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There were several reasons for the post-war “reconstruction” imposed upon the South that are seldom, if ever, mentioned in the “history” books in those government indoctrination centers we charitably continue to refer to as public schools.

One over-riding reason for reconstruction that is never mentioned was the almost fanatical hatred for the South, its culture and its institutions, especially the white South, among Northern Yankee/Marxist radicals, both political and religious. Hatred for the white South motivated the majority of those people much more than did their supposed and pretended “love” for the black man, which was, in most cases, a complete charade.

Another reason for reconstruction was their fervent desire to reshape the South into their own image, to completely revolutionize it, to change the theological outlook of the South. This is almost never mentioned, as the theological reasons for the War are never mentioned. And while seldom mentioned, it was a major goal. One of their first steps was the introduction of government schools into the South. These nefarious institutions had existed in the North for decades but were hardly known in the South except on the most local levels where parental control was a major factor, and where state control was not even a factor.

Still more was accomplished later on with the introduction of new theologies into the South, starting shortly after the supposed climax of reconstruction. These theologies were intended to replace the Reformed, or orthodox theology of the South with something that would theologically neutralize the people—both with a pro-Zionist outlook and an altered worldview. If you care to learn more in this area I would suggest Joseph Canfield’s book The Incredible Scofield and his Book, published by Ross House Books, http://www.rosshousebooks.org  Mr. Canfield, now deceased, spent years digging into all this, traveling all around the country to come up with evidence. This was before the internet. Yet he came up with some very interesting and informative information.

Another reason for reconstruction was to entrench the Republican Party into “perpetual ascendency” in the South, something that seems to have finally occurred in our own day. This was done by disenfranchising white voters who were Democrats and enfranchising black voters. This was supposed to ensure perpetual Republican Party control—a virtual one-party state! That was back when the Democratic Party still had some men of principle in it. In years following, a collectivist clique managed to do the exact same thing by taking control of both major political parties and guaranteeing that no third-party candidates would have any real chance of doing anything. George Wallace almost scared them silly in 1968 with his American Independent Party. In 1972 they made darn sure he never had a chance to do that again!

Interestingly enough, Thaddeus Stevens and Abraham Lincoln actually saw eye to eye on some points of reconstruction. In regard to Lincoln’s reconstruction plan, Stevens said it: “proposes to treat the Rebel territory as a conqueror alone would treat it. His plan is wholly outside of and unknown to the Constitution. But it is within the legitimate province of the laws of war…with his usual shrewdness and caution he (Lincoln) is picking out the mortar from the joints until eventually the whole tower must fall.” Lincoln never admitted that the Southern states had seceded. He said they only tried to. To have admitted that they were actually outside of the Union would have been to admit their right to secede. Stevens disagreed with Lincoln here.

The radical/abolitionist Republicans were a bit embarrassed by the fact that, in spite of all their flowery bovine fertilizer about emancipation and equality, only six Northern states permitted blacks to vote. Yet when, after the War, Louisiana sent new congressmen to Washington, Thaddeus Stevens and Charles Sumner worked...
to block their admission to Congress on the grounds that the Louisiana constitution did not permit Negro suffrage. So you couldn’t seat a congressman from a Southern state where blacks could not vote, but it seems it was perfectly okay to seat congressmen from Northern states that didn’t allow blacks to vote. This was the typical double standard for most of “those people”—a sneak preview of the cultural Marxism that was to burst upon the scene in the twentieth century! The Northern radicals worked mightily at concentrating on the moat in their brother’s eye while studiously ignoring the beam in their own eye (Matthew 7:1-5).

In regard to voting rights for blacks, the Northern states had, shall we say, a slightly less than spotless reputation. Connecticut, Wisconsin, and Minnesota all rejected Negro suffrage in 1865! One can hardly claim that any of these states were part and parcel of the “heart of Dixie!”

In arguing over the illegal 14th Amendment and the future reconstruction of the South in Congress, one man asked Stevens if he could build a penitentiary big enough to hold 8 million people in the South. “Yes” shouted Stevens—“a penitentiary which is built at the point of the bayonet down below, and if they undertake to come here, we will shoot them down.” Don’t you get the subtle impression that Thaddeus Stevens were really a nice guy at heart? He had the soul of Marx and the conscience of Robespierre!

Claude Bowers wrote, as we have noted previously and quoted from, *The Tragic Era.* It was written in 1929. You may still be able to locate a copy in some used book store that the thought police have somehow missed. I got my copy in a little used book store up in Northern Indiana, which I am sure the thought police must have missed due to its Northern locale. Although I’ve been told it has been reprinted, so the thought police may have to again start making their rounds. You just never know where this “subversive” literature will turn up.

If you do a little digging, you will find that Bowers’ book has been pooh-poohed by many of our current crop of Marxist “historians.” Marxist professor Eric Foner has also written a book on reconstruction and, needless to say, he attempts to shred Bowers’ book in his tome. If you want the truth about reconstruction, get Bowers’ book if you can and ignore Foner’s Marxist diatribe.

In the preface of his book Bowers wrote the following in regard to Washington politicians: “Never have American public men in reasonable positions, directing the destiny of the nation, been so brutal, hypocritical, and corrupt. The Constitution was treated as a doormat on which politicians and army officers wiped their feet after wading in the muck.” Sounds like he was describing “the Swamp” of the 1860s. You have to admit, though, he described the politicians accurately. And he labeled reconstruction as a revolution. He said: “The story of this revolution (reconstruction) is one of desperate enterprises by daring and unscrupulous men, some of whom had genius of a high order. In these no American can take pride. The evil that they did lives after them. They changed the course of history…” The evil that those men did does, indeed, live after them, right down to our own day! The “reconstruction” those people perpetrated, using the South as a guinea pig, was eventually spread nationwide, thanks to the 13th, 14th, and 15th Amendments. This tainted era spawned a massive increase in federal bureaucracy into the lives of all Americans, something that many of us realize has never been reversed!

Thus, they paved the way for their spiritual grandchildren to return in the 1960s with more federal troops under the guise of promoting “civil rights” which was really only the next phase of the continuing reconstruction.