

# The Plundering of Christian America

*by Anthony Wayne*

*Publisher's Note: This is part two of a three part series concerning the facts and events that brought about the abolition of Christian America, the former united States of America.*

Prior to 1861, the stage was being set to drive out the southern **Christian American** states from the union. This was not for any other reason other than commerce. The alleged **civil war** was a war between the southern **Christian Constitutional Republic of America** and the northern foreign commerce merchants (mostly British) who supported the central government and their military as an enforcement tool of their desires. This isn't much different than today.

In 1833, the public treasury had a surplus revenue of millions. By an act of the federal legislation, this surplus revenue was distributed only among the northern States and was used for public improvements. In all of history, this unequal distribution of wealth had never taken place before. The reason the federal legislature did this was based on a change in how U.S. Senators were placed in office. Rather than the People electing the Senators, the State Legislatures appointed them.

Pilfering the south to benefit the north was a way to force the south to declare secession and then take over the southern States in order to control their wealth from the federal level. Consider this; in the 1850's, *Senator Thomas Hart Benton* wrote

**"Under Federal Legislation, the exports of the South have been the basis of the Federal revenue. Virginia, the two Carolina's, and Georgia, may be said to defray three-fourths of the annual expense of supporting the Federal Government; and of this great sum, annually furnished by them, nothing or next to nothing is returned to them, in the shape of Government expenditures. That expenditure flows in an opposite direction - it flows northwardly, in one uniform, uninterrupted, and perennial stream. This is the reason why wealth disappears from the South and rises up in the North. Federal Legislation does all this."**

Now one can understand why A. Lincoln's motivation was not to totally destroy the south, but to take it over and plunder the entire southern wealth for the benefit of the federalized and foreign influenced northern states.

The **Louisiana Purchase**, under the term of Thomas Jefferson, began the rift between the north and the south as it was the New England States that had threatened secession because the south was to gain a commercial advantage. Prior to 1861, the jealousy of the north over the wealth and prominence of the south was no secret, and the New England States had no intention of allowing the free southern **Christian States** to continue eroding their market share of commerce and

exports to Europe.

In 1861, even Federal Attorney General John Black was not in agreement with what was taking place. He wrote

**"Whether Congress has the constitutional right to make war against one or more States... is a question for Congress itself to consider. It must be admitted that no such power is expressly given; nor are there any words in the Constitution which imply it."**

He went on to cite Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution where it states that the powers granted therein are to declare war, grant letters of marque and reprisal, and to make rules concerning captures on land and water. In commenting on this particular Constitutional Section, he said

**"This certainly means nothing more than the power to commence and carry on hostilities against the foreign enemies of the nation".**

He was stating, as the chief lawyer of the federal government, that the southern States were not foreign enemies as the north had declared, and that the Constitution could not be the means by which war was declared.

Since war could not be declared in this way against the southern States, any attempt to do so would be an expulsion by the central government of the southern States, which is absolutely unconstitutional. Black went on to say

**"And if Congress shall break up the Union by unconstitutionally putting strife and enmity and armed hostility between different sections of the country, instead of the domestic 'tranquility' which the Constitution was meant to insure, will not all the States be absolved from their Federal obligations? Is any portion of the people bound to contribute their money or their blood to carry on a contest like that?"**

Perfectly said. It's quite obvious that the purpose for the alleged **Civil War** was far from constitutional.

All of the American States were to be colleagues of one another, bound by a common declaration, and insured in a signed and sealed constitution of brotherhood in Christ. The southern states always believed this, but the northern States believed it only when they reaped the profits of commerce. Since some of the States (the north) have conquered the rest (the south) and have held them as subjugated provinces (of which they still are), then the entire theory upon which they were formed together as one indivisible nation under God has been totally destroyed. Some say that England was the victor of the Revolutionary War, and in most respects, that statement is true. Our nation had less than 100 years to enjoy freedom under Christ before the commerce pagans and atheists destroyed it. God bless America for what it was. God help the present 'Union' for what it is and has become since 1861.

