

Historians of the Past Tower Over the PC Frauds of Today

by Gene Kizer, Jr.

Esteemed historian Eugene Genovese said in the 1990s that to say anything good about the South "is to invite charges of being a racist and an apologist for slavery and segregation." He said: "We are witnessing a cultural and political atrocity."

This 30-page essay is loaded with fire and fact, excoriating and laughing at the PC frauds in academia and the news media that Genovese warned about, and it is thoroughly documented, as always.

It includes the Introduction to my book, *Charles W. Ramsdell, Dean of Southern Historians*, which shows clearly why historians of the past are so much better than many - perhaps most - historians today.

This essay, together with additional material on the shallow, historically ignorant times we live in, will soon be published as a separate book, in print and ebook formats. You are getting some of it free in this PDF.

Ramsdell is author of "Lincoln and Fort Sumter," one of the most famous treatises ever written on how Abraham Lincoln manipulated events in Charleston Harbor in the spring of 1861 to get the War Between the States started.

Ramsdell and historians before the rise of political correctness, had truth as their guiding principle. Many historians today don't, especially in academia and the news media. They have liberal political advantage (political correctness) as their perspective and guiding principle.

We are not fighting three enemies in academia, the news media and the Democrat Party. We are fighting one enemy, because those three are all the same. They are all liberals out for political advantage and they are, more-often-than-not, hate-America liberals. The identity politics of the Democrat Party is racist to the core, and that evil

divisive philosophy is the essence of academia and the news media, as well as the Democrat Party.

After the War Between the States, our ancestors had this same kind of fight over the cause and conduct of the war, and they left us a massive and complete record. The battlefield today with social media and the violence and hate coming from many liberals is different, but we are well equipped with powerful weapons and the sterling example of our ancestors.

And the excellent example of President Donald J. Trump who has stood up to the American Fake News media (actually Fraud News is a better term) and caused them to be discredited to the point that they are not trusted by almost 80% of the country.

Trump throws a lot of punches and exposes a lot of deceit, bigotry and fraud, and we should too. We should throw hard punches and expose Fake History like Trump exposes Fake News.

Buy my book, *Charles W. Ramsdell, Dean of Southern Historians, Volume One: His Best Work*, and read all his outstanding essays including another famous one, "The Natural Limits of Slavery Expansion."

Buy my book, *Slavery Was Not the Cause of the War Between the States, The Irrefutable Argument.*, and you will never lose another debate on the cause of the war. Give it to somebody or donate it. There are quantity discounts for camps, chapters, units and individuals.

Volume II will be out in the next six months and it is entitled: *Slavery Was Not the Cause of the War Between the States, The Conclusive Case.*

To our friends, everything each of us does is important, whether it's file a law suit, propose legislation, lobby, reenact, write letters to the editor, write articles and books, make DVDs or movies, speak, set up websites, study Southern history, join or recruit new members to the SCV, UDC, OCR, Abbeville institute, Society of Independent Southern Historians, GET YOUR CAMP TO BUILD NEW MONUMENTS

EVERYWHERE YOU CAN, put up roadside battle flag memorials/monuments everywhere (especially places where monuments have come down like New Orleans), go to city council meetings, march, go to Confederate Memorial Day, run for public office, support people and groups that are out there promoting our history, organize events, give radio or TV interviews, defend the South and the truth of our history in every way possible. Everything is important. Nothing is inconsequential.

To our enemies, bring it on.

The heart of this essay starts a page-and-a-half into the Ramsdell Introduction. Hope you enjoy it!

Introduction

"In all that pertained to the history of the Southern Confederacy, his scholarship was decisive."¹

In Memoriam
Charles William Ramsdell
University of Texas

I am deeply honored to bring out the writings of one of the greatest Southern historians of the first half of the twentieth century, Charles W. Ramsdell (1877-1942). His well-deserved title, Dean of Southern Historians, was given to him by his peers to acknowledge his scholarship and stature as the primary authority of his time on the Confederate States of America and much of Southern history.

He was a Texan and quintessential Southerner and saw things through those eyes. Objectivity, evidence and rigorous argument were the sacred standard for historians back then. It wasn't always attained but it was a far better standard than the political correctness of today. Ramsdell was analytical and known for sound judgment, and he wrote with clear vivid prose that is easy to read and comprehend.

¹ *In Memoriam, Charles William Ramsdell*, Index of Memorial Resolutions and Biographical Sketches, The University of Texas at Austin, <https://wikis.utexas.edu/display/facultycouncil/Memorial+Resolutions>, accessed November 29, 2016.

