

DISCOMFORTING THE YANKEE MYTHOLOGY ON THE EMANCIPATION OF SLAVES

“In 1863, the Union abolished the institution of slavery.” This is the general claim put forth by the cosmopolitan sprawl.

How does this claim hold up to the test of dialectical-materialism? We should investigate it further.

In the course of the American Civil War (which is a whole other topic ripe for study), the Unionist President, Abraham Lincoln, delivered the following executive order:

That on the first day of January in the year of our Lord, one thousand eight hundred and sixty-three, all persons held as slaves within any State, or designated part of a State, the people whereof shall then be in rebellion against the United States shall be then, thenceforward, and forever free; and the executive government of the United States, including the military and naval authority thereof, will recognize and maintain the freedom of such persons.

What is worth noting: the proclamation of the end of slavery had *nothing* to do with the interests of the African-Americans themselves, who had been waging a struggle against the crumbling institution for the last half century *against* the American state. It did not come from the offices a free African-American republic, but from the offices of the American integral federation, the USA, who intended to use the blacks in the ongoing war.

This is no baseless assertion. President Lincoln himself openly declared his views on abolition a year prior, in 1862:

If there be those who would not save the Union unless they could at the same time destroy slavery, I do not agree with them. **My paramount object in this struggle is to save the Union, and is not either to save or to destroy slavery. If I could save the Union without freeing any slave I would do it,** and if I could save it by freeing all the slaves I would do it; and if I could save it by freeing some and leaving others alone I would also do that. What I do about slavery, and the colored race, I do because I believe it helps to save the Union; and what I forbear, I forbear because I do not believe it would help to save the Union.¹

¹ *The Collected Works of Abraham Lincoln. V: 1861–1862. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press. pp. 388–389*

Is it not to be argued, then, that the American President only abolished slavery for the interests of northern whites, and not of blacks? Is it then not fair to assume that the emancipation was bound to result in a less than favorable result for the blacks it supposedly freed?

Lincoln states clearly and directly that his intention going forwards has *nothing* to do with the excision of slavery from the US economy. Rather, his intention was to preserve the economy altogether, regardless of its form.

Essentially, he swore to protect the American state which *depended on southern agriculture*; the large American textile mills, which were the backbone of the economy, would be nothing without the ‘land of cotton’ under their control.

Thus, the abolition which followed a year prior flowed from the pen of a man who openly declared his allegiance was not in the interests of southern black slaves, but the interests of the northern white industrialists. There was not a bone of moral indignation in the bodies of those who crafted the Union policy towards secession, only light pockets.

Is it at all surprising, then, that the “emancipation” granted to blacks was only a nominal and temporary emancipation, so that they could be used in the war against the Confederacy? Is it not to be argued that slavery was not abolished, but rather, it was industrialized in the aftermath of the war?

Let’s observe the constitutional amendment which regulates slavery:

Neither slavery nor involuntary servitude, except as a punishment for crime whereof the party shall have been duly convicted, shall exist within the United States, or any place subject to their jurisdiction.

It clearly stands: slavery is not abolished, but rather, it is relegated to the prisons. And what do the prisons look like?

Nationality	Imprisonment per 100,000 residents
Euro-American (white)	677
African-American (black)	4,607

That’s 4,607 black residents per 100,000 (or about 4.6%) in prisons, where they are constitutionally subjected to slavery. Whether or not they are all actually undertaking forced labor is irrelevant: the state declares that they *may* be induced to undertake coercive labor, and thus, slavery exists in this way².

² And further, slavery really is used today as inmates are forced to operate factory presses, clean roads, mine, and even fight fires. Overall, American prisons generate something like \$500 million a year in revenue.

If we take the overall 41 million population of the African-Americans, and apply our 4,607 per 100,000, we see that about 1,886,000 blacks are in American prisons today.

How could one possibly argue that slavery – which at its peak saw the exploitation of 3.5 million blacks – was “abolished”, when still 1,886,000 slaves (about 51% of the original slave population) exist in prisons?

What’s more: the American police are infamously ‘unfavorable’ towards the innocence of blacks. This needs no proving – the George Floyd killing left this impression on people the world over. When you combine the negative disposition of police towards blacks with the fact that about 25% (10,250,000) of blacks are impoverished, then you may argue that 10.2 million blacks could at any time be implicated by a false charge issued by a policeman and have no means to fight conviction (other than a *state appointed* lawyer!); 4.6% of American blacks are still enslaved, and 25% (10 mil) are at great risk of being enslaved at any moment.

And lastly, of the 41 million blacks, about 4 million (9%) are unemployed. Some of these 4 million are perhaps unemployed by choice, but the majority are unemployed by conditions forced on them. How many of these are going to be pushed to thievery, prostitution, or other criminal forms of moneymaking? In this case, not only are they likely to be arrested, but they justifiably *should* be arrested. Yet, since the American prisons operate on slavery, this means that the 9% of blacks who are unemployed are also on the brink of enslavement, by virtue of the actions they’re likely to commit. The only other option, should they refuse to turn to crime and still not find a job, is to die impoverished.

This is “emancipation”? Is it not the case that the Yankees (who themselves said they do not intend to abolish slavery, but only to preserve the industrialized half of the Union’s hold on the agricultural half) have not abolished slavery, but have merely industrialized it? That they have simply taken agriculture and agricultural slavery, and displaced it to the factories and prisons?

Is it not clear that the “free” black today is only a slave in waiting, and the only reason he is not a slave already is due to the physical limitations of the American state? Are we to assume that as the American state grows, it will seek to imprison *less* people and not more?

Here is our most important postulation: would it not have been better had the northern Yankees simply let their southern brothers go, and let slavery develop to its natural conclusion: the overthrow of slavery by the blacks themselves? Even the founders of the American state proclaimed such a fate should slavery be allowed to develop to its natural conclusion, with President Thomas Jefferson writing after the Haitian revolution:

This is so true, that of the proprietors of slaves a very small proportion indeed are ever seen to labour. And can the liberties of a nation be thought secure when we have removed their only firm basis, a conviction in the minds of the people that these liberties

are of the gift of God? That they are not to be violated but with his wrath? Indeed I tremble for my country when I reflect that God is just: that his justice cannot sleep for ever: that **considering numbers, nature and natural means only, a revolution of the wheel of fortune, an exchange of situation, is among possible events:** that it may become probable by supernatural interference!

The Almighty has no attribute which can take side with us in such a contest.--But it is impossible to be temperate and to pursue this subject through the various considerations of policy, of morals, of history natural and civil. We must be contented to hope they will force their way into every one's mind. **I think a change already perceptible, since the origin of the present revolution [in Haiti].** The spirit of the master is abating, that of the slave rising from the dust, his condition mollifying, the way I hope preparing, under the auspices of heaven, for a total emancipation, and that this is disposed, in the order of events, to be with the consent of the masters, rather than by their extirpation.³

Fear of an African-American revolt for an independent black republic is the crux of the much-celebrated “emancipation” of the black slaves, and the reason so many city-dwelling liberals today praise Lincoln as the greatest white savior. This is the essence behind the Yankee “emancipation” of slaves.

Where would the soils of a revolt for freedom have been most fertile? A confederacy based on the life-or-death struggle between the slave and his master, or in a union based on the “equality and democracy of everyone”? The answers should reveal themselves clearly to the honest truth-seeker. And upon so, the illusory “reforms” peddled by the American state today will wither to reveal their annexationist nature to all.

J. VOLKER

³ Thomas Jefferson, *Notes on the State of Virginia*, *Queries 14 and 18*, 137--43, 162--63