The Constitution was the insurance policy, signed by all the States, to form a Christian Brotherhood. The original Constitution was not the law itself, but a declaration of **Christian common law** bound by those whose signatures appeared thereon. The states are the individual pieces that were to form together the general and central government. According to the original

Constitution, the states are to exist and carry on as individual Christian nations. This occurs with or without the central government, but the central government cannot exist without the states. Sovereignty exists only among the states, but there is no such theory as **national sovereignty**. In reality and practice, this has been reversed since 1861. The states are no longer sovereign, only the central (federal) government is. Since the **Civil War**, the states are not to exist without the federal central government to dictate their laws. The entire Constitution has been turned upside down and made null and void.

The **united Christian States of America**, declared before God in 1776, were conquered in 1861 by the modern Roman administrative regime of continental Europe, whereby the emperor (the north, led by federalist A. Lincoln) became free from laws and his will had the force of a statute.

In the 1850's, there was a very strong anti-Christian movement growing in the north. They hid under the label of **Abolitionists** for the abolishment of slavery, but their true identity was that of **Unitarianism**. These Unitarians believed then, and still do now, in a united world community and a liberal social welfare agenda as their religion (as the modern day **new world order**). Their socialistic beliefs were a hostility towards Christianity and they actively and openly promoted violence as a means of **social cleansing**. Unitarians hated the southern **Orthodox Christianity** and, more specifically, the **Southern Presbyterians**. Their public tool was **John Brown**, who was born in Connecticut and grew up in Ohio. They supported him and his band of outlaws with money to terrorize and murder anti-abolitions. This was underground warfare, at the least.

The power people behind John Brown's group of twenty-one murderers formed a committee known as the **Massachusetts Kansas Aid Committee**. This group of six was financially backed by English and Greek funds from two of the members wealthy families.

Then there was the raid by John Brown's gang whereby they seized the arsenal and Armory at Harper's Ferry, Virginia, on Sunday, October 16, 1859. This was a principal incident of excuse behind Lincoln's initiating the civil war. It's interesting to note that the U.S. Marines, led by then **Colonel Robert Edward Lee**, attacked Brown and regained federal control of the U.S. Arsenal at Harper's Ferry. Brown's ensuing trial and hanging pushed to a forefront the excuse of slavery being a national division between the north and south. The fact is, this was a battle over the Constitution in light of the power that the federal government could exercise over any state in the Union.

Lincoln won the 1860 election (with only forty percent of the vote) and was sworn in on March 4, 1861. On December 20, 1860, **South Carolina** seceded from the Union. By February, 1861, six other southern states followed. In the last days of February 1861, outgoing **President James Buchanan** declared that the federal government would not forcibly prevent the secessions. Obviously, Lincoln didn't concur and in his inauguration address, rejected the Right of secession. Prior to Lincoln's inauguration, in February 1861, the **seven southern Christian states** who had seceded held a convention in Montgomery, Alabama to adopt a provisional Constitution. On March 11, 1861, seven days after Lincoln became President, the convention of southern states unanimously ratified a permanent Constitution, nearly word for word the same as the **1787 Constitution for the united States**, except that within their new Constitution they expressly prohibited any slave trade.

**"1. The importation of negros of the African race, from any foreign country, other**

**than the slaveholding States or Territories of the United States of America, is hereby forbidden, and Congress is required to pass such laws as shall effectually prevent the same. 2. Congress shall also have power to prohibit the introduction of slaves from any State not a member of, or Territory not belonging to, this Confederacy."**  
**Article I, Section 9, Constitution of the Confederate States of America.**

If the southern States who had seceded from the Union declared prohibition of slave trade, didn't that defuse the alleged **Abolitionist** controversy and put an end to the matter? Yes, it did, but this proves that slavery was not the reason behind the north declaring war on the south. Once again, this proves that the north was after something else.

