

## A CIVIL WAR ERA SERMON

By: Creighton Lovelace, Pastor of Danielstown Baptist Church and Sgt./Chaplain of 16<sup>th</sup> SC Regiment

Hello! I want to thank you for reading/listening to this sermon today. As a Pastor, North Carolina State Citizen, American Citizen and a Student of Confederate & American History, the notion of Secession has been a volital issue. In the 1860s it was so volitale that soon after the secession of the Southern States a War for Independence was fostered upon them by the US President (or Tyrant) Abraham Lincoln and the US Government. The North cried out that the Union had to be preserved; while the South cried out that the Constitution had to be preserved. When the Confederate States of America collapsed in 1865 and was subsequently occupied, the North congratulated itself for crushing the rebellion and then the Southern States – which the North alleged had never left the Union were placed under Reconstruction so they could be re-admitted.

In this sermon, I am taking the role of a Pastor residing in Rutherford County, NC who is preaching a message to his congregation on Sunday, March 3, 1861. North Carolinians had just voted on Thursday, February 28 47,323 to 46,672 NOT TO CALL FOR A SECESSION CONVENTION. The next day – March 4, 1861 – Abraham Lincoln would become the 16<sup>th</sup> President of the United States of America.....

### THOUGHTS ON SECESSION: A GODLY ENSAMPLE FOR OUR PRESENT DISCONTENTS

1 Corinthians 10:11 Now all these things happened unto them for ensamples: and they are written for our admonition, upon whom the ends of the world are come.

Good morning beloved. I wanted yall to know that Widder Dills and Widder Roach could use any leftover Cabbage or Brussel Sprouts yall can check with the Deacons before you leave.

I come to you at this time with a message of hope, a hope that we will not allow submissionists or the black abolitionists to triumph in our State, this is a message that we ought not to lower our arms in defeat. I come to you this morning to show that – secession - what I and many others hope for is in harmony with the Word of God. Allow me to bring yall up to why we find ourselves in the midst of this soul-searching at this time. So it is, beloved that I cast my eye upon the events that surround us at this hour. I am reminded of the words of Edmund Burke from 1770 when he said in a phamplet: Thoughts on the Cause of the Present Discontents: “...when bad men combine, the good must associate; else they will fall, one by one, an unpitied sacrifice in a contemptible struggle.”

So it is beloved, the good of the South must associate, else we will fall, one by one as an upitied sacrifice in our struggle to preserve our Life, Liberty and Rights. I hear that many of our Se-cessionist leaders are calling for those that would save this State from the clutches of the murdering maurading Abolitionists to meet soon, probably in Goldsborough later this month. Should I hear word on this matter I will dutifully pass it along. But why do we find ourselves talking of se-cession? We must note the Cause of why we find ourselves in the crux of this momentous decision. Most of our Grandfathers served in our War For Independence. Our State had not yet ratified the United States Constitution thus some of our Grandfathers were able to vote for George Washington for his Second Term.

It is from the him, the Father of our Country, the esteemable George Washington, that we have stern warnings, about what could destroy this country and our liberties. Such warnings were told to us in his farewell address: *“I have already intimated to you the danger of parties in the state, with particular reference to the founding of them on geographical discriminations. Let me now take a more comprehensive view, and warn you in the most solemn manner against the baneful*

*effects of the spirit of party, generally. This spirit, unfortunately, is inseparable from our nature, having its root in the strongest passions of the human mind. It exists under different shapes in all governments, more or less stifled, controlled, or repressed; but, in those of the popular form, it is seen in its greatest rankness, and is truly their worst enemy. The alternate domination of one faction over another, sharpened by the spirit of revenge, natural to party dissension, which in different ages and countries has perpetrated the most horrid enormities, is itself a frightful despotism. But this leads at length to a more formal and permanent despotism. The disorders and miseries, which result, gradually incline the minds of men to seek security and repose in the absolute power of an individual; and sooner or later the chief of some prevailing faction, more able or more fortunate than his competitors, turns this disposition to the purposes of his own elevation, on the ruins of Public Liberty.”*

Note well, beloved, that President Washington **admonished** us also to guard against parties based upon geographical boundaries. This sage advice was shunned by the North so much that in 1856 they created an Amalgamated sectional apparatus from the shambles of the Whig Party, the Free Soil party, the Liberty Party, the Anti-Masonic Party, and many of the Mormonites into the Republican Party. It was during that time that Senator Thomas L. Clingman (then our US Representative) spoke in favour of the Secession of North Carolina.

Those Republicans worked feverishly over the next 4 years so that last year - despite our hardest efforts and most fervent prayers – they saw their second Presidential candidate the bumbling country lawyer, Mr. Lincoln, elected as President of the United States on November 6. Yall know that he was elected **solely** on the votes of the North! The South gave him none! As a matter of fact I still fondly recall our own Rutherford county went for Vice-President Breckinridge with 695 votes, followed by 495 votes for Senator Bell, 3 votes going to Senator Stephen Douglas and NONE for that Black Republican Abe Lincoln!

Now as a result of this election, our former sister State South Carolina – called for a secession convention. I heard of a Se-cession meeting to be held on November 12, 1860 in Cleveland County so I attended what became known as the First Secession meeting held in this State. It was an exciting time beloved, for soon thereafter, the Republic of South Carolina was born on December 20! Isn't that something beloved? The territory of these united states ends just 9 miles down the road from us! But God forbid we should remain a border-line community ere long.

Seeing these events happening all around us, our own re-elected Governor, John W. Ellis urged the General Assembly to call for a Se-cession Convention. They voted 37-9 in the Senate and 86-27 in the House on January 29 in this one thousand eight hundred sixty-first year of our Lord to hold a referendum on February 28<sup>th</sup>

I know many of yall men were at the polls, I saw some of yall there. We had hopes that the call would lean FOR the convention, but from what I've heard the Submissionists, the Unionists have won in this vote, but not by much! Contrary to what I seed printed in the Weekly Catawba Journal – they seed the vote for the convention passed! But no. The final tally I seed was that the vote was 47,323 **against** a convention and 46,672 for the convention. **The Submissionists won by 651 votes.** This was a surprise to myownself, as the vote here in Rutherford County and our neighbours to the west in Polk County was 1,332 FOR THE CONVENTION and 431 AGAINST.

Now, in the time leading up to this referendum, many have called myself and others who learn towards our State casting her lot with the Southern Confereacy to be traitors or rebels. The tired argument has been that should this State leave the united States Union then (so said the *North Carolina Standard* of Dec. 1, 1860) the results would be: a loss of constitutional liberty and all that remained would be: discretionary powers; martial law; military rule; oppressive taxation;

civil and servile war; industry languishing; trade obstructed; internal improvements stopped; and the morals of society irreparably compromised.

I have heard these forebodings long enough and I seek to - on this sad eve of the Great State of North Carolina coming under the rule of Mr. Lincoln and his black Republican party - call you to the teaching of the Word of God in relation to the time in which we live and then to pray for the Ruler of the Universe to guide the leaders of this Great State.

I asked you to turn this morning to Saint Paul's First Epistle to the Corinthians – the 10<sup>th</sup> Chapter, and the 11<sup>th</sup> verse. It is there we note that the learned Apostle said “Now all these things happened unto them for ensamples: and they are written for our admonition...” what were “all these things?” Well when we read that he speaks of the Exodus the flight from Egypt and the subsequent wandering in the wilderness for 40 years.” The Apostle stated that “these things happened unto them for ensamples.”

Now recall that an Ensample is not exactly the same thing as an Example. An “example” is an outward sample, while an “ensample” is one that can be known say “inside a group” through specific personal knowledge of the object looked at. Thus those judgments from God that happened to the people who went against His divine will and commandments were to be Ensamples to the REST of the group of something to avoid – lest they succumb to the same wrath of the Almighty.

Then the Apostle says that these things “..are written for our admonition..” now Admonition means wise warnings – either spoken or written – against evil. What did Paul do? He recited some history to WARN the people of God.

We observe the same in the last verses of the sixth chapter and the entirety of the seventh chapter of The Book of the Acts of the Apostles where we find one of the first Deacons of the Church in Jerusalem, Deacon Stephen, who, after being condemned by his brethren, was brought before the council, he then in his stirring sermon appealed to history and brought them to his present hour, whereupon afterwards he became the first martyr of our Faith.

