

# Lincoln: An Alternative View<sup>1</sup>

Jack Judson

## I. Introduction

Abraham Lincoln, the 16<sup>th</sup> President of the United States, is quite possibly the most popular and highly respected of all American presidents. The number of biographies is currently about 16,000 (1). According to numerous polls, he is almost always ranked at or near the top of great presidents (2). He is embraced by both the political Left and the political Right, by both Democrats and Republicans in America. On the Democratic Left, Barack Obama, then U.S. Senator from Illinois, launched his 2008 presidential campaign from Lincoln's home town of Springfield, Illinois (3). That by this choice of venues he meant to compare himself to Lincoln and that this would make him look favorable to the voters is not open to doubt. On the Republican Right, President Dwight Eisenhower said the following at Lincoln's birthplace in Hodgenville, Kentucky in 1954: "Abraham Lincoln has always seemed to me to represent all that is best in America, in terms of its opportunity and the readiness of Americans always to raise up and exalt those people who live by truth, whose lives are examples of integrity and dedication to our country (4)." Moving from politicians to historians we note that Marxist

---

<sup>1</sup> Concerning the content of the paper, I owe a great debt to many of the writers at Lew Rockwell.com as well as Chronicles Magazine. The single most important writer on this topic (and the one who has influenced me the most) is Professor Thomas DiLorenzo of Loyola University in Baltimore, Maryland. In addition to numerous articles on Lincoln, Professor DiLorenzo wrote two complete books on the 16<sup>th</sup> president which are titled *The Real Lincoln* and *Lincoln Unmasked*. Both books are excellent but in my view the second book should be read if the reader only has time for one. Some other writers that I am indebted to are Donald Livingston, Murray Rothbard, Joseph Fallon and Patrick Buchanan.

historian Eric Foner has criticized Mikhail Gorbachev's decision to let the Soviet Union dissolve into its member states. According to Foner, Gorbachev should have acted like Lincoln and treated Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia, and Georgia the same way that Lincoln treated the southern states(5). And finally, British Conservative historian Paul Johnson has the following to say about the 16<sup>th</sup> President: "Lincoln was a case of American exceptionalism because, in his humble, untaught way, he was a kind of moral genius, such as is seldom seen in life and hardly ever at the summit of politics (6)."

Despite this seeming unanimity, there is an alternative view of Lincoln (7) which I will try to outline and defend in this paper. In order to do this effectively, however, I think it is perhaps best to explain the Standard or Received View of Abraham Lincoln. With this Standard View set out, it will then become clear that an examination of the actual history of the Lincoln administration reveals it to be largely mythology.

## II. The Standard or Received View of Lincoln

The Standard or Received View (alternatively the "Conventional Wisdom" (8)) is what most people think about a given topic. "Most people" in this context will include intellectuals and academics as well as non-intellectuals. Concerning the Standard View of Lincoln, perhaps it is best to start with a passage from a well-known biography of Lincoln written by Chicago poet and writer Carl Sandburg. In the preface to this book Sandburg approvingly quotes U.S. Representative Homer Koch of Kansas who said the following in 1923:

*There is no new thing to be said about Lincoln. There is no new thing to be said of the mountains, or of the sea, or of the stars. The years go their way, but the same old mountains lift their granite shoulders above the drifting clouds; the same mysterious sea beats upon the shore; the same silent stars keep holy vigil above a tired world. But to the mountains, sea and stars, men turn forever in unwearied homage. And thus with Lincoln. For he was a mountain in grandeur of soul, he was a deep under-voice of mystic loneliness, he was a star in steadfast purity of purpose and service. And he abides (9)*

Note that if this is not outright idolatry, it at least borders on it. But it is common in Lincoln scholarship. In a recent radio interview, Lincoln revisionist Thomas DiLorenzo noted that many people write about Lincoln as if he were the 4<sup>th</sup> person in the Holy Trinity (10).

But let me now turn to specifics. Let us look at the Standard View of Lincoln on the topics of Slavery and Race Relations, the Cause of the Civil War (11), the Union, and the Meaning of the Constitution, and the Founding of the United States.

### **Slavery and Race Relations**

The Standard View of Lincoln is that he was perhaps the greatest humanitarian leader in the history of the United States. Because he worked diligently to end the evil of chattel slavery, he is or ought to be a hero to Black Americans, and indeed to all people of good will in America and around the world. By freeing the slaves, he paved the way for future Civil Rights victories for Blacks and other minorities. A recent movie (12) about Lincoln shows that he worked systematically to get the 13<sup>th</sup> Amendment to the U.S. Constitution passed. This Amendment outlawed slavery in the U.S. forever.

