

A Biblical Analysis of the Civil War

Why did it happen?

The conflict between the North and the South involved sincere differences among loyal Americans on both sides over the interpretation of the U.S. Constitution. Both sides valued the rights of individual states, but many disagreed over the expression of these rights. The Southern states believed they had a right to secede from the Union if it infringed upon their rights. Many in the North firmly believed that the Constitution was like a covenant never to be broken for its very foundation was the Bible itself.

The issues of states rights became intertwined with the issue of slavery. Slavery had troubled our nation since it's founding. While the south was outraged by what they considered an abuse of their states rights, many Northerners were grieved and angered by the practice of human bondage in their land. There were those from the North that wanted to keep and even expand slavery just as there were those in the South that prayed for the end of it. Ultimately, both sides fought for values they held dear – the North for national unity and freedom for all men and the South for states rights and the defense of their homes and families.

When it comes to slavery, there are some that would minimize its part in the war. Slaves were considered property and to release them would mean the violation of one's personal rights. If only they could remember the precious words of the Savior when he said, "*And as ye would that men should do to you, do ye also to them likewise.*" Luke 6:31

How strange that a people that prides itself of being hospitable, kind and would defend a person's right to freedom, but because of a person's skin color could be blind of their freedom and would enslave them. This analysis is to show how slavery was a major part, if not the cause, of the Civil War.

Slavery vs. Abortion

In the presidential election of 2008, our nation, as well as the two largest political parties, is sharply divided over the issue of abortion. Half of our nation and one party believe that a woman has a constitutional right to control her body and that it is not a life until it is born. Their whole argument is regardless of anything, a woman has the right to do with her body as she pleases. Some have even tried to defend it on Biblical terms. In the other camp, abortion is seen as nothing but murder, due to the scriptural teachings that life begins in the womb. Both sides have a respect for people's rights. There are those who believe that if it continues, it will bring about the judgment of God on this nation.

In regards to slavery, it is very much the same as abortion. One side saw how it was their constitutional right to own slaves and to be forced to stop was a violation of those rights they held dear. We today can clearly see how slavery was wrong and how it was a multi-billion dollar enterprise. We struggle with how anyone could buy or sale a person without a second thought. If our Founding Fathers could see us now, they would strongly struggle with how one could stand and take this abuse concerning abortion.

When one studies this period of life, 1860-1865, one has to think in that time period to try to understand the problems of the day. Most importantly, we need to seek Godly wisdom and pray that God would give us a discerning spirit when we study anything. Ultimately, the problems that we have today in our country are many, but the root problem deals with our morality as a people. Slavery was believed by many, even our Founding Fathers, to be a judgment of Providence. If not dealt with, it would eventually bring about bloodshed and death.

When it comes to any subject, we must firmly base our decisions on the word of God. In Proverbs 21:30, God's word reads, ***"There is no wisdom nor understanding nor counsel against the LORD"***. What makes it even more difficult, is when there is a subject that both sides are shared with committed Christians. This is the problem that we face concerning the Civil War.

When I was growing up, my first lessons of the American Civil War was that it was caused because of the institution of slavery. As I entered into my high school years, I learned it was because of state's rights. I learned that it was fought and settled over 100 years ago. One of my favorite presidents during that time was Abraham Lincoln and how he had not only freed the slaves, but he kept our nation together. His death brought most of the north and south together once again. Recently, I have read books that have redefined Lincoln from a man of character to a tyrant and dictator.

This study will explore several questions concerning this terrible time from 1861-1865, but first we need to start as always with the Word of God.

Egypt

When Joseph went to Egypt, he went from slave to governor of the land. After he died, there rose a king that did not know Joseph and eventually the Israelites found themselves as slaves for over 400 years. When the Israelites cried out to God to send them a deliverer, he sent Moses, and by the hand of the Lord he delivered them and they were set free. The Egyptians saw the slaves as great revenue and felt that they were their property and no one was going to take what belonged to them. They were also considered as an inferior race that would always be servants to them. Even when the Lord punished Egypt and they were eventually freed, they never forgot what had been done to them. Over a thousand years later, when the Greeks ruled Egypt, the Egyptians tried to get compensated for what was done to them during the Exodus. They refused to see that they were being punished because of their own sin. May we learn from the mistakes of others in dealing with any subject.

When the kingdom of Israel was divided after Solomon's death, it all came to a head because the king refused to give his people relief in taxes, but it ultimately was because of sin. The division eventually brought destruction and dispersion of both kingdoms.

Like Israel, America was built on the very same godly principals that Israel started out with. But like Israel, America has people who want to rebel against the very principals that make it great.

The following subjects concerning the Civil War that we will review are:

- **How to properly study a subject**
- **Was Slavery the cause of the Civil War?**
- **States that left the Union because of Slavery**
- **The Dred Scott Case**
- **The Founding Fathers and their view of Slavery**
- **Slavery and the Constitution**
- **Black voting before and after the Civil War**
- **The real Abraham Lincoln**
- **The Right of Secession**
- **Lessons before the Civil War**
- **Problems within the Confederacy**
- **Timeline of the Civil War**
- **Problems with the League of the South**
- **Evaluation of pro-Southerner books**
- **How should a southerner look at their heritage?**
- **The Pledge of Allegiance**

How to properly study a subject

He that walketh with wise men shall be wise: but a companion of fools shall be destroyed.

Proverbs 13:20

When it comes to any subject, it is important that we start with the right foundation.

If the foundations be destroyed, what can the righteous do? Psalms 11:3

When a person's foundation is in God's word and they meditate on it and are committed to truth and not what he/she has always been used to, they will be given an understanding mind. One way this is demonstrated is when every area of their life is purposed to be under a Biblical principal.

#1) Always check out the beliefs and vision of the authors of the books you read!

I have several times read a book concerning a position that the author was promoting and then someone would give me a book condemning it. Both sides made good arguments, but the only way I could decide who was right was by assessing the following:

- What do they believe and how they live their lives. Nobody is perfect, but **a person's morality will dictate his life.** Make sure that the positions they hold are supported by Biblical principals.
- Check their sources and making sure that the source is in proper context. Whenever I read something I have never heard before I stop and verify that the information is correct.
- As a Christian, when we keep focused on God's word **He gives us a discerning spirit.** How does that happen? A great resource that I have read every month for years is the book of Proverbs. It tells us the traits of fools and the characteristics of wise people. When Proverbs is saturated in a person's life, as they read or talk to people, they will receive God's discerning spirit concerning those around them.
- Our background can be a help or a hindrance. Isn't amazing that most people in the South-side with the South and those from the North- side with the North?
Example: Solomon had a wiser mind than any king, but when it came to having a wife, he followed the example of his father and not to God's word and because of this it drew his heart away from following the Lord.
- The best writer is one who sees the subject in light of God's word. Just because a person says he is a Christian doesn't mean that the material he/she writes is consistent to God's word.
- Are the people whose books you read holding to a certain position? Do they only attack and have a degree of bitterness? Does their agenda violate biblical principals?

#2) Understand, that in the past 100 years great lengths have been taken to slowly rewrite history.

Here are some examples:

- Men like George Washington supposedly lived immoral lives and committed acts of Adultery
- That our country was never a Christian nation and most of our Founding Fathers were agnostic, atheists and Deists (from the book "The godless constitution").
- The Founding Fathers believed in a strong separation of Church and State, which the term is not found in the Constitution or the Bill of Rights.
- Three great heroes of our nation in the 1800's were Daniel Boone, Davy Crockett, and Peter Francisco. If it had not been for Walt Disney, Crockett and Boone would have been forgotten. After the latest Alamo movie, Crockett was looked at as far from a hero, and no one has even heard of Francisco.

#3) Read both sides of the argument.

When you hear a person speak out against something, hear the other side of the argument. Most of the time, you will be able to see where the truth lies. The same is with books, with the exception of God’s word, which should be our only foundation to looking at any side of an argument. This is true in dealing with relationships. Do we only get one side of the picture? When we hear the other side, most of the time we find ourselves understanding the problem better.

#4) Does the view one holds, effect people around them to godliness? Does it cause division? Does it cause those with struggles to have hope? Is this an area that needs to be put in the past? Does this issue occupy more of our devotion and time than the Lord?

#5) Be emotionally dead to the position you previously held. This can be difficult to a person who strongly holds to one position, but the only way you will get to the bottom of any issue is to think how does God see the issue instead of how you think the issue is.

Was Slavery the cause of the War?

When it comes to the causes of the Civil War, the top two answers are States Rights and The Institution of Slavery.

Many pro-confederacy books will tell you that the percentage of the number of slaves was in decline, but that was only in those that owned slaves. The fact was that it was growing beyond belief and *the Deep South had no intention of freeing them*. When Eli Whitney invented the Cotton Gin which made the production of cotton increase 50 fold, this could have been a way to let the slaves go. They could have hired the previous slaves and still make a sizable profit. It is the writer’s strong belief that God did this for that purpose. One pro-confederate article noted that because of the cotton gin it caused the south to increase slaves because of the money that could be made. So the invention of the cotton gin revived the economic benefit of slavery.

For the Love of money is the root of all evil I Timothy 6:10

<u>The census of Slaves from 1790 -1860</u>	<u>Total U.S. Population</u>	<u>Slave %</u>
1790 - 694,207 Slaves	3,894,000	17.8%
1800 - 887,612 Slaves		
1820 - 1,529,012 Slaves	9,638,453	15.8%
1830 - 1,987,396 Slaves		
1840 - 2,482,546 Slaves	17,069,453	14.7%
1850 - 3,200,600 Slaves		
1860 - 3,950,528 Slaves	31,443,321	12.6%

By the time of the Civil War, 8% of the north owned slaves, while 31% of the south owned slaves. The south had by far the largest number per owner of slaves. The only figures that show the percentage dropping in slaves is when they were figured in by total population. In some southern states, like South Carolina, there were more slaves than whites. South Carolina had a sizable profit to lose economically, but did God give them plenty of time to deal with the slave issue? They had 70 years since their forefathers agreed to eventually do away with it. Isn’t it amazing that their number one reason for leaving the Union was money they had tide up in slavery. They were blinded by money not to see that human beings were reduced to cattle. God’s mercy and judgments were very clear.

Alexander Stephen's Cornerstone speech

If the South had won, would slavery eventually have come to an end? According to the following speech by the Vice President of the Confederacy, it did not seem likely.

Slavery according to Alexander Stephens was the cornerstone of the Confederacy. In his speech, the south had no intention of freeing the slaves. Only when they realized that they were losing the war, did they offer to give freedom to blacks, but only if they fought for their country.

"...though last, not least. The new constitution has put at rest, forever, all the agitating questions relating to our peculiar institution—African slavery as it exists amongst us—the proper status of the negro in our form of civilization. This was the immediate cause of the late rupture and present revolution.... The prevailing ideas entertained by him (Thomas Jefferson) and most of the leading statesmen at the time of the formation of the old constitution were that the enslavement of the African was in violation of the laws of nature; that it was wrong in principle, socially, morally, and politically. It was an evil they knew not well how to deal with, but the general opinion of the men of that day was that, somehow or other in the order of Providence, the institution would be evanescent and pass away.... Those ideas, however, were fundamentally wrong. (This is where it is said that the beginnings of our republic was wrong in regards to all men are created equal) They rested upon the assumption of the equality of races. This was an error. It was a sandy foundation, and the government built upon it fell when the "storm came and the wind blew.... Our new government is founded upon exactly the opposite idea; its foundations are laid, its cornerstone rests, upon the great truth that the negro is not equal to the white man; that slavery—subordination to the superior race—is his natural and normal condition..." (according to Stephens the south had rejected the great ideals of our Founding Fathers in the area that all men were created equal and if left unchallenged slavery would have been sealed forever) ***... Their conclusions are right if their premises were. They assume that the negro is equal, and hence conclude that he is entitled to equal privileges and rights with the white man. If their premises were correct, their conclusions would be logical and just—but their premise being wrong, their whole argument fails.*** (According to the Vice President of the Confederacy, if the negro was equal then the South was wrong!!!)... ***They (our Founding Fathers concerning the entire human race) were attempting to make things equal which the Creator had made unequal.... Many governments have been founded upon the principle of the subordination and serfdom of certain classes of the same race; such were and are in violation of the laws of nature. Our system commits no such violation of nature's laws. With us, all of the white race, however high or low, rich or poor, are equal in the eye of the law. Not so with the negro. Subordination is his place. He, by nature, or by the curse against Canaan,(a misinterpretation) is fitted for that condition which he occupies in our system.*** (According to the South they were taking up the evolutionary teachings of Darwin which were already circulating in their region which later were accepted by Hitler in his teaching of the Arian Race. The Word of God teaches very plainly that we are all of one blood. Acts 17:26 states: ***And hath made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth.***