One must fully understand the facts behind the **civil war**. Firstly, it was a war raged by the northeastern States against Christianity. Secondly, it was a war of commerce motivated by the north's **love of money** that became the the root of all evil (as innocent blood from both sides poured out among the fields and streams of God's nation). Thirdly, the declared and public object of those southern States who felt compelled to resort to secession was not to overthrow the Federal Government of the United States, but to perpetuate and continue the Christian principles upon which it was founded; the same principles which were being destroyed by the Federal Government under control of the northern States. Simply put, the object of their having quit the Union was not to destroy America, but to save the Christian principles and Godly law insured by the Constitution and paid for with our forefathers blood. Having won the **civil war**, the **Unitarian** church of atheists, infidels, and socialists destroyed **Christian America** and replaced it with the god of Roman paganism and federalism.

By 1861, there were 8 million people in the south compared to 22 million in the north, yet the southern States were paying for the majority of the federal budget and receiving no infrastructure general Union funds for railroad, agriculture, manufacturing, or industrial growth. The northern States received 100% of these funds. The south had 36% of the population but paid more than 75% of the cost of the central Union government and, in reality, had financed the industrial growth of the north. The north obviously enjoyed the benefits of slavery by enslaving the entire south, both black and white.

Before 1861, the infidel Imperialist beast behind commerce had overcome the Christians, but when the Christians began to stand up for their Godly Rights and voice their disapproval, the beast slaughtered them in the arena and took their clothes and substance from them. This is exactly what took place in the Roman arenas and coliseums when Christians were persecuted and slaughtered by the lions, and the same took place in the fields of America during **Lincoln's civil war of Christian blood**.

Back to the **Lieber Code of 1863** mentioned in part one of this series. The Lieber Code governed those troops of the United States Army in domestic, not foreign, actions. This Code was Lincoln's 'legislative' mandate executed under **Executive Order** and proclamation. The Lieber Code was never adopted by Congress, who had been convened under Executive Order anyway, so it was not necessary to approve of Lincoln's rules for dictatorship. Named after co-author **Francis Lieber**, a German-American political science 'expert', Lieber was born in Germany and fought at Waterloo with dreams of assassinating Napoleon. Arriving in America in 1827, he taught for twenty-one years at South Carolina College at Columbia where he became a recognized authority on public law. Isn't it odd that South Carolina was not only the first State to

secede but was also the home of the author of the Lieber Code? Further yet, Lincoln used [Fort Sumter](#), located at the mouth of the harbor of Charleston, South Carolina, as a catalyst to declare war on the south.

On December 26, 1860, more than two months prior to Lincoln's inauguration and just six days after South Carolina seceded from the Union, a small garrison of Union forces moved from Charleston Harbor's [Fort Moultrie](#) to the unfinished, unsupplied, and ungarrisoned Fort Sumter. [Governor Francis Pickens](#) demanded the surrender of Fort Sumter, but the Union troop commander, Major Robert Anderson, refused. By President Buchanan's order, a Union merchant ship, under the guise of bringing supplies, attempted to offload reinforcement troops and ammunition at Fort Sumter on January 9, 1861. The vessel was fired upon and they withdrew without landing the troops. Someone contemplating motives and military strategy may ask why the Union troops moved from a well equipped and well supplied Fort Moultrie to an unsupplied and unfinished Fort Sumter unless there was some other motive not yet known or revealed. Such is the case.

Three months after the first attempt, newly elected President Lincoln notified Governor Pickens on April 8 that another Union supply ship was being sent to Fort Sumter from New York and that no troops or ammunition were on the ship. On April 11, [Confederate States President Davis](#) ordered the evacuation of the fort. Union Army Major Anderson replied that he would evacuate only if he received no supplies or further instructions from the federal government by noon of April 15. By April 10, [General Pierre Beauregard](#) of the Confederate Army had already learned from spies in New York that at least two ships, fully laden with Union troops and ammunition, were sailing towards Fort Sumter. It was obvious that Lincoln had lied and that he was provoking the southern States into a military skirmish. At about 4:00 AM on April 12, General Beauregard was notified that Union ships were approaching Fort Sumter. At 4:30 AM, he began firing artillery from [Fort Johnson](#) as the Union ships approached the fort, but Fort Sumter was positioned far enough away that no canon fire was able to reach either the ships or the fort. This was a warning to the Union ships to stay offshore and not attempt their deceitful plan. Thirty-four hours later, the firing ceased when the Union ships had retreated far enough offshore to pose no further threat. There was not one casualty or loss on either side.