Professor Ramsdell taught at the University of Texas at Austin most of his long career. He held "visitor lectureships in the state universities of Illinois, Colorado, West Virginia, Missouri, North Carolina and Louisiana; and in Columbia, Northwestern, Western Reserve and Duke Universities."² Ramsdell's papers are at UT's Dolph Briscoe Center for American History and include in a Biographical Note: "Recognized as the dean of Southern historians, Dr. Ramsdell held the distinction of being the most distinguished scholar and teacher in the field of Southern history."³ There is still today "The Fletcher M. Green and Charles W. Ramsdell Award" given by the Southern Historical Association for the "best article published in the *Journal of Southern History* during the two-preceding years."⁴

I have left the details of Ramsdell's life out of this Introduction because they are included in the first treatise in this book, "Charles W. Ramsdell: Historian of the Confederacy," by Wendell Holmes Stephenson, a distinguished historian himself and colleague of Ramsdell.

It is highly beneficial in this day and age to study the writings of renowned historians prior to 1960, especially Southern historians. They knew almost as much as

² Ramsdell, Charles W., short biography on Texas State Historical Association website by J. Horace Bass, <https://tshaonline.org/handbook/online/articles/fra25>, accessed October 25, 2016.

³ Biographical Note in *A Guide to the Charles Ramsdell Papers, 1844-1942*, Dolph Briscoe Center for American History. <http://www.lib.utexas.edu/taro/utcah/01314/cah-01314.html>, accessed October 20, 2016.

⁴ Southern Historical Association website, <http://thesha.org/awards/ramsdell>, accessed October 25, 2016.

historians today — certainly they knew all the major issues and arguments of American history — but they were not corrupted by political correctness. They were interested in a broad narrative of our great country and its part in Western Civilization. Since 1960, the racist identity politics of the left has degraded American history, especially in academia.

One of the problems with academia is that, in a metaphorical sense, it is inbred.

It is so liberal, the 33 wealthiest colleges in the United States gave Hillary Clinton \$1,560,000. They gave Donald Trump \$3,000.⁵

Over 90% of professors in the humanities and social sciences, which include history, are liberals, and it has been this way for decades.⁶ Those with differing opinions, if they

⁵ The 33 wealthiest colleges in the United States also gave Bernie Sanders \$648,382, so, adding Hillary Clinton's \$1,560,000 to Bernie's \$648,382 gives a whopping \$2,208,382 that academia gave to two extremely liberal Democrat candidates (99.9%) while giving \$3,000 to Donald J. Trump (.136%), who won the presidency. See "Donald Trump Campaign Lacking In Support From Academic Donors" by Carter Coudriet, August 16, 2016, <http://www.forbes.com/sites/cartercoudriet/2016/06/16/donald-trump-campaign-lacking-in-support-from-academic-donors>, accessed January 25, 2017.

⁶ See Horowitz, David and Jacob Laksin, *One-Party Classroom: How Radical Professors at America's Top Colleges Indoctrinate Students and Undermine Our Democracy* (New York: Crown Forum, 2009). From the Introduction: "A 2007 study by Neil Gross and Solon Simmons, two liberal academics, reported a ratio of liberal to conservative professors in social science and humanities of 9-1. In fields such as Anthropology and Sociology, these figures approach 30-1."

<http://www.discoverthenetworks.org/Articles/onepartydhjl.html>, accessed January 26, 2017.

even get hired, do not dare speak up. If they do, they will not get tenure and will often lose their jobs. There is no real debate on many topics, no fresh blood, no challenge to liberal dogma. The hypocrites in academia scream about diversity but have none themselves — and diversity of thought is the most important kind of diversity.⁷ When the views of half of the country are not represented, and, indeed, are deplored by most in academia (remember Hillary Clinton's "basket of deplorables"), then what comes out of academia and their accomplices in the news media — especially with regard to history — is the liberal party line, preached by liberals without fear of criticism or examination.

I know from my personal experience that many of the liberals in academia are fine people who, despite their liberal bias, try to be fair. But I know many others who are

⁷ **There is also rampant discrimination in hiring in academia.**

People are discriminated against because of their political views. How could it be any other way when academia is overwhelmingly liberal — in some fields, as stated by Horowitz and Laksin in the previous footnote, 30 to 1 — and it has been this way for the past 50 years. Liberals discriminate against non-liberals in hiring. Liberals hire only other liberals. It is obvious that academia is a hostile work environment for everybody but liberals, and increasingly hard left liberals, because of diversity departments that demean white people, speech codes that treat conservative views as hate, anti-Christian rhetoric, etcetera, ad nauseam. This also makes much of academia extremely hypocritical — again — because in addition to screaming about diversity, which is non-existent in academia, they also scream about discrimination, yet they discriminate openly against the views of over half the country. Conservatives and other non-liberals need not apply to academia, though much of academia is funded by taxpayer money, greater than half of which comes from conservatives and non-liberals.

rigidly doctrinaire and definitely not fair, and they have the power structure and majority to impose their will with impunity.

These doctrinaire liberals preach their views constantly by weaving them into their classes — comments, smirks, rolls of the eyes here and there — which intimidate young students and coerce them into writing things they don't believe in order to pass.

