communism in America than Dana.*

funds, (4) Raises military forces, (5) Conducts relationships with sovereign nations.<sup>8</sup>

These functions were being performed by each of the Thirteen Original Colonies before and during the War for American Independence. These acts of a sovereign nation began when the colonies expelled all Royal authority from their colony. This act of expelling Royal authority from their colonies transformed colonies into sovereign states. This transformation was performed without the assistance of some mystical union. The very first battles of the War for American Independence were fought by state troops without any assistance from Lincoln's omnipotent, ever-present union. It should be noted that each colony was acting

for its own benefit when expelling Royal authority from their colony. There was never a *master plan* laid out by a mystical union force for the colonies to follow. Acting for their own interests and benefit without assistance from Lincoln's *mother hen* union, former colonies became thirteen sovereign states. These states raised taxes, organized and equipped troops, and conducted foreign affairs with other sovereign nations, including enforcing the rule of international law. James Kent noted particularly that when it came to enforcing international law, the only thing the Colonial Congress could do was "... to have infractions of it punished in the only way that was then lawful, by the exercise of the authority of the legislatures of the several states."<sup>9</sup> Taken together,

the above-mentioned evidence points out Lincoln was most incorrect when he stated that the Union created the states and that the states were never sovereign.

As already noted, the war against the South was predicated upon Lincoln's assumption that the Federal government was sovereign and that the only way to "save the Union" was to use military force to compel the *rebel* states back into the Union. Nevertheless, as Edmond Burke so correctly pointed out to his fellow members of Parliament in 1775, when the application of force is used to maintain a relationship, everything changes. In an address to Parliament entitled "Conciliation with the Colonies" Burke stated the use of force to bring the colonies back into the British Union was wrong because "you impair the object by your very endeavors to preserve it. The thing you fought for is not the thing which you recover, but depreciated, sunk, wasted, and consumed in the contest."<sup>10</sup> Burke goes on to state that to prove the colonies should not be free, "we are obliged to depreciate the value of freedom itself."<sup>11</sup>

In his effort to "save the Union," Lincoln trampled upon the Constitution. Members of opposition parties in the North were tried and jailed by military courts for speaking against Lincoln's war policy. Francis Scott Howard, grandson of the author of the *Star Spangled Banner*, was jailed by Lincoln's military police for speaking against Lincoln's war policy. Francis Scott Howard was thrown into prison at Fort McHenry, the very fort his grandfather watched the British bombard and was

inspired to write what became our National Anthem. The irony was not lost on Key's grandson! Lincoln refused to abide by a Supreme Court order to obey a writ of *habeas corpus*; opened the private mail of citizens in the North; and closed down many Northern newspapers. All this Lincoln did in the name of "saving the Union." According to Lincoln, the government of the United States came first and then Constitutional rights came second.

Most neo-conservatives agree with Lincoln's view of saving the Union at any cost. Yet is this what our founding fathers fought for in 1776? Did they contend with the tyranny of an all-powerful central government in London just so they could live under the domination of an even more tyrannical central government in America? Patrick Henry gives us the truly American answer to these questions when he states, "The first thing I have at heart is American liberty, the second is American union."<sup>12</sup> For Patrick Henry and the vast majority of our founding fathers, liberty always trumps government. Unlike other nations of the world where people existed for the benefit of government or the governmental elite, in America liberty, *NOT* union, was the *sine qua non* (the essential element) of government. Without liberty, there is no real American government, only an empire which has become "depreciated, sunk, wasted, and consumed in the contest." Or, worse yet, these United States has, like Burke warned Great Britain in 1775, become an empire which has been "obliged to depreciate the value of freedom itself."

