

Revised History

If You Couldn't Leave Then Who Would Join?

By Al Benson Jr., July 11th, 2022

Professor Tom DiLorenzo had a couple short paragraphs about secession on Lew Rockwell's website on July 9th. They should still be there. He observed that: "Gouverneur Morris of New York was chairman of the Committee on Style and is credited with literally writing the final draft of the Constitution. Along with the New England Federalists, he advocated secession of New England and New York. The Federalists were so opposed to Jefferson, his and Madison's trade embargo, and the War of 1812, all of which they believed were harmful to the New England economy, that they plotted to secede." You seldom read about New England's secession plans in your "history" books. All you read is about how horrible it was when the South did it.

DiLorenzo continued: "This proves once and for all that the founding fathers all agreed with Senator Timothy Pickering of Massachusetts, who was George Washington's secretary of war and secretary of state, that secession was "the" principle of the American Revolution; that of course the union is voluntary; and of course, the citizens of each state have a right to secede. (Senator Pickering was the leader of the New England secession movement from 1801-1814)."

Professor DiLorenzo, the well-known author of such books as The Real Lincoln, Lincoln Unmasked, and Hamilton's Curse and others, has done a lot of homework in this area. I've read some of his insightful work over the years.

It doesn't take a rocket scientist to figure out that no one in his right mind would have agreed to be part of a union they could never get out of under any circumstances. The ratification ordinances of at least three states stated that if the new union turned out to be harmful to their states, they reserved the right to withdraw (secede) from it. That language in those ordinances was accepted. No one said it should be removed because they were signing onto a permanent union they could never leave.

Had the union been presented to the states as an entity they could never leave it is doubtful it would have had any takers. If that was the intent of the promoters of the new constitution, they hid it well and were truly evil people. I guess history will have to decide that.

Secession was not some diabolical concept that had to be put down as Lincoln did. Indeed, the Declaration of Independence was a document of secession from Great Britain. So, the founders were familiar with the concept of secession even though they may not have called it that specifically.

Much of the talk of secession being treason came from the Lincoln era and much of it was probably rooted in Lincoln's strange ideas about the beginning and foundation of the union—an entity he believed was eternal and could never be separated from no matter what. So, he denied the truth about secession, tried to suppress it, that he might promote his own pet theory—and that's what we remain stuck with today—Lincoln's pet theory. Most "historians" today love to have it so. After all, they have built their careers on it.

I understand there is a group in Texas promoting the idea of a secession project for the next election. I don't have all the details. Someone sent me one article about it. But it will be interesting to see what the response in Texas is in the next few months. Regardless of what the political liars tell you, secession was not and is not treason. Whatever legislation they have passed over the years saying it was is in gross error and needs to be revisited.