

YOUR KINDLE NOTES FOR:

Punished With Poverty: The Suffering South - Prosperity to Poverty & the Continuing Struggle

James R. Kennedy and Walter D. Kennedy

Last accessed on Thursday, July 25, 2024

32 Highlights | 0 Notes

Yellow highlight | Page: 10

All Southerners, black and white, are given false promises by their respective national political party but the end is always the same—Southerners remain the poorest people in the Federal Empire. Black conservative scholar Thomas Sowell noted that the evidence is clear that black Americans were doing better “100 years after slavery”7 (1865-1965) than in the “50 years since…1965.”8 During the height of Jim Crow segregation in the 1950s, the homicide rate among blacks was going down, but after massive government intervention beginning in 1965—War on Poverty, etc.—the downward trend reversed and to this day it continues at extreme levels. These levels would not be tolerated if they were occurring in white Northern communities. Prior to 1965 most black children were raised in two-parent families, but today such families are the minority in black communities. As Dr. Sowell noted, the environment created by politicians who claimed they would help black communities has actually caused the destruction of those communities. “Behavior matters and facts matter, more than the prevailing social visions or political empires built on those visions.”9 Walter Williams, another black conservative scholar, explained that the so-called good intentions of liberals have been destructive of black education as well. Americans typically think of education as a key pathway out of poverty. Yet education is helpful only if society produces employment opportunities and the educational system produces potential employees capable of mastering the technology required by the prospective employer. The modern day education system has failed blacks and has been a key element in keeping them on Uncle Sam’s plantation. Dr. Williams points to the deplorable fact that when it comes to math only 33% of American eighth-graders scored acceptable levels but blacks scored even lower at 13%! Reading scores for American eighth-graders were only 34% at acceptable levels but again blacks scored even lower at a mere 16%.10 Is the problem a racial problem—blacks cannot successfully compete against whites—or is it a system (political) failure? Is it actually a symptom of a failure of political leadership? This political system has worked to the great disadvantage of black Southerners. Dr. Williams points out that prior to massive government intervention beginning in 1965 blacks were not only successfully competing but in some cases actually doing better than their white contemporaries. “Paul Laurence Dunbar High School is a black public school in Washington, D.C. As early as 1899, its students scored higher on citywide tests than any of the city’s white schools.”11 Defenders of national politicians will dismiss these two black scholars as being “Uncle Toms,” doing the work

of white conservatives who, as Vice President Joe Biden assured his black audience in North Carolina, “want to put you all back in chains.” But a report from the liberal Schott Foundation for Public Education, titled “Black…

Note:

Yellow highlight | Page: 17

The cultivation of these labor-intensive crops had two important consequences for the South: (1) the movement of large numbers of indentured servants into the colonies; and (2) the establishment of African slavery on large plantations. Indentured servants were white freemen who, for the price of passage to the new world and maintenance during a term as an indentured servant, would work for a landowner from four to fourteen years. After this time, the worker would usually move into the plain folk status and become a small landowner. With the increase in plain folk population in the never-ending wilderness of the Southern colonies, additional people of the British Empire sought a better life in the American South. Having reached the South not as indentured servants but as freemen, they quickly filled the ranks of the plain folks of the colonial South. This and other measures, such as the Hundred and Headright systems of land grants, promoted the movement of free white men and families into the Southern colonies. While much wealth was created on the Southern plantations, another means of wealth production unrelated to direct agriculture was land speculation. This system was common throughout the colonies but seems to have been more active and lasting in the South from the colonial period to the advent of the War for Southern Independence (no doubt due to the vast expanse of Southern forest and prairie). As late as the 1830s, one hundred years after the settlement of the last Southern colony, in Mississippi the Kennedy family and their kith and ken were involved in land speculation.9

Note:

