Slavery is Wrong, How Can Abortion be Right?

By Daniel Mallock (July 2019)

Here Comes the Wind, Benny Andrews, 1980

When a thing *can* be done it does not follow that that thing

ought to be done.

Those who observe a growing conflict and speculate as to what it means and what might happen are not necessarily supporters of the conflict itself. Such was the case with Abraham Lincoln after his Cooper Union of February, 1860, both of which called for the restriction of the extension of the slavery system in the United States.

As the several states of the South now line up once again in opposition to the federal authority in pursuit of the protection of their rights, ironically, the right to protect others as opposed to enslaving them, it is clear that a national crisis is underway. Who can say in which ways the crisis will develop, how it will expand (or be alleviated), and who and what will suffer on account of it?

As the states of the south pass demonstrably erroneous decisions," like *Roe* and *Dred Scott*, can be challenged and defeated.

Lincoln told his audiences during his debates against Stephen Douglas for the Illinois seat in the US Senate in 1858 that a "Ordnance of Secession, the document with which they declared their justification for leaving the Union and rebelling against it, protection of the slavery system was the center of their complaint.

> We affirm that these ends for which this Government was instituted have been defeated, and the Government itself

has been made destructive of them by the action of the non-slaveholding States. Those States have assume the right of deciding upon the propriety of our domestic institutions; and have denied the rights of property established in fifteen of the States and recognized by the Constitution; they have denounced as sinful the institution of slavery; they have permitted open establishment among them of societies, whose avowed object is to disturb the peace and to eloign the property of the citizens of other States. They have encouraged and assisted thousands of our slaves to leave their homes; and those who remain, have been incited by emissaries, books and pictures to servile insurrection.

For twenty-five years this agitation has been steadily increasing, until it has now secured to its aid the power of the common Government. Observing the *forms* of the Constitution, a sectional party has found within that Article establishing the Executive Department, the means of subverting the Constitution itself. A geographical line has been drawn across the Union, and all the States north of that line have united in the election of a man to the high office of President of the United States, whose opinions and purposes are hostile to slavery. He is to be entrusted with the administration of the common Government, because he has declared that 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.

This sectional combination for the submersion of the Constitution, has been aided in some of the States by elevating to citizenship, persons who, by the supreme law of the land, are incapable of becoming citizens; and their

> votes have been used to inaugurate a new policy, hostile to the South, and destructive of its beliefs and safety.
>
> On the 4th day of March next, this party will take possession of the Government. It has announced that the South shall be excluded from the common territory, that the judicial tribunals shall be made sectional, and that a war must be waged against slavery until it shall cease throughout the United States.
>
> The guaranties of the Constitution will then no longer exist; the equal rights of the States will be lost. The slaveholding States will no longer have the power of self-government, or self-protection, and the Federal Government will have become their enemy.
>
> —South Carolina’s Ordnance of Secession, adopted December 24, 1860.

This is all very dramatic and very clear; in the view of the secessionists of South Carolina slavery was a legal, constitutionally protected, positive good whose existence was assailed by a new administration (Lincoln) that promised to be hostile to it.

Lincoln once made the observation that if slavery were a positive good then why weren’t people volunteering to become slaves? And, in our own troubled time, if not-yet-born children could speak would they say, “please abort me”?

During the Senate debates with Douglas, Lincoln was no abolitionist. He opposed the expansion of slavery because he thought it wrong and did not want it to expand into the territories yet abided a great respect for the laws and the Constitution (which he felt prevented him from being a full abolitionist); Douglas supported "Popular Sovereignty" whereby the residents of a territory could themselves decide the slave/free status of a state-to-be. This approach led to conflict and strife, and provided an easy path to corruption of the vote. The example of "bleeding Kansas" illustrated Lincoln's point well. "Popular Sovereignty" was, in Lincoln's view, just another method by which slavery could expand into the territories (and an indirect way in which slavery and its expansion could be supported).

Though Lincoln was ambivalent about black people and concerned about the viability of whites and blacks living together equally and peacefully under the same government (in the tradition of Jefferson's view) Lincoln was no friend of the slave system. During the time of the debates at a private event during which both Lincoln and Douglas were present, Lincoln was asked, "Do you know who Douglas is?" Knowing that Douglas himself would hear the answer, Lincoln replied,

> Why, yes, he's a man with tens of thousands of blind followers. It's my business to make some of those blind followers see.[6]

The immorality of slavery was clear as a fire bell in the night to Lincoln and to many others; it is wrong to force men and women to work, take their freedom, buy and sell them as

property, and steal the results of their labor. Such moral clarity drove Lincoln (and his Republican colleagues) in opposing Douglas—and later in his management of the war.