So then we must understand beloved that within the Word of God, it tells us that history can be an excellent teacher of the struggle of Good vs. Evil. Righteousness vs. Lawlessness. Some question what is the Almighty's Thoughts on Se-cession?

We begin in the pages of the Jewish Torah and we find that there was blackness upon the Earth and then in Genesis 1:4 “And God saw the light, that it was good: and God divided the light from the darkness.” So there was a division there between the light and the darkness. They were separated. We understand that is the goal of Se-cession – Separation. Now as we continue through that first Chapter we find that God makes Man – Male and Female created He them. God separated Man from the beasts of the Earth in that Man was made from the dust of the Earth and possesses a Soul and a Spirit whereas the beasts according to Ecclesiastes 3:21 has merely a body and a spirit. It is the Soul that is the divider, the separator betwixt Man and Beast for we are created in the image of God. The Apostle Paul brings forth another separation betwixt Man and Beast as told in the 15<sup>th</sup> Chapter, the 39<sup>th</sup> verse of the First Epistle to the Corinthians, that we possess one kind of flesh, the beasts have another kind of flesh and so forth. So we see that there is a Secession of Man from being part of the animal kingdom, though he was made from dust and has a spirit as the beasts of the earth do.

We come to the Third Chapter of the First Book of Moses Called Genesis and we see that the

Woman who will be named Eve and her husband Adam decide to disobey God and by doing so they became the first Sinners. In this action against the Righteous Holy God, we see that God Himself seceded from fellowship with the sinful couple. There was a sad division the Lord had to place between His Holy character and fallen man. Due to man's sin, God also caused the Secession – separation or removal of not only man from the Garden of Eden or Paradise, but God also caused the secession of the Garden itself in that it disappears after Genesis Chapter 3 only to reappear in the Gospel of Saint Luke as Abraham's Bosom. Christ called it Paradise as He hung upon the Rugged Cross of Calvary. That Paradise is where the Apostle Paul said he went some 14 prior to writing his 2<sup>nd</sup> Epistle to the Corinthians Chapter 12 and Verses 2 and 4. It and the Tree of Life reappears in the final Book of the Holy Bible in the Apocalypse of Saint John the Revelator, showing us that He provided a way to enter into His Paradise!

Now, as we turn page after glorious page of the Word of the Living God we find that God's creation, called man has grown and blossomed. Yet so has sin, insomuch that God decreed in the sixth Chapter of Genesis verse 7 “And the LORD said, I will destroy man whom I have created from the face of the earth; both man, and beast, and the creeping thing, and the fowls of the air; for it repenteth me that I have made them.” But then in the 8<sup>th</sup> verse we read: “But Noah found grace in the eyes of the LORD.” What happened after that? We read in the Seventh Chapter and 1<sup>st</sup> verse “And the LORD said unto Noah, Come thou and all thy house into the ark; for thee have I seen righteous before me in this generation.” Now Noah did not keep this news to himself, he called upon others who would heed the call to leave the unGodly wicked doomed world and enter into the Ark for we are told in the 2<sup>nd</sup> Epistle of Saint Peter, in the 2<sup>nd</sup> Chapter Verse 5 “And spared not the old world, but saved Noah the eighth person, a preacher of righteousness, bringing in the flood upon the world of the ungodly;” God called Noah and his family OUT of the world into the Ark – God then called for Secession. Then Noah his preacher, then preached the same for 120 years. What was that beloved? What did Noah preach? Secession!

We find after the Flood God established the Nations and Races by Genesis Chapter 10. Then Did God not separate the nations at the Tower of Babel in Genesis chapter 11? He certainly did. In fact, the goal of supreme union of all nations was thus attempted at Babel. At that point, it was God, Himself, Who was the sponsor of "State Se-cession!"

Now right after this we find a man named Abram. We will know him better as Abraham. Yes that Abraham who spoke to that rich man in Saint Luke's Gospel Chapter 16. It is this Abraham into whose bosom the Jews and we the Saved by being grafted in are said one day to go unto the Paradise of God. But we are not Hebrew. Why shall we also fly to Abraham's Bosom? It is because the Scriptures teach us in The Epistle to the Romans in the 4<sup>th</sup> Chapter and the 16<sup>th</sup> verse that the father of the faithful is Abraham. He was called out of Ur of the Chaldees, out of that fertility-cult and its depraved culture, with encompassed child sacrifices and fornication as its norm. Thus, Abraham became the father of the faithful through his secession from the perverted lifestyles around him as he chose to obey God Who had instructed him to leave, which guaranteed that the rulers could not attempt to force him to accept any of their abominations.

As Abraham was childless at this point, his nation originally was composed of his servants and his nephew Lot and his servants. Once in Canaan, the herdsmen of Abraham and Lot begin squabbling over pasture and water for their flocks. Abraham acted again as father of the faithful by arranging a peaceable separation between the two, with Lot allowed to pick which lands he will frequent as a free ranger. Abraham, then, allows Lot to secede from under his rule and become his own governor. Abraham does not declare that because God called him, Lot should submit to his will in all things and sacrifice his livestock for the good of Abraham's herds. Abraham does not demand that Lot remain directly under his rule. Abraham acts to prevent violence between the households of men who should be the closest of allies, and Lot's secession is the outcome, with Lot

then personally accountable for any moral failings that come from his decision to pitch his tent toward Sodom.

Thus my beloved, Abraham's life, then, highlights secession as being valid, even required, in two ways: to reject and escape from the rule of the perverted and to prevent violence between men who should be the closest of allies due to familial ties, even if that secession means one party chooses to live in Sodom.

We can go further from there. We follow Abraham's journeys and see the growth of Ishmael who is likewise caused to (with his mother) to secede from the family to go on and become another great nation. We watch Isaac then grow and then Esau and Jacob's birth and we then witness the growth of Jacob's family and the eventual move into Egypt.

We then cross into the Second book of Moses called Exodus. Did God not "separate" Israel from Egypt by a mighty and miraculous deliverance? Did not Pharaoh allow the Hebrew secession? Even the theocracy of Israel under Moses served as a presage for future State autonomy for God divided the nation of Israel into 12 independent tribes. Each tribe had its own individuality, leaders (under Moses, of course) and territories.

Remember, too, when Israel crossed the Jordan River and entered the Promised Land that 2 1/2 tribes (Reuben, Gad, and the half tribe of Manasseh) chose to stay on the east side of Jordan. This was happily allowed by Joshua and the other 9 1/2 tribes.

In fact, the Book of Judges is simply a redundant account of tyrannical powers enslaving God's people and the subsequent rise of deliverers (directed and empowered by God) to separate the nation, thus providing His people with freedom and independence.

Once the children of Israel had become the large nation promised by God, located in a specific land with cities, plowed fields and a standing army, secession would have torn up far too much to be allowed. Plus, they will conclude, God ordained the nation of Israel, and what God ordained is too sacred to be divided. But se-cession is exactly what comes to the kingdom of Israel, with God ordering the king in Jerusalem not to oppose it.

When Solomon, who had apostacized in his old age, died, leaders of most of the tribes – those north of Jerusalem – sent a delegation to Rehoboam, Solomon's son and heir, and requested that the grievous tax burdens be lifted. Rejecting the advice of the council of elders who had served Solomon, Rehoboam sought counsel from his peers, who encouraged him to flaunt his anointed status and his right to rule. Rehoboam's hubris guaranteed se-cession, with 10 of the 12 tribes refusing to accept his tyrannical rule. Rehoboam planned to wage war to force the tribes of Israel to submit to him and to Judah, but God instructs the prophet Shemaiah to order Rehoboam not to fight to force Israel to return to his rule.

As Jeroboam, king of the new Israel, quickly established false worship of the 2 golden calves along with non-Levitical priests, you might think that God would want his Secession stamped out. The reason that is not the case, I submit to you dearly beloved, is found in the story of Abraham and Lot. The cost of preventing the secession would be too great to bear: It would require kin slaughtering kin, which, considering the nature of sin in man, would mean that the victors would be tainted morally, which would guarantee that the fruits of their victory would be rotten, perhaps even poisonous.

