

I'M SOUTHERN; I'M SAVED AND I'M NOT ASHAMED OF BEING GOD'S MAN. *Is another rebellion brewing?*

This is not about hate or racism. No attempt will be made in this article to turn anyone against Northern people or black people. I have some Northern friends as well as some black friends. Many of these friends will say, "Amen" to everything you are about to read. Those who do not will remain my friends as long as they choose to do so.

As one would expect, I have received some criticism for preaching and writing about the subjects in this article, but I have marked no one as an enemy over this issue. The message you are about to read deal largely with stubborn historical facts that have been conveniently ignored by most modern publishers and educators. This work is written in hopes of offering some balance to the reader, not to turn him against anyone. We are all Americans, and we should be able to dwell together as fellow countrymen.

However, we should also be able to dwell together in truth. Those who *reject* the truth are the culprits, not those who write about it. As the author, I only ask that you read through this paper carefully and prayerfully. You are entitled to your own views and interpretations of history, and you may not agree with mine, but let's both be honest and admit that this is an *historical* issue, not an emotional one. Emotions are fine in their proper place, but they should never substitute the facts. Emotions may rightfully be stirred *because of* the facts, positively or negatively, but they should never cover or overshadow the facts.

I will readily confess that the South had some faults, but will you, dear reader, remain open to the idea that President Lincoln had some faults too? Will you remain open to the possibility that one does not necessarily hate black people just because he displays a Confederate flag? Do you insist on believing that all slaves were mistreated and that they all hated their masters, or will you remain open to other ideas? Are you driven by emotion or by a love for truth? I hope the latter proves to be the case.

Each topic in the forthcoming article has been preached in message form by myself at Victory Bible Baptist Church and is available in print. This article offers a condensed version of each printed message.

The first message I deal with is the issue of the Confederate flag and why no one should be ashamed to display it. Abraham Lincoln is the subject of the second message, and the third message attempts to offer some truth about Southern slavery.

In closing this introduction, allow me to apologize if my style of writing is offensive to you. Every author has his own style, and I, being an old-fashioned and fundamental preacher, have a way of shooting a little straighter than most are accustomed to. If my style offends you, I do apologize. If it's the truth that offends you, I owe you no apology.

When You See a Confederate Flag

"Thou hast given a banner to them that fear thee, that it may be displayed because of the truth. Selah." Psalm 60:4

The word "flag" as we use it today is not found in the Bible. Instead, words like *banner*, *standard*, and *ensign* are used. God supports people having and displaying flags so long as their flags represent good things. Our text says that God has given a banner to those who fear him. It says that this banner, or flag, is to be displayed, and it gives us the reason for displaying it: *because of the truth*.

Because of the truth, it says. That is, a flag should tell a story. The Israelites were commanded by God to display flags for each of their twelve tribes and each of their families during their encampments in Numbers chapters one and two. Throughout the Old Testament flags were used in war, and many prophecies speak of flags being used in future wars (Isa. 5:26, 11:12, 13:2, 31:9, Jer. 4:21, 50:2, etc.) Yet, in over thirty occurrences of flags in the Bible, never once is one said to be a symbol of hate or racism. This isn't to say that one *cannot* represent such, but it is instructive to realize that it never does in God's word.

When one sees the American flag, he isn't offended unless he's a communist or some other anti-American. No true American is ever offended by the sight of Old Glory because we all understand that it represents freedom.

The Confederate flag, however, is a different story altogether. In my studies of history, I have never encountered a flag that has been the subject of more controversy than the Confederate flag. I once read an editorial where a man wrote, "*I can understand the use of Confederate flags during a Civil War re-enactment, and I have been a part of such re-enactments myself. Why, however, does a Southern state need to fly a Confederate flag at the masthead over its state capitol building?*"

I suppose the gentleman's question deserves an answer: IT'S CALLED FREEDOM, MISTER! The man who wrote this is a World War II veteran, yet he can't seem to remember the cause for which he fought! If the Confederate flag cannot legally fly over a state capitol, then the American flag no longer represents freedom.

For every twisted liberal who asks why we should allow Confederate flags to fly over state capitols there are thousands of clear thinking Americans who ask, "*Why not?*" For every Confederate flag that comes down from a state capitol building there are thousands of them appearing on the front lawns, license plates, bumper stickers, caps and t-shirts of true freedom-loving Americans. The liberal establishment will likely provoke another Civil War before they convince all Americans to forsake the Confederate flag.

Now, the word "heritage" is found thirty times in the word of God. People need a heritage, and God is interested in them having one. The word "memorial" is found thirty-two times in the Bible because God is interested in people having memorials to bear witness to certain truths for future generations. In Joshua chapter four, for instance, God commands Joshua to set up twelve stones "for a memorial unto the children of Israel forever" (Josh. 4:7) A child could see those stones hundreds of years in the future and ask of their meaning, and this would provide a perfect opportunity for their parents to better educate them in the nation's history and in the power of their God. There are many such uses of memorials in the Bible, including the use of flags.