### **The Cause of the Civil War**

The Cause of the Civil War according to the Standard View is slavery, pure and simple. The Racial Egalitarian North opposed slavery while the South supported it. The only way to end it was by force of arms. Hence the Civil War and Lincoln's great role in leading the North to victory, freeing the slaves and accepting the recalcitrant South back into the Union.

### **The Union**

The Union had to be preserved at all costs. The Union was the gift of our Founding Fathers to us and they would have been appalled to see it split into two countries. Therefore the Civil War proved once and for all time that the Union could not be broken. Had a president taken office who wasn't as strong, resolute and courageous as Lincoln, the disaster of a United States split into two parts could well have happened.

## **The Meaning of the Constitution and the Founding of the United States**

On the Standard View Lincoln fulfilled the original intent of the Founding Fathers. In perhaps his most famous speech, “The Gettysburg Address” (1863), Lincoln makes this clear. According to Thomas Jefferson’s Declaration of Independence the country was founded on the proposition that all men are created equal. The problem, of course, is that the Constitution of 1788 allowed for slavery. We cannot have equality with the institution of slavery. Hence slavery must be abolished. Thus under the Lincoln administration slavery was abolished by the Emancipation Proclamation in 1863 and by the actions of the Northern Army in defeating the South and freeing the slaves. This process was finally completed with the 13<sup>th</sup> Amendment to the Constitution, supported by Lincoln, which was passed after his death in December 1865.

### **III. The Alternative View**

#### **Slavery and Race Relations**

Concerning Lincoln’s real views on slavery, it is perhaps best to start with Lincoln’s own words. While Lincoln was opposed to slavery, he did not really intend to do much about it. This is made evident in his speeches, letters and by his actions. Consider the following passage in his letter to Horace Greeley in 1862:

*My paramount object in this struggle is to save the Union, and is not either to save or to destroy slavery. 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; and what I forbear, I forbear because I do not believe it would help to save the Union. I shall do less whenever I shall believe what I am doing hurts the cause, and I shall do more whenever I shall believe doing more will help the cause (13).*

On race relations, consider the following statement Lincoln made in the fourth of the Lincoln Douglas debates held at Charleston, Illinois on September 18, 1858:

*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*

*racess—that I am not, nor ever have been, in favor of making voters or jurors of negroes, nor of qualifying them to hold office, nor to intermarry with white people; and I will say in addition to this that there is a physical difference 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 superior and inferior, and I as much as any other man am in favor of having the superior position assigned to the white race (14).*

Lincoln was certainly no racial egalitarian who would have marched with Martin Luther King.

It may be objected that while Lincoln was certainly racist by our 21<sup>st</sup> Century standards he was a man of his time and everybody was racist in that time. This is mostly true but beside the point. For if Lincoln truly was the incredibly great man that many take him to be, why couldn't he have transcended racism? And the second point is that it is not completely true. Many of the Northern abolitionists were clearly not racist. Why would anyone hold such strong anti-slavery views if he believed that blacks were truly an inferior race? Can anybody think that John Brown, insane though he may have been, was a racist? He gave his life in the abolitionist cause. Also note the incredibly touching portrait of Colonel Joshua Lawrence Chamberlain of Maine which is presented in the 1993 movie Gettysburg (15). This was the man who accepted Robert E. Lee's sword of surrender at Appomattox in 1865. And as is made clear in the movie, if it is indeed accurate, he believed in the absolute equality of the races. So if Chamberlain could believe in the equality of the races, then why couldn't Lincoln?

## **The Cause of the Civil War**

While slavery contributed to the Civil War, the main cause was the tariff. This was a Northern cash cow (16). Slavery had very little to do with it. Note that historians Charles and Mary Beard in their classic *The Rise of American Civilization* (1927) had the following to say about slavery and the Civil War:

*Since, therefore, the abolition of slavery never appeared in the platform of any great political party, since the only appeal ever made to the electorate on that issue was scornfully repulsed, since the spokesman of the Republicans [Lincoln] emphatically declared that his party never intended to interfere with slavery in the states in any shape or form, it seems*

*reasonable to assume that the institution of slavery was not the fundamental issue during the epoch preceding the bombardment of Fort Sumter (17).*

In a point related to this, Patrick Buchanan asserts:

*To those who yet contend that Lincoln and the Union went to war to 'make men free,' how do they respond to the fact that when the war began, with the firing on Fort Sumter, there were more slave states inside the Union (eight) than in the Confederacy (seven). Four Southern states, Virginia, North Carolina, Tennessee and Arkansas, had remained loyal. They did not wish to secede; they did so only after Lincoln put out a call for 75,000 volunteers for an army to invade and subjugate the Deep South (18).*

The Corwin Amendment which Lincoln supported and which would have been the original 13<sup>th</sup> Amendment to the Constitution was passed by Congress on March 2, 1861. This amendment, if ratified, would have prohibited the federal government from interfering in the domestic institutions of the Southern states. Of course, one of the key domestic institutions of the Southern states was slavery. This did nothing to stop the secessionist movement in those states. And the reason is simple. The preservation of slavery was not what was driving Southern secession. What was driving Southern secession was the tariff and Lincoln's 1860 campaign promise to triple it. And what was driving Lincoln's desire to crush secession was the preservation of the tariff. If the South seceded, the tariff could no longer be collected. This would be an economic catastrophe for many, including Lincoln's crony capitalists, in the North. All this is corroborated by Lincoln's actions and words as well as by many Northern, Southern, and foreign newspaper articles at the time.

Let us first look at some of the newspaper articles. On November 20, 1860 the *Cleveland National Democrat* wrote:

*Let the States of the South separate, and the cotton, the rice, hemp, sugar and tobacco, now consumed in Northern States, must be purchased (from the) South, subject to a Tariff duty, greatly enhancing their cost. The cotton factories of New England, now, by getting their raw cotton duty free, are enabled to contend with the English in the markets of their own Provinces, and in other parts of the world. A separation would take from us this advantage, and it would take from the vessels owned by the [North](#) *the* carrying trade of the South, now mostly monopolized by them (19).*

On December 10, 1860 the *Daily Chicago Times* wrote: "we have a tariff that protects our manufacturers from thirty to fifty percent, and enables us to consume large quantities of Southern cotton, and to compete

with the skilled labor of Europe. This operates to compel the South to pay an individual bounty to our skilled labor, of millions annually (20).”

Moving from North to South we note that in November 1860, the *Charleston Mercury* declared: “The real causes of dissatisfaction in the South with the North, are in the unjust taxation and expenditure of the taxes by the Government of the United States, and in the revolution the North has effected in this government from a confederated republic to a national sectional despotism (21).” On January 21, 1861, *The New Orleans Daily Crescent* wrote that “the people of the South know that it is their import trade that draws from the people’s pockets sixty or seventy millions of dollars per annum, in the shape of duties, to be expended in the North, and in the protection and encouragement of Northern interests... These are the reasons why these people do not wish the South to secede from the Union (22).”

The same things were being written in the English press. *Fraser’s Magazine* stated in April, 1861 that “Congress was rapidly passing a new tariff of the most astonishing protectionism to Northern manufacturers! [...] The unseemliness of the measure has filled all England with astonishment. It is a new affront and wrong to the slave states, and raises a wall against the return of the seceders (23).”

Finally, Lincoln himself makes clear his determination to collect the tariff in his First Inaugural Address. “The Power to me will be used to hold, occupy, and possess the property, and places belonging to the government, and to collect the duties and imposts; but beyond what may be necessary for these objects, there will be no invasion—no using of force against, or among the people anywhere (24).” Patrick Buchanan offers the following insightful comment on this passage: “Message to the Confederacy from Abraham Lincoln: you may keep your slaves, but you cannot keep your duty free ports (25)!”

## **The Union**

Lincoln and many others in the North believed that the Union was perpetual. But why think such a thing? When the 13 colonies joined together in 1776 to fight for their Independence and when they met later in 1787 to write their Constitution, where was it ever stated that no state could ever withdraw? Would they have ever even have entered into such a compact if they knew they could never leave? The question answers

itself. The country was born in secession from Great Britain. Great Britain actually signed 13 separate peace treaties with the individual colonies after losing the Revolutionary War. It is that simple. If the original American Revolution was just then it certainly was just that any member state could secede if remaining in the Union proved intolerable to it. And this is exactly what the southerners thought. They were fighting a second American Revolution.

## **The Meaning of the Constitution and the Founding of the United States**

Lincoln trashed the Constitution like no one before him. He suspended Habeas Corpus. He arrested Roger Taney, the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court. He shut down hundreds of newspapers. He jailed critics of his War. He deported Ohio Congressman Clement Vallandigham for opposing the War. Lincoln issued paper money dubbed “greenbacks” which violated Article I Section 10 of the Constitution.