So it is that we find these two nations--which shared the same history, heritage, ancestry, language, etc.--engaged in friendly (and sometimes not-so-friendly) commerce and trade, participated in mutually beneficial dialogue and diplomacy, and even sometimes allied themselves in times of war in page after page after page of the Old Testament. We see they also occasionally

became mortal enemies against each other.

But between the two, the Southern Kingdom enjoyed far and away more of the favor of Heaven. It had (for the most part) better leaders, had a more vibrant spiritual life, and was afforded more peace. In fact, the Almighty, through His prophets, often warned Judah against the propensity to become entangled with the idolatrous affairs of the Northern State. In general, the more Judah remained separate from Israel, the more successful it was. Conversely, the more entangled Judah became with Israel, the more dreadful the consequences became.

Judah's secession from Israel not only gave it a more peaceful and productive existence, it extended its liberty by over 100 years. Israel went into Assyrian captivity in 721 B.C., while Judah went into Babylonian captivity in 586 B.C.

It should be obvious to any reasonable person that there is absolutely nothing in Scripture that would preclude states from seceding, separating, or declaring independence from one another. In fact, just the opposite is true. The examples from the Bible should be plentiful enough for any rational person to understand that the God of Heaven has given mankind the individual and collective volition to choose (or reject) our leaders, government!

If neither the house of Abraham nor the ancient kingdom of Israel were too sacred to experience secession, is it not hubris, or worse, to declare as many Yankees do, including President-Elect Lincoln and others of his black Republican party that these United States are indivisible? Please do not misunderstand me beloved, we have no seen bloodshed for we saw the doings of Ol' Buck who will leave the presidency tomorrow, we will see Abraham Lincoln's response to Se-cession shortly no doubt, I fear that he will not agree with our sister States course of action as the Biblical Abraham would.

Thus Se-cession as we've noted in the Bible does not necessarily mean war, but war or no, I say to you beloved that there is no **biblical reason to oppose se-cession**, and while some Yankees say there are no valid biblical reasons to endorse it, I tell you that such an understanding is not rooted in Sound Biblical Theology – God's thoughts then on the topic of Secession we find is that He Himself is None Other Than The Original Author of Secession!

But every time someone such as myself or the late Senator John C. Calhoun or the learned Edmund Ruffin or some other so-called Fire-Eater attempts to encourage our Christian brothers and sisters to resist an unconstitutional or otherwise reprehensible government policy, or even secede from the union, we hear and have heard since the Yankee Christians retort, "What about Romans Chapter 13? We Christians must submit to government. Any government. Read your Bible, and leave me alone." No doubt, some who use this argument are sincere. They are only repeating what they have heard their pastor or some other Unionist say.

Nevertheless, for the benefit of those who are sincere (but obviously misinformed), let's briefly examine if, beloved, if Paul's Epistle to the Romans Chapter 13. verses 1 through 7, now suddenly changes God's policy of Se-cession as evidenced clearly from the pages of the Old Testament.

The Apostle Paul wrote: "Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers. For there is no power but of God: the powers that be are ordained of God. Whosoever therefore resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God: and they that resist shall receive to themselves damnation. For rulers are not a terror to good works, but to the evil. Wilt thou then not be afraid of the power? do that which is good, and thou shalt have praise of the same: For he is the minister of God to thee for good. But if thou do that which is evil, be afraid; for he beareth not the sword in vain: for he is the minister of God, a revenger to execute wrath upon him that doeth evil. Wherefore ye must

needs be subject, not only for wrath, but also for conscience sake. For this cause pay ye tribute also: for they are God's ministers, attending continually upon this very thing. Render therefore to all their dues: tribute to whom tribute is due; custom to whom custom; fear to whom fear; honour to whom honour."

Do our Yankee and Southern Christian Pastors and friends who use these verses to teach that we should not oppose America's political leaders really believe that civil magistrates have unlimited authority to do anything they want without opposition? I honestly doubt whether they truly believe that. It seems worth meriting that many of these seem to have no issue with our Grandfathers' efforts to oppose the Divine Right of the King.

Now let us then imagine dearly beloved, that this new president of the United States, that Black Republican Abraham Lincoln, what if he decides tomorrow to resurrect the old monarchical custom of Jus Primae Noctis (The Law of First Night)? You say Pastor, what is that? It was the old medieval custom when the king claimed the right to sleep with a subject's bride on the first night of their marriage. Would our sincere Christian brethren sheepishly say, "Romans Chapter 13 says we must submit to the government"? I think not. And would any of us respect any man who would submit to such a law? Well unless they espouse the new religion of the Mormonism taught by Brigham Young!

We note there are limits to authority. A father has authority in his home, but does this give him power to abuse his wife and children? Of course not. An employer has authority on the job, but does this give him power to control the private lives of his employees? No. A master has authority over his slaves, but that does not give him authority to brutalize them. A pastor has overseer authority in the church, but does this give him power to tell the brethren how to run their businesses? Of course not. All human authority is limited in nature. No man has unlimited authority over the lives of other men. Thus by the same token, a civil magistrate has authority in civil matters, but his authority is limited and defined.

Again, observe that Romans Chapter 13 clearly limits the authority of civil government by strictly defining its purpose: "For rulers are not a terror to good works, but to the evil . . . For he is the minister of God to thee for good . . . for he is the minister of God, a revenger to execute wrath upon him that doeth evil."

Notice that civil government must not be a "terror to good works." It has no power or authority to terrorize good works or good people. God never gave it that authority. And any government that oversteps that divine boundary has no divine authority or protection. This is a basic principle of Natural Law (and all of America's legal documents--including the U.S. Constitution--are founded upon the God-ordained principles of Natural Law). I will briefly touch upon this in a moment beloved.

For the moment however, the apostle clearly states that civil government is a "minister of God to thee for good." It is a not a minister of God for evil. Civil magistrates have a divine duty to "execute wrath upon him that doeth evil." They have no authority to execute wrath upon him that doeth good. None. And anyone who says they do is lying. So, even in the midst of telling Christians to submit to civil authority, Romans Chapter 13 limits the power and reach of civil authority. Consider then dearly beloved, Did Moses' Parents violate God's principle of submission to authority when they spared the life of their son for 3 months? Did Moses violate God's principle of submission to authority when he killed the Egyptian taskmaster in defense of his fellow Hebrew? Did Elijah violate God's principle of submission to authority when he openly challenged Ahab and Jezebel? Did David violate God's principle of submission to authority when he refused to

surrender to Saul's troops? Did Daniel violate God's principle of submission to authority when he disobeyed the king's command to not pray audibly to God? Did the three Hebrew children violate God's principle of submission to authority when they refused to bow to the image of the state? Did John the Baptist violate God's principle of submission to authority when he publicly scolded King Herod for his infidelity? Did Simon Peter and the other Apostles violate God's principle of submission to authority when they refused to stop preaching on the streets of Jerusalem? Did Paul violate God's principle of submission to authority when he refused to obey those authorities who demanded that he abandon his missionary work? In fact, Paul spent almost as much time in jail as he did out of jail.

We note from such works as Foxe's Book of Martyrs that Christians throughout church history were imprisoned, tortured, or killed by civil authorities of all stripes for refusing to submit to their various laws and prohibitions. Did all of these Christian martyrs violate God's principle of submission to authority?

Plus, Paul makes it clear that our submission to civil authority must be predicated on more than fear of governmental retaliation. Notice, he said, "Wherefore ye must needs be subject, not only for wrath, but also for conscience sake." Meaning, our obedience to civil authority is more than just "because they said so." It is also a matter of conscience. This means we must think and reason for ourselves regarding the justness and rightness of our government's laws. Obedience is not automatic or robotic. It is a result of both rational deliberation and moral approbation.

Therefore, there are times when civil authority may need to be resisted. Either governmental abuse of power or the violation of conscience (or both) could precipitate civil disobedience. So it is that seven States as of this date of March 3rd in the year of our Lord One-thousand-eight hundred and sixty-one, Seven states have reasoned and thought for themselves that the justness and rightness of remaining under the political bonds of the union of these united States of America is no longer beneficial to them or their citizenry, hence they have seceded.

But again, many in the North and some Unionists and Submissionists have clamored that such is unconstitutional that such a move cannot happen.

To show otherwise I submit to you as Stephen and as Paul did a brief review of history: We in the United States of America do not live under a monarchy. We have no king. We however once did before our Forefathers rose up and through their representatives declared from whence our Rights were and are derived. It is from Biblical principles and Natural Law that form the foundation of all of America's founding documents from the Declaration of Independence, the Articles of Confederation and Perpetual Union, the Constitution of the United States of America and the Bill of Rights.