One may argue that the Confederate flag is a hate symbol because it is used by some hate groups, but this is a vain argument. The same groups often use American flags and even Christian flags, but that doesn't make those flags hate symbols. A deceived Jehovah's Witness or Mormon may *misuse* the Bible to justify his false teaching, but this doesn't make the Bible a bad book. So, in reality, many people *misuse* the Confederate flag, but their misuse and abuse does not change its true meaning.

If we, as Southerners, are going to say that "heritage isn't hate" and that our flag does not represent racism and hatred, what are we going to tell people that it *does* represent. A football team isn't likely to win a ball game by simply playing defense! An *offensive* game plan must be executed or defeat is certain. So it is with the Confederate flag. Liberal lies have ruled for far too long. If we, as Southerners, do not educate people, especially our children, about the true meaning of the Confederate flag, no one else will, and our grand heritage will fade away. There are a number of things that should come to mind when you see a Confederate flag, and speaking of these things often to others will fill a great need.

The Good Cause for Which It Flew

The average American today believes that the Confederate flag flew in defense of slavery. This is a gross error, for there were many Confederate soldiers who didn't even believe in slavery, including our leading military commander Robert E. Lee.

It is incorrect to say that 300,000 of our Southern ancestors gave their lives in defense of slavery. The average Confederate soldier didn't own any slaves, and he wasn't particularly interested in the slave issue. However, he *was* interested in his freedom, and he knew that this freedom was being threatened by the Yankee invaders. Just as you would fight to defend *your* own land, Johnny Reb fought to defend his. I realize that the issue may not be that simple from the political standpoint, but from the standpoint of the average Southern soldier that is exactly what the war was about. He fought to keep his Southland free of a socialistic takeover headed up by a dictator. If that isn't a good cause, then there are none.

The Brave Men Who Fought

No war can produce more bravery than the wars which involve citizens fighting for their own freedom and independence. Good free people would rather be dead than be brought into bondage to tyranny, so Southerners by the thousands, whites and blacks, freemen and slaves, enlisted and fought for the cause of Southern freedom. (Yes, even slaves fought for the cause of Southern freedom.)

Men who knew of the poor living conditions of Confederate soldiers still went with their fellow Southerners to defend their rights, their families, and their heritage. Just as you would fight for your freedom, they fought for theirs. The Confederate army grew more and more poor as the war progressed, and food rations became very low, but our men kept fighting. Their uniforms were everything but "uniform," coming in numerous styles, colors, and conditions, but their hearts were knit together as one fighting force.

When you see a Confederate flag, remember a former slave by the name of John F. Harris. In 1890, twenty-five years after the war, Mr. Harris was serving as a Mississippi representative in the House of Representatives. During his term, a bill came before the house to erect a monument to the Confederate soldiers of Mississippi. Mr. Harris could have remained silent and coasted along the easy road of "political correctness," but his burning bravery wouldn't allow such cowardice. Here's what he said when he took the floor:

Mr. Speaker! I have risen here in my place to offer a few words on the bill. I have come from a sick bed . . . perhaps it was not prudent for me to come. But, sir, I could not rest quietly in my room without . . . contributing . . . a few remarks of my own. I was sorry to hear the speech of the

young gentleman from Marshall County. I am sorry that any son of a soldier should go on record as opposed to the erection of a monument in honor of the brave dead. And, sir, I am convinced that had he seen what I saw at Seven Pines and in the Seven Days' fighting around Richmond, the battlefield covered with the mangled forms of those who fought for their country and for their country's honor, he would not have made that speech. . . . When the news came that the South had been invaded, those men went forth to fight for what they believed, and they made no requests for monuments . . . But they died, and their virtues should be remembered. Sir, I went with them. I too wore the gray, the same color my master wore. We stayed four long years, and if that war had gone on till now I would have been there yet . . . I want to honor those brave men who died for their convictions. When my mother died I was a boy. Who, Sir, then acted the part of a mother to an orphaned slave boy, but my old missus? Were she living now, or could speak to me from those high realms where are gathered the sainted dead, she would tell me to vote for this bill. And, Sir, I shall vote for it. I want it known to all the world that my voice is given in favor of the bill to erect a monument in honor of the Confederate dead.

In 1862, when Fort Donelson was captured by Union forces, Nathan Bedford Forrest, a Lieutenant Colonel at that time, was told by his Confederate superiors that he and his 15,000 men would have to surrender to the enemy since they were all surrounded and out-numbered. Failure to do so would mean certain death, he was told.

Forrest had other plans. *"I did not come here for the purpose of surrendering my command,"* he replied. Forrest informed his men that he would either lead them out or he would die trying. With that he invited as many as wished to come to *"Follow me."* They followed him, indeed! His entire regiment followed him over a partly flooded and frozen river road all the way to Nashville and out of the Union trap. Forrest fought through the entire war, having been wounded numerous times. He had at least twenty-nine horses shot out from under him, and he personally killed thirty enemy soldiers in one-on-one combat. It is believed that no soldier since the knights of medieval times has performed such a task. When General Lee was asked at Appomattox, *"Who is the best soldier under your command?"* he answered, *"A man I have never seen, sir. His name is Forrest."* When I see a Confederate flag, I don't think of hate or racism. I think of brave men like Forrest who exhibited more courage in any given week than most of us will exhibit in our lifetimes.

