

Anglophile Enemy of Abraham Lincoln Promotes Break-Up of United States

by Mark Burdman

When In the Course of Human Events: Arguing the Case for Southern Secession

by Charles Adams

Lanham, Md.: Rowman & Littlefield, 2000

257 pages, hardbound, \$24.95

Amidst all the triumphalism in leading Anglo-American circles, typified by the unstable Zbigniew Brzezinski, about the United States being “the only global superpower” (or “hegemon”) for at least the next quarter-century, and about the 21st Century being the “next American century,” the possibility is rarely raised, that the United States itself might not long exist in its present form.

Aside from the nightmare that would ensue from a clown such as Al Gore or George W. Bush being American President as the global financial system disintegrates and as social-economic conditions dramatically worsen, it is also the case, that there are forces working to bring about the end of the United States, through new “secessions.” And leading elements within the ranks of “our most reliable ally” in London would like nothing more, than to see the break-up of the United States, just as Britain supported the Southern Confederacy in the 19th Century, and as British Royal Consort Prince Philip expressed the desire that the United States be broken up into “bio-regions,” during a speech in Washington in the spring of 1990.

Charles Adams’s pernicious and venomous book is a good place to start, to get a better appreciation of this threat. He is an advocate for the Southern Confederacy, hopes that new “secessions” today will break up the United States, and, while American by passport, is a fanatically loyal toady of the British Empire, who boasts about relying overwhelmingly, for his “case for Southern secession,” on British sources.

The book provides back-handed proof, of the contention long made by Lyndon LaRouche and collaborators, that what is universally known as the “American Civil War,” was a war fought by President Abraham Lincoln and the American nation against the monstrosities of the British Empire. As LaRouche stressed on Sept. 2, in his keynote speech to the annual Labor Day weekend conference of the International

Caucus of Labor Committees and Schiller Institute, Lincoln led a war to “defend upon this planet, the right of a republic to exist, free of the domination of the British Empire and the British monarchy. That was the great world cause, the cause of all humanity, for which the greatest war ever fought by the United States, the Civil War, was fought. The defeat of the Confederacy, was a defeat of the British Empire.”¹

Sovereign Nation-State Targetted

Adams is an “adjunct scholar” at both the Auburn, Alabama-based Ludwig von Mises Institute and the Cato Institute in Washington, D.C. These are two among the representatives of the so-called “anarcho-libertarian” wing of the Mont Pelerin Society “free trade/free market” cult, the latter founded in 1947 by the late Friedrich von Hayek and his British backers. Both institutes support all sorts of wild schemes for “privatization,” “local control,” “local currencies,” and destruction of the sovereign nation-state.

The Ludwig Von Mises Institute, named after the late leading figure of the so-called “Austrian School” of economics, has backed secessionist programs for the United States, and has frequently praised the Southern Confederacy. During Oct. 6-7, it held a conference on “The Rise and Fall of the State,” largely devoted to the 1999 book by Israeli military historian Martin van Creveld, *The Rise and Decline of the State*. Van Creveld is an extreme opponent of the sovereign nation-state, who promotes the “privatization of warfare,” a euphemism for restoring forms of conflict as they occurred in the 1618-48 Thirty Years War, and earlier, in the era of feudalism. He was the main guest at the conference, and held a special autograph session for his enthusiasts there.

A Von Mises Institute promotional for the event castigated “the state” as “ravenous and cruel” and as an “engine of redistribution and oppression,” responsible, in the 20th Century, for “concentration camps, mass murder, mass starvation, and world war.” It blamed President Lincoln for having begun the era of “state aggrandizement” in the United States, which, until Lincoln, had supposedly resisted this process. It invited participants and attendees to “accelerate . . . the decline of the state.”

1. See Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr. “Storm Over Asia, Take Two: I Told You So, and Now It Is Happening,” *EIR*, Sept. 15, 2000.



THE NEW ORLEANS PLUM.

