

Dedication Statement

(1863-2013)

One hundred fifty years after the signing of the Emancipation Proclamation African-American children cannot walk home without the fear of being murdered because they are Black.

We are still not free.

Justice for Trayvon Martin

Radical Abolitionists and the African Origins of the American Civil War Cause Lincoln to Free the Slaves

“...the abolitionists, climaxing their efforts with such uprisings as those of Nat Turner and John Brown, precipitated the Civil War...The work of Abraham Lincoln would have been impossible if he had not been preceded by the abolitionist. In the crisis he had to come to the position of instant abolition, for his plan was to get rid of the institution through gradual and compensated emancipation by 1900.”

Carter G. Woodson, *History Made to Order: The Negro Since Emancipation* p.103

In an article by James Illington, entitled, *Slavery and the Origin of the Civil War*, “the Pew Poll found that sixty percent of Americans under the age of thirty identified States’ Rights as a more important cause of the American Civil War than Slavery. These results are all the more disheartening when we take into account this generation’s generally progressive political leaning on other issues.” What is most disconcerting is that African-Americans were not excluded from these findings. In this regard, African-Americans are as miseducated on this most important issue as are Whites and other Americans. White Americans have chosen to ignore and forget part of their history that they as a community have found too unpleasant to remember. This selective amnesia is in part what is happening on the issue of the origin of the American Civil War. In fact, on several occasions I have spoken with veterans of the Vietnam War and on one occasion I spoke to a soldier who had lost his leg. I made the comment that losing a leg must have been excruciatingly painful. He looked me straight in the eyes and replied very matter of fact, “no, it did not hurt at all.” I was amazed. He further explained, “When your body experiences a traumatic level of pain, you pass out. So, I really do not remember the pain.” Similarly, the bloody physical revolution of Nat Turner’s Rebellion along with radical abolitionist/ Republicans courageous and physical acts of resistance, waged by Africans is the root cause of the American Civil War. The fact that enslaved Africans dared to physically rise

up against their white enslavers for freedom was so awful and unimaginable to white America's historical, cultural and psychological imaginations that they systematically suppressed this terrible reality. According to Dr. Bruce Chadwick, author of The Reel Civil War: Mythmaking in American Film "it seemed that to realize reunification, the Civil War's political and cultural history almost had to be rewritten so that the Southerners would never again be seen as harsh slave owners or as the people who started—and lost—the war." (10) College professors in the South who criticized enslaving Africans lost their jobs and were driven out of town. As one chemistry professor was at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill when he spoke positively of the presidential campaign of General John C. Fremont students burned him in effigy, he was terminated as a result of his positive comments. The youth were strongly encouraged not to study in the North for fear they would become radical abolitionists. Schools of higher learning were constructed to keep Southerners isolated and protected from foreign Northern ideology. Thomas Jefferson used this as one of the motivating factors in the construction of the University of Virginia. (Wills 307) The creative community including playwrights, poets, novelists and writers set about creating a mythological South of morals and ethics, an ignoble society that fought for state's rights and for the protection of their women, children, and property, which only incidentally included ownership of the Africans. This rewriting was a fabrication of history but it was perceived as an absolutely necessary revision in order to establish peace between the warring states. In this regard it can be considered an ignoble lie. The true story of the Civil War was submerged, and only partially remembered as it was being reconstructed to fit the perceived needs of a nation over several generations. By 1903 the ignoble lie that was the reconstructed myth of the bloody Civil War which had been led by radical abolitionists and Republicans reached the silver screen in America and it was received by

the public as true history. As Teddy Roosevelt once commented it was “history written in lightning.” “But the myth had a high price. The only way mythmakers could wash away the bitterness between North and South and bring about reunification was to erase the fundamental cause of the war and all its death and destruction—slavery. The historical writings and popular culture of the late nineteenth century began the erasure, but it was the all-powerful film medium that, in thousands of darkened movie houses across the Republic, most effectively absolved the South of any blame for slavery...the movie’s complete denial of dignity to African Americans, the former slaves—whether at the turn of the century in the crude “Rastus” and “Sambo” films about contemporary blacks or in the Civil War dramas showing slaves before, during and after the war. Stripped of humanity on the screen, they became stripped of it in real life.” (Chadwick 14)

“First, early battles like Bull Run and Wilson’s Creek dispelled delusions about a short and easy war. One shaken survivor of Bull Run testified to the impact that combat could have when he lamented to his fiancée, “O Emily you can imagine nothing about the horrors of war. I have read about it but knew nothing what it was until I experienced it.” As soldiers came to grips with the likelihood of a long and difficult struggle, they also looked differently at measures that might once have seemed too radical. Second, soldiers heard over and over from southern civilians that Yankees were out to destroy slavery, and the South went to war to save it. Wisconsin chaplain A.C. Barry spent a lot of time talking to residents of Virginia’s eastern shore, where he was repeatedly struck by their insistence that they had gone to war because they believed, “the institution of slavery was in danger.” Sgt. E. C. Hubbard, a hard-bitten volunteer serving in Missouri, explained to his brother that white men were killing one another “all for a detestable Black man.” Hubbard hardly qualified as a radical abolitionist, yet his observation convinced him that slavery had caused the war. The longer he served, the more certain he grew that successful war policies would have to strike at slavery. (Dr. Chandra Manning, *What This Cruel War Was About* 44-45)

I contend further, that it was this *Africans’ bloody rebellion* and not just the state of what Lerone Bennett has calculated as “74,000 nights of American enslavement” or “slavery.” (Forced Into Glory Bennett 531) When we think of the noun “slavery” a hundred and fifty years after the Emancipation Proclamation (1863- 2013) it no longer carries with it the weight of the

devastation and human tragedy that was “slavery”—the “sum of all sins” which equals the total of all imaginable human wrongs added together—has become a distant memory. This is what Frederick Douglass and his fellow radical abolitionists meant when he called slavery “the sum of all sins.” This became the motto of Abolitionists. Any cruel and terrible practice could be added to the list with other atrocious behavior and added all together they would be equivalent to “slavery.” We no longer relate to it as the horrible occurrence and it has become trite. It is a ghost of things past. It is most difficult to give the modern reader of history a feel of the gravity of the psychological and physical depravity involved in this most barbaric enterprise. History has proven and it has been copiously documented that the Africans in the United States were treated with absolute barbarity in what is arguably the worst crime ever committed against humanity. African mortality was high. It was considered cheaper to buy than to breed: the planters held that it was less expensive to get every ounce of work out of Africans and then replace them than to try to keep them in good health. One cruel enslaver thought that he got his money out the Africans if they lasted for four years; less severe enslavers might estimate the figure from five to seven years. The African population was not allowed to reproduce itself, African babies not being valued highly since the cost of rearing them was figured as greater than that of importing a fresh supply from Africa. (The Negro In The Making of America Benjamin Quarles 27) In 1839 Theodore Weld, a modest abolitionist, argued in his book, *A Testimony of A Thousand Witnesses*, in the introduction entitled, *On American Slavery*, that two million seven hundred thousand persons in these States are in slavery and America is guilty of violating their human rights. (Ruchames 165) He further states that the Africans, “...are overworked, underfed, wretchedly clad and lodged, and have insufficient sleep; that they are often made to wear round their necks iron collars armed with prongs, to drag heavy chains and weights at their feet while

working in the field, and to wear yokes, and bells, and iron horns;...have some of their front teeth torn out or broken off, that they may be easily detected when they run away; that they are frequently flogged with terrible severity, have red pepper rubbed into their lacerated flesh and hot brine, spirits of turpentine, &c., poured over the gashes to increase the torture; that they are often stripped naked, their backs and limbs cut with knives, bruised and mangled by scores and hundreds of blows with the paddle, and terribly torn by the claws of cats, drawn over them by their tormentors, that they are often hunted with blood hounds and shot down like beasts, or torn in pieces by dogs; that they are often suspended by the arms and whipped and beaten till they faint, and when revived by restoratives, beaten again till they faint, and sometimes till they die; that their ears are often cut off, their eyes knocked out, their bones broken, their flesh branded with red hot irons; that they are maimed, mutilated and burned to death over slow fires.”

(Ruchames 165-169) This book was considered the most devastating compilation ever published. “Hundreds of thousands of copies of the pamphlet were published and its influence was incalculable. There was no effective replied to it, nor could it have been.” (The Abolitionist: Immediatism and the Question of Means, Ed. Hugh Hawkins 25) In this regard, the Africans rebelled long before there was a Ho Chi Minh or Mao Zedong or Che Guevara. However, in the 21st century the word “slavery” has been sanitized. It no longer carries with it the horrific acts of inhumanity that it once conjured up. This being the case, we must renew and refresh the original connotation and denotation of this peculiar institution. When scholars such as Dr. Chandra Manning, Civil War historian and author of the award-winning book, What This Cruel War Was About, a discussion of the Civil War from the perspective of the enlisted soldier, and film writers such as Steven Spielberg who produced the movie *Lincoln* dismiss the cruelty inherent in Abraham Lincoln’s racism we have a major problem. “People think whatever they see is

basically true says historian Eric Foner. And they often believe things to be true even when they are told they are not.” (Chadwick 11) Lincoln’s slow decision to end Africans’ enslavement forced Africans to literally take matters into their own hands. “But then late in August, came news of the uprising of Virginia of slaves led by Nat Turner; while a week earlier rebels in Poland were “sons of the noble,” now the Virginia [African] rebels were bandits, blood-thirsty wolves and deluded wretches. How shall one explain this extraordinary shift except to observe that now the rebels were at home, not six thousand miles away, and the now the rebels were not white but Black [Africans]. Humans, no matter of what color, humans have rebelled when their treatment was bestial and opportunity and capacity for rebellion was present. (American Negro Slave Revolts, Herbert Aptheker, 1)

“the threat of insurrection was real, and the slave-owners fear was historically justified, for groups of slaves had been rebelling ever since the Africans arrived in the New World. In the Caribbean and in Brazil, for instance, large numbers of slaves had fought for freedom from their masters and had succeeded in setting up independent states. And Southern whites were well informed about the role played by slaves in establishing Haiti as a free Black state and thus destroying Napoleon’s dream of a Western empire.” (Afro-American History, Thomas R. Frazier, 49) Pan-African ties to the West Indies and even with continental Africa have been found. Revolutions in the West Indies played a significant role. Africans were influenced by political events nationally and internationally.

Some basic facts about African insurrection are it was usually continental Africans and not freed Negroes, although some freed men did participate. White participation was uncommon and rare.

There is evidence that this is especially true for the last years of the enslavement period.

The War of 1812 reached the minds of the Africans and stimulated revolutionary outbreaks.

African rebellion in the decade before the Civil War took every form. And there is evidence of some southern white participation. If these facts are not understood all the sources or the impact of John Brown's and the African's rebellion themselves are not accredited as being sources and the origins of the American Civil War. The only other people to free themselves from chattel property by violent revolution were the Haitian people during the Haitian Revolution. Dr. Jacob H. Carruthers has written a classic work on the Haitian Revolution. In this work he illustrates how the overseer Bookman Dutty conducted the men and women of Haiti to win the military victory over the French. The inhumanity and savage bestial behavior of the dominant whites precipitated and made necessary Haiti's bloody response.

The unity of whites in maintaining and supporting 300 years of brutal slavery made such a motive force the natural and logical response. The Blacks had been brutally kidnapped from their homeland. The work on the plantations was such travail that Blacks were literally worked to death. The average life span after being sold into slavery was about seven years. Thousands were murdered or maimed because of refusal to obey commands. Black women were raped. The so-called free Blacks were humiliated constantly. In short, the Black people had been the victims of the most oppressive and miserable system of tyranny in history. Surely revenge guided by wisdom and tempered with the desire for the "liberty which speaks in all our hearts" was the appropriate guiding spirit. (The Irritated Genie 24)

Bookman's war plan consisted of at least five somewhat overlapping phases: 1) The simultaneous self-emancipation of the Blacks; 2) kill all whites and burn all crops in the area of cultivation; 3) burn the cities; 4) set up camps populated by the men, women and children and begin cultivation of crops in the old free-community fashion while making raids against the presumed French reinforcements, thus decimating the European troops; and 5) finally destroy the French forces and then turn on the Spaniards to drive them from the eastern section of the island and thus dominate the island by Africans. This was, of course, an excellent battle plan in keeping with the goal of Race Vindication. (The Irritated Genie, 25)

Bookman's Prayer:

At the celebration, Bookman eloquently charged the assembly with the wisdom of the Black rebels from times past. "Death to the whites," "Destroy the colonial settlements" and "Black dominion." He uttered in Black creole:

Good God who created the Sun which shines on us from above, who rouses the sea and makes the thunder rumble; Listen! God though hidden in a cloud watches over us. The god of the white man calls forth crime but our God wills good works. Our God who is so good commands us to vengeance. He will direct our arms and help us. Throw away the likeness of the white man's god who has so often brought us to tears and listen to liberty which speaks in all our hearts.

