



Revised History

Fake History Debunked

By Al Benson Jr., July 29th, 2022

About five or six years ago I did a book review of Gene Kizer's book "Slavery Was Not the Cause of the War Between the States." It was a good book and deserved much more attention than it got. Naturally, it was anathema to today's leftist historians who continue to prattle on about how the glorious North went to war to free the slaves and emancipate them from the clutches of those greasy slave magnates in the South.

We know Lincoln was death against the Southern states seceding, but why? It sure wasn't over the slavery issue. Mr. Kizer brings up several issues not routinely dealt with. For instance, he notes that: "The reason Lincoln needed to preserve the Union was because, without it, the North faced economic annihilation, the magnitude of which easily made war preferable....By the time Lincoln was inaugurated on March 4, 1861 there was gloom, despair and panic in the North with thousands of business failures, hundreds of thousands of people out of work, serious trouble with the stock market, threatened runs on banks, and Northern ship captains heading South because of the South's low tariff. There was no talk whatsoever of ending slavery." Kizer continued: "The North quickly discovered that manufacturing and shipping for the South were the sources of most of its employment, wealth, and power. Cotton alone was 60% of U.S. exports in 1860. Without the South, the North was headed for bankruptcy."

And then Kizer deals with the Crittenden Compromise, which he says "...would almost certainly have prevented the war." He notes that it was based on the old Missouri Compromise that had worked out so well for thirty years. He said: "Slavery had been prohibited north of the line and allowed south of it." The Crittenden Compromise was popular in both North and South—and yet Lincoln was opposed to it. Instead, Lincoln supported the Corwin Amendment which left black people in bondage forever. Your history books didn't tell you about the Corwin Amendment? I'm not surprised. Mind didn't either. Such information would not have fit in well with the persona of the Great Emancipator the "historians" were crafting for Lincoln. While probably not perfect, the Crittenden Compromise would have prevented war, which Kizer notes, and it would also have "...given the country time to work on ending slavery."

Kizer also observes that "Historian Richard N. Current believed slavery would not last another generation, and that seems a reasonable assessment." Current wrote that "Lincoln and his fellow Republicans, in insisting that Congress must prohibit slavery in the West, we're dealing with political phantoms." Current said Congress "...approved the organization of territorial governments for Colorado, Nevada, and Dakota without a prohibition of slavery" because it was not thought to be necessary. Kizer noted that, in 1860, "...there were only two slaves in Kansas and 15 in Nebraska, and that was after being open to slavery for 10 years. Current did not believe slavery would have lasted another generation, even in the deep South."

Kizer tells us that author Charles W. Ramsdell concluded that "...slavery had about reached its zenith by 1860 and must shortly have begun to decline, for the economic forces which had carried it into the region west of the Mississippi had about reached their maximum effectiveness. It could not go forward in any direction and was losing ground along its northern border." So, all the bunk about trying to extend slavery into the far west was just that—bunk!

Suffice it to say, many of our "history" books need major alterations. A novel thought here—wouldn't it be wonderful if they started telling us the truth for a change? Don't hold your breath waiting for that to happen though.