Jefferson Davis's position of Slavery

Jefferson Davis Farewell Speech: January 21 1861

“... It has been a conviction of pressing necessity, it has been a belief that we are to be deprived in the Union of the rights which our fathers bequeathed to us, which has brought Mississippi into her present decision. She has heard proclaimed the theory that all men are created free and equal, and this made the basis of an attack upon her social institutions; and the sacred Declaration of Independence has been invoked to maintain the position of the equality of the races. That Declaration of Independence is to be construed by the circumstances and purposes for which it was made. The communities were declaring their independence; the people of those communities were asserting that no man was born--to use the language of Mr. Jefferson--booted and spurred to ride over the rest of mankind; that men were created equal--meaning the men of the political community; that there was no divine right to rule; that no man inherited the right to govern; that there were no classes by which power and place descended to families, but that all stations were equally within the grasp of each member of the body-politic. These were the great principles they announced; these were the purposes for which they made their declaration; these were the ends to which their enunciation was directed. They have no reference to the slave; else, how happened it that among the items of arraignment made against George III was that he endeavored to do just what the North has been endeavoring of late to do--to stir up insurrection among our slaves? *Had the Declaration announced that the negroes were free and equal, how was the Prince to be arraigned for stirring up insurrection among them? And how was this to be enumerated among the high crimes which caused the colonies to sever their connection with the mother country? When our Constitution was formed, the same idea was rendered more palpable, for there we find provision made for that very class of persons as property; they were not put upon the footing of equality with white men--not even upon that of paupers and convicts; but, so far as representation was concerned, were discriminated against as a lower caste, only to be represented in the numerical proportion of three fifths.*”

He, along with Stephens, believed that Negroes were an inferior race and would never be equal with whites. If Thomas Jefferson believed that all men were created equal-which he did, Davis like Stephens would have disagreed with most of the Founding Fathers. Slavery was not going away, it was getting worse. It is interesting to note that Stephens believed that the Founding Fathers were wrong and Davis believed that Jefferson was not referring that all men were created equal just the white man.

States that left the Union because of Slavery

There are many that believe that slavery was not the main reason why the states seceded. The following are actual quotes from the states themselves on why they left.

South Carolina Secession Document

South Carolina became the first state to do so. In its secession document, South Carolina boldly proclaimed to the world why it left the Union. Note its repeated emphasis on preserving slavery:

[A]n increasing hostility on the part of the non-slaveholding states to the institution of slavery has led to a disregard of their obligations. . . . [T]hey have denounced as sinful the institution of slavery. . . . They have encouraged and assisted thousands of our slaves to leave their homes [through the Underground Railroad]; and those who remain have been incited by emissaries, books, and pictures to servile insurrection. . . . 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 [Abraham Lincoln] 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 "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 slaveholding states will no longer have the power of self-government, or self-protection, and the federal government will have become their enemy . . .

I can not imagine or wonder how South Carolina or any other state could justify the institution of slavery. I wonder how they would have felt if they were treated the same as the slaves for one year. I bet they would have solved the slavery problem much quicker than 70 years.

Texas Secession Document

.... She was received as a commonwealth holding, maintaining and protecting the institution known as negro slavery-- the servitude of the African to the white race within her limits-- a relation that had existed from the first settlement of her wilderness by the white race, and which her people intended should exist in all future time. ... In all the non-slave-holding States, in violation of that good faith and comity which should exist between entirely distinct nations, the people have formed themselves into a great sectional party, now strong enough in numbers to control the affairs of each of those States, based upon an unnatural feeling of hostility to these Southern States and their beneficent and patriarchal system of African slavery, proclaiming the debasing doctrine of equality of all men, irrespective of race or color a doctrine at war with nature, in opposition to the experience of mankind, and in violation of the plainest revelations of Divine Law. They demand the abolition of negro slavery throughout the confederacy, the recognition of political equality between the white and negro races, and avow their determination to press on their crusade against us, so long as a negro slave remains in these States. We hold as undeniable truths that the governments of the various States, and of the confederacy itself, were established exclusively by the white race, for themselves and their posterity; that the African race had no agency in their establishment; that they were rightfully held and regarded as an inferior and dependent race, and in that condition only could their existence in this country be rendered beneficial or tolerable. That in this free government all white men are and of right ought to be entitled to equal civil and political rights; that the servitude of the African race, as existing in these States, is mutually beneficial to both bond and free, and is abundantly authorized and justified by the experience of mankind, and the revealed will of the Almighty Creator, as recognized by all Christian nations;

Understand that the overwhelming majority of confederates that held to these principals were Democrats.

Georgia Secession Document

The people of Georgia having dissolved their political connection with the Government of the United States of America, present to their confederates and the world the causes which have led to the separation.

For the last ten years we have had numerous and serious causes of complaint against our non-slave-holding confederate States with reference to the subject of African slavery.

The prohibition of slavery in the Territories, hostility to it everywhere, the equality of the black and white races, disregard of all constitutional guarantees in its favor, were boldly proclaimed by its leaders (the Republican Party) and applauded by its followers.

With these principles on their banners and these utterances on their lips the majority of the people of the North demand that we shall receive them as our rulers. The prohibition of slavery in the Territories is the cardinal principle of this organization.

Alabama's Secession

Speech of E. S. Dargan, in the Convention of Alabama, Jan. 11, 1861 member of the Alabama State Senate and Mayor of Mobile in the early 1840's, U.S. Representative in 1845-47

I wish, Mr. President, to express the feelings with which I vote for the secession of Alabama from the Government of the United States; and to state, in a few words, the reasons that impel me to this act. I feel impelled, Mr. President, to vote for this Ordinance by an overruling necessity. Years ago I was convinced that the Southern States would be compelled either to separate from the North, by dissolving the Federal Government, or they would be compelled to abolish the institution of African Slavery. This, in my judgment, was the only alternative; and I foresaw that the South would be compelled, at some day, to make her selection. The day is now come, and Alabama must make her selection, either to secede from the Union, and assume the position of a sovereign, independent State, or she must submit to a system of policy on the part of the Federal Government that, in a short time, will compel her to abolish African Slavery... Mr. President, if pecuniary loss alone were involved in the abolition of slavery, I should hesitate long before I would give the vote I now intend to give. If the destruction of slavery entailed on us poverty alone, I could bear it, for I have seen poverty and felt its sting. But poverty, Mr. President, would be one of the least of the evils that would befall us from the abolition of African slavery. There are now in the slaveholding States over four millions of slaves; dissolve the relation of master and slave, and what, I ask, would become of that race? To remove them from amongst us is impossible. History gives us no account of the exodus of such a number of persons. We neither have a place to which to remove them, nor the means of such removal. They therefore must remain with us; and if the relation of master and slave be dissolved, and our slaves turned loose amongst us without restraint, they would either be destroyed by our own hands-- the hands to which they look, and look with confidence, for protection-- or we ourselves would become demoralized and degraded. The former result would take place, and we ourselves would become the executioners of our own slaves.

The above speech is consistent to the rest of the other southern states, that their main reason for secession was the right to have slavery.

Alabama's secession document also blamed the 1860 Republican victory as a reason for its secession, condemning. . .

. . . the election of Abraham Lincoln and Hannibal Hamlin to the offices of president and vice-president of the United States of America by a sectional party [the Republicans], avowedly hostile to the domestic institutions [slavery] and to the peace and security of the people of the State of Alabama

Mississippi's Secession

On January 9, 1861, Mississippi became the second state to secede. In its secession document, it set forth the reasons it left the Union:

Our position is thoroughly identified with the institution of slavery - the greatest material interest of the world. . . . A blow at slavery is a blow at commerce and civilization. That blow has been long aimed at the institution and was at the point of reaching its consummation. There was no choice left us but submission to the mandates of abolition, or a dissolution of the Union, whose principles had been subverted to work out our ruin. That we do not overstate the dangers to our institution [slavery], a reference to a few facts will sufficiently prove. The hostility to this institution commenced before the adoption of the Constitution and was manifested in the well-known Ordinance of 1787. ⁱ . . . It has grown until it denies the right of property in slaves and refuses protection to that right on the high seas [i.e., banning the slave trade], in the territories, and wherever the government of the United States had jurisdiction. It refuses the admission of new slave states into the Union and seeks to extinguish it [slavery] by confining it within its present limits, denying the power of expansion. . . . It advocates Negro equality, socially and politically. . . . It has made combinations and formed associations to carry out its schemes of emancipation in the states and wherever else slavery exists. . . . We must either submit to degradation and to the loss of property [i.e., slaves] worth four billions of money, or we must secede from the Union framed by our fathers to secure this as well as every other species of property.

Florida's Secession

On January 10, 1861, Florida listed its primary reason for leaving the Union:

All hope of preserving the Union upon terms consistent with the safety and honor of the Slaveholding States has been finally dissipated by the recent indications of the strength of the anti-slavery sentiment in the Free States.

Louisiana's Secession

On January 26, 1861, Louisiana became the sixth state to secede. Only days later, Texas was scheduled to hold its secession convention. In order to urge Texas to secede, Louisiana sent Commissioner George Williamson to speak to the Texas convention, where Williamson told the convention:

Louisiana looks to the formation of a Southern Confederacy to preserve the blessings of African slavery. . . . As her [Texas'] neighbor and sister state, she [Louisiana] desires the hearty co-operation of Texas in the formation of a Southern Confederacy. . . . Louisiana and Texas have the same language, laws, and institutions. . . . and they are both so deeply interested in African slavery that it may be said to be absolutely necessary to their existence and is the keystone to the arch of their prosperity. . . . The people of Louisiana would consider it a most fatal blow to African slavery if Texas either did not secede or, having seceded, should not join her destinies to theirs in a Southern Confederacy. . . . As a separate republic, Louisiana remembers too well the whisperings of European diplomacy for the abolition of slavery in the times of annexation not to be apprehensive of bolder demonstrations from the same quarter and the North in this country. ⁱⁱ The people of the slaveholding states are bound together by the same necessity and determination to preserve African slavery. The isolation of any one of them from the others would make her a theater for abolition emissaries from the North and from Europe. Her existence would be one of constant peril to herself and of imminent danger to other neighboring slave-holding communities. . . . and taking it as the basis of our new government we hope to form a slave-holding confederacy. . . .

The Dred Scott Case

Dred Scott was a slave who sued unsuccessfully for his freedom in the famous *Dred Scott v. Sandford* case of 1856. His case was based on the fact that he and his wife Harriet were slaves, but had lived in states and territories where slavery was illegal, including Illinois and parts of the Louisiana Purchase. The court ruled seven to two against Scott, finding that he held no property and therefore was not entitled to file suit in a federal court.

Chief Justice Roger B. Taney delivered the majority opinion. It consisted of the following points:

- Any person descended from black Africans, whether slave or free, is not a citizen of the United States, according to the U.S. Constitution. *This ruling alone destroyed the very purpose that our Founding Fathers intended concerning Negroes as they were called at the time.*
- The Ordinance of 1787 could not confer freedom or citizenship within the Northwest Territory to Black people.
- The provisions of the Act of 1820, known as the Missouri Compromise, were voided as a legislative act because the act exceeded the powers of Congress, insofar as it attempted to exclude slavery and impart freedom and citizenship to black people in the northern part of the Louisiana cession.

In effect, the court ruled that slaves had no claim to freedom. They were property and not citizens; they could not bring suit in federal court; and because slaves were private property, the federal government could not revoke a white slave owner's right to own a slave based on where he lived, thus nullifying the essence of the Missouri Compromise. Chief Justice Taney, speaking for the majority, also ruled that Scott was a slave, an object of private property, and therefore subject to the Fifth Amendment prohibition against taking property from its owner "without due process." The foundation of the case was based on the assumption that the Declaration of Independence only applied to whites in the phrase "*all men are created equal*". This decision was applauded by the south; Taney hoped it would end the battle between the North and South. The decision only caused tension to rise even more. What was our Founding Fathers view on Slavery?

The Founding Fathers and their view on Slavery

The overwhelming majority of early Americans and most of America's leaders did not own slaves. Some did own slaves, which were often inherited (like George Washington at age eleven), but many of these people set them free after independence. Most Founders believed that slavery was wrong and that it should be abolished. William Livingston, signer of the Constitution and Governor of New Jersey, wrote to an anti-slavery society in New York. John Jay, the first Chief Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court and President of the Continental Congress, was President of this society.

I would most ardently wish to become a member of it [the anti-slavery society] and . . . I can safely promise them that neither my tongue, nor my pen, nor purse shall be wanting to promote the abolition of what to me appears so inconsistent with humanity and Christianity. . . . May the great and the equal Father of the human race, who has expressly declared His abhorrence of oppression, and that He is no respecter of persons, succeed a design so laudably calculated to undo the heavy burdens, to let the oppressed go free, and to break every yoke.