So it was that the Kingdom of Great Britain set forth to plant colonies upon this portion of the world. Settlements were made. One of the first was the fabled Lost Colony which settled on the banks of our State. Another settlement arrived in what is today Virginia and there Jamestowne was planted. Soon the Puritanical Seperatists – who were Secessionists – having failed in their desire to reform the Church of England, they seceded and moved from here to there until they gained passage to what they would call Plymouth and today we know as Massachusetts. Boat by boat, others would arrive and soon Royal Charters would be granted by the English Monarchy and soon 13 Colonies arose upon these shores.

Our first successful secession of those British colonies, originated after the Crown incurred national debt due to the Seven Years' War with France and the costs to control the Native American tribes. The first Lord of the Treasury, George Grenville (1763); introduced three major

reform programs to enact on the colonies: contain American settlers east of the Appalachian Mountains, in order to tax the fur trade, force observance of the Navigation Acts to bring more wealth to Great Britain, and compel the colonists to contribute directly to British military. The main objective of Grenville was to make the colonies more supportive of the British Empire.

British Parliament enacted a wide range of restrictions on colonial trade from 1660-1732; however, in 1733, Parliament passed the Sugar Act, which imposed heavy taxation on sugar, molasses, and rum. This act amounted to 100% on these goods, which gave British West Indian sugar industries a monopoly of the market, raising tension between the colonies and Britain.

The English constitution entailed certain basic rights of Englishmen, and one of those rights was no taxation without representation. In addition, the English Bill of Rights included that these fundamental rights "shall stand, Remain and be the law of this realm forever." This principle was between the Englishman, King, and parliament; "no taxation without representation" did not change from Englishman in England to Englishman in an English colony. The Virginia colonial charter supported this principle in 1606, which pertained that all the King's people living in the colonies "shall have and enjoy all Liberties, Franchises and Immunities . . . as if they had been abiding and born within this our Realm of England."

Moreover, this principle again was affirmed in the British Colonial Naturalization Act in 1740 entailing that persons in the colonies "shall be deemed, adjudged, and taken to be his Majesty's natural born subjects . . . as if they, and every of them, had been or were born within this kingdom." In the situation where the civil government contradicts itself, to obey one law is to disobey the other law, and to obey the other law is to disobey the first law; the Christian is free to do what is right according to God.

So when the civil government requires sin of the Christian, the individual is first to take legal action in protest; however, if this fails, he or she should withdraw from the government and escape. In addition, if escape is not an alternative, force is allowed, if necessary, in defense. On the contrary, when the civil government requires a corporate body to act contrary to God's Law, often, escape is unrealistic; therefore, when protest fails, use of force is the next course of action. If at all possible, the state should act under the protection of the lesser authorities because the lesser authority in office is a minister of God just like the greater authority. The lesser official must impeach or remove from office any greater magistrate who will not act according to the Law of God.

The use of force may sometimes be necessary; however, there must be legitimate grounds in order to use force, and if the grounds are not legitimate, force then becomes unnecessary violence, such as the ungodly and wicked revolutions in France. Augustine asserted that just wars are within a Christian's moral code; however, these wars must be fought under a legitimate authority in order to establish peace and to bring justice.

In this fallen world, beloved times come when physical force sadly, is necessary. This course of action is only appropriate when all other courses have been exhausted; such was the case of our War of Independence. His Majesty King George the 3<sup>rd</sup> ruled then through tyranny which is ruling outside of what God has commanded; moreover, a tyrannical state is immoral. Once Tyranny had been fostered upon the people, our forefathers subjected themselves to the colonial civil government, who deemed that the British Government had broken their covenant with the people by violating the English constitution through taxation without representation and other acts of tyranny. Hence when men like the learned Benjamin Franklin stated: Rebellion to tyrants is obedience to God, there was and there is no contradiction betwixt what they did and Romans 13.

Now, that is not to say that everything our forefathers did was within the realm of the rightness

and righteousness of God and thus had His approval. For example God did not condone the Boston Tea Party or our own Edenton Tea Party as they violated the Law of God by stealing, which is an unlawful way of protest.

Our War of Independence was a defensive just war as our forefathers defended themselves against the real revolutionaries – the British – who attempted to overthrow our legitimate colonial governments. As a matter of fact the British are known to have had a disgust for what they called the Black Robed Regiment whom they said were the instigators of our Cause. This Regiment consisted of the courageous and patriotic clergy during our War for Independence. The robes of course were in reference to the black robes that ministers wore in that day. Those pastors boldly proclaimed the Word of God in everything that applied to life, whether spiritual or temporal, whether related to eternal life with Christ or to topics such as taxation, education, government, military, or any other issue touched in the Bible. These men had no weapon but the sword of the Lord and they preached truth, just as I am striving to give you, my dearly beloved, the Truth today in 1861.

Now having decided upon a course of action, of protest our forefathers sought reprieve and a redress of grievances with His majesty. But when King George III shot down the Olive Branch Petition the Colonists began to see that the Crown was going to force a war, no matter what. Hence, prior to the Declaration of Independence, many colonies impeached their royal governors, which in itself was an act of state sovereignty. They were taking the necessary steps to defend and preserve our Liberties since the government was no longer going to do so. Hence to show what the *causus belli* was, our forefathers drew up a document that stipulated for the world to see, where our Rights were derived from and why we were seceding and why we had to fight for them. So it is well known to many of you beloved, that on July 4, 1776 our Continental Congress issued the Declaration of Independence, which in its first section states:

When in the Course of human events, it becomes necessary for one people to dissolve the political bands which have connected them with another, and to assume among the powers of the earth, the separate and equal station to which the Laws of Nature and of Nature's God entitle them, a decent respect to the opinions of mankind requires that they should declare the causes which impel them to the separation.

We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness.--That to secure these rights, Governments are instituted among Men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed,

That whenever any Form of Government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the Right of the People to alter or to abolish it, and to institute new Government, laying its foundation on such principles and organizing its powers in such form, as to them shall seem most likely to effect their Safety and Happiness. Prudence, indeed, will dictate that Governments long established should not be changed for light and transient causes; and accordingly all experience hath shewn, that mankind are more disposed to suffer, while evils are sufferable, than to right themselves by abolishing the forms to which they are accustomed.

But when a long train of abuses and usurpations, pursuing invariably the same Object evinces a design to reduce them under absolute Despotism, it is their right, it is their duty, to throw off such Government, and to provide new Guards for their future security.--Such has been the patient sufferance of these Colonies; and such is now the necessity which constrains them to alter their former Systems of Government. The history of the present King of Great Britain is a history of repeated injuries and usurpations, all having in direct object the establishment of an absolute Tyranny over these States.”

Now our forefathers thus established the 13 united States of America – most people fail to recall that when this document was issued the emphasis was upon the States – capitalized “S” - and not the United “as in a capitalized “U” hence the States were here before any type of unity or union was forged. Such union was forged by a common cause – Independence. The following year the States – in the Congress – drafted and adopted a governing document which was called the Articles of Confederation and Perpetual Union in November of 1777.

Inside this document, it specifically states in Article 1: The Style of this Confederacy shall be "The United States of America". Then in Article 2: It reads: “Each state retains its sovereignty, freedom, and independence, and every power, jurisdiction, and right, which is not by this Confederation expressly delegated to the United States, in Congress assembled.” Thus when our forefathers formed the first governing entity to function the States were here before any governing document was agreed to. Having outlined the States to be a part of this government, all those States – all 13 – had to agree to this governing document the final State to ratify was Maryland on March 1, 1781 when the Articles of Confederation and Perpetual Union went into effect. Thus when it did, although the States were “sovereign” they could not “break” the Union thus formed, notice Article 13: "Every State shall abide by the determination of the United States in Congress assembled, on all questions which by this confederation are submitted to them. And the Articles of this Confederation shall be inviolably observed by every State, and the Union shall be perpetual; nor shall any alteration at any time hereafter be made in any of them; unless such alteration be agreed to in a Congress of the United States, and be afterwards confirmed by the legislatures of every State."

