

THE FIRE EATER

in silence & in stillness

The Last Cause (from Yankee Babylon)

by MacDonald King Aston

1 November 2008

It is nigh impossible to analyse rationally the foundations underlying the Yankee Myth while, at the same time, issuing a critique of any part of those foundations. The Yankee Myth, as propaganda, has so successfully captured the discourse, for example, surrounding Abraham Lincoln, that even in arguing from historical facts the case against Lincoln, the critic is bound to be maligned as either a “Lincoln-basher” or a poor scholar. The propaganda of the Yankee Myth forms an umbrella under which one is safe only so long as he stands in the gentle rain which falls adoringly upon Lincoln (and any other constituent of the Yankee Myth).

To criticise Lincoln is to criticise the propaganda of and about Lincoln. Yet the propaganda assumes for itself the exclusive hold on the truth, on “American history,” which must have quotation marks because the Yankee Myth’s American history is not factual, but propagandistic at bottom. Lincoln critics such as Thomas DiLorenzo, Jeffrey Rogers Hummel, and Clyde N. Wilson, therefore, no matter the verity and substance of their critiques, are vilified by the Lincoln Court Historians simply for issuing a critique to begin with. Because this state of affairs reigns, I find it equally necessary to qualify Yankee Babylon with my own anti-propaganda statement, to wit, that I do not belong either to any “Lincoln-bashing” camp nor to any Court-Historian camp. I make a distinction between Lincoln the man and Lincoln the historical figure. Any discussion of Lincoln the man must ipso facto belong to biography or psychology. Any discussion of Lincoln the historical figure belongs properly to historical analysis and any related disciplines necessary to understand history (especially philosophy). One may, of course, interject opinions, as I have liberally done. Indeed, the very purpose of studying history is to understand oneself in relation to history, and to form conclusions about history; conclusions which are bound to be opinions in some sense of the term, if only for the fact that human beings comprehend all phenomena only within the limits of their experience.

Extra-experiential reality is non-existent reality, and even if it were real, one could never know it, for epistemologically, all knowing is derived from experience. There is no peeking beyond experience. History as experience is therefore history as the facts present themselves. If the facts about Lincoln (or any other part of the Yankee Myth) present themselves as facts and not as dogma, then those facts constitute a fair enough reason for either a defense of Lincoln or a critique of Lincoln. In Yankee Babylon, it should be manifest that I have decidedly critical opinions of Lincoln the historical figure. I hold those opinions, however, not for some love of “Lincoln-bashing,” as the Court Historians will predictably argue, but because the facts of history, at least as they present themselves to me, are facts, and not otherwise. I have never known Lincoln the man. He died long ago. I have never known his boyhood, nor his inmost thoughts; nor have I known his “humor,” which James G. Randall finds a fit excuse for Lincoln’s war crimes. The only Lincoln I have ever known is the Lincoln of history, and the truth of history, not I, has implicated the historical Lincoln in one of the most vicious displays of evil ever witnessed in the world. The facts, once again, tell the truth, not opinion. Either Lincoln did or did not commit war crimes. Either Lincoln did or did not assume dictatorial and extra-constitutional powers of might makes right.

The facts speak for themselves.

When Court Historians like James G. Randall attempt to soften the ugly portrait of Lincoln’s evil, they do so at the peril of both the historical facts and their own reputations in analysing and treating of those facts. Thus Randall, in *Constitutional Problems Under Lincoln*, can give an impressive list of newspapers which Lincoln unconstitutionally subjected to military suppression, the editors whom Lincoln’s military arrested and threw into jail, and even the specific individuals responsible for these crimes. At the same time, he can, apparently without blinking an eye, claim that the “urgings of the war mind and the demands of military men tended to pull the Government in the direction of arbitrary

measures, while that deeper sense of regard for the law was at the same time operating as a powerful restraining force.” And: “Despite particular occasions of harsh treatment, the prevailing policy was one of tolerance and leniency.” Randall even goes so far as to claim that the absence of the word “censorship” in the official records of the War logically proves that “liberty of the press, even to the point of license did exist,” despite the obvious truth that the winners wrote those official records, and the winners of any war are not obliged to reveal their own iniquity in official records. After all, they won. Randall can equally, and with the same logic of illogic, declare that Lincoln waged a war in which the “rule of law” broke down, but conclude his study with the religiously tinged diction that “the profound reverence still paid to the memory of Lincoln” stands as clear evidence of “democratic faith,” ineffable and immaterial. Randall’s work presents the fundamental propaganda of the Yankee Myth in clear light. That it is propaganda is also clear, for all propaganda relies, in some form, on special pleading, the intentional omission or addition of facts relative to the predicate. The basic works on the War and on Lincoln, if not the entire reading of the antebellum period itself, rest on this special pleading, and thus, nearly the entire “scholarly” corpus forms a subreption of magnitude. The unwary researcher, with this corpus at his side, faces the unpleasant task of ceaselessly searching for the truth amid the prevarications which pass as facts.