Most of the men who gave us the Declaration and the Constitution wanted to see slavery abolished. For example:

George Washington wrote in a letter to Robert Morris: *I can only say that there is not a man living who wishes more sincerely than I do to see a plan adopted for the abolition of it.*

Charles Carroll, Signer of Declaration from Maryland, wrote:

Why keep alive the question of slavery? It is admitted by all to be a great evil.

Benjamin Rush, Signer from Pennsylvania, stated:

Domestic slavery is repugnant to the principles of Christianity. . . . It is rebellion against the authority of a common Father. It is a practical denial of the extent and efficacy of the death of a common Savior. It is an usurpation of the prerogative of the great Sovereign of the universe who has solemnly claimed an exclusive property in the souls of men.

Father of American education, and contributor to the ideas in the Constitution, Noah Webster wrote:

Justice and humanity require it [the end of slavery] — Christianity commands it. Let every benevolent . . . pray for the glorious period when the last slave who fights for freedom shall be restored to the possession of that inestimable right.

Quotes from John Adams reveal his strong anti-slavery views:

Every measure of prudence, therefore, ought to be assumed for the eventual total extirpation of slavery from the United States. . . . I have, through my whole life, held the practice of slavery in . . . abhorrence.

My opinion against it [slavery] has always been known. . . . [N]ever in my life did I own a slave.

When Benjamin Franklin served as President of the Pennsylvania Society of Promoting the Abolition of Slavery he declared: ***“Slavery is . . . an atrocious debasement of human nature.”***

Thomas Jefferson's original draft of the Declaration included a strong denunciation of slavery, declaring the king's perpetuation of the slave trade and his vetoing of colonial anti-slavery measures as one reason the colonists were declaring their independence:

He [King George III] has waged cruel war against human nature itself, violating its most sacred rights of life and liberty in the persons of a distant people who never offended him, captivating and carrying them into slavery in another hemisphere. . . . Determined to keep open a market where MEN should be bought and sold, he has prostituted his negative for suppressing every legislative attempt to prohibit or restrain this execrable commerce.

“Even the sacred scriptures have been quoted to justify (slavery). It is true that the Egyptians held the Israelites in bondage for four hundred years,... but Gentleman cannot forget the consequences that followed: they were delivered by a strong hand and stretched out arm and it ought to be remembered that the almighty power that accomplished their deliverance is the same yesterday, today, and forever.

Elias Boudinot:

The Founders took action against slavery.

The Founders did not just believe slavery was an evil that needed to be abolished, and they did not just speak against it, but they acted on their beliefs. During the Revolutionary War, black slaves who fought won their freedom in every state except South Carolina and Georgia.

Many of the founders started and served in anti-slavery societies. Benjamin Franklin and Benjamin Rush founded the first such society in America in 1774. John Jay was president of a similar society in New York. Other Founding Fathers serving in anti-slavery societies included: William Livingston (Constitution signer), James Madison, Richard Bassett, James Monroe, Bushrod Washington, Charles Carroll, William Few, John Marshall, Richard Stockton, Zephaniah Swift, and many more.

As the Founders worked to free themselves from enslavement to Britain, based upon laws of God and nature, they also spoke against slavery and took steps to stop it. Abolition grew as principled resistance to the tyranny of England grew, since both were based upon the same ideas. This worked itself out on a personal as well as policy level, as seen in the following incident in the life of William Whipple, signer of the Declaration of Independence from New Hampshire. Dwight writes:

When General Whipple set out to join the army, he took with him for his waiting servant, a colored man named Prince, one whom he had imported from Africa many years before. He was a slave whom his master highly valued. As he advanced on his journey, he said to Prince, *“If we should be called into an engagement with the enemy, I expect you will behave like a man of courage, and fight like a brave soldier for your country.”* Prince feelingly replied, *“Sir, I have no inducement to fight, I have no country while I am a slave. If I had my freedom, I would endeavor to defend it to the last drop of my blood.”* This reply of Prince produced the effect on his master's heart which Prince desired. The general declared him free on the spot.

The Founders opposed slavery based upon the principle of the equality of all men. Throughout history many slaves have revolted but it was believed (even by those enslaved) that some people had the right to enslave others. The American slave protests were the first in history based on principles of God-endowed liberty for all. It was not the secularists who spoke out against slavery but the ministers and Christian statesmen.

Before independence, some states had tried to restrict slavery in different ways (Virginia had voted to end the slave trade in 1773), but the English government had not allowed it. Following independence and victory in the war, the rule of the mother country was removed, leaving freedom for each state to deal with the slavery problem. Within about 20 years of the 1783 Treaty of Peace with Britain, the northern states abolished slavery: Pennsylvania and Massachusetts in 1780; Connecticut and Rhode Island in 1784; New Hampshire in 1792; Vermont in 1793; New York in 1799; and New Jersey in 1804.

The Northwest Ordinance (1787, 1789), which governed the admission of new states into the union from the then northwest territories, forbid slavery. Thus, Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, Wisconsin, and Iowa all prohibited slavery. This first federal act dealing with slavery was authored by Rufus King (signer of the Constitution) and signed into law by President George Washington.

Although no Southern state abolished slavery, there was much anti-slavery sentiment. Many anti-slavery societies were started, especially in the upper South. Many Southern states considered proposals abolishing slavery, for example, the Virginia legislature in 1778 and 1796. When none passed, many, like Washington, set their slaves free, making provision for their well being. Following independence, “Virginia changed her laws to make it easier for individuals to emancipate slaves,” though over time the laws became more restrictive in Virginia.

While most states were moving toward freedom for slaves, the deep South (Georgia, South Carolina, North Carolina) was largely pro-slavery. Yet, even so, the Southern courts before 1840 generally took the position that slavery violated the natural rights of blacks. For example, the Mississippi Supreme Court ruled in 1818:

Slavery is condemned by reason and the laws of nature. It exists and can only exist, through municipal regulations, and in matters of doubt,...courts must lean in favorem vitae et libertatis [in favor of life and liberty].

The same court ruled in 1820 that the slave ***“is still a human being, and possesses all those rights, of which he is not deprived by the positive provisions of the law.”***

Free blacks were citizens and voted in most Northern states and Virginia, North Carolina, and South Carolina. In Baltimore prior to 1800, more blacks voted than whites; but in 1801 and 1809, Maryland began to restrict black voting and in 1835 North Carolina prohibited it. Other states made similar restrictions, but a number of Northern states allowed blacks to vote and hold office. In Massachusetts this right was given nearly a decade before the American Revolution and was never taken away, either before or after the Civil War. One of the reasons slavery would never go away was because the south went against the desire of our founding fathers.

Slavery and the Constitution

The issue of slavery was considered at the Constitutional Convention. Though most delegates were opposed to slavery, they compromised on the issue when the representatives from Georgia and South Carolina threatened to walk out. The delegates realized slavery would continue in these states with or without the union. They saw a strong union of all the colonies was the best means of securing their liberty (which was by no means guaranteed to survive). They did not agree to abolish slavery as some wanted to do, but they did take the forward step of giving the Congress the power to end the slave trade after 20 years. No nation in Europe or elsewhere had agreed to such political action. Even so, many warned of the dangers of allowing this evil to continue. George Mason of Virginia told the delegates:

Every master of slaves is born a petty tyrant. They bring the judgement of heaven upon a country. As nations cannot be rewarded or punished in the next world, they must be in this. By an inevitable chain of causes and effects, Providence punishes national sins by national calamities.

Thomas Jefferson had also written this:

The whole commerce between master and slave is a perpetual exercise of the most boisterous passions, the most unremitting despotism on the one part, and degrading submissions on the other. . . . And with what execration should the statesman be loaded, who permitting one half the citizens thus to trample on the rights of the other. . . . And can the liberties of a nation be thought secure when we have removed their only firm basis, a conviction in the minds of the people that these liberties are of the gift of God? That they are not to be violated but with his wrath? Indeed I tremble for my country when I reflect that God is just: that his justice cannot sleep forever.

Because of the south's refusal to allow slavery to end, many people on both sides of the country believed that God gave a season to release them and when it did not happen, His wrath came upon this nation.

Constitutional Convention Delegate, Luther Martin, stated:

It ought to be considered that national crimes can only be and frequently are punished in this world by national punishments; and that the continuance of the slave-trade, and thus giving it a national sanction and encouragement, ought to be considered as justly exposing us to the displeasure and vengeance of Him who is equally Lord of all and who views with equal eye the poor African slave and his American master.

Some today misinterpret the Constitutional provision of counting the slaves as three-fifths for purposes of representation as pro-slavery or black dehumanization. But it was a political compromise between the north and the south. The three-fifths provision applied only to slaves and not free blacks, who voted and had the same rights as whites and in some southern states this meant even being able to own slaves. While the Southern states wanted to count the slaves in their population to determine the number of congressmen from their states, slavery opponents pushed to keep the Southern states from having more representatives, and hence more power in congress.

The Constitution did provide that runaway slaves would be returned to their owners. We saw previously that returning runaway slaves is contrary to Biblical slave laws, unless these slaves were making restitution for a crime. But the words slave and slavery were carefully avoided. Many of the framers did not want to blemish the Constitution with that shameful term. The initial language of this clause was "legally held to service or labor," but this was deleted when it was objected that *legally* seemed to favor "the idea that slavery was legal in a moral society."

While the Constitution did provide some protection for slavery, this document is not pro-slavery. It embraced the situation of all 13 states at that time, **the Founders leaving most of the power to deal with this social evil in the hands of each state. Most saw that the principles of liberty contained in the Declaration could not support slavery and would eventually overthrow it. This is where Alexander Stephens believed they were wrong: Even though he was but one man, his speech was applauded and was accepted by the south. There is no record I know of that any southerners disagree with it.**

As delegate to the Constitutional Convention, Luther Martin put it like this: ***“Slavery is inconsistent with the genius of republicanism, and has a tendency to destroy those principles on which it is supported, as it lessens the sense of the equal rights of mankind, and habituates us to tyranny and oppression.”***

We have seen that after independence the American Founders actually took steps to end slavery. Some could have done more, but as a whole they probably did more than any group of national leaders up until that time in history to deal with the evil of slavery. They took steps toward liberty for the enslaved and believed that the gradual march of liberty would continue, ultimately resulting in the complete death of slavery. The ideas they infused in the foundational civil documents upon which America was founded — such as Creator endowed rights and the equality of all men before the law — eventually prevailed and slavery was abolished. But not without great difficulty because the generations that followed failed to carry out the gradual abolition of slavery in America.

Slavery and the Confederate Constitution

On March 11, 1861, the constitution of the Confederate States of America was adopted. Given the strong support of the individual confederate states for slavery, it is not surprising that the Confederate constitution contained a number of clauses not only protecting but also making it illegal to end slavery. For example:

ARTICLE I, Section 9, (4) No bill of attainder, ex post facto law, or law denying or impairing the right of property in Negro slaves shall be passed.

ARTICLE IV, Section 2, (1) The citizens of each state . . . shall have the right of transit and sojourn in any state of this Confederacy, with their slaves and other property; and the right of property in said slaves shall not be thereby impaired.

ARTICLE IV, Section 2, (3) No slave or other person held to service or labor in any state or territory of the Confederate States under the laws thereof, escaping or lawfully carried into another, shall . . . be discharged from such service or labor but shall be delivered up on claim of the party to whom such slave belongs.

If slavery was not an issue, then why was its preservation so aggressively safeguarded throughout the Confederate constitution?

Black Voting before and after the Civil War

Acknowledgment that blacks voted long before the 1965 Voting Rights Act was provided in the infamous 1856 Dred Scott decision in which a Democratic-controlled US Supreme Court observed that blacks ***“had no rights which a white man was bound to respect; and that the Negro might justly and lawfully be reduced to slavery for his benefit.”*** Non-Democrat Justice Benjamin R. Curtis, one of only two on the Court who dissented in that opinion, provided a lengthy documentary history to show that many blacks in America had often exercised the rights of citizens – that many at the time of the American Revolution “possessed the franchise of voters on equal terms with other citizens.”

State constitutions protecting voting rights for blacks included those of

Delaware (1776)

Maryland (1776)

New Hampshire (1784)

New York (1777)

Constitution signer Rufus King declared that in New York, *“a citizen of color was entitled to all the privileges of a citizen. . . . [and] entitled to vote.”*

Pennsylvania also extended such rights in her 1776 constitution.