As every honest scholar knows, to understand the past, one must view the past the way the people who lived in the past viewed it. In the past, things were almost always brutal, disease-ridden and unfair. Pain and death were always present. As English philosopher Thomas Hobbes wrote in *Leviathan*,⁸ there was "continual fear, and danger of violent death: and the life of man, solitary, poor, nasty, brutish and short." In most of the past, people did the best they could to survive and get ahead in a harsh world. The world of the past was not today's middle class America but that is the standard ignorant liberals want you to judge it by.

David Harlan in his book, *The Degradation of American History*, says that, starting in the 1960s with the Civil Rights Movement, leftist historians began criticizing American history as elitist. They said it "focused our attention on great white men at the expense of women and minorities, that it ignored the racial and ethnic diversity of national life, that it obscured the reality of class conflict." They wanted to expose the complicity of white men "in the violence and brutality that now seemed to be the most important truth about American history." They "feel no

⁸ *Leviathan* was Thomas Hobbes most famous work. It was written in 1651.

need to say what is good in American history."⁹

It's worse for Southern history.

Eugene D. Genovese,¹⁰ one of America's greatest historians before his death in 2012, wrote this in 1994:

Rarely, these days, even on Southern campuses, is it possible to acknowledge the achievements of the white people of the South. The history of the Old South is now often taught at leading universities, when it is taught at all, as a prolonged guilt-trip, not to say a prologue to the history of Nazi Germany. . . . To speak positively about any part of this Southern tradition is to invite charges of being a racist and an apologist for

⁹ David Harlan, *The Degradation of American History* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1997), xv.

¹⁰ Genovese was a brilliant historian as the following paragraph illustrates. It is the opening paragraph of an essay in *The Journal of Southern History*, Volume LXXX, No. 2, May, 2014 entitled "Eugene Genovese's Old South: A Review Essay" by J. William Harris: "The death of Eugene D. Genovese in September 2012 brought to a close a remarkable career. In the decades following his first published essay on Southern history, Genovese produced an outstanding body of scholarship, based on a rare combination of deep research in primary sources; a mastery of the historical literature, not only in Southern history but also in many complementary fields; a sophisticated command of methodological issues; and often sparkling prose. And Genovese's reputation reached far beyond specialists in Southern history, and even beyond the academy. In 2005 a reviewer in one magazine for a general readership called Genovese the 'Country's greatest living historian' and his *Roll, Jordan, Roll* 'the most lasting work of American historical scholarship since the Second World War.'"

slavery and segregation. We are witnessing a cultural and political atrocity.¹¹

Dr. Genovese goes on to say that this cultural and political atrocity is being forced on us by "the media and an academic elite."¹²

In the 2016 presidential campaign, 96% of money donated by journalists went to liberal Democrat Hillary Clinton. Most of the news media are so biased,¹³ it makes them untrustworthy and even more dishonest than academia. In campaign coverage, the fraudulent media colluded with Clinton and gave her debate questions in advance, allowed her campaign to edit stories, asked her campaign for advice and quotations they could use to attack Donald Trump, and made no effort to hide their contempt for objectivity.

Too bad it backfired and greatly damaged the credibility of the media — perhaps beyond repair — just as political correctness has turned much of academia into a caricature to laugh at.

Over half the country now sees much of the "mainstream media" as liars where fake news is

¹¹ Eugene D. Genovese, *The Southern Tradition, The Achievement and Limitations of an American Conservatism* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1994), Preface, xi-xii.

¹² *Ibid.*

¹³ In numbers of journalists giving, 50 gave to Republican Donald J. Trump, while 430 gave to Clinton. That means 10% of journalists donated to Republican Trump, and 90% to Democrat Clinton. See David Levinthal and Michael Beckel article, October 27, 2016, "Journalists shower Hillary Clinton with campaign cash", <https://www.publicintegrity.org/2016/10/17/20330/journalists-shower-hillary-clinton-campaign-cash>, accessed January 25, 2017.

pervasive.¹⁴ Think "hands up, don't shoot," which tore the country apart but never happened. However, it did meet racist liberal objectives to paint a black criminal as a victim, and a white person, a white cop doing his job, as the bad guy.

Angelo M. Codevilla,¹⁵ in his excellent essay "The Rise of Political Correctness",¹⁶ gives us a perfect parallel between the loss of credibility of the American news media and the loss of credibility of the Communists in the old Soviet Union. He points out that the Communists were so distrusted that "whenever the authorities announced that the harvest had been good, the people hoarded potatoes; . .

¹⁴ Some 69% of voters today (2017) "do not believe the news media are honest and truthful." See Media Research Center NewsBusters Staff article, November 15, 2016, "MRC/YouGov Poll: Most Voters Saw, Rejected News Media Bias." <http://www.newsbusters.org/blogs/nb/nbstaff/2016/11/15/mrcyougov-poll-most-voters-saw-rejected-news-media-bias>, accessed January 26, 2017.