## Lincoln, Marx, And Engels

Most Americans, schooled by the victors of the War for Southern Independence, would never consider the founders of modern-day communism as allies of Abraham Lincoln. However, there is a long history of radical socialists and Communists, including Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, supporting Lincoln and his war. This history of radical socialists and communists support for Lincoln goes well beyond Lincoln's war effort and to the early days of the Republican Party, Lincoln's nomination by the Republican Party, and Lincoln's election as president. James S. "Jim" Allen, AKA, Sol Auerbach, in his book *Reconstruction: The Battle for Democracy*, offers this view of the so-called Civil War: "Modern Socialism in the United States found its start in the Civil War decade. The forerunners were organizations of German émigrés such as the Communist Club of New York, and the General German Labor Association... . They also laid the foundation in this country of scientific socialism."<sup>13</sup> "Scientific Socialism" is a Marxist euphemism for modern-day Communism. It should be noted Allen was a well-known Communist author who served for many years as editor of a Communist publishing company in New York. Allen was a life-long Communist and member of the Communist Party USA.

Allen describes radical socialists and Communists as being "German émigrés." Allen was not alone in speaking of members of the far left who had come to the United States after the failure

of many European socialist and Communist revolutions during the decade of 1840. Many historians of the American left have also noted that some of the first "Marxist Socialists" in the United States were immigrants from the ill-fated Socialist revolutions of 1848. In his book on the history of American communism, Theodore Draper noted the 1848 radical Socialist immigrants brought with them a "political consciousness then unknown in the United States" and that "they set about duplicating their old-world allegiances in their new homeland."<sup>14</sup> Both in America and in Europe, radical Socialists and Communists were very eager to assist in the war against the South.

The events surrounding the War for Southern Independence were closely watched by both Karl Marx and Frederick Engels. No less than 61 letters between Marx and Engels touching on the subject of the War for Southern Independence were exchanged between these founders of modern-day Communism. Marx wrote two memorials which were read and adopted by Communist organizations in Europe and sent to Lincoln and his successor, Andrew Johnson. In an effort to prevent European nations from granting recognition to the Confederacy, Marx and Engels participated in planning rallies against what they called "the slave power" in the South. During this time many fellow Communists and friends of Marx and Engels were officers in the Union Army. To list the numerous radical Socialists, Marxists, and Communists in Lincoln's army would take volumes. The following three


Yankee generals will serve as a small sample of Lincoln's tyrants who fought to *save* the union and destroy State's Rights. (1) General Joseph Weydemeyer, who was a member of the Communist League of London along with Marx and Engels. Weydemeyer with the assistance of Charles A. Dana was responsible for having the first copies of the *Communist Manifesto* published in America. (2) General Lewis Blenker, having been expelled from Europe for his radical Socialist views, he eagerly joined Lincoln's Union cause. Blenker informed the War Department he was eager to enlist "thousands of Germans ready to fight for the preservation of the union."<sup>15</sup> Notice he was not ready to fight for the Constitution or maintaining the Rights of the people of the States. Unlike the patriots of 1776 who fought for liberty and self-government, these radical Socialists were ready to fight for the one thing tyrants always love, big government. (3) General August Willich whom Marx called "a communist with a heart." Willich's fellow Communists referred to him as "the Reddest of the Red." Not only were radical Socialists and Communists active members of the Union Army as it invaded the South, but Lincoln has the distinction of being the first American president to have in his administration a close friend of Karl Marx. This close friend of Marx was Charles A. Dana, Assistant Secretary of War, in Lincoln's Administration. Lincoln often referred to Dana as "the eyes of the Army."

In 1853 when Joseph Weydemeyer arrived in New York, he had in his pocket a letter from

his friend, Karl Marx. Weydemeyer's letter was addressed to Marx's friend, Charles A. Dana. Responding to his friend's request, Dana then gave vital assistance to Weydemeyer in both securing employment and promoting Communism in the United States. Both Weydemeyer and Dana became active in the newly formed Republican Party, as did most radical Socialists and Communists at that time, and rose in influence within the Republican Party. With assistance from Dana, Weydemeyer had published in the United States for the first time copies of Marx's *Communist Manifesto*. A future Union Army general and the future assistant secretary of war in Lincoln's administration, both close friends of Marx, both admirers and supporters of Lincoln, both stalwart Republicans and these are the men who introduced America to Marx's tome, the *Communist Manifesto*. What a band of brothers!