Yellow highlight | Page: 18

Another means of gaining wealth was the production of food and of livestock. For example, in 1649 Virginia was said to have 20,000 head of cattle. Sixteen years later Virginia was home to 100,000 head of cattle. This figure does not include those animals slaughtered for home consumption. Open range cattle and hog production was a common method of gaining a means of existence for the plain folks of the non-plantation South. What is demonstrated here in these early days of the colonial South is a slow but steady growth of wealth that was not solely concentrated in the hands of a few very rich men. True, there were men of much wealth, but those men were never perceived by the plain folk as harsh competitors and enemies. These plain folks were slowly beginning to make up the bulk of white Southern society.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Page: 18

According to historians such as Frank L. Owsley, Francis B. Simkins, and Grady McWhiney, the South was not a place of dire poverty during the early stages of its history. Just a few years after their founding, the Southern Colonies were exporters of tobacco, rice, indigo, and producing food in the form of grains and cattle for both home and foreign consumption. Non-Southerners also have verified the South's position as a wealthy area of not just the thirteen original colonies but also on a par with Great Britain.11 Southern Colonial wealth was so great as to make the South "much richer than the North."12 Looking at net personal incomes, Lindert and Williamson place 1774 personal income for the New England Colonies, Middle Colonies, and Southern Colonies in millions of dollars at around: N.E., $35; M.C., $36; S.C., $91.13 Here we see, according to these non-Southern statisticians, that the South is almost three times as wealthy as New England and over twice as wealthy as the middle colonies. By 1800 after the disruption of the War for American Independence, the South still held the leading position in property and total income. By 1800, the South was only twice as wealthy as New England,14 but, nevertheless, still the wealthiest portion of the United States. In looking at what Lindert and Williamson describe as "Real Product per Capita" for the time frame of 1774 to 1860, the fact of a glaring loss of wealth in the South is made obvious. According to Lindert and Williamson's report from 1788, the date of the adoption of the Constitution, to the eve of Southern secession (1860), the South experienced a steady loss of wealth. After 1840 the Southern wealth fell behind that of New England and the Middle Atlantic North, and has never recovered to this day.15 By no means does this drop in wealth indicate rank poverty in the South during the antebellum period. What it does dramatically demonstrate is that there was a "great sucking sound" of wealth being moved from the South and landing in the North. This transfer of wealth from the South to the North was one of the major fears of the Southern Founding Fathers as they debated the wisdom of ratifying the Constitution. For example, George Mason of Virginia warned of the danger of going into a government with the North because: "Northern States have interests different from Southern States.…The Southern States had therefore grounds for suspicions."16 Hugh Williamson of NC warned: "Southern interests must be extremely endangered by the present arrangement."17 Again it must be pointed out that although the South did lose its place as the wealthiest section of the nation, it by no means sank into anything faintly similar to the poverty that black and white Southerners were saddled with after the invasion and conquest of the Confederate States of America by the United States of America.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Page: 21

This sense of hospitality and caring for neighbors lives on in the South today. In a 2007 Pew Research poll on per capita charitable giving it was discovered that Southerners are more charitable than Northerners. The State with the highest per capita charitable

giving was impoverished Mississippi, whereas the State with the lowest per capita giving was rich Massachusetts.24 It would appear that the society of “dollar-worshipers” is alive and well in the State of Massachusetts. As Tocqueville noted in 1830, Yankees were taught from infancy “to place wealth above all the pleasures.”25 This money-grubbing Yankee life-style can only be contrasted, not compared, to the Southern life-style of family and leisure. In Cracker Culture, historian Grady McWhiney notes that Northerners and Southerners held values that were more than just “different, they were antagonistic.”26 McWhiney rejects the idea of the so-called “Civil War” being a conflict of “brother against brother,” and pronounces it to be a conflict of “culture against culture.”