Thomas J. Jackson is another one. At the battle of Manassas (First Bull Run), Brigadier General Barnard Bee and his men were being badly weakened, and their morale was dropping quickly. At that moment, Bee looked up, pointed with his sword, and cried, *"There is Jackson standing like a stone wall! Rally behind the Virginians!"* Hence "Stonewall Jackson" earned his name, and he lived up to it until the day he died.

Jackson was once seen sitting on a stump reading a theological book on a battlefield. When warned of the danger that he was in, he stated his belief that God would protect him as long as he was useful, and when he ceased to be useful, he wouldn't be needed anyway. General Lee once confided with a fellow officer that he could have won at Gettysburg if he'd had Jackson. When Stonewall lost his left arm to friendly fire (and died several days later), Lee lamented that Jackson had lost his *left* arm and commented that he (Lee) had lost *his right arm*.

The bravery of men like Forrest and Jackson inspired soldiers and citizens throughout the South. These men brought out the best in people. Whether it be citizens like Emma Sanson, who voluntarily laid her life on the line (and was shot at) to help Forrest find a place to ford Black Creek, or whether it be the

lonely, yet loyal, soldier under Lee's command who stated in his letter home that he would "*charge the gates of hell for that old man*," our Southern heritage is filled with inspiring acts of bravery. Just as II Samuel chapter 23 honors the brave mighty men of King David, we need to honor the many brave Southerners who fought, suffered, and often died for the good cause of freedom between 1861 and 1865. May their memory be forever embellished in the stars of the Confederate flag? If you think that's "hate," you need a new thinker.

The Thirteen Original Colonies

The majority of the "13's" in the Bible have a negative connotation, oftentimes speaking of outright rebellion. In fact, the Bible's very first mention of the word "thirteenth" involves rebellion (Gen. 14:4). Our nation began in 1776 with thirteen colonies that *rebelled* against the oppressive government of England. Consequently, thirteen stars were sewn on our first national flag.

I think it is no mere accident that the Confederate flag bears the exact same number of stars. There is a message in those thirteen stars, a message that says, "*We represent the same thing the original thirteen stars represented. We represent rebellion against corrupt government.*" As a later quote from a Northern newspaper will suggest (in the next message), the Confederate States of America had just as much right to rebel against Lincoln in 1861 as the thirteen original colonies had when rebelling against King George in 1776. The Southern states didn't rebel just because they liked rebellion and war. They rebelled because they believed in freedom, just like Patrick Henry and Thomas Jefferson. So the stars on the Confederate flag represent the same thing as the stars on the original American flag, and *thirteen* stars are on both flags to help us remember.

Courage to Display the Flag

It takes no courage to display an American flag, a state flag, or even a Christian flag. Such flags are seen regularly, and rightly so, but it takes no courage to display them because they aren't controversial. The Confederate flag, however, is a flag of controversy. It is a flag loved by many, hated by more, and misunderstood by most. Because of this controversy, one must have a certain amount of "guts" in order to display the Southern flag. I personally appreciate people who count the cost and make the choice to "let her fly" anyway.

The way I see it, if Hollywood, the liberal news media and our corrupt educational system have the courage to repeatedly feed endless lies to the American people about the Civil War, Lincoln, slavery, and the Southern people, then I ought to have the courage to display a Confederate flag. We have one displayed in our church's auditorium (as well as an American flag and a Tennessee flag), and I personally have a "rebel" license plate on my Jeep and a couple of good Southern bumper stickers. I view it as a way of creating opportunities to speak with people and better educate them about the real meaning of the Confederate flag.

I doubt if the average Confederate flag hater even knows when the Civil War was fought, what year Lincoln was elected, when he was shot or who shot him. The flag hater's brain has been so manipulated by television and magazines that he has become a thoughtless programmed robot. He does only what he has been programmed to do: panic each time a Southern flag enters his vision. His only words of response are *hate*, *prejudice*, and *bigotry*. If you wish to be intimidated by such weak-minded people, suit yourself, but I'll display the Confederate flag with honor and tell its story as often as I can. I refuse to be ashamed of our Southern flag.

The Confederate Flag Should Remind Us of Our Freedom

Yes, freedom. I wouldn't care to live in a land where laws existed which would forbid citizens from displaying the flags of their choice. I am an American, and I believe in real freedom: freedom to do business with whom I wish, freedom to worship where and how I wish, freedom to have as many children as I wish, freedom to home school my children, freedom to work where I wish, freedom to speak what I wish and freedom to display any flag of my choosing.

If I had a neighbor to the left of my home who displayed a German flag on his property because he was of German descent (or for any other reason), I would not be the least bit offended. If I had another neighbor to the right of my home who flew a Papal flag and had a Mary statue on his front lawn, I would not be offended, and I wouldn't waste any segment of my precious time trying to restrict his freedom. This is America, a land of freedom and opportunity. People who spend their lives trying to restrict the lawful freedoms of others are not true Americans, and they should not be paid any respect or reverence. Such people are traitors to the American way of life, and they should be treated as such.

