PART 1

Speaker 1: ****.

Other Speaker: I can almost see her.

Speaker 1: I'm just so tired. And my eyes were at half-mast in a [place?] that you don't –

Other Speaker: ****.

Speaker 1: Okay please state for us your, your full name? Spell it, and also what you'd like to appear underneath your name in the documentary.


Speaker 1: Thank you. Professor, what did Jefferson Davis mean when he said that slavery was the occasion but not the cause of the war?

Tom DiLorenzo: That was a famous, uh, statement of his, and I think, uh, what he was referring to is there, there was a, uh, ongoing political conflict between North and South for decades prior to the War Between the States, and, uh, slavery came in as a big issue in the mid-1850s, uh, late-1850s, uh, but, but the way in which it became into a big issue in the political conflict was over the extension of slavery in the new territories. I think it's important to
remember that, uh, Abraham Lincoln and the Republican Party only opposed in 1860 the extension of slavery into the new territories, and not slavery in the South. In fact, in his first inaugural, uh, Lincoln, uh, pledged his support of a constitutional amendment that had just passed the United States Senate that would have forbidden the federal government from ever interfering in southern slavery. And, uh, so, uh, they were content to leave southern slavery alone, but the, the reasons they gave for, uh, opposing so fiercely the extension of slavery in the new territory is--they gave two main reasons. One had to do with the three-fifths clause of the Constitution that counted, for every five slaves, they were counted as three people for purposes of determining how many members of Congress there would be in each state. And so if slavery were to go into the new territories, that would have artificially inflated the, uh, congressional representation of the Democratic party, which was the southern, uh, mostly in the South. And, so, uh, that's reason number 1. Reason number 2 is, you know, uh, almost all the northern states in 1860, uh, had laws and even constitutional amendments that deprive the, uh, small number of free blacks there of any semblance of citizenship. Illinois, for example, amended its constitution in 1848 to make it illegal for a black person to move into the state. And so, uh, and Abraham Lincoln himself, uh, in the legislature in Illinois, supported, uh, the allocation of funds to deport the free blacks who were in the state, out of the state of Illinois. And so, uh, when it came to the new territories, you had these black codes in the North that, uh, discriminated. They were like northern apartheid laws. They were almost like the South African apartheid laws. And so the Republicans wanted to win the votes and the political support of the white population in the North that was migrating to the new territories, and so they came right out and said, we wanna keep the territories the preserve of the white race. Abraham Lincoln himself said that in a, in a, during the Lincoln-Douglas debates and, and in other places. And so, uh, um, of course there were moral denunciations of slavery as well, uh, by just about everyone. Robert E. Lee was just as eloquent as anyone, for example, in, uh, denouncing slavery as a moral, uh, as an immoral institution, but, uh, those were the two practical reasons the Republican party and Abraham Lincoln gave for it, and so when Jefferson Davis said slavery was the occasion, but not the cause, it was the dispute over the extension of slavery that was linked in very closely to the, the balance of political power between the northern states and the southern states. The North feared that the extension of slavery would tip the balance even more in the favor of the South, and so that they could get their way with federal legislation. Uh, and, uh, and vice-versa. The South, uh, their
politicians didn't want the North to have overwhelming power, uh, because among other things, um, in the North, they seem to have gotten the upper hand politically and they were ready to, uh, use tax dollars to build a transcontinental railroad through the North. The southern politicians, of course, including Jefferson Davis, wanted the transcontinental railroad, if the government was gonna, uh, subsidize it, to go through at least some of the southern states. And that was a big political fight over that, too. And so this whole battle over the extension of slavery I think impacted on, uh, politics in general, and that's why I think he said it was, uh, the occasion but not the root cause, not the actual cause of the conflict.

Other Speaker: **** sayin'.

Other Speaker: ****.

Speaker 1: Check com over the same?

Other Speaker: Yeah, there we go.

Speaker 1: ****. Okay.

Other Speaker: Okay.

Speaker 1: Discuss Lincoln's early agenda of emancipation, then evacuation, regarding the slaves.

Tom DiLorenzo: Uh, evacuation, you mean colonization?

Speaker 1: Yeah, ****.

Other Speaker: **** removing the slaves from the country.
Tom DiLorenzo: Oh, uh, well, well Lincoln was a, uh, lifelong, um, uh, not lifelong, but career-long member of, uh, the American Colonization Society. And he was, uh, at one time he was appointed the, the head or the president of the Illinois Colonization Society. And this was a group that was organized around the turn of the, uh, uh, the 19th century, if not a little earlier, and they advocated, uh, sending, um, the, the, uh, the blacks out of the country to Africa, Central America, Haiti, uh, and they, they proposed all sorts of places, uh, to, to deport, essentially, uh, black people. And, uh, and, and as of around 1857, 1858, the only solution, if you will, uh, to the slavery issue that Lincoln ever talked about was colonization. And, and in fact when he was President, he, uh, invited a, uh, a group of, uh, free blacks, uh, into the White House and, uh, the reason he invited them into the White House was to ask them to lead by example and leave the country. And he pointed to Liberia. He mentioned the, the country of Liberia and even mentioned that he had just met with the former president of Liberia. Roberts was his name. And, uh, if you read The Collected Works of Abraham Lincoln, you can see this actual, the minutes of his meeting are in there, where he said, uh, effectively, there are about 12,000 American blacks who had already been sent to Liberia, but most of ’em had died and, uh, and Lincoln told these men, but, uh, uh, years from now, the offspring of the survivors will surely outnumber the number of people who were sent to Liberia, which didn't sound like a very good deal to me. Leave the country, you know, most of you will die, but if the few who live procreate, uh, 50 years from now there'll be more of them than there are you sitting here before me, and they wisely turned down the offer to, to leave the country. And, uh, but during his administration, he actually also, uh, allocated funds to, uh, to getting things going to try to start colonies in Panama and elsewhere, and, uh, he put a businessman named Bernard Cook in charge of this project to, uh, send free blacks to Panama, and Bernard Cook turned out to be an embezzler, embezzled the money, and so nothing came of it. And, uh, the abolitionists, the genuine abolitionists--and Lincoln never called himself an abolitionist, he actually distanced himself from the real abolitionists like William Lloyd Garrison. Uh, they started, uh, fuming over this and calling him, uh, a slave hound from Illinois and, and, and, uh, uh, William Lloyd Garrison once said in response to this whole episode that, uh, he, Lincoln doesn't have an ounce of anti-slavery blood in his veins. He was so furious over this idea that, uh, we should ship the black people out of the country. And so that's, that was his position all along. You mentioned emancipation, also, which is a different, uh, issue altogether.
Tom DiLorenzo: Okay.

Other Speaker: ****.

Speaker 1: Yeah. What was the motivation for the early **** – well, you pretty much answered that. Do you want a little bit more ****?

Other Speaker: No. I think we got that.

Speaker 1: Okay. Um –

Other Speaker: Well, actually, if we **** –

Speaker 1: Well, actually, I wanna get the creation of Liberia here.

Other Speaker: Exactly.

Speaker 1: Yeah.

Other Speaker: Okay.

Speaker 1: Uh, can you discuss a little more the, the, uh, creation of Liberia?

Tom DiLorenzo: Uh, well Liberia, uh, was, uh, was created by the American Colonization, uh, Society. They purchased land in, uh, Liberia in Africa for the purpose of sending, uh, blacks who were here in the U.S., uh, to that, to that place. That's why when Abraham Lincoln met with this group of free blacks in the White House early in his administration, he could say there are, we have sent 12,000, uh, uh, uh, black people from America to Liberia already. That had
occurred over the decades, over the previous decades, and that's, that's how Liberia got started as, as a country. And that's why Abraham Lincoln had mentioned, uh, this and, and by the way, this is one of the things why some of the Europeans, it's very interesting to look at, uh, what the Europeans, especially the British, had to say about Jefferson Davis and Lincoln and the War Between the States, because they looked at this type of fact and most of, the majority of British opinion-makers, for example, uh, did not believe that the war was over freeing the slaves, uh, for a minute. Uh, and this was one of the reasons for it. They, you know, it's, people are dying by the thousands, uh, you know, it, could it be over slavery or something else? They were of the opinion it's unlikely that northern men were dying by the thousands for the benefit of the slaves when one, they didn't even allow the free blacks among them, the few that were there, to have, um, citizenship really, and they advocated, uh, and supported deporting them outta their country. And so, uh, they didn't believe it. They didn't buy, a lot of’em. Charles Dickens, for example, was, uh, was, uh, on the side of Jefferson Davis. Uh, so was the famous Lord Acton, uh, the famous, uh, philosopher and historian of liberty and, and a protégé of the, uh, prime minister of England at the time [Gladstone].

Speaker 1: Could you talk about the, uh, potential freedmen colonies in the Caribbean and Central America?

Tom DiLorenzo: Free, the freedmen colonies –

Speaker 1: Mm hmm.

Tom DiLorenzo: – in the, in the Caribbean? Um, what in particular? Uh –

Speaker 1: I guess the, the creation of them.

Tom DiLorenzo: Um –

Speaker 1: **** –
Other Speaker: Did it ever happen? You know, what was the –

Tom DiLorenzo: Um –

Other Speaker: – the political motivation ****?

Tom DiLorenzo: Well, in the, well, you know, in the Caribbean, um, one of the points I make in my book is that, um, the United States was the only country in the, in the 19th century where a war was associated with emancipation. And, and so a lot of the Caribbean countries, uh, where, where, or islands where slavery existed were British colonies, Spanish colonies, French and Danish colonies. And all of these countries eliminated slavery peacefully during the 19th century, uh, all throughout the Caribbean, Central America, and South America where they had colonies, and so, uh, and so, uh, the slaves were freed. In, in the case of the British Empire, uh, they used tax dollars to purchase the freedom of the slaves from the slave owners to peacefully end it all. You know, on the one hand a lot of people think, might think it’s odious to, uh, tax someone who had nothin' to do with slavery and use his or her money to give to slave-owners. Uh, but if the alternative is violence and, uh, insurrection or war, then using tax dollars doesn't sound, doesn't seem so, so bad, and, uh, and Abraham Lincoln, by the way, did talk about this, but I, I fault him in my book for not using his legendary political skills for, for following through and doing what every other country on earth did in the 19th century about slavery and ending it peacefully through, uh, some sort of compensated emancipation. So I guess after this took place there were, uh, emancipated slaves all throughout the Caribbean and, uh, and Central and South America.