BIG LINCOLN HORNER,
UP IN A CORNER,
THINKING OF HUMBLE PIE.

FOUND UNDER HIS THUMB,
A NEW ORLEANS PLUM,
AND SAID, WHAT A 'CUTE YANKEE AM I!



THE FEDERAL PHOENIX.

Adams reprints these cartoons from the British magazine *Punch*, published during the Civil War, denouncing Lincoln as a tyrant and aggressor.

As for the Cato Institute, its senior fellow, Doug Bandow, an advocate of drug legalization, has written a review salivating over Adams's book, gloating over Adams's attacks on Lincoln's 1863 Gettysburg Address.

Killing Lincoln a Second Time

When in the Course of Human Events: Arguing the Case for Southern Secession is, indeed, a violent diatribe against Lincoln, who is variously labelled a "tyrant," "dictator," "despot," and "war criminal," for his vigorous actions against the Confederacy. Adams likens Lincoln to an "ancient Aztec deity" bent on "blood sacrifice," as well as to Adolf Hitler and other "20th-Century dictators." Adams, obviously distraught that the great American leader was assassinated only once, goes so far as to express the wish that Lincoln had been "hanged" or even "lynched." As for the assassination itself, he likens Lincoln to Roman Emperor Julius Caesar, and welcomes assassin John Wilkes Booth's self-identification as "Brutus." Adams writes: "For all his benevolent acts as a dictator, Caesar rode roughshod over the Roman Constitution, and that resulted in his assassination; the killing of a tyrant was a patriotic act, a belief held by both the Romans and the Greeks. John Booth felt that way about Lincoln."

(Although, in the same passage, the racist Adams expresses admiration for Caesar's "plan to reduce the numbers of Romans on perpetual welfare by having them removed and resettled in the provinces where they could work for a living rather than survive on government handouts. Maybe that is the only way to cut down on the welfare state.")

These anti-Lincoln diatribes are repeatedly emitted, even though Adams, in spite of himself, presents convincing evidence that Lincoln's ruthless means of coordinating the war against the Confederacy, were unavoidable. In one rare moment of honesty, he confesses that, had Lincoln not been assassinated, the defeated Southern states would never have been subjected to the brutal kinds of treatment they often received, after 1865. This, from an author who cheers on the launching and activities of the Ku Klux Klan after the Confederacy was defeated in 1865, and who favorably quotes Klan leader Albert Pike's appeals for Arkansas to join the Confederacy.

British-Confederate 'Free Trade' Pact

Adams is in love with the Confederate cause, and gushes when he writes of Confederate leader Jefferson Davis, military leader Gen. Robert E. Lee, and other renegades. But, as a contemporary writer in the 21st Century, he cannot openly defend slavery. On one occasion, he moans that slavery was the South's "Achilles' heel," and that the Confederacy would have done better without it—which is like arguing that fecal matter would be fine, if only it got rid of its smell.

Nervous about the slavery question, he makes his main polemic, the celebration of the Southern secessionist states' commitment to "free trade," and opposition to the high protectionist tariff promoted by Lincoln's Republican Party.

His contention that this was the fundamental issue driving the momentum toward what became the "Civil War," is not entirely wrong, he just has the whole thing upside-down, mor-

ally and otherwise. The Confederacy was, indeed, fully committed to the British Empire's "free trade" policies, of the type that the Mont Pelerin Society peddles today, and was in fanatic opposition to the "American System" policies of protective tariffs, and government promotion of manufacturing and infrastructure ("internal improvements"), supported by the Lincoln Republicans—or better, Lincoln-Carey Republicans, in reference to American System economist Henry Carey, who played the key role in shaping economic policy for the Lincoln circles.

The Confederacy saw itself in alliance with the British, primarily, and Emperor Napoleon III's France, selling cotton at the cheapest possible price (hence, slavery, the cheapest form of labor) to both. Fundamentally, the core Confederate leaders saw themselves as returning to the bosom of Mother Britain, a point made most insistently by leading personalities in the main slaveholders' bastion of secessionism, South Carolina. Conversely, the British supported the Confederacy, as the stepping-stone to establishing full imperial control over North America—a point we shall return to below.²

Adams repeatedly portrays the secessionist Southern states as peace-loving victims of the brutal tyrant Lincoln, only wanting to live, according to their own rules, as a separate "nation," in accordance with the principles of "self-determination," and based, he claims, on the same justification whereby the American colonies had originally "seceded" from Great Britain—the latter an argument constantly invoked by the vengeful British commentators so beloved by Adams.

Adams's portrayal of the Confederacy as peaceful victims ("a war of conquest by the North to destroy the Confederacy") is a lie, and goes hand in hand with his absurd assertion that slavery was dying out by the late 1850s, and was, therefore, no longer really an issue. The fact is, the cotton-dependent ("Cotton is King," as the 1855 propaganda piece boasting about the slaveholders' economic system was titled) insurrectionist states lived on a system of primitive accumulation, whereby the land was depleted, at the same time that it became harder and harder to maintain a growing slave population. "Free trade" and slavery were mutually interdependent.

In essence, the slave-based economy was able to survive only by *expansion*, westward into new territories that had not yet become American states, as well as by doing whatever were possible, to weaken those Northern forces that were committed to industrial and manufacturing growth, so that the Northern states could be made into assured providers of cheap food for the slaveholders. This is why Lincoln pro-

2. For the best account of both the underlying economic policy issues behind the Union war to crush the Confederacy, featuring the decisive role of Henry Carey and his circle, as well as the British role in the Confederacy and other "free trade" assaults on the United States, see Allen Salisbury, *The Civil War and the American System: America's Battle With Britain, 1860-1876* (Washington, D.C.: EIR, 1992; reprint of 1978 edition.)

pelled himself into much more active politics after the 1854 Kansas-Nebraska Act was passed, a piece of legislation that legitimized the bestial notion of "popular sovereignty" in these territories, and made almost inevitable, the extension of slavery there.

As for the "peaceful, leave us alone" Confederacy, Adams, in his second chapter dealing with the circumstances leading up to the Civil War, himself provides evidence that this is a fraud. He reports that the secessionists had captured "a long list of Federal properties," including several Federal forts, navy yards, and arsenals, and had seized or fired on government ships, in the short time between Lincoln's election in early November, and South Carolina's April 1861 attack on Fort Sumter, the which was the immediate cause of war. He also reports, that Lincoln's predecessor James Buchanan "did not block these takeovers," while Buchanan was a lame duck, between the November 1860 election and Lincoln's inauguration on March 4, 1861. In praising Buchanan's refusal to act, Adams quotes the latter's December 1860 annual address to Congress, where Buchanan lied that "our Union rests on public opinion," and, therefore, could only be held together by force.

Simply from this evidence provided by Adams, it is clear that Lincoln was faced with an *active aggression*. In reality, things were far worse for Lincoln than Adams reports. Parts of the slaveholding South had been on an incipient war mobilization for a long time preceding 1860-61. Especially in South Carolina, leading slaveholder families had plans for secession already back in the early 1830s, and while the 1833 "nullification" crisis was ultimately settled without bloodshed, war plans were in existence during the next two decades, and intensified during the Presidencies of Franklin Pierce (1852-56) and Buchanan (1856-60). As it became clear that Lincoln would become President, and on through Buchanan's lame-duck period, secessionist operatives were absconding with weapons, personnel, and documents from Union facilities. Anti-American espionage was rife, money was being looted for the emergent Confederate cause, and so on.

The secessionists were also receiving encouragement, and various forms of support, from Britain and France. In his second chapter, on the period immediately preceding the war, Adams writes: "It was reported in the Cleveland *Daily National Democrat* on 20 November (1860)"—i.e., barely two weeks after Lincoln's election—"that the English cabinet had entered into a secret trade agreement with the South for free trade in which cotton would be exchanged for British goods, duty free for both parties." Issuing no disclaimer or further information about this extraordinary item, he next writes: "This would, said the editors, 'cripple' Northern commerce in these products and strike 'a deadly blow' at the United States. In short, a free and independent South would be an economic dagger to plunge into the heart of the nation." A few pages later, he writes: "The free trade zone and its threats

to Northern prosperity was a serious matter, justifying a strong response in one form or another.”

Here, he has blown his own “case” to smithereens! But that does not stop him, only a couple of sentences later, from denouncing Lincoln for violating the American Constitution like “a Roman consul” and acting “dictator for the duration of his life”—a “duration” that was, of course, limited, thanks to British-run assassin Booth.

One other cautionary note, before proceeding to Adams’s love affair with the British Empire: He repeats, for his own devious purposes, the common fallacy that the Civil War was one between “the North” and “the South,” thereby sidestepping the issue that powerful forces in “the North” were committed to the same “free trade” atrocities as the Confederacy, and that policies of New York and New England (as well as City of London) banks had greatly reinforced the institution of slavery, by enforcing draconian debt repayment policies on Southern states. In one psychedelic chapter, Adams goes so far as to portray Lincoln as an agent of Wall Street, including of Rothschild agent August Belmont. In reality, as historian Anton Chaitkin has documented, Belmont was among those bitter New York enemies of Lincoln, who were not only supportive of the Confederate cause, but who threatened that, if Lincoln were to continue the war, New York would secede from the Union!³

‘The British View’

What is clinically useful to the counterintelligence specialist, is Adams’s fanatical zeal for what he calls “the British view” of the Civil War. Of his 15 chapters, three are devoted to this, with chapter headings “The British Press Views the War,” “British Scholars Speak,” and “How British Cartoonists Saw the War.”

In his “Bibliographical Remarks,” he writes: “I found that the most fascinating and honest accounts of the war were written by Europeans, especially the British. Every periodical in Britain ran continuing accounts of the Civil War, focussing on just about every phase of the conflict. British editors wrote in an atmosphere of pure freedom of expression, something totally lacking in America, then and even perhaps now. . . . As for British newspapers, the *Times* is all-important, but there were newspapers in every town and village, let alone cities, in Britain, and they were all obsessed with the war in America.”

He repeatedly cites British writers espousing the “Southern” cause, or castigating Lincoln and the Union, and gloats that “British scholars haven’t changed their position in a hundred years.”

He quotes British journals of the 1860s advising active intervention on behalf of the Confederacy. He reports that

British writers and war correspondents “had little difficulty condemning the North and supporting the South, even to the point of urging the British government to join in the conflict for Southern independence.”

Adams quotes a number of British prominents who supported the Confederacy, including Liberal leader William Gladstone; James Bryce, the leading 19th-Century British profiler of the American political system; and Lord Acton, who is today a hero of the Mont Pelerin crowd. In correspondence to General Lee, Acton bemoaned the loss of the war by the Confederacy: “Secession filled me with hope, not as the destruction but as the redemption of Democracy. I deemed that you were fighting the battles of our liberty, our progress, and our civilization, and I mourn the stake which was lost at [the Confederate capital] Richmond more deeply than I rejoiced over that which was saved at Waterloo” by the defeat of Napoleon Bonaparte.

Adams also makes dubious efforts to recruit British 19th-Century novelist Charles Dickens to his cause.

To show to what depths Adams crawls to emphasize his treasonous Anglophilia, he writes at one point: “The British are still chiding us for the absurdity of the Declaration of Independence. Some years ago, while I was living in a British colony, we Americans got together on the Fourth of July for a barbecue. One of my older English friends asked me what the celebration was all about. I took the bait and told him it was to celebrate the Declaration of Independence. He replied, ‘Wasn’t that document kind of a farce?’ . . . Of course I had no answer.”

One of Adams’s obsessions, is to insist that Lincoln and his advisers were driven by the lust for expanding the “American empire.” He barely bothers to mention, that his beloved Britain then sat astride the largest and most brutal world empire. This leads him to such grotesque historical inversions, as the claim that the contingency of Lincoln and his strategists, for a possible military move against Canada after the war against the Confederacy were concluded, was a plan for conquest. In reality, this contingency was developed to prevent Canada from being used as a staging ground for a British attack on the United States. But in Adams’s universe, the British Empire was victim of big, bad Lincoln.

So, of course, Adams covers up the real intent behind all of this support for the Confederacy, namely, to re-colonize the United States, and establish British imperial hegemony throughout all the Americas. The reader should keep in mind, that 1859 was a high-point of the British Empire, underscored by that year’s publication of Charles Darwin’s “survival of the fittest” pseudo-scientific apologia for imperialism, in his *Origin of Species*. Just preceding that year, the British had been on the victorious side in the Crimean War against Russia; had bloodily suppressed the Sepoy Mutiny in India; and had carried out, with the French, the Second Opium War against China. There was a feverish mood for Empire expansion in the United Kingdom, and the break-up of the United States,

3. See Anton Chaitkin, *Treason in America: From Aaron Burr to Averell Harriman* (Washington, D.C.: EIR, 1998, reprint of 1985), pp. 364-67, pp. 364-65.

using the Confederacy and British tools in New York, New England, and elsewhere in “the North,” was a priority British strategic aim.

The British elites have never forgiven Abraham Lincoln for ruining their plans, and the anti-Lincoln poison spewed by such of their toadies as Charles Adams, is emblematic of the fury still felt for the great American leader—and of the fear that Lincoln’s policies and leadership qualities can re-emerge in the United States, in such a conjuncture of historical crisis as the present.

‘Secession Is in the Making in America’

This rage of his masters, drives Adams to yearn for the break-up of the United States. In the midst of his condemnations of Lincoln and the Union cause as driven by the lust for “empire,” he jumps to the present time: “As the world’s great empires have broken up in the latter half of this century, with the Soviet Union being the latest casualty, only America remains as the last of the great empires.”

Then, in Chapter 12, he erupts: “Secession is in the making in America, and it is not in the old South—it is in the Southwest, by the Mexican-Americans. . . . As their numbers move them into the majority, secession from the United States to form a Mexican-American nation is not as far-fetched as it may sound. This prospect has been in the

vision of Mexican-American leaders as their long-term game plan, and, unlike the Southerners, they do have the numbers.” He then quotes two “Chicano nationalist” leaders, who make militant statements, but without the slightest hint of secession. But with his usual concern for truth and rigor, that is enough for Adams, who writes of this misnomered “vision for secession”: “When they have the numbers, will they not have every reason to secede, to withdraw from the leviathan in Washington to form a new nation where they will be, like the Southerners tried to be, making their own destiny, free from gringo domination—as the South wanted freedom from Yankee domination?”

Obviously, this eventuality is “making the rounds.” This reviewer had the opportunity, earlier this year, to speak to Professor van Crefeld, the hero of the Oct. 6-7 Von Mises Institute bash. In the discussion, van Creveld suddenly proclaimed that the United States would do better to pay less attention to foreign trouble spots and exotic new military doctrines, because the real threat to the United States comes from Mexico, and from the danger of a secession by Mexican-Americans in the Southwest. He reported that a book was circulating, through certain American networks, entitled *Civil War Two*, putting forward this scenario.

Something nasty is afoot, and Adams’s ugly diatribe is a key contribution to this nastiness.

Challenges of Human Space Exploration

by Marsha Freeman

21st Century Science & Technology

\$45, illustrated, 300 pages

Special offer to *EIR* readers: Receive a free copy of *21st Century Science & Technology* magazine with your book order.

Mail check or money order (U.S. currency only) to:

21st Century Space Books
P.O. Box 1951, Dept. E
Leesburg, VA 20177

The real story of the accomplishments of the U.S. and Russia aboard the Mir space station. Foreword by Dr. Michael DeBakey.