Massachusetts in her 1780 constitution in fact, nearly a century later in 1874, US Rep. Robert Brown Elliott (a black Republican from SC) queried: “*When did Massachusetts sully her proud record by placing on her statute-book any law which admitted to the ballot the white man and shut out the black man? She has never done it; she will not do it.*”

As a result of these provisions, early American towns such as Baltimore had more blacks than whites voting in elections; and when the proposed US Constitution was placed before citizens in 1787 and 1788, it was ratified by both black and white voters in a number of States.

This is not to imply that all blacks were allowed to vote; free blacks could vote (except in South Carolina) but slaves were not permitted to vote in any State. Yet in many States this was not an issue, for many worked to end slavery during and after the American Revolution. Although Great Britain had prohibited the abolition of slavery in the Colonies before the Revolution, as independent States they were free to end slavery – as occurred in Pennsylvania, Massachusetts, Connecticut, Rhode Island, Vermont, New Hampshire, and New York. Additionally, blacks in many early States not only had the right to vote but also the right to hold office.

Congressional Actions

In the early years of the Republic, the federal Congress also moved toward ending slavery and thus toward achieving voting rights for all blacks, not just free blacks. For example, in 1789 Congress banned slavery in any federally held territory; in 1794 the exportation of slaves from any State was banned; and in 1808, the importation of slaves into any State was also banned. In fact, more progress was made to end slavery and achieve civil rights for blacks in America at that time than was made in any other nation in the world. This is a known fact that the author of “The Real Lincoln” chose not to put in his book!

In 1820, however, following the death of most of the Founding Fathers, a new generation of leaders in Congress halted and reversed this early progress through acts such as the Missouri Compromise, which permitted the admission of new slave-holding States. This policy was loudly lamented and strenuously opposed by the few Founders remaining alive.

- **Elias Boudinot** – a president of Congress during the Revolution – warned that this new direction by Congress would bring “an end to the happiness of the United States.”
- **John Adams** feared that lifting the slavery prohibition would destroy America
- **Thomas Jefferson** was appalled at the proposal, declaring, “*In the gloomiest moment of the Revolutionary War, I never had any apprehensions equal to what I feel from this source.*”

Congress also enacted the Kansas-Nebraska Act, allowing slavery into what is now Colorado, Wyoming, Montana, Idaho, North Dakota, South Dakota, Kansas, and Nebraska.

This new anti-civil rights attitude in Congress was also reflected in many of the Southern and Mid-Atlantic States. For example, in 1835 North Carolina reversed its policies and limited voting to whites only, as also occurred in Maryland in 1809.

Political Parties

The Democratic Party had become the dominant political party in America in the 1820s, and in May 1854, in response to the strong pro-slavery positions of the Democrats, several anti-slavery Members of Congress formed an anti-slavery party – the Republican Party. It was founded upon the principles of equality originally set forth in the governing documents of the Republic. In an 1865 publication documenting the history of black voting rights, Philadelphia attorney John Hancock confirmed that the Declaration of Independence set forth “equal rights to all. It contains not a word nor a clause regarding color. Nor is there any provision of the kind to be found in the Constitution of the United States.”

The original Republican platform in 1856 had only nine planks – six of which were dedicated to ending slavery and securing equal rights for African-Americans. The Democratic platform of that year took an opposite position and defended slavery, even warning that “all efforts of the abolitionists . . . are calculated to lead to the most alarming and dangerous consequences and . . . diminish the happiness of the people and endanger the stability and permanency of the Union.” The next Democratic platform (1860) endorsed both the

Fugitive Slave Law and the Dred Scott decision; Democrats even distributed copies of the Dred Scott ruling to justify their anti-black positions.

Reaction to the 13th & 14th Amendments of the Democrats of the South

When Abraham Lincoln was elected the first Republican President in 1861 along with the first ever Republican Congress, southern pro-slavery Democrats saw the handwriting on the wall. They left the Union and took their States with them, forming a brand new nation: the Confederate States of America, and their followers became known as Rebels. During the War, Lincoln implemented the first anti-slavery measures since the early Republic: in 1862, he abolished slavery in Washington, DC; in 1863, he issued the Emancipation Proclamation, ordering slaves to be freed in southern States that had not already done so; in 1864, he signed several early civil rights bills. After the war ended in 1865, the Republican Congress passed the 13th Amendment abolishing slavery and the 14th Amendment providing full civil rights for all blacks, thus fulfilling the original promise of the Declaration of Independence.

Most southern states ignored these new amendments. Congress therefore insisted that the southern states ratify and implement these amendments before they could be readmitted into the United States.

Until their readmission, the civil rights of the Rebels in the South – including their right to vote in elections – were suspended. The Constitution authorizes that certain civil rights may be suspended “in cases of rebellion” or when “the public safety may require it” (Art. I, Sec. 9, cl. 2). In fact, because the Rebels had taken up arms against their own nation – an act of treason according to the Constitution (“Treason against the United States shall consist only in levying war against them . . .” Art. III, Sec. 3, cl. 1), they could have been executed (Art. III, Sec. 3, cl. 2). Instead, amnesty was granted to the Rebels if they took an oath of fidelity to the United States, which most eventually did. Regrettably, after their readmission, and after Democrats regained the State legislatures from Republicans, those States worked aggressively to circumvent the 14th Amendment in violation of the pledge they had taken.

Since the Rebels, who had almost exclusively been Democrats, were not allowed to vote in the early parts of Reconstruction, Republicans became the political majority in the South. Since nearly every African-American was a Republican and could now vote, most southern legislatures – at least for a few years – became Republican and included many black legislators. In Texas, 42 blacks were elected to the State Legislature, 50 to the South Carolina Legislature, 127 to Louisiana’s, 99 to Alabama’s, etc. – all as Republicans. These Republican legislatures moved quickly to protect voting rights for blacks, prohibit segregation, and establish public education, and open public transportation, state police, juries, and other institutions to blacks. **(It is noteworthy that the blacks serving both in the federal and state legislatures during that time forgivingly voted for amnesty for the Rebels.)**

During the time when most southern Democrats had not yet signed the oath of fidelity to the United States and therefore could not vote, they still found ways to intimidate and keep blacks from voting. For example, in 1865-1866, the Ku Klux Klan was formed by Democrats to overthrow Republicans and pave the way for Democrats to regain control. The Democrats attacked the State Republican Convention in Louisiana in 1866, killing 40 blacks, 20 whites, and wounding 150 others. In addition to the use of force, southern Democrats also relied on absurd technicalities to limit blacks. In Georgia, 28 black legislators were elected as Republicans, but Democratic officials decided that even though blacks had the right to vote in Georgia, they did not have the right to hold office; the 28 black members were therefore expelled.

Because of such blatant attempts to nullify the guarantees of the 14th Amendment, the Republican Congress passed the 15th Amendment to give explicit voting rights to African-Americans. Significantly, not one of the 56 Democrats serving in Congress at that time voted for the 15th Amendment.

Democratic Efforts to Limit Voting Rights for Blacks

During Reconstruction (1865-1877), Republicans passed four federal civil rights bills to protect the rights of African-Americans, the fourth being passed in 1875. It was nearly a century before the next civil rights bill was passed, because in 1876 Democrats regained partial control of Congress and successfully blocked further progress. As Democrats regained control of the legislatures in southern States, they began to repeal state civil rights protections and to abrogate existing federal civil rights laws. As African-American US

Rep. John Roy Lynch (MS) noted, “*The opposition to civil rights in the South is confined almost exclusively to States under democratic control . . .*”

Devious and cunning methods were required to circumvent the explicit voting protections of the 14th and 15th Amendments, and southern Democrats implemented nearly a dozen separate devices to prevent blacks from voting, including:

- Poll taxes
- Literacy tests
- “Grandfather” clauses
- Suppressive election procedures
- Black codes and enforced segregation
- Bizarre gerrymandering
- White-only primaries
- Physical intimidation and violence
- Restrictive eligibility requirements
- Rewriting of State constitutions

Some say that the Democratic party used to be a good party. My ancestors were strong democrats, but their fruit shows since their beginnings that they have sought to destroy the freedoms that our Founding Fathers died for. Note: This is the same party that in over 100 years took away the following:

- Taking away hope of a people who were of a different color (Democratic controlled Supreme Court *The Dred Scott case*)
- Took away the right to vote and be a representative to their people even when provision was made for them.
- Took out Prayer from our schools (a democratic controlled Supreme Court) and was supported by a Democratic President
- Took out Bible reading from our schools
- Took out Creation from our schools
- Took out the Ten Commandments
- Trying to take “Under God” from our pledge
- Tying to take out “In God we Trust” from our money
- Wants to outlaw home education.

The Real Abraham Lincoln

When it comes to Abraham Lincoln, I have to admit that he was always my favorite President. Last year I met people who I respect and care for who hold different opinions about him and some who see him as a great tyrant. Myself, as a researcher, I was challenged by their statements and this paper is a result of that meeting. Even though I have a love for this subject, I have to die to what I had held for this president and follow the truth where it would lead.

I started reading books against Lincoln and as time went I was actually getting sick of what I was reading and seeing quotes that were starting to destroy the image I had of him. I was confused about this. I had to take a break from it and get into God’s word and seek Him for a discerning spirit on this subject. One verse that stood out to me was ***Luke 9:23, “ And he said to them all, If any man will come after me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross daily, and follow me.”***

One day I went back to the quotes that plagued me and started checking their resources and it was then that I discovered misquotes or no references or the quote was not complete and changed the meaning of the text. I realized that these books were nothing more than propaganda to promote a small group of people, who are out of balance. They had cleverly left out important facts to their followers and then encouraged them not to read anything contrary to their words and if they did find information that is contrary then it was wrong.

One author in particular who wrote the most devastating account of Lincoln, I believe to be a person who I sensed is not a Christian or one who does not practice it in his writings, but a person who is bitter and therefore can not look at this subject correctly. I have since found numerous errors in his book and one which was held by others who contributed to the removing the influence of God out of our country. One of the most important errors of those who condemn Lincoln is taking what he said and not properly putting it in its chronological order. This was one of the most confusing areas I came upon while I was researching. Without this; one can easily come to the conclusion of Lincoln's hypocrisy.

In my walk with the Lord Jesus Christ, I have had to take things that I have held to for years and had to discard them because they were untrue, so I truly have no problem doing the same with this subject. The conclusions I have come to are what I held before, that he was clearly a man who with the Hand of Providence was able to hold this great nation together through the most difficult time in American history.

Even his critics have admitted that if it was purposed that the United States was to stay together, he was truly in the best sense a unique person. I, for one, am not one for making up heroes, but this man in my humble opinion was one of the greatest presidents this nation ever produced during one of the most critical times in American History. Lincoln was not a perfect person, but neither were the rest of them. I hope those which this paper was written for and others will re-evaluate him like I did on this subject and clearly with an open mind to scripture and His discerning spirit find this man innocent.

The Right of Secession

The right of revolution is referred to in the Declaration of Independence when it says, "***Whenever any form of government becomes destructive of these ends [the security of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness], the people have a right to alter or abolish it, and to institute new government.***" When Jefferson wrote this the king had released them, so they were not revolting against their God given authority, but protecting their lands. That is what has been referred to ever since as the right of revolution. It's the right to resist intolerable oppression. It's the right to prevent anyone from being reduced under absolute despotism, which is what the Declaration of Independence says. The Declaration gives a long catalog of the abuses, of usurpations of power practiced by the King and Parliament of Great Britain, which justified the colonies in their rebellion. The colonists did not, at this point, claim any privileges under the law of Great Britain. They were breaking from the law of Great Britain. They were appealing instead to the laws of nature and of nature's God. It was under those laws that they had the right to resist oppression.

Now, there were many reasons why the South did not appeal to the right of revolution. One reason was that there were no abuses that they had been subject to, comparable to the ones enumerated in the Declaration of Independence. Lincoln, in his inaugural address, said that there was not a single constitutional right which anybody could point to, to say that that had been violated. They were exercising this right as something that was to their pleasure, for their own purposes, but that had nothing to do with the Constitution, and yet they were claiming it as a Constitutional right to withdraw from the Union.