Speaker 1: What was the significance of the Cooper Union speech in February 1860?

Tom DiLorenzo: Uh, well, I guess one of the, the significance of that, uh, partly, is it really, uh, uh, catapulted Abraham Lincoln into prominence. He was in New York City and he was, uh, in, uh, which was, even back then was the media capital of America, if not the world, the New York city newspapers, and, uh, and he said some surprising things in that speech. He quoted, uh, Jefferson, who himself talked about deportation. He actually used the word deportation of, uh,
the slaves or, or ex-slaves or freed slaves in the, in the Cooper Union speech, and I would say the most important thing is it really, uh, uh, catapulted him into, uh, national prominence and cemented the fact that he was, uh, you know, a, uh, a major political player. Uh, whereas just a couple years ago he was a relatively obscure trial lawyer, uh, working for the railroad companies of Illinois.

Speaker 1: Why wasn't emancipation with compensation employed?

Tom DiLorenzo: Uh, well, in, you know, these, part of the subtitle of my book, uh, has the words “unnecessary war” in it, and, uh, the reason we put that in there was, uh, the argument, uh, that I make is that if the purpose was to end slavery, then the war was unnecessary because the entire rest of the world ended slavery peacefully. And we're talking about dozens of countries. And, by the way, about, um, of all the slaves that were brought to the Western Hemisphere, only about 5 percent ended up here in America. The rest were the Caribbean, Central America, South America, and almost all of them, there was a slave insurrection in Haiti in 1794 [1791], I believe it was, but other than that, all of these other slaves, uh, achieved, uh, emancipation peacefully. There were no wars, uh, to, to lead to this, and so, uh, you know, why didn't we do it here? I think the purpose of the war, in my view, was, uh, what Abraham Lincoln said it was. He said it was to save the Union and, uh, I look at that as a, uh, as saying to destroy the secession movement and, uh, I argue, by the way, that, uh, he didn't save the Union because the Union was a voluntary union, and if you hold a, a state into a union by force, by military force, you're really destroying the Union as a voluntary measure. The analogy I use is, uh, if a woman leaves her husband because he's been abusing her, and he goes and forces her back into the home and chains her to the bedpost and threatens to shoot her if she leaves again, the union has been saved, hasn't it? They're back, they are back together again in a literal sense, but it's not a union. It's not a voluntary union like the original marriage was. And that's how the Union was kept together, and so I think that was the purpose of the war. That's what Abraham Lincoln said was the purpose of the war. There was a famous letter he wrote to Horace Greeley in 1862 where he said, uh, if I could save the Union without freeing a single slave, I would do so, and if I could save the Union by freeing some and leaving others in bondage, I would do that, too, but my overriding objective is to keep the Union together. Uh, geographically, anyway. And so I think
that explains why he didn't use his legendary political skills to do what, uh, the British and the French and the Danish governments and the Spanish Empire did, and end slavery peacefully.

Other Speaker: Pause a second.

Other Speaker: ****.

Speaker 1: Okay. In your opinion, was the Emancipation Proclamation unconstitutional?

Tom DiLorenzo: Uh, well, uh, no president at the time had the power to, uh, sign a piece of paper and, uh, and enact something like that. I don't think, I don't think there was even any debate over that among historians, for example, that, uh, that a president had the ability to do such a thing at the time, and, uh, and the Emancipation Proclamation, by the way, uh, uh, specifically exempted, uh, all the slaves that, at the time that were in the territory that was held by the Union government and the Union army. It specifically exempted all the parishes in Louisiana, for example, where the Union army was at the time. It was occupying these different parishes. It exempted West Virginia, which had seceded and was part of the Union. And so, uh, uh, Lincoln was excoriated severely by newspapers in America and in Europe for the Emancipation Proclamation because, uh, people looked at it and understood that, uh, it didn't free the slaves. It was, because it only applied to rebel territory, where the government at the time had no ability to free any slaves. Even William Seward, Lincoln's own secretary of state, uh, harshly criticized him for that. It was the sort of thing that you would expect a secretary of state to resign over by so severely criticizing his president like that. He didn't resign, but, but he, he, uh, he was apparently pretty upset with the hypocrisy of it all, but I don't think anyone would say that a president has the constitutional power to do that at the time on his own.

Speaker 1: Why did Secretary of State Seward say of the Emancipation Proclamation we show our sympathy with slavery by emancipating slaves where we cannot reach them and holding them in bondage where we can set them free?
Tom DiLorenzo: Well, he was just, he was reciting what the, what the Emancipation Proclamation says.

Speaker 1: ****.

Tom DiLorenzo: Yeah. And, uh, and, uh, because that's exactly what the Emancipation Proclamation said. It only applied to rebel territory and so, uh, where we, meaning the Union government, the federal government, had no power to free anybody, that's where it applied. And then, uh, where it does apply, like West Virginia, where there were slaves, we don't free them. So the position was essentially if you support the Union, you can keep your slaves. And that, in fact, was what some of the British newspapers were saying that I've read, uh, at the time. There were prominent British newspapers were specifically saying uh, if you can, if you keep the Union, if you support the Union, you can keep your slaves. If you don't support the Union, uh, we're gonna emancipate your slaves.

Other Speaker: I guess the natural question is … I’m gonna interject one here.

Speaker 1: Okay.

Other Speaker: **** answer **** is what was the intent? Behind the Emancipation Proclamation.

Tom DiLorenzo: The intent. Okay. ****.

Other Speaker: What was his intent?

Tom DiLorenzo: Okay. I have to wait for you to answer, ask, ask that. Okay. The intent for the Emancipation Proclamation. Well, obviously, it didn't, uh, free the slaves with one sign of the pen, like, like some people seem to believe it happened. I think the main, uh, the main purpose of it at that time, if you, if you consider the historical and military con, uh, context, uh, at that time, the late 1862, early 1863, the Confederates had the upper hand in the war. They had
just won some, uh, uh, quite incredible victories on the battlefield; at Fredericksburg, for example, in December of 1862, and, uh, and, uh, and so Lincoln said in his own words, he said he was at the end of his rope militarily and there was also more and more talk about Britain possibly, not necessarily militarily intervening, but, uh, recognizing the Confederate States, and the other European powers recognizing a Confederate government as a legitimate government. Abraham Lincoln never did. He never admitted that there was a legitimate government, um, in the South, and, uh, also they might've supported the Confederacy by trading with them even more than they had been doing. The British, the European powers had been, uh, trading with the Confederacy. And so I think, uh, uh, Lincoln, this was a very wise political move on his part, that he wanted to introduce slavery as one of the reasons for the war, uh, midway through the war so that the British Empire, especially, which had just ended slavery, uh, 10 years earlier, 10 or 12 years earlier [ended slave trade in 1807; emancipation act, 1833], uh, would not recognize the Confederate government as a legitimate government, uh, because slavery was attached to the conflict now. So I think it was, it was a, uh, very, uh, clever public relations move, and I also think that Lincoln, uh, suspected it might've caused a slave insurrection. I think he must've thought that if the slaves understood that even though they were in rebel territory, if they ran off, that legally they were free that there would be an insurrections, and it was mostly the women and the old men who were too old for the military who were back on the plantations, and so, um, I think that's what he, uh, anticipated, but that never happened. Uh, that never happened. They never had, uh, any significant slave insurrections.

Speaker 1: Discuss the legislation, uh, **** you already answered this. I'm sorry. Let me go in further detail. Discuss the legislation that other states had, and Illinois included, regarding the integration of black peoples into those states.

Tom DiLorenzo: Okay. Well, Ill, Illinois and, and qui, and most other states in the North, um, uh, prohibited immigration of black people into the states. Uh, black people could not marry, uh, intermarry with white people. Um, they could not own property. Uh, they, they had to, if they, if they could attend public schools and, and, uh, it was not always true in every state that they could, but if they did, they had separate schools, uh, of course, and they were segregated in every aspect of, of their life, whether in, in, they were separate black pews in the
churches in the North, uh, separate schools, if there were allowed schools. Um, they couldn't sue white people. A black person could not sue a white person, so if a, if a white person criminally abused a black person, the black person did not have, uh, due process of law that he could use to protect himself. And of course that invited criminal abuse of black people on the part of criminals, uh, because they had no equal protection, no civil rights, really, at all in the North. And so, uh, the, the so-called Black Codes that a lot of Americans are familiar with that existed in the South after the War Between the States, really existed in the North decades earlier and they were pretty much copied or imitated in the South after the war, uh, and very similar to what they had, uh, in, in every single state in the North.

Other Speaker: Could you contrast that with how freed men were treated in the South in the same time period? Pre-war.

Other Speaker: ****.

Speaker 1: ****.

Tom DiLorenzo: Well, there, there were free blacks in the South because, um, there had been in, in decades earlier before the war, uh, manumission was possible. That meant that, uh, you know, the slaves were paid something. Most people don't know this, but they were paid, uh, a pittance. They were exploited, uh, you know, most of their labor was exploited. They were slaves. But they were paid something, and, uh, and so some of them saved up enough money and were frugal enough to buy their own freedom. And so there were free blacks. There were even free blacks who owned black slaves in, in the South, uh, uh, during the War Between the States and, and before that, also. And so those people had essentially, I think, pretty much the same rights as, as anyone did in the South. And, uh, and Tocqueville, by the way, uh, in Democracy in America, uh, when he did his tour of America and went back and wrote Democracy in America, uh, one of the comments he made in there was, uh, the irony that, uh, race relations -- he didn't use the phrase race relations -- but he, I think he said, the problem of race seems to be worse in the states that have eliminated slavery than it was in the states that had
slavery. And most people would find that to be a shocking thing if they had never read Tocqueville all the way through, but that was his observation. I think.

Other Speaker: ****.

Speaker 1: ****.

Tom DiLorenzo: Yeah.

Other Speaker: ****.

Speaker 1: Would you explain, uh, Henry Clay's American System and how did that ideology manifest itself in Lincoln's government?