¹⁵ Angelo M. Codevilla: Claremont Review of Books contributor information states that "Angelo M. Codevilla is a senior fellow of the Claremont Institute and professor emeritus of International Relations at Boston University. He has been a U.S. Naval Officer, an Assistant Professor at the Grove City College and North Dakota State College, a U.S. Foreign Service Officer, and a member of President-Elect Reagan's Transition Team. He served as a U.S. Senate staff member dealing with oversight of the intelligence services, a professorial lecturer at Georgetown University and a Senior Research Fellow for the Hoover Institution at Stanford University." <http://www.claremont.org/crb/contributor-list/116>, accessed January 15, 2017.

¹⁶ Angelo M. Codevilla, "The Rise of Political Correctness," in the Claremont Review of Books, posted November 8, 2016, Volume XVI, Number 4. <http://www.claremont.org/crb/article/the-rise-of-political-correctness>, accessed January 15, 2017.

. ".

Same in America today, and that is what Donald J. Trump's victory signifies. Over half the country despises academia and the media and does not trust them. When the mainstream media, frothing at the mouth with liberal condescension and hate tried every sleazy trick in the book to defeat Trump, it reinforced to half the country that Trump was their man.

Academia has done the same dishonest thing with American history, especially Southern history.

The War Between the States is the defining event in American history. Out of a population of 33 million, 800,000 were killed and over a million wounded.¹⁷ If the soldiers of World War II were killed at the same rate as the War Between the States, we would have lost 3,870,000 instead of 405,399; and we would have had 6,385,500 wounded instead of 670,846.

But history is so pathetic in this day and age that the cause of this gargantuan event is not even studied. Historian Joe Gray Taylor noted that Pulitzer Prize winning historian David H. Donald "seems to have been correct when he said in 1960 that the causation of the Civil War was dead as a serious subject of historical analysis" and

¹⁷ Rachel Coker, "Historian revises estimate of Civil War dead," published September 21, 2011, Binghamton University Research News — Insights and Innovations from Binghamton University, <http://discover.binghamton.edu/news/civilwar-3826.html>, accessed July 7, 2014. These are the widely accepted death statistics of historian J. David Hacker of Binghamton University. He has determined a range of between 650,000 and 850,000 deaths. He splits the difference and uses 750,000. I believe it was on the higher end of his range so I use 800,000 in my books.

that "A 'Southern' point of view on the secession crisis no longer exists among professional historians."¹⁸

A Southern point of view certainly does exist.

For the South, 1861 was 1776 all over.

The North unquestionably did not invade the South to end slavery. This is provable beyond the shadow of a doubt, though that is exactly the view that the media and academia have forced on us since the 1960s. They either force it on us directly, or validate it by not challenging it (and if we disagree with them, we are racists and apologists for slavery and segregation as Dr. Genovese noted).¹⁹

The North invaded the South to preserve the Union as Abraham Lincoln said over and over and over — not end slavery. All Northern documents such as the War Aims Resolution, Corwin Amendment, Preliminary Emancipation Proclamation, et al., prove this conclusively. These documents came about before the war or through the first two years of the war when the North was glad to state its true intentions, which it made crystal clear.

What came later such as the Emancipation Proclamation, which freed no slaves or few, were war measures after hundreds of thousands of people had been killed. They had nothing to do with why the North went to

¹⁸ Joe Gray Taylor, "The White South from Secession to Redemption," in John B. Boles and Evelyn Thomas Nolen, *Interpreting Southern History, Historiographical Essays in Honor of Sanford W. Higginbotham* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1987), 162-164.

¹⁹ The compiler's book, *Slavery Was Not the Cause of the War Between the States, The Irrefutable Argument*. (Charleston, SC: Charleston Athenaeum Press, 2014), makes a powerful argument and is thoroughly documented with 218 footnotes and 207 sources in the bibliography.

war in the first place. They and Lincoln were adamant that the North went to war to preserve the Union, and the reason for that is that Northern wealth and power were dependent on the Union and on the South.

Cotton was king and the most demanded commodity on the planet and the South had 100% control of it. Without the ability to ship Southern cotton — which alone had been 60% of U.S. exports in 1860 — and manufacture for its huge rich captive Southern manufacturing market, the North was dead. It faced economic annihilation leading straight to anarchy. Manufacturing for the South was the majority of Northern manufacturing, while shipping cotton and other Southern commodities was the majority of Northern shipping. No country can lose the majority of its manufacturing and shipping overnight without a complete collapse into anarchy.

Abraham Lincoln knew that with European recognition and military treaties, the North would not be able to beat the South militarily. The way would then be clear for the South with total control of King Cotton, to ascend to dominance in North America and the world.

These were extremely weighty issues for Abraham Lincoln, president of the North, because the entire future of the North for all time was dependent on them. He was looking at a complete shift of national power from North to South, and it was happening with lightning speed.

Going to war, however, was not a difficult decision for Lincoln.