In the area of secession, not everyone believed that states had the right to leave if they wanted to. For example:

The letter that George Washington wrote transmitting the new Constitution to the Congress on September 17, 1787, "***It is obviously impracticable in the federal government of these states to secure all rights of independent sovereignty to each, and yet provide for the interest and safety of all.***"

When it comes to violating the Constitution, during the 1860 presidential election 10 southern states did not allow Lincoln to be put on the ballot and he still won the election. This was truly an act of God. When we think about who was violating the constitution (Amendment 12) concerning elections, understand that the south was guilty as charged. Over 100,000 men from the south left to join the Union, so they probably would have voted for Lincoln. This is not denied by Thomas Dilorenzo (author of "The Real Lincoln). ***If a minority, losing an election can break up the government rather than accept the results of the election, free government is impossible.***

Important thought: In the book “The Real Lincoln” the author attacks Lincoln for violating the Constitution, but fails to talk about the South and how they failed to allow freedom of speech and voting rights to their people to make their own choice. When their man didn’t win, they, acting like spoiled children said we don’t want to play by the rules anymore. **If people can break up the government rather than accept the results of a fairly conducted election, then the only alternatives are anarchy or tyranny. What is to prevent anyone of the states seceding from any future union?**

Once the ballots had been decided, the only recourse must be through future elections in which the minority can try to become the majority; but there can be no right to reject the results of an election conducted under the rules of the Constitution. Our Founding Fathers set up a government with checks and balances and knew by past history that good government could become corrupt. It would start with good men who wanted good government, but there would be some that would be off in their thinking about government, being influenced by corrupt men or profit. The next generation would be so concerned about their own concerns that instead of ridding themselves of an evil (slavery) that the founders knew eventually had to go, they would take steps to permanently enslave a people because of the color of their skin. It did not matter if they were free, their right to vote would be taken away.

Important note: At the time of the Civil War there were northern states that were slowly increasing slavery, taking away the rights that previous founders had set up for them. The results of the Dred Scott decision if left alone would eventually make free states into slave states and there would be no hope for the enslaved.

If slavery was wrong, southerners admit this today, and the new confederate states had no intention of releasing them, then it would be no surprise that the hand of the Lord would be against them. They would have to lose if the nation was ever to be truly united again.

The Declaration of Independence

There are some in the pro-secession movement that believe that the Declaration of Independence is a classic example of secession with America leaving England. There is just one problem with that and it is that of the 27 issues America had with England that were listed, #23 states “**He has abdicated (to give up or renounce) Government here, by declaring us out of his Protection and waging War against us.** Which in other words is the king kicking us out of being British citizens to an independent group of states, that way he could attack us without it being a civil war. The only problem was that he did not expect to lose.

The Constitution and the Bill of Rights

Does the Constitution prohibit what the south did?

The Tenth Amendment says: ***The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the states, are reserved to the states respectively, or to the people.***

What are some examples that each state has that the federal Government does not?

The states determine the rules for marriages, divorces, driving licenses, voting, state taxes, job and school requirements, rules for police and fire departments.

What powers are not delegated to the States?

According to Article 1 section ten: ***No State shall enter into any Treaty, Alliance, or Confederation; grant Letters of Marque and Reprisal; coin Money; emit Bills of Credit; make any Thing but gold and silver Coin a Tender in Payment of Debts; pass any Bill of Attainder, ex post facto Law, or Law impairing the Obligation of Contracts, or grant any Title of Nobility.*** (The Union cited this section to show that the Confederation was in violation of the Constitution.) Whether you believe in secession or not, this article was violated.

No State shall, without the Consent of the Congress, lay any Imposts or Duties on Imports or Exports, except what may be absolutely necessary for executing it's inspection Laws: and the net Produce of all Duties and Imposts, laid by any State on Imports or Exports, shall be for the Use of the Treasury of the United States; and all such Laws shall be subject to the Revision and Controul of the Congress.

No State shall, without the Consent of Congress, lay any duty of Tonnage, keep Troops, or Ships of War in time of Peace, enter into any Agreement or Compact with another State, or with a foreign Power, or engage in War, unless actually invaded, or in such imminent Danger as will not admit of delay.

James Madison on Secession

Madison, who was considered the Father of the Constitution, had a thorough knowledge of the Old Testament and English tradition, and was able to create, along with others, one if not the greatest constitutions in the world.

In a letter addressed to William Cabell Rives Montpr, March 12, 1833:

Dear Sir,

I have received your very kind letter of the 6th, from Washington, and by the same mail a copy of your late Speech in the Senate, for which I tender my thanks. I have found as I expected, that it takes a very able and enlightening view of its subject. **I wish it may have the effect of reclaiming to the doctrine & language held by all from the birth of the Constitution, & till very lately by themselves, those who now contend that the States have never parted with an Atom of their sovereignty, and consequently that the Constitutional band which holds them together, is a mere league or partnership, without any of the characteristics of sovereignty or nationality.**

It seems strange that it should be necessary to disprove this novel and nullifying doctrine, and stranger still that those who deny it should be denounced as Innovators, heretics & Apostates. Our political system is admitted to be a new Creation — a real nondescript. Its character therefore must be sought within itself, not in precedents, because there are none, not in writers whose comments are guided by precedents. Who can tell at present how Vattel and others of that class, would have qualified (in the Gallic sense of the term) a Compound & peculiar system with such an example of it as ours before them.

What can be more preposterous than to say that the States as united, are in no respect or degree, a Nation, which implies sovereignty, altho' acknowledged to be such by all other Nations & Sovereigns, and maintaining with them, all the international relations, of war & peace, treaties, commerce, &c, and, on the other hand and at the same time, to say that the States separately are compleatly nations & sovereigns, although they can separately neither speak nor harken to any other nation, nor maintain with it any of the international relations whatever and would be disowned as Nations if presenting themselves in that character. The milliners it appears, endeavor to shelter themselves under a distinction between a delegation and a surrender of powers. But if the powers be attributes of sovereignty & nationality & the grant of them be perpetual, as is necessarily implied, where not otherwise expressed, sovereignty & nationality according to the extent of the grant are effectually transferred by it, and a dispute about the name, is but a battle of words. The practical result is not indeed left to argument or inference. The words of the Constitution are explicit that the Constitution & laws of the U. S. shall be supreme over the Constitution & laws of the several States, supreme in their exposition and execution as well as in their authority. Without a supremacy in those respects it would be like a scabbard in the hand of a soldier without a sword in it. The imagination itself is startled at the idea of twenty four independent expounders of a rule that cannot exist, but in a meaning and operation, the same for all. ***The conduct of S. Carolina has called forth not only the question of nullification, but the more formidable one of secession. It is asked whether a State by resuming the sovereign form in which it entered the Union, may not of right withdraw from it at will. As this is a simple question whether a State, more than an individual, has a right to violate its engagements, it would seem that it might be safely left to answer itself. But the countenance given to the claim shows that it cannot be so lightly dismissed. The natural feelings which laudably attach the people composing a State, to its authority and importance, are at present too much excited by the unnatural feelings, with which they have been inspired against their brethren of other States, not to expose them, to the danger of being misled into erroneous views of the nature of the***

Union and the interest they have in it. One thing at least seems to be too clear to be questioned, that while a State remains within the Union it cannot withdraw its citizens from the operation of the Constitution & laws of the Union. In the event of an actual secession without the Consent of the Co States, (meaning an amendment) the course to be pursued by these involves questions painful in the discussion of them. God grant that the menacing appearances, which obtruded it may not be followed by positive occurrences requiring the more painful task of deciding them?

Lessons before the Civil War

Georgia Platform

With the nation facing the potential threat of disunion over the passage of the Compromise of 1850, Georgia, in a special state convention, adopted a proclamation called the Georgia Platform. The act was instrumental in averting a national crisis. Slavery had been at the core of sectional tensions between the North and South. New territorial gains, westward expansion, and the hardening of regional attitudes toward the spread of slavery provoked a potential crisis of the Union, which in many ways portended the tragic events of the 1860s. In 1850, however, compromise and conciliation remained viable alternatives to secession and war. There were many southerners in the decades before the Civil War who preferred disunion to any concessions on slavery for the sake of the Union. These radicals, often known as fire-eaters, called on the South to reject the Compromise of 1850 as an assault on the constitutional right of slavery. As in the nullification crisis of 1832, South Carolina led the protest.

Immediate secessionists were numerous throughout Georgia, Alabama, and Mississippi. Georgia was best prepared to respond to events, having established a provision for a special convention to deliberate alternatives; the convention, held in Milledgeville, would be a testament to the skill and moderation of a handful of Georgia statesmen. Howell Cobb, Alexander H. Stephens, and Robert Toombs represented Georgia in Congress and wielded a great deal of political influence within the state. Their roles in these events not only aided the passage of the Compromise of 1850 in Washington but also ensured the defeat of the radical secessionists in Georgia. The culmination of their efforts was the Georgia Platform.

The November elections for the special convention to be held in December 1850 demonstrated an overwhelming support for the pro-Union position in Georgia. Of the 264 delegates to the convention, 240 were Unionists. In a five-day session the convention drafted an official response to the tensions threatening the Union. Only 19 delegates voted against the Georgia Platform. The genius of the document lay in its balance of Southern rights and a devotion to the Union.

Voice of warning from the South

Not all southerners believed in secession:

Southerner Judge Garnett Andrews warned the south that peaceable secession was nonsense. *Secession was in reality revolution, and revolution would produce war.* One editor in Alabama even made clear how war would occur: *The chief executive was charged by the constitution to execute the laws of the land, and as secession necessarily broke the laws of the Union, secessionist actions inevitably would force the president to stop the lawbreaking. When the president attempted to arrest secessionists, an armed conflict between states would come.* (Resource: Georgia Journal and Messenger Oct, 2 1850 & Independent Monitor May 1, 1851) This was nearly 10 years before Lincoln would fulfill the Judges warning. Lincoln was only doing what he believed the Constitution was telling him which was supported even by those in the south years before it happened.

Many others such as Henry W. Miller from North Carolina warned that the ideal of Secession by convention was *“in my humble judgment, repugnant to the Constitution, if established, will lead to the overthrow of our Republican system.*

When the southern states seceded from the Union, nearly 100,000 people left their homes and their roots to stay with what they believed to be true.

Problems within the Confederacy

How quick are pro confederates to point out the problems and violations that Union had, but don't say one word concerning problems they had.

1. The most serious question was the constitutionality of the conscription acts (April/September 1862, and February 1864). Jefferson Davis justified the legislation on the basis of the constitutional clause giving Congress the power to raise and support armies. But Brown and Stephens argued that the Confederate government could raise troops only by making requisitions upon the states, which alone, they said, had the constitutional power to impose a draft. Stephens declared: "The citizen of the State owes no allegiance to the Confederate States Government... and can owe no military service to it except as required by his own State." Brown protested to Davis that conscription was a "bold and dangerous usurpation by Congress of the reserved rights of the States."
2. The question of constitutionality could not be referred to a Confederate supreme court, for there was none. In 1861, the Provisional Congress provided for such a court, with the power of judicial review, but the permanent Congress established only a system of lower tribunals. When Congress considered adding a supreme court in 1863, opponents objected to the potential subordination of the state supreme courts. These consequently were left to go on deciding the constitutionality of both state and Confederate laws.
3. Despite the pro-Confederate decisions of state courts, conflicts between the Confederate government and the state governments persisted. Texas objected to giving up control of state troops, as did Alabama, Mississippi, and all the Gulf states except Florida. A Florida judge, however, issued an injunction against Confederate officers who were ordered to take up some of the track of the Florida Railroad--and who disregarded the injunction.

More serious obstruction came from North Carolina, where Governor Vance took pains to "preserve the rights and honor of the State." He said it was "mortifying" to see North Carolinians "commanded by strangers"--that is, by men from other states--and he demanded that their officers be North Carolinians. Operating a state-owned blockade runner, *Advance*, he objected to the Confederacy's claim to half of the cargo space. He warehoused uniforms, shoes, and blankets for the exclusive use of North Carolina troops at a time when Robert E. Lee's army in Virginia was suffering from the want of such supplies.

Historians have differed about the importance of state rights as a cause of Confederate defeat. One writer has gone so far as to suggest that the following words should be engraved on the Confederacy's tombstone: "Died of State Rights." Others minimize its effects, pointing out that it was a symbol of more fundamental grievances, as indeed it had been throughout American history. Some have even argued that it was an asset rather than a liability to the Confederate cause, since, they say, it served as a safety valve for possibly disruptive discontent.

Conclusion on State's Rights

Today, the spirit of the institution of marriage consisting of a man and a woman is supported by the constitution, but not spelled out directly and so I would not hesitate for a minute for an amendment clearly indicating this. Just like marriage, state's right is not clearly defined and what the states should have done was instituted an amendment on secession. According to several pro-confederacy groups they would have had no problem getting enough states to support this action.

Timeline of the events leading to the Civil War

1776 – The Declaration of Independence – Not only declared our freedom from England but set the record of two things that:

1. Men were endowed by their Creator with certain rights that cannot be taken away
2. All men were created equal

This set the foundation of the hope of Thomas Jefferson and others that would lead to the abolition of slaves. This concept would be challenged and rejected by the leaders of the Confederate States of America.

1793 Fugitive Slave Law - were statutes passed by the United States Congress in 1793 and 1850 to provide for the return of slaves who escaped from one state into another or into a public territory. The measure soon met with strong opposition in the northern states and Personal Liberty Laws were passed to hamper officials in the execution of the law.