Such obvious moral truth is clear to many today about abortion; it is wrong to deny the most innocent and vulnerable among us of their lives. It is wrong to kill our children and celebrate such horrors as motherly empowerment. It is a moral abomination to participate in and support such things. It is a clear wrong to kill children—regardless of *any* legal arguments or Constitutional "protections" that might support it. Sometimes laws are mistaken and must be changed or defeated (*Dred Scott* being another example of morally-wrong law).

Read more in New English Review:
- A Detransitioner's Story
- Bible Champs of the Ring
- Are We Really in the Back Row?

That some women who have had abortions now trot their experiences forward in public as a badge of honor, as if their abortion(s) were a positive and good thing worthy of applause and respect, shows further that so many are blind, and cannot see.

The immorality of slavery is clear to all reasonable and decent people *nowabortionists and their blind adherents have been generally successful.*

The national debate on the subject is obfuscated by bizarre

linkages and assertions of women's empowerment and equal rights between the sexes, all of which have one single purpose—to obscure the ugly, immoral truth of the killing thing that they defend and applaud. A national battle is being waged between those who want to kill infants and those who want infants to be born and live.

The moral clarity of the matter when stated so starkly is difficult to evade. Abortion advocates go to great pains to assert that infants in the womb are not people, that unborn humans are not fully human, that a child growing in a woman's body is akin to a tumor and, should the mother wish to excise it, such destruction of the unwanted growth is within her rights.

It is important for the defenders of infanticide to assert that the murder of a not-yet-born child is not, in fact, a murder. This is the bizarre, disingenuous woman's-health-care-decision argument deployed by many feminists, fans of child murder, and mainstream support abortion. All of this is a great lie and fraud whose purpose is to justify and minimize the slaughter of children.

Such lies are the things upon which national disgraces and national tragedies are built. That the Democrat party is now "the abortion party" and once was the party of slavery and secession prior to the Civil War; and that the Republican party supported abolition and sustaining the Union are perhaps not relevant historical truths.

In fact, the success of the pro-abortion paradigm is so

extensive in the popular culture and in politics that among some in the pro-infanticide movement the true marker of love between a man and a woman is whether the man will the murder of children by their mothers is not wrong.

The matter of abortion, about killing children, is not about the empowerment of women. How can it be that some women can feel empowered by having, and implementing, the right to kill their children? Some nations and cultures throughout history, and still today, believe that the murder of children is empowering, good, and acceptable—not this one.

There are challenges abroad and there are challenges here at home, but there is no more fundamental domestic fight than that over the controversy as to whether or not the murder of children is wrong and whether legal protections for it should be rescinded.

A nation such as ours at the height of economic, military, and cultural success and might should have as its national position that idea that innocent life is of great and unmeasurable value and that we, Americans, will protect and succor such individuals.

Therefore, in furtherance of this essential and foundational concept, the Supreme Court decision on *Roe*, allowing abortion anywhere in the several states must be overturned, and the authority of deciding if mothers should have the legal right to kill their children returned to the several states.

The position of the nation should be one of reverence and respect for life, and a written-in-law sentiment that our children are our greatest national treasures that we can have now and into the future. Under the law, after the overturning of *Roe*, each state will decide for itself if they want infanticide or not within their borders. Perhaps in some future not so far distant in time, *all* the states will recognize and acknowledge this vile killing practice for what it is, and abandon it.

In late December, 1860, Lincoln replied to a query from [in some states, some Democrat political leaders would extend abortion even *after* birth)](). This is a great fraud which all who contend in this debate fully know but the abortion advocates must embrace to support their goal. Their goal is to protect their right to murder their children.

1. It is wrong to murder children, born or unborn.
2. Slavery was once protected by the Constitution, though it was wrong to do so.
3. The murder of children is now protected by the Constitution, though it is wrong to do so.
4. Any law at the national level that protects the murder of children must be defeated.
5. Any politician who supports the murder of children must not be elected and, if elected, opposed and defeated at the earliest electoral opportunity.
6. The blind must be made to see, and the laws that support their blindness—utterly, totally, and fully ended.

Times Out of Joint

The abortion matter is so abundantly morally clear yet now profoundly muddied by a culture that devalues life, wisdom,

and the defense of the right. Some deeply troubled people do not even believe in the existence of “right” –only in what each individual considers to be the right. This bizarre, self-absorbed, Hobbesian, anti-human, amoral, humanist world-view is contrary to the concept of a just nation built upon laws and institutions.

In such a vexed climate as this few have taken up this matter as too difficult, too controversial, too heightened. Such were most likely the feelings of those who opposed slavery all the while it was protected by the Constitution. In that climate then and in this, now, certainly these similar struggles to defeat an injustice have like elements of challenge.

> There were times when Abraham Lincoln himself seemed to be a sort of ghost standing on a platform in broad daylight before thousands of people solemnly unwrapping the sheets about their old laws and murmuring of forgotten oaths and wasted sacrifices.[9]

In May, 1856, amidst the violence over slavery in the territories on the Missouri/Kansas border which saw hundreds killed, Lincoln spoke at a Republican party rally in Springfield, Illinois.