I and one of the men of our church once drove up to a seminar in Illinois, the good ole' "Land of Lincoln." We saw a roadway named after Lincoln, and we also saw the image of Lincoln's head and face on nearly all Illinois license plates. At every stoplight I pulled up, there sat "honest Abe" staring right at me from the rear bumper of an Illinois motorist. Did I rush home quickly and start organizing a protest against the State of Illinois for funding a "hate" symbol? Thanks to Abe Lincoln and his unnecessary war, some 300,000 of my Southern people lost their lives in a four year period. Did I protest to the State of Illinois about their Lincoln license plates? No, I did not. I am an American, and I believe in freedom. Have I organized an effort to have Lincoln's image removed from our pennies and our five dollar bills? No, I believe in freedom.

With all of the controversy surrounding the issue of the Confederate flag, it is truly a blessing from God that we are still allowed to fly it. Among other things, it should remind us of our freedoms.

Lies about Lincoln

"Remove not the ancient landmark, which thy fathers have set." Proverbs 22:28

"My son, fear thou the LORD and the king: and meddle not with them that are given to change."
Proverbs 24:21

The very mention of the name Abraham Lincoln brings two things to the mind of the average American: the saving of the Union and the freeing of the slaves. What usually does not come to one's mind is the fact that Lincoln was a big government socialist who sought a more centralized Federal powerhouse in Washington.

Abe Lincoln was born in Kentucky in 1809, moved to Illinois in 1830, announced an interest in politics in 1832, was elected to the Illinois legislature in 1834, and he began practicing law in 1836. So, prior to becoming President in 1860, Lincoln held his own political views and fought for them.

In order to understand his political views, one must first understand the basic political climate of the first half of the 1800's. Between our nation's independence in 1776 and the Civil War in 1861 there were basically two main political camps. One camp was what we might call the *constitutional* camp, patterned after the views of such great Americans as Thomas Jefferson, James Madison, James Monroe and later Andrew Jackson and John C. Calhoun. This camp was similar to the conservative camp of our day in that it believed in a very limited Federal Government. The opposing political camp, what one could rightfully call the *socialist* camp, was patterned after the views of men like Alexander Hamilton and Henry Clay. This camp believed that Washington should be empowered greatly by involving the Federal Government in the American economy, largely through high protectionist tariffs, a centralized national bank with a common currency and corporate subsidies. In short, the socialist camp believed that Americans couldn't care for themselves, so a big brother government had to be set up and empowered.

In 1832, when announcing his run for the Illinois legislature, Abe Lincoln told everyone which of the two political camps he belonged to:

I presume you all know who I am. I am humble Abraham Lincoln. I have been solicited by many friends to become a candidate for the legislature. My politics are short and sweet, like the old woman's dance. I am in favor of a national bank . . . in favor of the internal improvements system and a high protective tariff.

In plainer words, Lincoln believed in pulling as many tax dollars as possible into Washington and then letting "big brother" Government decide how to spend it.

Now, suppose you are a constitutional conservative and this man is running for President. If he is elected, he and his political camp will shove their socialist agenda down your throat. Suppose you are a Southerner whose state does much foreign trade? Lincoln's "high protective tariff" will harm your state's economy, and "honest Abe" will use the tax revenue to extend his power and expand his agenda for bigger and more centralized Government. Is this the kind of country your forefathers had in mind? Is this the kind of country you want to live in and raise your children in, or would you *possibly* be interested in starting a *new* country?

Now, let's deal with some lies that are commonly taught about Abraham Lincoln. Of the some 16,000 volumes that have supposedly been written about the man, there are three "whoppers" which keep surfacing over and over. We'll tackle them one at a time.

Whopper Number One: "Lincoln was The Great Emancipator"

In the 1970's, the Pittsburgh Steelers were a *great* football team. They had a great coach, a great offense, a great defense and several great players who went to the Pro Bowl numerous times. This great team didn't win just one Super Bowl; they won four Super Bowls in a six-year period. They were great at football because they labored hard to be great at football. The life-long ambition of most of the men on the team was to play professional football and play it well on a great team. By the end of the 1970's, it could be truthfully said that these men had accomplished what they set out to accomplish many years before as high school athletes. Their success was not incidental. It was the good fruit of their many years of hard work. Winning four Super Bowls was an appropriate reward for their labor.

The same could be said of the San Francisco **Forty Niners** of the 1980's, or the Chicago Bulls of the 1990's. Their great accomplishments were consistent with their many years of hard work. That is, they accomplished *the thing that they worked for*, not something different than what they worked for.

Bill Clinton just happened to be President during the stock market boom of the late 1990's, and many have been so naïve as to credit him for the boom. However, no one can seem to put their finger on anything that Clinton did to bring this boom about. In fact, the most significant thing that Clinton ever did to the American economy was done in 1993 when he gave us the largest tax increase in our nation's history! History books may be written so as to cause future Americans to view Bill Clinton as a "great" President, but very few people living today would view him as such. We know too much about the man to make such a mistake.