The demand from the South for more effective federal legislation was voiced in the second Fugitive Slave Law, as part of the Compromise of 1850. Special commissioners were to have concurrent jurisdiction with the U.S. circuit and district courts and the inferior courts of territories in enforcing the law; fugitives could not testify in their own behalf; no trial by jury was provided. Many of our Founding Fathers were against the original law stating that the law violated Biblical principals. For example:

Thou shalt not deliver unto his master the servant which is escaped from his master unto thee: He shall dwell with thee, even among you, in that place which he shall choose in one of thy gates, where it liketh him best: thou shalt not oppress him.
Deuteronomy 23:15-16

Kidnapping and enforced slavery are forbidden and punishable by death according to scripture. *And he that stealeth a man, and selleth him, or if he be found in his hand, he shall surely be put to death.*
Exodus 21:16

1817 – The American Colonization Society

Founded as a result of Southern efforts for emancipation, established the independent nation of Liberia, Africa, for freed African-American Slaves. By 1860, the society aided in the transportation of 1200 slaves to Liberia.

1819 Tallmadge Amendment

A bill proposed on 13 February by Rep. James Tallmadge of New York to amend Missouri enabling legislation by forbidding the further introduction of slavery into Missouri and declaring that all children born of slave parents after the admission of the state should be free upon reaching the age of twenty-five. The bill provoked heated debate in Congress and nationwide agitation, marking the beginning of sectional controversy over the expansion of slavery. The slave section was convinced of the necessity of maintaining equal representation in the Senate. The House adopted the amendment but the Senate rejected it. The Missouri Compromise (1820) settled the issue. The bill passed by a narrow margin, but failed in the Senate. This was proof that the South had no plans of ever getting rid of slavery.

1820 – The Missouri Compromise –

An agreement passed in 1820 between the pro-slavery and anti-slavery factions in the United States Congress, involving primarily the regulation of slavery in the western territories. It prohibited slavery in the former Louisiana Territory north of the parallel 36°30' north except within the boundaries of the proposed state of Missouri. This was the first of several compromises that showed that the nation was being divided by slavery and would ultimately lead to the Civil War. The Founding Fathers that were still alive like Thomas Jefferson and John Adams saw this act as a turn from the direction in which they fought for and knew it could eventually destroy the Union.

1828 The Tariff of Abominations

Congressional Democrats in a ploy to politically damage the Adams Administration proposed a tariff bill that called for higher rates on imported goods and raw materials. In order to ensure that the tariff would not pass, the Democrats made the rates so high that even Northern Congressman would oppose the bill. Their plan backfired and the South was outraged.

Faced with a reduced market for goods and pressured by British abolitionists, the British reduced their imports of cotton from the United States, which hurt the South. The tariff forced the South to buy manufactured goods from U.S. manufacturers, mainly in the North, at a higher price, while Southern states also faced a reduced income from sales of raw materials.

1830 Southern president Andrew Jackson supports the Union

Andrew Jackson declared that he would preserve the Union over States rights. This smashed the hopes of Democratic Southerners to promote their ideals of Nullification. This would eventually lead to Vice President Calhoun's resignation.

1832 Tariff of 1832

In Washington, an open split on the issue occurred between Jackson and Vice-President Calhoun. On July 14, 1832, after Calhoun had resigned his office, Jackson signed into law the Tariff of 1832 which made some reductions in tariff rates.

1833 South Carolina threatens the ideal of secession concerning Tariff of Abominations, Congress reduces tariff to keep the Union.

On March 12, James Madison, who is referred to as the Father of the Constitution, wrote to a friend concerning Nullification and Secession stating that States do not have the right to leave the Union.

1835 a Gag rule is instituted by Congress to prevent parts of the Deep South from trying to secede from the Union. The Gag rule prohibits talk of ending Slavery.

The Liberty Bell cracks while tolling for the death of Chief Justice John Marshall

1850 The Compromise of 1850

Congress is divided over California being admitted into the Union as a Free State. This would bring imbalance of free versus slave states. The Deep South nearly secedes over the slavery question. Later, compromise allows California to enter as free in exchange for compensation which included a stronger Fugitive Slave act which would allow more freedom for slave owners to recover runaway slaves in Free States.

1854 The Kansas-Nebraska Act

The act was designed by Democratic Senator Stephen A. Douglas of Illinois. The act established that settlers could decide for themselves whether to allow slavery, in the name of "popular sovereignty" or rule of the people. Opponents denounced the law as a concession to the Slave Power of the South. The act and the subsequent civil war in Bleeding Kansas was a major step on the way to the American Civil War. States of the Deep South threaten secession unless the Missouri Compromise was repealed, opening Kansas to slavery.

Oct 16th Lincoln at Peoria concerning Slavery

Slavery is founded in the selfishness of man's nature -- opposition to it is in his love of justice. These principles are an eternal antagonism; and when brought into collision so fiercely, as slavery extension brings them, shocks, and throes, and convulsions must ceaselessly follow. Repeal the Missouri Compromise -- repeal all compromises -- repeal the declaration of independence -- repeal all past history, you still can not repeal human nature. It still will be the abundance of man's heart, that slavery extension is wrong; and out of the abundance of his heart, his mouth will continue to speak.



This 1856 map shows slave states (grey), free states (red), and US territories (green) with Kansas in center (white).

1855 August 24th Abraham Lincoln's Letter to Joshua Speed concerning slavery:

"I am not a Know-Nothing. That is certain. How could I be? How can any one who abhors the oppression of negroes, be in favor of degrading classes of white people? Our progress in degeneracy appears to me to be pretty rapid. As a nation, we began by declaring that "all men are created equal." We now practically read it "all men are created equal, except Negroes." When the Know-Nothings get control, it will read "all men are created equal, except Negroes and foreigners and Catholics." When it comes to this, I shall prefer emigrating to some country where they make no pretense of loving liberty - to Russia, for instance, where despotism can be taken pure and without the base alloy of hypocrisy." The slave-breeders and slave-traders, are a small, odious and detested class, among you; and yet in politics, they dictate the course of all of you, and are as completely your masters, as you are the master of your own negroes.

Note: During the Cold War less than 8% of Russia was actual Communists, but the whole nation was pictured as if that amount represented the whole.

1856 Senator beaten after anti-slavery speech

May 22, Preston Brooks, a congressman from South Carolina with three others, two of which were also from South Carolina, approached Sumner and said, "**Mr. Sumner, I have read your speech twice over carefully. It is a libel on South Carolina, and Mr. Butler, who is a relative of mine.**" As Sumner, who was six feet and four inches tall, began to stand up, Brooks began beating Sumner on the head with a thick gutta-percha cane with a gold head. Sumner was trapped under the heavy desk which was bolted to the floor, but Brooks continued to bash Sumner until he ripped the desk from the floor. By this time, Sumner was blinded by his own blood, and he staggered up the aisle and collapsed, lapsing into unconsciousness. Brooks continued to beat Sumner until he broke his cane, then quietly left the chamber. Several other senators attempted to help Sumner, but were blocked by one of the men with Brooks who was holding a pistol and shouting "**Let them be!**" Sumner was an out spoken senator against slavery and called for the repeal of the Fugitive Slave law, which he said it not only violates the Constitution but Divine Law as well.

1857 Dred Scott Case

Decided March 6: The results of the case would give freedom for slave holders to migrate to Free states and territories. Many Southerners saw this as a way make free states slave states. Northern copperheads were already encouraging laws to divide the North on the issue of slavery and segregation. The court hoped it would end the battle of freeing slaves, but it only caused more problems that lend to the breakup of the Union. The court further stated that parts of the Missouri Compromise creating free territories were unconstitutional because Congress had no authority to abolish slavery in federal territories.

1858 Lincoln's "House Divided" Speech Springfield, Illinois, June 16,

"A house divided against itself cannot stand." I believe this government cannot endure permanently half slave and half free. I do not expect the Union to be dissolved -- I do not expect the house to fall -- but I do expect it will cease to be divided. It will become all one thing, or all the other. Either the opponents of slavery will arrest the further spread of it, and place it where the public mind shall rest in the belief that it is in the course of ultimate extinction; or its advocates will push it forward, till it shall become alike lawful in all the States, old as well as new -- North as well as South.

I will say here, while upon this subject, that I have no purpose, directly or indirectly, to interfere with the institution of slavery in the States where it exists. (Lincoln is correct that he did not have the authority to free them, but we need to understand that he was running for senator, not President and did not expect to go to into a civil war. During the war he believed that through the war powers of the Constitution he had the duty to do so.) I believe I have no lawful right to do so, and I have no inclination to do so. I have no purpose to introduce political and social equality between the white and the black races. There is a physical difference between the two, which, in my judgment, will probably forever forbid their living together upon the footing of perfect equality, and inasmuch as it becomes a necessity that there must be a difference, I, as well as Judge Douglas, am in favor of the race to which I belong having the superior position. I have never said anything to the contrary, but I hold that, notwithstanding all this, there is no reason in the world why the Negro is not entitled to all the natural rights enumerated in the Declaration of Independence, the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. [Loud cheers.] I hold that he is as much entitled to these as the white man. I agree with Judge Douglas he is not my equal in many respects--certainly not in color, perhaps not in moral or intellectual endowment. But in the right to eat the bread, without the leave of anybody else, which his own hand earns, he is my equal and the equal of Judge Douglas, and the equal of every living man.

The underlined is a quote that is usually left out by Lincoln haters, who try to promote Lincoln as a white supremacist

July 10 Lincoln's speech at Chicago, Illinois

I have always hated slavery, I think as much as any Abolitionist. I have been an Old Line Whig. I have always hated it, but I have always been quiet about it until this new era of the introduction of the Nebraska Bill began. I always believed that everybody was against it, and that it was in course of ultimate extinction.

October 7th Lincoln at Galesburg, Illinois

Now I confess myself as belonging to that class in the country who contemplate slavery as a moral, social and political evil...

1859 April 6, Lincoln's letter to Henry Pierce

This is a world of compensations; and he who would be no slave, must consent to have no slave.

September 16th Lincoln in Columbus, Ohio

"Now what is Judge Douglas' Popular Sovereignty? It is, as a principle, no other than that, if one man chooses to make a slave of another man, neither that other man nor anybody else has a right to object."

September 17th Lincoln's speech at Cincinnati, Ohio

I say that we must not interfere with the institution of slavery in the states where it exists, because the constitution forbids it, and the general welfare does not require us to do so.

Here we see Lincoln understandably not wanting to interfere with slavery where it exists. During the Civil War, Lincoln believed under war powers he had the power to free them.

1860 Democratic Party split over slavery

Southern delegates walked out of the Democratic National Convention in Charleston after failing to win support for the federal protection of slavery in the territories, thus clouding the outlook for victory by the Democrats. This event gave Abraham Lincoln an opportunity to be elected President

April 6th Abraham Lincoln wrote to Henry Pierce concerning those who owned slaves:

"This is a world of compensations; and he who would be no slave, must consent to have no slave... Those who deny freedom to others deserve it not for themselves; and, under a just God, can not long retain it."

November 5th South Carolina threatens to secede if Lincoln is elected President

Another reason that secession is not legal is because a state like South Carolina would threaten other states with an election saying if we do not get our man in, we will leave. Instead, they should exercise their constitutional rights and work to bring a man in that would be a president they could support. In the past, they have elected southerners like Andrew Jackson, but not all southerners believed in Secession. If a state could leave when ever, free government can not stand. South Carolina's reason for secession was over slavery.

December 6th Lincoln is elected President

With the Democratic Party split over slavery and ten Southern States refusing to put Lincoln on the ballot (*A violation of the 12th Amendment*), Lincoln still won the election and becomes the 16th President of the United States.

December 3rd President Buchanan's Last State of the Union address

In his final message to Congress, Buchanan said that States have no legal right to secede from the Union, but that the federal government has no legal power to stop them. He further stated that secession is nothing more or less than revolution.

December 17th Lincoln's letter to Thurlow Weed

"...my opinion is that no state can, in any way lawfully, get out of the Union, without the consent of the others; and that it is the duty of the President, and other government functionaries to run the machine as it is."

December 20th -South Carolina secedes from the Union

South Carolina became the first state to secede from the Union listing their reason was over the slavery issue. Throughout the last forty years, South Carolina was the leading state in fights over slavery. This is because the slave population was more than those who were free. South Carolina was also one of the states represented during the writing of the Constitution that threaten to leave if they tried to outlaw slavery.