War would solve the enormous political problems he had at that time, and it would solve his impending economic disaster. He knew, at that point in history, that the North had four times the white population of the South,

most of the country's manufacturing including perhaps over 200 times more weapon manufacturing than the South, a standing army, a navy with fleets of warships, merchant shipping, a functioning government with access to unlimited immigration (around 25% of Northern soldiers ended up being immigrants), and more.

Lincoln figured he could win easily. After all, he was a 20 foot tall man loaded with modern weaponry starting a fight with a five foot tall man carrying a musket.

Of course Lincoln wanted to fight.

But what he got back was an epic amount more than he anticipated.

Henry L. Benning, one of Robert E. Lee's most able brigadier generals and for whom the sprawling U.S. Army base, Fort Benning, is named, stated before the war:

The North cut off from Southern cotton, rice, tobacco, and other Southern products would lose three fourths of her commerce, and a very large proportion of her manufactures. And thus those great fountains of finance would sink very low.... Would the North in such a condition as that declare war against the South?²⁰

Benning's prescient analysis and the Southern view

²⁰ Henry L. Benning, "Henry L. Benning's Secessionist Speech, Monday Evening, November 19," delivered in Milledgeville, Georgia, November 19, 1860, in William W. Freehling and Craig M. Simpson, *Secession Debated, Georgia's Showdown in 1860* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1992), 132. Benning was a justice on the Georgia Supreme Court before the war. Fort Benning is near Columbus, Georgia.

(not the cherry-picked quotations about slavery) is not studied because political correctness in academia and the news media prevent a serious study of Southern history — really American history — in this day and age, as David H. Donald stated, though it would certainly benefit students and the public to know the Southern view.

Think about the silliness surrounding Thomas Jefferson, founder of the University of Virginia and author of one of the greatest documents in the history of mankind, our Declaration of Independence. In 2016, a UVA professor — a professor! — drafted a letter and got 469 signatures of students and other professors protesting the use of quotations of Thomas Jefferson by UVA President Teresa Sullivan because Jefferson owned slaves. UVA faculty circulated the letter,²¹ thus impressing young students that they too should hate Thomas Jefferson and, by extension, America's founding.

Can you imagine anything as shallow as a university

²¹ "President of university founded by Jefferson asked to not quote Jefferson," November 14, 2016, FoxNews.com, <http://www.foxnews.com/us/2016/11/14/president-university-founded-by-jefferson-asked-to-not-quote-jefferson.html>, accessed November 20, 2016. UVA President Teresa Sullivan's response included: "Quoting Jefferson (or any historical figure) does not imply an endorsement of all the social structures and beliefs of his time." The following correction was posted on *The Cavalier Daily* website under an article entitled "Professors ask Sullivan to stop quoting Jefferson, Faculty, students believe Jefferson shouldn't be included in emails": "This article previously stated that student groups on Grounds collaborated to write this letter. While students and student groups signed the letter, it was drafted and circulated by University faculty." <http://www.cavalierdaily.com/article/2016/11/professors-ask-sullivan-to-stop-quoting-jefferson>, accessed January 19, 2017.

faculty circulating a petition protesting the use of quotations of Thomas Jefferson, as towering a figure as he is in American history, because he owned slaves during a time when slavery — as horrible as it was — was legal everywhere, widespread and even many blacks in the South owned slaves?

It is as if academia wants students to be stupid, uninformed and incapable of thinking for themselves, i.e., easily led.

Academia is more interested in producing good liberal voters by intimidation and indoctrination. Many in academia don't even want conservative speakers to show up on campus and if they do, they must come with "trigger warnings" that taint their message before they utter a word. However, if any of their fragile students accidentally hear a conservative idea, there are safe spaces to run to with milk and cookies, and Play-Doh (I liked plain old modeling clay when I was in kindergarten).

Dr. Clyde Wilson, Emeritus Distinguished Professor of History of the University of South Carolina, points out that the "vast literature in recent years that has fought heatedly over Jefferson's racial views and sex life has been carried on in an atmosphere of complete unreality."²² Thomas Jefferson, author of the Declaration of Independence, which for the first time in human history asserted the rights of people over the rights of kings and governments (which troubles many liberals greatly), advanced the good of mankind in a gargantuan way.

²² Clyde N. Wilson, "American Historians and Their History" in *Defending Dixie, Essays in Southern History and Culture* (Columbia, SC: The Foundation for American Education, 2006), 8.

Jefferson was profoundly influenced by John Locke,²³ the Age of Enlightenment's most influential philosopher. Locke's *Two Treatises on Government* discuss his revolutionary concepts of the natural rights of man, and the social contract.

The social contract is an understanding, a contract between the people and their government, meaning that the government is to protect the people and their property, and if it doesn't, it can be replaced by the people.