Richard N. Current’s work on the perennial question of who fired the first shot of the War, itself a blame game of dubious worth, reveals the same propagandistic false premises seen in Randall’s work. In *Lincoln and the First Shot*, Current has gained standing as a primary work on the subject. Like Randall’s *Constitutional Problems Under Lincoln*, whose very title (problems, not crimes) gives away his bias from the start, Current begins his book by hiding his biases. The Foreword never mentions Current’s view, for example, that Lincoln waged his War to make “possible the ultimate redemption of the union,” the diction of the Puritan and the Yankee, which bespeaks a “religious belief in American Destiny,” as Tuveson saw. Nor does the Foreword or any of the main part of the book prepare the reader for the insubstantial conclusion that Jefferson Davis started the War, a conclusion which would, no doubt, have been laughable to Davis as well as his contemporaries, including those in the North. Even Current admits that Lincoln’s own private secretaries wrote of Lincoln’s policy toward Fort Sumter (or Fort Sumpter, as Lincoln spelled it) as a ploy to initiate a Confederate attack. The attack would then gain for Lincoln “the response of an awakened and united North,” and though Lincoln was right, somehow, in warring upon the South and her people, “to make the issue sure, he determined in addition that the rebellion should be put in the wrong.”

In other words, according to two men who were present during the Fort Sumter affair, two men who were close to Lincoln personally and historically, Lincoln fired the first shot by tricking the South into firing upon Fort Sumter. But rather than call the Nicolay-Hay thesis for what it was, an admission that Lincoln started the War and used Fort Sumter the same way that Adolph Hitler used the Reichstag fire, Current employs special pleading, and transparently at that. He calls the Nicolay-Hay thesis “the Ramsdell thesis,” after Charles W. Ramsdell, a scholar at the University of Texas who wrote a paper which concluded, as Lincoln’s own private secretaries did, that Lincoln maneuvered the South into firing the first shot. The Nicolay-Hay thesis, disguised as “the Ramsdell thesis,” was obviously not acceptable to Current, who passes it off as “an effort to document the rationalizations of Davis, Stephens, and other Confederates or Confederate sympathizers.”

Once again, though, Current had to admit evidence even against his special pleading, namely that Northerners in 1861 also thought that Lincoln was to blame for starting the War. Even to Northerners it was clear that Lincoln, in sending an armed expedition against the harbour at Charleston, South Carolina, forced the hand of the South. The Southern General G. P. T. Beauregard, in his report on military activities at Fort Sumter spelled out the necessity of the South’s military response:

As, in consequence of a communication from the President of the United States to the governor of South Carolina, we were in momentary expectation of an attempt to re-enforce Fort Sumter, or of a descent upon our coast to that end from the United States fleet then lying at the entrance of the harbor, it was manifestly an imperative necessity to reduce the fort as speedily as possible, and not to wait until the ships and the fort should unite in a combined attack upon us.

Indeed, what military commander would wait patiently while his country and men were attacked? Evidently, Current thought that the South should have simply borne the assault without any response, since Fort Sumter “offered no immediate threat to the physical safety of Charleston or of South Carolina or of the other six Confederate States.” The soldiers at Charleston, could they speak *hors de combat*, might conclude differently about their “physical safety” at the

approach of armed warships. Current's book is full of such muddled inferences, a full listing of which would take its own book to explicate, but the overall picture he tries to paint is one coloured by a predetermined opinion, for facts he has little to offer. Instead, after conceding that the South "felt that they had no quarrel with the Northern people as a whole," and after conceding that Lincoln turned down all efforts at peace negotiations; after conceding that Lincoln himself admitted that the "provisioning" of Fort Sumter was an excuse to "advance the cause of the country... even if it should fail," and that the assault upon Fort Sumter was "justified by the result"; and after conceding that "Lincoln could not quite remember, perhaps, exactly what his plans and purposes had been at various points of time between his inauguration and his final decision with regard to Fort Sumter," Current could, at best, conclude:

On the one hand, Lincoln did not count confidently upon peace.... On the other hand, he did not deliberately provoke war. He thought hostilities would be the likely result, and he was determined that, if they should be, they must clearly be initiated by the Confederates.