1861 – 1865 the American Civil War

1861 More Southern states secede from the Union

January 4th President Buchanan calls for the Nation to Pray

Because of South Carolina's leaving the Union, Buchanan called for the nation to set aside this day for humiliation and prayer asking *"In this , the hour of our calamity and peril, to whom shall we resort ... but to God of our fathers?"*

Jan. 9th Mississippi secedes from the Union

Listing in reason for leaving, Slavery was the main reason

Jan. 10th Florida secedes from the Union

Slavery being one of the main causes

Jan. 11th Alabama secedes from the Union

Slavery was the cause

Jan. 19th Georgia secedes from the Union

Slavery was the cause

Jan. 26th Louisiana Secedes from the Union

Slavery was the cause

Feb. 1st Texas secedes From the Union

Slavery was the cause

Feb. 9th Davis becomes President of the Confederate States

Jefferson Davis, a Democratic U.S. Senator from Mississippi, was elected president of the new Confederate States of America, and Alexander Stephens, a Democratic U.S. Representative from Georgia, as their new vice-president.

March 4th Lincoln's Inaugural Address

"I therefore consider that in view of the Constitution and the laws, the Union is unbroken; and to the extent of my ability I shall take care, as the Constitution itself expressly enjoins upon me, that the laws of the Union be faithfully executed in all the States."

March 11th the Constitution of the Confederacy was adopted

The document was very much like the U.S. Constitution, but with the wording and protection of slavery. The right of secession is not directly mentioned but somewhat implied.

March 16th Sam Houston fights against Secession

Despite Houston's being a slave owner and against abolition, he opposed the secession of Texas from the Union. In 1860, he offered the following prediction: *"Let me tell you what is coming. After the sacrifice of countless millions of treasure and hundreds of thousands of lives you may win Southern independence, but I doubt it.* The North is determined to preserve this Union.

Despite Houston's wishes, Texas seceded from the United States on February 1, 1861, and joined the Confederate States of America on March 2, 1861. This act was soon branded illegal by Houston, but the Texas legislature nevertheless upheld the legitimacy of secession. The political forces that brought about Texas's secession also were powerful enough to replace her Unionist governor. Houston chose not to resist, stating that, *"I love Texas too well to bring civil strife and bloodshed upon her. To avert this calamity, I shall make no endeavor to maintain my authority as Chief Executive of this State, except by the peaceful exercise of my functions...."* He was evicted from his office on March 16, 1861, for refusing to take an oath of loyalty to the Confederacy, writing,

"Fellow-Citizens, in the name of your rights and liberties, which I believe have been trampled upon, I refuse to take this oath. In the name of the nationality of Texas, which has been betrayed by the Convention, I refuse to take this oath. In the name of the Constitution of Texas, I refuse to take this oath. In the name of my own conscience and manhood, which this Convention would degrade by dragging me before it, to pander to the malice of my enemies....I refuse to take this oath."

He was replaced by Lieutenant Governor Edward Clark. To avoid more bloodshed in Texas, Houston turned down U.S. Col. Frederick W. Lander's offer from President Abraham Lincoln of 50,000 troops to prevent Texas's secession, stating in his response, *"Allow me to most respectfully decline any such assistance of the United States Government."*

March 21st Alexander Stephens Cornerstone Speech

Savannah, Georgia. In it he reaffirmed that *"African Slavery ... was the immediate cause of the late rupture and present revolution."*

April 12th Firing of Ft. Sumter

Jefferson Davis was warned by one of his cabinet members not to fire because this could eventually blow back in their face.

April 17th Virginia secedes from the Union

Thomas "Stonewall" Jackson and Robert E. Lee were both against secession and slavery and would have sided with the Union if Virginia had stayed. They believed their first loyalty was to their state. Western Virginia was still loyal to the Union and eventually broke off and became West Virginia.

1862 March 24, 1862 Letter to Horace Greeley

"I am a little uneasy about the abolishment of slavery in this District, not but I would be glad to see it abolished, but as to the time and manner of doing it."

1863 Lincoln concerning the Union and Slavery

August 22: *My paramount object in this struggle is to save the Union, and is not either to save or to destroy slavery. If I could save the Union without freeing any slave I would do it, and if I could save it by freeing all the slaves I would do it; and if I could save it by freeing some and leaving others alone I would also do that. What I do about slavery and the colored race, I do because I believe it helps to save the Union; and what I forbear, I forbear because I do not believe it would help to save the Union. I shall do less whenever I shall believe what I am doing hurts the cause, and I shall do more whenever I shall believe doing more will help the cause."*

This quote of Lincoln's is a favorite for those who are pro-south; the only problem with this is that they only quote the first part instead of the whole section showing the true meaning of his words which was that the first point of business was preserving the Union. The issue of slavery was very strong for southerners

that it seemed to him impossible to free them and keep the Union, but he did say if he could do it he would.

1863 Emancipation Proclamation

Lincoln issued his final Emancipation Proclamation on January 1, 1863. In his letter to Hodges, Lincoln explained his belief that *"If slavery is not wrong, nothing is wrong ... And yet I have never understood that the Presidency conferred upon me an unrestricted right to act officially upon this judgment and feeling ... I claim not to have controlled events, but confess plainly that events have controlled me"*. This only gave freedom to slaves that were in the Confederate States, but it was a start to eventually free them all, including those that were on the union side that still had slaves. This would also encourage nations like England to stay out of their support of the Confederacy.

July 2-4 Battle of Gettysburg

August 26th Lincoln's letter to 1863 Letter to James Conkling

But to be plain, you are dissatisfied with me about the Negro. Quite likely there is a difference of opinion between you and myself upon that subject. I certainly wish that all men could be free, while I suppose you do not.... You dislike the emancipation proclamation; and, perhaps, would have it retracted. You say it is unconstitutional--I think differently. I think the constitution invests its Commander-in-chief, with the law of war, in time of war.

Nov. 19 Lincoln gives the Gettysburg Address and receives Christ as his savior

1864 Lincoln's letter to Albert Hodges

"I am naturally anti-slavery. If slavery is not wrong, nothing is wrong. I can not remember when I did not so think, and feel. And yet I have never understood that the Presidency conferred upon me an unrestricted right to act officially upon this judgment and feeling."

1865 Lincoln's 2nd Inaugural Address

One eighth of the whole population were colored slaves, not distributed generally over the Union, but localized in the Southern part of it. These slaves constituted a peculiar and powerful interest. All knew that this interest was, somehow, the cause of the war.

April 9th General Robert E. Lee surrenders to General Grant

On Sunday, Ulysses S. Grant and Robert E Lee met at Appomattox Court House, Virginia, to discuss terms of surrender. The two men exchanged cordial words, briefly reminisced about their participation in the Mexican War. The following were the terms of surrender:

- Lee's troops were to be paroled
- Officers were allowed to keep their side arms
- All the men of his army who had mules or horses could keep them
- Grant gave 25,000 rations to Lee's troops
- Grant allowed Lee to keep his sword

By the end of May all units of the Confederacy had surrendered

April 14th Lincoln's Assassination

Good Friday -President Abraham Lincoln was assassinated by John Wilkes Booth at Ford's Theatre. President Lincoln dies the next morning.

1865 – 1870 Reconstruction Era

1880 – 1964 By 1880 nearly all the Southern state Democrats had regained their positions of power and even thought blacks were free and had the right to vote, laws were passed which outlawed blacks to hold office. The bitterness of the Civil War was effectively passed on to each generation until the 1970's when they were seen as equals.

Problems with the League of the South

The following has been found on their website:

We of THE LEAGUE OF THE SOUTH are pledged to:

- 1. Advance the interests and independence of the Southern people.**
- 2. Defend the historic Christian faith of the South and return the regulation of religion and morals to the jurisdiction of states and local communities.**
- 3. Educate Southerners (and other Americans of good will) about our history and our civilization.**
- 4. Protect the symbols and heritage of the traditional South.**
- 5. Maintain our link with the great civilizations of Europe, especially that of the Anglo-Celts, from which the South has drawn its inspiration. (Meaning in other words; no Africans, nor Orientals, Asians, just plain whites.)**

The following clips are from the Florida LOS website

...There is no choosing neutrality. You must choose sides, either the South or extinction. And if you walk out that door today saying to yourself, "That fellow's crazy, he's exaggerating, I don't have to choose sides," you will only be lying to yourself, and you will have made a choice. You will have chosen economic & cultural *suicide* for yourself and your family.

"The League of the South seeks

- 1. To create a climate of public opinion conducive to Southern Independence,**
- 2. Making the League the leader of that movement**

Even though the league has made some good points concerning things that need to happen they still have many members that are racist and the league does not challenge them to either change their way of thinking or leave the league. The fact that they encourage their members not to refer to themselves as Americans, but as Southerners is very unpatriotic and only creates more division. I believe that the real problem that America suffers from started when we allowed ungodly men disguised as U. S. Supreme Court Justices to take God out of our public schools in the early 1960's. Ultimately, we are to blame because most Americans, nearly all of the South, was against it and we did nothing. The fact that they tell their members that it's either *the south or extinction* declares to this writer that the league has totally missed the point or there is a hidden agenda. Either way, this group is not one that a committed Christian needs to be a part of.

Behold, I set before you this day a blessing and a curse; A blessing, if ye obey the commandments of the LORD your God, which I command you this day: And a curse, if ye will not obey the commandments of the LORD your God, but turn aside out of the way which I command you this day, to go after other gods, which ye have not known.
Deuteronomy 11:26 - 28

Many of our Founding Fathers considered slavery a curse that if not eliminated would bring a curse upon our land. What the League of the South is preaching is how they can save the South and produce a more perfect union, but if they can save the South why not save our nation? Historically speaking, the only hope that our nation has is a Great Awakening and that can effect a whole nation. The only reason why the original American colonies separated from England is because the king disowned us.

If my people, which are called by my name, shall humble themselves, and pray, and seek my face, and turn from their wicked ways; then will I hear from heaven, and will forgive their sin, and will heal their land
II Chronicles 7:14

Evaluation of pro South Civil War Books

1. The Real Lincoln

- Example: In the book, "The Real Lincoln", the author blames Lincoln for suspending Habeas Corpus during the war, but fails to mention that Jefferson Davis did the very same thing. At the time Lincoln did this, the nation was in rebellion and congress was not in secession. When they returned they supported Lincoln's decision.
- On page 94, the author claims that Thomas Jefferson believed in the strict Separation of Church and State. I noticed that he did not give any references to this because Jefferson never believed it. It was started by liberal judges in the 1940's that slowly turned the hearts of the original intent of our Founding Fathers in knowing the spirit of our country's foundation. This is an example that the author is following to some degree a liberal agenda because it was a liberal Democratically controlled Supreme Court who started that false ideal concerning Jefferson and it led to the removing of biblical principals from our schools as early as 1947! ***A tree will be known by his fruit***
- The following underlined words are found on page 11 in which the author tries to give the impression that Lincoln was a white supremacist, but as usual he only quotes enough to twist the facts. When you read the rest of the speech you will get the rest of the story I will say here, while upon this subject, that I have no purpose, directly or indirectly, to interfere with the institution of slavery in the States where it exists. I believe I have no lawful right to do so, and I have no inclination to do so. I have no purpose to introduce political and social equality between the white and the black races. There is a physical difference between the two, which, in my judgment, will probably forever forbid their living together upon the footing of perfect equality, and inasmuch as it becomes a necessity that there must be a difference, I, as well as Judge Douglas, am in favor of the race to which I belong having the superior position. I have never said anything to the contrary, but I hold that, notwithstanding all this, there is no reason in the world why the Negro is not entitled to all the natural rights enumerated in the Declaration of Independence, the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. [Loud cheers.] I hold that he is as much entitled to these as the white man. I agree with Judge Douglas he is not my equal in many respects—certainly not in color, perhaps not in moral or intellectual endowment. But in the right to eat the bread, without the leave of anybody else, which his own hand earns, he is my equal and the equal of Judge Douglas, and the equal of every living man. [Great applause.]
- DiLorenzo repeatedly asserts that Lincoln did not believe in human equality and shared the widely held prejudices of his time that blacks were inferior. Here is DiLorenzo: "Lincoln even mocked the Jeffersonian dictum enshrined in the Declaration of Independence that all men are created equal. He admitted that it had become "a genuine coin in the political currency of our generation," but added,
"I am sorry to say that I have never seen two men of whom it is true. But I must admit I never saw the Siamese Twins, and therefore will not dogmatically say that no man ever saw a proof of this sage aphorism" So, with the possible exception of Siamese Twins, the idea of equality, according to Lincoln, was a sheer absurdity.
- This is in stark contrast to the seductive words of the Gettysburg Address, eleven years later, in which he purported to rededicate the nation to the notion that all men are created equal. DiLorenzo cites the first joint debate between Lincoln and Stephen Douglas, held in Ottawa, Illinois, in 1858, as the source of the quotation. The language actually comes from Lincoln's eulogy of his longtime friend and colleague Henry Clay, delivered in July 1852. But that is the least of DiLorenzo's problems. He uses this quotation, and a few other excerpted phrases, to "prove" that Lincoln's professed belief in human equality was disingenuous. Here are Lincoln's actual words:

“There are a few, but an increasing number of men, who, for the sake of perpetuating slavery, are beginning to assail and to ridicule the white man's charter of freedom, the declaration "that all men are created equal." So far as I have learned, the first American, of any note, to do or attempt this, was the late John C. Calhoun; and if I mistake not, it soon after found its way into some of the messages of the Governors of South Carolina. We, however, look for, and are not much shocked by, political eccentricities and heresies in South Carolina. But, only last year, I saw with astonishment, what purported to be a letter of a very distinguished and influential clergyman of Virginia, copied, with apparent approbation, into a St. Louis newspaper, containing the following, to me, very extraordinary language:

I am fully aware that there is a text in some Bibles that is not in mine. Professional abolitionists have made more use of it, than of any passage in the Bible. It came, however, as I trace it, from Saint Voltaire, and was baptized by Thomas Jefferson, and since almost universally regarded as canonical authority 'All men are born equal and free.'