Soon after the Articles' adoption, Lord Cornwallis surrendered in October 1781. Now these States were operating under a new government while they were Independent States. That was acknowledged in the Treaty of Paris in September 1783 which officially ended our War for Independence resulted in a successful secession from the Kingdom of Great Britain.

It is interesting to note here that the Treaty begins with an acknowledgment of God's sovereignty as follows: In the name of the most holy and undivided Trinity. It having pleased the Divine Providence to dispose the hearts of the most serene and most potent Prince George the Third, by the grace of God, king of Great Britain, France, and Ireland, defender of the faith, duke of Brunswick and Lunenburg, arch-treasurer and prince elector of the Holy Roman Empire etc., and of the United States of America, to forget all past misunderstandings and differences that have unhappily interrupted the good correspondence and friendship which they mutually wish to restore, and to establish such a beneficial and satisfactory intercourse, between the two countries upon the ground of reciprocal advantages and mutual convenience as may promote and secure to both perpetual peace and harmony; and having for this desirable end already laid the foundation of peace and reconciliation by the Provisional Articles signed at Paris on the 30th of November 1782, by the commissioners empowered on each part, which articles were agreed to be inserted in and constitute the Treaty of Peace proposed to be concluded between the Crown of Great Britain and the said United States, but which treaty was not to be concluded until terms of peace should be agreed upon between Great Britain and France and his Britannic Majesty should be ready to conclude such treaty accordingly; and the treaty between Great Britain and France having since been concluded, his Britannic Majesty and the United States of America.

The first article then describes the United States of America to wit: His Britannic Majesty acknowledges the said United States, viz., New Hampshire, Massachusetts Bay, Rhode Island and Providence Plantations, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Maryland, Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina and Georgia, to be free sovereign and independent states, that he treats with them as such, and for himself, his heirs, and successors, relinquishes all claims to the

government, propriety, and territorial rights of the same and every part thereof.”

Three years later in 1786 the Congressional delegates would crave a convention to reform problems in the government and the Articles.

So it was that on May 25, 1787 the first Constitutional Convention was held. By September of that same year the delegates had re-written the entire document into the Constitution of the United States of America. Gone was the Perpetual Union; Gone was the requirement that all of the States ratify it. Instead the Constitutional Convention sought to create a better or “more perfect” as in “more complete” union. But where is Se-cession? It was the unwritten, unspoken but proper right of the Independent States.

But some of the States, when they ratified it, pushed for more protection from the government that was to operate solely upon the delegated powers granted to it, which in turn infers sovereign States “loaning” powers to the central government. Three States: Virginia, New York and Rhode Island pushed for two concessions when they ratified the Constitution: 1.) The Right of Se-cession and 2.) A Bill of Rights.

VIRGINIA June 26, 1788 - "We the Delegates of the People of Virginia duly elected in pursuance of a recommendation from the General Assembly and now met in Convention having fully and freely investigated and discussed the proceedings of the Federal Convention and being prepared as well as the most mature deliberation hath enabled us to decide thereon Do in the name and in behalf of the People of Virginia declare and make known that the powers granted under the Constitution being derived from the People of the United States may be resumed by them whensoever the same shall be perverted to their injury or oppression and that every power not granted thereby remains with them and at their will: that therefore no right of any denomination can be cancelled abridged restrained or modified by the Congress by the Senate or House of Representatives acting in any Capacity by the President or any Department or Officer of the United States except in those instances in which power is given by the Constitution for those purposes: & that among other essential rights the liberty of Conscience and of the Press cannot be cancelled abridged restrained or modified by any authority of the United States."

NEW YORK July 26, 1788 - "That the Powers of Government may be reassumed by the People, whensoever it shall become necessary to their Happiness; that every Power, Jurisdiction and right, which is not by the said Constitution clearly delegated to the Congress of the United States, or the departments of the Government thereof, remains to the People of the several States, or to their respective State Governments to whom they may have granted the same; And that those Clauses in the said Constitution, which declare, that Congress shall not have or exercise certain Powers, do not imply that Congress is entitled to any Powers not given by the said Constitution; but such Clauses are to be construed either as exceptions to certain specified Powers, or as inserted merely for greater Caution."

Finally RHODE ISLAND May 29, 1790 - "We the Delegates of the People of the State of Rhode-Island, and Providence Plantations, duly elected and met in Convention, having maturely considered the Constitution for the United States of America, agreed to on the seventeenth day of September, in the year one thousand seven hundred and eighty seven, by the Convention then assembled at Philadelphia, in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania (a Copy whereof precedes these presents) and having also seriously and deliberately considered the present situation of this State, do declare and make known: In That there are certain natural rights, of which men when they form a social compact, cannot deprive or divest their posterity, among which are the enjoyment of Life and Liberty, with the means of acquiring, possessing and protecting Property, and pursuing and obtaining happiness and safety. 2d That all power is naturally vested in, and consequently derived from the People; that magistrates therefore are their trustees and agents, and at all times

amenable to them. 3d That the powers of government may be reassumed by the people, whensoever it shall become necessary to their happiness:- That the rights of the States respectively, to nominate and appoint all State Officers, and every other power, jurisdiction and right, which is not by the said constitution clearly delegated to the Congress of the United States or to the departments of government thereof, remain to the people of the several states, or their respective State Governments to whom they may have granted the same; and that those clauses in the said constitution which declare that Congress shall not have or exercise certain powers, do not imply, that Congress is entitled to any powers not given by the said constitution, but such clauses are to be construed as exceptions to certain specified powers, or as inserted merely for greater caution."

The ratifications of the Constitution by New York, Virginia, and Rhode Island were not given conditionally upon those states being granted the right to secede by the other states. Had that been the case, the ratifications would have been invalid. Ratifications of the Constitution had to be unconditional. Those who voted to ratify the Constitution in New York, Virginia, and Rhode Island simply put into writing a right they thought naturally belonged to their respective states. The states were voluntarily joining the Union, and it was believed the same principles toward self-governance that gave states the right to join the Union also gave states the right to withdraw from the Union. That is exactly the principle was saw exercised by the several States that formed almost 30 days ago – the new Confederate States of America!

The ratifications of Virginia, New York, and Rhode Island were unanimously accepted as valid. Those states' claims to the right of secession was understood and agreed to by the other ratifiers, including George Washington who presided over the Constitutional Convention and served as a delegate from Virginia. The acceptance of these three ratifications (New York, Virginia, and Rhode Island) as valid guarantees all states the right to secede. This conclusion is based on the principle that whatever rights are held by some states must be held by all states.

Also other States might have included clauses asserting their right to secede. However, they thought it unnecessary since the Constitution did not forbid secession and because it was believed that states' rights were preserved wherever the Constitution did not expressly transfer states' powers to the new federal government. The protection of these rights among others was secured on Dec. 15, 1791, when Congress adopted and submitted to the States the first 10 Amendments to the Constitution which was called the Bill of Rights. The idea of States' Rights was incorporated into the Constitution as the Tenth Amendment which states, "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."

The belief of the Constitution's ratifiers was that the states were entering into a voluntary association as the Confederacy was still preserved only the union was no longer perpetual and it was seen that these several States thus were not giving up their sovereignty. As a matter of fact, one of the Federalist Papers #45 stated "The powers delegated by the proposed Constitution to the federal government are few and defined. Those which are to remain in the State governments are numerous and indefinite."

I have made a strenuous search through the writings and addresses of some of the Presidents and it is interesting to note that they all support Calhoun's compact theory and rejected Chief Justice John Marshall and the late Senator Daniel Webster's Indisouable Union theory.

John Adams (March 4, 1797) Also a signatory of the Treaty of Paris "The zeal and ardor of the people during the Revolutionary war, supplying the place of government, commanded a degree of order sufficient at least for the temporary preservation of society. The Confederation which was early felt to be necessary was prepared from the models of the Batavian and Helvetic confederacies, the only examples which remain with any detail and precision in history, and certainly the only ones which the people at large had ever considered.