This evocation on the night of the celebration of the Voodun Spirit, Ogun, the "God" of war, was more than a call to arms; it was even more a summation of the historical experience of the Blacks on the Island of Santo Domingo and indeed the diaspora in general. At the same time this prayer was not mere "ideological" statement, it was all of these, but more importantly it was the expression of an Afrocentric Worldview. (Irritated Genie, 22-23)

Bookman gives the concept that African God and European God concept were diametrically opposed. European culture evokes crime, enslavement, at war with nature, and lust for power and wealth. In an unnatural power to master everything. In this regard, the Island of Haiti was the penultimate example where Bookman implored the Africans, "throw away the symbol of the god of the whites." This command represents the first command of African Revolutionary commitment to clear the African mind of service to white people and white god. This then was the revolutionary spirit on the island. "Abolitionists were generally stereotyped as impractical, self-righteous, self-deceived, warped, fanatical and disturbed. Historians according to Martin B. Duberman viewed "Abolitionist without sympathy or understanding." (Eusenstadt 221-228)

Africans had a tradition of violent rebellion or radical abolition in the United States but this tradition has been muted and not honored in racist western society but this tradition helped to focus attention on the atrocity that was American enslavement. Africans themselves and their rebellious behavior set forth a noble example that abolitionists like Henry Highland Garnett and white militants like John Brown followed. They proved beyond a doubt that enslavement not only violates human nature but it so enrages the human psyche that it creates revolutionary heroes. Thus, negating the chauvinistic stereotype concerning the happy passive black Sambo,

protective of master's plantation to expose the mythology of the cooperative darkie who just loved and embraced and fought for his own enslavement. They further expose the academic apologists for racism who give credit to Africans for placing their implicit nonviolent and friendly protest on the Union agenda. Nothing could be further from the truth and one-sided than this half- truth. Manning's half truth is a whole lie. Discontent, disturbed and violent revolutionary actions provide a catalog of continuity for the historical record that African women and men created prior to and in the Civil War years in their great struggle for their human liberation. (American Negro Slave Revolts, Aptheker 3-5)

If General George Washington who fought with his colonial weapons of mass destruction and killed Europeans by the truck load could be hailed as a cultural hero in American culture then General Nat Turner ought to be held in similar esteem in African-American culture. Africans needed "no outside agitators" as alleged by their enslavers to inform them they were oppressed. Enslavement was proof enough. To end violent revolution one needed to end the violence indicative of enslavement. But the idea that Africans could and would eventually throw off the American yolk of oppression with their concerted acts of physical violence simply has no place in white America and is objectionable. This reality has been denied, it has been silenced, it has been obscured, its' been avoided but the bloody fact is—it is without question—the bloody violence of uprisings or radical abolitionist committed by Africans and the fear it brought on was the root cause of the American Civil War.

"In 1831, Virginia was an armed and garrisoned state...With a total population of 1,211,405, the State of Virginia was able to field a militia force of 101,488 men, including cavalry, artillery, grenadiers, riflemen, and light infantry! It is true that this was a "paper army" in some ways, in that the county regiments were fully armed and equipped, but it is still an astonishing commentary on the state of the public mind of the time. During a period when neither the State nor the nation faced any sort of exterior threat, we find that Virginia felt the need to maintain a security force roughly ten per cent

of the total number of its inhabitants: black and white, male and female, slave and free! Only one explanation is possible; that the existing situation, with regard to slavery was looked on as a major threat, and the State had prepared itself to deal with such a threat if it arose.” (The Southampton Slave Revolt of 1831: A Compilation of Source Material, 17, Henry Irving Tragle)

With independence came what the Virginians have wanted most—the power to make law to protect their “existence”, “happiness” and “security” against the threat of African insurrection. Accordingly, harsh laws called the Black Codes were enacted to restrict every conceivable aspect of the enslaved African’s life. The crisis of terror was mounting in the American psyche as African resistance and physical acts of violence intensified. These threats of violence and acts of radical abolition so captivated the imagination of white America that the planters and aristocracy never overcame their fears and subsequently began to fight amongst themselves about how best to rid the colonies of their eternal African problem. This would finally result in Lincoln’s signing the Emancipation Proclamation. Abraham Lincoln himself in his “annual message to congress, on Dec. 8 1863, reiterated the emancipation-as-practical-necessity theme in his Message” (Manning Article 15)

These African revolts caused all manner of discussions and political disagreements to emerge amongst American white men and women, “but below these real disagreements lay the profound and inescapable fact of massive African slavery, and a dread of the potential for mutual disaster arising out of that presence. Politicians would ignore it, openly attempt to rise above it, or try to tap it for their own advantage, but in the end fear of the Negro—physical dread, and fear of the consequences of emancipation—would control the course of the state.” (Crisis of Fear: Secession in South, Steven A. Channing, 26)

“Not far from this time Nat Turner’s insurrection broke out; and the news threw our town into great commotion...Everywhere men, women, and children were whipped till the blood stood in puddles at their feet. Some received five hundred lashes; others were

tied hands and feet, and tortured with a bucking paddle, which blister the skin terrible. The dwellings of the colored people...were robbed of clothing and everything else the marauders thought worth carrying away. All day long these unfeeling wretches went round, like a troop of demons, terrifying and tormenting the helpless.” (Brent, 64-65)

...on August 4, 1857 Douglas spoke at Canandaigua... He complains justly that the white people in the United States had never shown any general appreciation of the grandeur of this act, [The Dred Scott Decision] and did not even then appear to care anything for the improvement of the morality, intelligence and happiness of the Freedman. The only question asked even at the north, was still, ‘Did it pay? (Frederick Douglass Biography 259- 260) [i.e., to assist black people to attain freedom]

He left the task of answering the question does it pay to assist “colored people to acquire full citizenship?’ to Dr. Garnett, who was on the platform, and himself took the opportunity to give his audience some advice, as follows: [Note that within the advice is the now famous quote on “The Philosophy of Political Reform.” This quote has been erroneously assigned to Frederick Douglass.]

I know, my friends, that in some quarters the efforts of colored people meet with very little encouragement. We may fight; but we must fight like the Sepoys of India, under the white officers. This class of Abolitionists don’t like colored anti-slavery fairs for the support of colored newspapers. They don’t like any demonstrations whatever in which colored men take a leading part. They talk of the proud Anglo-Saxon blood as flippantly as those who profess to believe in the natural inferiority of races. Your humble speaker has been branded as an ingrate, because he has ventured to stand up on his own right and to plead our common cause as colored man, rather than as a Garrisonian. I hold it to be no part of gratitude to allow our white friends to do all the work, while we merely hold their coats. Opposition of the sort now referred to, is partisan opposition; and we need not mind it. The white people at large will not be largely influenced by it. They will see and appreciate all honest efforts on our part to improve our condition as a people. Let me give you a word of the philosophy of reform.

If there is no struggle, there is no progress. Those who profess to favor a freedom, and yet deprecate agitation, are men who want crops without plowing up the ground. They want rain without thunder and lightning. They want the ocean without the awful roar of its many waters. This struggle may be a moral one; or it may be a physical one; or it may be both moral and physical; but it must be a struggle. Power concedes nothing without a demand. It never did, and it never will. Find out just what people will submit to, and you have found out the exact amount

of injustice and wrong which will be imposed upon them; and these will continue till they are resisted with either words or blows, or with both. The limits of tyrants are prescribed by the endurance of those whom they oppress. In light of these ideas, Negroes will be hunted at the North, and held and flogged at the South, so long as they submit to those devilish outrages, and make no resistance; either moral or physical. Men may not get all they pay for in this world; but they must certainly pay for all they get. If we ever get free from all the oppressions and wrongs heaped upon us, we must pay for their removal. We must do this by labor, by suffering, by sacrifice, and, if need be, by our lives and the lives of others. (260-261) [emphasis mine]

This most powerful and true statement must be assigned to its proper creator, Dr. Henry Highland Garnett. This does not in any way reduce the stature of our great public intellectual warrior, Frederick Douglass. In fact, when he gives consent to his first biographer, Frederic May Holland, with mixed thoughts and emotions he says, “[i]f you can say anything of me that the public does not already know, by all means tell it. I am sure you cannot say anything of me which will not be pretty strongly colored, but go ahead.” (III) In this regard, Mr. Douglass had a passion for honesty and that the public may always be given the most accurate information available about his life. Therefore, let it be publicly known that Frederick Douglass was a panelist and recipient of Dr. Garnett’s profound and divine instructions on that day, August 4, 1857, and not the progenitor of these deep thoughts. (260-261)

Now let us compare, contrast and analyze the necessary tyranny that accompanied the enslaver’s psychology of the southern planter: “It is a pity, a North Carolina planter wrote, that agreeable to the nature of things Slavery and Tyranny must go together and that there is no such thing as having an obedient and useful Slave, without the painful exercise of undue and tyrannical authority. The legislatures and courts of the ante-bellum South recognized this fact and regulated the relationship of master and slave accordingly...[although] A wise master did not take seriously the belief that Negroes were natural born slaves. First, those who managed slaves had to maintain strict discipline...Second, the masters felt that they had to implant in the

bondsman a consciousness of personal inferiority...Third step in the training process was to awe the slaves with a sense of the master's enormous power...The fourth aspect was the attempt 'persuade' the bondsman to take in the master's enterprise and to accept his standard of good conduct...The final step was to impress Negroes with their helplessness, to create in them 'a habit of perfect dependence' upon their masters." (Stampp 141-147) Africans were active agents in their quest for freedom not simply passive subjects in a horrible situation. African violence or what is termed "radical abolition" precipitated discussions between Northern and Southern whites to the extent that whites began to talk of removing Africans from the colonies. In 1816 the American Colonization Society (ACS) was formed at the request of the so-called Honorable Henry Clay, speaker of the House of Representatives. The objective of the ASC was to deport Africans to Africa. Lincoln was a major supporter of deportation for Africans (Nimley, 92). In 1691 Virginia passed a law prohibiting the emancipation of Africans unless owners were financially prepared to deport them from Virginia within six months. As an unoriginal political thinker, Lincoln simply did not try to reinvent the wheel but rather he perpetuated the idea of removing Africans from America. This was his solution to the so-called Negro problem. The Negro stands in innocence at the center of white America's self-betrayal. The Black man has merely to exist, to be, to provoke a frenzy of sacrilege, a feverish disemboweling of sacred precepts. A God is enthroned so cruel as to despise those He created. The wings of beauty are clipped so that this bird of universal truth cannot soar beyond parochial walls. And history, the great teacher of mankind, is transformed into a slave. And this violence against God and beauty and history is done to dehumanize Black people and then to justify their degradation." (Hoyt Fuller 69)

Manning agrees with Hoyt Fuller that the Africans are denigrated and that Southern whites are being contradictory by arguing Africans were both happy while they diligently built an army to protect themselves from the alleged content and happy Africans.