Note:

Yellow highlight | Page: 22

and equal to the total of all crops for that year.28 Americans who love Western folklore are familiar with the famous Chisholm Trail. Over this trail cattle were driven from Texas north to markets during the 1870s and 1880s. On the average about 280,000 head of cattle per year passed over the Chisholm to market. During the antebellum period in South, the plain folk drove to market around 4,500,000 head of hogs per year (this number does not include those used for home consumption). According to Federal records, around 1,000,000 head of cattle were also driven to market by farmers of Mississippi, Louisiana, and Alabama during this time period.29 This vast amount of hogs and cattle was not being produced by “poor whites,” but rather by a prosperous and stable middle-class, aka, “plain folk.” They were not in competition with the rich plantation owners, nor did they feel threatened by their richer fellow Southerners. Yes, they had a different life-style than their wealthy fellow Southerners but they were not at odds with them. 30 Confederate General E. Porter Alexander points

Note:

Yellow highlight | Page: 23

As Olmsted (a Northerner not to be confused with Owsley the Southerner) and Alexander point out, these plain folks of the old South provided for themselves by marketing their hogs and cattle to local plantations and foreign markets.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Page: 25

the conclusion of his work, The Southern Tradition at Bay, Weaver proclaims that from the “bleakness” of bureaucratic socialism, sooner or later people will seek something “stirring” as they decide to live “strenuously or romantically.”37 In other words, like our Southern forefathers, people will learn to enjoy life and live it with honor as did Southerners in the leisure-orientated society of the antebellum South. Nowhere in that society do we see any evidence of sickly starving poor white or black people so typically

seen in the South after the invasion and conquest of the Confederate States of America.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Page: 26

As already stated, this view of slavery in the Old South runs counter to the accepted politically correct view of a racist hate-filled South. Equally true, Tocqueville's view of a racist North filled with people who detested the thought of equality with black Americans also runs counter to the modern politically correct view.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Page: 27

There were two major differences between slavery in the Old South and slavery in the sugar colonies of Spain: (1) The sugar plantations were usually very large enterprises with absentee landlords—whereas in the South plantations were run by planters living alongside their slaves; (2) A large number of small slave-holders (five or fewer slaves) lived and worked alongside their slaves in the South—this was virtually unheard of in the sugar plantations of the Caribbean.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Page: 30

A plantation is not long lived if it is not profitable. Antebellum masters used the preverbal "carrot and stick" to encourage a smooth-running and therefore profitable plantation. The carrot consisted of good food, health care, care for the sick and infirm, and as much pleasure time as feasible according to the calendar. The "stick" or lash was always in sight, carried by the overseer or otherwise on prominent display, to remind a wayward individual that he was under the authority of the overseer. This "stick" or lash was far less commonly used than modern T.V. miniseries or Hollywood movies would have one believe. Indeed, many Northerners who traveled into the South were astonished by the laxity of discipline applied to slaves. As one Northerner noted: "The slaves

Note:

Yellow highlight | Page: 40

The impoverishment of the South began in earnest as the North gained control of Congress. During the years following the adoption of the Constitution a host of schemes, from banking and monetary systems which benefitted the banking and commercial interest of the North to tariffs that protected Northern industry but increased prices for Southern consumers, were passed through the Federal Congress. Raphael Semmes points out the toxic results to the South of these measures: "Under

the wholesale system of spoliation, which was now practiced, the South was becoming poorer and poorer."21 Semmes is pointing out that economically the South was unfairly losing ground to the North. This economic downturn fell upon not just the rich white plantation owners but also on the average white non-slave holder as well as on the free and enslaved black people of the South—Northern-imposed poverty is an equal opportunity villain. Long before Semmes wrote his famous memoirs, Thomas Hart Benton, Senator from Missouri, was denouncing the treatment the South was receiving at the hands of the Northern majority. In a speech before the U. S. Senate in 1828 notice how Benton points out that the rich South was being plundered by the Northern majority:

Note:

Yellow highlight | Page: 46

Lincoln, while speaking to African-Americans, was simply restating his racial views as expressed in the 1858 Lincoln-Douglas debates. In another message to Congress in 1862, Lincoln again spoke in favor of colonization, i.e., removing African-Americans from the U.S. and sending them back to Africa: "I cannot make it better known than it already is, that I strongly favor colonization."7 Modern Americans find it difficult understanding the strong desire of Northerners for the removal of Africans from America. John Adams of Massachusetts, founding father and second President of the United States, throws much light on the subject of removal of Africans from New England. The desire for ending slavery and the removal of Africans from New England society was expressed by Adams when he stated that moral argument:

Note:

Yellow highlight | Page: 46

The foundation of Northern abolitionism was based not on goodwill for the enslaved African but the desire to rid their society of the African-American even to the point of putting "the slaves to death." Tocqueville in the 1830s points out: "It is not for the good of the negroes, but for that of the whites, that measures are taken to abolish slavery in the United States."10 In a shocking revelation of racism in the North, Joanne Pope Melish explains how first New England, quickly followed by other Northern States, embraced the anti-slavery movement as a means of making the North a pure white society.11 This desire to rid Northern white society of African-Americans is displayed even among strong abolitionists. A noted abolitionist, Thomas Branagan, exposed the feeling of many Northerners as it relates to the presence of African Americans in the North: "The sons of Africa in America, are the inveterate enemies of America."12 Even the abolition of the African slave-trade in many Northern States was not predicated upon helping end the horrors of slavery but to assist white workers.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Page: 47

The State of New Jersey, for example, ended the importation of slaves in order "that white labor may be protected."13 Even the title "slave" was changed to "apprenticeship" or something similar in order to avoid the label of slaveholder. As late as 1860 both "apprentices" and slaves were to be found on the census records for the State of New Jersey.14 Notice the difference between the attitude of the "Free" North and the "Slave" South as it relates to living with African-Americans. The North displayed more racist tendency than the South. As Tocqueville points out, Northerners were shocked and repulsed by the close relationship between the races down South.15

Note:

Yellow highlight | Page: 50

The second thing that put an untimely end to the emancipation efforts of Southerners was the extreme and murderous attacks on Southerners by the Radical Abolitionists.19 From the colonial era until near 1830, "there was little difference between the North and the South in the volume and vigor of antislavery expression."20Until the advent and growth of the radical abolition movement, Southerners and Northerners were happy to work together for the elimination of slavery. A perfect example of Northerners and Southerners working together is displayed in the life of William Rawle of Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. Rawle was a Northern abolitionist who served as president of the Maryland Society for Promoting the Abolition of Slavery from 1818 until his death in 1836. (Maryland was very much a Southern State at this time.) This and other Southern abolition movements were very active until the radical abolitionist's "threat to the South…put an end to most of such activity."21

Note:

Yellow highlight | Page: 51

Throughout the North secret societies were forming to assist radical abolitionist assassins such as John Brown. In the late 1850s Brown attacked and murdered five non-slave holding Southerners in Kansas. For any nonslave holding Southerner who did not believe that Northerners hated all Southerners, here was positive proof that Northerners did indeed hate all Southerners—black or white, nonslaveholders, as well as slaveholders. Brown attacked these Southerners with the shout "The Northern army is upon you," and then, like Nat Turner, hacked the men, young and old, to death. Such incidents were followed by the infamous raid upon Harper's Ferry, Virginia, financed secretly by wealthy Northerners. (The first person Brown killed was a free man of color.) The fact that Northerners supported Brown and encouraged his bloody work with public celebrations and editorials sealed the issue for Southerners. They now understood that they were hated not because of slavery but because they were Southerners.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Page: 51