It is interesting to note why these radical Socialists and Communists were so eager to fight in Lincoln's war. None other than Frederick Engels, Marx's co-author of modern-day Communism, offers us a clear answer as to why they fought in Lincoln's war. In a letter to his friend, Joseph Weydemeyer, Frederick Engels stated, "The preliminaries of the proletarian revolution, the measures that prepare the battleground and clear the way for us, such as a single and indivisible republic...that is now *convenu* [taken for granted]."<sup>16</sup> The history of the failure of many Socialists and Communists' revolutions during the decade of 1840 had taught Engels the necessity of do-





*Frederick Engels: Co-founder with Karl Marx of modern day communism. In a letter to General Joseph Weydemeyer, Engels praised the efforts of building strong "indivisible" central governments as laying the foundation for future communist expansion.*

ing away with small governments and consolidating them into one single and indivisible republic. According to Engels, when this is done, it would "prepare the battleground and clear the way" for Communist revolution. State's Rights as known in the United States before Appomattox stood as a roadblock to the advancement of big, indivisible government, and therefore, it stood in the way of the Communist revolution. Just a few years after the defeat of the South, Colonel Robert G. Ingersoll a veteran of the Eleventh Illinois Cavalry, a Freethinker, Radical Abolitionist, and Radical Republican, noted why the late war had to be fought. Ingersoll tells us, "The great stumbling block, the great obstruction in Lincoln's way and in the way of thousands, was the old doctrine of States' Rights."<sup>17</sup>

Yes, indeed, real States' Rights

serve as "the great stumbling block, the great obstruction" to tyrants. From the Communist point of view, States' Rights — that is, local self-government — must be destroyed if the Communist revolution is to go forward. In summing up the consequences of the war and reconstruction, Communist author James S. Allen noted, "this effort produced one of the most glorious chapters in our revolutionary history."<sup>18</sup> The "revolutionary history" Allen is referring to is the history of the advancement of Communism. One thing stood in the way of this Communist advancement, real States' Rights which was being defended by the Confederate States of America. But as the South has found out to our great distress, tyrants are not easily thwarted. When we understand why radical Socialists and Communists hated States' Rights, we will understand why they flocked to assist Lincoln in his effort to destroy real States' Rights and establish Federal supremacy. Lincoln was a lifelong advocate of a strong and vigorous Federal government. Both as a Whig following his political mentor Henry Clay's American Plan and as a Republican, Lincoln pushed for Federal supremacy. Communists and radical Socialists also believe in a strong, indivisible and supreme central government. Has there ever been a Communist or Socialist nation which did not also have a strong indivisible central government? With this insight, one can understand why radical Socialists and Communists found the Republican Party, Lincoln, and Lincoln's war on the defenders of real State's Rights so worthy of

their assistance.

One of the most shocking aspects of Karl Marx's view of the South is his view of why the people of the South were fighting for independence. In November 1861, Marx wrote an article for *Die Presse* in Vienna titled, "The Civil War in the United States." Here is Marx's view of why the South was fighting the so-called Civil War: "The war of the Southern Confederacy is, therefore, not a war of defense, but a war of conquest, a war of conquest for the extension and perpetuation of slavery."<sup>19</sup> In today's politically correct environment it is not uncommon to hear the South slandered with the very same falsehood as enunciated by Karl Marx. How many times has a Confederate Flag, monument, holiday, or hero been condemned because "the South fought for slavery?" Some of America's most famous conservative talk radio hosts will parrot Karl Marx's words as they defend Lincoln's war upon the South. Politicians from both political parties will use the very words of Marx to puff up the egos of non-Southerners as they proclaim the North fought the war to "free the slaves." Even the most conservative of the two national political parties has embraced Marx's view of the War for Southern Independence. For example, when George Bush was governor of Texas, he had a plaque honoring Texas Confederate Veterans removed from the Texas Supreme Court; when Mitt Romney was campaigning for the Republican nomination, he declared the Confederate Flag to be unworthy of respect.

*Continued on page 24*


# Lincoln's Band of Tyrants

It is rather ironic the party of Lincoln, the party which was founded and nurtured by the efforts of so many radical Socialists and Communists is today considered America's party of conservatism and small government. What is even more ironic is this party that has nothing good to say about the South's effort to gain its independence, and wastes little time in distancing itself from the specter of Southern influence, is now the very political party which depends upon Southern voters for its control of Congress and the White House! Despite how many times we are told that this or any other national political party will govern according to the Constitution and as our Founding Fathers intended, it must be remembered that regardless of who controls the government in Washington, Federal supremacy is a constant reality. Federal supremacy negates REAL State's Rights. No matter how many times a politician is elected who carries a copy of the Constitution

in his pocket, the Constitution will be judged not by "We the people" of sovereign states but by the Federal government. Continuous and unrelenting Federal supremacy is the most deleterious result of Lincoln's victory at Appomattox. Facing this post-Appomattox reality, one must remember this is the very type of government we live with, regardless who is elected the next president.

Fundamentally the Republican Party and Abraham Lincoln offered a means for introducing into the United States a system which no one less than Karl Marx's co-founder of modern-day Communism, Frederick Engels, referred to as absolutely essential to the promotion of the Communist struggle — one strong, national and indivisible government. The power of this *new* federal government cannot be checked by anyone other than the federal govern-

Continued on page 52



**WAS YOUR GREAT-GRANDFATHER A TERRORIST OR PATRIOT?**

\*\*\*\*\*

It's been very politically correct the past few years to classify as traitors, or even worse, terrorists the citizen-soldiers of the South who resisted an illegal invasion of their homes during the War Between the States. We see it differently. Outmanned, out-gunned, and out-supplied — but never out-fought — Confederate soldiers wrote a proud chapter in this country's history for independence, toughness, bravery, patriotism, and honor. If you want Confederate symbols to remain a part of our cultural history, and you're the male descendant of a Confederate soldier, we invite you to join us.

The SCV is a non-political heritage organization, not affiliated with any other group, dedicated to the preservation of the reputation of men like Robert E. Lee, Stonewall Jackson — and your great-grandfather.

**SONS OF CONFEDERATE VETERANS**

**For More Information:**

**Mail Today • 1-800-MY-SOUTH • 1800MYSOUTH.COM**



# Lincoln's Band of Tyrants

ment itself — something every American, North and South, has had to deal with since the dawn of Federal supremacy.

## Adolph Hitler: Lincoln's Number One Fascist Fan

It may be shocking to many Americans to learn Adolph Hitler viewed Lincoln's effort to end State's Rights and create a strong supreme Federal government as worthy of duplicating in the German Federal Republic. Hitler's opinion of the Rights of the Union and the Rights of the States in America is remarkably similar to that of Lincoln's opinion: "The states which make up the American Union are mostly in the nature of territories ... formed for technical administrative purposes. These states did not and could not possess sovereign rights of their own. Because it was the Union which created most of these so-called states."<sup>20</sup> It should not come as a surprise if these words sound familiar. In his 1861 speech to Congress Lincoln stated, "The Union is older than the States and, in fact created them as States. The Union, and not themselves separately, procured their independence and their liberty. [T]he Union threw off their old dependence for them and made them States, such as they are."

Notice both Lincoln and Hitler believed the Union "made them States" (Lincoln) or "it was the Union that created most of these so-called states" (Hitler). Also,

notice in this statement Hitler ridiculed the idea the states of the American Union were ever sovereign. In his message to Congress, November 1861, Lincoln stated, "Much is said about the 'sovereignty' of the States; but the word, even, is not in the national Constitution." So both Lincoln, an advocate of Federal supremacy, and Hitler, an advocate of all-powerful Reich, repudiated the concept of state sovereignty for their respective countries.

In his book *Mein Kampf*, Hitler ridiculed the idea that the various German states could be sovereign. In derision he referred to the concept of state sovereignty within the German Federation as "statal sovereignty." Hitler asserted "It is absurd to speak of 'statal sovereignty' for the constituent states of the Reich."<sup>21</sup> Why did Hitler, the tyrant, assert sovereignty did not reside with the local states of the German Federation? He did so for the very same reason every tyrant opposes placing the power of government into hands other than their own — so he could control every aspect of government from an all-powerful, indivisible central government. Once the states of Germany became nothing more than political districts of the central government (in this case the Third Reich), Federal supremacy became the law of the land in Germany.

Just as Lincoln was the advocate of a strong, indivisible federal government much like the one

High Federalists and Whigs had always sought to impose on the United States, Hitler also sought to establish a strong central government. In *Mein Kampf*, Hitler addresses his love for strong national government: "We, National Socialists ... would adopt the following axiom: A strong national Reich."<sup>22</sup> As has been stated, Lincoln viewed the states as being subservient to the will of the Federal government because he viewed the states to be junior in time, power, and, of course, sovereignty to the Federal government; i.e., the Union. This same concept was announced by Hitler when he noted that those parties who "placed the interests of their states ... before the Reich had now to look on passively while the pressure of events forced the Reich, in its own interests, to abolish the existence of the individual states. It was an unparalleled example of hypocrisy to raise the cry of lamentation over the loss which the federal states suffered in being deprived of their sovereign rights."<sup>23</sup> It is not uncommon to hear sycophants of Lincoln declare that, yes, Lincoln did act beyond his authority and did trample upon the Constitution but, he did so because "the pressure of events forced" him to do so. Is this not the same thing Hitler claimed while destroying the sovereign states of the German Federal Republic?

Once Federal supremacy is established, no matter where or

how lightly it is applied, local self-government is lost, and the ability of the people to force their central government to respect their liberty and property is "gone with the wind." Advocates of big government always clothe their grab for power in high and praiseworthy rhetoric. For example: Socialists are struggling to uplift the workers; Communists are bringing economic freedom to the oppressed masses; Nazis are trying to free the workers from the parasitic influence of an alien culture; and Lincoln was saving the Union. With the passage of time the high-sounding and praiseworthy rhetoric is replaced with the heavy hand of an all-powerful central government. Likewise in these United States we must face the reality that Lincoln did not "save the Union." Lincoln did not save the Union, if by that term you are referring to the union as established and defended by our forefathers. Lincoln and his tyrannical allies completely destroyed the Union as described by Thomas Jefferson and James Madison in the Kentucky and Virginia Resolves of 1798. That Union has been replaced with an all-powerful, indivisible, central government more akin to the government of an empire than that of a republic of free men in sovereign states.


Julius Caesar took control of the Roman Republic and in the process of creating an empire, destroyed the Roman Republic. Likewise, Hitler took control of the Federal Republic of Germany, and in creating his Nazi Empire, destroyed the German Republic. Lincoln, Caesar and Hitler were all successful in defending and

expanding the landmass and number of people under the control of the central government. In all three cases, liberty and freedom were exchanged for the exercise of power and the trappings of glory.

The one inescapable fact of history is that tyrants love big, all-powerful, indivisible government. The degree of oppression lying upon the subjects of a tyrannical government may vary from nation to nation and from time to time, but its application or threat of application is the death knell of liberty as described by our founding fathers. The very idea that Adolph Hitler would parrot the words and actions of Abraham Lincoln as he sought to establish his Nazi Reich should make even the most worshipful sycophant of Lincoln stop and reconsider his view of the War for Southern Independence.

### **Real States' Rights, The Guardian of American Liberty**

Juvenal, the Roman satirist, posed this most vexing question for society in his day and for members of any republic: "*Quis custodiet ipsos custodes*" (Who shall guard the guards themselves?). Juvenal here is pointing out an obvious fact that when you put a fox in charge of guarding the henhouse, someone had better watch the fox! What was true in Roman times is equally true in a republic of free men. How can "we the people," who are not an active part of the machinery of government, be sure those we elect to serve our best interests are not abusing their power? When we delegate certain powers to the Federal government to be used




*Joseph Weydemeyer: Marx described this Union General as "My friend Joseph Weydemeyer." With the assistance of Charles A. Dana, Weydemeyer had the first copies of The Communist Manifesto published in the United States. After moving to the United States he became active in the Republican Party, the election of Lincoln, and the war against the South.*

for our collective benefit, how can we make sure the Federal government will act according to our direction as laid down in the Constitution? If we depend upon the Federal government to be the guardian of our best interests, then, "*Quis custodiet ipsos custodes*," Who shall guard the guards?

Real States' Rights provide the people of these United States with sufficient tools to force the Federal government to abide by the limitations of the Constitution. Our Founding Fathers gave us a nation where "we the people" had the right to check the abuse of Federal power. They established a nation where the Federal government understood that if it did not keep

*Continued on page 56*

# Lincoln's Band of Tyrants



General August Willich: Karl Marx described Willich as "A communist with a heart." Willich's fellow radicals often referred to Willich as "the Reddest of the Reds."

the respect and voluntary loyalty of the people, it would cease to exist. There was a time in American history, prior to the advent of Federal supremacy, when the Federal government feared what the people of America would do if it acted in an un-Constitutional manner. As Thomas Jefferson and James Madison pointed out in the Kentucky and Virginia Resolves of 1798, it is the duty and responsibility of "we the people" of the sovereign states to judge for ourselves if the Federal government is acting in the manner ordained by the Constitution. As Jefferson pointed out in the Kentucky Resolves: "That the government created by this compact was not made the exclusive or final judge

of the extent of the powers delegated to itself; since that would have made its discretion, and not the Constitution, the measure of its powers."

Jefferson understood the deleterious results of letting the Federal government be the agent that would determine what power the Constitution allowed it to exercise. If the Federal government was the "exclusive or final judge" of its powers, how can "we the people" of the sovereign states be sure that our rights, property, and liberty will be safeguarded? Considering these facts, Juvenal's warning, "*Quis custodiet ipsos custodes*" (Who shall guard the guards themselves?) should be ringing in the ears of all Americans who fear the loss of liberty. The ability of "we the people" of sovereign states to place an effective *guard* on the actions of our agent, the Federal government, was lost at Appomattox. More than Robert E. Lee's Army of Northern Virginia was surrendered on that sad Appomattox morning; the Constitution was effectively given over to the Federal government. From that day forth the Federal government and only the Federal government is allowed to be (in Jefferson's words) "the exclusive or final judge" of its power under the Constitution.

Would it be prudent of Miss Virginia to allow Mr. Jonathan to keep her checkbook and pay her bills for her and not have a means to "keep an eye" on her money?

Even if Mr. Jonathan was an honest man, he is subject to making small or large mistakes. But Mr. Jonathan, being human, is much more concerned about his best interest than he is in taking care of Miss Virginia's business. Surely even the most trusting of souls in this country understands that giving your checkbook to a distant person with the hope that he will always serve your best interest would be the height of folly. Yet, these same people are willing to extend to the Federal government not only their and their children's checkbooks, but our freedom and liberty as well. As many American patriots have noted, if all people were angels, we would not need government. But mankind is far from being angelic; therefore, we must have government. If our rulers were angels, we would not need a system of government to "keep an eye" on them because angels are always good. But as we all know too well, mankind is not angelic, and our elected rulers are not angels; therefore, if we are to be a free people, we must have a means of forcing our government to abide by the rules "we the people" set before them. Without this means of forcing the government to abide by the Constitution, there is little hope of maintaining that little freedom upon which we now barely subsist. This was well-understood in 1776 as our Colonial forefathers struck for our rights and liberty. Likewise in 1861 our Confederate forefathers



understood what would happen to future generations of Americans if *REAL* states' rights were banished from these United States.

In the midst of this sesquicentennial celebration of the War for Southern Independence, every Southerner should take pride that the military force and government of the Confederate States of America was not populated with radical Socialists and Communists. Furthermore, our president did not have a friend of Karl Marx as a highly placed member of his administration, nor did our president receive congratulatory memorials from Karl Marx. It was Abraham Lincoln and not our president who Marx praised as "the single-minded son of the working class, [who would] lead his country through the matchless struggle for the rescue of an enchained race and the reconstruction of a social world."<sup>24</sup> There are two things which the twentieth century has proven without a doubt about Communism: First, Communists have no qualms about making slaves out of people and, secondly, the "reconstruction of a social world" would include some of the most hideous acts of violence and human wretchedness since the advent of Western civilization. Yet these men found much in Abraham Lincoln, the Republican Party, and the war upon the South which would aid them in promoting their form of tyranny.

Northern victory in 1865 was not the signal for Lincoln's fellow tyrants to stop their efforts in destroying Constitutional government as given to us by our Founding Fathers. The agents of tyranny are like cancer. They do not give

up and will continue in a slow and methodical way until they have complete control of their host. Communist author James S. Allen demonstrates this fact when he wrote, "Reconstruction was the continuation of the Civil War into a new phase, in which the revolution passed from the stage of armed conflict into primarily a political struggle which sought to consolidate the Northern triumph."<sup>25</sup> Lincoln, Marx, Engels and Hitler are indeed a strange but deadly "Band of Brothers."

### Endnotes

<sup>1</sup>James Madison, as cited in George W. Carey and James McClellan, *The Federalist* (Kendall/Hunt Publishing Co., Dubuque, IA: 1990), 268. Madison expounds upon this subject in *The Federalist Paper* Number 51.

<sup>2</sup>Al Benson and Walter D. Kennedy, *Lincoln's Marxists* (Pelican Publishing Co., Gretna, LA: 2011), 19.

<sup>3</sup>Abraham Lincoln, "July 4th Message to Congress," 4 July, 1861.

<sup>4</sup>Ibid.

<sup>5</sup>Ibid.

<sup>6</sup>Raphael Semmes, *Memoirs of Service Afloat* (The Blue and Gray Press, Secaucus, NJ: 1987), 26.

<sup>7</sup>Constitution State of Louisiana, as cited in *The American's Guide to the Constitution of the United States of America* (Trenton, Moore and Lake: 1813), 341.

<sup>8</sup>James Kent, *Commentaries on American Law* (Da Capo Press, NY: 1971), Vol. I, Pt. I, Lecture II, "Of the Law of Nations."

<sup>9</sup>Ibid, I, 171.

<sup>10</sup>Edmond Burke, "Speech on Conciliation with the Colonies" in *The Norton Anthology of English Literature*, Third Edition (W.W. Norton

and Co., NY: 1974), I, 2352-366.

<sup>11</sup>Ibid.

<sup>12</sup>Patrick Henry, as cited in William Wirt Henry, *Patrick Henry: Life, Correspondence and Speeches, Vol. 1* (1891; Sprinkle Publications, Harrisburg, VA: 1993), 449.

<sup>13</sup>James S. Allen, *Reconstruction: The Battle for Democracy*, (International Publishers, NY: 1937), 175-76.

<sup>14</sup>Theodore Draper, *The Roots of American Communism* (The Viking Press, NY: 1959), 11.

<sup>15</sup>Louis Blenker, as cited in *The War of the Rebellion: a Compilation of the Official Records of the Union and Confederate Armies*, Sr. III, Vol. I, p.459.

<sup>16</sup>Frederick Engels, as cited in *Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, Letters to Americans: 1848-1895*, (International Publishing Co., NY: 1953), 57.

<sup>17</sup>Robert G. Ingersoll, "Abraham Lincoln, a Lecture," speech given by Ingersoll in New York City, 1894, as cited in [www.archive.org/stream/abrahamlincolnle00inge/abrahamlincolnle00inge\\_djvu.txt](http://www.archive.org/stream/abrahamlincolnle00inge/abrahamlincolnle00inge_djvu.txt), accessed March 16, 2009.

<sup>18</sup>Allen, p.208.

<sup>19</sup>Karl Marx, "The Civil War in the United States," *Die Presse*, 7 November 1861, as cited in *Marx and Engels, the Civil War in the United States* (International Publishing Co., NY: 1971), 73.

<sup>20</sup>Adolph Hitler, *Mein Kampf* (Hurst and Blackett, LTD., NY: 1942), 312.

<sup>21</sup>Ibid, 315.

<sup>22</sup>Ibid.

<sup>23</sup>ibid, 314.

<sup>24</sup>Karl Marx, "Address of the International Workingmen's Association to Abraham Lincoln," as cited in *Marx and Engels, Letters to Americans*, 65-66.

<sup>25</sup>Allen, 207. ■