At the time Vice-President Thomas Jefferson and future President James Madison wrote the Kentucky and Virginia resolves that protested the illegality of President John Adams' Alien and Sedition Acts. In those resolves these future presidents stated: "Resolved, that the several States composing the **United States of America**, are not united on the principles of unlimited submission to their General Government; but that by compact under the style and title of a **Constitution for the United States** and of **amendments** thereto, they constituted a General Government for special purposes, delegated to that Government certain definite powers, reserving each State to itself, the residuary mass of right to their own self Government; and that whensoever the General Government assumes undelegated powers, its acts are unauthoritative, void, and of no force; that to this compact each state acceded as a state, and is an integral party; that the Government created by this compact was not made the exclusive or final judge of the extent of the powers delegated to itself; since that would have made its discretion, and not the Constitution, the measure of its powers; but that, as in all other cases of compact among powers having no common judge, each party has an equal right to judge for itself, as well of infractions as of the mode and measure of redress."

James Madison (March 4, 1813)

And now we find them [The British], in further contempt of the modes of honorable warfare, supplying the place of a conquering force by attempts to disorganize our political society, to dismember our confederated Republic.

The next year on December 15, 1814 a convention would meet in Hartford, Connecticut and would meet until January 5, 1815. Delegates from Massachusetts, Connecticut, Rhode-Island, Vermont and New Hampshire met to address their grievances with the Madison Administration and call for Se-cession. Seems to me beloved our Yankee brethren have amnesia!

John Quincy Adams (March 4, 1825)

Since that period a population of four millions has multiplied to twelve. A territory bounded by the Mississippi has been extended from sea to sea. New States have been admitted to the Union in numbers nearly equal to those of the first Confederation.

If there have been those who doubted whether a confederated representative democracy were a government competent to the wise and orderly management of the common concerns of a mighty nation, those doubts have been dispelled;

Andrew Jackson (March 4, 1829)

As the instrument of the Federal Constitution it will devolve on me for a stated period to execute

the laws of the United States, to superintend their foreign and their confederate relations, to manage their revenue, to command their forces, and, by communications to the Legislature, to watch over and to promote their interests generally.

In such measures as I may be called on to pursue in regard to the rights of the separate States I hope to be animated by a proper respect for those sovereign members of our Union, taking care not to confound the powers they have reserved to themselves with those they have granted to the Confederacy.

Martin Van Buren (March 4, 1837)

A natural fear that the broad scope of general legislation might bear upon and unwisely control particular interests was counteracted by limits strictly drawn around the action of the Federal authority, and to the people and the States was left unimpaired their sovereign power over the innumerable subjects embraced in the internal government of a just republic, excepting such only as necessarily appertain to the concerns of the whole confederacy or its intercourse as a united community with the other nations of the world.

Our system was supposed to be adapted only to boundaries comparatively narrow. These have been widened beyond conjecture; the members of our Confederacy are already doubled, and the numbers of our people are incredibly augmented.

William Henry Harrison (March 4, 1841)

Mischievous, however, in their tendencies as collisions of this kind may be, those which arise between the respective communities which for certain purposes compose one nation are much more so, for no such nation can long exist without the careful culture of those feelings of confidence and affection which are the effective bonds to union between free and confederated states.

John Tyler (Open Letter from 2 months ago in December, 1860)

If the Free and Slave States cannot live in harmony together, and that fact be plainly established, does not the dictate of common sense admonish to a separation in peace? Better so than a perpetual state of irritation and ill-feeling. Far better than an unnatural war between the sections. What fruit is to be borne by the adoption of an opposite policy? Grant that the one section shall conquer the other, what reward will be reaped by the victor? The conqueror will walk at every step over smouldering ashes and beneath crumbling columns. States once proud and independent will no longer exist and the glory of the Union will have departed forever.

James Knox Polk (March 4, 1845)

Our Union is a confederation of independent States, whose policy is peace with each other and all the world. To enlarge its limits is to extend the dominions of peace over additional territories and increasing millions. The world has nothing to fear from military ambition in our Government.

The Republic of Texas has made known her desire to come into our Union, to form a part of our Confederacy and enjoy with us the blessings of liberty secured and guaranteed by our Constitution.

Foreign powers should therefore look on the annexation of Texas to the United States not as the conquest of a nation seeking to extend her dominions by arms and violence, but as the peaceful acquisition of a territory once her own, by adding another member to our confederation, with the consent of that member, thereby diminishing the chances of war and opening to them new and ever-increasing markets for their products.

By this system of united and confederated States our people are permitted collectively and individually to seek their own happiness in their own way, and the consequences have been most auspicious. Since the Union was formed the number of the States has increased from thirteen to twenty-eight; two of these have taken their position as members of the Confederacy within the last week.

Franklin Pierce (March 4, 1853)

The rights, security, and repose of this Confederacy reject the idea of interference or colonization on this side of the ocean by any foreign power beyond present jurisdiction as utterly inadmissible.

The dangers of a concentration of all power in the general government of a confederacy so vast as ours are too obvious to be disregarded. You have a right, therefore, to expect your agents in every department to regard strictly the limits imposed upon them by the Constitution of the United States.

I believe that involuntary servitude, as it exists in different States of this Confederacy, is recognized by the Constitution. I believe that it stands like any other admitted right, and that the States where it exists are entitled to efficient remedies to enforce the constitutional provisions.

James Buchanan (March 4, 1857)

We at present enjoy a free trade throughout our extensive and expanding country such as the world has never witnessed. This trade is conducted on railroads and canals, on noble rivers and arms of the sea, which bind together the North and the South, the East and the West, of our Confederacy. Annihilate this trade, arrest its free progress by the geographical lines of jealous and hostile States, and you destroy the prosperity and onward march of the whole and every part and involve all in one common ruin. But such considerations, important as they are in themselves, sink into insignificance when we reflect on the terrific evils which would result from disunion to every portion of the Confederacy—to the North, not more than to the South, to the East not more than to the West.

I have even scoured the records and even found that some 13 years ago, the black Republican abolitionist Abraham Lincoln said in a Speech in the United States House of Representatives on January 12, 1848: “Any people anywhere, being inclined and having the power, have the right to rise up, and shake off the existing government, and form a new one that suits them better-- This is a most valuable, -- a most sacred right -- a right, which we hope and believe, is to liberate the world-- Nor is this right confined to cases in which the whole people of an existing government, may choose to exercise it-- Any portion of the such people of an existing government that can, may

revolutionize, and make their own, of so much of the territory as they inhabit-- More than this, a majority of any portion of the such people of an existing government, -- may revolutionize, putting down a minority, intermingled with, or near about them, who may oppose their movement-- Such minority, was precisely the case, of the Tories of our own revolution."

Then I read in a paper just a few days ago, that the black Republican gave a speech in Philadelphia on February 22 and in it he said: "I have often inquired of myself, what great principle or idea it was that kept this Confederacy so long together. It was not the mere matter of the separation of the Colonies from the motherland; but that sentiment in the Declaration of Independence which gave liberty, not alone to the people of this country, but, I hope, to the world, for all future time. It was that which gave promise that in due time the weight would be lifted from the shoulders of all men. This is a sentiment embodied in the Declaration of Independence."

Yet all we have seen put forth from the incoming administration is hostility and animosity towards the new Confederacy for though Lincoln knows the United States is a Confederacy a voluntary one at that – I do not foresee he will "let Israel go" as Moses told Pharaoh.

Thus what we see then beloved that in America, due to our founding documents, there is no single governing official in this country. America's "supreme Law" does not rest with any man or any group of men. America's "supreme Law" does not rest with the President, the Congress, or even the Supreme Court. In America, the Constitution is the "supreme Law of the Land." Under our laws, every governing official publicly promises to submit to the Constitution of the United States.

This means that, in America, the "higher powers" are not the men who occupy elected office; they are the tenets and principles set forth in the U.S. Constitution. Under our laws and form of government, it is the duty of every citizen, including our elected officials, to obey the Constitution. Therefore, this is how Romans Chapter 13 reads to Americans:

"Let every soul be subject unto the [Constitution.] For there is no [Constitution] but of God: the [Constitution] that be [is] ordained of God. Whosoever therefore resisteth the [Constitution], resisteth the ordinance of God: and they that resist shall receive to themselves damnation. For [the Constitution is] not a terror to good works, but to the evil. Wilt thou then not be afraid of the [Constitution]? do that which is good, and thou shalt have praise of the same: For [the Constitution] is the minister of God to thee for good. But if thou do that which is evil, be afraid; for [the Constitution] beareth not the sword in vain: for [the Constitution] is the minister of God, a revenger to execute wrath upon him that doeth evil. Wherefore ye must needs be subject, not only for wrath, but also for conscience sake. For this cause pay ye tribute also: for [the Constitution is] God's minister, attending continually upon this very thing. Render therefore to all their dues: tribute to whom tribute is due; custom to whom custom; fear to whom fear; honour to whom honour."