The logic is abominable, of course. If Lincoln did not count upon peace, he did count upon non-peace as "the likely result." Given the logical waffling of his own making, Current ends his book in determined waffling: "Viewed impartially, both sides were guilty of aggression, and neither was."

Both Randall and Current serve as examples of the main body of supposedly "scholarly" works on Lincoln and his War. In all such works runs a consistent theme: the inability to examine the historical facts logically and without recourse to a sentimental view of Lincoln. It is telling that Current's last words quote Lincoln in the passive voice: "And the war came," as if Lincoln had nothing to do with actively prosecuting a war; merely, "the war came." The War, despite the conjurations of the Court Historians, did not merely come; it was actively set in motion by some one, at some time, and for some reason. Lincoln did choose war and not peace. The South did not attack the North, yet another historical fact. The North did attack and invade the South: one more historical fact. The Constitution after Lincoln resembles but a shadow of the founding document of the United States of America: fact. Historical facts are historical facts, and not pliable to any sentimentalisation; though history is always interpreted, it must be interpreted by the available facts, not by a priori opinion.

The truth about the War which Court Historians call a "Civil War," is actually quite simple in its overall design, and all the historical evidence points to the simplicity, not to any need for "the student of history and politics to broaden his view and definition of the Constitution," nor to find, as Woodrow Wilson did, that the Constitution must be "a vehicle of life" (the living-Constitution theory prevalent today). Again, logic requires better treatment. Either the Constitution reasonably says what it does say or it unreasonably does not say what it does not say. Unfortunately for Randall and all Court Historians, the Constitution is accessible, not hidden, and it does say what it does say; and in saying what it does say, the meaning is not mystically borne away by the tide of years. Instead, its meaning is reasonably obvious and transparent in light of the actual facts of the historical period in which it was written. A "living Constitution" is not a requirement for understanding any constitutional problem under Lincoln; the actual Constitution is. The truth about Lincoln's War, and it was Lincoln's War, not Jefferson Davis' War, a war of the North and not of the South, can be expressed in simple and logical propositions, each verifiable by historical factuality and not by a mythic "vehicle of life."

1. The Northern states of the sovereign United States of America invaded the Southern states of the sovereign Confederate States of America.
2. The military of the Northern states killed men, women, and children in that invasion.
3. The invasion itself was completely and inarguably without just or moral cause, for no Southern state, no Southern army, no Southern sword ever threatened the United States of America at any time before that invasion.

The historical facts are overwhelmingly clear on the matter. The South asked for peace. Lincoln delivered war. The War was not necessary to preserve any Gnostic "Union," for there never existed at any time in history such a "Union." What existed in fact was an agreement, a compact, a confederacy, as the Founders styled it (despite the fact that Court Historians shudder at the terms, they are historically factual terms applied to the "Union"). The "right" to secede from that agreement is irrelevant, for even if there were no such "right," the slaughter of human beings, both black and white, by the North, human beings who posed no threat to the safety of human beings in the North, was plain and simple an exercise in raw evil. The immorality of what the North actually did, its bloodshed, stands forever opposed to any and all

abstract theories about a “Union” which allegedly pre-existed before the foundations of the world, or about the need to “preserve” the non-existent “Union” for whose thirst blood seemed the cup of righteousness. All arguments to the contrary are, by definition, arguments from hindsight, and worse, arguments made within the rhetoric of discourse established by those who did the killing. Puerile arguments about slavery ignore the fact that the institution could have and should have been resolved without recourse to violence and depredation. A legal document known as the Constitution of the United States of America contained within it all necessary means to eliminate, without violence, the institution of slavery, as well as maintain harmony amidst regional and party factionalism.

Yankee Babylon assumes at all times and in all its deliberations the existence of a moral standard, a standard which its opponents, the Court Historians of Lincoln in particular, do not and will not recognise as either operative or valid. I am content to rest in the validity of a moral standard, and leave thereby the evil to those who are content to rest in the validity of evil. More important, though, the Southerner of today needs to rest in the validity of that moral standard. Impassioned debates about the “right” of secession, or the “abolition” of slavery, or “states’ rights,” or, for that matter, any discussion of any political abstraction, ultimately brings nothing to bear upon the more centrally important issue of morality.