Abraham Lincoln is unworthy of being called "the great emancipator" simply because he spent very little of his life working to end slavery, and those living in the 1800's knew this very well. True, slavery ended "on his watch," and he was the author of the Emancipation Proclamation, but does this make him "great?" Does taking advantage of a social movement make a man great, especially when the man didn't stand and fight for the movement's cause until he had seen the *political* benefits of doing so?

Lincoln practiced law for twenty-three years, yet never once did he defend a run-a-way slave. Six years before being elected President, on October 16, 1854, Abe Lincoln said,

The whole nation is interested that the best use should be made of the [new] territories. We want them for the homes of free white people.

Would a man destined to be a Great Emancipator make such a statement? On August 21, 1858, only two years before being elected President, Abraham Lincoln made the following remarks in a debate with Senator Stephen Douglas:

I have no purpose to introduce political and social equality between the white and 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 insomuch 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.

Perhaps you were required to memorize Lincoln's Gettysburg Address in school, but was anyone required to memorize the *above* quote? No, because the above quote doesn't fit the god-like image that has been given to Lincoln. It's hard to be recognized as a Great Emancipator with quotes like the above one floating around!

If Lincoln's heart beat so heavily for freeing the slaves, then why didn't he attempt to accomplish this with *peaceful* emancipation like so many other nations had done? In Lincoln's own lifetime there were numerous examples of ending slavery without war (Argentina, 1813; Chile, 1823; Mexico, 1829; Bolivia, 1831; Peru, 1854, and others as well), so why did Lincoln need a war? The answer isn't that hard: one doesn't need a war to end slavery, but one does need a war to force a big centralized government on an independent and free people.

In an 1862 letter to Horace Greely, editor of the *New York Tribune*, Lincoln said,

My paramount objective 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 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.

Mind you, that was in 1862, while Lincoln was serving *as President* and *after* the Civil War had begun. Here, from Lincoln's own words, one can see that the war wasn't fought to end slavery and the man is unworthy of being called "the Great Emancipator."

Whopper Number Two: "Lincoln Was a Good Dictator"

Even the most liberal historians will usually confess that Abe Lincoln was indeed a dictator, but they argue that this was acceptable under the circumstances and that he was a *good* dictator. Clinton Resistor, in his book, *Constitutional Dictatorship*, writes that

Dictatorship played a decisive role in the North's successful effort to maintain the Union by force of arms . . . one man was the government of the United States . . . Lincoln was a great dictator . . .

This is scary stuff, indeed, because it shows that at least some Americans are willing to live under a dictatorship as long as they can call it a *good* one. With enough media spin and cover up, even the likes of Adolph Hitler could be made to look "good." God save us from *any* Dictatorship be it bad or good, but I suppose a good one would be preferred to a bad one by most.

But was Lincoln a good dictator? In the book, *The Real Lincoln*, author Thomas Dilorenzo lists several of the dictatorial acts of President Lincoln. Some are printed below. As you read the following list of Lincoln acts, please ask yourself if a good man would do such things:

Invade the Southern states with 75,000 troops without Congress issuing a Declaration of War, as required by our Constitution

Imprison thousands of Northern people (not POW's) without trial (some estimates claim that as many as 13,000 political prisoners were held by Lincoln)

Arrest newspaper publishers who criticized him

Censor all telegraph communication

Create new states without the consent of the citizens of those states

Order Federal troops to interfere with Northern elections

Deport a Northern member of Congress for criticizing his tax policy

Confiscate private property, including firearms, in violation of the Second amendment

Establish a secret police force for arresting those who were disloyal to his war policies

Arrest members of the clergy who refused to say prayers for him

Place the entire states of Kansas and Kentucky under Martial law

Order the Postmaster General to stop delivery of newspapers which wrote against his war policies

Order 39 Indians to be put to death without having proven their guilt beyond reasonable doubt

Repeatedly allow his armies under such commanders as Sherman and Sheridan to attack civilians by destroying their livestock, their possessions, their homes, and their towns, and often raping their women (hundreds of accounts of rape - Sherman wrote in his memoirs that Lincoln even enjoyed hearing him tell of such attacks)

On November 7, 1861, the Maryland state legislature stated the following regarding Lincoln's dictatorial war:

the war now waged by the Government of the United States upon the people of the Confederate States is unconstitutional in its origin, purposes and conduct; repugnant to civilization and sound policy; subversive of the free principles upon which the Federal Union was founded, and certain to result in the hopeless and bloody overthrow of our existing institutions.

Was Lincoln a good dictator? Only in the eyes of those who choose to ignore the clear facts of history.

Whopper Number Three "Lincoln Saved the Union"

As I've already tried to point out, Lincoln's political views were not those of our founders--certainly not those of Jefferson and Madison--so one would not expect Lincoln to lead the nation after the ideas of our founders. Take the list of abuses given in the previous section, for instance. How many signers of our Declaration of Independence would approve of such conduct by a sitting U.S. President? None, I should think. Well then, "the Union" which existed *before* the Lincoln years must have been very different from the one that existed *after* the Lincoln years, or else dictatorial powers would not have been needed in order to "save" it. French historian and writer, Alexis de Tocqueville, well described America's early union in his work, *Democracy in America*:

The Union was formed by the voluntary agreement of the States; and in uniting together they have not forfeited their nationality, nor have they been reduced to the condition of one and the same people. If one of the states chooses to withdraw from this compact, it would be difficult to disprove its right of doing so, and the Federal Government would have no means of maintaining its claims directly either by force or by right.