What I have just shared with you – not attempting to change the Word of God but rather to apply the Word of God – that dearly beloved is exactly the proper understanding of our responsibility to civil authority in these United States, according to the teaching of Romans Chapter 13.

So it has been over the past several years that attempts by certain fanatics within the Northern States they have sought to deprive us of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.

In 1860, Governor John Ellis addressed the Democratic State Convention in Raleigh. In his speech he spoke against Senator William H. Seward – now Lincoln's Secretary of State designate. The Governor said: "What says Wm. H. Seward, above all others, the true exponent of the sentiments of the abolition party:--"The party of freedom seeks complete and universal emancipation. \* \* \* \* It (slavery) can be and must be abolished, and you and I can and must do it. \* \* \* \* It requires only to follow this simple rule of action: To do everywhere and on every occasion what we can, and not to neglect or refuse to do what we can at any time, because at that precise time and on that particular occasion, we cannot do more." Everywhere, and upon all occasions, in power and out of power, this man and his party seek, in his own language,"complete and universal emancipation." Can proof be clearer or evidence more convincing?

Of the same tenor is the notorious Rochester speech of this man, delivered ten years after the sentiment quoted: "It is an irrepressible conflict between opposing and enduring forces; and it means that the United States must and will, sooner or later, become either entirely a slaveholding nation, or entirely a free labor nation." Here, sir, is the bold announcement that a state of hostilities exists between the North and the South, which shall not cease until the one party or the other be conquered, and trodden under the feet of the victor. It is a declaration of war against the South by this man and his partizans. Give them power and it will be used in the prosecution of that war. Your Army, Navy, and a hundred million of revenue annually, and as much more as they may choose to extort from the people, will all be directed against this devoted people. But is it perfectly certain that Seward speaks the sentiments of his party?

The proof upon this point too, is clear and conclusive. In a book of infamous notoriety, which has received the full and complete approval of the black Republican party, and is now circulated by them as a campaign document, is this sentiment, among others, equally treasonable: "Our purpose is as firmly fixed as the eternal pillars of Heaven. We have determined to abolish slavery, and so help us God abolish it we will."

A Senator of the Empire State of the Union, under his own hand, endorses this book, after a careful perusal; a Governor of the same State contributes \$100 towards its circulation here among the best customers of his people. This shame, brought upon the Empire State by unworthy sons and faithless public officers, is destined, I trust, to be gloriously wiped out by the Democracy in the coming contest, when the land of Silas Wright will once more stand proudly forth among the States of the Union, without a spot or a stain upon her escutcheon.

Is further proof wanted of the designs of these men? Does the tragedy of Harper's Ferry teach us nothing? when traitors and assassins found men to lament their failure and mourn their discomfiture; when the graves of executed felons drew forth copious tears, as though one distinguished for patriotic service to the country had fallen!

But the apologists of this man Seward and his followers, boast that we have Constitutional guaranties that will protect our property, even though he or one of his associates be elected President and the Abolitionists placed in power. What, the Constitution stand in the way of the Abolitionists! What says this same Mr. Seward on that point? Hear his admonitions to some of his more innocent followers, who really thought, in the simplicity of their hearts, that the Constitution of the United States did possess some binding force: "Correct your own error that slavery has any Constitutional guaranty which may not be released and ought not to be relinquished." Think you that the Constitution would bind the conscience of a man entertaining such sentiments? Does not all the world know, too, that one of the cardinal articles of the Abolition creed is, that there is a law higher than the Constitution, which claims their first allegiance?

Have not more than a dozen States, where these men now predominate, adopted laws nullifying

an important clause of the Constitution? Can we hope that men will respect our rights of property, who incite, aid and abet the murderers of our citizens? Expect assassins to keep faith or traitors to observe oaths? Let us not be deceived, my fellow-citizens, in a matter so nearly affecting our personal security and most sacred rights.”

There are many of us in the South that have sought to end slavery, yet it was slowed by the Yankee black Abolitionists stirring the slaves to revolt as they did some years ago under Nat Turner and more recently under John Brown. Even the evil Transcendentalist Ralph Waldo Emerson who was acquainted in advance with Brown's Virginia plot, gave a speech at Boston's Music Hall on November 8, 1859 while the murdering abolitionist Brown was under sentence of death. In that speech entitled “courage” Emerson spoke of this murderer as ‘that new saint than whom none purer or more brave was ever led by love of men into conflict and death,—the new saint awaiting his martyrdom, and who, if he shall suffer, will make the gallows glorious like the cross.” DO you hear that beloved! Such blasphemy! Such evil! Such efforts of this Abolitionists have thwarted the many efforts of Southern Emancipationists – such as Randolph's plan in Virginia during the 1830s – as many had to forego teaching the slaves reading and writing due to the flurry of murderous pamphlets inudating our States and hence our people were forced to implement a stronger militia to defend ourselves against the black abolitionist fanaticism calling for bloodshed.

Yet, in a move that is so strange and hypocritical to ther Cause, the Yankee Black Abolitionists have gained enough votes – 133-65 on February 28 to pass the Republican Thomas Corwin's proposed 13<sup>th</sup> Amendment to send to the Senate. This Amendment would preserve slavery forever, It is rumored that the Senate will pass it and send it to the States for ratification. I hear that this has been done to coax our seceded brethren back into the Union! Yet, the majority of Southern Congressmen from these seceded States were still there – who did not leave until February 21 – did not vote, speak in favour of, or ratify this Amendment. Hence the refusal by our Southern legislators should show the world that what our States have seceded over is not the preservation of African Slavery but the preservation of ALL of our lives and our embattled rights as given in the Constitution.

Not only have these Yankee attacks been made upon our lives and our liberties but also we find that since the early part of our governmental operation the Representatives from the Northern States have controlled the US House of Representatives and as such have controlled the spending of funds from the public Treasury. With the admission of a Northern State, our men would cry out for a Southern State (and vice versa) to preserve our ability in the US Senate to block the runaway Yankee spending. So it was in this last election of 1860, the Northern States were able to elect 6 more Senators thus giving them control of the Senate now. With the House and Senate under their control, and tomorrow, the preseidency is there any wonder left what impeachable and unconstitutional offenses will be levelled against the several states of this Union.

Seeing then that the North has abandoned all reason, having largely departed from the Christian faith and having marched into Abolitionism, Natural Selectionism, Atheism, Industrialism, Mormonism, Trascendentalism, Feminism, Vegetarianism and other such Fanaticisms and the like, I stand stupefied that tomorrow to know that these heathens are then ignaugurating the very party and leadership that essentially has sworn to upend and uproot all manner of our Constitutional liberties and if need be to accomplish their stated desires – to end our lives.

So in viewing that, we of the South, have seen radicals attempt to destroy our Rights, take away our Property, murder us in our beds and now with the ascendancy of such an evil despotic power now in control of all 3 branches of government, there was no recourse left to the Southern States but to secede. Indeed beloved that is exactly the last two cries of se-cession that we find mentioned

within the Holy Bible in the Second Epistle of the Apostle Paul to the Corinthians in Chapter 6 and verse 17: "Wherefore come out from among them, and be ye separate, saith the Lord, and touch not the unclean thing; and I will receive you," and lastly we have the voice from Heaven as recorded by Saint John the Revelator in the eighteenth Chapter and 4<sup>th</sup> verse of the Apocalypse: "And I heard another voice from heaven, saying, Come out of her, my people, that ye be not partakers of her sins, and that ye receive not of her plagues."

So beloved seeing the crisis the United States is about to inaugurate tomorrow on March 4, 1861 I could not abide this silently. I urge you to pray for peace and that the leaders of our State will remain vigilant and protect our rights – even if it should come to our State (I pray it will be soon) casting her lot with the new Southern Confederacy by passing our own Ordinance of Se-cession!

So beloved, today you to are being called to a secession convention. You see the Bible tells us that we are all sinners: Romans 3:10 As it is written, there is none righteous, no, not one, in Romans 3:23 it says: "For all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God." Then Romans 5:12 tells us: "Wherefore, as by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned:" Thus there are wages that go along with one being a sinner - Romans 6:23a decalres: "For the wages of sin is death" That ultimately means I will be sperated from God for Eternity first in Hell and then in the Lake of Fire.