This is the fundamental assertion of the Declaration of Independence of 1776, and the South's secession from the Union in 1860-61. The most widely quoted phrase in the secession debate in the South in the year before Southern states began seceding comes from the

Declaration of Independence and Locke's social contract:

Governments are instituted among Men,
deriving their just powers from the consent
of the governed, That whenever any Form of
Government becomes destructive of these
ends, it is the Right of the People to alter or
to abolish it, and to institute new
Government, laying its foundation on such
principles and organizing its powers in such
form, as to them shall seem most likely to

²³ John Locke is known as the father of classical liberalism, which underpins Western political thought. Classical liberalism, with its emphasis on civil liberties, rule of law and free market capitalism, is not to be confused with the fascist political liberalism of the American Democrat Party today (2017 and 50 years before), which is anti-free speech, "politically correct," and often violent.

effect their Safety and Happiness.

How pathetic and unenlightened for the faculty of any university,²⁴ but especially the one founded by Thomas Jefferson, to want to forbid his quotations because he owned slaves. Intelligent people can be appalled at slavery but understand that in our evolution as a nation, slavery existed for a while,²⁵ as with most nations on earth, though slavery has been gone for a century-and-a-half.

Dr. Wilson states that this nonsense about Jefferson

proceeds on the assumption that Jefferson

²⁴ It surprised me greatly that liberals got upset that the Russians might have influenced our election, since so many liberals, especially in academia, are Marxists who adored the old Soviet Union and Communism before President Ronald Reagan defeated them both. Seems like liberals would have appreciated the Russian influence. The Russians and Wikileaks, in the 2016 presidential campaign, did the job of our bigoted, incompetent news media, and exposed extreme media collusion with the Clinton campaign and Democrat Party such as a CNN reporter and head of the DNC, Donna Brazile, who gave debate questions to Clinton in advance (and Clinton gladly accepted them), another "journalist" who let the Clinton campaign edit stories, another who asked the Clinton campaign for things he could use to bash Donald Trump, and another who stated clearly that they should not be objective but should be the opposition party to Trump. And three-fourths of them were, and are, as of this writing (2017).

²⁵ New Englanders and the British before them brought most of the slaves here and made huge profits in the process. Slave-picked cotton made the North rich and powerful. Slavery was not expanding in 1860 but contracting, and the slave trade had been outlawed for 52 years in 1860. The industrial revolution with great new labor-saving farm machinery would have killed slavery with nobody dying, and no excessive hate.

was essentially a twentieth century middle class American rather than an eighteenth-century Virginia planter. This is not simply the common mistake of reading the present into the past. It is a pervasive intellectual confusion that runs unchecked and unrecognized through both our popular and academic history.²⁶

Dr. Wilson observes that "The main theme of American history is being shifted from national unity and national achievement". The "transformation of American history from an account of the building of a new nationality to the celebration of an ethnic collage is not a result of the discovery of new knowledge."²⁷ It is "the actual destruction or suppression of old views, and their replacement by others newly manufactured for social purposes rather than as a consequence of knowledge."²⁸

Sounds like what Orwell warned us about in *1984* when Winston Smith lamented

Do you realize that the past, starting from yesterday, has been actually abolished? If it survives anywhere, it's in a few solid objects with no words attached to them, like that lump of glass there. Already we know almost literally nothing about the Revolution and the years before the Revolution. Every

²⁶ Wilson, "American Historians and Their History" in *Defending Dixie, Essays in Southern History and Culture*, 8

²⁷ *Ibid.*, 10.

²⁸ *Ibid.*, 5.

record has been destroyed or falsified, every book has been rewritten, every picture has been repainted, every statue and street and building has been repainted, every statue and street and building has been renamed, every date has been altered. And that process is continuing day by day and minute by minute. History has stopped. Nothing exists except an endless present in which the Party is always right. I *know*, of course, that the past is falsified, but it would never be possible for me to prove it, even when I did the falsifications myself. After the thing is done, no evidence ever remains.²⁹

Falsification of the record is the essence of political correctness and it is "atrocious treason" as Dr. Johnson (Samuel Johnson) writes in Rambler No. 136.

To deliver examples to posterity, and to regulate the opinion of future times, is no slight or trivial undertaking; nor is it easy to commit more atrocious treason against the great republic of humanity, than by falsifying its records and misguiding its decrees.

Dr. Wilson goes on:

Even when it is not badly distorted,

²⁹ George Orwell, *1984* (New York: New American Library, 1950), 128.

academic history has become, not the remembered story of human life but only a commentary on dogma. . . . It converts great segments of humanity into oppressors who deserve only annihilation. The result is today's academic history — a weird combination of supposedly objective 'social science' and romantic exaltation of favored minorities designated as the oppressed. This history fails both as accurate record and as material for social comity. As Christopher Lasch pointed out years ago, scholars have abandoned the search for reality in favor of the classification of trivia. But it is worse than that. It is in the nature of dogma that dissenters are quickly suppressed. Conformity of opinion about what is significant and true about the past has never been as rigorous among academic historians, and all who listen to them, as it is today.³⁰