[General Beauregard](#) had succeeded in stopping an armed conflict by keeping the Union ships from entering Charleston Harbor under false pretense. Lincoln's deceitful plan had apparently failed. On April 14, Union Major Anderson surrendered Fort Sumter. The following day, April 15, 1861, Lincoln declared war on the eleven southern Christian States. Eighty-six years before, on April 19, 1775, the shot 'heard around the world' was fired at [Lexington, Massachusetts](#).

In his Inaugural Address on March 4, 1861, [Lincoln](#) declared

**"I have no purpose, directly or indirectly, to interfere with the institution of slavery in the States where it exists".**

This directly contradicts a speech he made in New Hampshire in 1860, and also contradicts his [Emancipation Proclamation](#) a few years later.

**"I believe I have no lawful right to do so, and I have no inclination to do so... I trust this will not be regarded as a menace, but only as the declared purpose of the**

**Union that it will constitutionally defend and maintain itself. In doing this there needs to be no bloodshed or violence, and there shall be none unless it be forced upon the national authority."**

What he is saying here is that bloodshed will occur if any of the States do not do what the federal central Union government mandates.

**"The power confided to me will be used to hold, occupy, and possess the property and places belonging to the Government..."**

This is exactly what Fort Sumter was all about. **Lincoln** had full intent to use Fort Sumter as the excuse for declaring war against the southern States before he took his oath of office as President. The mere fact that the Union garrison moved their troops into a facility that wasn't completed yet and had no provisional supplies foretells that another motive was at work. It was four months between Lincoln's election and his inauguration, so he had time to devise plans and put them into place. He carefully planned to use Fort Sumter as the **property and place belonging to the Government** that he would use his executive power as **Commander-in-Chief of the Union military** to **hold, occupy, and possess** knowing that South Carolina would not allow it. This was a provocation initiated by Lincoln to force the **Christian southern states** into a war that they did not want nor did they ask for it.

**"...but beyond what may be necessary for these objects, there will be no invasion, no using of force against or among the people anywhere".**

These are the words of an infidel and liar sitting in the **Federal White House**.

**"May Congress prohibit slavery in the Territories? The Constitution does not expressly say. Must Congress protect slavery in the Territories? The Constitution does not expressly say."**

Notice that Lincoln is not referring to the States but to the federal territories west of the Mississippi river, including Missouri. The southern and northern States had all agreed in Congress that slavery within the western territories was a matter of their own territorial resolve, yet slavery within the States was an issue that the north refused to resolve in the same manner. Why? This was their way to provoke the Christian south to secede and go to war. In that manner, the north would later occupy the former southern States and reap the benefits of her agriculture and land riches. Cotton alone was a booty worth plundering as the south was the world's number one cotton exporter in the world.

Lincoln had declared during his campaign speeches in 1860 numerous times that **"Government cannot endure permanently half slave, half free"** and that **"the public mind must rest in the belief that slavery is in the course of ultimate extinction"**. The real extinction Lincoln was referring to was that of the Christian south, and slavery (Abolition) was just an excuse to force them into submission either through Legislature or through war. When the Legislative way didn't work, the southern States seceded. The only other way to force the south to give up their riches and wealth was to declare an unconstitutional and ungodly war against them.

First and foremost it must be understood by all that the debate concerning slavery was only the smokescreen, not the problem. For twenty-five years prior, the southern States were being raped

of their wealth by the north and the northern central Union government.

For example; In April 1852, South Carolina declared

**"that the frequent violations of the Constitution of the United States, by the Federal Government, and its encroachments upon the reserved rights of the States, fully justified this State in then withdrawing from the Federal Union".**

Ironically, it was the other Christian southern States that convinced them not to do so at the time.