...Slavery rested on a foundation of force and violence, tensions always smoldered beneath the surface of southern society, where they kindled a contradiction that southern whites were forced to confront. If slaves were truly happy in slavery, as proslavery ideologue insisted, then whites should have nothing to fear from approximately four million enslaved human beings who lived among them. Yet, the fear of slave revolt haunted white Southerners constantly, inflamed by actual uprisings such as Denmark Vesey Conspiracy of 1822, the Nat Turner rebellion of 1831, and John Brown's failed uprising in 1859. White men, slaveholders alike, shared constant responsibility for ensuring community safety by serving together in slave patrols that safeguarded neighborhoods while also testifying to the community standing, commitment to slavery, and manhood of patrol members. Southern whites generally coped with the contradiction between supposedly contented slaves and the concerted need for vigilance by assuming the slaves would not rebel of their own accord; they would have to be contaminated by Northern ideas released into the atmosphere like infectious spores every time Northerners agitated on any aspect of the slavery question. Consequently, Republican claims to oppose slavery's spread but not to touch it where it existed did nothing to assuage white Southerners' concerns that slavery was in imminent danger in 1860."(Manning What This War...24-25)

This proactive fighting caused whites to realize something had to be done with Africans.

Irrespective of popular opinion which states that the white Americans were fighting for many issues such as State's Rights, and to preserve the Union, and protect property and family. In addition they also fought to stop the possibility of anarchy and rebelling to preserve the sanctity and authority of the Constitution, nevertheless, the primary motivating factor of the American Civil War were the physical revolutions or the "radical abolitionist" campaign being waged by the enslaved Africans against their enslavers for the immediate freedom. Lincoln never championed the causes of Africans. This is what led him to be at odds and in opposition of the dissenting voice of Frederick Douglass and other radical Republicans and abolitionists like Sojourner Truth, Harriet Tubman, Henry Highland Garnett, William Lloyd Garrison, Wendell Phillips and others. Frederick May Holland wrote the first authorized biography of Frederick

Douglass which was published in April, 1891. Mr. Holland tells us that Mr. Douglass himself suggested the title *Is God Dead*, a chapter in his biography which examines the Dred Scott Decision at a time when many Africans and Mr. Douglass were profoundly questioning the justice of God. Ms. Sojourner Truth who was seated on the panel interrupted Mr. Douglass while he lamented the cause of the African at the passage of the Dred Scott Decision with the profound question, “Is God dead?” As he was dwelling upon the darkness of the hour Douglass replied, “No, God is not dead. Sojourner Truth then predicted the Civil War and that it would end in blood!” (256) This bloody ending to the Civil War would be the beginning of freedom for Africans. The radical abolitionist from the first shot heard at Fort Sumter, SC on April 12, 1861 knew that this war was the beginning of their salvation and that non-violence and moral suasion had been tried and did not produce freedom. It was an impossibility given the violent determination of the Southern nationalist.

The first lie was the cornerstone of the Confederate’s government. “Alexander H. Stephens, Vice-President of the Confederacy, Speaking at Savannah, Georgia, on March 21, 1861, he declared: The Confederacy’s foundations are laid, its cornerstone rests upon the great truth, that the Negro is not equal to the white man; that slavery subordination to the superior race is his natural and moral condition. This, our new government, is the first, in the history of the world, based upon this great physical, philosophical, and moral truth.” (Wesley and Romero 2) In as much as the Confederacy was claiming a moral truth they elicited God’s participation in their racist government. The scripture that supported this morality was Ephesians 6:5 and with this God almighty became an accomplice in this criminal activity. It is most unfortunate that far too many African-Americans fail to understand that this is the biblical proof-text for the argument of the enslaved African’s inferiority and inhumanity. This meant that the bible itself was against

the equality of African people. Therefore, it should be incumbent upon us as a formally enslaved people to be hypersensitive to how we use the bible to prove our points and how the scripture is used to justify our logic. Christians should not use the bible like the alcoholics use the lamppost merely for support but rather we should use scripture for both support and illumination. The Confederate country cousins of our beloved founding fathers were both racists and inhumane. However, their more sophisticated cousins in the North, were no less inhumane or racist. They hid their inhumanity better by not using the word slavery or enslaved in the Constitution. They spoke in terms of rendering service and labor to whom service and labor was due and a myriad of euphuisms to disguise the same barbaric behaviors, attitudes and practices of their Southern cousins. In as much as the northerners were more sophisticated they also were more vicious and racist because they made racism complex.

A major change was imminent and it came as a result of personal interactions between soldiers and Africans many of whom had never had any contact with Africans before. This transformation in the thinking of the average soldier began as early as August and December, 1861... “you have no idea of the changes that have taken place in the minds of the soldiers in the last two months,” The soldier continued, and the changes were not restricted to Republicans. Now that they saw slavery with their own eyes, “men of all parties seemed unanimous in the belief that to permanently establish the Union, is to first wipe [out] the institution” of slavery...(Manning 45)

Formula: Power + Prejudice = Racism. Lincoln was both powerful and prejudice. It is an open secret that he was a racist. However, this monumental fact is almost never addressed when dealing with the sixteenth president of the United States. He appears to have diplomatic immunity to the racism ascribed to the ordinary soldier confederate or so-called Yankee. “We

have to understand that Lincoln was a racist at his center and his circumference.” (Bennett, 66)

This is the essence or Metaphysics of white-skinned privilege. Manning listens to and claims to hear the voices of ordinary soldiers where in most cases historians are known to speak primarily about the experiences of the officers, she successfully avoids this elitist habit. However, she fails when it comes to properly assigning blame to Lincoln for his bigoted attitudes.

“Hostility to slavery did not necessarily mean support for racial equality. In fact, white Union soldiers strove mightily to keep the issues of slavery and black rights separate...the coexistence of antislavery sentiment and racism among northern troops may seem contradictory from a modern point of view, but many Union soldiers did in fact hold antislavery and racist views at the same time.” (Manning 50)

Manning admits that while ordinary soldiers fought in the north for emancipation they still harbored racist sentiments towards Africans. Lincoln was well known for harboring vacillating views over race and the question of emancipation but in this instance Lincoln escapes critique about his contradictory views which are identical to the views held by the soldiers. This is the classism to which Manning falls prey. Manning gives Lincoln a presidential pardon.

It is good to remember that the American Heritage College Dictionary, fourth edition, gives as its second definition of politician, “one who seeks personal or partisan gain, often by maneuvering.” William Lee Miller, a Yale professor and author of Lincoln’s Virtues acknowledges the Lincoln myth and maintains, “I do not mean altogether to mock or debunk this mythic picture; on the contrary, on the whole, I accept it, and would defend its main feature, more than would some others.” (xiii) He goes further to state, “If Abraham Lincoln was not a politician, then words have no meaning.” (xv) I submit that Abraham Lincoln was the consummate politician, a poor ambitious Kentuckian—Machiavellian in nature and care nothing for the enslaved Africans. The African themselves took the initiative to over-throw enslavement by physical force or “radical abolition” and neither Lincoln nor the Emancipation Proclamation saved them. It was their own

efforts and that of “the Union Army, the Thirteenth Amendment, and three empowering and liberating provisions of the emancipating Thirty-seventh Congress: 1) a revision of the military code forbidding soldiers to return slaves to slave owners; 2) the Confiscation Act which freed the slaves of all rebels; and 3) an act that freed all slaves and their families who enlisted in the Union Army. In 1864 alone, twenty- five thousand Kentucky slaves freed themselves and their families by enlisting---twenty-five thousand more than were ever freed in Kentucky” and other states--- despite Abraham Lincoln, not because of him. “This means, among other things, that the enslaved were among the greatest of all emancipators and that they helped emancipate themselves and nearly freed Lincoln.” (Bennett 21)

In an effort to give her paper, *Can Soldiers Tell Us Anything about Lincoln?* uniqueness Manning creates what she calls “stubborn mysteries” for example Lincoln was truly anti-slavery. This mystery is based on a contemporary idea that Lincoln was somehow more politically progressive and liberal than he was. In fact, Lincoln was proslavery his entire political career right up to the signing of the Emancipation Proclamation where even then he gave no hint of what he was about to do. In fact, Horace Greeley a newspaper editor and friend to Lincoln chastised him for not being more aggressive on the enslavement question and Manning herself admits that Lincoln at the time of this severe tongue lashing had the Emancipation Proclamation sitting in a drawer but nevertheless chose to give his old party line of saving the Union as an answer. The Reverend Henry McNeal Turner criticized Lincoln’s slow pace towards racial justice. He thought the framers of the Chicago [political platform] ‘ought to everyone be hung til dead by the neck’ but he also regretted that Lincoln had not adopted a firm line on slavery more promptly.” (Manning 185) Clearly then, Lincoln was a proslavery agent and Manning’s repeated attempts to make him anti-slavery does not work. Thus, the mystery of Lincoln is contrived and

a device to make him appear more mysterious than he actually was. She uses the same material that proves him proslavery to justify his antislavery platform which of course he never had. This is in fact a trick to use negative material in a positive way in order to create a false image of antislavery sentiment that did not exist in reality. This is how the Lincoln industry and propaganda machine would create and does create a Lincoln who is against slavery. “The mere mention of the Negro made the president nervous” (Franklin 14) because it was the key issue that could make or break his presidency and he could not afford to allow his position to become unbalanced in favor of the radical abolitionist which could cause him to lose his presidency. “Lincoln did not move as fast as the men in the ranks did. He had a more complex array of duties than they did, and chief among those duties in 1861 was keeping the Border States of Delaware, Maryland, Kentucky, and Missouri in the Union. He knew that the surefire way to lose them was to threaten slavery. When Union Army commanders like John C. Frémont and David Hunter made bold moves against slavery, the President rescinded them.” (Article Manning 4) Here again he sides with the Southern nationalist and the Confederacy to keep the Africans enslaved. “Frustrated with Lincoln’s caution, a Wisconsin soldier spat, “Great God what a system! And still, our Government handles slavery as tenderly as a mother would her first born.” (Article Manning 5) According to Manning Lincoln hated slavery but how could he treat it gently as would a mother with her first born child if he in fact hated slavery. How does Manning justify claiming Lincoln was antislavery which flies in the face of her own historical research.

Lincoln’s record prior to him signing the Emancipation Proclamation was proslavery. In fact, “when the rebel army was at Frederick,” Lincoln said, “I determined as soon as it [the rebel army] be driven out of Maryland, to issue an Emancipation Proclamation such as I thought most likely to be useful. I said nothing to anyone; but I made a promise to myself and my Maker. The

rebel army is now driven out, and I am going to fulfill that promise.” (Brodie 159) If his record is proslavery prior to the signing of the Emancipation Proclamation and he doesn’t tell anyone otherwise, how do we know that he is antislavery? “My paramount object in this struggle is to save the Union, and is not either to save or to destroy slavery,” Lincoln told Greeley. “If I could save the Union without freeing any slave I would do it, and if I could save it by freeing all the slaves, I would do it; and if I could save it by freeing some and leaving others alone I would also do that. What I do about slavery, and the colored race, I do because I believe it helps to save the Union.” (Manning Article 5) At no point and at no time are the enslaved Africans considered as human beings and what the impact of Lincoln’s decision would mean for them. To properly understand Abraham Lincoln’s cruel behavior towards Africans and African-Americans, Dr. Bobby E. Wright’s *The Psychopathic Racial Personality* will be used as a working theory. A Black Psychologist Dr. Wright in 1984 introduced the theory which he calls *The Psychopathic Racial Personality*. This theory helps us to contextualize and understand the motivation of Abraham Lincoln in particular and white people in general. Wright explains that, “This presentation is based upon a very simple premise: in their relationship with the Black race, Europeans (Whites) are psychopaths and their behavior reflects an underlying biologically transmitted proclivity with roots deep in their evolutionary history. The psychopath is an individual who is constantly in conflict with other persons or groups. He is unable to experience guilt, he is completely selfish and callous, and he has a total disregard for the rights of others. This premise is supported by overwhelming scientific evidence. There is a scientific dictum which states, “everything that exists, exists in some amount and if it exists, it can be measured.” (Wright 2) As an Africentric scholar, I accept Dr. Wright’s base theory although on the point that everything can be measured I disagree and reserve the right to critique specific portions of

his reasoning because the level of inhumanity meted out to Africans can never be properly measured although the crippling results have been documented continuously over time. We in our effort to redefine reality for ourselves must be very careful not to accept European scientific biases as if science does not have a human base. Dr. Jacob H. Carruthers has done an excellent job by alerting us “to the science of oppression.” The level and the reality of their barbarism is evident. It is time that we address American white people’s behavior forthrightly. Can anything be any more ridiculous than Abraham Lincoln arguing outright that the African’s presence cause suffering for the American colonist. Frederick Douglass addressed the issue honestly and from the perspective of the enslaved African but his and other dissenting voices has met a wall of silence in popular media and world history. If Lincoln were not president and a white man of privilege his comments would have been seen for the illogical, racist, and psychopathic nonsense that they were. It is a stereotype that psychopaths “do not know the difference between right from wrong. This belief is not true; psychopaths simply ignore the concept. By ignoring this trait in the White race (the lack of ethical and moral development) Blacks have made and continue to make a tragic mistake in basing the worldwide Black liberation movement on moral suasion. It is pathological for Blacks to keep attempting to use moral suasion on a people who have no morality where race is the variable.” (Wright 6) They create a moral and religious system to justify their inhumanity to others. For instance, “Slave obey your master” Ephesians 6:5. You ought to see Christians performing incredible intellectual gymnastics making arguments that white people never meant this to apply to Africans. This is simply untrue. In fact, that is exactly what this scripture was designed for and they have one thousand more to reinforce it. African Americans in particular have a difficult time seeing oppression in American fundamentalist Christianity. When I call Abraham Lincoln a racist I am not referring to a

clinical illness but rather a choice of behavior and I agree with Drs. Alexander Thomas and Samuel Sillen when they say:

In explaining the origin and meaning of racism, it has become ritualistic to involve psychiatric concepts. The roots of prejudice are sought in the “sick personality” or the “sick white psyche.” Many authors speak of frustration-aggression, projection, anxiety, and guilt. Such terms suggest that racism necessarily reflects psychopathology. It is often argued that a mentally normal person cannot be a racist, and that a racist cannot be a mentally normal person. Just as Hitler was characterized as a madman and the Germans as a paranoid nation, so the white racists in American society are described in terms of psychological aberrations.

...Some people feel that to label racists as “sick” is the ultimate indictment. On the contrary, it is the assumption that racist are all disturbed persons that lets them off the hook. A mentally ill individual cannot be held fully accountable for his behavior. The full horror of systematic prejudice can be grasped only if it is seen as a characteristic of persons who are not deranged. When we view the racist as a creature driven by blind and irresistible psychodynamic forces, we cushion his crime. The massacres at Auschwitz or Mylai are all the more horrible because they were perpetrated by men who were not mental cases. (Thomas and Sillen 112-113)

Think about it. Europeans sailed thousands of miles and forced Africans into their ships bringing Africans through the horrible Middle Passage while beating and torturing them all the way to the shores of America and once upon the American shores the African's mere presence causes the European to suffer? This is nonsense. Lincoln's behavior never once takes into account the pain, suffering and utter devastation that the African endured based upon his callous decisions. Lincoln does not consider the African as an expression of God and as a direct consequence brings his own humanity into question and he is the primary representative of American white people of his time. The African's humanity was and has never been a question at issue. Rather, the humanity of the enslaving Europeans has always been the point at issue. And, because they are in the power position they never allow their humanity to be questioned. We are now questioning their humanity. What manner of humans enslave a none offending African people and keep them captive for centuries and design a worldview which includes a

moral and religious system that reinforces the dehumanization of these people? I have no inclination or desire to let the mad dog racist known as Abraham Lincoln off the hook. H. Ford Douglass, the 28 year old African living in Lincoln's home state petitioned Mr. Lincoln to repeal the Testimony Law because the law dictates that "men of my complexion are not allowed to testify in a court of justice, where a white man is a party." (Garfinkle 33) Mr. Lincoln rejected his personal petition. This rejection was a personal devastation to an African man seeking to redress wrongs done to him by white men leaving him with no other alternatives. This is the handiwork of the so called liberator. Mr. Lincoln chose to be a racist because other men like John Brown and other Republicans and radical abolitionists chose to fight against the group for liberation for Africans in particular and humanity in general.

Lincoln's racist reasoning continued when he sounded a similar note on September 13, 1862 when a delegation of ministers presented emancipation petitions. Lincoln firmly told the ministers, "I view the matter as a practical war measure, to be decided upon according to the advantages or disadvantages it may offer to the suppression of the rebellion. At the very time that he wrote that letter to Greeley, he answered the pro-emancipation ministers, Lincoln had sitting in his desk a draft of what would become the preliminary Emancipation Proclamation, a document that declared "forever free" all slaves located in areas still in rebellion against the Union as of January 1, 1863. The Proclamation did so by defining such a move as a military necessity, which is to say as a move necessary for the life of the Union." (Manning article 6) Lincoln frees Africans in the South where he has no power and keeps them enslaved in the North where he could free them and he gives the Southern Confederates the opportunity to save "slavery" if they stop their rebelling. The fact that Lincoln had this preliminary emancipation hidden away proves that he was proslavery and nobody knew except according to him his maker,

i.e. God. But, we can judge him by his record which was proslavery and all of the sentiment otherwise is wishful thinking, ahistorical, illegitimate, and fiction.

“In his inaugural address President Lincoln declared that he had no purpose, “directly or indirectly, to interfere with the institution of slavery where it exists.” “A few months after Sumter Congress passed a resolution in which it asserted that the war was not being prosecuted with the intention of overthrowing the “established institutions” of the states. President Lincoln could continue to disclaim either the power or the desire, under the circumstances, to emancipate the slaves. Congress could deny any intention of setting free a single slave.” (Franklin 13)

Then how do we have Manning declaring that Lincoln is antislavery? Lincoln allowed slavery to exist where it was he simply did not want to expand it. To let it exist proves categorically that he was proslavery. “Some thought we had in Mr. Lincoln the nerve and decision of an Oliver Cromwell; but the result shows that we merely have a continuation of the Pierces and Buchanan and that the Republican President bends the knee to slavery as readily as any of his infamous predecessors.” (Foner 74)

I just finished watching Steven Spielberg’s long, boring, meandering, ahistorical, propagandized epic movie on Lincoln. The movie stumbled, failed and tripped all the way to its anticlimactic end. At the invitation of Spielberg’s *Lincoln* we are welcomed into Republican politics in 1861 starting with a formula horrific war scene to give the film a feel of authenticity. We are introduced to an incredible amount of legislative activity. Within this matrix are legislators pushing for their respective agendas. The plotline and characterization lead us to see Lincoln as a careworn, physically tired, all wise introspective, holy -father for a divided nation. I have read the five volume set on Frederick Douglass by Philip Foner. Douglass was a contemporary

adversary and primary critic of the politics of the historical Abraham Lincoln which is in stark contrast to the safe mythical and mysterious Lincoln as portrayed by Steven Spielberg.

Spielberg and his advisors appear not to be remotely familiar with Phillip Foner's scholarship.

In fact, the first thing a serious student of the historical Lincoln observes about the movie is that

Spielberg cuts the historical facts that would paint Abraham Lincoln as anything other than "a man of moral courage and fierce determination" bent on the freeing of enslaved Africans as

advertised on the movie's jacket cover. The fact that Fredrick Douglass is not given a major, his voice silenced and muted on the subject of slavery, a condition he lived to experience for 21

years, is an indictment and evidence that Spielberg's rendering of Abraham Lincoln, the

sixteenth president of the United States is one sided and negates true historical facts.

Spielberg's disregard for Frederick Douglass in the 21st century is equal to Lincoln's disrespect

and racism towards Africans in the 19th century. Telling the story of the Civil War without

assigning Frederick Douglas a major role is like telling the story of the Civil Rights Movement

without mentioning Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Consider the case in another Hollywood movie

Abraham Lincoln: Vampire Hunter where the president is portrayed as the killer of vampires

whose goal is to take over America. At the president's side is an African man whose name

William Johnson we only hear uttered a few times, but who is clearly depicted as one of

Abraham Lincoln's comrade-in-arms and as his human and social equal. William Johnson from

the beginning of the movie is saved from a severe beating and is subsequently rescued by

Lincoln throughout the movie setting up the metaphor Lincoln as the savior of Black people. In

the movie there is a scene where Lincoln is putting his youngest son Willie to bed. Willie kisses

his father goodnight and then turns and gives William Johnson, the African, a goodnight kiss too.

This scene is poetic license run amok. Nothing could be further from the truth and this is pure

fantasy. The historical William Johnson never had it so good. William Johnson was an “African-American who worked in the Treasury Department as a messenger and moonlighted as Lincoln’s personal servant. When Lincoln was stricken with chicken pox immediately after making the Gettysburg Address, Johnson...nursed him and almost certainly provided the towel treatment he required on his way back to Washington. Before long, Johnson himself contracted the disease...Lincoln said later that he didn’t think that he gave Johnson the disease,...The president survived, but Johnson, who was probably the only African-American close enough to actually hear the Gettysburg Address, died.” (Bennett 582-583) Given the extremely contagious nature of Chicken Pox and if a person has never been infected, it is most probable that simply being exposed to the sick patient is enough to become infected irrespective of Lincoln’s denial of not being the source of William’s contagion. Also notable is William Johnson was comparable to Lincoln in age and his replacement was a young man of 21 years old. Nevertheless, to Lincoln they were both considered boys in reference letters he wrote to prospective employers for Johnson and his replacement. Additionally, when signing his biography over to Sojourner Truth he refers to her as ‘Aunty.’ Lincoln’s conception of William Johnson and Sojourner Truth is as inferiors and is identical to the Southern Nationalist. (Bennett 109) He cannot see William Johnson as a man or human and this attitude extended to older Black women as well. Manning and Spielberg try to make Lincoln out to be better and on that score different from his compatriots however, he is not for he does not challenge in any way the stereotyped tradition. Instead, he perpetuates these stereotypes. He does not represent the headlight he is the tail light and this ought not be the position of the commander-in-chief.

Reflecting upon a youthful Lincoln’s burgeoning personality the story is told that the boys in Lincoln’s neighborhood put hot coals on the backs of turtles for fun and to see how the turtles

would react, “as a good fellow, you may go along with the fun. As one who does not feel the turtle’s pain, but is intimidated, you keep your objections to yourself. As one who has more important business elsewhere, you could ignore the whole matter. As a budding representative of the relativisms of the century to come, you could shrug your shoulders and say, “They like to put hot coals on turtles, I don’t like to put hot coals on turtles—preferences differ. Who is to choose? Don’t be judgmental.” “Or you can do what the ten-year-old Abraham Lincoln did: You can tell your companions that what they are doing is wrong. You may “chide” them, and say that it hurts the turtle, and that they should not do what they are doing. And you may even, as young Lincoln did, draw out the larger moral principle, and write a composition—cruelty to animals is wrong—and argue publicly on its behalf in your one-room school.” (Miller 28) If we are to believe Mr. Miller Abraham Lincoln is essentially a forefather of the Animal Rights Movement. He is not indifferent nor reflective or passive. He actively lectures thereby becoming an advocate for the humane treatment of turtles at 10 years old. Contrast this scenario with a 32-year old Abraham Lincoln who in 1841 while travelling with his friend Joshua Speed down to Mississippi encountered a group of enslaved Africans on the deck of the ship. In a personal correspondence after this experience he relates to a friend that the Africans were being sold away from family and friends, chained in groups of six, and “sailing into unknown and undoubtedly unhappy circumstances.” He continued his observation that the Africans were, “the most cheerful and apparently happy creatures on board.” Fourteen years later in 1855 at 46 years old again by letter Lincoln reminisced about those chained enslaved Africans on his previous trip. In retrospect, he maintained:

You may remember, as I well do, that from Louisville to the mouth of the Ohio, there were on board ten or a dozen slaves shackled with iron. That sight was a continual torment to me, and I see something like it every time I touch the Ohio or any other slave border. It is not fair for you to assume that I have no interest in the thinking which has,

and continually exercise, the power of making me miserable. You ought rather to appreciate how much the great body of the Northern people do crucify their feelings in order to maintain their loyalty to the Constitution and the Union... (Wesley and Romero 9)

A man who is hypersensitive to the inhumane treatment of turtles sees a group of enslaved Africans who are classified as animals. Does Lincoln say do not put chains on these “creatures?” No he does not. Does he tell the captain of the ship or the crew that placing chains on Africans is wrong and may even be painful to their wrists and legs? He does not. Or does he ignore the matter and do nothing? Lincoln completely ignores the matter. He says nothing to the captain or crew. He writes no lectures about the inhumane treatment of Africans. In fact, the only thing he does do is remember it 14 years later in 1855. Finally, he tells us the sight of these chained enslaved Africans “crucified his feelings” yet he does absolutely nothing and gives us no measurable or definable indication except the memoir that he was hurt by the sight. Miller would have us believe however that Lincoln, “abhors the oppression of negroes...and according to a young Lincoln’s testimony when he was grown [he] was already and always opposed to slavery.” (Miller 39) Nevertheless, this antislavery politician never mentions the cruel treatment of Africans. It is safe to say then that Lincoln as a boy of 10 years old was more humane than he was as a man of 32 years or 46years old and that the lives of turtles were more valuable to him than the lives of enslaved Africans and men like Lincoln had created the Constitution he claimed that was so difficult to uphold--- Lincoln then is almost always politicking i.e. saying one thing while supporting and meaning something else.

Lincoln apologists and creators of the Lincoln myth would argue that Lincoln’s position on slavery is unclear and that his early comments on the subject were strictly confined to the issues of citizenship and the extension of slavery. However, his personal position on slavery was a

willingness to abide by the laws and to sustain them. This is fallacious reasoning. Lincoln was a politician, a sort of rising star if you will and he became a successful lawyer. He was a powerful white citizen. He writes these private letters to make others believe that he is not a proslavery advocate but his voting record proves that he is on the side of enslavement. This private torture is part of Lincoln's routine to convince himself and others that he is not the monster his voting record reveals. This is a classic example of Machiavellian politics. Lincoln was conscious of the future at this stage of his political career. He wanted to be remembered as an Antislavery politician although he voted proslavery and returned escaped Africans back to a state he later claimed crucified his feelings. This is nonsense, I have found personally that one of the most difficult things I have ever been asked to do is to enforce rules that I was personally and philosophically against. I learned that I could not enforce rules with which I disagreed. Lincoln although emotionally tortured he claims could and did enforce African enslavement which he would have us believe he was personally against. He was both a political and social climber and he left very little to chance in his political career. He could not afford to if he were ever going to be president and he was going to be president. To try to make him appear as if he did not plan and strategize himself into the presidency of the United States is to negate his extreme ambition. Lincoln is no ordinary politician coming from a legacy of wealth and power rather he comes from abject poverty and ignorance in Kentucky and Indiana. Therefore, Lincoln's strength is his intelligence his ability to think and out think men whose wealth, power, and education place them above him. Lincoln was without question was a political genius in his time and he measured and counter measured all of his actions and inactions. This is why he was extremely conservative and proslavery although he often professed to be antislavery in his private letters and comments.

Manning's and Spielberg's sentiments that Lincoln at bottom was antislavery simply cannot hold given his refusal to identify with Africans and publically denounce enslavement in America. Philosophically he often waxed eloquently and theoretically about slavery being wrong. But that's only theory. In reality he allowed slavery to exist where it was and he did not protest its horrors. He simply claimed not to want to extend it. This is not an antislavery position. It is a proslavery position that does not wish to increase itself.

Manning agrees with this characterization of Lincoln as a conflicted leader deeply troubled over slavery and she writes as if she believes Lincoln "genuinely hated slavery." Manning maintains that Lincoln said, "if slavery is not wrong, then nothing is wrong." (Manning Article 1) This is an unfortunate reality for many professional scholars and Hollywood filmmakers who get tangled in the web of nonsense they write and produce for popular consumption. Spielberg is a film icon in his own right, Manning is an up and coming new intellectual star who earned a coveted PhD from Harvard University but like Michael Jackson's last song lyrics, /they don't care about us/ nor did Lincoln care about the Africans. Take for example Lincoln's March 4, 1861 first inaugural address where he maintains, "...Apprehension seems to exist among the people of the Southern States, that by the accession of a Republican Administration, their property, and their peace, and their personal security, are to be endangered. There has never been any reasonable cause for such apprehension...I declare that 'I have no purpose directly or indirectly, to interfere with the institution of slavery in the States where it exists. I believe I have no lawful right to do so, and I have no inclination to do so...'"(Garfinkle 35) The apprehension to which Lincoln was speaking is the Southern Nationalist's fear that he would end enslavement. These are the words and sentiments spoken by a proslavery advocate and not the future liberator of African people—he who has "no inclination to" free them. How can Manning in good

scholarly faith argue that Lincoln thought that slavery was in fact wrong when he says the south has nothing to fear from the accession of a Republican Administration? Clearly then Lincoln is saying that although he does not have southern support he in fact supports the State's right under the Constitution to enslave Africans.

The basic flaw in the historical rendering of facts skewed by the belief these scholars and film makers hold is that at the bottom there was a goodness and basic human decency lining the fabric of American white leadership. This leads to a belief that in order to be good and righteous today and in the future one must come from a good and righteous past. But, from a Christian point of view this argument is fallacious because every saint has a past which implies sin and every sinner has a future. This simply implies that one is not locked into evil simply because one has come from evil because human possibility can always be realized. The reasoning of the poet Robert Penn Warren flies in the face of western Christian logic when he says, "that people really don't want to remember their actual past if it had defects." Western fundamentalist Christian logic although his point is well taken and seems to be the case for many Western historians who need to invent a glorious past in order to believe in the possibility of a glorious future. Manning and Spielberg are two such myth-makers who need to see excellence and purity in the past to imagine it to be so in future leadership. Lincoln was made out to be a great man by "omission and evasions, by half- truths and quarter-truths and lies, by selective quotations and suppressed quotations, by begging the question and forgetting the question and ignoring the question, by committing all the logical fallacies in the book, and by inventing new ones, by all these methods, and others, and by the biggest attempt in recorded history to hide a man, Lincoln defenders have managed to turn a separatist into a integrationist and fool all the Black people and all the White people, save one or two, all the time." (Bennett 113) These apologists have hidden the real man

who told nigger jokes, supported slavery, returned Africans to certain death and/ or a life time of slavery “The hunting down a few slaves, the sending back of a few Lucy Bagleys, young and beautiful though they be, to the lust and brutality of the slave-breeders of the Border States, is to the rapacity of the rebels only as a drop of water upon a house in flames. The value of the thing was wholly in quality. “Mr. Lincoln, you will catch and return our slaves if they run away from us, and will help us hold them where they are;” what cause, then, since you have descended to this depth of wickedness, withholds you from coming down to us entirely? Indeed, in what respect are you better than ourselves, or our overseers and drivers who hunt and flog our Negroes into obedience?—Again, the slaveholders have a decided advantage over Mr. Lincoln, and over his party. He stands upon the same moral level with them, and is in no respect better than they. If we held the Constitution, as held by Mr. Lincoln, no earthly power could induce us to swear to support it. The fact is, (following the lead of the Dred Scott decision, and the Southern slaveholding politicians, with all the doughfaces of the North who have been engaged in making a constitution, for years, outside of the Constitution of 1789) Mr. Lincoln has taken everything at this point in favor of slavery for granted. He is like the great mass of his countrymen, indebted to the South for both law and gospel.” (Foner 75) Lincoln who did not believe in citizenship for Africans actually deporting 450 Africans born in America only to have approximately 350 returned because of inhumane treatment and over poor conditions. This means that at least one hundred Africans met death because of Lincoln’s impractical deportation plan. His turtle like conservative politics, his waffling, indecisive cautious hand kept slavery in place along with his inability to lead caused great human suffering among Africans. Lincoln was the quintessential White man who was illegitimately privileged because of the African Slave Trade, American slavery, Native American Genocide and American Apartheid. Manning’s impressive awards are

no indication that her scholarship on Lincoln is either fair or balanced. It does inform us that she has been welcomed into the “good old boy’s club” as one of the few women and first rate Civil War scholar to speak so widely on the subject. And, why not when she panders to the same racist sentiments as do other scholars who suppress the historical facts and fashion a Lincoln beyond mythical proportions. When describing the Battle of Plymouth in 1864 Manning states, “the violence at Plymouth was ruthless, but not senseless.” This is while African soldiers were being butchered by cannibalistic Confederate soldiers who showed African Union soldiers no mercy. How quickly she becomes an apologist for the logic of the Confederate soldiers who fought to keep the Africans enslaved and who slaughtered Africans when their lives should have been spared. Enslaving human beings for personal profit is “ruthless and senseless.” This is the primary lesson that the Civil War taught the world. Nevertheless, this is the same lesson that Manning has failed to learn. By conservative estimation at least 620,000 people lost their lives for this reason. It is senseless to kill people because they do not want to be enslaved! (Manning 175-176) In fact, in one of Lincoln’s more honest political moments while arguing for the passage of the Thirteenth Amendment he says Africans are a “harmless race of men inflicted without cause and without excuses for ages.” (Brodie 202) History however, informs me that the majority of white Americans endorsed slavery. America according to Manning “...built its treasure and might on the backs of slaves....” (Manning 158) It was the extreme minority that were against it like the white radical abolitionist John Brown, groups of Quakers, the Amish and a few others who are still marginalized today. According to Stephen Douglass, Lincoln’s Illinois challenger, in their first debate in 1858, 12 of the 13 colonies were slaveholding. We don’t need fiction writers to create make-believe enemies or demonic vampires for Lincoln to hunt and slay. To my way of thinking the historical Lincoln and men who thought like him were indeed the

actual vampires who literally sucked the blood of life out of Africans by working and beating them to death in order to empower their own blood-thirsty existence, deriving wealth from the blood of enslaved Africans.

The demons we had to fight were white Americans bound to force Africans to serve them from generation to generation forever. White filmmakers and professional writers have created the metaphor of vampires, werewolves, and monsters that ravaged the bodies and souls of human beings. As it relates to Africans and African Americans white people themselves have been our vampires and our werewolves the men and the women who have been the monsters of our reality and have broken our spirits and have dehumanized our souls. These writers who would fashion for us a hero who like their racist ancestors take for granted that we cannot think for ourselves and that we are ignorant and cannot check the historical record for ourselves. Let us be clear, white Americans have been the African's historical and cultural enemies as a group since we were forced into chains to these American shores. We are aware of this historical reality that Spielberg and Manning gloss over. I am not indicting all white people and their sympathizers. I am, however, indicting most white people who caused slavery to exist from essentially 1619 – 1868, from the first 19 or 20 Africans to arrive in America and until the passing of the Fourteenth Amendment. Spielberg and Manning believed in a fairness that never existed in those times and many would question does it exist even today. All Black people are not politically naïve. The Lincoln of Spielberg and the Lincoln of the movie: Abraham Lincoln – Vampire Hunter, an ax wielding martial artist ninja-like Lincoln who hunts and slays vampires are equally fiction and the historical Lincoln was neither moral or courageous or a dedicated integrationist who had a Black best friend. Lincoln answered when queried by an elderly [white] gentleman whether he was really in favor of producing a perfect equality between Negroes and

white people. “I will say then that I am not, nor ever have been in favor of bringing about in any way the social and political equality of the white and black races,--that I am not nor ever have been in favor of making voters or jurors of negroes, nor qualifying them to hold office, nor to intermarry with white people; and I will say in addition to this that here is a physical differences between the white and black races which I believe will forever forbid the two races living together on terms of social and political equality. And inasmuch as they cannot so live, while they do remain together there must be the position of of superior and inferior, and I as much as any other man am in favor of having the superior position assigned to the white race...”(Garfinkle 18) This is the historical Lincoln the cold, calculating, evil mean and racist colonial politician who cared nothing about enslaved Africans and all the fantasy in the world cannot change this hated reality. Listen to the voice of a man who knew Lincoln personally as the great radical abolitionist Frederick Douglass in 1862 characterizes Lincoln’s personality, “Mr. Lincoln is quite a genuine representative of American prejudice and Negro hatred and far more concerned for the preservation of slavery, and the favor of the Border Slave States, than for any sentiment of magnanimity or principle of justice and humanity.” (Foner 268) “... To these colored people, without power and without influence, the President is direct, undisguised, and unhesitating. He says to the colored people: I don’t like you; you must clear out of this country. So too in dealing with anti-slavery Generals the president is direct and firm. He is always brave and resolute in his interferences in favor of slavery, remarkably unconcerned about the wishes and opinions of the people of the north; apparently wholly indifferent to the moral sentiment of civilized Europe; but bold and self- reliant as he is in the ignominious service of slavery, he is timid as a sheep when required to live up to a single one of his anti-slavery testimonies. He is scrupulous to the very letter of the law in favor of slavery, and a perfect latitudinarian as to the

discharge of his duties under the law favoring freedom.” (Foner 269) This is the historical Lincoln described by his African contemporary, Frederick Douglass not some dreamy eyed film maker or some admiring academician writing nearly a hundred and fifty years (1861-2011) after his service. Fantasy and self- deception has a long and tortured history in the American mind and character. Historical facts are often forsaken for popular myths and folklore to give appeal to lackluster characters like Abraham Lincoln who has been turned into a revenue creating industry in a capitalistic environment that says to hell with the facts--- make money at all cost! Douglass spoke forthrightly about American mental delusion. “Self-deception is a chronic disease of the American mind and character. The crooked way is ever preferred to the straight in our mental processes, and in all our studied actions. We are masters in the art of substituting a pleasant falsehood for an ugly and disagreeable truth, and of clinging to a fascinating delusion while rejecting a palpable reality. Every reflecting man knows, and knows full well, that the real source and centre of treason, rebellion and bloodshed under which the country is now staggering as if to fall, is slavery.” (Foner 126) This was common knowledge in 1862 where White Americans lied and denied this hated reality so thoroughly that an aging Oliver Wendell Holmes, Jr. said, “there is one thing I do not doubt ... and that is that the faith is true and adorable which leads a soldier to throw away his life in obedience to a blindly accepted duty, in a cause which he little understands.” (Manning 18) Holmes is wrong. The soldiers were aware that they were fighting for slavery and to imply that they were confused or simply ignorant to the fact is to distort the reality that the soldiers were fighting to preserve the institution of slavery. The ultimate confusion over why the Civil War was fought is because men of the stature of Holmes purposefully distorted the issue. This is the conspiracy of silence that causes white Americans not to know the truth about their own history. There has been a white revisionist version which

dominates the current American historical primary narrative especially relative to the American Civil War. As testimonies to this truth are the awards that Manning's book has received for coming close to the actual history of the American Civil War which maintains that Slavery was the cause of the war. Her work is groundbreaking in that it dares to listen to the stories of the soldiers, those who actually fought the war. Now do not take my positions for granted. Lies in the white academy have been so pervasive that as late as September, 2005, a man, according to Manning from Buffalo, New York spent more than an hour insisting slavery had nothing to do with the Civil War. (Manning 3-4) Why is it that the masses of American citizens are so uninformed when it comes to the root cause of the American Civil War? It must be understood that the dominant culture has so anesthetized the noun slavery that it no longer captures the meaning of the horrific institution that it once represented. In fact, the complete denunciation of slavery from the American Civil War is part of the sanitizing of the term. Americans are kept ignorant on this particular issue because they have created the notion that Africans are nonviolent and meek when it comes to fighting for their own freedom. Ironically, Africans are expected to go to war to for white America's causes, fighting physically and yes, even violently for white people and their causes. It makes sense that Africans would ultimately rise up physically against the inhumane acts committed by their enslavers.

Africans fought so gallantly and successfully for themselves that they terrified the collective white American psyche to the extent that it caused a crisis of fear so unthinkable in the minds of whites that it caused the American population to not be able to connect the violent revolution brought on by the Africans' quest to be free as the origins of the problems that forced the president of the United States into freeing the enslaved Africans by the signing of the

Emancipation Proclamation. This is one of the most hated realities in American historical culture—Africans initiated the violence that led to their release in the American Civil War.

Since white people are psychologically conditioned to see Africans and their Black descendants as nonhumans, and are aware that they religiously indoctrinate Africans with Christianity and its messages of nonviolence it is therefore unimaginable in their minds that Africans would fight physically in their freedom struggles. “Slaves did not take abuse passively...Slaves attacked bondage at its core...but the evidence is strong that slaves resisted by challenging the slavocracy at every level, and perhaps, forcing it towards a breakdown.” (Owens 104-105) Feeding this massive lie of nonviolence are historians the caliber of Manning who maintains, “Slaves themselves did the most to force emancipation onto the Union agenda, but the first and most important way they did so was by winning over enlisted Union soldiers, who, in the first year of the war, became the first major group after black Americans and abolitionists to call for an end to slavery, and who expected their view to influence the prosecution of the war.” (Manning 50-51) This statement is only partially true because the question of African freedom was paramount and found its way to the Union agenda because it was at the epicenter of the African’s agenda where the slaves set fires to crops, they joined forces with Native Americans, broke tools, formed maroon groups and terrorist bands. (Owens 80) They acted clumsy and lazy which “these characteristics were often cited as evidence of the inferiority of the slave.” (Frazier 50) Protests among Africans in the United States took individual and collective form. Among the ways they rebelled was to put poison in the master’s food or his well water, they committed suicide, they maimed and injured themselves, sabotaged tools and animals, feigned sickness, and flight including simply walking off of the plantations individually or in groups, so much so that “...In the spring of 1863 there were swarming crowds of Negroes and white refugees along the line of

defense made between the armies of the North and South... (Du Bois 64) These are just some of the ways Africans forced emancipation onto the Union's agenda. All of these acts and more were done prior to African's freedom making the agenda of white soldiers none of which Manning mentions culminating in physical violence that made its way to America's agenda which she conveniently negates and makes it appear as if African freedom got on the American agenda through diplomatic negotiations and nonviolence. This glossing over of the bloody facts is how professional historians distort American history.

In a desperate effort to win the war Africans forced the Confederacy to see the utility of using them and the Confederacy with great reluctance did the "previously unthinkable" and enlisted African soldiers "arming some black slaves to "stave off imminent defeat..." (Manning 305) And they also won some of the affections of Union soldiers. This is the true way and not the stereotyped way that Africans influenced the Civil war. Manning gives us only a partial non-violent version or a stereotype of the truth. Dr. Aptheker's classic volume, *Negro Revolts*...maintains that the African's violent "uprisings and plots came in waves, as though anger accumulated and vented itself and then a period of rest and recuperation was needed before the next upsurge. Certainly, waves were the rule, with clearly defined periods, as: 1710-1722, 1730-1740, 1790-1802, 1819-1823, 1829-1832, 1850-1860." (Aptheker 3) Within these "waves" are insurrections by Nat Turner (1832), Denmark Vesey (1822), and Gabriel Prosser (1800).

Lincoln was a hypocrite that waffled and gave fuzzy answers on the issue of African enslavement. The government "degenerated into a compromise, so that an American wherever met with is simply a bundle of contradictions, incongruities and absurdities. For every truth he utters, he has a qualification, and for every principle he lays down, he has an exception. All his doctrines are accompanied with "ifs" and "buts." The attempt to reconcile slavery with freedom

has dethroned our logic and converted our statesmanship into stultified imbecility. It has given three tongues to all our politicians, a tongue for the North and a tongue for the South, and a double tongue for the nation.” (Foner 139) Lincoln was a proslavery politician right up to the moment just before he signed the Emancipation Proclamation. Prior to that time he chose silence over advocacy. At a time where Frederick Douglass, William Lloyd Garrison, Harriet Tubman, Sojourner Truth, and John Brown withstood public persecution and hatred for their unpopular position in their life times, it is patternly unfair to heap praise and honor on people like Lincoln who did as little as humanly possible to aid and abet these truly moral people. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. who was considered by millions the moral leader of America in the 1960’s reminds us “the ultimate measure of a man is not where he stands in moments of comfort and convenience, but where he stands at times of challenge and controversy.” Lincoln stood with the enslavers of African people until he was forced to break ranks to save the Union. That he finally broke ranks with his criminal country men and women does not make him the saint that he has been catapulted into being. The real saints are often not known and are dismissed as political and religious fanatics. John Brown has been in the out- house of American politics since his murder in 1859. It is difficult to find a respectable course taught on this truly great American figure in any major university or academic institution in America. Why? It is because he dared to stand before the white American public as a white man and declare that Africans were human beings and as such expressions of God and that their lives were sacred. In fact, he was willing to sacrifice his white life and the white lives of his family to stop the crime and sin of enslaving Africans. He and other abolitionists were the minority totally committed to African freedom whereas, Lincoln and the majority of white Americans were pro-enslavers. Yet, the name of Lincoln as the emancipator is ubiquitous whileas poor John Brown, William Garrison, and Gerrit

Smith are relegated to footnotes of history. Case in point, Manning places Frederick Douglass and others in inconspicuous footnotes, and the body of her book does not give details about people like Daniel Payne, Sojourner Truth, Henry McNeal Turner, and others who actually met in person with Lincoln to discuss slavery. This most important issue—an issue that in the eyes of those writing about history like Spielberg and Manning is consciously silenced and erased from the history in which Africans played a major role in acquiring liberation.

This is the ying and the yang of the dynamic duo, Manning and Spielberg who promote Lincoln into demagoguery. Spielberg's pensive deeply introspective or Solomon-like wise, Lincoln, and Lincoln the vampire slayer who is revengeful, animated and incredibly violent and nocturnal like the Ku Klux Klan but only for righteousness. In the first few minutes of the movie, "history prefers legends to men, nobility to brutality, soaring speeches to quiet deeds. It remembers the battle, and forgets the blood." Just like white Americans who have chosen to forget the bloodshed by radical abolitionists for African freedom. Further, the Stephen Douglas character in the Lincoln the Vampire Hunter is given the line, "slavery is a complicated issue." The Lincoln character retorts, "I couldn't disagree with you more, Mr. Douglass." Similarly, Manning maintains that Lincoln is a complicated man. I could not disagree with her more. This creation of Lincoln who dispels the evil of vampirism in the South is a conscious created adaptation of evil being systematically stamped out by our super hero president. This fabrication is very careful not to say that the southern people themselves are evil or were evil but that vampires fight on the side of the South is a condemning fact.

Rather, to use historian Lerone Bennett's term Lincoln has been "forced into glory." In this regard hear the testimony of H. Ford Douglass, a 28 year old freed Negro from Lincoln's home state of Illinois, who had personally met Abraham Lincoln on several occasions. This Douglas is

not to be confused with the national and international freedom fighter Frederick Douglass. In a speech he delivered before the presidential election of 1860 he says, "...I do not believe in the anti-slavery of Abraham Lincoln, because he is on the side of this Slave Power of which I am speaking, that has possession of the Federal Government. ...Abraham Lincoln in favor of carrying out the infamous Fugitive Slave Law, that not only strikes down the liberty of every black man in the United States but virtually the liberty of every white man as well...Not only would I arraign Mr. Lincoln, in regard to that law for his proslavery character and principles, but when he was a member of the House of Representatives, in 1849, on the 10th day of January, he went through the District of Columbia, and consulted the prominent proslavery men and slaveholders of the District, and then went into the House of Representatives and introduced, on his own responsibility, a fugitive slave law for the District of Columbia. It is well known that the law of 1793 did not apply to the District, and it was necessary, in order that slaveholders might catch their slaves who sought safety under the shadow of the capital that a special law should be passed for the District of Columbia; and so Mr. Lincoln went down deeper into the proslavery pool than even Mr. Mason of Virginia did in the Fugitive Slave Law of 1850." (Garfinkle 32-33)

He was a critic of the policies of Lincoln. We must remember at all times he was living during the administration of Abraham Lincoln and was directly affected by Lincoln's policies on Africans. Who better to hear from? It is known by both pro-Lincoln and anti-Lincoln forces that Lincoln was reluctant to take positive action against slavery during his first year in office. Lincoln apologists like Dr. Chandra Manning would argue that this did not stem from his affection for the institution. Let us be clear, Abraham Lincoln was the penultimate politician. He looked after his own self-interest—simply put, Lincoln gave lip service without giving real service to being antislavery even when he says "he hated it because of the monstrous injustice of

slavery itself.” (Manning Article 2) It may have been the case that he never changed his mind but his policies were always proslavery. Lincoln was publically a “divided house” on the subject of slavery. His rhetoric ran the gamut of the political circuit and his politics were guided by the particular audience he was addressing at the time. Even when campaigning in Illinois his chief opponent, Stephen Douglass accuses Lincoln of being politically unstable and waffling on the issue of race, “...Abolitionists up north are expected and required to vote for Lincoln because he goes for the equality of the races, holding that by the Declaration of Independence the white man and the negro were created equal and endowed by the Divine law with that equality, and down south he tells the old Whigs, the Kentuckians, Virginians, and Tennesseans, there is a physical difference in the races, making one superior and other inferior, and that he is in favor of maintaining the superiority of the white race over the negro. Now, how can you reconcile those two positions of Mr. Lincoln?” (Garfinkle 20-21) This is the political dodge ball that Lincoln played with the American people leading right up to the signing of the Emancipation Proclamation. And, let us remember, there is no colonial CNN or other news media agencies that can televise these contradictions immediately. Here is the problem with playing dodge ball with African lives: The Africans he sent back to the front lines of the Confederacy were often tortured and brutally murdered by the Confederates. And, the freed Africans living in states like Illinois could not vote and were treated just like the Africans in the south. And remember, it was Lincoln himself who introduced a Fugitive Slave law to capture Africans in Washington, DC. Therefore, his abstract theory of antislavery did not pan out in reality. In a word, until Lincoln freed Africans he was a pro-slavery president in deeds and in fact. All of his apologists who talk so glowingly of this anti-slavery theory did not have the luxury of living as an African under his administration. My wish for them is that they could live as an Africans under Lincoln’s theoretic

certain death. Knowing Lincoln's politics and his proslavery actions and inclinations how any honest person square that he was a moral individual when he had no regard for the human life of Africans. Anyone arguing that Lincoln should be praised as the liberator of Africans does not understand who Abraham Lincoln was. In as much as Europeans are expressions of God so were the Africans. Hear the words of Frederick Douglass when he critiques America's beloved Independence Day celebration when he poses the question:

What, to the American slave, is your 4th of July? I answer; a day that reveals to him, more than all other days in the year, the gross injustice and cruelty to which he is the constant victim. To him, your celebration is a sham; your boasted liberty, an unholy license; your national greatness, swelling vanity; your sounds of rejoicing are empty and heartless; your denunciations of tyrants, brass fronted impudence; your shouts of liberty and equality, hollow mockery; your prayers and hymns, your sermons and thanksgivings with all your religious parade, and solemnity, are, to him, mere bombast, fraud, deception, impiety, and hypocrisy—a thin veil to cover up crimes which would disgrace a nation of savages. There is not a nation on the earth guilty of practices, more shocking and bloody, than are the people of these United States, at this very hour.

Go where you may, search where you will, roam through all the monarchies and despotisms of the old world, travel through South America, search out every abuse, and when you have found the last, lay your facts by the side of the every day practices of this nation, and you will say with me, that, for revolting barbarity and shameless hypocrisy, America reigns without a rival. (Barksdale and Kinnamon 94-95)

What must be said of Lincoln is that he must be seen as a leading figure of his time and someone who did not want to be considered outside of popular opinion. By necessity this made him wrong on the war question and the question of African enslavement. By being politically correct in the 1860s made him morally wrong forever. Lincoln was a leading white male racist who wanted a world created by white people for white people. There must never be a denial of his power, his prejudice, and his racism. Not until and unless, America can come to grips that its founding fathers and some of its heroes and heroines were evil personalities will truth have a chance. Truth is the political football in the arena of politics. In other words, whoever is in

power at any particular time are the truth bearers. This is the reality of America's sordid political past. In this regard might makes right!

The lives of Africans should be ends in themselves because their lives mattered to them, if no one else. To use the lives of Africans to solidify the problems of white Americans illustrates the bestial nature of Abraham Lincoln. A man who sent innocent Africans back to the Confederates which meant certain death to the poor African because they had a "Black Flag" or a "no quarter policy" which meant Black troops were killed as opposed to being taken prisoner. Lincoln is not worthy of the praise lavished upon him.

According to historian, Lerone Bennett, Jr. "to say that Lincoln was a racist is to understate the case and divert attention from the fact that racism was the center and circumference of his being and that one cannot say a single word about him that is not informed by this fact." (Bennett 66) These southern patriots were determined to continue enslaving Africans by any means. In 1836-1844 they had what was termed a Gag Rule where the southern controlled congress stopped the reception of any antislavery petitions from white northerners. (Manning 15) In a similar vein, President Jackson, born in South Carolina, could not sanction the destruction of the U.S. mail, but he did not want to exacerbate the tensions created when he quashed the Nullification Act three years earlier, so he issued this policy directive to the postmaster general:

We can do nothing more than direct that those inflammatory papers be delivered to none but who will demand them as subscribers; and in every instance the postmaster ought to take their names down, and have them exposed through the public journals as subscribers to this wicked plan of exciting the Negroes to insurrection and to massacre. (Wills 306)

In other words, President Jackson is instructing the postmaster general to become an informant for the government to expose any American who disagrees with the proslavery agenda. This is

the beginning of national censorship and the forcing of American citizens to renounce their consciences.

Given that Lincoln understands the political implications of public sentiment he is crafting his image then and for the future that it might be used positively versus negatively. Clearly, understanding public sentiment Lincoln is designing the best case scenario for himself. This has everything to do with political strategy and nothing to do with morality.

“As early as 1837, during the debates over the proposal to lay antislavery petitions on the table and again in 1842, John Quincy Adams provided an answer to the question. He asserted that during a war all laws governing the institution of slavery was swept aside. It was ridiculous, he argued, to claim that under such circumstances the federal government had no power to interfere in any way with slavery. When two hostile armies oppose each other the commanders of both have the power to emancipate all the slaves under their jurisdiction, he concluded. Surely, by the reasoning of Adams the situation in 1861 provided the Union commanders with such an opportunity and imposed on them the obligation to emancipate the slaves in the interest of victory over the Confederacy.” (Franklin 14)

Lincoln had been supplied with the political solution to the problem for Southern secession by John Quincy Adams twenty years before he actually applied Adams’ strategy to the solution for American union. Africans were seen as weapons of war they must not be controlled by the hostile enemy. Therefore, emancipation was a weapon that could be used psychologically as well as militarily. To this fact many members of congress were aware. (Franklin 17) Lincoln’s freeing of Africans was strictly political, psychological, and military and had absolutely nothing to do with morality or any sentimental affection for Africans. Lincoln perceived Africans as non-human and he could use them at his discretion even if it meant being used (or not used) as liberating forces or pawns of war.

White Americans have been in denial about African rebellion. This State’s rights and the restriction of the expansion are great subterfuges not to admit the carnal fear that ultimately

caused the greatest political crisis in American history. Disunion was not the primary cause rather it was the violence of radical abolitionists that sparked the reasons for disunion. There simply would not have been anyway that white America could lay aside its racism to be totally honest for the balancing of history and the future of America.

“Such was the world in which Civil War soldiers had come of age. To be sure, they did not spend night and day thinking about the [African] slavery issue, and most probably preferred to push it [African Enslavement] as far from the forefront of their minds as possible, but once the war came, they could not, and more importantly, did not, ignore it. Some historians have criticized (implicitly or explicitly) the study of Civil War soldiers are something of an escape hatch offering authors and readers a way to avoid wrestling with difficult and sometimes painful ideological questions about war. Even some veterans in their later years did their best to suppress the role of slavery. Slavery, and even to deny that the soldiers possessed any ideological awareness at all.” (Manning 18)

The fact that I had to include the pronoun African proves how easy it is to obscure the reality of African humanity by even well meaning professionals. Manning herself participates in obscuring the classical barbarism of slavery by not unpacking classical slavery (1441-1865) (Quarles 19) as the horrific institution that it was. She presents slavery in 21st century style sanitized. She takes for granted that the reading population understands the cruel nature and implications of enslavement which is not necessarily the case. As a historian it is paramount that she clarifies the nuances in the term slavery from the antebellum period to contemporary times. As historians we must be vigilant in keeping our audience in mind those who are not professional historians and also that terms or the definitions of words change from generation to generation. The noun slavery for persons in the 15th century meant something completely different than say for my son who in the 21st century is studying history at Morehouse College. But, as a historian she is using the word slavery in the proper context to the time of its occurrence but her contemporary audience does not necessarily have the historical and cultural

experience to understand it properly so it is necessary for Manning to dismantle the loaded term in order to connect the historical and cultural divide.

“... the men in the ranks do not allow us to duck the uncomfortable issue of human slavery, but rather take us right to the heart of it. They forced us to look at it unflinchingly, and what is more, to see it [African Enslavement] as a national, not simply southern, issue that defined a war and shaped a nation.” (Manning 18)

Whereas with Manning there is a level of courageousness and honesty for daring to even use the term slavery and all of its negative connotations in her scholarship when the same term is used in contemporary society it is neutered unless Manning is willing to fill in the historical and cultural blanks for contemporary students which she does not do. To assign blame white Americans have traditionally found a way to include Africans while denying blame for themselves and members of their group. White Americans are vanguards for requiring others to take responsibility for their mistakes, misdeeds, and wrongdoings. But, they almost always avoid accepting responsibility for their own bad behavior. Part of the reason Africans are not given credit for the crisis of fear and radical abolition that ultimately caused the American Civil War is that there was fear and American white scholars and political thinkers are hard pressed to admit publically that they could not protect their property, their women and their children. But, they could not protect them and the historical record is filled with letters, diary and journal entries that substantiate this fact. Then the Africans must be credited for being both human and smart and willing to fight for their own lives. All of these things we know in 2013 were true. But, white historians and professional academics as well as film makers simply find it difficult and distasteful work to find their ancestors racist, naïve and often horribly wrong. Therefore, it is simpler to let sleeping dogs lie. But, the historical record is in need of balancing and this tedious, odious most difficult work often fall to the most oppressed themselves to balance the

record. This is my mission to champion radical abolitionist both Black and white, and give primary credit to the continental Africans.

If these white immigrants had to wage the American Revolution against their cousins who oppressed them and were justified in their actions the enslaved Africans who were most oppressed and enslaved and discriminated against were equally if not more justified in their physical protesting of their enslavement. Like the Africans who had to fight their enslavers to save their lives the enslavers must now fight the King of England to save their own lives. The effects of the decision made by the colonists in the latter instance are summed up as the American Revolution. To justify that position Mr. Jefferson among other things charged King George, III of England as follows:

“He has waged cruel war against human nature itself, violating its most sacred rights of life and liberty in the persons of a distant people who never offended him, captivating and carrying them into slavery in another hemisphere, or to incur miserable death in their transportation thither. This piratical warfare, the opprobrium of infidel powers, is the warfare of the Christian King of Great Britain.” (Nimley 82)

This passage is significant in that it assists us in understanding the thought processes of the American enslavers who were colonists. From the passage after a close, it is evident that in the deep recesses of their minds African rebellion or radical abolition loomed large and that the enslaved Africans were seen as human beings. However, considering that the enslavers were the first to violate the African’s human rights and to treat them savagely up to the time of the Declaration of Independence it was impossible for these enslavers to admit openly that the Africans were as human as they. Consequently, they lied and denied the truth that they knew in order to reap the benefits of enslaving Africans. The plea made by the colonists to the King of England was exactly the same plea that the Africans made to the colonists with exactly the same results. On this score, the Continental Congress of the Colonists was therefore forced to delete

this passage from the Declaration of Independence because of the protesting by the Southerner Nationalist.