Lincoln clearly did not save *this* Union because it is nowhere to be found today. In fact, it was nowhere to be found after Lincoln's war was over. The Union which emerged after the Civil War was a Union of states which had *surrendered* far more power to the Federal Government than ever before. The states before the war had *delegated* (not surrendered) very limited powers to Washington. After the

war, Washington enjoyed more power than ever and Lincoln's un-American agenda was implemented. Lincoln's acts were widely recognized as being un-American and unconstitutional, even by Northerners. Many Northern newspapers condemned Lincoln's acts openly. The *Albany (NY) Atlas and Argus*, Nov. 1, 1860 wrote these words:

We sympathize with and justify the South because their rights have been violated to the extreme.

On November 13, 1860, the *New York Journal of Commerce* claimed that Lincoln and company wanted to

Seek to regulate and control people in other communities

The *Cincinnati Daily Press*, on November 21, 1860, wrote that the Southern states had every right to secede:

We believe that the right of any members of this Confederacy to dissolve its political relations with the others and assume an independent position is absolute.

On December 17, 1860, the *New York Tribune* really spoke out for the South when they wrote these words:

If tyranny and despotism justified the Revolution of 1776, then we do not see why it would not justify the secession of Five Millions of Southerners from the Federal Union in 1861.

Before the Lincoln years, it was generally understood that states reserved the right to secede from the Union if they chose to do so. Our *Declaration of Independence* says that governments receive their powers "from the consent of the governed." The founding document then goes on to say

That whenever any Form of Government becomes destructive to these ends, it is the Right of the People to alter or to abolish it, and to institute new Government.

After taking office, Abraham Lincoln didn't believe the above for a minute. He believed in "saving the Union" in spite of the "Right of the People to alter or to abolish it, and to institute new Government."

Some suggest that the South should have waited for Lincoln to become "destructive" before pulling out of the Union, but his long held political views were clearly destructive to anyone who cherished the America formed by our founders. Lincoln had made it clear that he was going to change America forever. Waiting for him to literally do so would have been like a woman waiting for a rapist to enter her bedroom window before running out the door. The only thing that the Southern states needed in order to know that the time had come to secede was to see Lincoln win the Presidency.

So, did Lincoln save the Union? No, he forever *changed* the Union and set our nation on the course of self-destruction. Andrew Jackson said it best when he said that

Our government is not to be maintained or our Union preserved by invasions of the rights and powers of the several States . . . its true strength consists in leaving individuals and States as much as possible to themselves . . . not in binding the States more closely to the center.

Since the Union *before* the Lincoln years was clearly different from the Union *after* the Lincoln years, the notion that Lincoln “saved” the Union cannot be true. The sovereign rights of the states are gone forever, and centralized power in Washington is here to stay—thanks to Mr. Lincoln, the creator of the *new* Union.

The Truth about Southern Slavery

“And if thy brother that dwelleth by thee be waxen poor, and be sold unto thee; thou shalt not compel him to serve as a bondservant: But as an hired servant, and as a sojourner, he shall be with thee, and shall serve thee unto the year of jubile: And then shall he depart from thee, both he and his children with him, and shall return unto his own family, and unto the possession of his fathers shall he return. For they are my servants, which I brought forth out of the land of Egypt: they shall not be sold as bondmen. Thou shalt not rule over him with rigour; but shalt fear thy God. Both thy bondmen, and thy bondmaids, which thou shalt have, shall be of the heathen that are round about you; of them shall ye buy bondmen and bondmaids. Moreover of the children of the strangers that do sojourn among you, of them shall ye buy, and of their families that are with you, which they begat in your land: and they shall be your possession. And ye shall take them as an inheritance for your children after you, to inherit them for a possession; they shall be your bondmen for ever: but over your brethren the children of Israel, ye shall not rule one over another with rigour.” Leviticus 25:39-46

Before getting into this message, please allow me to make one thing clear. I am a Bible-believing Christian. I’m not just a Christian; I am a *Bible-believing* Christian. That is, I believe every single word and sentence from Genesis 1:1 through Revelation 22:21. It matters not to me if you, your family, your friends, your church or your preacher do not believe all of the Bible. I believe it all. I believe that God is a good God with no unrighteousness in Him. If God’s word says that all have sinned, then all have sinned. If God’s word says that Hell is a place of weeping, wailing and gnashing of teeth, then that’s what Hell is like. If God’s word said that the earth was round when everyone else thought it was flat, then the earth was round when everyone else thought it was flat. God’s word is always right, regardless of how few people agree with it. I apologize to no one for the goodness and accuracy of God’s holy words.

According to our opening text from Leviticus chapter twenty-five, God *approves* of slavery when certain guidelines are followed. This doesn’t mean that He approves of all slavery, but it does mean that He approves of some slavery. The text is quite clear about that. If you’ve never heard or read of a preacher making such a statement, I’m sorry, but you can see the Scripture for yourself.

