



# Revised History

## Conspiracy! Oh, Heaven Forbid No!

By Al Benson April 6th, 2022

If you only follow the mainstream media and those people in Washington who claim to represent us you will think the only conspiracy that ever existed was St. Hillary's "vast right-wing conspiracy" against her ever-virtuous husband. If you are one who seeks alternate news sources and have a healthy distrust of the Washington elite, then you know better.

Awhile back I came across an article called "Conspiracy Theater" on the internet. The article contained a couple brief comments which noted why many, even today, still think the Lincoln assassination was part of a conspiracy. The article observed: "Yet from the moment of the president's murder on that drizzly Good Friday, suspicions about the actual nature of the conspiracy began to fester. Did the government have foreknowledge of Booth's plot? Was Booth a pawn of high-ranking officials? Inevitably, 125 years after the crime of the nineteenth century, fact and lore are more than a little tangled. Still, given the abundance of odd 'coincidences and curious admissions of the players, in many ways America's first presidential assassination remains a genuine mystery." The article noted that most of those involved were "ne'er-do-well Northerners" with Southern sympathies. That description does not quite fit Lewis Powell, the man who tried to kill Secretary of State Seward. At one point he is supposed to have ridden with Mosby.

The article also stated that: "The more enduring—and earthbound—theories assert that Booth was working for traitors among Lincoln's own cabinet, that he escaped with their assistance, and that the rakish actor lived to a ripe old age on a handsome government pension." I don't know about the part about the government pension. That seems a little farfetched. But I think the rest of the theory has some credibility.

Author and researcher Otto Eisenschiml also noted that "There was one man who profited by Lincoln's assassination. This man was Secretary of War, Edwin M. Stanton. A member of the Radical Republican faction that bitterly opposed Lincoln's lenient reconstruction plan for the South, Stanton stood to consolidate his own power if the North imposed a hardline military occupation instead." As Eisenschiml and other revisionist historians saw it Stanton's behavior immediately preceding the assassination, and also after, was highly suspicious. Stanton refused a request by Lincoln to allow the secretary of war's assistant, Major Thomas Eckert, to accompany the president to the fateful performance at Ford's Theater. The implication, according to Eisenschiml is that "Stanton knew something Lincoln didn't." You can see why Eisenschiml felt that way. Lincoln was informed that Eckert had to work late and so could not accompany him, in truth, Eckert went home early that night.

And then there was the "coincidence" of the telegraph being down at the exact time Booth was making his escape. Now was that a handy occurrence or what?

Dave McGowan, a researcher who did some amazing articles in a series "Everything You Think You Know About the Lincoln Assassination Is Wrong" noted some very interesting information regarding those who actually witnessed the assassination. McGowan said: "Of the four potential eyewitnesses none were ever questioned by reporters. Only one was ever questioned by authorities. Only one was ever deposed. Only one was ever called on to testify as to what he or she witnessed that evening...Despite the fact that the Lincoln assassination was billed as the Crime of the Century, authorities seem to have had no interest at all in speaking with the handful of people who actually witnessed the event." As for Mrs. Lincoln, her only words

made public about the assassination came from a letter she wrote to Edward Lewis Baker in 1877. That was twelve years after the assassination!

McGowan also noted that “Clara Harris was similarly tight-lipped about what she witnessed at Ford’s Theater.” What little she said came from personal correspondence. No public statements whatever. McGowan then observed: “That leaves us only with the tale told by Major Henry Rathbone, which we already know was a hopelessly scripted, rehearsed affair that he told under oath in almost exactly the same words on no less than three occasions...It is a strange tale to be sure, and it would seem to indicate that Rathbone spent more time studying the physical characteristics of the room than he did watching the play...it is very hard to believe that Rathbone would have spontaneously offered up such testimony. These details were undoubtedly provided to him as part of the script he appears to have been following.” Remember, Rathbone was an officer in the army. That means he would have been under Stanton’s influence as to what he should say publicly.

Then there was the supposed struggle between Rathbone and Booth after Lincoln was shot. McGowan again noted: “And yet none of the witnesses who claimed to see the man leap from the box mentioned seeing him struggling with Rathbone either before or while doing so. Another problem is that Rathbone claims to have suffered a substantial wound that bled profusely, so much so that his fiancé allegedly found herself drenched in blood, and yet all of the witnesses who said they saw the fleeing man prominently brandish a large knife as he made his exit across the stage, not one of them mentioned seeing any blood on the knife. Or on the man’s hands. Or on his clothing. How is it possible that he could have cut Rathbone so severely, and then continued grappling with him, and yet walked away with no visible blood on him?” McGowan asked some good questions, again, questions I never saw anyone else ever ask—and we have no answers for them! The politically correct among us would just as soon these questions were never asked—and they seek to pooh-pooh those who ask them.

Another point—as badly as Rathbone was supposed to have been cut up, he never went for any medical treatment. He was “merely taken home and dropped off.” McGowan told us that, according to the official story, there were three doctors on hand, and they could not do very much for Lincoln, obviously, but why didn’t anyone think of treating Rathbone’s wounds? Why was he just taken home and it was let go at that?

McGowan sums it up thusly: “What we seem to have here is a situation in which; (a) witness accounts don’t allow enough time for Rathbone to have been seriously wounded; (b) Rathbone never received treatment for a serious wound; (c) the knife that allegedly inflicted the wound was bloodless just seconds later, as was the guy carrying it; and (d) none of the self-proclaimed witnesses in the theater that night saw Rathbone grappling with his alleged assailant.”

Now, remember, folks, there’s nothing to see here. Nothing to see her except Booth and his merry misfits. So just sit back and swallow the “official version” of what went on—just like you are supposed to buy the “official version” of the Kennedy assassination. Don’t look too closely. Don’t see anything you are not supposed to see and, above all, don’t ask any questions that might be embarrassing to the powers that be. Do all that and you will remain exactly where the elites want you—fat dumb, —and ignorant. That way they and their left-wing friends can steal your real history and your heritage and you will remain too dumb to know what’s happening.

That’s the safe way out—but is it the most satisfying???