Lincoln's racism was so virulent in 1862 that he says he suffered from the mere sight (and the physical threat that Africans posed) as he rationalizes African suffering "...I think your race suffer very greatly, many of them by living among us, while ours suffer from your presence. In a word we suffer on each side. If this be admitted, it affords a reason at least why we should be separated" (Franklin 31) Here, Lincoln blames the African victims for his and fellow colonists' suffering. But, Frederick Douglass finds Lincoln's position ludicrous when he states.... " It does not require any great amount of skill to point out the fallacy and expose the unfairness of the assumption, for by this time every man who has an ounce of brain in his head, no matter to which party he may belong, and even Mr. Lincoln himself...knows that in Mexico, Central America and South America, many distinct races live peaceably together in the enjoyment of equal rights, and that civil wars which occasionally disturb the peace of those regions never originated in difference of the races inhabiting them. A horse thief pleading that the existence of the horse is the apology for his theft or a highway man contending that the money in the traveler's pocket is the sole first cause his robbery are about as much entitled to respect as the president's reasoning on this point. No, Mr. President, it is not the innocent horse that makes the horse thief, not the traveler's purse that makes the highway robber, and it is not the presence of the negroes that causes this foul and unnatural war, but the cruel and cupidity of those who wish to possess horses, money and Negroes by means of theft, robbery, and rebellion. Mr. Lincoln further knows or ought to know at least that Negro hatred and prejudice of color are neither original nor invincible vices, but merely the offshoots of that root of all crimes and evil—slavery. If the colored people instead of having been stolen and forcibly brought to the United

States had come as free immigrants, like the Germans and the Irish, never thought of as suitable objects of property, they never would have become the objects of aversion and bitter persecution, nor would there ever have been divulged and propagated the arrogant and malignant nonsense about natural repellency and the incompatibility of races. [As] illogical and unfair as Mr. Lincoln's statements are, they are nevertheless, quite in keeping with his whole course from the beginning to the end of his administration up to this day....As Mr. Lincoln however in all his writings has manifested a decided awkwardness in the management of the English language, we do not think there is any intention in this respect, but only the incapacity to do better." (Foner 267-270) Here we have the writer of the unforgettable Gettysburg Address and the unparalleled Emancipation Proclamation charged with being illiterate by an enslaved African prior to the Emancipation Proclamation in September, 1862. Southern society was in complete denial relative to the inhumanity of enslaving Africans. The fact that the Northerners pointed to this reality absolutely infuriated the Confederates. They considered this the language of abuse and vilification, violence and denunciation. The Abolitionist sank to the depths of vulgarity and obscenity. Men such as Frederick Douglass, Wendell Phillips, Charles Sumner, Steven Foster and others... "All crimes were laid at the door of these [Southern] people: they were kidnappers, manstealers, pimps, common horse thief...they became monsters and their children were not children but young monsters...thus in the language of abuse and insult the Southern Nationalists prepared for war." (Stampps, 57-58) But of course the South saw itself as none of these things but rather filled with morality and beloved Southern tradition.

It is no marvel that slaveholders are always talking of their *kind treatment* of their slaves. The only marvel is, that men of sense can be gulled by such professions. Despots always insist that they are merciful. The greatest tyrants that ever dripped with blood have assumed the titles of "most gracious," "most clement," most merciful," &c., and have ordered their crouching vassals to accost them thus. When did not vice lay claim to those virtues which are the opposites of its habitual crimes? The guilty, according to their own

showing, are always innocent, and cowards, brave, and the drunkards sober, and harlots chaste, and pickpockets honest to a fault. Everybody understands this. (Ruchames 166-167)

Complicated racial positions are simply subterfuge for blatantly anti-African behavior on the part of Lincoln. Lincoln is given diplomatic immunity to be hate-filled because at the time it was politically correct. This nonsense is absolutely unacceptable. He must be critiqued and his behavior must be critiqued for the evil that it was. Dr. Manning has dismissed in her argument Lincoln's bigoted behavior as not really explaining much about Lincoln. This is a classical historical lie. It explains Lincoln's evil and demonic behavior relative to Africans. As a contemporary scholar who is both an award winner and is classically trained, Dr. Manning hides her own racism by not exposing Lincoln's racism. She and Steven Spielberg though working separately are in fact working in tandem. They are partners in crime when it comes to forming the premise for the primary historical American narrative which says to the world that Lincoln was basically a good human being. But as Erich Fromm has said, "the fact that an idea satisfies a wish does not mean necessarily that the idea is false." (Eisenstadt 228) Unless of course, the historical reality and facts prove the idea false. What makes their crimes even worst is that in an effort to push the primary narrative forward the distorted information they write about Lincoln is disseminated to thousands of innocent young men and women, handed off as history through various media outlets has the potential of murdering the sympathies of those who are simply searching for the truth. The attempt to make Abraham Lincoln's behavior seem politically complicated and racially neutral is in itself an indictment against Africans and a siding with the blood thirsty, murdering Confederate whites who took no prisoners and showed no mercy like their general at Fort Pillow--- Nathan Bedford Forrest. It is incredible beyond belief that the ancestors of Jefferson Davis are claiming a hundred and fifty years later that their ancestors have

been misunderstood historically and that they were not racist, but simply victims of the spirit of their times. The problem with this logic is that there were real heroes and heroines that dissented from this fanatical and politicized majority's logic. If Jefferson Davis president of the Confederacy was not racist and General Nathan Bedford Forrest, the butcher at Fort Pillow were not racist then Adolph Hitler, the chancellor of Nazi Germany was not racist. In fact, no racist has ever existed! Abraham Lincoln is as guilty of enslaving Africans as are the forefather's of American Nazism and American Apartheid Jefferson Davis and Nathan Bedford Forrest. Lincoln's signature on the Emancipation Proclamation can not absolve him of the murders of the Africans who died in slavery under his administration nor those who had escaped slavery that he allowed to be returned. Lincoln's hands were red with African blood! There can be no diplomatic immunity—presidents such as Lincoln are not excluded.

Manning has carefully and consciously as did Steven Spielberg silenced the dissenting voices of Frederick Douglass, Sojourner Truth, and William Lloyd Garrison whose dominant call for the immediate emancipation of Africans were ignored, diminished and relegated to footnotes and do not give us a proper historical context or understanding of the ferociousness of their disagreement with Abraham Lincoln's proslavery politics. Spielberg is hypersensitive when it comes to issues concerning Jews and the Holocaust yet he has a tin ear when it comes to the cries of enslaved Africans demanding freedom. His ears are not attuned to the cries of African people, his sensitivities numb to the emotions of the enslaved and he is utterly handicapped when it comes to contextualizing and presenting the genuine historical atrocities that affected their humanity. Comparatively, in the 21st century, token Blacks such as Condelezza Rice, Colin Powell, and of course, Barack Obama gives the façade that Black people are empowered since these Blacks hold high powered positions. This is absolutely not true. Their power lies

primarily in undermining the causes of African-Americans therefore promoting white dominance nationally and internationally. They have the attention of peoples of color the world over people who would otherwise not deal with white American policy makers are open to them given their race. But their policy making is still Eurocentric and more often works against people of color. In the 21st century Jim and Jane Crow are now Black and their color affords them the cloak under which to work for white causes without being readily identity by Blacks and other people of color as double agents. Yet, this goes nearly unnoticed. But, we must shout into their ears and sound an alarm—these racists who are awarded and praised from the highest citadels of America—to stop lying, stop perverting history, stop quieting the quake of truth and give it a chance to transform the American mindset into fulfilling its potential to become the greatest country in the world for freedom and diversity rather than falsely claiming the prize while the masses of the people never experience the reality of freedom. When authentic freedom becomes a reality in America the precious blood of those continental Africans and radical Republicans and Abolitionist such as Nat Turner and John Brown and Frederick Douglass who lit the fuse that caused the explosion that was the American Civil War will not have died in vain!

Works Cited

Aptheker, Herbert. *American Negro Slave Revolts*. International Publishers. New York, 1952

Barksdale, Richard and Kenneth Kinnamon, Editors. *Black Writers of America: A Comprehensive Anthology*. The Macmillan Company. New York, 1972

Bennett, Lerone, Jr. *Forced Into Glory: Abraham Lincoln's White Dream*. Johnson Publishing Company. Chicago, 1999

Brent, Linda. *Incidents In The Life of a Slave Girl*. Harcourt Brace Jovanovich Publishers. San Diego, 1973

Brodie, Fawn M. *Thaddeus Stevens: Scourge of the South*. W.W. Norton & Company, Inc. New York, 1959

Channing, Steven A. *Crisis of Fear: Secession in South Carolina*. W. W. Norton & Company, New York, 1970

Carruthers, Jacob H. *The Irritated Genie: An Essay on the Haitian Revolution*. The Kemitic Institute. Chicago, 1985

Chadwick, Bruce. *The Reel Civil War: Mythmaking in American Film: Mythmaking in American Film*. Vintage Books, New York , 2002

Du Bois, W.E.B. *Black Reconstruction in America 1860-1880*. Atheneum. New York, 1935

Eisenstadt, A.S. *The Craft of American History Volume 1 Selected Essays*. Harper Torchbooks. New York, 1966

Foner, Philip S., Editor. *The Life and Writings of Frederick Douglass: Reconstruction and After, Volume 4*. International Publishers. New York ,1955

Franklin, John Hope. *The Emancipation Proclamation: The Dramatic Story of Abraham Lincoln's Greatest Document and its Significance in American History*. Anchor Books. New York, 1965

Frazier, Thomas R., Editor. *Afro-American History: Primary Sources*. Wadsworth Publishing Company. California, 1988

Fuller, Hoyt W. *Journey to Africa*. Third World Press. Chicago, 1971

Garfinkle, Norton, Editor. *Lincoln and the Coming of the Civil War: Problems in American Civilization*. D. C. Heath and Company. Boston, 1965

Hawkins, Hugh. Editor. *The Abolitionists Immediatism and the Question of Means: Problems in American Civilization*, D. C. Heath and Company. Boston, 1964

Holland, Frederick M. *Frederick Douglass: The Colored Orator*. Funk and Wagnalls. New York, 1891

Huggins, Nathan I., Martin Kilson and Daniel M. Fox, Editors. *Key Issues in the Afro-American Experience*. Harcourt Brace Jovanovich. San Diego, 1971

Illington, James. *International Socialist Review, Slavery and the Origin of the Civil War, Issue 78, online edition*. July-August, 2011

Manning, Chandra M. *What This Cruel War Was Over: Soldiers, Slavery, and the Civil War*. Alfred A. Knopf. New York, 2007

- Manning, Chandra M. *Can Soldiers Tell Us Anything about Lincoln? Chicken Bones: An* Journal online
- Miller, William Lee. *Lincoln's Virtues: An Ethical Biography*. Vintage Books. New York, 2002
- Nimley, Anthony J. *The Liberian Bureaucracy: An Analysis and Evaluation of the Environment, Structure and Functions*. University Press of America. Washington, DC 1977
- Owens, Leslie Howard. *This Species of Property: Slave Life and Culture in the Old South*. Oxford University Press. New York 1976
- Quarles, Benjamin. *The Negro In The Making Of America*. Collier Books. New York, 1964
- Robertson, David. *Denmark Vesey: The Buried Story of America's Largest Slave Rebellion and The Man Who Led It*. Vintage Books. New York, 2000
- Ruchames, Louis. *The Abolitionists: A Collection of Their Writings*. G. P. Putnam's Sons. New York, 1963
- Thomas, Alexander and Samuel Sillen. *Racism & Psychiatry*. Carol Publishing Group. New York, 1991
- Stamp, Kenneth. *The Peculiar Institution: Slavery in the Ante-Bellum South*. Vintage Books. New York, 1956
- Tragle, Henry Irving. *The Southampton Slave Revolt of 1831: A Compilation of Source Material*. The University of Massachusetts Press. Amherst, 1971`

Van Der Zee, John. *Bound Over: Indentured Servitude & American Conscience*. Simon and Schuster. New York, 1985

Wesley, Charles H. and Patricia W. Romero. *Negro Americans in the Civil War: From Slavery to Citizenship*. Publishers Company, Inc. New York, 1967

Wills, Garry. *Head and Heart: American Christianities*. The Penguin Press. New York ,2007

Wish, Harvey, Editor. *The Negro Since Emancipation*. Prentice-Hall, Inc. New Jersey, 1964

Wright, Bobby E. *The Psychopathic Racial Personality and Other Essays*. Third World Press. Chicago,1984