Tom DiLorenzo: Uh, well, uh, ever since the founding of America, really, there was a conflict between the Jeffersonians and the Hamiltonians, and the Jeffersonians were, uh, in favor of, uh, smaller government and in keeping of local, decentralized government, and the Hamiltonians were in favor of a, a bigger government, more active government, more centralized in the, in the nation's capital, and the purpose of that, especially with Hamilton himself, was they wanted the government to have a more active role in economic planning. And after Alexander Hamilton died, the, the mantle of that philosophy was picked up by Henry Clay. And for all of his career, Henry Clay advocated, uh, high tariffs on imports to protect American manufacturers from competition and he advocated, uh, what were called internal improvement subsidies; that is, taxpayer subsidies to companies that build roads, canals, and railroads, and he advocated a, a federal government central bank, uh, that could print money, uh, to finance a lot of these things, these subsidies. The Jeffersonians opposed that. The Jeffersonians were opposed to using tax dollars for corporations to do anything, for the most part, uh, although it's not uniform. There were, there were Jeffersonians who called themselves Jeffersonians who if, who if they had the chance to have a government-funded canal in their congressional district, they would've voted for it, but by and large, the, the main opposition to this, uh, in the 50 years before the War Between the States came from the South, and the majority of the opposition came from the North, and
Abraham Lincoln, uh, said many times that, uh, Henry Clay was his political idol, his, uh, uh, the man he looked up to more than anyone else, and also Lincoln said that he was a Whig longer than he was a Republican. The Whig Party was formed, I think, in 1832 [1833] and then died off in the mid-1850s. All during that time, Abraham Lincoln was almost, uh, uniformly devoted in his political life to those things, to the Henry Clay's so-called American System: high tariffs, uh, taxpayer subsidies to corporations to build roads and canals, and, and a, and a federal government takeover of the money supply, essentially, to, to print money to, to finance all of these things. And, uh, and that was a, a big part of the political battle between North and South at the time, and, uh, sure enough, when Lincoln came into office, uh, almost none of these things had been achieved in the previous 50 years, but they were all put into place in the first 18 months of his administration. So I make the case in my book that this is one of the main motivations that Lincoln had for getting into politics and for being elected president. The men who elected him president, got him elected, were mostly high-rollers, uh, financiers, bankers, manufacturers from New England, New York City, Pennsylvania, Illinois, uh, and he was their man and he was, um, the man. He was the Whig Party. He was the representative of the Whig Party and Henry Clay's American System.

Speaker 1: Lincoln also adopted Clay's thoughts on slavery, which are summed by, uh, biographer Robert Johannsen as oppos –

Other Speaker: ****.

Speaker 1: Okay. As opposition to slavery in principle, uh, toleration of it in practice, and vigorous hostility toward the abolition movement.

Tom DiLorenzo: Right.

Speaker 1: How did Lincoln's behavior in office differ from his writings and his speeches, theory and practice?
Tom DiLorenzo: Um, well, that, that's, I think that's the best way to think about Abraham Lincoln and his views of, of slavery; is that he was very eloquently, uh, opposed to it in principle, always in principle, but tolerated it in practice. And, uh, in office, uh, during his first inaugural address on March 4th, uh 1861, he clearly stated that he had no intention to, uh, disturb southern slavery and even if he could, he said it would be unconstitutional for him to do so. And then also, uh, uh, just 2 days before that, on March 2nd, the United States Senate had passed a proposed constitutional amendment that would have forbidden the federal government from ever interfering in southern slavery, and the House of Representative had already passed it. In his first inaugural address, Abraham Lincoln, uh, pledged his support of that, also. So in, uh, in office, he supported the existence of southern slavery as far as he knew long after his own death. Uh, but then he continued to denounce it, uh, in general terms, in principle, as most people did at the time. Everybody did. Stonewall Jackson did, Robert E. Lee did, as well as Abraham Lincoln. They all knew there was an immoral system and it was counter to, uh, Christianity and, uh, and had to go, uh, but, uh, of course the big issue was how to get rid of it.

Other Speaker: We should prob'ly take a break ****.

Speaker 1: Okay.

Tom DiLorenzo: Okay.

PART 2
Other Speaker: **** museum in Baltimore. I don't know how long you're long you're gonna stick around here, but there's a –

Speaker 1: Oh, you ready?

DiLorenzo: Uh huh.
Speaker 1: Okay, speaking of wars, historically, wars have always been very complicated affairs. What issues, other than slavery, caused the tensions between the North and the South in the 1850s?

DiLorenzo: Oh, well, there's, there was the balance of political power, um, which is why Jefferson Davis said, uh, that, uh, slavery was the occasion, but not the cause, of the war. Uh, be a balance of power in terms of congressional representation. Uh, southerners had been sla, uh, complain, complaining for years that, uh, most of the taxes, they believed, were being collected at their expense, whereas most of the money the federal government was spending was being spent in the North, and if you read some of the, uh, uh, debates in Congress and speeches in Congress prior to the war, you read such things as, uh, Senator Robert Toombs, from Georgia, complaining that there was a federal program at the time that paid Massachusetts cod fisherman a bounty for every cod fish they caught, and so, you, and, and of course the, uh, cotton farmers, or the hemp farmers, or wheat farmers in Georgia weren't getting a bounty at taxpayers' expense for every bushel of wheat or every bale of cotton they were, they were growing, and so, uh, they felt they were being plundered. And, uh, one of the main reasons why they thought they were being plundered in the South was that the South was an agricultural society that exported about three-fourths of everything that was grown, and it was, they, almost all their output was agricultural, and they essentially, uh, sold it in Europe, sold most of these, this output in Europe, three-fourths of it. And the problem was, with, uh, with import tariffs, which was the main source of federal revenue, the, the tariff-- there was no income tax back then-- and there were a few excise taxes on a few things, but not as much. The tariff was the main source of revenue. Um, if, if you put a tax on, on, say, shoes that are imported in the country, we all end up paying more for shoes no matter where you live, if you live in South Carolina or Boston, you pay more for shoes because that tax is built into the price of the shoes, at least most of it anyway. Well, if you're a manufacturer in the North, you can try to, uh, pass on some of that higher cost of living that you have by charging higher prices for what you sell, if you're a, no matter what it is that you're selling, but the South, uh, the southern farmers, had to sell most of their output in Europe in very competitive world markets. So they found that they couldn't pass on any of the higher cost of living that they incurred by the, the tariff tax. They had to just swallow it. They just had to pay the tax, and they didn't benefit from it. And most of these tariffs were on manufactured
goods. There was very little manufacturing in the south. They mostly benefited the northern manufacturers. So it's, it's a bit complicated, but that, that explains why the, the southerners thought they were being plundered by the tax system. And when Lincoln and the Republicans gained power, the very first thing they did in 1858, 1859, was to proposed doubling the tariff rate, more than doubling it, from 15 percent, on average, to 32 percent, and, which they did. That was one of the very first things Lincoln did as president was sign the Morrill Tariff, M-O-R-R-I-L-L it's, it's spelled, to, uh, to more than double the average tariff rate. Now, put yourself in the, in the shoes of southerners who are complaining, “We're paying most of the tax, and the money is being spent up North.” The Republicans gain power and say we're gonna double the tax rates, double. That was a big issue to them. Uh, I know a lot of historians deny this, but Abraham Lincoln himself gave a speech in Pittsburgh, just before he became president, and he was lobbying for the Morrill Tariff. And he said in his spe, speech in Pittsburgh, to the people there in Pittsburgh, that raising the tariff is the number one issue before your member of congr, members of congress; number one, not number two, or three, or five, number one. He didn't say slavery was the number one issue. He said raising the tariff was the number one issue. So clearly, this was an, an important part of the, the, uh, the whole issue here. And, and by the way, Lincoln owed his, uh, nomination to the advocates of high tariffs. It was the Pennsylvania delegation that put him over the top, that gave him their support in the 1860 Republican nominating convention, and the steel manufacturers in Pennsylvania demanded a strong protection of someone who wanted high tariffs and Lincoln was their man. And so he owed them big favors, and as an astute politician, he knew that he had to come through. He had to come through with high tariffs, and so that's just one issues that was, uh, apart from slavery, that I think was a very big issue; economics, in other words.

Speaker 1: In his first inaugural address, Davis quoted the part of the Declaration of Independ, of Independence that says, "Governments derive their just powers in a [from the] consent of the governed" and said that southerners no longer consented to being governed by Washington, D.C. Did he think that the southern secessionists were following in the footsteps of the American revolutionaries who seceded from the British Empire in 1776?
DiLorenzo: Right, exactly right. He, he considered, um, um, his war, a war of secession from the U.S. government, just as George Washington –

Speaker 1: Could we cut for a second?

Other Speaker: **** a second.

Speaker 1: I'm so sorry.

DiLorenzo: Okay.

Speaker 1: Um, in the editing room we have to differentiate. We've been talking about –

DiLorenzo: Yeah.

Speaker 1: – when you, could you say Davis –

DiLorenzo: Okay.

Speaker 1: – I mean I'm, I'm, I'm –

DiLorenzo: Okay.

Speaker 1: – sorry I forgot to ask you to –

DiLorenzo: Okay.

Speaker 1: – include that in your –

DiLorenzo: Okay.
Speaker 1: – in your answer. My fault.

DiLorenzo: Okay.

Speaker 1: Okay.

DiLorenzo: Well, Jefferson Davis considered, uh, the war he was waging to be a war of secession from the U.S. government just as George Washington waged a war of secession from the British Empire, uh, and that's why he invoked the words of the Declaration of Independence, Davis did, in his own first inaugural address and, uh, also, uh, the majority of southern soldiers, Confederate soldiers believed this, also. James McPherson has written a, a little book called, What They Fought For, 1861 to 1865 and, uh, he surveyed thousands of letters and diaries of soldiers, uh, North and South, uh, letters to their mothers, let, letters to their wives and girlfriends, uh, relatives, uh, and he looked in these letters and diaries for any statement of, by the soldiers, on what they thought they were fighting for, and he concluded that the average Confederate soldier who was a, a yeoman farmer or a small merchant who didn't own, own slaves, was a small, small farmer or laborer, uh, said he was fighting against a tyrannical federal government that was invading his home and threatening his women, which it was, which it was and, uh, and so he, they thought they were fighting the same, for the same reasons that the American revolutionaries of 1776 did. McPherson, uh, concluded that the average northern soldier was also a yeoman farmer or a, a laborer, thought he was fighting to save the Union. Uh, he didn't, uh, he think he was fighting to free the slaves. He thought he was fighting to save the Union because that was the official purpose of the war according to Abraham Lincoln in 1861 and according to the United States Congress in 1861 and, uh, and, uh, interestingly, uh, after the Emancipation Proclamation there were draft riots in New York City and elsewhere over this and one of the reasons for the riots was, uh, when the government started announcing that slavery was part of the reason for the war, uh, there was a desertion crisis in the U.S. Army, for one thing, and there were draft riots, people, uh, against, against that and if, uh, you saw the movie, "The Gangs of New York" at the very end of it there's actually a fairly realistic portrayal of the New York City draft riots in there.
Speaker 1: Actually I didn't see that –

DiLorenzo: Yeah.