This is a genuine coin in the political currency of our generation. I am sorry to say that I have never seen two men of whom it is true. But I must admit I never saw the Siamese Twins, and therefore will not dogmatically say that no man ever saw a proof of this sage aphorism. “

Perhaps even more distorting than the false statements and misrepresentations in the book are the omissions. For a book intended to reveal the "real" Lincoln, it is astounding how little of Lincoln's political universe DiLorenzo discusses or seems to understand. For example:

- DiLorenzo never attempts to explain or account for the natural rights foundation of American constitutional government, and hence the fundamental problem of slavery, as articulated by nearly all the Founding Fathers. He seems oblivious to the central problem with which Lincoln's statesmanship had to struggle: the problem of combining government by the consent of the governed with the protection of the equal rights of all, when a growing number of the governed denied the rights of others.
- Wholly absent is any mention of the Kansas-Nebraska Act, the event that propelled Lincoln back into national politics and signaled a turning point in public opinion regarding slavery: from understanding slavery as an evil to be tolerated out of necessity where it existed in the South, to viewing slavery as a morally neutral institution that should be allowed to spread into the territories.
- DiLorenzo characterizes John C. Calhoun as a great defender of freedom and constitutional government, based solely on Calhoun's later opposition to tariffs and support for secession. But he never so much as hints at Calhoun's supposedly "scientific" theory of racial hierarchy, which would come to drive the secessionists. According to no less an authority than Confederate Vice President Alexander Stephens, "the great truth that the Negro is not equal to the white man," and that "slavery...is his natural and normal condition" was the "cornerstone" of the Confederate constitution. Calhoun and his Southern followers explicitly rejected the idea of individual natural rights because they explicitly rejected the core teaching of the Declaration of Independence, that all men are created equal. (This is the racism Lincoln was countering in his eulogy of Henry Clay.)
- Calhoun divorced the idea of states' rights from natural rights, and invented the doctrine of legal or constitutional "secession" to replace the natural right of revolution as the ground for independence. The South understood that to appeal to the right of revolution, as Jefferson had in the Declaration, was necessarily to appeal to the idea of individual natural rights. Southern leaders balked at such an appeal, because they understood that natural rights flew in the face of their fantastic justifications for slavery. All this is lost on DiLorenzo. (It was also apparently lost on Walter Williams, who wrote the foreword to DiLorenzo's book. It is shameful that Williams, a black libertarian economist and frequent guest host for Rush Limbaugh, would endorse a book that celebrates John C. Calhoun, who more than anyone in American history made the case for the subjugation of blacks by whites.)

- The *Dred Scott* case, which more than any other event divided the Democratic Party and led to Lincoln's election in 1860, is mentioned in precisely two sentences. One incorrectly summarizes the Supreme Court's opinion in the case; the other feebly asserts that Lincoln wanted to talk about *Dred Scott* only as an avenue for championing the nationalization of money. There is no mention of the Democratic Convention in April 1860, from which the seven states of the Deep South walked out (the first real act of secession) because they refused to accept Stephen Douglas as their candidate for president. Douglas was the champion of the "popular sovereignty" doctrine of the Kansas-Nebraska Act, which held that the people of the territories could accept or prohibit slavery as they chose. This was in direct opposition to the Supreme Court's ruling in *Dred Scott*, that a slave owner had a constitutional right to take his slave property into any U.S. territory and that the people of a territory could not violate that right. Standing upon the *Dred Scott* decision, the South demanded federal protection of slave property in the territories, which was nothing less than a demand for the largest expansion of federal government power up to that time in American history. As the historian Don Fehrenbacher (whom DiLorenzo never mentions) has pointed out, the 1860 Democratic Convention in Charleston was the prelude to the "secession winter" of 1860-61: Any Southerner who would not accept Stephen Douglas as the Democratic candidate would never accept Abraham Lincoln as President of the United States.

2. Why The South Was Right

In the book, "**The South was Right**", the authors are both members of Confederate regiments and their great-great granddad was part of the famous Pickett's Charge at Gettysburg. Many of my relatives also favored slavery and fought in the Confederacy, but this is where the truth must reign more than ancestry.

1. The view that there were no traditional Southern Supreme court justices since the War.

Here is the following that I personally researched.

- **Lucius Quintus Cincinnatus Lamar, Slave holder and served in the Confederacy**
- **John Marshall Harlan, slave holder and against Lincoln's proclamation**
- **Edward Douglass White, Jr., served in the Confederacy**
- **Howell Edmunds Jackson, Served in the Confederacy**
- **Horace Harmon Lurton, Served in the Confederacy**

These men served with distinction during the Civil War and some fought with Lee & Jackson.

In less than 15 years after the Civil war most southern states were returning back to the southern Democratic Party that were a part or supported the Confederacy

- **Florida was controlled by Democrats from 1877 – 1967 and only had 4 republicans since.**
- **Georgia held a democrat governor since 1872. The present governor is the first Republican since the war**
- **Alabama controlled by democrats from 1874-1972**

2. Saying that Gandhi was a good guy and a man of peace page 250

This is considered not a big deal to some but when we look into the life of Gandhi, he rejected the ideal that Jesus Christ was the Son of God mainly because his religion forbids it. Therefore according to Scripture he is and has the spirit of anti-christ. Any real committed Christian would never make a statement like that, especially in a book that bears their name. When I ask other Christians in discussion concerning this question, the answer has always been **No way!**

Just recently the author was asked about why that was in the book. In my opinion his answer did not justify why.

Conclusion: These are just a few of the errors that I had found in the previous books mentioned. Why these books are popular with southern people is that an author can take a fact and turn it in such a way to make it sound credible just as they think. Most people do not check out the sources of the books they are reading. I had done the same thing until years ago someone had challenged me on a subject and the source I had. I did not verify the subject and had to retract what I had written. It is very important that when we write on a subject we purpose to be as clear and correct as we can, if we find ourselves being corrected or our work being in error people tend to not listen or read what we have to say. God also gives us a warning to those who teach things that are not true.

Whosoever therefore shall break one of these least commandments, and shall teach men so, he shall be called the least in the kingdom of heaven: but whosoever shall do and teach them, the same shall be called great in the kingdom of heaven. *Matthew*
5:19

How should a Southerner look at their heritage?

I am a sixth generation child of the South, my Great-Great Grandmother was a Hatfield, whose families were involved in guerrilla warfare for the Confederacy during the Civil War. My mother's maiden name is Adams who is descended from Samuel Adams, the Father of the American Revolution, whose cousin John Adams was a strong abolitionist. I have ancestors who had very strong feelings on both sides. So the million dollar question is how does one look to a very sensitive time period such as the Civil War? As already stated earlier, to see anything correctly one must look to God's word.

Israel was the apple of God's eye and at one time was the greatest nation on earth during Solomon's reign, but Solomon, who was given a wiser mind than any other, made some bad decisions concerning how many wives he should have. Traditionally, he was following the example of his father King David who was a man after God's own heart, but they had ignored God's principal of one man, one woman for life. It was not until Jesus came, did he set the record straight when he reminded them. Needless to say, Solomon's fall was due to having too many wives. The same is with slavery, it was wrong, it violated the very plan that God had for man, but because of the money that was made by them and it was the Southern tradition, it got out of hand.

Like Israel, the south had a part of her past that was wrong and it was dealt with and one needs to move on. The evils that some contribute to the North are also found in the South. Those that would call themselves committed Southern Christians need to see this as a dark spot in our past and one that should have humbled the South and opened their eyes concerning slavery and the rights of all men. Through the love of Christ, take down the walls that divide our country, North and South, because our God is so much bigger than the issues that were fought over 150 years ago. Then we will no longer hear the words he/she is a Yankee/Rebel.

If God's people can not put this in it's proper perspective, how can we expect the world to see it?

The Pledge of Allegiance

Recently, I have seen different groups on the Web that are pro-south that are encouraging others to not recite the Pledge of Allegiance. First of all, I am a retired veteran who has honorably served his country and helped defend it so that we can enjoy the freedoms we have to express our ideals and beliefs. Many of these articles that I have read were written by youth who have expressed bitterness, profanity, inexperience and lack of wisdom. Some of the young people I know that are involved are good people that I love and care for, but I believe that the information they have received has been by people who hold the truth in distortion.

Socialist editor and Baptist pastor, Francis Bellamy, wrote the pledge in 1892. He wanted the words to reflect the views of his cousin, Edward Bellamy, author of "Looking Backward" and other socialist utopian novels. It read, "*I pledge allegiance to my flag and the Republic for which it stands; one nation, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.*"

By 1924, the words "*the flag of the United States of America*" was substituted for "my flag." Bellamy was angered and did not support the change. In 1942, the U.S. Government recognized it and adopted it in our schools. Then in 1954, America was experiencing somewhat of a revival and religious leaders lobbied with lawmakers to insert the words "*under God*" into the pledge. President Dwight D. Eisenhower, fearing an atomic war between the U.S. and the Soviet Union, joined the chorus to put God into the pledge. He also felt that the real strength in America was not her being a world power, but in her faith in God. Bellamy was gone, but his granddaughter was angered and reported that he would not have supported this even though he was a supposed minister. Congress did what the president asked and the revised and current pledge now reads: "*I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.*" The reason some southern people today are against saying the pledge is because of the words "*one nation under God, indivisible*"

1. **Under God** taken from Lincoln's Gettysburg Address
2. **One Nation, Indivisible** was in response to the generation at that time that still remembered the losses that were felt from the Civil War and wanted to remind the next generation that we purpose never to be divided again
3. **That it is a form of Idolatry pledging to a piece of cloth.** They only forget that pledging is a form of showing loyalty to one's country which is encouraged by all Christians. The words are not in any way contrary to our Christian faith.

One thing that is certain today is when the Pledge is said most people have forgotten the words meanings. I hope that the following will cause everyone to think about their meanings the next time they say the Pledge.

I

me, an individual, a committee of one.

Pledge

dedicate all of my worldly goods to give without self pity.

Allegiance

my love and my devotion.

To the flag

our standard, Old Glory, a symbol of freedom. Wherever she waves, there's respect because your loyalty has given her a dignity that shouts freedom is everybody's job!

United

that means that we have all come together.

States

individual communities that have united into 50 great states. Fifty individual communities with pride and dignity and purpose; all divided with imaginary boundaries, yet united to a common purpose, and that's love for country.

And to the republic

A state in which sovereign power is invested in representatives chosen by the people to govern. And government is the people and it's from the people to the leaders, not from the leaders to the people.

For which it stands, one nation

One nation, meaning "so blessed by God"

Under God

Recognizing that our protection, freedom and liberties come from Him.

In God do we ultimately put our trust

Indivisible

Incapable of being divided.

With liberty

Which is freedom -- the right of power to live one's own life without threats, fear or some sort of retaliation.

And Justice

The principle or quality of dealing fairly with others.

For all

Which means, as Americans, it's as much your country as it is mine.

In Conclusion

This paper's purpose is to appeal to those who love the Lord, but have listened to men who are out of balance when it comes to our nation's history. Not because they are incapable of truth, but through their actions in reporting it accurately, do I challenge them to a higher calling. The past has shown us many times Godly men who were wrong in certain areas. Only when we can look at an issue of being dead to self and alive in the foundation of God's word can we properly see the truth. I have seen violations of this on both sides of the issues. One thing is certain concerning being out of balance when a person's desire to violate God's word is protected by those who say it is their right.

Whosoever therefore shall break one of these least commandments, and shall teach men so, he shall be called the least in the kingdom of heaven: but whosoever shall do and teach them, the same shall be called great in the kingdom of heaven.

Matthew 5:19
