



Revised History

If Lincoln Did It Then It's Okay (And Later Presidents Can Do The Same With Impunity)

By Al Benson May 23rd, 2022

Back on September 24th of 2004 Professor Tom DiLorenzo did an article on <http://www.lewrockwell.com> called The American Gulag which is still relevant today. Professor DiLorenzo observed that: “Whenever a neocon defends governmental acts of tyranny, despotism, and brutality...it's a sure bet that he will eventually ‘justify’ such acts by invoking the image of the ‘sainted’ Abraham Lincoln. If ‘Father Abraham’ did it, the argument goes, then it must not only be accepted but celebrated.” He makes a valid point here which you can use to describe the tyrannical actions of several presidents.

The first in our day is Obama's puppet, sleepy Joe Biden and his newly attempted “Ministry of Truth” which, due to a lot of fuss in certain quarters, we are now told will be abandoned. Don't kid yourself. It will not be abandoned. It may undergo a name change or a description change but the real efforts of that board will continue in some form because its true purpose is to curtail your First Amendment rights and that is a priority for the Biden/Obama Regime. So don't be fooled when they tell you it's gone. It ain't! All it has done is gone into hiding

DiLorenzo continued: “Lincoln certainly did unconstitutionally suspend habeas corpus. But the tens of thousands of Northern citizens who were imprisoned without due process by the Lincoln administration (as many as 38,000 by one estimate in the Columbia Law Journal) were overwhelmingly plain citizens from all walks of life who simply expressed doubt over the administration's unconstitutional and despotic policies, including the shutting down of more than 300 opposition newspapers and the mass arrest of political dissenters by the military...Anyone overheard questioning virtually anything the administration had done, let alone publishing critical articles or editorials in newspapers, could land in prison without any due process. In fact, Lincoln himself even argued that those who simply remained silent and did not actively support his administration should also be subject to imprisonment...”

Undoubtedly all those who tried to avoid politics, like too many church members, were probably guilty of “domestic terrorism” or of “insurrectionist tendencies” and had to be arrested because they would not wholeheartedly endorse Lincolnian tyranny. Any of this sound familiar in our day? And Lincoln continues to have his apologists even now. I just read an article on <https://theinternetsaysitstrue.com> which stated: “Abraham Lincoln is known as ‘The Great Emancipator.’ But not many people know that during the Civil War, he jailed as many as 2,000 political opponents without charges...” Only 2,000? I wonder where this site got its figures from. The same article concluded, in part, with: “When Lincoln jailed political opponents during the civil war, he was doing so to protect the Union.” Really? Was the vaunted Union any safer with over 30,000 people in prison, some of whom had done nothing more than give their opinion of what Lincoln was doing? Lincoln's version of the Union may have been safer, but what about the God-given rights of the inhabitants of that Union? Their rights had been abrogated—tossed down the “memory hole” if you will. A “Union” that cannot stand constructive criticism is no real Union at all—it is merely a collection of political entities held together at the point of a bayonet—like the old Soviet Empire.

There was an interesting article on <https://www.americanthinker.com> for November 11, 2021, by E. Jeffrey Ludwig that noted: “Even saying that ‘it’s only a few bad dudes’ being held without habeas corpus does not dilute the evil that suspension of habeas corpus is. Only a couple weeks after seven Southern states seceded from the Union in 1861, Pres. Lincoln suspended habeas corpus and arrested an individual in Maryland—a state that had not seceded—for advocating secession. The U.S. Circuit Court ruled that Lincoln’s action violated the U.S. Constitution...” Didn’t matter—Lincoln didn’t rescind it. Lincoln’s ruling made your private opinion of his actions illegal unless you happened to agree with him.

You must ask yourself—how similar is this to the situation that occurred on January 6, 2021, at Trump’s rally, where those who disagreed with the highly questionable results of the 2020 election are now labeled as “domestic terrorists? In other words, don’t you dare to question the edicts of the “rulers on high” or you could be in trouble. Makes you wonder how much has changed since the Alien & Sedition Acts of the late 1700s except the names.