According to Lincoln revisionist Joseph Fallon:

*Lincoln circumscribed the Bill of Rights, suppressing the First ('Freedom of Speech, Press, Religion and Petition'), Fourth ('Right of Search and Seizure regulated'), Fifth ('Provisions Concerning Prosecution'), Sixth ('Right to a Speedy Trial, witnesses, etc. '), Seventh ('Right to a Trial by Jury'), and Eighth ('Excessive bail, cruel punishment') Amendments. He did so by claiming extraordinary powers as commander in chief, establishing extra-constitutional precedents that would be exercised by his successors—launching wars without congressional authorization, ignoring international treaties, targeting civilians, initiating warrantless searches, denying habeas corpus, imposing indefinite detention, fabricating law through executive decisions, and declaring that the courts have no jurisdiction to review or judge presidential acts in 'wartime'. These acts were, and are, done in the name of national security (26).*

## **IV. Lincoln's Inheritance**

When Lincoln took office in 1861, the USA was not terribly different than it was in 1787. The constitution was followed by and large although there were certainly exceptions even here. For example, it can perhaps be argued that President Thomas Jefferson's retaliation against the Barbary Pirates was not based on a Declaration of War by Congress and hence was not constitutional. The states were basically sovereign as



they were intended to be by the Founding Fathers. The Central Government in Washington was a minimalist government of the kind that Libertarians could celebrate. There was no draft. There was no large standing Army. There was no income tax. There was a gold standard for the Dollar and there was no national bank. President Andrew Jackson's greatest achievement, ending the Second National Bank of the United States, was not yet undone.

As the country was born by secession from the British Empire, secession was still considered a right of the sovereign states. Massachusetts considered seceding from the Union in the War of 1812. In 1848 a freshman congressman critic of the Mexican War said the following about secession:

*Any people, anywhere, being inclined and having the power, have the right to rise up, and shake off the existing government and form a new one that suits them better. This is a most valuable,—a most sacred right—a right which we hope and believe, is to liberate the world. Nor is this right confined to cases in which the whole people of an existing government, may choose to exercise it. Any portion of such people, that can, may revolutionize, and make their own, of so much of the territory as they inhabit.... It is a quality of revolutions not to go by old lines, or old laws but they break up both, and make new ones.*

This freshman congressman was named Abraham Lincoln (27).

## **V. Lincoln's Legacy**

Fortunately, not all of the measures the Lincoln Administration implemented during his tenure remained permanent. However, the precedent had been set and many of them would return in time. The income tax, for example, was suspended until it reappeared with the passage of the 16<sup>th</sup> Amendment in 1913. The draft would also return in time, although it was finally eliminated by President Richard Nixon in 1973. But let us look in more detail at some of the most important legacies of Lincoln.

### **Military Keynesianism**

We noted above that the Civil War was actually fought for economic reasons, not to free the slaves. According to Joseph Fallon:

*Lincoln employed the war of 1861–65 to increase the tariff and restore the repudiated system of internal improvements. Both endeavors transferred public money to private companies with political connections under a pretext of national security. The tariff was declared necessary to ensure political independence by securing economic independence for the United States from foreign suppliers, in particular the British. Internal improvements—the building of roads, railroads, turnpikes, ports and canals by private firms with public funds—were declared essential to enhance commerce and defense, even though the projects were often never completed and the funds frequently embezzled (28).*

This Military Keynesianism continued long after Lincoln's death and even continues today. Fallon notes the following concerning U.S. Wars to advance well connected business interests:

*The Civil War and Reconstruction were followed by more military adventures on the part of the U.S. government to advance various U.S. business interests. These included the Plains Indians War (1861–90) for the railroads; the Hawaiian Island (1893) for the sugar industry; the Spanish-American War (1898); the Philippine Islands (1899–1913); Cuba, Haiti, Mexico, Panama and Central America (1895–1913) for the banks, the oil industry, and agriculture interests (29).*

## **Unconstitutional Government**

As noted above Lincoln violated the Constitution like no one before him. His successors in office were quick to notice and followed him in this practice. Of course, we all know from the recent revelations of the former Defense Department and CIA Contract worker, Edward Snowden, that the combination of the Patriot Act and the NSA make the Fourth Amendment a dead letter. There is no more Right to Privacy for Americans. Americans are not free from unwarranted searches and seizures. All emails, phone calls and all internet activity are stored and can be accessed by the Federal Government without warrant. And in May of 2014, the U.S. Supreme Court has refused to hear the lawsuit brought by journalist Chris Hedges against the Obama Administration. This suit concerned the National Defense Authorization Act which basically gives the president power to arrest anyone he chooses and detain them indefinitely. This means that Habeas Corpus, one of our Constitutional Rights, is for all intents and purposes, null and void.