Speaker 1: – movie not yet. Sorry. I had to scroll down to get to my next question.

DiLorenzo: Okay.

Speaker 1: Are there constitutional grounds granting the right of secession to the states?

DiLorenzo: Um, I think, um, you know, the Tenth Amendment of the Constitution says that all the powers not delegated to the U.S. government are, are reserved to the people respectively or the states and that has to include the right of secession. Uh, at the time, uh, uh, that the Constitution was adopted, it was adopted voluntarily, of course, and three states, Virginia, New York and Rhode Island, explicitly stated that they reserved the right to resume the powers that they had delegated to the U.S. government, the federal government, if in the future that government ever became abusive of their liberties and so they always retained sovereignty. The states always retained sovereignty. They were always, it was always their understanding that they were in charge and that they were creating the federal government as their agent and if they decided to uncreate the federal government, if that's a word, they could do that too and these three states were accepted into the Union by the other states, uh, even with this proviso, this explicit written proviso in there. So I think, uh, without a doubt, um, um, these men certainly saw, um, secession as constitutional. Um, Senator Timothy Pickering of Massachusetts, uh, after Thomas Jefferson was elected president in 1800, led a 10-year battle to try to get the New England states to secede from the Union and Timothy Pickering was George Washington's adjutant general in the Revolutionary War. He was George Washington's secretary of state and his secretary of war. He served as secretary of state under President John Adams, so this is not a fire-breathing nut that we're talking about. This is, this is one of the Founding Fathers who was George Washington's right-hand man in the Revolutionary War and in his administration, uh, and he said in, uh, in some of his letters during this whole episode that secession was the principle of the American Revolution and so, uh, uh, you could hardly say that it's an
illegitimate, uh, practice if it's the whole purpose of the government in the first place was to establish the right, uh, to secede as is stated in the Declaration of Independence. Most of the people in the North believed this, too, in 1860. After Fort Sumter, attitudes changed, the flag was fired on. There was more support for going to war because of that, but in my book I survey northern newspaper editorials prior to Fort Sumter, prior to the war, and the majority of northern newspapers believed that the secession was legal, constitutional, and that you didn't have a right, the government did not have a right to, uh, to force any state to stay in.

Speaker 1: Um, okay. I think you've already answered –

Other Speaker: ****.

Speaker 1: Okay.

DiLorenzo: Okay. Um, in, in, in all the founding documents, if you look at the Declaration of Independence and the Articles of Confederation, which was the constitution before the existing Constitution, and the Constitution itself, the words “free and independent states” are all throughout. That's how the states, uh, identify themselves in the Declaration. It's, in fact, the formal title of the Declaration of Independence is the Declaration of Independence of the, the, the Free and Independent States and, uh, whenever the phrase United States is used in the Constitution, it's always in the plural, uh, and that signifies that the free and independent states are united in getting together to create the federal government as their agent. It doesn't say the United States is, as a, as a monolithic, uh, entity. It says the individual states are united and when the Revolutionary War was over the King of England signed se, a peace treaty, the Treaty of Paris, with all the individual states. There was no, there was no treaty with the United States government. He explicitly mentioned each state, Massachusetts, New York, Rhode Island and plantations, New Jersey, there were, Virginia. They were named one by one because that's who, uh, the war was being waged against, the individual sovereign states and so there's no question that, um, the states always viewed themselves as sovereign and that the federal government was their agent, but that was destroyed forever, uh, in all likelihood by the War Between the States
when, uh, uh, when, ever since 1865 it's the central government that has been, uh, pretty much the master of the states, rather than the other way around.

Speaker 1: What was Lincoln's stance on the secession issue?

DiLorenzo: Uh, well, Lincoln never, uh, never admitted that legal secession had ever existed or taken place. He called it an insurrection and he always said that it was a, just a, a minority of rabble-rousers and radicals and anarchists within the southern society, even though the way in which they went about it was exactly the way in which the Constitution was adopted. They held political conventions. Some states like Virginia actually took popular re, votes and, and they took a, a majority vote of the entire, uh, voting population, in addition to holding a political convention, where they sent delegates, so it wasn't just a group of rabble-rousers but that was his, uh, position on secession and, uh, Lincoln adopted the, uh, the peculiar and ahistorical theory that the Union was older than the states and therefore no such thing as state sovereignty ever existed and, uh, uh, and that makes about as much sense to me, though, as saying that a marriage can be older than either spouse. It's a logical impossibility, but that was Lincoln's argument, that the Union, the Union is older than the two parts that it is a union of. That, that's an impossibility and it's ahistorical. The states created the federal government as their agent. That's, that's how it happened but, uh, but he made up, uh, the opposite theory.

Speaker 1: What was the – I'm observing that. Um –

DiLorenzo: Yeah.

Speaker 1: – what was the –

DiLorenzo: You –

Speaker 1: – significance of the creation of West Virginia in relation to secession?
DiLorenzo: Uh, well, uh, the Lincoln administration orchestrated the secession of western Virginia from the rest of the state which was, uh, uh, for one thing, is, it's telling because secession was okay if it supported, uh, the Lincoln government according to Abraham Lincoln and another thing is it was clearly unconstitutional. The United States Constitution says that you can't carve a new state out of an existing state. It also says to create a new state you need the, uh, you need a vote of the, the legislatures, the legislature of that state as well as Congress. That never happened. There was no legislature in West Virginia that, that, that voted to secede from, from the rest of the state. It was, uh, a, a land grab. It was orchestrated by the Lincoln administration and they set up a puppet government in Alexandria, Virginia, to be the governor and the, and to run the state and it added a few electoral votes to the Republican vote count in 1864 as well since it was a new state and so, uh, I think that's the significance; that it showed that, uh, he wasn't, uh, as opposed to secession as, as you'd think, as long as it served his, his political ends and also by the way in 1848 in a speech on, um, the Mexican War, uh, Abraham Lincoln, uh, clearly advocated the right of secession, uh, in a, in a speech in 1848, so he's on record as, uh, as saying that people do have a right of secession in, in some instances but when it, uh, didn't fit his political purposes he was dead set against it.

Other Speaker: Pause a second.

Speaker 1: Okay.

Other Speaker: Um –

DiLorenzo: Okay. If, if you're wondering why Robert Byrd is a senator, the senator from West Virginia, why West Virginia is a state, um, there were, there were Union sympathizers in West Virginia, as there were in eastern Tennessee and other parts of the South. Not huge numbers, but there were. There were also slaves and slave-owners in, in West, what we now call West Virginia and, uh, the Lincoln administration, uh, essentially carved out this new state out of northern Virginia without the, uh, consent of the Virginia legislature, as would have been required by the Constitution, because there were some unionists there who they could, uh, depend on, uh, supporting the union army and so they carved out, uh, the state of West Virginia,
although it wasn't unanimous by any, uh, by any stretch of the imagination. There were quite a few men from West, West Virginia, what we call today West Virginia, who fought in the Confederate Army but, uh, and, and the, and Maryland, for that matter. Maryland was about 50-50 in terms of the amount of men, uh, men who fought on the North versus the South, uh, but then, uh, it was orchestrated by the Lincoln administration. They created a new state, um, gave 'em a couple of, uh, additional electoral votes in the 1864 election and they ran the government from, uh, from Alexandria, Virginia, uh, as essentially a puppet government run by the Republican party and, uh, uh, that's, that's how West Virginia became a state.

Speaker 1: Okay. That's ****. Uh, discuss the suspension of constitutional liberty under the Lincoln administration.

DiLorenzo: Well, uh, historians for, for generations have used the word dictator to describe Lincoln as president but they call, they usually call him a benevolent dictator. Um, there's a, a famous historian named Clinton Rossiter who –

Other Speaker: Hold just a second.

DiLorenzo: Okay.

Other Speaker: ****.