The good news is that Romans 5:8 But God commendeth his love toward us, in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us!" Why is that? Because 2 Peter 3:9 The Lord is not slack concerning his promise, as some men count slackness; but is longsuffering to us-ward, not willing that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance." God doesn't want anyone to die and go to Hell. He wants you to be saved.

Colossians 1:12-14 tells us where we were and where we can be: "Giving thanks unto the Father, which hath made us meet to be partakers of the inheritance of the saints in light: 13 Who hath delivered us from the power of darkness, and hath translated us into the kingdom of his dear Son: 14 In whom we have redemption through his blood, even the forgiveness of sins:"

Did you see that? When we are lost we are a aprt of Satan's kingdom of darkness. So God wants you to secede and to be "delivered from the power of darkness" and become a partaker of the inheritance of the saints! If you are ready to secede from Satan's kingdom and join God's Kingdom the Bible tells us in Romans 10:13 For whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved." So then we must call upon the Lord Jesus Christ to be our Ordinance of Secession! Romans 10:9-10 tells us: That if thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and shalt believe in thine heart that God hath raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved. 10 For with the heart man believeth unto righteousness; and with the mouth confession is made unto salvation."

---

If you asked God into your heart would you let me know? You can contact me via [www.sermonaudio.com/danieltown](http://www.sermonaudio.com/danieltown) or by my email address at [creiglovelace@gmail.com](mailto:creiglovelace@gmail.com)

Before I conclude, I want you to understand that on March 4, 1861 Abraham Lincoln, would indeed take the oath of office and declare that he was going to go against the standard understanding of the union as a compact – a fact he himself had even agreed with as late as February 1861! Lincoln said: "I hold that, in contemplation of universal law and of the Constitution, the Union of these States is perpetual. Perpetuity is implied, if not expressed, in the fundamental law of all national governments. It is safe to assert that no government proper ever

had a provision in its organic law for its own termination. Continue to execute all the express provisions of our National Constitution, and the Union will endure forever—it being impossible to destroy it except by some action not provided for in the instrument itself.” That was his belief, but believing the grass is purple does not make it so!

Also Lincoln explicitly stated that he had no objection to the proposed Corwin Amendment to the Constitution, which was approved by both houses of the United States Congress. Remember that amendment would have formally protected slavery forever. Interestingly enough, Ohio ratified it on May 13, 1861; Maryland Ratified it on January 10, 1862 and Illinois ratified it on February 14, 1862.

One Virginia Congressman John B. Baldwin asked Lincoln if he would let the South go in peace? To which Lincoln is stated to have replied: ***“what about the revenue? What would I do about the collection of duties?”*** Lincoln had indeed promised in his inaugural: “The power confided to me will be used to hold, occupy, and possess the property and places belonging to the government, and to collect the duties and imposts; but beyond what may be necessary for these objects, there will be no invasion, no using of force against or among the people anywhere.” Yet on April 8, 1861 he sent the Revenue Cutter Harriet Lane to purportedly re-supply Fort Sumter – yet it was coming with the Warships: Powhatan, Pawnee and Pocahontas. President Davis was alerted and on April 9 sent word to Governor Pickens that a Naval Invasion force was bearing down on Charleston.

Thus on April 12 Confederate forces forcibly ejected (without loss of life) the foreign troops on their soil with the bombardment of Fort Sumter. Such actions played into Lincoln the politician trickers' hands so that now the South could be seen as an aggressor. Yet such action was mere self defense. Lincoln then called for 75,000 volunteers to put down what he termed “the rebellion” and also proclaimed a blockade – which according to the Paris Declaration of Maritime Law of April 1856. Hence with this unofficial declaration of war and the raising of an Invading army, Virginia, Tennessee and Arkansas would secede from the Union.

Governor Ellis of North Carolina would wire the US Secretary of War on April 15, 1861 the following: “I can be no party to this wicked violation of the laws of the country and to this war upon the liberties of a free people. You can get no troops from North Carolina.” The same day he would call the general assembly to action; on May 13 special elections were held to elect delegates to a secession convention to be held on May 20, 1861. With a unanimous vote 117 – 0 the delegates passed AN ORDINANCE to dissolve the union between the State of North Carolina and the other States united with her, under the compact of government entitled "The Constitution of the United States."

We, the people of the State of North Carolina in convention assembled, do declare and ordain, and it is hereby declared and ordained, That the ordinance adopted by the State of North Carolina in the convention of 1789, whereby the Constitution of the United States was ratified and adopted, and also all acts and parts of acts of the General Assembly ratifying and adopting amendments to the said Constitution, are hereby repealed, rescinded, and abrogated.

We do further declare and ordain, That the union now subsisting between the State of North Carolina and the other States, under the title of the United States of America, is hereby dissolved, and that the State of North Carolina is in full possession and exercise of all those rights of sovereignty which belong and appertain to a free and independent State.

With that act North Carolina acted to defend her citizens and liberties during the War of Northern Aggression – which was for us in the South a Just War because the war was defensive in nature

against Northern aggression; the legitimate leaders of the government were in power; and the Southern states waged the war to establish peace. The Bible does allow for this war because the war was a just war, and the Christians at the time remained in submission to the governing authority, which was defending against Northern aggression (Rom, 13:1-2).

Four harrowing years later the toll upon the South was horrific. North Carolina which had a military age male population of 115,000, furnished during the bloody sadly unsuccessful war for our independence 127,000 Confederate Soldiers. In Rutherford County, we furnished 1,981 of that number. Some 40,375 Tar-Heels lost their lives.

Some believe that with such Supreme Court cases a Texas v. White (1869) that Secession was unconstitutional – well if you had just spent Billions of Dollars and ultimately the economic collapse of the South and saw over 750,000 dead would you want to say that you were in the wrong going to war to conquer another nation? This is why President Jefferson Davis was never tried for treason – his and the South's argument that secession was (and is) legal would triumph. People ask me did God approve of Secession? I say what do you mean did He? He still does.

Looking at the situation of the Empire of the United States of America today in 2015 we see that:

In 1962 Prayer was taken out of school; in 1963 Bible reading was taken out of school. In 1973 Abortion – the murder of innocents was legalized. In Gun Control advocates have pushed for the removal of our rights. In 2015 the supreme court legalized Sodomy but this is nothing new for in 1997 Jo Ann Knight was fired by the Connecticut Department of Public Health after she counseled a homosexual couple from the Bible about salvation and about the necessity of repenting of sin.

In April 2014, Brendan Eich was forced to resign as CEO of Mozilla (maker of the popular web browser Firefox) because of his support for traditional marriage. In 2008, he contributed \$1,000 to back California's Proposition 8 referendum which sought to define marriage as between a man and a woman.

The Lord Jesus Christ likened the last days to that of Sodom and Gomorrah (Luke 17:28-30). And the apostle Paul prophesied: "This know also, that in the last days perilous times shall come. For men shall be lovers of their own selves, covetous, boasters, proud, blasphemers, disobedient to parents, unthankful, unholy, Without natural affection, trucebreakers, false accusers, incontinent, fierce, despisers of those that are good, Traitors, heady, highminded, lovers of pleasures more than lovers of God; Having a form of godliness, but denying the power thereof: from such turn away" (2 Timothy 3:1-5).

We are not surprised at the wickedness that is sweeping across the world, but it is our responsibility to take a stand for God's Word until Jesus comes. Even though I am standing for Christ as are others the words of the Lord keep ringing in my ears, those words of His that form His last thoughts about Secession: in 2 Corinthians 6:17 "Wherefore come out from among them, and be ye separate, saith the Lord, and touch not the unclean thing; and I will receive you," and Revelation 18:4 "And I heard another voice from heaven, saying, Come out of her, my people, that ye be not partakers of her sins, and that ye receive not of her plagues." I cannot say what you or others must do but I will say this from Joshua 24:15 in closing: "And if it seem evil unto you to serve the LORD, choose you this day whom ye will serve; whether the gods which your fathers served that were on the other side of the flood, or the gods of the Amorites, in whose land ye dwell: but as for me and my house, we will serve the LORD."