



Adam Serwer 🍌 @AdamSerwer

27 Apr 19 · 4 tweets · [AdamSerwer/status/1122090884277907456](#)



I can't believe people are still doing this, but drawing a moral equivalence "had racist views of black people, but preserved the union and abolished slavery" and "fought to shatter the union in order to preserve slavery" is absolutely cretinous.



Patterico ✓
@Patterico



"I am not, nor ever have been, in favor of bringing about in any way the social and political equality of the white and black races, [applause]-that I am not nor ever have been in favor of making voters or jurors of negroes, nor of qualifying them to hold office." - Lincoln

Adam Serwer 🍌 ✓ @AdamSerwer
Replying to @AdamSerwer

Contrary to myth, Lee did not oppose slavery or secession. He called slavery "necessary for their instruction as a race," he enslaved free black people in his invasion of the North, and after the war, opposed black suffrage. theatlantic.com/politics/archi...

♥ 8 4:49 AM - Apr 27, 2019



💬 19 people are talking about this



Lincoln wasn't a saint, but his actions left America closer to its ideals than it had ever been. Also I love the idea that somehow I would be ignorant of Lincoln's views. (The Johnson below is LBJ).



Lyndon Johnson was a civil rights hero. But also a racist.

Lyndon Johnson was a racist. He was also the greatest champion of racial equality to occupy the White House since Lincoln.

<http://www.msnbc.com/msnbc/lyndon-johnson-civil-rights-racism>

Nor should Johnson's racism overshadow what he did to push America toward the unfulfilled promise of its founding. When Republicans say they're the Party of Lincoln, they don't mean they're the party of [deporting black people to West Africa](#), or the party of [opposing black suffrage](#), or the party of [allowing states the authority to bar freedmen from migrating there](#), all options Lincoln considered. They mean they're the party that crushed the slave empire of the Confederacy and helped free black Americans from bondage.

Meanwhile, the idea that to call Lee a traitor, and see him as a villainous actor in history rather than a hero, is somehow modern woke sensibilities gone mad requires ignoring history. From Blight's biography of Douglass:

trial might; that they had never fought for slavery but for state sovereignty and homeland; that the South's racially ordered civilization had been tragically crushed by Yankee invasion; and that "just" causes can lose militarily but with time regain the moral and political high ground. Douglass vehemently resisted the rapid emergence in national political circles of these ideas. He was appalled at the national veneration of Robert E. Lee when he died in 1870. Disgusted at what he called the "bombastic laudation" and the "nauseating flatteries" of the "rebel chief," Douglass attacked the Lost Cause as a betrayal of the verdicts of the war. "It would seem," he wrote in a biting editorial, "that the soldier who kills the most men in battle, even in a bad cause, is the greatest Christian, and entitled to the highest place in heaven." By early 1871, after so much romance about Lee's death and the sentiment that he had "died of a broken heart," Douglass expressed a precise verdict: "He was a traitor and can be made nothing else."²⁵

By intellectual predilection and by experience, Douglass embodied the idea that history mattered. The Douglass who endures as an unending subject of literary and historical inquiry—because of the autobiographies—is and was the creature of memory. The very nature of memory provided a subject

Anyway, I do enjoy modern Republicans throwing Lincoln under the bus to own the libs (and defend the confederacy) because if nothing else, it is certainly revealing.