Academia is able to get away with this because there is

³⁰ Wilson, "Scratching the Fleas: American Historians and Their History" in *Defending Dixie, Essays in Southern History and Culture*, 47. Those "favored minorities" are found in the Democrat Party, which is itself defined by identity politics: race, class, gender, sexual orientation, etc. The Democrat Party does not represent Americans in the aggregate. It represents groups of Americans, thus history is being rewritten by liberal academia and promoted by liberals in the media to favor liberal Democrat groups and spew hate on everybody else, especially those who disagree with them.

no diversity of thought or debate to challenge it. The left does not want debate as we saw February 1, 2017 at UC-Berkeley when conservative speaker Milo Yiannopoulos had to be rushed off campus when a riot erupted in which fires were set, windows smashed, a girl pepper-sprayed in the face on national TV, etc. There was only one arrest, which tells violent leftists that liberal administrators are on their side: Put on black masks and come destroy campuses, set fires, use sledge hammers, pepper spray and other weapons when conservatives speak as the thugs at UC-Berkeley did recently. Be as violent as you want because you are our brown shirt heroes and will not be prosecuted.

Liberal discrimination by academia in hiring only liberals, has given them an absolute protected liberal environment (paid for with taxpayer money from over half of the country that despises them) with which to impose their bigoted intolerant views.

Many in academia are cowards because they know if they run afoul of political correctness they can have their careers destroyed. Again, they know that to say anything good about the Old South in this atmosphere of hate and censorship invites the charge of being a racist and apologist for slavery and segregation as Dr. Genovese stated. They would rather tell lies and keep their paychecks coming.

Academia has been overwhelmingly liberal for a long time, with little diversity of thought and much pressure to conform, and so has the news media. Neither are going to change, but the difference today is that over 70% of the country do not take either of them seriously and indeed despise their bigotry.

About history, Dr. Wilson states that "The young person must be able to make his nation's history his own,

make it a history of his own 'fathers,' just as was done, until a generation or so ago."³¹ Today, however, young people are taught by academia to hate their country because they are descended from vile oppressors or the oppressed.

Most of the work of academic historians today can portray the American story in no other terms except as an abstract fantasy of oppressors and oppressed. No society has ever had more professional historians and devoted more resources to historical work of all kinds than modern America — or produced so many useless, irrelevant, and downright pernicious products.³²

Angelo M. Codevilla agrees that there is a revolution going on and it's "all about the oppressed classes uniting to inflict upon the oppressors the retribution that each of the oppressed yearns for" because, as liberals see it, "America was born tainted by Western Civilization's original sins — racism, sexism, greed, genocide against natives and the environment, all wrapped in religious obscurantism, and on the basis of hypocritical promises of freedom and equality."³³

I saw a man-on-the-street interview recently with a white male college student. He said he did not vote because

³¹ Wilson, "American Historians and Their History" in *Defending Dixie, Essays in Southern History and Culture*, 7.

³² Wilson, "Scratching the Fleas: American Historians and Their History" in *Defending Dixie, Essays in Southern History and Culture*, 45.

³³ Angelo M. Codevilla, quotations from "The Rise of Political Correctness".

America was a racist nation founded on stealing land and slavery, and he hated our country.³⁴

On February 13, 2017 I tuned into Fox News and Jesse Watters was interviewing a college woman who had been chanting "Two, four, six, eight, America was never great." He asked her why she was chanting that and she said because it rhymed. He pressed and said "You really don't think America is great?" to which she said no. He said, what about us defeating the Nazis? She shrugged her shoulders.

This is the essence of the political correctness and hate-America liberal indoctrination she is getting in the classroom, on campus, and in much of the news media. This indoctrination is also illustrated well by the attacks on Thomas Jefferson by the pathetic UVA faculty.

American history should be an inspiring and inclusive story of our country. The darker parts should not be whitewashed but neither should they define the whole.

The historians of the past are extremely important today. When a historian such as Ramsdell writes about the Fort Sumter incident and beginning of the war, our cultural standards today are irrelevant to that argument.

Ramsdel's treatises in this book can be considered primary sources themselves of a sort. They demonstrate the state of historiography up to the early 1940s when Ramsdell died.

I agree with every word in his two most famous treatises: "Lincoln and Fort Sumter" and "The Natural

³⁴ This interview occurred in January or February 2017 on Fox News one afternoon. I tuned in as it was going on so do not know the context.

Limits of Slavery Expansion". Both are as powerful and apropos today as the day they were written.

Ramsdell proves, in "Lincoln and Fort Sumter," that Abraham Lincoln engineered the beginning of the war in Charleston Harbor when he sent a hostile naval expedition loaded with artillery troops and ammunition into the most tense situation in American history. It was his intent to start the war as many Northern newspapers admitted. The *Providence (R.I.) Daily Post* wrote, in an editorial entitled "WHY?", April 13, 1861, the day after the commencement of the bombardment of Fort Sumter:

We are to have Civil War, if at all, because Abraham Lincoln loves a party better than he loves his country. . . . Mr. Lincoln saw an opportunity to inaugurate civil war without appearing in the character of an aggressor.