Another passage dealing with slavery is Deuteronomy 15:12-18:

And if thy brother, an Hebrew man, or an Hebrew woman, be sold unto thee, and serve thee six years; then in the seventh year thou shalt let him go free from thee. And when thou sendest him out free from thee, thou shalt not let him go away empty: Thou shalt furnish him liberally out of thy flock, and out of thy floor, and out of thy winepress: of that wherewith the LORD thy God hath blessed thee thou shalt give unto him. And thou shalt remember that thou wast a bondman in the land of Egypt, and the LORD thy God redeemed thee: therefore I command thee

this thing to day. And it shall be, if he say unto thee, I will not go away from thee; because he loveth thee and thine house, because he is well with thee; Then thou shalt take an aul, and thrust it through his ear unto the door, and he shall be thy servant for ever. And also unto thy maidservant thou shalt do likewise. It shall not seem hard unto thee, when thou sendest him away free from thee; for he hath been worth a double hired servant to thee, in serving thee six years: and the LORD thy God shall bless thee in all that thou doest.

Clearly, slavery is endorsed in the Bible, but with certain guidelines or rules. If one should suggest that this is an Old Testament practice and that the New Testament does not endorse slavery, we only have to turn to I Timothy 6:1-2:

Let as many servants as are under the yoke count their own masters worthy of all honour, that the name of God and his doctrine be not blasphemed. And they that have believing masters, let them not despise them, because they are brethren; but rather do them service, because they are faithful and beloved, partakers of the benefit. These things teach and exhort.

"These things teach and exhort" is obviously one of the most disobeyed commands in all the Bible, for not one Christian out of a thousand would say that God approves of slavery, yet there it is in plain black and white for all to see. If you disagree, your argument is not with Bro. Melton; your argument is with God.

It wasn't until modern times that people practically started having heart attacks every time the word "slavery" pops up. Slavery, in its various forms, has been a part of human history for thousands of years. To think of slavery only in the narrow context of seventeenth century Americas being shallow to say the least. As we've already seen, the Bible addressed the slavery issue long before the Civil War, and there are numerous books that one can read to learn more about the institution of slavery throughout history. The average American's concept of slavery is a few brutal scenes that he saw on the "Roots" television series, which bear very little resemblance to the truth.

According to the Bible, God's infallible words, slavery is not always wrong. There is a right way to have slavery, and, as the Scriptures state, many slaves love their masters and prefer this kind of slavery over being set free: Deut. 15:16.

I am not saying that America was right in starting slavery in the first place. I am saying that slavery *was* brought here, like it or not, so was it all *bad* slavery, or did it sometimes agree with the sort of slavery that we've just read of in the Bible? You can decide for yourself shortly as we quote from some former slaves.

It is commonly stated that slavery began in America when twenty African slaves were purchased from some Dutchmen in the South at Jamestown, Virginia, around the year 1620. What is not commonly stated is the fact that only seventeen years later America would send out her very own slave ship, but this ship would not sail from a Southern port. It sailed from Salem, Massachusetts, a *Northern* state. The slaves at Jamestown in 1620 were not requested by anyone. They were *offered* to be sold, and the offer was accepted. The ship that sailed out in 1637 was sailing from a Northern port for the purpose of purchasing slaves for a profit. Since that time, many slave ships have sailed from Northern ports, and many of them sailed under an American flag. So far as we know, the Confederate flag has never flown over a slave ship.

The first colony in America to legalize slavery was not in the South. It was the Northern colony of Massachusetts. The first state of the Union that attempted to stop the importing of slaves was not a Northern state. It was Virginia.

Slavery was big business in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Due to industry and angry white people who grew tired of losing their jobs to the much cheaper slave labor, slavery did not prove profitable in the North, so the Northern states didn't utilize slave labor as much as the South. However, they certainly did profit from it by trading for slaves in Africa and selling them to the South. So, in reality, *money* was the reason for the Northern states continually increasing slavery in America, and money was their reason for moving it out of the Northern states. The notion that the Yankees ridded themselves of slavery because of moral reasons is just plain false.

Now, about slavery in the South: How bad was it? The Bible does not declare that slavery in and of itself is evil; only that certain *abuses* of slavery are evil. Was racism a major problem in the South, or do we just assume that it was?

The South Was Right, by James and Ronald Kennedy, quotes some interesting words that were written by English abolitionist James Buckingham. This English gentleman visited America in 1842 and then wrote about his observations. Here's what he wrote:

This is only one among the many proofs I had witnessed of the fact, that the prejudice of color is not nearly so strong in the South as in the North. [In the South] it is not at all uncommon to see the black slaves of both sexes shake hands with white people when they meet, and interchange friendly personal inquiries; but at the North I do not remember to have witnessed this once; and neither in Boston, New York, or Philadelphia would white persons generally like to be seen shaking hands and talking familiarly with blacks in the streets.