DiLorenzo: Okay, well generations of historians have used the word dictator to describe Lincoln. Uh, for example Clinton Rossiter who, uh, was a distinguished historian at Cornell University for many, many years wrote a whole book called Constitutional Dictatorship and devoted a whole chapter to the Lincoln presidency and, uh, the reason they used the work dictatorship is that, uh, when, as soon as he took office he, uh, launched a military invasion without the consent of Congress. Congress eventually got involved but he, he, he spent money on a military invasion without the consent of Congress and, uh, he, he blockaded the southern ports without first declaring war, without first having Congress declare war, and most importantly, he suspended the writ of habeas corpus and that's our basic defense against arbitrary
tyranny at the hands of the state. It's what gives us due process. It what gives, it's what gives us a right to confront our accusers if the state accuses us of a crime, but with the suspension of habeas corpus, uh, the military went around, uh, during the entire Lincoln administration, uh, arresting political opponents, tens of thousands of them, uh, and putting them in military prison with no charges, no warrants, uh, no due process of any kind whatsoever and, uh, the number of, uh, political opponents put in jail, uh, that most historians seem to write about is around 13,000, but I've run across a Columbia Law Review article that says it was closer to 30 or 40,000 people and this included, uh, newspaper editors. Uh, Lincoln shut down, uh, literally hundreds of newspapers were shut down, uh, according to, uh, James Randall, is another distinguished scholar who wrote a book called Constitutional Problems under Lincoln. Uh, when Lincoln first took office the New York Journal of Commerce published a list of 100 newspapers in the North that were opposed to the war, uh, meaning opposed to his administration. He ordered, uh, Lincoln ordered the, uh, postmaster general to, uh, cease mail delivery of all 100 papers and this is how newspapers were delivered at the time. So it essentially shut down the papers. Some of the papers hired, uh, couriers to deliver the papers, paper boys. Uh, Lincoln then ordered the military to destroy the newspapers and so the press was censored, uh, the telegraphs were censored, and the most outspoken Democrat in Congress was Congressman Clement Vallandigham from Ohio. He was the mouth, most outspoken and so in, in April of 1863, 47 armed federal troops broke down the door to Congressman Vallandigham's home in Dayton, Ohio and dragged him out of his home and put him in military prison and deported him, and he was deported, uh, eventually he went into exile in, uh, Canada and the Ohio Democratic party made him their gubernatorial nominee even though he was in exile in Canada, and he had made stirring speeches in the House of Representatives against this tyranny, against the arbitrary arrest of, uh, political dissenters, uh, um. We're sitting here in Baltimore. Uh, the grandson of Francis Scott Key [Francis Key Howard] was a, was a newspaper editor in Baltimore who had editorialized against the suspension of the writ of habeas corpus. He, too, was thrown in prison in Fort McHenry of all places, uh, near where his grandfather wrote “The Star-Spangled Banner.” Uh, the mayor of Baltimore [George William Brown] was imprisoned, Congressman Henry May from Baltimore. About 20 members of the Maryland legislature were put in prison, uh, by the Lincoln administration and, uh, and so he essentially trashed the Constitution, discarded it. Uh, there were, uh, confiscation acts that allowed the government to confiscate
private property of anyone who, who did such things as, uh, I can remember the exact words, “exult the motives of the traitors.” So if you even said in public that there might've been a right of secession, a legal right of secession, which was a debatable issue at the time, you could have your private property confiscated by the U.S. government, or even, a part of that law even says if you exaggerate the success of the enemy in battle you could have your private property confiscated, and a part of this confiscation act that Abraham Lincoln signed, which applied to the North and the South said that if, if an informant informs on somebody that they said one of these things and there's due process and you're found guilty, then the informant got to keep 50 percent of your private property. So they gave the incentive on people to snitch or make up stories about their enemies, their personal enemies, uh, so they could take their property from 'em. It was a, a truly rotten thing, but that's why Clinton Rossiter, James Randall and others have, uh, used the word “dictator” to describe Abraham Lincoln and, uh, some of the historians though will tell you that he had to destroy the Constitution in order to save it, which, uh, has never made any sense to me, but that's what you read in the, in some of the history books.

Speaker 1: It almost feels like there's a little bit of pre-McCarthyism going on.

DiLorenzo: Oh it was much worse. Mc, McCarthy was just a blowhard. He talked a lot. He didn't really do near to the, I mean they put people in jail for years. Some, some of these people were in jail for years. I don't think McCarthy actually put people in jail like that, imprisoned people. He just, he, he just, uh, committed some libel, I think, for, for the most part.

Speaker 1: Um, discuss, please, Lincoln's war actions in light of the Declaration of Independence, which were a direct response to the actions of King George III.

DiLorenzo: Um, well, in one of the things I do in my book is, um, uh, I look at this whole issue that, uh, some historians claim that Lincoln was a champion of the Declaration of Independence because in the Gettysburg address he mentions the part about all men are created equal and, um, doesn't, didn't mention women by the way. Of course, they didn't get to vote even until 1920, long after; the Republican party wasn't too concerned about that, apparently, at the time, but, um, it seems to me if you look at the Declaration of Independence closely,
especially the part, uh, where Jefferson wrote the train of abuses against King George III, and if you study history, then I think you have to come to the conclusion that the things that went on during the Lincoln administration in the North, uh, were every bit as bad, if not worse, than what King George did. Uh, Jefferson accused King George of, uh, of, uh, disrupting our courts and our legal system. Lincoln suspended habeas corpus. Uh, he accused King George of ravaging our coasts and burning our towns. Lincoln had a naval blockade of the southern ports and literally did burn towns to the ground, the bombing of Atlanta, that most Americans have seen if they've seen the movie *Gone with the Wind*. Uh, 90 percent of the buildings in Atlanta were destroyed and there was no Confederate Army there. The Confederate Army had left. It was bombing a town with civilians in it. Um, Meridian, Mississippi, in 1860, '63, Sherman was there, General Sherman, and after the Confederate Army had left, in Sherman's memoirs there's a letter to Grant where he said after the Confederate Army left, for 4 days 10,000 soldiers with axes, crowbars and matches laid waste to Meridian, Mississippi, and he actually said Meridian no longer exists. And so, uh, if, if King George III had been setting fires or his troops had been setting fires in American cities and Jefferson was complaining about that, it was orders of magnitude worse with Lincoln's army going through the southern states, uh, burning entire cities to the ground. Columbia, South Carolina, uh, once again, only civilians at the end of the war, was burned to the ground. Uh, most of the city was, was burned down and private property. Sherman boasted that, uh, that, uh, that his army destroyed $100 million worth of private property and back in 1864 that was a lotta property, and then they stole $20 million worth. That's by Sherman's own admission, carried it home. Jewelry, dresses, furniture, uh, clothing, all sorts of private property, and then of course, um, you had, um, General Philip Sheridan in 1864 was ordered to turn the Shenandoah Valley into a desert essentially and once again the Confederate Army had finally been kicked out of the Shenandoah Valley, so Sherman and, uh, tens of thou, not Sherman, Sheridan and tens of thousands of troops went through the Valley and burned, uh, pretty much every home, every business, every farm. Uh, they, they either killed all the livestock or took it with them. Sometimes they would take all the horses and cows they could find and they would find that it slowed them down too much so they would just kill them all en masse and so if you look at this train of abuses in the Declaration of Independence against King George and then study history and see what happened during the Lincoln administration, I think it's orders of
magnitude worse, and so that's why I believe, uh, it's, uh, quite a stretch to say that Lincoln was a champion of the principles of the Declaration of Independence. Uh, the people who say that never look at the train of abuses or the part about “consent of the governed.” Uh, they look only at the “all men are created equal,” uh, part and, by the way, Lincoln didn't, himself didn't believe all men are created equal. He stated on numerous occasions. He even used the words superior and, and inferior to describe what he thought were the appropriate relations between the white and black races. He was against intermarriage of, of the races, so you could hardly say he believed in equality at all as far as that goes.

Speaker 1: Discuss the Union war tactics please in light of the 18 –

Other Speaker: I think we just did that.

Speaker 1: Oh we did?

DiLorenzo: Yeah. I kind of –

Speaker 1: ****.

DiLorenzo: – yeah, I kind of got into that, uh.

Speaker 1: Uh, **** okay.

DiLorenzo: Waging war on civilians.

Speaker 1: Uh, let me see. Let me see what ****. How did the Confederate constitution, uh, defend against what it perceived to be federal tyranny?

DiLorenzo: Well, the Confederate Constitution, Jefferson Davis's Constitution, was almost identical to the U.S. Constitution. Uh, even you know, word for word, most of it is identical to the U.S. Constitution. Uh, both constitutions protected slavery. Slavery was constitutional in, in
the U.S. Constitution in 1861. It was constitutional in the Confederate Constitution. The big difference was the Confederate Constitution allowed each individual state to decide on its own if it wanted to end slavery. Uh, that was not true of the U.S. Constitution, so, uh, you know irony of ironies, the Confederate Constitution was actually, uh, uh, less protective of slavery than the U.S. Constitution was in 1861, anyway, and apart from that, um, the Confederate constitution, uh, allowed for one 6-year term for president, so there were term limits. Um, uh, members, a president could be, uh, impeached by Congress or, uh, citizens or a popular referendum. It outlawed protectionist tariffs. Constitutional, the, uh, Confederate Constitution outlawed the spending of tax money on corporations for anything other than, uh, dredging harbors, which was a very minor thing. They, they knew they had to, they would eventually need to spend some money to dredge harbors, but they made it unconstitutional to give money to railroad corporations and things like that, but, of course, that was what Lincoln and the Republicans championed. They began subsidizing the transcontinental railroads as soon as they took office, uh, and, and there and so, so the big difference between the Confederate Constitution and the U.S. Constitution is the Confederate Constitution was more restrictive of the central government and gave more latitude to the citizens of the states in controlling their government and it term-limited the president to one 6-year term explicitly. Both constitutions allowed for slavery at the time, and also, uh, I guess another big thing is there was no general welfare clause in the U, in the Confederate Constitution, and that's been the source of a great deal of mischief because a lot of government programs that are not in the Constitution, politicians have made arguments over the years that well it's in the general welfare to, uh, subsidize railroad corporations or maybe to subsidize college professors like me. It's in the general welfare, and there have been a lot of clever legal arguments made for this and that government program because of this general welfare clause, but the Confederates were wise enough to know that there would be a lot of mischief because of that clause and there had already been a lot of mischief done, uh, because of that so they left that out of their constitution, and so it was more conducive to smaller government than the U.S. Constitution was.

Other Speaker: Change the tape.

Speaker 1: Okay.
DiLorenzo: Yeah.

PART 3
Speaker 1: Jefferson Davis was imprisoned by the Federal government for several years after the war.

DiLorenzo: Mm hmm.

Speaker 1: What exactly was he charged and why wasn't he ever brought to trial?

DiLorenzo: Uh, well, he was never charged. Uh, there was a lot of talk about treason, but he was never brought to trial.

Other Speaker: Can you, can you start that question?

Speaker 1: Oh okay.

Other Speaker: Uh, the answer over with Jefferson Davis was never charged.

DiLorenzo: Oh okay.

Other Speaker: Thank you.

DiLorenzo: Okay. Well, Jeff, Jefferson Davis was never charged. Um, there was a lot of talk about treason and, and the government was threatening to charge him with treason and put him on trial for that, but it never came into being, uh, for a number of reasons. Uh, well one reason is a, uh, a very prominent lawyer from New York City named Charles O'Conor, uh, volunteered to represent him. The trial would have taken place in Virginia because the government of, of the Confederacy was in Richmond, and it's unlikely that the, the Federal government would have had a friendly jury if they picked the jury in the, the proper way and, uh, and also there was a
long history of the belief in the right of secession, including the fact that the New England Federalists, after Jefferson was elected, spent a decade, uh, plotting to secede. Um, they, they'd even, they even had talked for awhile that there was a constitutional right of secession. At West Point there was a man named William Rawle who was a, a, uh, protégé of George Washington's and a famous Pennsylvania abolitionist who wrote a book called *A View of the Constitution* that was used for awhile at West Point, and that was even, even taught that there was a constitutional right of secession there and so, uh, proving that secession was treason would have been a very tall order indeed for, for the government and so they, they didn't, they didn't do it. They didn't put him on trial and I think, uh, they knew that they, they had just waged a war to destroy the right of secession and they were not about to reverse their victory by, uh, by losing in a court of law because world opinion would have been, uh, would have been in favor of the South had Jefferson Davis won the, won the trial and so it was, uh, probably potentially the, the most famous trial in history, even more famous than the OJ trial, that never happened and that, it never took place.