## **Lincoln and Neoconservatism**

It is not surprising that the expounders of the ideology of Neoconservatism (30) regard Lincoln as one of their heroes. Rich Lowrey, editor of the former Conservative magazine, now Neoconservative magazine, National Review, recently wrote a book called *Lincoln Unbound: HOW AN AMBITIOUS YOUNG RAILSPLITTER SAVED THE AMERICAN DREAM — AND HOW WE CAN DO IT AGAIN* (2013). Moreover, First Generation Neoconservative Norman Podhoretz praised George W. Bush's Second Inaugural Address which included his Utopian Idea of ending tyranny in the world as being in the spirit of Abraham Lincoln. Podhoretz writes: "... it is Abraham Lincoln—the greatest Republican of them all, and the greatest of all American Presidents—whose spirit hovers most brightly over the face of Bush's Second Inaugural (31)." Lowry, Podhoretz, and many other Neoconservatives were instrumental in getting the Bush Administration to start the 2003 war in Iraq. As we now know, the war was based on falsehoods and has been, by any standards, an unmitigated disaster (32). While it is certainly a stretch to say that the Bush Administration's invasion of Iraq was inspired by Lincoln, it does seem consistent with his actions 140 years before.

## **All Powerful Central Government**

After Lincoln, the U.S. was no longer a voluntary confederation of states with strong states rights; it was a nation with a powerful central government held together by military force.

Perhaps the best summary of exactly what Lincoln brought about is given by the great British historian and moralist Lord Acton (33). Acton wrote a letter to Robert E. Lee on November 4, 1866 in which he stated:

*I saw in State Rights the only availing check upon the absolutism of the sovereign will, and secession filled me with hope, not as the destruction but as the redemption of Democracy...Therefore I deemed that you were fighting the battles of our liberty, our progress, and our civilization; and I mourn for the stake which was lost at Richmond more deeply than I rejoice over that which was saved at Waterloo (34).*

## Postscript: A Proper Way to End Slavery

As many have pointed out (35), it was probably not necessary to go to war to end slavery. Slavery was ended all over the western world without recourse to war. This happened in the British Empire, Brazil, Holland, Argentina and many other countries. The U.S. Government could have purchased the slaves from slave owners and then set them free. The process is called “Compensated Emancipation”. There is no reason to think that this could not have happened in America. Why was it not tried here? The obvious reason is that slavery was not the cause of the war. Again, Lincoln did not care about slavery.

### Notes

- (1) [http://wiki.answers.com/Q/How\\_many\\_books\\_have\\_been\\_written\\_about\\_Abraham\\_Lincoln?#slide=2](http://wiki.answers.com/Q/How_many_books_have_been_written_about_Abraham_Lincoln?#slide=2).
- (2) A CSPAN poll in 1999 ranks Lincoln first. An ABC poll in 2000 ranks Lincoln first. A Gallup poll in 2011 ranks Lincoln second behind Ronald Reagan.  
[http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Historical\\_rankings\\_of\\_Presidents\\_of\\_the\\_United\\_States#2012\\_Gallup\\_poll](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Historical_rankings_of_Presidents_of_the_United_States#2012_Gallup_poll)
- (3) [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Barack\\_Obama\\_presidential\\_primary\\_campaign,\\_2008](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Barack_Obama_presidential_primary_campaign,_2008)
- (4) <http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/?pid=10218>
- (5) Eric Foner, “Lincoln’s Lesson”, *Nation Magazine*, February 11, 1991.
- (6) Paul Johnson, *A History of the American People*, 1997, p. 435.
- (7) This view of Lincoln has been developed by two schools of thought, which are called Libertarianism and Paleoconservatism. Libertarianism has been promoted by thinkers like Murray Rothbard and Lew Rockwell and Rockwell maintains a website named LewRockwell.com dedicated to Libertarian ideas. There is not enough space here for an adequate summary of Libertarianism. Suffice it to say that Libertarians are committed to extremely limited government in both foreign and domestic affairs. They are opposed to what they call the Welfare/Warfare state. Paleoconservatism holds much in common with Libertarianism. The most important Paleoconservative magazine is called *Chronicles* and has been edited for many years by Thomas Fleming.