So, what is all this talk about *Southern* prejudice? If slavery was so horrible in the South, then why would any black person be seen shaking hands and conversing with whites? If slavery had driven the wedge between the races that so many suppose, why didn't Mr. Buckingham make a note of it, especially since he was opposed to slavery to start with? The fact is that if one could leave our present year and go back to personally visit the Southland of the mid 1800's, he would be very surprised to find that most slaves were not resentful toward their white masters because their masters had treated them well. That is, many slave masters practiced *Scriptural* slavery, similar to the kind that we read of in Leviticus 25 and Deuteronomy 15. As a result, many slaves loved their masters and respected them greatly.

The book previously mentioned by the Kennedy brothers contains some actual quotations from former slaves. These quotes were gathered during a Government survey in the 1930's. Read the following words slowly and carefully and then ask yourself, "Did *Roots* really tell me the truth and give me a balanced understanding of slavery?"

Former slave Isaam Morgan:

Any time a slave worked over time or cut mo' wood dan he s'pose to, Massa pay him money for it, 'cause whenever one of us slaves seen somp'n we lak, we did jus lak de white folks does now. Us bought it. Massa never whupped none of his slaves . . . No'm none of our slaves tried to run away. Dey all know'd dey wasm well off . . . dey [Yankees] offered me a hoss iffen I would go nawth wid dem, but I jus couldn't leave de Massa eben dough I did want dat hoss mighty bad.

Former slave Simon Phillips:

People has the wrong idea of slave days. We was treated good. My Massa never laid a hand on me the whole time I was wid him . . . Sometime we loaned the Massa money when he was hard pushed.

Former slave Mary Rice:

Massa Cullen and Mistis Ma'y Jane was de best Massa and Mistis in de worl! Once when I was awful sick, Mistis Ma'y Jane had me brung in de Big House and put me in a room dat sot on de 'other side of de kitchen so she could take kere of me herself cause it was a right fur piece to de quarter and I had to be nussed day and night . . . I was happy all de time in slavery days, but dere ain't much to git happy over now . . .

Former slave Elija Henry Hopkins:

I was fed just like I was one of the [masters] children . . . You see, this discrimination on color wasn't as bad then as it is now. They handled you as a slave, but they didn't discriminate against you on account of color like they do now. In slavery times, a poor white man was worse off than a nigger.

Former slaves Sarah and Tom Douglas:

Slavery times wuz sho good times. We wuz fed an' clothed an' had nothing to worry about . . .

Former slave Jane Georgiana:

De times was better fo' de war . . . I goes to church an sings an prays, and when de good Lord teks me, Ise ready to go, and I specs to see Jesus an' Ole Mistis an Ole Master when I gits to de he'benly land!

Former slave Gus Brown, speaking of his former master:

I know I will see him in heaven, and even though I have to walk ten miles for a piece of bread [in the Great Depression] I can still be happy to think about the good times we had then . . . The Yankees didn't beat us, we wuz starved out! . . . I am a Confederate veteran . . .!

Former slave Cora Gillam, speaking on the North's attempt to "reconstruct" the South after the war:

I'll tell you lady, if the rough element from the north had stayed out of the south the trouble of reconstruction would not have happened . . . they tried to excite the colored against their white friends. The white folk were still kind to them what had been their slaves. They would have helped them get started. I know that. I always say that if the south could have been left to adjust itself both white and colored would have been better off.

When Confederate President Jefferson Davis died, thirteen of his former slaves sent a telegram to his family:

We the old servants and tenants of our beloved master, Honorable Jefferson Davis, have cause to mingle our tears over his death, who was always so kind and thoughtful of our peace and happiness. We extend to you our humble sympathy.

Was Southern slavery all evil? No it wasn't, not according to the people who were there and told their story about it. Yes, there were many cases of abuse, but such cases make up the *exceptions*, not the *normal* slave/master relationships. To claim that all slavery was evil and destructive because of *some* cases of abuse would be like claiming that all families are evil and destructive because of the

fact that some parents neglect and abuse their children. All parents should not be judged in the evil shadow of the abusive ones. The same principle applies to slavery in the South.

Many slaves became Christians because their Christian masters allowed them to attend church services and hear the Gospel. Had they been left in Africa they would likely have died without Christ and gone to Hell forever. Many slaves lived long lives only because their masters gave special care to them when they were sick. Slave women often gave birth to many children because their masters cared enough to see that their health needs were met. There were many good masters who refused to allow their slave families to be divided up, even when doing so meant financial gain for them. Slaves were sometimes "bailed out" of legal troubles by their masters, and many slaves served as their master's close friends and personal bodyguards. Because of this closeness between the masters and the slaves, even after the war was over and the slaves were free, most of them refused to move northward and escape the land of their servitude. The fact that our Southland is still populated by a good portion of black people is a living testimony to the fact that Southern slavery was not at all like we've been taught.

Like it or not, slavery is a part of our Southern history, and we cannot change that, but we can change our attitude about it. We can stop hanging our heads in perpetual shame and start telling people the truth about Scriptural slavery in general and Southern slavery in particular. We can honor God and our Southern heritage by displaying a true balance when dealing with the slavery issue. May God be our Helper?

"A false balance is abomination to the LORD: but a just weight is his delight." Proverbs 11:1
James L Milton