> “These are sad times, and seem out of joint,” he said. “All seems dead, dead, dead; but the age is not yet dead; it liveth as surely as our Maker liveth. Under all this seeming want of life and motion, the world does move, nevertheless. Be hopeful. Let us adjourn and appeal to the people.”[10]

The Confederate Monuments

Since the Confederacy was founded upon slavery and its protection should Confederate monuments be allowed to stand? The answer *must* be “yes.”

This apparent contradiction is fundamental to understanding American history.

After the war, our forefathers forgave one another and re-united the country. This forgiveness (and subsequent re-unification of the country) is one of the essential lessons of the Civil War for the future generations.

Our forebears forgave each other and moved forward together as one united nation—without slavery. Statues and monuments and memorials to Confederate soldiers and leaders are acknowledgements in stone and bronze by the victors that the vanquished were not only defeated enemies in war, but brothers (and sisters) once again going forward into the future.

These monuments are silent lessons to us of mistakes made, courage exhibited, magnanimity in victory, and national unity into the future. If our boys and girls in blue forgave our boys and girls in gray then who are we to cancel their lessons and abandon their forgiveness? This was a conflict fought and resolved by previous generations which only relates to us now because of radical agitation to reignite old, resolved

controversies for current political purposes. It is the self-destructive height of ignorance and anti-history.

Lessons of a Contrary Past

Accepting the lessons of our forebears is a debt we owe to the past and to ourselves. If there is no learning, if there is no lesson, if there are no themes of reunification then the tragedy of the war is compounded over and over again. We are mandated by history and by nature to learn the lessons of the past.

But we do have such lessons and themes—one in particular from an unexpected source. Here is a speech that former Confederate General Nathan Bedford Forrest gave toward the end of his life, at Memphis, Tennessee, July, 1875. Forrest had been one of the leading generals of the Confederacy and acknowledged by many in the post-war years, including Robert E. Lee, as the best commander of the war (Sherman, Johnston, and Davis appeared to concur on this assessment). Prior to the war, Forrest had been a slave trader through which activities he acquired great wealth all of which he lost during the war.

After the war, Forrest was the first Grand Wizard of the Klan, which he later ordered disbanded. Now widely reviled for these things, and the controversial battle at Fort Pillow in 1864, Forrest had an extraordinary change of heart in the post-war years which is now generally unknown and unacknowledged. He is a fitting example of the concept that people can learn and change and that reconciliation and forgiveness are real.

For this generation, Forrest's post-war change and the forgiveness presented to him by some he had harmed the most is an important story that challenges ignorance and hatreds now so widespread in our troubled country, and merits acknowledgement and review.

This is the last public address General Forrest delivered. He gave this speech to a black organization, at their invitation, called the "Independent Order of Pole-Bearers Association." Prior to the address he was presented a bouquet of flowers by a black woman, which he gladly accepted. funeral, is evidence that the contradictions of our history and ourselves were once understood, and now tragically forgot.

The bravery and sacrifices of both sides now belong to *all of us*, north and south, black and white, blue and gray—and the Confederate statues can speak one lesson or another to *all*. We ignore and eradicate our history at our grave peril.

Unifying the Contradictions of American History

> The past and present wilt – I have fill'd them, emptied them,
> And proceed to fill my next fold of the future.
>
> Listener up there! what have you to confide to me?
> Look in my face while I snuff the sidle of evening,
> (Talk honestly, no one else hears you, and I stay only a minute longer.)

Do I contradict myself?
Very well then I contradict myself,
(I am large, I contain multitudes.)

I concentrate toward them that are nigh, I wait on the door-slab.

Who has done his day's work? who will soonest be through with his supper?
Who wishes to walk with me?

—Walt Whitman, Miller Center).

[6] Winston Churchill, The Crisis, (MacMillan, London, 1902), vol. 4, p.136.

[7] Report of the Joint Select Committee to Inquire Into The Condition of Affairs in The Late Insurrectionary States, (Washington, Government Printing Office, 1872), p.19.

[8] John G. Nicolay, A Short Life of Abraham Lincoln: Condensed from Nicolay and Hay's Abraham Lincoln: A History, (Century, 1902), p.166.

[9] Carl Sandburg, Abraham Lincoln, The Prairie Years-2, (Charles Scribner's Sons, 1945), vol. 2, p.136.

[10] Ward Hill Lamon, The Life of Abraham Lincoln: From His Birth to His Inauguration as President, (Applewood reprint, 1872), p.378.

[11] Jack Hurst, Nathan Bedford Forrest: A Biography, (Vintage, 1993), pp.366-7.

«Previous Article Table of Contents Next Article»

Daniel Mallock is a historian of the Founding generation and of the Civil War and is the author of The New York Times Bestseller,