From his standpoint, Lincoln had to get the war started as fast as he possibly could. There was no reason whatsoever for him to wait. With every second that went by, the South got stronger and the North got weaker. His economy was heading fast into complete annihilation and the moment Confederates established trade and military alliances with Great Britain and Europe, the North would not be able to beat the South. The South, with 100% control of the most demanded commodity on the planet — cotton — would then ascend to dominance in North America and the world.

Ramsdell ends "Lincoln and Fort Sumter" with absolute proof that Lincoln started the War Between the States: the diary entry of Lincoln's good friend, Orville H.

Browning, in which Browning recorded Lincoln's exact words, as told to him the night of July 3, 1861 by the usually closed-mouth Lincoln. Abraham Lincoln bragged about deliberately starting a war that ended up killing 800,000 Americans and wounding over a million, to save himself and the Republican Party politically.

Ramsdell's "The Natural Limits of Slavery Expansion" proves that slavery was not extending into the West. One prominent historian called the slavery in the West issue a bogus issue about an "imaginary Negro" in an impossible place. Two of the Western territories had been open for slavery for 10 years and there were only 24 slaves in one, and 29 in the other. Slavery only worked on rich cotton soil near rivers or railways on which cotton could be transported.

Within 20 years of the end of the war, slavery would have ended in the United States by the industrial revolution and technological advancements in farm machinery that would pick the cotton much faster than slaves and at a fraction of the cost. Ramsdell, and an increasing number of historians today, maintain that the War Between the States was a totally unnecessary war, and I agree.

Ramsdell's treatises "General Robert E. Lee's Horse Supply, 1862-1865," "The Confederate Government and the Railroads" and "The Control of Manufacturing by the Confederate Government" are the most enlightening I have ever read as to why the South won the early part of the war, but wore down due to massive Northern industrial and other resources.

Lee's horses, after 1862, were often half-starved, sick, impossible to replace thus his cavalry was severely restricted on the battlefield, but also his artillery because it

took horses to pull the cannons and other ordnance. Ramsdell writes this toward the end of "General Robert E. Lee's Horse Supply, 1862-1865":

With his flank turned and his remaining communications about to be cut, Lee began at once the withdrawal which he had long foreseen must be made. It would have been a difficult operation with his animals in good condition; but now at the end of a severe winter when they were weak and slow from exposure and starvation it was a desperate undertaking. Only the stronger teams were able to take out wagon trains and guns, and on the forced marches without food they soon broke down. The cavalry could not keep pace with the better horses of Sheridan. At the end of a week what was left of a proud army was surrounded and the long struggle was over.

The problems with critical rail transportation were just as dire. Ramsdell writes in "The Confederate Government and the Railroads":

For more than a year before the end came the railroads were in such a wretched condition that a complete breakdown seemed always imminent. As the tracks wore out on the main lines they were replenished by despoiling the branch lines; but while the expedient of feeding the weak

roads to the more important afforded the latter some temporary sustenance, it seriously weakened the armies, since it steadily reduced the area from which supplies could be drawn.

All of the other treatises are extremely enlightening too. You can tell the view with which historians of the past looked at history and how it affected their interpretations. Even with the perspective of a different time, the vast majority of the history of Ramsdell and his colleagues is solid as a rock — and in fact includes much important information long overlooked or discounted by the politically correct frauds of today.

Ramsdell's book reviews are works of art. He reviewed many of the books we still hold in high esteem such as *R. E. Lee: A Biography*, by Douglas Southhall Freeman; *Life and Labor in the Old South*, by Ulrich Bonnell Phillips; *The Civil War and Reconstruction*, by J. G. Randall and 12 others (which are just a handful of Ramsdell's reviews). Included are reviews of books by famous historians such as Frederick Jackson Turner, creator of the Frontier Thesis.

This book — *Charles W. Ramsdell, Dean of Southern Historians, Volume One: His Best Work* — is an important book; and, *Volume Two: His Texas Treatises*, will be out by the end of summer, 2017 followed fast by a third book centered around Ramsdell's "Lincoln and Fort Sumter".

The treatises, book reviews and citation are all verbatim as they appeared originally. Nothing has been edited out or added except for some additional explanatory footnotes. The footnotes have all been renumbered to run continuously throughout the book.

Most of the punctuation and capitalization in the treatises, book reviews and notes are exactly as written by Ramsdell and edited by the various scholarly publications in which they appeared. Some of it is not as we would do today but it doesn't matter one iota. There is nothing that is not understandable in any of it. It is just different here and there, and I wanted to acknowledge that.

It is nice to have mostly Confederate names for battles such as Manassas for Bull Run, and Sharpsburg for Antietam.

As stated, I am very proud to bring out the writings of Charles W. Ramsdell, Dean of Southern Historians, and others who were brilliant and uncompromised by political correctness. There is MUCH more to come.

Gene Kizer, Jr.

Charleston, South Carolina

April 12, 2017