Speaker 1: In *The Rise and Fall of the Confederate Government*, written after the war, Davis makes his case for the legality of secession.

DiLorenzo: Right.

Speaker 1: Oh we've already asked **** 1860. You already answered that.

DiLorenzo: That's right. Yeah.

Speaker 1: Um –

DiLorenzo: Yeah, I could've, yeah. I answered that -

Speaker 1: - yep.

DiLorenzo: - in, in my answer to the previous question.
Speaker 1: I didn't, I didn't see that part. Uh, ****. Let me read these and see so I don't waste any time.

DiLorenzo: Okay, well, after Jefferson Davis got out of prison [1867], uh, in the years after that, he wrote The Rise and Fall of the Confederate Government [1881] and, uh, there's, there's 100 pages or so in there on the whole issue of secession, uh, which I look at it as, uh, what would have been his legal defense had he ever gone to trial to defend, to defend himself against treason, secession as treason. And so if you read that 100 pages or so, I think that essentially would have been his case, and he mentions all the things that I've been talking about; about how, uh, the, the New Englanders, uh, when they thought it was in their self-interest to be in favor of secession, they were all for it, but then by 1860 they seemed to be, uh, turned against it because it was not in their political self-interest anymore to be, to be for it, and, uh, so it's all in there in his book, The Rise and Fall.

Speaker 1: ****.

Other Speaker: That's all right.

Speaker 1: Is there anything else to add about, uh, the differences of the U.S. Constitution from the Confederate, or have you pretty much –

Other Speaker: No, I think we got that.

Speaker 1: - exhausted that?

DiLorenzo: Uh, I think I, I think we've covered that pretty well.

Speaker 1: ****, um, let me go on to the next one then.

Other Speaker: Okay.
Other Speaker: ****.

Speaker 1: You answered the question about pedagogy really.

DiLorenzo: But, yeah.

Speaker 1: Uh, the standard story that most of us have been taught in school is that Davis led a government that threatened to destroy constitutional government in America whereas Lincoln is portrayed as the savior of the Constitution. Is this the true story?

DiLorenzo: Uh, no, it's not the true story, and the reason is that in war the victors always write the history. It's, it's an old saying but it's, it's true and, uh, it ignores the fact that the, uh, the U.S. Government, the, the Constitution was created, uh, by the states in political convention, and the government was created as their agent. It was a voluntary union. Uh, these same people, many of these same people had just fought a war of secession. They believed it was a right. Thomas Jefferson, Alexander Hamilton, John Quincy Adams, uh, Alexis de Tocqueville; all made statements to the effect that, uh, the union is voluntary and that it would be an abomination someday for the federal government to use force, to use military force, to keep the Union together. They all wanted the Union to thrive. They all wanted it to succeed, but that's a separate issue from, uh, from using force to make it secede, uh, succeed, and so, uh, many of the founders were, were explicit in stating that and so, uh, it was constitutional, the 10th Amendment of the Constitution, which re, retains powers to the people respectively or to the states that are not delegated to the federal government. It has to include that right of secession. That was a very important right of the American colonists when they fought their revolution and so, uh, on the other hand, Abraham Lincoln, uh, uh, recklessly discarded the Constitution when he suspended habeas corpus and spent money and waged war without first getting the consent of Congress and, uh, confiscating private property. In fact the 2nd Amendment of the Constitution, uh, that, uh, protects the right to bear arms, uh, was totally obliterated by Lincoln's war because the main reason James Madison gave for the 2nd Amendment in The Federalist Papers was, he said, an armed populace would be a deterrent to any federal government that had any plans to
invade a sovereign state and deprive the citizens of that state of their liberties. That's why we need the 2nd Amendment, James Madison said, before the Constitution was adopted. Well Lincoln's invasion, uh, uh, proved him wrong, I guess, that, uh, there was an armed populace, but it wasn't armed heavily enough, uh, apparently to withstand an invasion because the federal government had become st, strong enough at that point to, to succeed. In fact I think, uh, what really happened during this war is that the federal government, as soon as it became strong enough to essentially destroy the voluntary Union, it did. It did it, and it made it a coerced union. Twenty years earlier, it didn't have quite the power, but it did it by 1861, and so it used that power to destroy the voluntary union, which is how the Constitution was, was put together in the first place. So I think the standard hist, history has it backwards. I think that, uh, it was the Confederates who were, who were, trying to stick to the Con, the original Constitution of the Founding Fathers which created a voluntary union. That's why when they seceded, they meticulously followed the procedures, the exact same procedures that were followed in adopting the Constitution. They followed those procedures in withdrawing from the Constitution, political conventions, and popular votes. Uh, the Lincoln administration on, on the other hand, uh, was an enemy of the voluntary union and destroyed the voluntary union.

Other Speaker: Just a, a quick follow-up on this question; why is the popular opinion what it is of Lincoln?

DiLorenzo: Uh, why is the ****, uh.

Speaker 1: Why is he so venerated today?

DiLorenzo: Uh, well, uh, uh, historically, I think, uh, David Donald, who is one of my favorite, uh, Lincoln historians, is, uh, wrote the Pulitzer, a Pulitzer Prize-winning biography of Lincoln, uh, noted in one of his books that Lincoln was wildly unpopular in his own time. So at the time of his death he was wildly unpopular among the North as well as, especially of the South, of course but, uh, but after that it mostly northern clergy that began deifying Abraham Lincoln after he was assassinated, and in those days the clergy was extraordinarily, uh, influential in terms of, uh, spreading the word, communicating to the public, telling the public
what to think. Uh, they were the, uh, you know the talk radio, uh, talking heads of their day, I 
guess, before there was such a thing as radio, and so that's where it all started, and I think 
something else that's, uh, that is, is even more influential is that after the War Between the States 
we had more and more federal, uh, control over the educational system in America and more and 
more government control and, after all, the government is not gonna, uh, present very many 
unflattering facts about itself to the public. Uh, government power ultimately rests on a long 
series of myths about the benevolence and of, of the states of government, and so it shouldn't be 
a surprise to anybody that, uh, that the use of power, like the killing of 620,000 people, the total 
destruction of entire southern cities, has all been written up in the history books, uh, in a very 
antiseptic way and, and, and that, that the leader of all this has been made out to be a saint. Um, 
it's, what would you expect the government schools to say about, about this? So I think, uh, 
government control of education is, uh, is the main reason why we, uh, Abraham Lincoln has 
gone down as such a saint in, in American history.

Speaker 1: Actually, by the same token what, what is your opinion, uh, as to why Davis has 
been demonized so?

DiLorenzo: Oh, for the same reason. Uh, it's, uh, uh, the standard story is that Lincoln saved 
the Union and freed the slaves. Jefferson Davis supposedly wanted to destroy the Union and, 
and keep slavery. Uh, that's sort of the crude version of, of events that has been told for decades 
and, and decades and, uh, and I think Southern slavery, uh, was on its way out for economic 
reasons anyway. Slavery, uh, is inherently less efficient than free labor. If you're a slave, you 
don't have much incentive to educate yourself, develop skills because you can't benefit from it 
and especially with the advent of capitalism. Uh, cotton-picking machinery would have made 
slavery pretty much defunct, uh, in the South because of the capital; machinery is much more 
effective. It was like the, uh, the trac, using tractors to plow fields instead of digging it by hand. 
It would have, why would anyone dig a field by hand if, if they had a tractor? Uh, why would 
anyone pick cotton by hand if they had a, a machine that could pick cotton? And so as soon as 
that came along it, it would have been uneconomical as, as well as immoral, and slavery would 
have ended and we, and Americans tend to lose complete sight of this and, uh, and, and also 
complete sight of the awesome nature of the, the death toll of, of the Civil War, um, and that's
one of the reasons why these myths persist I, I think but if you sit and think about it for a minute, 620,000 deaths and that's when the population of the country was about 30 million. If you were to, uh, compare that to today, where the population of the country is about 280 million, that would be, uh, what, roughly the equivalent of about 5½ million American deaths in four years or 100 times the number of Americans who died in Vietnam, and so if you look at it that way, um, you would question whether or not Lincoln really needed to do what he did, especially in light of the fact that all the other countries on the earth ended slavery peacefully. Uh, was it really worth it to kill all those people and to destroy all that wealth? Several years of accumulated wealth in the country, North and South, was destroyed during the war, which would never be made up, never be compensated for. We'll never benefit from the hundreds of thousands and millions of offspring of all those dead men in the war. Who knows how many of Einsteins, uh, would have been among that group, uh, and these are things that you can't calculate in any way, and so, um, I think that these were things that most Americans have never thought of. It's my impression and that's one of the reasons why, uh, the, the standard myths are as they are.

Other Speaker: ****.

Speaker 1: ****.

Other Speaker: Uh, actually we ****.

DiLorenzo: Yeah. I want to wait for her to ans, ask it. Um, well as far as differences in a waging of war, um; I've already mentioned this, but it was very clearly, uh, the policy of the Lincoln administration to wage war on civilians. Uh, when, when, uh, Randolph, Tennessee, was burned to the ground in 1862 by General Sherman, he was not reprimanded for that. He was promoted eventually. Uh, when Meridian, Mississippi, was totally destroyed by Sherman, again in 1863, he was not chastised, uh, uh, by, for that. He was not demoted for that. He was, he became more and more powerful and so, and on and on, and so southern cities and southern civilians were fair game and so the way in which the war was waged was not just against combatants. It was against the whole southern society and the whole culture, uh, there whereas, uh, the way Jefferson Davis waged the war, is there were some, uh, attacks on civilian
targets, um, uh, General Jubal Early burned some houses and some warehouses in Chambersburg, Pennsylvania, in retaliation for some of the attacks on, uh, private property and private homes in, in Virginia, but that was minor, uh, uh, it was burning down warehouses. Uh, he robbed a few banks, uh, but, but then Jubal Early was eventually stripped of his command in 1864 also and so, uh, uh, and war wasn't waged. Uh, Stonewall Jackson could well have gone into Philadelphia and bombed Philadelphia or Washington, D.C., for that matter, but he didn't, uh, and, uh, and when Robert E. Lee went into Pennsylvania during the battle of Gettysburg they didn't destroy everything in their path like, like the, uh, Federal Army did when it went through the South. Um, Davis, um, was a West Point graduate. He was a former secretary of war. He was a war veteran, Mexican War, and, uh, all of the, all of the military men of that era were trained in the Napoleonic tactics, and what that meant basically was organizing these large charges, uh, several divisions deep, uh, uh, running into attack, uh, an entrenched position and, uh, more often than not and so in terms of Davis' way of waging war he, uh, didn't devote many resources at all to, uh, guerrilla tactics, even though Robert E. Lee after the war said that his most effective military commander was Nathan Bedford Forrest, who was essentially a guerrilla fighter in, uh, Tennessee and Mississippi and around there and, uh, he was never given a full command of a whole division of the army because he was so unconventional in, in his methods. Uh, John Singleton Mosby, the famous guerrilla fighter from northern Virginia, uh, was very successful also and, uh, and he, and, and a lot of historians have speculated that had they done more of that rather than these Napoleonic charges, where tens of thousands of people would be shot and maimed and wounded and killed in, in one day, uh, then things might have turned out differently but that's, he stuck to that. He stuck to his commanders who were trained at West Point in, in those tactics, and that's what I have to say about that.

Speaker 1: Uh, states, states' rights.

DiLorenzo: Right.

Speaker 1: Many historians believe, however, that the notion that the war was fought over states' rights is part of the so-called Lost Cause myth, that is, it was invented after the war, uh, by
former Confederates to justify their actions. Is this accurate or is the Lost Cause, uh, is the Lost Cause myth a myth?

DiLorenzo: Um, yeah. I think that's a good way to put it. The myth of the Lost Cause is a myth that, uh, and, and the lost cause story is just as you said it is, there have been a number of books and articles written about how supposedly, uh, after the war, history was rewritten to say that the war was about states' rights and another part of it is about the gallantry of the southern soldiers. Uh, um, the myth of the Lost Cause is that they weren't as gallant as some historians have made them out to, be but, but when, when you look at American history, Thomas Jefferson was really essentially the inventor of, of the doctrine of states' rights. In 1798 he authored something called the "Kentucky Resolve of 1798" [Kentucky Resolves or Resolutions] and this was after John Adams, the John Adams administration, uh, had passed the, uh, Alien and Sedition Acts, which made it illegal essentially to criticize the government and only members of the opposition party were ever prosecuted under the, uh, the Alien and Sedition Acts. So it was clearly a tool used by the Federalists to, to shut up, quiet, to, to, uh, censor the political opposition and, uh, Jefferson made the, it was a great statement that, uh, uh, about how the Constitution is a compact where there is no common judge, and when you have no common judge then each side of the compact has an equal right to judge for itself what's constitutional and what's not and, therefore, we, uh, we refuse to abide by things such as the Alien and Sedition Acts, which are unconstitutional. That was the origins, uh, part of the origins of the notion of states' rights and of course there, there was the understanding that the states were sovereign. All of the Founders understood that the states, states were sovereign, and so when the, when we say the war was fought over states' rights, it really was. If you look at, uh, Lincoln's reason for the war, he made a public statement giving the reason for the war in 1861, again in 1862, as did Congress. They said it's not about slavery. It's about saving the Union, and, and, and destroying the secession movement, but the thing is, if the states are sovereign, then they have a right to withdraw. If they're not sovereign, then they don't have that right, and so states' rights simply means the states are sovereign. They created the federal government as their agent. If they didn't do that, then they don't have that right. I believe all of history is on the side that they were sovereign. They did create the federal government. They did create the Constitution and political conventions and so, therefore, uh, that's what they were fighting over. They were
fighting over, over their vision of our form of government as a voluntary union. Lincoln's vision was no, the union is coerced and I think that the Founding Fathers, if they had thought in 1787 that if a state ever wanted to withdraw from the compact, from the, from the Constitution that the president of the United States would have a right to invade their state and kill 1 out of every 4 men of military age, burn down their cities, and steal their private property, there's no way James Madison would have signed off on the United States Constitution, if that was his understanding. But that was Lincoln's understanding. That's what Lincoln said, uh, was the, the founding, the understanding of the founding and I think it's baloney and so, uh, it certainly was over states' rights. Abraham Lincoln said it was. He said it was about destroying, destroying states', states' rights, but the language he used was saving the Union. That sounds much nicer, saving the Union but that's just a euphemism for destroying States' rights.

Speaker 1: ****

DiLorenzo: Already ill, illegal. So what is the question, uh?

Speaker 1: So then, uh, regardless of the importance of states' rights –

DiLorenzo: Mm hmm, yeah.

Speaker 1: - um, as a cause of the war, the fact is the states' rights were all destroyed by the war and that political powers were then consolidated, uh, in Washington, D.C., ever since, that this was a revolutionary change in the American form of government?

DiLorenzo: Yes. It was, it was a revolution, uh, for sure. It overthrew the voluntary union of the Founding Fathers. It consolidated power in Washington, D.C., and, in, uh, my view that's what Lincoln and the wigs and the Republicans always wanted to do and, uh, uh, it put the federal judiciary in charge as the sole arbiter of constitutionality. Uh, Woodrow Wilson, President Woodrow Wilson, who was a, uh, a college professor at Princeton before he became president, wrote a book called, um, Constitutional Government, I believe is the title, in 1908 and in that book he said, uh, the, the, uh, Civil War created the situation of where the Supreme Court
is the final decision maker with regard to what is constitutional and what is not. Now, prior to that, uh, from the time of Jefferson on, uh, there were various statesmen such as Senator John Taylor [of Caroline] of Virginia, St. George Tucker. who was a legal scholar at William and Mary. who was, uh, the, uh, uh, stepfather of John Randolph [of Roanoke], um, he said that if the day ever comes when the federal government gets to determine the limits of its own powers, then before too long it will decide that there are no limits to its powers, and that of course wasn't the purpose of the Founders. The, the whole purpose of the Constitution is to limit the power of the government but it's the fox guarding the henhouse and the Founding Fathers understood this. The Jeffersonians understood this, uh, but that was all changed, that was destroyed. That's why today we have federal judges who can order people of the states around to do almost anything. You can't show the Ten Commandments in Alabama. You can't, uh, you can't pass your own community ordinances if, if some federal judge somewhere disagrees with it. It wasn't always like that, um, and, uh, I think it's important to understand that when a Founding Father has put together a system of government, uh, and talked about citizen sovereignty, the way in which citizens were supposed to be sovereign over their own government was through their political organizations at the state level. That's how we were supposed to get together collectively and politically, and, and, uh, control our government and be the masters rather than the servants of our own government, but once you destroy that and once you destroy states' rights, I think you also destroy citizen sovereignty over their own governments, not the state or the politicians necessarily. It's the citizens who are supposedly sovereign over their own government. That was destroyed. That's why I think it's not a stretch to say that ever since 1865 the American citizens were really not genuinely sovereign over their own government. They became more and more of the slaves rather than the masters, or the servants rather than the masters of, of the government especially with the adopted, the adoption of the income tax and military conscription and other interventions like that.

Speaker 1: Why didn't any world government recognize the Confederacy as a legitimate nation?

DiLorenzo: Uh, I think a number of governments were about to but, um, uh, the Emancipation Proclamation was Lincoln's ace in the hole in terms of propaganda and, and public relations, uh,
because by associating slavery with the cause of the war it caused the European powers to back off and, and not, uh, recognize, uh, the Confederate government. Although at the same time, there's a, there's a book by, um, Sheldon Vanauken called *The Glittering Illusion* and the illusion that he writes about is, is it's about British opinion toward the War Between the States and he documents how the big majority of, uh, uh, opinion-makers in England were on the side of Jefferson Davis and the South because they thought it was essentially a war of secession against the tyrannical federal government. They didn't see it was a war for slavery. Charles Dickens, uh, was one of these people; Lord Acton, uh, was one of these people and, uh, the illusion is that, uh, they were of the belief that the military commanders of the South like Robert E. Lee were so superior to the bumbling fools like General Hooker that they thought they didn't need to intervene. They didn't even need to recognize the Confederacy; that they would win. Why take the political risk in siding with one side when it looks as though the side you want to win is going to win anyway? And that's, that's the thesis of this book, *The Glittering Illusion*, but then in the last, uh, year or two of the war it all changed of course and, uh, it didn't work out that way, and so it's kind of an interesting question of why they didn't recognize them and I think it's probably the combination of they didn't think they needed to take the political risk to do that and then also, uh, uh, Lincoln's, uh, very smart strategy of announcing that emancipation all of the sudden was a cause, cause of the war, and so it forced them to back off and, uh, and not, uh, be associated with the, with such a thing.

Other Speaker: I think we've got one last –

Speaker 1: I think that's it. Uh, ****.

Other Speaker: - I don't ****. That's it.

Speaker 1: That's it.

Other Speaker: Yeah.

Speaker 1: ****.
DiLorenzo: ****, oh is that it?

Speaker 1: I, I don't ****.

Other Speaker: We're gonna ask you one more question.

Speaker 1: One, one more question.

DiLorenzo: Okay.

Speaker 1: Do you need a glass of water?

DiLorenzo: No, I'm fine.

Speaker 1: No water? Okay. What do you think the country would be like today had Jefferson Davis prevailed and the South had won the war?

DiLorenzo: Well I think slavery would certainly have ended, uh, for economic reasons. Uh, the Industrial Revolution was gaining steam and the development of capitalism would have made slavery, uh, economically defunct and, and, uh, just not, not rational and it could have been helped out had, had there been some, uh, alternative statesmen, alternative to Lincoln, for example who wanted to end the Fugitive Slave Act. Lincoln supported the Fugitive Slave Act and what that did was subsidized the slave system. It forced northerners to hunt down runaway slaves and return them to their owners at, at their expense, at their tax expense, and that's why the Underground Railroad ended up in Canada. If you were a, a runaway slave, you did not want to end up in New Jersey or Pennsylvania because there were people there who were being paid to, to, uh, run you, to hunt you down and return you to slavery and so, uh, that, slavery would have ended and, and I think it could have been ended quickly within five to ten years. The British took six years, uh; the British Empire took six years to phase out slavery. That's one thing that would have happened and if, had slavery ended that way, uh, there of course, there never would
have been Reconstruction. During Reconstruction for a while, uh, the, uh, southern states were kicked out of the Union because they refused to, uh, uh, vote in favor of the 14th Amendment. Uh, the reason they gave was that it was a dangerous centralization of law enforcement. It put too much law enforcement power in the hands of the federal government, which they thought was unconstitutional. They opposed it. President Andrew Johnson opposed it for that reasons, the same reason, uh, uh, initially. Uh, and so, uh, and so what would have happened was, uh, re, with Reconstruction the slaves, the ex-slaves, the male ex-slaves, were registered to vote Republican. The adult white males were disenfranchised for awhile during Reconstruction and so the Republican party ran the South. They raised taxes; property taxes in South Carolina in 1870 were 30 times higher than they were in 1860. They did this so that they could, uh, buy up land in the South at fire sale prices and essentially plunder the South for 12 years after the war. None of that would have happened. Southerners reacted to this with the Ku Klux Klan, the Jim Crow Laws, and the, the Ku Klux Klan was created originally to intimidate the ex-slaves out of voting, voting for all these tax increases and debt increases. They were putting burdens on the rest of the, rest of the population. That's what created the Ku Klux Klan and so we never would have seen that. That wouldn't have been a, a, never heard of it. Uh, Jim Crow Laws; they might have existed because they did exist in the North before the war. We might've had some, but I don't think they would have been as vicious as they would have been because there would have been no need to intimidate the, the black voters because I think black people would have integrated economically into the society quicker and once they integrate economically they would have integrated socially quicker. So I think black people in America would have achieved justice sooner than they actually did, uh, as well as freedom, had we ended slavery peacefully in some way and I think that's what would've happened if, if the South had prevailed, slavery would have ended, but it would have ended in a peaceful way, and I think the Union would have been eventually been reunited because I think, uh, I think, uh, the, the federal government became more aggressive. Robert E. Lee in 1866 predicted that, the, the centralized or consolidated government was sure to become, in his words, despotic at home and aggressive abroad, and he was right; and I think the threat of secession was always intended to place a check on these proclivities of politicians to become imperialists and statists and, and, and to spend beyond what the Constitution calls for, to invade other countries and we did, I don't think we would have gotten into the Philippines. We have the Spanish-American War we wouldn't have gotten into
because that would have been seen as an unconstitutional, uh, usurpation of military power and you can go on forever speculating. If we hadn't of gone into, uh, the Spanish-American War there's a good chance that we would also not have gotten involved in World War I, and if we hadn't gotten involved in World War I and let the European powers have settled the thing themselves, I think you can make a case that there may not have been a World War II. It was our punishment of, of, uh, the Germans in World War I and the Versailles Treaty that, uh, that, uh, led to the rise of Adolf Hitler as far as that's concerned and it, it might sound like quite a stretch, but, uh, but I think if you think through what would have happened had secession were have been allowed to work in the way in which the Founding Fathers wanted it to work, as a check on the, uh, the, uh, empire-building proclivities of the central government, it would have worked. It would have done that, but instead we went in the opposite direction. We began massive subsidization of the transcontinental railroads and many other corporations as well. We had a massive protectionism and more and more military adventurism, uh, at the same time. Three months after the war was over, General Sherman was put in charge in essentially a campaign of ethnic genocide against the Plains Indians in which he ordered his men--in my book I quote him-as, as giving an order to the soldiers to not distinguish between male or female or even as to age whenever they were attacking an Indian village, and one of the reasons he gave for all this is to make way for the railroads, so the railroads could go through the, the Plains, the Great Plains. And so, uh, if you read about the Indian wars, it was mass killing of, of women and children included in the Indians, and by 1890 they were all either dead or put on reservations and so that, I think that also would not have happened. The federal government wouldn't have had the revenue to do that for one thing. They would have been checked and, uh, and since I mentioned railroads, um, the great James J. Hill built a transcontinental railroad called the Great Northern without a penny in government subsidies. So he proved that they didn't need government subsidies. They didn't need the army to kill off all the Indians. He paid for rights of way, uh, across Indian land, you know, to give them cattle or, or money if they wanted money, so it wasn't necessary to do this in my opinion, but the army did it.

PA Speaker 1: We left off when you're talking about the Plains Indians and the massacre and everything.
DiLorenzo: Mm hmm.

Speaker 1: Then the capitol there.

Other Speaker: ***.

DiLorenzo: Uh, uh, James J. Hill.

Other Speaker: James J. Hill ***.

DiLorenzo: Okay. Um, well James J. Hill, uh, built a railroad called the Great Northern without a dime of government subsidy, so he proved that subsidies weren't needed. And he built his railroad better and faster than the government-subsidized transcontinental railroads. In fact, the transcontinental railroads that were subsidized by government, beginning with Lincoln's administration, were so corrupt and so inefficient that when they finally finished the first one in 1869 both of the companies that had been formed to build the transcontinental railroad were bankrupt in 1869. And so, uh, the whole Indian War, if you read, uh, Sherman's biographies, he said it was, the main reason was to make way for the railroads. He said we're not gonna let a few ragged thieving Indians stand in the way of the railroads, and so, uh, it essentially was a campaign of ethnic genocide against the Plains Indians. And, uh, one of the deep ironies, again there, is that there's even been a movie made about some ex-slaves who joined the United States Army after the war and became what they called “buffalo soldiers.” And what these buffalo soldiers were, were, uh, soldiers in Sherman's army out west to eradicate the Indians. And they, they killed off buffalos by the, by the hundreds of thousands, uh, not just for recreation, but they were the main source of food for the Plains Indians. So it was all part of the strategy to kill off the Plains Indians, to kill off the American buffalo. And so the American buffalo didn't just go almost extinct, uh, because there were a lot of happy hunters out west. It was a part of our military policy to starve out the Indians. And that contributed, uh, greatly to why the buffalo herd almost became extinct in, in North America.
Speaker 1: I guess one last kind of summation question and that is what should the modern American think?

DiLorenzo: Well, I think, uh, Americans obviously think that the War Between the States, even to this day they think, it was, uh, probably the most important event in all of American history. That's why there's so much fascination over it. Uh, popular movies are still being made about it. If you go to any bookstore, any major bookstore, they all have huge sections of Civil War books and biographies of generals and leaders in the Civil War and diaries of Civil War soldiers and women during the Civil War. It's a big business. There's Civil War magazines, uh, that are very popular. And, uh, and so I think Americans need to educate themselves, but, um, and don't rely on the government schools because the government schools tell mostly one side of the story. Uh, read some history. Read the mainstream biographers of, uh, of Lincoln that are very worshipful. But look for other literature, too, like, uh, like I said I promote my own book, The Real Lincoln. Read, uh, read Charles Adams, When in the Course of Human Events. Read Emancipating Slaves, Enslaving Free Men by Jeffrey Rogers Hummel. And, uh, and just in general educate yourself about American history. Read about the founding documents. Educate yourself about how the Constitution was formed as a system of states' rights and a voluntary union. Uh, don't rely on the filter of the government schools to tell, uh, tidbits of politically correct information. And so, uh, that's what Americans, uh, need to do who are serious about educating themselves about their own country. I don't know what else I can say without getting too longwinded.

Other Speaker: Well greatness ****.

Speaker 1: I guess go ahead –

Other Speaker: Yeah I don't ****.

DiLorenzo: Well, uh, well, um, I, I think of the Lincoln myth as the ideological cornerstone of the American state. It's what has been used to give moral authority to what the American government does. And, uh, after Lincoln's death, even though he was a wildly unpopular in his
own day, even some of the politician who were his enemies politically during his lifetime began claiming that he was their bosom buddy in reality. And because he became a martyr and they wanted to associate themselves with his cause, with his martyrdom, and so that whatever political cause they were promoting they started making the argument that Abraham Lincoln would be with me, my friend Abraham Lincoln. Teddy Roosevelt, when he was president, for example, uh, was excoriated on the floor of the United States Senate after he got our government into a military intervention in the Philippines where 10,000 American soldiers were killed and 200,000 Filipinos were killed. And senators were, were badgering him on why are we doing this asking why are we involved in this? What interest do we have in the Philippines? Why so much death? Teddy Roosevelt answered these critics in a Memorial Day speech he gave to Civil War veterans, aged Civil War veterans. And what he told them was, uh, we are in the Philippines, uh, and we're doing what we're doing in the Philippines for the good of the Philippine people, Filipino people, who wanna bring democracy there and he invoked Abraham Lincoln. He said just as Abraham Lincoln did in your time, your sons and your nephews are out there in the military now doing this. And he was essentially saying we're killing them for their own good. It's for their own good that we're killing 200,000 Filipinos. And, uh, to this day, like right now today you can, it's not hard to find political pundits and politicians invoking the mantle of Abraham Lincoln to justify whatever they're wanting to do. I don't know how many times I've read in the past year or so a line in a newspaper op-ed, where someone says like Abraham Lincoln before him, President Bush is, is, is doing this or that in the Middle East. And so it is the party of Lincoln, the Republican party. So especially the Republican party still clings to the Lincoln myth as moral justification for whatever it wants to do almost. If it wants to invade the Middle East, if Lincoln would've done it, then that's fine. Uh, you know, no opposition. If they wanna invade Korea, Abraham Lincoln would've done it, and that's fine. So they, that, that's the purpose that the whole Lincoln myth serves, is to provide moral cover for things that some of us think are immoral. And so, um, that's all I can say about that.

DiLorenzo: No that's great. Thank you.

Other Speaker: Room time, 30 seconds starting now. Okay.
[film follows of Cabin John Bridge, now known as the Union Arch, part of the Washington Aqueduct, designed in 1853, completed in 1857]