In the history of American slavery there is “good” to be reported: Americans freely ended the African slave trade and used their navy to police that nefarious commerce; Americans prohibited slavery in the Northwest territory; Americans, North and South, slaveholders and non-slaveholders, organized societies to begin the effort to end slavery; American States passed laws against reducing a free man (regardless of color) to a slave (man-stealing); and, Americans, especially in the South, freed many of their slaves at their own expense. In addition to these “good” facts about America and slavery, Southern states passed laws to protect slaves from abuse and to protect their right to care after they became old or infirm. In Mississippi for example in 1821 a white man was sentenced to be hanged for the murder of a slave.29 Even a Northern clergyman in 1863 noted that Southern law holds a master accountable for the death of a slave.30 All of these “good” acts were done with the full support of the South. Of course these laws did not prevent all abuses of slaves any more than laws against murder prevent all murders. But it does indicate that the general population desired good treatment for the enslaved population. These laws and public scorn of those breaking the moral codes in regard to slavery did go a long way to protect the slave population. The “bad” was also to be found. Slavery, although often referred to as a “necessary” evil, was an evil just the same. The New Englanders who used slave labor in the early history of their existence and profited from the nefarious African slave trade felt justified in their actions. Southerners who profited from the labor of slaves felt justified, as did the New England merchants, bankers, and industrialists who felt no pangs of remorse in profiting from the merchandising of slave-grown cotton, tobacco, and sugar. So jealous were Northern merchants of their Southern markets that they continually insisted that Congress pass a plethora of protective tariffs. Speaking about slavery, Thomas Jefferson, a slaveholder all his life, mused, “We have the wolf by the ears, and we can neither hold him, nor safely let him go. Justice is in one scale, and self-preservation in the other.”31 And now to the “ugly.” Once the North found that by using of the power of the Federal government it could enrich itself at the expense of the South, issues were found to support their efforts to control the Federal government. In the modern era the P.C. narrative proclaims that a virtuous North had to contend with an evil South over the issue of ending of slavery. This false narrative is taken for granted as fact and woe be unto he who rejects this view. This false narrative centers almost exclusively on the issue of slavery as the point of contention between the North and the South. Yet, as Simkins so correctly noted, if slavery had not existed “some other sin could have been shrewdly conjured up” to overcome Southern political resistance…

Note:

Yellow highlight | Page: 62

The statement, “they have properly no future” tells us the depth of Emerson’s hatred of Southerners. Hitler and Stalin believed the same thing about those they hated and turned up the heat in ovens or expanded the Gulag to prove it! Only two years before the secession of the Southern States, Emerson declared that Southerners were “felons who have disentitled themselves to the protection of the law.” Hitler and Stalin also believed that those whom they hated were beyond the “protection of the law.” Emerson predicted that even if Southerners catch and kill John Brown it would not matter because: the air [of New England] breeds them [John Browns], every school, every church…every home of courtesy, genius and conscience is educating haters of him [Southerners] and his misdeeds.17 After the terrorist John Brown’s murderous escapades were brought to an end by a length of Virginia rope, Emerson eulogized Brown as “the rarest of heroes, a pure idealist.”18 A very similar eulogy was given throughout the Muslim world for Bin Laden. Both men, John Brown and Osama Bin Laden, were acting on what they believed were the high principles of a “pure idealist.” Both men believed in a higher law while rejecting the general rule that civil society follows, which is “live and let live.” In the name of doing good (as they defined “good”), both men were willing to do great evil—as we say down South, they were just “two peas in a pod!”

Note:

Yellow highlight | Page: 63

There is a class of people [Southerners] men, women, and children, who must be killed or banished before you can hope for peace and order."23 Were the authorities in Washington shocked and disgusted by Sherman's suggestion of murdering (exterminating) Southerners including children? NOT AT ALL! Abraham Lincoln's Secretary of War replied to Sherman in the following manner, "Your letter of the 21st of June has just reached me and meets my approval."24 These unlawful and shocking acts, euphemistically referred to as a "vigorous war policy" by Lincoln, were not just pursued by high ranking officers of the United States Army but permeated the army down to the lowest rank. In Jackson, Louisiana, Celine Fremaux, a fourteen-year-old girl, recounts how these acts of brutality were played out upon Southern civilians. In her diary Fremaux records the story of a neighbor lady who had already lost her husband and six of her seven sons in defense of the South. The neighbor, a Mrs. Fluker, had one sixteen-year-old son living at home who wanted to enlist in the Confederate army. Mrs. Fluker, as so many women of the South of that time did, began making her son a uniform. Needing a few more buttons, she sent her son to town to acquire the needed items. While in town her son noticed that Yankee raiders were approaching town. As he began to leave town, dressed as a civilian and not a member of the military, the Yankee troops gave chase. In the process of escaping the Yankees the young boy's horse fell into a ravine, killing the horse and severely injuring the boy. The Yankees pulled the boy from the ravine and, according to her diary:

Note:

Yellow highlight | Page: 73

The use of race-hatred became a very successful Republican tool to divide the South into warring parties. These warring parties, both black and white, failed to realize that in the process of enriching Republican industrialists, bankers and politicians, they were at the same time impoverishing themselves. This was the message that Senator Revels delivered to the Republican Party when he resigned from that cabal of thieves and bigots. French journalist and literary critic Jean-Baptiste Alphonse Karr is noted for his epigram, "The more things change, the more they stay the same." Karr would surely agree that in the 20th and 21st centuries American politics reflects his little truism. The only change is in the name of the political party that is the most dedicated to keeping the races in a high pitch of animosity. This has been a win-win for the Federal Empire. As long as Southerners continue fighting each other, they will never recognize who is really benefitting from continued racial hatred. Being thus distracted, the defeated, conquered, and occupied people of the Confederate States of America are much less likely to follow the lead of other occupied nations and demand the right to govern themselves as happened in Hungary in 1956.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Page: 81

During World War II the “civilized” world deplored acts of the German SS when they punished local civilians in reprisal for local military acts against German targets. Yet, the United States of America (better described as the Federal Empire) engaged in acts against Southern civilians that were no less hideous. Indeed, Germans during World War II were following Union General Sheridan’s recommendations to German Chancellor Otto von Bismarck. Prior to World War I, while visiting Bismarck, General Sheridan declared that it was his policy to “leave civilians with nothing but their eyes to weep with.” A war of extermination can be conducted only if

Note:

Yellow highlight | Page: 86

The Federal Empire did not care—to be precise the United States of America did not care! Lincoln did not care! The Republican-controlled Congress, and the officers of the United States Army and Navy did not care! Their mission was to create and expand the Federal Empire by invading and conquering a sovereign nation—the Confederate States of America—and ultimately making the Southern states subservient provinces of the Federal Empire. The lasting effect was to make once free and prosperous citizens of the South into impoverished subjects of the Federal Empire. Woe to the vanquished!

Note:

Yellow highlight | Page: 100

One scholar estimated that in 1865 over $2,000,000,000 worth of investment capital vanished overnight as a result of Northern imposed radical emancipation in the South.7 The South’s capital loss in 1865 from slave property alone would be approximately $28,000,000,000 in 2015 dollars! In Louisiana, as an example, over $170,000,000 of invested capital was lost.8 That would be in excess of $4,063,000,000 in 2015 dollars! Contrast Yankee uncompensated emancipation in the South to the way in which the British emancipated their slaves. In 1833 the British Parliament, which had new members, many of whom were owners of slaves and textile mills, passed an act freeing over time all slaves and providing over £20,000,000 to compensate slaveholders.9 This amount has been estimated to be worth £16,500,000,000 today. 10 The British compensated these slave- holders for the loss of their capital investment in slaves even though many, if not most, were absentee landlords and Britain did not need the capital to invest because it already had a well establish industrial economy—unlike the defeated, devastated and occupied South. For example, John Gladstone, who resided in England and was the father of 19th century prime minister William Gladstone, received £106,769 (modern equivalent £83m) for the 2,508 slaves he owned across nine plantations.289 But even more applicable to the South is the way Lincoln and the United States Congress emancipated slaves in Washington, D.C., during the war. President Lincoln signed Congressional legislation emancipating slaves in Washington on April 16, 1862. The title of the legislation was “District of Columbia Compensated

