

**Honest Abe**  
**or**  
***How to Buy a People with Counterfeit Money***

2 Jan 08

Dear Mr. Lincoln,

It is with great respect that I write you today regarding your courageous efforts when it was necessary for you to save the Government of the United States – by sacrificing its Constitution, and plunging the people into war. As President George Bush II has reportedly opined, the Constitution is “just a goddamned piece of paper.” You yourself by sleight of hand and your remarkable way with words, sidelined the Constitution in your 1<sup>st</sup> inaugural address. You elevated your current Government to the exalted heights previously reserved for the Constitution. No one seemed to notice when you said, “*You* [the South] have no oath registered in heaven to destroy the Government, while I shall have the most solemn one to “preserve, protect, and defend it.” Of course, your public oath was actually to preserve, protect, and defend the *Constitution* – not the Government, not your job. But no one can say you didn’t give fair warning of what your true intentions were – and you had the guts to state your intentions before your first act as President. Well done!

And you have not been praised highly enough for the skillful way you utilized the national crisis, to reform the Right to Contract by passing the *Legal-Tender Act of 1862*. No longer could anyone contract with another without having the government as a silent third party monitoring how payments will be made. (It was also made retroactive – voiding existing contracts if they stipulated payment to be made in other than US currency. Thankfully, Constitutional prohibition of ex post facto laws did not slow the Government down when its very existence was threatened.)

It is doubtful that without your groundwork, the later establishing of point #5 of the Communist Manifesto – *Centralization of credit in the hands of the state, by means of a national bank with State capital and an exclusive monopoly* – the Federal Reserve System – could ever have been realized. Granted, you could not have envisioned the blossoming of the seed you planted. Your pressing problem at the time, was the Federal enslaving of all of the States and all their people – the justification for which was that some of those States wished to be free to enslave some of their people. And when it seemed that the majority of the folks still under your control were not willing to support what some called *Lincoln’s War*, your solution was elegant! At the point of a gun, you forced everyone to accept your worthless Greenbacks, and thereby, you were able to continue to prosecute that unpopular war. (And you still hold the record for Americans killed in war – well done, sir!)

I have included herein an article from the newspaper of record, the New York Times. Unfortunately you were not in the flesh to enjoy the vindication of your “unconstitutional” usurpation of powers. The Supreme Court affirmed the Constitutionality of your *Legal-Tender Act* in May of 1871.

You were the first forcefully effective Chief Executive, understanding that your most important duty was as a steward of governmental Power. Because of your war, the Central Government was able to make it abundantly clear to the States that in any future situation where some of them might get uppity, if they were getting out of line – they could be smashed. In large part due to your guidance, the Constitution has grown from a strictly interpreted instrument to protect a young Republic, into an amorphous ever changing instrument allowing the mature Social Democracy to flourish. Don’t pay much attention to the poor sports on the court who dissented. They are disloyal to the proven fact that the Constitution is a living document whose purpose is to consolidate and centralize Power.

Published: May 2, 1871

Copyright © The New York Times

[http://query.nytimes.com/mem/archive-](http://query.nytimes.com/mem/archive-free/pdf?_r=1&res=9505E0D81F30EE34BC4A53DFB366838A669FDE&oref=slogin)

[free/pdf?\\_r=1&res=9505E0D81F30EE34BC4A53DFB366838A669FDE&oref=slogin](http://query.nytimes.com/mem/archive-free/pdf?_r=1&res=9505E0D81F30EE34BC4A53DFB366838A669FDE&oref=slogin)

## **Constitutionality of the Legal-Tender Acts Affirmed—Important Decision Given Yesterday.**

WASHINGTON, D. C., May 1.—There was a large number of the members of the Bar present at the Supreme Court Chambers today, includ-

ing Solicitor-General BRISTOW and Senators TRUMBULL and COLE, as it was known the Court would announce many opinions prepared during the week's recess, previous to adjourning until 16th of October next. All the Judges were on the Bench, with the exception of Mr. Justice NELSON, who is absent from the city. The Chief-Justice retired at about 2 o'clock. None of the opinions were announced by him. At 3 o'clock Mr. Justice CLIFFORD read a brief paper in the legal-tender cases of KNOX *vs.* LEE and PARKER *vs.* DAVIS, as follows :

In these two cases two questions were heretofore directed to be argued, namely : First—Is the act of Congress known as the Legal-tender act constitutional as to contracts made before its passage ? Second—Is it valid as applicable to transactions since its passage ? These questions have been considered by the Court, and both have been decided in the affirmative. The decree of the Supreme Judicial Court of Massachusetts in the case of PARKER *vs.* DAVIS is therefore affirmed, and the judgment of the Circuit Court of the United States of the Western District of Texas is also affirmed. The Chief-Justice, with Associate Justices NELSON, CLIFFORD and FIELD, dissent from the majority of the Court upon both propositions and the result, holding that the act of Congress, so far as applicable to contracts made before the passage, is repugnant to the Constitution and void, and also that it is repugnant to the Constitution and void, so far as applicable to contracts made since its passage. The opinion of the Court, and the reasons for dissent will be read before the close of the adjourned term.

In DUNNING against SEARS and others two