Other important Paleoconservative writers are the late Samuel Francis and columnist and former presidential candidate Patrick Buchanan. An important area of difference between the two schools is the Tariff on imported goods. Libertarians oppose it while Paleoconservatives tend to support it. They are united in their opposition to the Neoconservatives.

- (8) For an interesting discussion of “Conventional Wisdom”, see John Kenneth Galbraith, *The Affluent Society*, 1957.
- (9) *ABRAHAM LINCOLN: THE PRAIRE YEARS AND THE WAR YEARS*, Carl Sandburg, 1954, p. viii.
- (10) DiLorenzo was interviewed by Tom Woods on February 12, 2014. The link is <https://itunes.apple.com/us/podcast/the-tom-woods-show/id716825890?mt=2>
- (11) There are many names for the conflict between North and South which began in 1861 and ended in 1865. While “The Civil War” is probably the most commonly used name, some others are “The Great Unpleasantness”, “The War Between the States”, “The War for Southern Independence” and “The War of Northern Aggression”.
- (12) *Lincoln*, Directed by Steven Spielberg, 2012.
- (13) *The Collected Works of Abraham Lincoln* edited by Roy P. Basler, Volume V, “Letter to Horace Greeley” (August 22, 1862), p. 388.
- (14) <http://www.dailypaul.com/100173/abe-lincoln-racist-the-lincoln-douglas-debates-1858>
- (15) *Gettysburg*, Directed by Ronald Maxwell, 1993
- (16) Joseph Fallon, “The North’s Southern Cash Cow”, *Chronicles*, June, 2013, p. 42.
- (17) Cited in Patrick J. Buchanan, “Mr. Lincoln’s War”, *Chronicles*, October, 1997, p.18.
- (18) Patrick J. Buchanan, “Mr. Lincoln’s War”, *Chronicles*, October, 1997, p.18.
- (19) Cited in Joseph Fallon, “The North’s Southern Cash Cow”, *Chronicles*, June, 2013 p. 42.
- (20) Cited in Joseph Fallon, “The North’s Southern Cash Cow”, *Chronicles*, June, 2013 p. 43.
- (21) Cited in Joseph Fallon, “The North’s Southern Cash Cow”, *Chronicles*, June, 2013 p. 43.
- (22) Cited in Joseph Fallon, “The North’s Southern Cash Cow”, *Chronicles*, June, 2013 p. 43.

- (23) Cited in Joseph Fallon, “The North’s Southern Cash Cow”, *Chronicles*, June, 2013 p. 43.
- (24) Cited in Patrick J. Buchanan, “Mr. Lincoln’s War”, *Chronicles*, October, 1997, p. 20.
- (25) Patrick J. Buchanan, “Mr. Lincoln’s War”, *Chronicles*, October, 1997, p. 20.
- (26) Joseph Fallon, “Never-Ending War: an Economic Policy”, *Chronicles*, March 2014, p. 42.
- (27) Cited in Patrick J. Buchanan, “Mr. Lincoln’s War”, *Chronicles*, October, 1997, p.18.
- (28) Joseph Fallon, “Never-Ending War: an Economic Policy”, *Chronicles*, March 2014, p. 42.
- (29) Joseph Fallon, “Never-Ending War: an Economic Policy”, *Chronicles*, March 2014, p. 44.
- (30) The literature by and about Neoconservatism is huge. Perhaps it would be best for an interested reader to start with two Neoconservative magazines: *The Weekly Standard* and *Commentary*.
- (31) See Norman Podhoretz, “A Masterpiece of American Oratory”, *The American Spectator*, November, 2006, p. 31–32.
- (32) For an analysis of the Neoconservative role in the lead up to the Iraq War see Thomas Ricks’ 2006 book *Fiasco* and many columns in 2003 by Justin Raimondo at AntiWar.com.
- (33) Lord Acton is perhaps best known for his famous aphorisms that “Power tends to corrupt and absolute power corrupts absolutely” and “Great men are almost always bad men.” It is not clear whether Acton had Lincoln in mind when he developed these aphorisms.
- (34) Cited in Joseph Fallon, “The North’s Southern Cash Cow”, *Chronicles*, June, 2013, p. 45.
- (35) [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Compensated\\_emancipation](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Compensated_emancipation).