Emancipation Act." The Act set aside $1 million to compensate slave owners in Washington, D.C. It provided for compensation of $300.00 per slave to D.C. slave holders. The investment cost (price) of a slave was $300.00 in 1804 and had increased to $800.00 by 1860.11 This D.C. emancipation was done nine months before Lincoln issued his Emancipation Proclamation which declared free those slaves who resided in the territory controlled by the Confederacy but did NOT apply to those slaves who resided in territory or states controlled by the United States. The D.C. Emancipation Act also set aside $100,000.00 to provide each newly freed slave a cash grant of $100.00. But this was not an act of generosity on the part of Lincoln and the United States Congress. The only way a freed slave could obtain the $100.00 was to agree to immediately leave North America!12 As has been pointed out many times, but never by the Federal Empire's propagandists (scholars, mainline media & Hollywood), Lincoln's and the North's (i.e., the Republican Party's) goal was to rid North America of the black race. For example, while debating the emancipation policy in 1862, a Republican-controlled House Committee issued a report that declared in part: "the highest interests of the white race, whether Anglo-Saxon, Celtic, or Scandinavian, requires that…

Note:

Yellow highlight | Page: 105

In 1860 railroads were beginning to expand across the South. These railroads were owned by Southern investors and were built to promote Southern commerce. As such they represented a major competitor for Northern owned railroads, especially in the efforts to establish the eastern terminus for the proposed transcontinental line. The so-called "Civil War" was a financial and strategic windfall for Northern railroads—not to mention the tariff-protected Northern iron industry. Lincoln's war required a major increase in Northern railroad carrying tonnage consisting of war materials for Northern imperial armies invading the Confederacy—which opportunistic Yankee factory owners realized would result in large and immediate profits! The glittering prospects of such enormous profits solidified Northern crony capitalists' support for Lincoln's imperial war. In addition, it provided these crony capitalists with a "legal" means to destroy their potential Southern railroad competitors. During Lincoln's war over 10,000 miles of Southern railroads were destroyed.9 These destroyed and bankrupt Southern railroads were confiscated by the Federal government and turned over to "loyal" boards or bought at "fire sale" prices by Northern "investors."

Note:

Yellow highlight | Page: 106

Post-war Northern-owned "Southern" railroads were built to haul raw materials away from the South10 and to transport finished Northern goods into the South.11 Thanks to Yankee invasion, conquest and occupation, the once prosperous South had become

the Federal Empire's first colonial possession. 12 One of the many Yankee-engendered reasons for post-war Southern poverty was the lack of Southern capital—financial where-with-all—necessary to re-start destroyed farming and emerging industrial/commercial enterprises.13 For example; If you were a farmer in 1865, before you could plant a crop you must first purchase seed and fertilizer; you must acquire plows and draft animals, and then you must have enough cash or credit to purchase food for draft animals and yourself/family until the "crop comes in." And of course this scenario presumes that the farmer owns land to cultivate. Capital was virtually non-existent in post-war Dixie. Furthermore, there were very few banks that would loan money on such risky ventures, and those that did make loans to start-up farmers charged extremely high interest rates—some as high as 125%. 14

Note:

Yellow highlight | Page: 108

The Wall Street-created panic of 1907 was used by Northern financiers and industrialists to gain control of emerging Southern iron and steel industries in Tennessee and Alabama. On November 2, 1907, "Robber Baron" J. P. Morgan acquired the Tennessee Coal, Iron, and Railroad Company. He later headed the Moore and Schley Steel Company of Birmingham, Alabama. The otherwise "Trust Busting" Theodore Roosevelt agreed to the purchase and instructed his Attorney General not to interfere with the purchase/merger.16 This purchase of struggling Southern iron and steel industries prevented the development of competition for Northern companies and put Southern industries under eastern control.17 Southern industries had been "struggling" due to a chronic lack of investment capital—by 1907 the struggle was over and so was the opportunity to develop iron and steel industries on a par with those mills in the North.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Page: 110