If, as I argue, the Southerner stood under the banner of moral necessity, and conversely, if the Yankee stood under the banner of political necessity, then the entire circumference of the Southerner’s existence is bounded by a moral definition of existence, not a political definition of what it means to be alive, to make choices, to stand before Creation as both morally deficient, but therefore, morally capable. The Yankee Myth, though, so overlies the definition of modernism—is modernism—that the Southerner finds himself in the curious position of arguing from a tradition not his, and a culture alien to him. Yankee Babylon stands, therefore, outside that despicably inhuman and peculiarly Yankee rhetoric of discourse in every fact or opinion offered, and unequivocally stands as an *argumentum contra malum*, an argument against evil. Equally does it stand as an *argumentum pro bono*, an argument on behalf of the morally good.

There is no “Lost Cause.” It is a fiction of the Yankee Myth. Southerners do not, in general, live their lives based upon political causes, as seen both in the 1860s and the 1960s (try to imagine a Southern origin to the 1960s and see how far you get). Instead, the culture of the South stands before the Creation, and finds therein only that which is there: God. But not the uneasy and anxious God projected upon creation by the Puritan and the Yankee God of the New England town hall; rather the God of what simply is. In rejecting Lincoln’s offer of supreme command over the Yankee armies, Robert E. Lee rejected not merely political or military opportunity, but the “this world” of which Jesus the Christ and his disciples spoke and knew—and rejected. Because he could spurn the worldliness of the Yankee Myth, Lee represents to this day not some noble but dejected product of a “Lost Cause,” but the image of a human being, and only a human being, who had direct access to the only world which mattered, and the only world which will ever matter: the Kingdom of God. The Southerner of 1861 and the Southerner of today share a cause which can not be lost, because it is not a cause of human volition and desire, but the very will of God. And what God wills, man must follow. If God willed the political loss of Southern independence, that is no loss, but infinite gain, for God, as even the Puritans understood, purposes always that which will bring together those who are His. If Lincoln’s American “nation” won, then why is it now lost? And if Lee’s Confederacy lost, then why is the Southerner so clearly God’s?

The implicit argument presents itself as overly simple, and perhaps it is. Yet the express argument is indeed simple. There still remains but one truly recognisable American and one eminently recognisable American culture, and that American and that culture is not the Yankee nor of the Yankee, but the Southerner and the South. The sterility of the Puritan remains stamped upon the Yankee. The green hills of Ruffin’s Virginia remain fixed within the soul of the Southerner. The Southerner lost a war, but gained his God. The Yankee won his war, but lost his God. If this message be no mere apologia, but truth, then the Southerner need but awake from the false nightmare of the Yankee Myth into the true dream of who and what he is: him whom God took in His arms forever. If every single disciple of the Christ met with suffering in the name of God’s truth, then every single Southerner met with suffering in the name of God’s truth. But God, in the imposition of suffering, as always, seeks not the broken man, but the whole man; not the deist, but the theist; and ironically, not the many who are called, but the few who are called out.

To understand the Southerner, though, is not to proclaim the Puritan, but to refute the Puritan’s profoundly blind reading of God’s volition immanent in His creation. The elect are indeed the elect; but they are chosen not for any City upon a Hill, not for any Yankee Empire, and not as a “beacon of faith unto the world.” The Southerner is merely and

simply called out for God's purposes. If those purposes be obscure to man, they are not so to his Creator. But beyond the experience of man, man can not go. The truth of all things remains with Him who is truth. If, as Weaver observed, the Southerner remains not only unreconstructed but unreconstructible, that fact is the truth of God, not the truth of man. And the Southerner does remain unreconstructible, a truth which man can at least perceive. In that perception must the Southerner rest, confident, as he always has been, in the knowledge not of any Lost Cause, but of the Last Cause.

May God bless the South and her people.

Historidrive: The Sanitizing of War Criminals and Terrorists

By Al Benson, Jr.

1 November 2008

Whether others have noted this trend or not I don't know, but it seems to me that about every five to seven years someone comes out with a new book that endeavors to sanitize, for public consumption, some notable scoundrel from the North who was involved in the War of Northern Aggression or events leading up to it. In 1993, John F. Marszalek wrote a book called *Sherman—A Soldier's Passion For Order*. I felt it was a very pro-Sherman book. Comments on the dust jacket of the book state: "Yet he left a legacy of 'total war' against unarmed civilians and their property which has haunted military leaders and all Americans up to the present day. Now, in this definitive biography, the nature and motives of this legendary and controversial military genius are at last explored." So the sanitization of the war criminal begins! Marszalek is going to explain to us why Sherman did it all, and in the process Sherman is going to come out looking much better *than ever he could deserve*. However, you know how it is—the best laid plans of mice and men oft go astray. A short two years later, Michael Fellman's book *Citizen Sherman* was published. It was as truthful a book about Sherman as I have yet seen. I don't feel Mr. Fellman was purposely trying to make Sherman look bad—he was just telling the truth—and the truth was far from complimentary. Of the two books about the grand arsonist of Georgia, I would recommend Mr. Fellman's book if you can still get it. With the release of Fellman's book, Sherman became a bit less sanitized than he had previously been. But not to worry; though no major books had come out for awhile, there were some lengthy magazine articles that sought to engender a bit of Sherman worship. And in April of 2007 the History Channel aired a special about Sherman's March through Georgia. Although I didn't see all of it, I saw enough to know where it was headed.

Author Victor Davis Hanson, who has written about Sherman, considers him to be one of his heroes. Needless to say, I rather disagree with Mr. Hanson's taste in "heroes."

Recently, we had yet another attempt to whitewash the noble Sherman, a book of over 600 pages written by Noah Andre Trudeau, who I am told was a former public radio broadcaster. Recently, the History Book Club presented Trudeau's book as a major offering, and a glowing review of it was written by William C. Davis, whose name will be known to many Southern folks, and not always with deep affection. According to Mr. Davis' review, most of the stories about Sherman's March through Georgia are myths. In fact Davis calls them "America's most eloquent examples of the myth supplanting the fact." Davis notes that "though he took most of his necessary supplies with him...Sherman lived off the land to a small extent, meaning that civilian livestock and foodstuffs were appropriated for his use. But his army did not practice a wholesale policy of rape, arson, murder, and vandalism." According to William Davis, it sounds like good old "Uncle Billy" Sherman was really a nice guy after all, taking only what he absolutely needed and not bothering anyone. If Mr. Davis really believes this—well, my comments as to his viewpoint would be unprintable! I've read other work by William Davis over the years and he is no friend of the South. Several years ago he did a biography of Jefferson Davis, and I got the distinct impression reading it that he really had a hard time saying anything nice about Jeff Davis. There were numerous times when he had to, and it really seemed to pain him to do it. At any rate, Trudeau's book seems to be the latest attempt to rebaptize the grand arsonist with the aura of Yankee holiness and virtue.

Should anyone care to read a book with a slightly different take on Sherman's March, I would suggest the one by Burke Davis, simply entitled *Sherman's March*. It was published by Vintage Books, a division of Random House, back in 1988.

Check your used book stores, or you may still find it on the Internet. Burke Davis has written fourteen books I am aware of, quite possibly more, and at least five of them have been on the War of Northern Aggression, so he seems to know what he's talking about. For example, on page 152 of the *Sherman's March*, Davis notes the attitude of a Charles Brown, a clerk in the 21st Michigan. Davis tells us: "Even so, Brown was ashamed of the army's progress through this poor country. He wrote to his family, 'I saw property destroyed until I was perfectly sick of it, and that for me to say in S.C. is considerable.'" Brown noted that he couldn't blame the people of the South for the way they felt, and he wouldn't have blamed them if they resorted to guerilla warfare. Yeah, nice guy that Uncle Billy Sherman—a real humanitarian, if you listen to his sanitizers! I can hardly wait for the next offering about him. It will probably seek to promote him to co-divinity with Abraham Lincoln—a major object of Yankee idolatry.

And then there is another favourite of the Yankee/Marxist elite, good old terrorist John Brown, the gentle soul who presided over the hacking to death with swords of five pro-slavery men at Ossawatimie, Kansas, in 1856, while their families were forced to stand and watch the brutality. This is one individual that really needs lots of sanitizing, but then, the establishment "historians" if such they can be called, are more than equal to the task.

Back in the late 1970s, historian Otto Scott wrote a book called *The Secret Six: The Fool As Martyr*. It was the story of abolitionist and terrorist John Brown and the infamous "Secret Six," a group of radicals who supported and financed his terrorist activities both in Kansas and Virginia. One of the most notable of the six was Thomas Wentworth Higginson, a Unitarian, (most of the others were, too) who, when he was appealed to by Brown for money, said "I am always ready to invest money in treason, but at present I have none to invest." Interesting enough, Higginson's solution to the "slavery problem" in this country was disunion! He said he would use "whatever means may lie in my power to promote the Dissolution of the Union." For having a similar disunionist mindset, Southern folks were accused of treason—and still are today. But Higginson wasn't. I find that interesting.

Theologian and author R. J. Rushdoony noted, regarding Higginson and other Unitarians of his era, they were strongly influenced by the French Revolution and by Fabian socialism in England. So, Brown's supporters had more than a slight tinge of left-wing radicalism in their makeup. Interestingly enough, two of the men Brown had with him for awhile were refugees from the failed 1848 socialist revolts in Europe. So it all fits. However, the "historians" in our day can't come out and really admit any of this, so to avoid dealing with it, they try to kill the messenger, hoping the message will be forgotten as they run to sweep it under the historical rug. Hence, Otto Scott has been labeled by some of them as a "servant of the Neo-Confederate Movement." This charge is pure fertilizer of the highest grade and most of them know it. Otto Scott was an honest historian and researcher and wrote about a great many personalities, among them James I and Robespierre. What many of these folks seem to have against Scott is that he tells the truth as objectively as he can about some of their heroes, while many of them do nothing more than pass along abolitionist propaganda, pretending it's real history.

Scott's book definitely told the unwholesome truth about John Brown and his Secret Six supporters of terrorism, and this was something the "historians" couldn't abide. Scott wasn't the first one to do this, he was just the latest. Back in 1959, J. C. Furnas wrote a very good book about Brown and Company called *The Road to Harpers Ferry*, published by William Sloan Associates in New York. But Furnas' book had been pretty well forgotten, while Scott's book reopened the debate about the saintliness of Old Brown. Scott unreservedly labeled him as a terrorist. I agree. Since Scott's book there have been at least two others about Brown and the Secret Six who financed and approved his terrorist acts.

Now we are working our way into a new century, and recently it was time for yet another episode of the sanitizing of old John Brown. After all, his whitewashed image as the "courageous abolitionist" has to be kept in front of the masses so that in this age of potential reparations for slavery, ordinary folks will seek to identify with him.

So, in 2005 David S. Reynolds came out with a book called *John Brown, Abolitionist: The Man Who Killed Slavery, Sparked the Civil War, and Seeded Civil Rights*. Now isn't that a mouthful of a title? Almost everybody should be able to find something to identify with in at least some of that. If you can't, then you're just not trying! Reynolds goes where others have not tread. In mentioning John Brown in the book, Reynolds refers to Julia Ward Howe, the Unitarian who wrote that Unitarian dirge, *The Battle Hymn of the Republic*. According to Reynolds, Howe "caught the essence of John Brown, a devout Calvinist who considered himself predestined to stamp out slavery." Ah, now we've taken the Brown legend a step further. Now we have identified Brown as a "devout Calvinist." It's interesting to note that these Unitarians with whom Brown associated with all hated Calvinism with a passion. Many of them had come from Calvinist homes

and had repudiated their Calvinist faith in favor of Unitarianism. In other words, they were apostates! Yet Reynolds has one of them gushing over Brown as a “devout Calvinist.” It sounds a bit thin to me.

In his book on Brown and the Secret Six, Scott mentions a Rev. H. D. King who talked with Brown before he was hung, trying to ascertain why he did what he did. King was never able to pin Brown down theologically, but was able to say “For him, there was only one wrong and that was slavery. He was rather skeptical, I think, not an infidel, but not bound by creeds. He was somewhat cranky on the subject of the Bible...” Then King went on to quote Brown: “If any great obstacle stands in the way, you may properly break all the Decalogue to get rid of it.” I’m sorry, but Brown doesn’t sound anything like a Calvinist to me, and I have been an adherent of the Reformed faith for over thirty years now. Brown’s rationale is not Calvinist—it is Marxist—the end justifies the means. However, again, you can’t really tell folks that. It won’t be nearly as appealing as will a carefully crafted portrait of a “devout” Christian trying to uplift the oppressed and downtrodden of the world.

And so the beat goes on and on. Whenever someone comes out with the truth about some historical personality the establishment wants revered, his efforts must be contradicted by yet another new book or television docudrama which gives us the “official” version of what we are all supposed to believe.

So, folks, if you are like me and love to read history, read it with discernment, because all the history floating around out there ain’t real history—some of it is “cunningly devised fables” to trip up the unwary. Take the time and trouble to learn which is which. Once you know it, the truth will, indeed, “make you free.”

God Damn The Yankee (A Prayer)

By Mr Poe, Chief Psychopomp, The Fire Eater

1 November 2008

I have been encouraged of late to try my, um, talons at poetry. My daddy was a poet, back in Okie Land. I remember his advice: "First write, then think. Then write again." Never was too good at the thinking part, though.

God Damn The Yankee (A Prayer)

God damn they Yankee man.

God damn his soul to hell.

God damn the Yankee man.

May he wear the fire well.

God damn the Yankee man.

God damn his soul to hell.

God damn the Yankee man.

To the bottom of the final well.

God damn the Yankee man.

God damn him forever and no less.

God damn the Yankee man.

And grant him forever no rest.

God damn the Yankee man.

God damn the Yankee man.

Digging Up Sally

For Saraniah King Aston

By MacDonald King Aston

1 November 2008

Turn me around, turn me upside down
Watch me dance
Watch me drown
I'm falling now.

Circles in my head every day
I always love what can not stay
What can not stay.

Pretend you're me, pretend you're you,
Pretend we see each other through to the blood.

Hold me for a little while and I'll wear
my "lost-little-girl-lost-in-the-Big-World" smile.

I wish I may, I wish I might
I never quite go to sleep at night—I'm wide awake.

Heaven's a place up in the stars
But I live down here with the junkies
and the flunkies and the Hallelujah Bars.

Where the streets have eyes
and no one's wise and we all live beneath
kinder skies than really are.

I wish I may, I wish I might
I never quite go to sleep at night—I'm wide awake.

Sometimes I feel like letting go,
watching the sideshow go down burning
like a cross on fire.

Sometimes there's hope,
sometimes there's not,
But in-between is all I've got
to give to you, O to give to you.

I wake up in the middle of the night,
eyes wide open, fumble for the light,
But I still can't see.

So I'm digging up Sally teaching her to sing
One day she'll teach me everything
I need to know O I need to know.

I wish I may, I wish I might
I never quite go to sleep at night—I'm wide awake.

The Secret of Life, Pt. V

By Collier Z. Wellington

1 November 2008

A syllogism:

1. The Yankee is *atheos* ("not of God").
2. The *atheoi* ("those not of God") have not their names written in the Book of Life.
3. Therefore: "Their place will be in the lake that burns with fire and sulfur, which is the second death."*

*Revelations 21:8

Jayhawkers and Terrorism

Gary Ayres

1 November 2008

There is much ado today about Confederate symbols. From schools, which have or have had the Confederate Battle Flag as their symbol, to heritage organizations which honour their Confederate ancestors, down to individuals who want to honour their ancestors. This even goes as far as government officials spearheading the removal of Confederate flags at Confederate cemeteries. These folks are just looking for the vote or prestige. Folks like former Missouri Governor Bob Holden, Presidential candidate Richard Gephardt, and current Missouri Governor Matt Blunt. These are just a few among the many. The Veteran Administration and the Department of Natural Resources of Missouri are just a couple of departments to name. Government officials want to degrade Confederate symbols, and they want them erased from history. Though they know what is right, they just want to be elected, and will do whatever there is to do for a vote. Our government wants you to recognize countries which secede from their mother countries today, yet they do not want you to recognize the secession of the Southern States and the forming of their new country. Either secession is right or it is wrong. You can't have it both ways, regardless of what our elected officials want and seems to get. I should not just say "government officials," but also those folks and anyone else who joins in with them. It is something akin to wanting to be popular with the bullies on the block. A jayhawker (I refuse to capitalize jayhawker, for it does not rate that distinction) is a most evil description of a person or an institution. It represents nothing good—thievery; murder of men, women, and children; rape; and complete destruction of communities in Missouri before, during, and after the War Between the States (WBTS). A "jayhawker" equals "genocide," for that is what they were good at!

Two very well known "jayhawkers" were Senator James H. Lane of Kansas, who later was made a Brigadier General by President Lincoln, and Col. Charles "Doc" Jennison. Brigadier General Lane had the go ahead from President Lincoln to do his "duty" to Missouri, but not convey it back to Washington. This was state terrorism provided for by the federal government. (1) Senator, and later United States Army BG, James H. Lane, was given the name "The Grim Chieftain" for his atrocities in Missouri. Col. Jennison of the US Army, in tandem with Lane, burnt the western part of Missouri, turning it into a wasteland. This was an order from the federal government—to leave Missouri a wasteland and remove all its citizens from the area. Again, genocide. After these mens' atrocities in Missouri, the only things remaining were charred fireplaces. These sites were known as "Jennison's Monuments." This, along with the rape, murder and thievery should not be something to be proud of. Certainly not to have a collegiate school's mascot and the nickname of a State to be known as "the jayhawkers." This would be the State of Kansas and the Kansas University, both being known as "the jayhawkers." Today these men would be considered war criminals; they committed atrocities on citizens of the United States and the Confederate States and at the nod of Lincoln. They have never been brought to justice.

Regardless of the many years past, these crimes should and must be brought to justice. Let us bring this into today's events. The burning and depopulation of Missouri in the 1860s mirrors what has been happening to many European countries today. You do not condone what is happening there, so why would you condone the same activities from your own government or military. In other words, genocide was OK when the US government enacted it, but it is not OK when it involves other countries today. Now take the Confederate Battle Flag or symbols of the Confederacy. They did not stand for any such actions as did "the jayhawkers," regardless of what you have heard from teachers or clergy.

Confederate symbols are good and uplifting. Do some studying yourself and you will find this to be true. The Confederate Battle Flag was and is a symbol of freedom and religion. It is an ensign of the Christian faith, patterned after Saint Andrew's cross. For those who do not know the history of St. Andrew's cross, research it. It's well worth the time. "The Confederate flag is a Christian flag and it represents freedom from tyranny." Judge Alfred Roman said this as he presented the flag to Colonel Walton. He said "In the name of General Beauregard, under whose eyes you first went under fire at Manassas, I have the honour to present to you this sacred emblem of Southern valour and patriotism."(2) "The flag represents those who are opposed to unlimited federal government. The flag represents a limited constitutional republic. A view of government opposed to the powers that be."(3) The Confederate Battle flag is also known as the "Southern Cross." It was adopted consciously, purposefully, and premeditatedly to display faith in the sovereign God of heaven and earth, faith in the providence of that God, the God of history and the God of salvation. (4) But of another symbol, how can a group of folks come to memorialize a symbol which represents everything bad and against the foundation of what this country was founded under? That symbol is the "jayhawker" of Kansas. The Confederate Battle Flag and symbols are the symbols of what the United States were founded under: a republic of limited centralized government, or in other words states' rights. What is sad is that our children learn the distorted version of history, which teaches that the Confederate States of America and the Confederate flags are evil. They also teach an egregious error in that the Confederacy was for slavery and the Confederate flags stand for slavery. They learn from government-instituted schools. These schools teach what they are instructed to teach and not what history actually was. And if it can be worse, we buy into what the education system teaches our children and grandchildren. When will we put a stop to it? Confederate mascots and symbols are removed from schools, yet the KU "jayhawker" can be proudly seen on KU's campus and all over the TV, especially during sports events. Nothing is ever said how terribly wrong this is, but then look who writes the text books for schools: the same type of individuals who caused hundreds of thousands of our southern citizens to die. They were either killed on the battle field; in their homes before, during, and after the war; ordered to leave Missouri; and the mothers and children jailed for no reason other than standing up for what they believed in. Let us remember that when the several states seceded from the United States, they did nothing illegal; it was their right under the US Constitution. Also remember that the Confederate symbols are not bad. It is the few "bad apples" who have made it looked upon as bad, and then many who are ignorant to the facts who jump on this band wagon and want to destroy the history of a new country, its people, and its descendants today. Then we have the US Army and the Kansas jayhawkers who were nothing but evil.

The jayhawkers were formed to do evil, supported by the US Army and US government, yet they are looked upon as heroes or saviours. The next time you see someone saying he is a "jayhawker," ask him why he wants to symbolize or associate himself with something so vile, evil, and just plain un-Christian?

NOTES:

Abraham Lincoln, Complete Works, Speeches, Letters, State Papers by Nicolay and Hay

<http://www.truthinhistory.org/flag.htm> <http://www.truthinhistory.org/flag.htm>

"The Truth About the Confederate Battle Flag," Pastor John Weaver, West Columbia, South Carolina.