The lack of investment capital in the South was noted by former Union Army officer and outspoken socialist Carl Schurz in his report to the President on December 19, 1865. He wrote that the lack of finances made it difficult to pay day laborers (field hands) and in many cases the newly freed slaves were working and being paid in food.18 As a direct result of the Federal Empire's destruction, exploitation, and confiscation of Southern investment capital there were few paying jobs available for black and white Southerners post-war. A person moving dirt with a shovel works harder than the person operating a dirt-moving machine and is paid less—investment capital in the free market allows for the development/acquisition of technology for more productive output per unit of investment, lower cost for consumers and higher paying jobs for workers. Unfortunately, this was not the case in post-war Dixie. Due to Yankee

invasion and occupation, capital was removed from the South and now resides on Wall Street and other points in the North.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Page: 148

From the end of Reconstruction to 1965 the South was beset with a continuing stream of bad politicians. The progressive era gave us men such as Huey Long, James K. Vardaman, and eventually Lyndon Banes Johnson. What caused this change from Southern statesmen to unprincipled politicians who used black and white Southerners for their own benefit? Yankee-imposed cultural distortion is the only legitimate explanation for the radical change in the way Southern political leaders approached black voting and civil rights post-Reconstruction.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Page: 151

State legislatures became scenes of vulgar comedy and engines of fraud and corruption. The white people of Northern states would never have allowed such a lawmaking body to rule their states but these same Northerners were more than willing—actually eager—to impose such rule upon the conquered people of Dixie. Ohio's Cincinnati Commercial was forced to declare: "My God! The whites have borne and borne until forbearance ceased to be a virtue and almost became a crime."40 White Southerners' fear of black rule was produced by Republicans in Congress. It was the genesis of the current black/white political divide in Dixie. This is a culturally unnatural divide that greatly benefited first the white Republican Party (during Reconstruction), then the white Democratic party (during the era of white supremacy). Today both national political parties rely on black or white Southern votes to maintain the ruling elite's control of the Federal Empire as the elite in Washington dispense perks, privileges and power to their crony capitalist allies.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Page: 170

Unfortunately, too many Southerners have become docile and pacified worshipers of the Federal Empire! They have never questioned their assigned position as the United States of America's poorest people; they have never questioned why Southern children have a lifetime earning expectation 33% below the average for children born in New England; they have meekly accepted their assigned position on the "stools of everlasting repentance." Too many Southerners have accepted the North's narrative about the War for Southern Independence and the implied suggestion that after the South surrendered everything went back to "normal" except that slavery (a purely Southern problem according to the Northern narrative) was abolished. Most Southerners seem to think that after Lee surrendered the North and South had a "Kum

Ba Yah" moment—one large group hug and everything was forgiven and forgotten.3 The "Kum Ba Yah" moment never happened! Not only did the "group hug" never occur, but things never went back to normal. Remember, "normal" would have meant a very prosperous and free South where cordial race relationships existed. Rather than normal, the South became a colonial appendage of the Federal Empire and the once free and prosperous people of Dixie became an impoverished embarrassment in an otherwise prosperous United States. While the Federal Empire's ruling elite and their crony capitalist allies were eager to exploit cheap Southern labor and the South's abundant natural resources—neither crony capitalists nor national politicians were concerned about the impoverished people of Dixie. We the people of the formerly free and prosperous Confederate States of America were intentionally impoverished by the Federal Empire. This impoverishment continues even today! (See table for Median Household Income.)

Note:

Yellow highlight | Page: 173

The graph8 showing the 2014 median household income for the U.S.A., Washington, D.C., and the Southern states demonstrates the plight of the modern- day South. Even "rich" Southern states such as Texas, Georgia, and Florida are still below the national median for household income. A similar graph using 2002 data for per capita income was published in Reclaiming Liberty in 2005, and it shows almost identical results for Southern states vs. Washington and national averages.9 In other words, "the punishment continues!" Take a good look at the graph of Median Household Income. No Southern state other than the two repopulated states adjacent to the Empire's capital (Maryland and Virginia) are above the national median household income. Another (2016) study reveals that the five states where children are living in the lowest income homes were from Southern states (80%); children living in the five highest income homes were all from Northern States.10 Yes, the Federal Empire is still punishing Southerners! The increased income in Maryland and Virginia

Note: